

Citizen Satisfaction and Officer Understanding of Citizen Expectations: A Quantitative
and Observational Analysis

by

Analisa Gagnon

A Dissertation Presented in Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved July 2020 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee

Kate Fox, Chair
Cody Telep
Alyssa Chamberlain

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

August 2020

ABSTRACT

Scholars have extensively researched citizens' preferences regarding the actions, language, and demeanors displayed by officers during citizen-police interactions. Specifically, there are a multitude of factors that can influence a citizens' perception of such interactions as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. What appears to be missing from the literature, however, is police officers' understanding of citizens' preferences for regarding factors. In other words, it is unclear if and how officers are actively attempting to interact with victims and witnesses based on actual citizen preferences or if officers do not consider these preferences during citizen interactions. This gap has important implications for officer training on citizen's preferences due to the influence such interactions can have on citizens, specifically citizens' physical and psychological well-being, as well as citizens' perceptions of - and reaction to - the criminal justice system. This project examines original data collection of citizen and officer surveys regarding officers' actions, language, and demeanors. Additionally, observations during ride-alongs are presented to expand on the current literature regarding citizen preferences during interactions with the police and to assess officers' understanding and application of this knowledge. Results indicate that, while officers seem to understand what actions, language, and demeanors will increase citizen satisfaction, officers may believe that there exist situational factors that are more important in affecting citizen satisfaction with officers. Observations revealed that the vast majority of citizen-police interactions were positive and productive. Even so, results from the surveys and observations point to several important policy implications for improvement between officers and citizens.

To Adam Lusk

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I want to extend my thanks to my partner, Adam Lusk, without whose constant and unwavering encouragement, love, and support none of this would be possible. I am “down” for whatever comes next as long as you are there by my side. I also want to thank my family (Alan, Teresa, and Emilee Gagnon, Frank Oberle, Shirley and Dennis Payne, Jan and Garmon Whitenack, along with so many other extended family members) who always pushed me and believed in my potential.

I, of course, would be remiss to not thank my dissertation committee. To Kate Fox, I have no words for the support, help, and – probably most importantly – patience you have given to me over the years. I cannot thank you enough for your guidance. My other committee members, Cody Telep and Alyssa Chamberlain, have also been an amazing help throughout this project. Cody, your insights into the world of policing are something I know I will carry with me throughout my career. Alyssa, thank you for being so generous in offering your assistance and expertise in this project. I also would like to thank Bill Terrill for his early contributions to the project. I would further like to thank my past mentors, especially Dan Martinez, Rachel Stein, and Jeri Kirby, who helped an early law enforcement-hopeful to realize the excitement that is academia. Also, I extend a special thank you to Shannon Stewart for all of her help over the past six years.

To my friends who knew me before graduate school, thank you for sticking by me then and supporting me now. I hold a special place in my heart for the friends I have made during my time at ASU. To my cohort and my fellow graduate classmates, you shaped not only my academic interests, you helped me grow as a person. I also would like to acknowledge my Oz family: you kept me happy, you kept me sane.

I want to end by thanking two groups without which this project would not be what it is today: The International Summer School for Policing School at George Mason and the men and women of Prince George's County, Maryland. To the International Summer School for Policing School at George Mason and its patrons, thank you for the priceless knowledge that you gave me. As a victimologist with an interest in citizen-police interactions, your welcoming nature was much appreciated, and I cannot wait to see what the future holds for us all. To the men and women of Prince George's County, both officers and citizens, thank you for your willingness to participate in a project intent on giving a voice to both sides with the hope of improving the lives of victims and witnesses of crime. A special thank you to Sergeant Dave Vastag and the employees of the Evidence Unit; your inside knowledge and ever-present interest in helping gave me that foot in the door that is, at times, elusive to us researchers.

Thank you all!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Citizen Satisfaction with Police Interactions	5
Importance of Victim Satisfaction	15
Current Study	20
3 DATA AND METHODS	21
Research Questions	21
The Research Design.....	21
4 RESULTS	42
Descriptive Statistics	42
Univariate Results	46
Observation Results.....	54
5 CONCLUSIONS.....	64
Discussion.....	64
Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research	73
Final Thoughts	83

	Page
CHAPTER	
REFERENCES	85
APPENDIX	
A MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING	101
B OFFICER ATTITUDES, LANGUAGE, AND DEMEANOR (OALDS)	103
C CITIZEN ACTION, LANGUAGE, DEMEANOR SURVEY (CALDS)	11010
D OBSERVER WORKBOOK.....	11818
E IRB STUDY APPROVAL	12222
F OFFICER CONSENT FORM.....	12525
G CITIZEN CONSENT FORM.....	12727
H RIDE-ALONG PROGRAM APPLICATION AND GENERAL RELEASE	12929
I TABLE 5.....	13434
J TABLE 6.....	13737
K TABLE 7	14040
L TABLE 8.....	14343
M TABLE 9.....	14646
N TABLE 10	14949

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Descriptive Statistics Among Citizen Respondents.....	43
2. Descriptive Characteristics of the Calls for Service as Reported in the CALDS...	44
3. Descriptive statistics among officer respondents.....	45
4. Citizen Satisfaction with Officers Overall.....	47
5. Descriptive Statistics of Citizens’ Perceptions of the Effects of Officer’s Actions on Their Satisfaction.....	123
6. Descriptive Statistics of Citizens’ Perceptions of the Effects of Officer’s Language on Their Satisfaction.....	125
7. Descriptive Statistics of Citizens’ Perceptions of the Effects of Officer’s Demeanors on Their Satisfaction.....	127
8. Descriptive Statistics of Officer’s Perceptions of the Effects of Their Actions on Citizens’ Satisfaction.....	129
9. Descriptive Statistics of Officer’s Perceptions of the Effects of Their Language on Citizens’ Satisfaction	131
10. Descriptive Statistics of Officer’s Perceptions of the Effects of Their Demeanors on Citizens’ Satisfaction	133
11. Observed Frequency of the Actions Displayed by the Officers.....	57
12. Observed Frequency of the Language Displayed by the Officers.....	58
13. Observed Frequency of the Demeanors Displayed by the Officers.....	61

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Now, more than ever, law enforcement agencies are being met with widespread backlash of centuries of systemic oppression, misuse of force, and killings of people of color. While this study took place before the killing of George Floyd and the resulting protests, it is nonetheless imperative to point out the importance of these current events due to the reality of systemic violence that people of color still face at the hands of law enforcement. The current events further highlight the importance of evaluating and addressing areas of improvement and reform that law enforcement agencies so desperately need, especially when it comes to improving citizens' perceptions of and satisfaction with officers.

In the United States, police officers are considered the gatekeepers of the criminal justice system (Bradley, 2009; Buzawa & Buzawa, 1996; Buzawa & Buzawa, 2003; Frazier & Haney, 1996; Kerstetter, 1990; Rosenbaum, 1987). This means that the police are the first point of contact that victims and witnesses have when a crime has been reported. Indeed, the majority of crimes that police respond to are initiated by a victim or witness (Crank, 2014). Whether or not these interactions are perceived as satisfactory can have major effects on many people, namely victims, witnesses, and the various actors in the criminal justice system. For example, a citizen's perception of an interaction with police as positive can improve their physical and psychological recovery as well as increase their likelihood of cooperating with the investigation and later parts of the criminal justice process (APA, 2013; Hilden et al., 2004). Based on officers' knowledge of this effect coupled with the training they receive, the (1) actions, (2) language, and (3)

demeanors they display when interacting with citizens may vary, resulting in some officers experiencing higher satisfaction ratings from citizens. Demeanor can sometimes encompass the other two factors. For the purposes of this paper, demeanor specifically refers to the citizens' interpretation of the officers' attitude. This will be discussed in greater detail below.

Due to the importance of citizen-police interactions, and the fact that the majority of work that police officers find themselves engaging in is public order maintenance (Bittner, 1967; Thacher, 2003; Wilson, 1978), it is important to adequately and thoroughly train police officers in positive communication techniques (Lum et al., 2012). Notably, there exists *no standard of training* for police officers in the United States (Connolly, 2008). While this project does not intend to imply that there should be a reduction in other types of training (e.g. defense, vehicle, firearm, or health and fitness training), it would appear that police academies may be failing to focus enough attention on the everyday conflict de-escalation skills that are so vital to successful interactions with citizens. To be sure, extant literature does not provide clear guidance on a preferred balance of communication and “physical” skills training. Indeed, the extant literature on police training, in general, is scarce and under-developed (Mazeika et al., 2010; Skogan & Frydl, 2004; Skogan, Van Craen, & Hennessy, 2015; Telep 2016).

While there is literature to suggest what *actions, language, and demeanors* citizens prefer officers display during citizen-police interactions, there is little to no research addressing if the actions, language, and demeanors officers' display reflect citizens' preferences. For example, citizens express greater satisfaction with police interactions when the officer responds to the scene quickly, when officers provide

information regarding victim services, and when officers provide comfort (Brandl & Horvath, 1991; Hirschel, Lumb, & Johnson, 1998; Percy, 1980; Skogan, 2005). The missing link in the literature, then, becomes whether the officer is aware of these citizen preferences and how they are utilizing this knowledge to increase citizen satisfaction during these interactions.

The current study addresses gaps in knowledge about citizens' and police officers' perceptions of (1) actions, (2) language, and (3) demeanors displayed by officers during a citizen-police interaction. This research contributes to the criminal justice discipline by (a) expanding the literature regarding citizen satisfaction with police interactions and (b) addressing the potential discrepancies that may exist between what officers believe affects citizens' satisfaction with police interactions versus what actually affects citizens' satisfaction. This project involves original data collection including (1) self-administered surveys of active-duty police officers, (2) self-administered surveys of citizens that have an interaction with police (i.e. victims and witnesses, not suspects), and (3) field observations of citizen-police encounters. During ride-alongs, police officers completed a self-administered survey about their overall (a) actions, (b) language, and (c) demeanors and how they believed these affect citizens' satisfaction with police interactions. Specifically, officers were asked to indicate from a list of actions, languages, and demeanors which they actively attempt to display during any given citizen-police encounter and what effect such displays have on citizens' satisfaction with a citizen-police interaction. A similar survey was given to the citizens encountered by the officer. The citizen was asked to assess the same indicators of police officers' (a) actions, (b) language, and (c) demeanors and how those factors increased, decreased, or had no effect

on their satisfaction with that specific officer. Finally, the field observations consisted of detailed notetaking of the interactions between each police officer and the citizens they encountered.

The dissertation is organized as follows: the next chapter (Chapter Two) provides a review of the extant literature on citizen satisfaction with police and how this affects themselves, as well as personnel employed in the criminal justice system. Chapter Three describes the methodology of the project. Chapter Four presents the results regarding (1) satisfaction (a) actions, (b) language, and (c) demeanors as perceived by both officers and citizens. Chapter Five provides a summary of the results, implications for theory and policy application, generalizability and limitations, and suggestions for future research on citizen-police interactions. Finally, the Appendix contains copies of the memo of understanding from the participating police department, surveys (for both citizens and officers), observer workbook, Institutional Review Board (IRB) study approval, participation consent forms, ride-along application and release form, and several other pieces of information presented in table format.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following literature review is organized as follows: the first section will review the extant literature on what actions, language, and demeanors officers display which can increase or decrease citizens' satisfaction with a citizen-police interaction. Second, the literature review will then provide information as to why increasing citizen satisfaction with police interactions is important for both citizens and the criminal justice system overall.

Citizen Satisfaction with Police Interactions

One way through which victims' experiences are often affected is through their interaction with the police. The importance of this interaction is compounded by the fact that the police are often the first point of contact for citizens with the criminal justice system. This has led to the coining of the term "gatekeepers of the criminal justice system" for law enforcement personnel. This is important to consider as individuals experience a plethora of effects as the result of victimization. For example, citizens who experience a crime (either directly as a victim or indirectly as a witness to the event) can experience a multitude of physical and psychological side-effects as a result of the crime (APA, 2013; Breslau et al., 1998; Brewin, Andrew, & Rose, 2000; Hilden et al., 2004; Paras et al., 2009; Wilson et al., 2011). The following discusses citizens' satisfaction with police officers' (1) actions, (2) language, and (3) demeanors. For the purposes of this study, satisfaction is defined as a positive view of the police officer's actions, language, and demeanors during their interaction. Further, it is acknowledged that demeanor can, at times, be confounded with actions and language. For the purposes of this study,

demeanor reflects the citizen's perception of the attitude displayed by the officer. This is discussed in greater detail below.

Police Officers' Actions

Naturally, police officers take many actions before and during an interaction with a citizen. For example, officers may perform any of the following actions: travel to the scene, conduct interviews, investigate the scene, provide emotional support to victims, or make an arrest. Each of these actions has its own role in increasing – or decreasing – victim satisfaction.

One important factor that increases victim satisfaction is the **time it takes an officer to arrive to a scene** once a call for service has been placed. A quick response time has been found to increase victim satisfaction with the police (Brandl & Horvath, 1991; Percy, 1980; Skogan, 2005). However, some evidence suggests that victims' *perception* of response time – not *actual* response time – is more influential for victims' satisfaction with the police (Brown & Coulter, 1983). A quick response time is interpreted by citizens as a greater effort made by the police (Skogan, 2005). A quick response time to calls for service is further believed to increase the sense of community safety, the likelihood of criminal identification and arrest, and belief in police officer effectiveness (Pate et al., 1976).

Another action that can affect victim satisfaction is the way in which the officer conducts an **active investigation** (e.g., canvassing the scene and interviewing witnesses). Victims' perceptions of officers' time and effort spent investigating affect victim's satisfaction with their interaction with police (Hirschel, Lumb, & Johnson, 1998; Koster et al., 2018; McNamara, 1967; Reisig & Strohshine, 2001; Skogan, 2005). Specifically,

when a citizen perceives that an officer spent a lot of time investigating their claims, their satisfaction with that officer increases. These results appear to hold for people who voluntarily called the police as well as those who did not (Ekblom & Heal, 1982; Reisig & Stroshine, 2001; Skogan, 1990).

Further, the act of **providing emotional comfort to victims** has been found to increase satisfaction with a police interaction (Callanan et al., 2012; Foley & Terrill, 2008; Kelly, 1984; Murray, 1982; Rook, 1982). Comforting victims is often considered to be an essential service expected of the police (Mastrofski, 1999). The only time providing comfort appears to result in an unsatisfying interaction is when the timing of the provision of comfort is perceived as out of place (Glauser & Tullar, 1985). That is, officers tend to prioritize law enforcement tasks before providing comfort, which can result in a victim's perception that the officer will not provide comfort at any point during the interaction.

Finally, the **arrest of the offender** can influence a victim's satisfaction with a police encounter. As research on the topic continues to grow, it is increasingly more apparent that the decision to make an arrest will increase satisfaction for some victims, but decrease satisfaction for others (Brandl & Horvath, 1991; Chandek, 1999; Percy, 1980; Wilson & Jasinski, 2004; Yegidis & Renzy, 1994). This mixed finding is most likely due to the differing expectations of victims. That is, victims report greater satisfaction with the police if the officer makes the arrest decision in-line with the victims' preferences (Buzawa et al., 1992; Erez & Tontodonato, 1992). Indeed, victims' personal experiences do individually shape their preferences for police action (Robinson & Stroshine, 2005). In all, officers' actions have the potential to greatly increase or

decrease citizen satisfaction with a citizen-police interaction. These actions can occur during - and even before - the officer has made contact with the citizen.

Police Officers' Language

In addition to what police officers *do* (actions) during calls for service, there are things that police officers *say* (language) that also affects victims' satisfaction with police. For example, some officers may discuss available services with victims, inform victims about the next steps in the criminal justice system, or ask the victims questions about the crime. Like with police actions, police language also plays an important role in increasing – or decreasing – victim satisfaction.

Police officers provide victims with much information. For example, a police officer will ideally **tell the victim about available victim services** (Brown, 1984; Kesteren, Dijk, & Mayhew, 2014; Martin, 1997; Sims, Yost, & Abbott, 2005). Such services include mental health counseling, victim advocacy, or medical treatment. Similarly, victims are more likely to report being satisfied with the interaction if the officer told them about safety measures they could take to protect themselves in the future (Dugan, Nagin, & Rosenfeld, 2003; Johnson, 2007; Watson, 2014). Such measures include filing for protection orders or going to a domestic violence shelter. Once again, both of these factors were greatly impacted by whether the victim wanted such referrals (Apsler, Cummins, & Carl, 2003; Robinson & Stroshine, 2005).

Also important to victims is **being informed about the next steps in the criminal justice system** (Ekman & Seng, 2009; Friedman, 1985; Johnson, 2007; Kennedy & Homant, 1983). Many victims do not know what occurs after filing a police report, or what might happen to an arrested offender. Victims are also often unsure of the

proceedings and expectations if the case moves through the court system. As such, many victims have questions concerning the entire criminal justice process (Strang & Sherman, 1997). When officers ask the victim if they have any questions about the impending process, this further increases victim satisfaction with the interaction (Hodgson, 2005). In other words, victims are more satisfied with the police when they are provided with information about what to expect and allowed to ask questions about the next steps in the criminal justice system.

Avoiding victim-blaming questions is important when officers are interviewing citizens. Specifically, officers who use victim-blaming language decrease victims' satisfaction with the interaction (Hart, 1993; Holmstrom & Burgess, 2017; Laxminarayan, 2012). Officers may intentionally or inadvertently contribute to victim-blaming when officers question the victims' actions or choices. For example, asking a victim questions such as "What were you wearing?", "Were you drunk?", or "Do you often leave the door unlocked?" negatively impacts victims' perceptions of the police. Conversely, officers who use encouraging and reassuring phrases such as "You did the right thing by contacting the police" increase victim satisfaction (Myhill & Bradford, 2012; Percy, 1980). Further, officers who use profanity have negative effects on perceptions of the police (Baseheart & Cox, 1993; Patton et al., 2017).

In all, an officer's language has the potential to greatly increase or decrease citizen satisfaction with a citizen-police interaction. Such language includes that which the officer does and does not say to the citizen.

Police Officers' Demeanor

In addition to what police officers *do* (actions) and *say* (language), there are things that police officers *display* (demeanors) that affect citizens' satisfaction with police. Note, there are actions and languages that may appear to overlap with demeanor. The main difference is that demeanor reflects the citizen's perceptions of the officer's attitude during the interaction (Brandl, Frank, Wooldredge, & Watkins, 1997; Engel, 2005; Jones, 2007; Webb & Marshall, 1995). In other words, citizens' *perceptions* of an officer's actions and language have direct effects on their satisfaction ratings of interactions with that officer. For example, citizens will rate an interaction as more satisfactory if they perceive the officer's actions and language as professional, fair, and attentive as detailed below.

Police officer's demeanor is important when interacting with a citizen. The way officers present themselves to the citizen can have significant impacts on satisfaction levels for citizens' interactions with the police. For example, citizens report higher levels of satisfaction after interacting with officers who were **respectful** (e.g. attentive, courteous, or polite) (Bradford, Stanko, & Jackson, 2009; Tewksbury & West, 2001). Respectful behavior towards citizens improves citizen satisfaction through increasing trust and confidence in the police force.

Another quality that increases citizen satisfaction is if the officer **appeared rushed or not** (Stroshine, 1999). Officers can display this demeanor by taking their time with the citizen. Officers who do not rush their investigations or interviews can increase citizens' satisfaction because devoting adequate time to citizens communicates that their problems are important and worthwhile. Similarly, officers who also received high

satisfaction ratings from victims made an effort to **appear that they were listening** by maintaining eye contact or nodding their head (Butterworth & Westmarland, 2015; Hinds, 2009; Robinson & Strohshine, 2005; Skogan, 2005; Strohshine, 1999; Winkel & Vrij, 1990).

Citizens are also more satisfied with police interactions if the officer **appears to believe the citizen**. Blaming the victim or acting on stereotypes about “true victims” are some ways in which citizens can interpret an officer as not believing them (Campbell et al., 2001; Madigan & Gamble, 1991). Examples of officers blaming victims include asking victims questions about the way they were dressed or how much they had to drink. Examples of officers not believing the victim can be interpreted through dismissive or laissez-faire investigating. Acting on stereotypes about “true victims” can include the officer viewing the event as non-criminal because weapons were not used or the victim and offender were in an intimate relationship (Estrich, 1987; Venema, 2016). As was mentioned in the previous section, feeling blamed, perceiving a lack of active investigation, and not being believed can all lead to citizens’ dissatisfaction with the police.

Citizens also report increased satisfaction with police interactions when they perceive that the officer **showed concern and an interest in helping the victim** (Skogan, 2005; Skogan, 2006; Tewksbury & West, 2001). Showing concern and an interest in helping can be displayed by officers in the forms of several of the previously mentioned actions and languages. For instance, officers who ask about injuries and provide information about safety measures that the citizen can take typically receive higher satisfaction ratings (Tewksbury & West, 2001). Concern and helpfulness can also be

displayed through asking questions about the incident, providing referrals, or explaining the next steps in the criminal justice system to the citizen.

Finally, officers who were perceived as **honest** and **fair** were also given high satisfaction ratings by victims (Hickman & Sampson, 2003; Skogan, 2005; Skogan, 2006; Tyler, 2005). Honesty and fairness can also be displayed by officers in the form of several of the previously mentioned actions and languages. For instance, officers who acknowledge citizen preference (such as in arrest decision-making) and explain why certain actions can or cannot be taken typically receive higher satisfaction ratings (Skogan, 2005; Tyler, 1990). These factors can also be displayed by treating all citizens the same, especially in terms of race differences (Hickman & Sampson, 2003; Tyler, 2005).

In all, an officer's demeanor has the potential to greatly increase or decrease citizen satisfaction with a citizen-police interaction. This factor is much more difficult for officers to self-evaluate as it is based solely on the citizen's perception of the officer's attitude.

Effects of Citizen Demographics

There are numerous factors that are outside of officers' control which still affect citizens' satisfaction with the police. Specifically, these factors are demographic characteristics held by the citizens themselves (i.e. race, gender, age, income, and education). This section gives a review of the way in which these factors have been found to affect citizens' satisfaction ratings of the police.

As has been recently demonstrated by the resurgence of killing of Black people by law enforcement, **race** has been found to be a significant predictor for satisfaction

with the police. More specifically, White individuals are more likely to report significantly higher satisfaction with the police than Black or Hispanic individuals (Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996; Garcia & Cao, 2005; Wu, Sun, & Triplett, 2009). White individuals also report significantly higher satisfaction with police response time, police services, confidence in the police, and perceived police protection than Black individuals (Brown & Coulter, 1983; Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996; Skogan, 2005). Further, compared to Black and Hispanic individuals, White individuals are significantly more likely to report perceived fairness and officers taking the time to explain the situation to the citizen (Skogan, 2005). In a study surveying citizens' satisfaction with police officers by utilizing demeanor (e.g. respect, friendly, concerned) and characteristic (e.g. honest, hardworking, well trained) scales, Black and Hispanic individuals reported significantly lower satisfaction with both officers' demeanors and officers' characteristics than White individuals reported (Webb & Marshall, 1995).

However, **neighborhood demographics** may also alter the effect of these findings. Black individuals in higher income neighborhoods report higher satisfaction with the police than White individuals in higher income neighborhoods (Wu, Sun, & Triplett, 2009). Further, White and Black individuals in lower income neighborhoods express equal rates of satisfaction with the police. Similarly, Black and White individuals in suburban areas report higher satisfaction with the police than those who live in the city (Kusow, Wilson, & Martin, 1997). Race-based satisfaction is so important that studies have found that Black individuals report higher satisfaction than White individuals in cities where there appears to be greater Black representation (i.e. Black-majority

neighborhoods, Black government officials, and Black-majority police forces) (Frank, Brandl, Culle, & Stichman, 1996; McCluskey, McCluskey, & Enriquez, 2008).

Relatedly, **income** has been found to have an effect on citizens' satisfaction with the police. Specifically, those with higher income report greater satisfaction with the police (Schafer, Huebner, & Bynum, 2003). These findings are consistent for satisfaction with police response time, perceived police protection, and confidence in the police (Brown & Coulter, 1983; Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996).

Age has also been found to affect citizens' satisfaction with the police. Specifically, older individuals report higher satisfaction with the police (Brown & Coulter, 1983; Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996; Kusow, Wilson, & Martin, 1997; Schafer, Huebner, & Bynum, 2003). This holds for satisfaction with the police overall as well as satisfaction with police services, police response time, perceived police protection, and confidence in the police. Similarly, older individuals were more likely to report higher demeanor and characteristic scores for police than younger individuals (Webb & Marshall, 1995).

Less consistent findings are found for the impact of gender on police satisfaction. For example, the effect of **gender** on police satisfaction has produced some studies which find that females report higher satisfaction with general police services and confidence in the police than males (Apple & O'Brien, 1983; Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996; Schafer, Huebner, & Bynum, 2003; Taylor et al., 2001), while other studies find that males report higher satisfaction with the police than females (Correia, Reisig, & Lovrich, 1996; Hurst & Frank, 2000). Moreover, other studies report no significant gender differences among overall attitudes towards the police, favorability of law enforcement, and level of

satisfaction with police performance (Decker, 1981; Hindelang, 1974; Gainey & Payne, 2009; Kusow, Wilson, & Martin, 1997).

Similarly, studies on the effects of **education** on satisfaction with police have produced mixed results. For example, some studies show that more educated individuals report greater satisfaction than less educated individuals (Kusow, Wilson, & Martin, 1997; Priest & Carter, 1999), while other studies find that more educated individuals are less satisfied with the police than less educated individuals (Percy, 1980; Thomas & Hyman, 1977). Still, other studies find that education does not significantly impact satisfaction with police protection (e.g. police response time and police treatment of people), confidence in the police (e.g. police responsiveness and care about safety), and attitudes towards the police (Brown & Coulter, 1983; Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996; Correia, Reisig, & Lovrich, 1996; Davis, 1990).

Importance of Victim Satisfaction

There are many important reasons why law enforcement personnel should be concerned with victim satisfaction, beyond basic professional standards. These reasons include avoiding secondary victimization, increasing the likelihood that the victim will report future crimes, and influencing victims' cooperation with the police and subsequent actors within the criminal justice system. Each of these reasons will be discussed in more detail below.

Avoiding Secondary Victimization

It is important to first understand the physical and emotional toll that victimization can have on a person. To be sure, a victim of a violent crime may exhibit outwardly visible physical effects (e.g. stab wounds or bruises). However, there are also

other physical side-effects of victimization that are not as visible. For example, victims of violent crime have reported symptoms such as chronic pain, gastrointestinal disorders, and seizures (Hilden et al., 2004; Paras et al., 2009; Woods et al., 2008). Victims of various crime types also report psychological symptoms, specifically, symptoms often associated with Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD; Breslau et al., 1998; Brewin, Andrew, & Rose, 2000; Wilson et al., 2011). These symptoms include intrusive flashback memories, over-active responsiveness (e.g. being easily startled), sleepiness, dizziness, quickened heart rate, attention deficiencies, and injuries resulting from self-destructive behavior (APA, 2013; Paras et al., 2009).

Indeed, there are other emotional symptoms related to victimization - many also considered in a PTSD diagnosis - that can affect victims of crime. These can include negative emotional states, such as fear, guilt, and shame (APA, 2013; Foa, Chrestman, & Gilboa-Schechtman, 2008). Victims of crime also experience feelings of depression, anxiety, and even suicidal ideation (Klomek et al., 2008; Pico-Alfonso et al., 2006). Similarly, these symptoms can include increased difficulties with experiencing positive emotional states, such as happiness, and emotions that are often associated with intimacy (APA, 2013; Schiraldi, 2009). Emotional symptoms also include negative alterations in cognition, such as amnesia and having a negative outlook on life, the future, or society (APA, 2013; Foa & Rothbaum, 2001; Hansen et al., 2017). Finally, victims can also experience feelings of detachment, dissociation, and an increased use of avoidance techniques (APA, 2013; Feeny et al., 2000; Schiraldi, 2009).

As should now be clear, victims of crime experience a great number of negative side-effects, both physically and emotionally. How people react to being victimized can

affect the severity of these side-effects. When police officers' actions, language, or demeanors negatively affects a victim, this is called secondary victimization (Williams, 1984). Specifically, secondary victimization refers to the negative emotions that victims experience as a direct result of the negative treatment at the hands of criminal justice actors (e.g., police officers) investigating their initial victimization (Maier, 2008).

Secondary victimization by police can lead to the same negative side-effects as those that resulted from the initial victimization which were detailed above. For example, people who have stated they experienced secondary victimization report psychological and emotional issues, such as anger, irritability, isolation, and feelings of being misunderstood (Campbell et al., 1999; Campbell et al., 2001). Others report feelings of dehumanization, helplessness, shame, fear, and increased self-blame (Hattendorf & Tollerud, 1997; Logan et al., 2005). Victims have also reported reduced emotional distress after having interacted with a police officer who did not make them feel revictimized (Patterson, 2011). Police officers who actively avoid actions, language, or demeanors that may result in secondary victimization have a greater chance of increasing citizen satisfaction with the police.

Victim Satisfaction Increases the Likelihood of Reporting Future Victimization to Police

Increasing victim satisfaction with police interactions is also important for increasing the likelihood of victims reporting future crimes (Garofalo, 1977). The majority of crimes that come to the attention of the police are reported by citizens rather than uncovered by police alone (Crank, 2014; Greenwood & Petersilia, 1975; Reiss, 1973). If victims stopped reporting crimes that they experienced, the police would be

unaware of a significant percentage of crimes occurring in their jurisdictions. Therefore, increasing victim reporting habits aids the police in more effectively performing their duties.

Victims are more willing to report future victimization when officers appear to be making a great investigative effort (Xie et al., 2006). This can be displayed through actively searching the scene and collecting evidence. Similarly, officers who made an arrest or recovered the victim's property were more likely to influence a victim's willingness to report future crimes (Conaway & Lohr, 1994). Once again, this appears to be true if the actions of the officer are in-line with the victim's preference (Hickman & Simpson, 2003).

Alternatively, victims are less likely to report future crimes to the police if they perceive the officer to have an unprofessional demeanor. For example, victims are less likely to report future crimes if they thought the officer did not believe them, blamed them for their victimization, or did not see them as a "true victim" (Carbone-Lopez, Slocum, & Kruttschnitt, 2016; Weiss, 2010). Victims who perceive officers' as being rude and treating victims unfairly are also less likely to report crimes to police in the future (Rosenfeld, Jacobs, & Wright, 2003; Semukhina, 2014).

Victim Satisfaction Increases Cooperation with the Police and the Criminal Justice System

Police officers often state that "law enforcement" is the primary role within their occupation (Bittner, 1967; Fielding, 1988; Ingram, 2010; Jermier et al., 1991; Paoline, 2001; Paoline, 2003; Wilson, 1978). Therefore, in urging officers to be conscientious of victim satisfaction, it is pertinent to highlight how victim satisfaction can improve

officers' capabilities of successfully performing their duties and enforcing the law. Specifically, increasing victim satisfaction will likely increase later cooperation and compliance with police officers.

Police officers who citizens perceive as procedurally just experience greater cooperation and compliance during future interactions (Jackson et al., 2012; Mastrofski, Snipes, & Supina, 1996; McCluskey, 2003; McCluskey, Mastrofski, & Parks, 1999; Murphy & Cherney, 2011; Murphy, Hinds, & Fleming, 2008; Murphy, Tyler, & Curtis, 2009; Paternoster et al., 1997; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler & Fagan, 2008). Procedural justice in this case is defined as a victim's perception of the officer acting neutral, respectful, trustworthy, and who allows the victim to have a voice in the investigation (Tyler & Murphy, 2011). Cooperation with the police is displayed through assisting in the investigation as well as participating in crime prevention programs. Complying with the police is displayed through obedience, respectfulness, and a generally positive attitude. Compliance can also be displayed when the victim's actions reflect social norms (e.g. acting appropriately or abiding by the law). Similarly, citizens who see the police as procedurally just are more likely to assist in broader crime control efforts, such as participating in neighborhood watch programs or calling the police if they were to witness crimes in the future (Ziegenhagen, 1976).

Not only do positive citizen-police interactions lead to supportive attitudes for the police, they also lead to supportive attitudes for the rest of the criminal justice system (Dawson & Dinovitzer, 2001). For instance, positive interactions with police may increase victims' support and satisfaction with prosecutors, judges, and defense attorneys (Koster et al., 2016; Wemmers, 1998; Wemmers, Van der Leeden, & Steensma, 1995).

Police officers who take the time to speak with victims and who receive an overall satisfaction rating from the victim increases the likelihood that the victim will attend bail and bond hearings (Greenman, 2010).

Current Study

This study aims to utilize the feedback of citizens and police officers to better understand the factors that influence citizen satisfaction with police interactions as well as officers' understanding of citizen preferences. The surveys distributed in this project asked citizens and police officers to evaluate the actions, language, and demeanors of police officers and their potential impact on citizen satisfaction with the interaction. This project aims to expand the literature on citizen satisfaction with police interactions while also emphasizing officers' understanding of this phenomenon.

CHAPTER THREE
DATA AND METHODS

Research Questions

Citizens' Satisfaction with Police

1. What specific officer actions influence citizen satisfaction with police?
2. What specific officer language influences citizen satisfaction with police?
3. What specific officer demeanors influence citizen satisfaction with police?

Officers' Perception of Citizen's Satisfaction with Police

4. What specific actions do officers believe influence citizen satisfaction with police?
5. What specific language do officers believe influences citizen satisfaction with police?
6. What specific demeanors do officers believe influence citizen satisfaction with police?

The Research Design

Research Setting

The location of the data collection, Prince George's County, Maryland, is a large metropolitan county in the central east coast region of the United States. More than 1,500 sworn officers and 300 civilian personnel serve a population of over 900,000 citizens and patrol nearly 500 square miles. The county consists of a mix of urban, suburban, and rural areas. While this location was chosen for its generalizability due to its diverse population and landscape, the county police department is unique in that they respond to large-scale issues not dissimilar to a large city. Prince George's County is very diverse, however it

boasts some very unique attributes. The county has a majority Black population representing one of the wealthiest Black counties in the country while being home to one of the 10 oldest historically black universities, Bowie State University. The county is also home to University of Maryland, however it is not just a college town. The county is actually mostly urban with urban borders, though it does still include expansive suburban and urban areas throughout. It is further influenced by its proximity to Baltimore County, Washington, D.C., and the neighboring county of Montgomery, the richest county in Maryland.

The sites of the data collection were in each of the county's eight districts. A district can cover as few as three cities or as many as 15 cities. Exactly which districts were included depends on the voluntary participation of both officers and citizens. According to the most recent data from the Uniform Crime Report (2016) for this county, the violent crime rate was approximately 584.1 per 100,000 and the property crime rate was approximately 2311.6 per 100,000.¹ For context, in 2016, the neighboring county of Baltimore County, Maryland had a violent crime rate of approximately 532.3 per 100,000 and a property crime rate of approximately 2836.7 per 100,000.

Sample

The data for this project came from three sources: (1) citizens, (2) county police officers, and (3) observations of the citizen-police interactions. Citizens who were eligible for participation in this study were victims or witnesses to crimes that were

¹ The violent crimes reported for this county included murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, domestically-related crimes, and carjacking. The property crimes reported for this county included breaking or entering, larceny-theft, vehicle theft, and arson.

reported to the police within the research setting. Witnesses to crimes are included to capture the views of those who may have experienced indirect victimization during the event. To avoid potential issues with consent and safety, citizens excluded from the sample were those (1) under the age of 18 as verified by the officer, (2) those with intellectual disabilities as perceived or known by myself or the officer, (3) those under the influence of drugs/alcohol as perceived or known by myself or the officer, (4) those who behaved belligerently as perceived by myself or the officer, and (5) those who appeared to be hurt or in distress.

Procedure

Officer Participation

Permission to conduct ride-alongs with police officers within the research setting was obtained from the Office of the Chief (see Appendix A). An announcement was released by each district's Commanding Officer via email regarding the intent and procedures of the project. Police officers were then invited by myself during day and evening (i.e. no midnight shifts) pre-shift roll call to volunteer as a ride-along host. Those officers who volunteered to participate were administered the Officer Attitudes, Language and Demeanor Survey (OALDS) (see Appendix B). The Consent Form (see Appendix F) instructed participating officers to respond to questions with their general beliefs regarding factors that may or may not influence citizen satisfaction during citizen-police interactions.

The OALDS consists of questions pertaining to officers' intentional display of the actions, language, and demeanors discussed in the literature review above and how they

believe these factors affect citizen satisfaction with the interaction. Operationalization of these questions are provided below.

Each participating officer had the option of filling out the survey at the time it was presented to them, during “downtime” on shift, or at their own convenience after their shift had ended. Surveys administered to police officers enjoy a relatively high response rate, especially when administered face-to-face as opposed to other methods (i.e. online, mail, or telephone) (Nix, et al., 2017). There were times where the survey could only be returned at a later time. For instance, at any given scene, it was possible that officers would perform any of the following actions: interview victim(s) and witness(es), obtain updates from other responding officers, evaluate the scene, or interact with other criminal justice system actors, such as forensic personnel. Participating officers were permitted to return their surveys later at their own convenience. This was done by providing each officer with a pre-stamped envelope addressed to a Post Office Box rented for the purposes of this study. These procedures were in place given the research that finds that providing a pre-stamped and pre-addressed envelope increases the response rates for mail-in surveys (Fox, Crask, & Kim, 1988; Peak, 1990; see also Dillman, 2016 for mail survey research among the general public).

Citizen Participation

During the course of each ride-along, each police officer responded to a number of calls for service. It was during the moments where the officer was not interacting with the citizen that I approached the citizens to invite participation in the citizen survey. With the police officer’s permission, I approached each individual citizen, introduced myself and the project, and invited their participation in the Citizen Attitudes, Language, and

Demeanor Survey (CALDS) (see Appendix C). The Consent Form (see Appendix G) instructs the citizen to respond to questions about the officer with whom they interacted with the most.

Citizens were asked to indicate if the responding officer displayed any of the actions, languages, or demeanors identified in the literature review, including making an arrest and investigating the scene, telling the citizen about victim and medical services, and listening and making eye-contact. Then, citizen participants were asked to indicate how each action, language, and demeanor affected their level of satisfaction with the officer.

When time did not permit for citizen participants to complete the survey during the call for service, the citizen was allowed to return the survey later at their own convenience. While having the citizens complete the survey on-scene was the ideal method for generating a higher response rate, there were instances where the survey had to be returned at a later time. This was done by providing each citizen with a pre-stamped envelope addressed to a Post Office Box rented for the purposes for this study. Mail-in surveys about citizens' views on law enforcement have relatively low return rates (for example, see results from: Gau, 2014; Ratcliffe et al., 2015; Reisig & Strohshine, 2001). However, survey acquisition via mail was the secondary method, as opposed to the primary method, and was implemented when necessary to increase the response rate.

Note that officers are often called to scenes where no citizens are present (e.g. stores where the security alarm has been tripped), spend a great deal of time on administrative tasks (e.g. filling out paperwork), and are asked by citizens to complete tasks that are not related to police work (e.g. 'settling' neighbor feuds where no crime has

occurred) (Brodeur & Dupont, 2006; Ericson & Haggerty, 1997; Huey, & Ricciardelli, 2015; 1997; Waddington, 1993; Wilson, 1978). The current project, then, only focuses exclusively on calls for service which result in an interaction between at least one citizen (i.e. a victim or witness) and the hosting officer. Further, there were times where the ride-along hosting officer could not stay at the scene long. For example, there were times where the ride-along officer is not the lead investigator and, therefore, was called to another scene after having been present for only a few moments. In such cases, minimal interaction between the officer and citizen prevented survey distribution. Finally, in instances where the officer or myself perceive my presence to be distracting or the situation to be dangerous, survey distribution did not occur. This agreement was previously made between me and the police department.

Observer Workbook

To further assess the nature of the citizen-police interaction, researcher observations were recorded. Notetaking was implemented to further explain differences between officer and citizen perceptions of the interactions in a natural setting (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995; Palmer, 2001). At the end of the ride-along, extensive field notes regarding the citizen-police interaction were recorded in a pre-made workbook (see Appendix D). While brief notations of events were taken at each scene so that no important factors were forgotten or overlooked, detailed field notes were recorded at a later time so that no observed party was distracted or altered their behavior (Fontana & Frey, 1994; Whitehead, 2006). The workbook included all of the actions, language, and demeanors that are present in the OALDS and CALDS. The workbook also includes a free-write space to record any potentially relevant information that was observed during

the interaction, such as the physical environment, other citizens present, expressive culture, or ideational elements (Whitehead, 2006). The intention of the field notes is to provide a third-party perception of the interaction taking place (Palmer, 2001). During data analysis, these notes were compared against the citizen and officer responses to assess where discrepancies between the two may exist. This process is described in more detail below.

Response Rate

Data collection took place from September of 2019 to March of 2020. The opportunity for officers to participate as a ride-along host was available to all officers within all eight districts within the county. All citizens (i.e. victims and witnesses) that the ride-along host interacted with were eligible for participation. Exclusion occurred for (1) citizens under the age of 18, (2) those with intellectual disabilities, (3) those under the influence of drugs/alcohol, and (4) those who behave belligerently.

During the course of the project, I witnessed a total of 132 potential interactions between citizens and the police. Of the 132 interactions, 32 citizens completed the survey in the field, 56 accepted the survey with the intent to return it via postal mail, 37 citizens were unapproachable based on standards covered herein, and seven citizens declined to participate.² Therefore, of the 132 possible interactions, I disseminated 88 citizen surveys. Of the 88 surveys, 32 were returned in person and five were returned via mail resulting in a response rate of 42%. Finally, of the 14 officers that were offered to

² The reasons for non-approaches ranged from signs of obvious intoxication, age restrictions, and my personal safety. The reasons to decline participation were not stated by the citizen except in one case where an elderly woman indicated it was too hot outside to sit around and fill out a survey (even though the mail-in option was provided).

complete the survey, eight did so, resulting in a response rate of 57% for officers. Seven of the officers returned their surveys by mail and one completed the survey during the final moments of their shift.

Protection of Human Subjects

This project was approved by Arizona State University's Institutional Review Board (STUDY00009039) (see Appendix E). An informed consent form was given to officer participants (see Appendix F) and citizen participants (see Appendix G). All participants were assured that their participation was voluntary and that they could refuse to answer any part of the survey or choose to stop at any time. Participants were also informed that their participation and survey responses would remain confidential. This also includes assurance (1) to citizens that no information provided by them will be shared with the police department and (2) to officers that no information provided by them will be shared with co-workers or superiors in their department. Instead, the consent forms specified that the completion and return of the survey implies consent for participation in this project.

Respondents were provided no incentive for their participation. Similarly, respondents experienced no penalty or loss for refusing to participate. The only anticipated risk to citizen respondents was the potential for discomfort in discussing their experiences with the police. The only anticipated risk to officer respondents was the potential for discomfort in discussing their experiences with negative attitudes towards the police. To minimize this potential risk, contact information for free counseling services was included in the consent form. Finally, I signed a Ride-Along Program Application and General Release (see: Appendix H). Briefly, this form (1) released the

state and county from potential liability for any damages that may result as a part of the ride-along participation, and (2) indicated an acknowledgement that the ride-along participant may not hinder or assist the officer.

Pilot Study Data Collection to Determine Feasibility of the Citizen Survey

During a Pilot Study period of the project, preliminary data were collected to determine the feasibility of administering the citizen survey. Specifically, the intent of the Pilot Study collection was to assess (1) the number of citizens that would be available to approach while riding along with officers (sample size) and (2) the number of citizens that would agree to participate in the survey (participation rate). Given committee members' concerns about the feasibility of surveying citizens, only the citizen survey was administered during pilot data collection. Procedures for data collection are found in the "Citizen Participation" section described earlier (i.e. no officer surveys were administered).

Citizen Eligibility Criteria: Since law enforcement officers responding to calls for service do not have a "typical day" there are inherent challenges presented in undertaking a project of this magnitude. Although every single situation cannot be foreseen that may make citizens ineligible for participation, standard eligibility criteria are specified here based on pilot study results. All non-offending citizens with whom the officer interacted while on scene were eligible to participate. This included those individuals who were either a victim or witness to the crime. Specific to citizens, exclusions resulted for citizens (1) under the age of 18 as verified by the officer, (2) with intellectual disabilities as perceived or known by myself or officer, (3) under the influence of drugs/alcohol as

perceived or known by myself or officer, (4) who behaved belligerently or dangerously as perceived by myself or officer, and (5) who appeared to be hurt or in distress.

The project exclusively focused on citizens involved in calls for service that resulted in an interaction between the hosting officer and at least one citizen (i.e. a victim or witness). Yet, not all encountered citizens were invited to participate. It is important to acknowledge that being the victim or witness to a crime and interacting with police is often highly stressful (Maier, 2008; Scott, 2013). Many victims and witness may be in distress or in pain physically and/or emotionally. Citizens that were in distress – as determined by myself or the officer – were not approached about the research project.³ Every effort was made to cautiously and carefully gauge citizen’s distress and to avoid interaction with these citizens. Indeed, researchers conducting studies in the field often make such split-second decisions about people’s suitability to participate (Earley, 2009; McAuliffe & Coleman, 1999). While the current study aims to include citizens from calls for service pertaining to all property or violent crimes, some limitations are necessary. For example, due to citizen distress, there were split-second decisions made to especially avoid approaching victims and witnesses of sexual assault and homicide. Further, as outlined in the Ride-Along Program Application and General Release (see: Appendix H), I agreed to defer to the hosting officer’s opinion regarding scenes that were too dangerous or where my presence may have hindered their work. Therefore, there were citizens who were not approached due to restrictions set by the hosting department. Inevitably, the eligibility criteria developed as the project continued – and was documented along the

³ Persons in distress were those who appeared agitated, expressed a desire for the process to be over, or had asked for an ambulance.

way – as I encountered situations where instincts and common sense were used to refrain from approaching some people. At all times, I complied with the officer’s preference or instruction to avoid approaching citizens.

Further, there were times where the ride-along hosting officer did not stay at the scene long enough for the citizen to be invited to participate. There were times where the ride-along officer was not the lead investigator and, therefore, was called to another scene after having been present for only a few moments. In such cases - and given the purpose of the study to comprehensively assess citizen-police interaction - minimal interaction between the citizen and officer naturally excluded participation.

Pilot Study Participation Rate: From August 1st to September 1st of 2019, 14 ride-alongs were undertaken. The preliminary data were collected from ride-alongs on two 8-hour shifts in each of the county’s seven districts.⁴ These ride-alongs resulted in 47 approaches and 12 non-approaches of citizens. Non-approaches were due to dangerous scenes (N=5), citizens did not speak English (N=2), or citizen intoxication (N=5). Nearly all of the 47 approached citizens agreed to participate (N=43; 91%). Of the 4 citizens who declined to take the survey, the majority were Black women (N=3; 75%). Of the 43 accepted surveys, about half were completed at the scene (N=19; 44.18%) and the other half were provided with a pre-addressed, pre-stamped envelope to be mailed at a later date (N=24; 55.81%). During the Pilot Study, 10.53% (N=2) of the surveys that were provided in an envelope were returned. Therefore, the final count of completed surveys was 21. The results of the returned surveys are described next.

⁴ Note, during the Pilot Study phase, there were only seven districts in the county. Partway through the study the county opened up their eighth district station.

Pilot Study Results. The majority of the respondents were not involved in violent crime. Specifically, 4.76% (N=1) of the respondents were involved in a violent crime, 33.33% (N=7) were involved in a property crime, 19.04% (N=4) were involved in a disorder crime, and 42.85% (N=9) were involved in “other” crime.⁵ The majority of respondents categorized themselves as a victim. Specifically, 80% (N=16) of the respondents categorized themselves as a victim, and 20% (N=4) categorized themselves as a witness.⁶ The majority of the respondents wanted the police to be called and made the call themselves. Specifically, 76.19% (N=16) of the respondents made the call for service, while 100% (N=21) wanted the police to be called.

The majority of respondents were very satisfied with the police officer. Regarding overall satisfaction with the police officer, 76.19% (N=16) of the respondents were extremely satisfied, 14.28% (N=3) were satisfied, 4.76% (N=1) were dissatisfied, and none were very dissatisfied. Regarding satisfaction with how the police officer acted, 76.19% (N=16) of the respondents were extremely satisfied, 19.04% (N=4) were satisfied and none were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Regarding satisfaction with what the police officer said, 76.19% (N=16) of the respondents were extremely satisfied, 19.04% (N=4) were satisfied, and none were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Regarding satisfaction with the police officer’s demeanor, 76.19% (N=16) of the respondents were extremely satisfied, 14.28% (N=3) were satisfied, 4.76% (N=1) were dissatisfied, and

⁵ Note that the respondents did not utilize the “please specify” section when indicating that they called for an “other” crime type.

⁶ Victim can include a person who witnessed a crime happening and then became a victim of the crime.

none were very dissatisfied. The next section details demographic responses of the respondents.

The majority of respondents were Black. Specifically, 63.15% (N=12) of the respondents were Black, 15.78% (N=3) were White, 10.52% (N=2) were Hispanic, 0% (N=0) were Asian, and 10.52% (N=2) were “other”. The majority of respondents were also female. Specifically, 68.42% (N=13) of the respondents were female, 31.57% (N=6) male, and 0% (N=0) were “other”. All of the respondents (N=18) answered that they identified as heterosexual. The majority of respondents were either single or in a relationship/engaged. Specifically, 31.25% (N=5) of the respondents were single, 31.25% (N=5) were in a relationship/engaged, 18.75% (N=3) were married, 18.75% (N=3) were separated/divorced, and 0% (N=0) were widowed. The age of the respondents ranged from 18 to 75 years old (median=44). The majority of respondents were college/university graduates. Specifically, 44.44% (N=8) of the respondents were college/university graduates, 22.22% (N=4) were graduate/law/or medical school graduates, 22.22% (N=4) had some college experience, 5.55% (N=1) were high school graduates, 5.55% (N=1) discontinued their education between grades 9-11. The majority of respondents’ household incomes exceeded \$100,000. Specifically, 41.17% (N=7) of the respondents’ household incomes exceeded \$100,000, 29.41% (N=5) respondents’ households income was between \$50,000 - \$80,000, 17.64% (N=3) respondents’ households income was between \$20,000-\$50,000, and 11.76% (N=2) respondents’ households income was below \$20,000. The majority of respondents were also employed. Specifically, 61.11% (N=11) of the respondents were employed and 38.88% (N=7) were unemployed. Finally, the majority of respondents were also currently unenrolled in

college/university. Specifically, 16.66% (N=3) were not college/university students and 83.33% (N=15) were college/university students.

Implications of the Pilot Study Data to Inform the Full Study. The takeaway from the Pilot Study is twofold: First, police officers come into contact with a great number of citizens during their shifts. While some of these citizens were unapproachable for the purposes of this project, there were still many citizens that were approachable. Second, citizens were readily willing to accept and complete the surveys. The majority of the approached citizens did, in fact, agree to complete the survey. The results further suggest that one can anticipate an average of 63 citizen surveys being completed during the 3-month data collection period. Therefore, the results from this study support the feasibility of the citizen survey. The citizen survey results are therefore included in the final results for this project. However, due to the police department's requirement that officers must volunteer for the full project, observations of the citizen-police interactions are not included in the final analysis and subsequent discussion.

The next section will discuss the operationalization of the survey variables. This includes variables from both the officer and citizen surveys. Included is also a brief description of the Observer Workbook.

Operationalization

This study statistically examined the relationship of multiple variables. The following section will describe the operationalization of these variables. Next, the plan of analysis is described.

The Officer Action, Language, Demeanor Survey (OALDS)

Officer Perceptions of Their Own Actions, Language, and Demeanors.

The section of the survey about officers' *actions* consists of seven questions. These questions mirror those on the Citizen ALD Survey by asking the officer "Do you actively attempt to DO any of the following when interacting with citizens?": (a) make an arrest, (b) arrive quickly, (c) allow citizen to express concern, (d) investigate the scene, (e) provide comfort, (f) ask questions, and (g) consider citizens' opinion when making the arrest decision. Response options were yes (coded as 0) and no (coded as 1). Respondents were then asked, "What effect do you believe this had on the citizen's satisfaction with the interaction?" Response options included: increases (coded as 0), decreases (coded as 1), no effect (coded as 2), and depends on the situation (coded as 3).

The section of the survey about officers' *language* consists of 11 questions. These questions mirror those on the CALDS by asking the officer "Do you actively attempt to SAY any of the following when interacting with citizens?": (a) tell citizen about victim services, (b) tell citizen about medical services, (c) tell citizen about safety information, (d) tell citizen about their rights, (e) tell citizen about the next steps in the criminal justice system, (f) blame the citizen, (g) ask the citizen if they had any questions, (h) repeat questions back to the citizen, (i) use "swear" words, and (j) say something to make the citizen feel better, (k) tell citizen that reporting was "a good thing to do". Response options were yes (coded as 0) and no (coded as 1). Respondents were then asked, "What effect do you believe this had on the citizen's satisfaction with the interaction?" Response options included: increases (coded as 0), decreases (coded as 1), no effect (coded as 2), and depends on the situation (coded as 3).

The section of the survey about officers' *demeanors* consists of 10 questions. These questions mirror those on the CALDS by asking the officer "Do you actively try to

DISPLAY any of the following when interacting with citizens?": (a) respect, (b) listening, (c) made eye contact, (d) appear rushed, (e) appear concerned, (f) appear interested in helping citizens, (g) appear to believe the citizen, (h) fair treatment, (i) honesty, and (j) helpfulness. Response options were yes (coded as 0) and no (coded as 1). Respondents were then asked, "What effect do you believe this had on the citizen's satisfaction with the interaction?" Response options included: increases (coded as 0), decreases (coded as 1), no effect (coded as 2), and depends on the situation (coded as 3).

Officer Demographics. Demographic variables of interest included race, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, age, education, household income, and years on the force. *Race* was measured by asking "what is your race?" Response options included White (coded as 0), Black (coded as 1), Hispanic (coded as 2), Asian (coded as 3), and Other (coded as 4). *Gender* was measured by asking "what is your gender?" Response options were (0) male, (1) female, and (2) other. *Sexual orientation* was measured by asking "what is your sexual orientation?" Response options were heterosexual (coded as 0) and other (coded as 1). *Marital status* was measured by asking "what is your marital status?" Response options were single (coded as 0), in a relationship/engaged (coded as 1), married (coded as 2), separated/divorced (coded as 3), and widowed (coded as 4). Respondents were prompted to mark all that apply for this question. *Age* was measured continuously by asking "what is your age?" *Education* was measured by asking "What was the highest level of education you completed?" Response options included grade 0-4 (coded as 0), grade 5-8 (coded as 1), grade 9-11 (coded as 2), high school diploma/ GED (coded as 3), some college/ Associate's degree (coded as 4), college/ university (coded as 5), and graduate/ law/ medical school (coded as 6). *Household income* was measured by

asking “what is your household income?” Response options included Under \$20,000 (coded as 0), \$20,000-\$50,000 (coded as 1), \$50,001-\$80,000 (coded as 2), \$80,001-\$100,000 (coded as 3), and Over \$100,000 (coded as 4). *Years on the force* was measured continuously in years by asking “how long have you been a police officer?”

The Citizen Action, Language, Demeanor Survey (CALDS)

Citizen Satisfaction with Police. To assess victims’ and witnesses’ overall satisfaction with responding officer(s), three questions were asked. The first question captured *Overall satisfaction* by asking “Overall, how satisfied were you with the police officer?” Response options included very satisfied (coded as 0), satisfied (coded as 1), dissatisfied (coded as 2), and very dissatisfied (coded as 3). *Overall action satisfaction* asked citizens “Overall, how satisfied were you with how the officer acted?” The second question captured *Overall language satisfaction* by asking “Overall, how satisfied were you with what the officer said to you?” Response options included very satisfied (coded as 0), satisfied (coded as 1), dissatisfied (coded as 2), and very dissatisfied (coded as 3). The third question captured *Overall demeanor satisfaction* by asking “Overall, how satisfied were you with the officer’s attitude?” Response options included very satisfied (coded as 0), satisfied (coded as 1), dissatisfied (coded as 2), and very dissatisfied (coded as 3).

To identify more nuanced dimensions of citizens’ satisfaction with officers’ actions, a series of seven items were presented measuring *Action Satisfaction*. These questions asked, “Did the officer do any of the following?”: (a) make an arrest, (b) arrive quickly, (c) allow the citizen to express concern, (d) investigate the scene, (e) provide comfort, (f) ask questions, and (g) consider citizen’s opinion when making the arrest decision. Response options were yes (coded as 0) and no (coded as 1). Respondents were

then asked for each item “What effect did this have on your satisfaction with the interaction?” Response options included: increased satisfaction (coded as 0), no effect (coded as 1), and decreased satisfaction (coded as 2).

To identify more nuanced dimensions of citizens’ satisfaction with officers’ language, a series of 11 items were presented measuring *Language satisfaction*. These questions ask “Did the officer say any of the following?”: (a) told citizen about victim services, (b) told citizen about medical services, (c) told citizen about safety information, (d) told citizen about their rights, (e) told citizen about the next steps in the criminal justice system, (f) blamed the citizen, (g) asked the citizen if they had any questions, (h) repeated questions back to the citizen, (i) used “swear” words, and (j) said something to make the citizen feel better, k) told citizen that reporting was “a good thing to do”. Response options were yes (coded as 0) and no (coded as 1). Respondents were then asked for each item “What effect did this have on your satisfaction with the interaction?” Response options included: increased satisfaction (coded as 0), no effect (coded as 1), and decreased satisfaction (coded as 2). Finally, to identify more nuanced dimensions of citizens’ satisfaction with officers’ demeanor, a series of 10 items were presented measuring *Demeanor Satisfaction*. “Did the officer display any of the following?”: (a) respect, (b) listening, (c) made eye contact, (d) appeared rushed, (e) appeared concerned, (f) appeared interested in helping citizen, (g) appeared to believe the citizen, (h) fair treatment, (i) honesty, and (j) helpfulness. Response options were yes (coded as 0) and no (coded as 1). Respondents were then asked for each item “What effect did this have on your satisfaction with the interaction?” Response options included: increased satisfaction (coded as 0), no effect (coded as 1), and decreased satisfaction (coded as 2). **Incident.**

Incident consists of six questions. These questions ask the citizen to indicate several specifics regarding the offense that led to this police interaction. First, citizens were asked "Why were the police called?" Response options were violent crime (coded as 0), property crime (coded as 1), disorder problem (coded as 2), and Other (coded as 3)? The "Other" option allowed for citizens to specify why the police were called. Second, citizens were asked "Were you the victim or witness to the crime?" Response options were victim (coded as 0) or witness (coded as 1). Third, citizens were asked "Were you the one who called the police?" Response options were yes (coded as 0) and no (coded as 1). Fourth, citizens were asked "Did you want the police to be called?" Response options were yes (coded as 0) and no (coded as 1). **Citizen Demographics.** Demographic variables of interest included race, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, age, education, household income, employment, and student status. *Race* was measured by asking "what is your race?" *Race* was measured by asking "what is your race?" Response options included White (coded as 0), Black (coded as 1), Hispanic (coded as 2), Asian (coded as 3), and Other (coded as 4). *Gender* was measured by asking "what is your gender?" Response options were (0) male, (1) female, and (2) other. *Sexual orientation* was measured by asking "what is your sexual orientation?" Response options were Heterosexual (coded as 0) and Other (coded as 1). *Marital status* was measured by asking "what is your marital status?" Response options were single (coded as 0), In a relationship/engaged (coded as 1), married (coded as 2), separated/divorced (coded as 3), and widowed (coded as 4). Respondents were prompted to mark all that apply for this question. *Age* was measured continuously by asking "what is your age?" *Education* was measured by asking "What was the highest level of education you completed?" Response

options included grade 0-4 (coded as 0), grade 5-8 (coded as 1), grade 9-11 (coded as 2), high school diploma/ GED (coded as 3), some college/ Associate's degree (coded as 4), college/ university (coded as 5), and graduate/ law/ medical school (coded as 6).

Household income was measured by asking "what is your household income?" Response options included Under \$20,000 (coded as 0), \$20,000-\$50,000 (coded as 1), \$50,001-\$80,000 (coded as 2), \$80,001-\$100,000 (coded as 3), and Over \$100,000 (coded as 4).

Employment was measured by asking "are you currently employed?" Response options were yes (coded as 0) and no (coded as 1). *Student status* was measured by asking "are you currently a college/university student?" Response options were yes (coded as 0) and no (coded as 1).

Observer ALD Workbook

To complement the perceptions of both the citizens and the officers who participated in this study, an observer workbook was created (see: Appendix D). In this workbook I reflect on how the officer and citizens interacted during that shift. This workbook consisted of the same action, language, and demeanor factors that were present in both the CALDS and OALDS. I indicate whether I noticed the officer using any of the actions, language, or demeanor covered in the OALDS and CALDS. A free-write section was also included in the workbook in case any actions, language, or demeanors are displayed that was not included in the original surveys or workbook checklist. While brief notations were taken on-scene to preserve memory, the majority of these notes were written immediately after each shift so as not to influence the officer's behavior by witnessing the note-taking process.

Analytic Plan

For this project, quantitative statistical analyses were performed to examine the factors that affected citizens' satisfaction and the factors officers perceived would affect citizens' satisfaction. Given the small sample sizes due to the premature data collection termination from the COVID-19 pandemic, descriptive statistics and univariate analyses are presented and more sophisticated statistical analyses cannot be performed. The descriptive findings are contextualized with rich observational data that detail my observations across all citizen-police interactions.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

This section presents the descriptive results of the study. First, the demographic information for citizens is featured, followed by results detailing citizens' role in the call for service. The section then provides the demographic information for officers.

Citizens. The sample consisted of 37 Prince George County, Maryland citizens.⁷ The sample of citizen respondents was majority Black (N=22; 65%), followed by 15% (N=5) White, 12% (N=4) Hispanic, and 9% (N=3) identifying as other races. The majority of the citizens (N= 22; 65%) were female. The majority of the citizens (N=31; 97%) identified as heterosexual. Further, approximately a third of citizen respondents were single (N=11; 33%). Citizen respondents ranged in age from 18 to 75, with the majority being younger (mean = 43; SD= 18).⁸ Nearly a third of citizens had a college/university degree (N=11; 34%), followed by some college/ Associate's degree (N=8; 25%), high school diploma/GED (N=7; 22%), graduate level/ law/ medical school (N=5; 16%), then grade 9-11 (N=1; 3%). Almost a third of citizen respondents (N=10; 32%) claimed an income of between \$50,001 and \$80,000. Finally, regarding employment and student status, the majority of citizen respondents indicated they were

⁷ Note: One additional citizen survey was received via mail, but excluded from the analysis due to respondent's hand-written confusion about how to answer questions and incorrect answer to responding officer's gender (e.g., respondent indicated they interacted with a female officer when no ride-alongs with female officers had been performed).

⁸ Recall, no citizens under the age of 18 were invited to participate. However, officers did interact with those under the age of 18 during these ride-alongs. Such observations are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.

currently employed (N=22; 67%) and not currently a college/ university student (N=27; 82%).⁹

Table 1. Descriptive statistics among citizen respondents (n=37).

Black	22 (65%)
Female	22 (55%)
Heterosexual	31 (97%)
Single	11 (37%)
Age	Range 18-75
M (SD)	43 (18)
Education	
Grade 9-11	1 (3%)
High school diploma/GED	7 (22%)
Some college/Associate's degree	8 (25%)
College/university	11 (34%)
Graduate/Law/Medical school	5 (16%)
Income	
Under \$20,000	4 (13%)
\$20,001-\$50,000	4 (13)
\$50,001-\$80,000	4 (12%)
\$80,001-\$100,000	10 (32%)
Over \$100,000	9 (29%)
Employed	22 (67%)
Non-Student	22 (82%)

Note. Mean age excludes two participants who identified their ages in general terms as ">70" and "65+."

Note. Some respondents did not complete the demographic section of the survey and, therefore, responses, at times, do not reflect a total of 37 respondents.

Citizen respondents were asked to indicate their role in the incident for which a call for service was made and resulted in officer response and corresponding ride-along. First, the majority of respondents indicated that they identified as victims (N=24; 71%), while remaining respondents indicated they were a witness (N=6, 18%) or other (N=4;

⁹ Note: Some respondents did not complete the demographic section of the survey and, therefore, responses, at times, do not reflect a total of 37 respondents.

12%).¹⁰ Next, the majority of respondents indicated that the reason for the call was due to an “other” crime type (N=20; 56%), followed by property crime (N=10; 28%), violent crime (N=3; 8%) and then disorder problems (N=3; 8%).¹¹ Further, most citizen respondents (N=29; 78%) indicated that they were the one to place the call for service and indicated that they wanted the call for service to be placed (N=36; 97%).

Table 2. Descriptive characteristics of the calls for service as reported in the CALDS (n=37).

Crime Type	
Violent	3 (8%)
Property	10 (28%)
Disorder	3 (8%)
Other	20 (56%)
Citizen Role in Incident for which Call for Service Occurred	
Victim	24 (71%)
Witness	6 (18%)
Other	4 (12%)
Respondent Placed Call for Service	
Yes	29 (78%)
No	8 (22%)
Respondent Wanted Call for Service	
Yes	36 (97%)
No	1 (3%)

Note. Some respondents did not complete the call for service section of the survey and, therefore, responses, at times, do not reflect a total of 37 respondents.

Officers. The sample consisted of eight Prince George County, Maryland police officers. Of the eight officers, one volunteered as ride-along twice. The sample was

¹⁰ Those who indicated that their role was “other” self-described themselves as a victim and witness, were a guardian of the victim, or did not specify further.

¹¹ Of those who used the “please specify” write-in space for “other” crime type, responses included (1) assault with an automobile, but no serious injuries, (2) fender bender in a parking lot, (3) illegally parked car at stop sign, (4) fraud report, (5) runaway, (6) car accident, (7) hit and run, and (8) someone stole my car keys.

mostly White (N=4), followed by Hispanic (N=2), then by Black (N=1). All of the officers (N= 7) were male. Further, all of the officers (N=7) identified as heterosexual. Most of the officer respondents (N=5) indicated that they were married. Officer respondents ranged in age from 26 to 39, with the majority being young (mean = 32 years old; SD=4).

Table 3. Descriptive statistics among officer respondents (n=8).

	N
White	4
Male	7
Heterosexual	7
Married	5
Age	Range 26-39
M(SD)	31 (4)
Education	
Grade 9-11	0
High school diploma/GED	1
Some college/Associate's degree	4
College/university	2
Graduate/Law/Medical school	0
Income	
Under \$20,000	0
\$20,001-\$50,000	0
\$50,001-\$80,000	3
\$80,001-\$100,000	2
Over \$100,000	2
Years on the Force	Range <1-10
M (SD)	5 (3)

Note. One officer did not provide demographic data.

The range of education for officers was high school diploma/GED (N=1), some college/Associate's degree (N=4), and college/university (N=2). Most of the officer respondents (N=3) claimed a household income of between \$50,001 and \$80,000.

Finally, the length of time employed as a police officer ranged from 9 months to 10 years (mean of 5 years; SD=3).¹²

The following section details the univariate results regarding both (1) citizens' reports of factors that affect their satisfaction with officers and (2) officers' perceptions of those factors that they believe can affect citizen satisfaction with officers. The factors are categorized as actions, language, and demeanors. The citizens' overall satisfaction with the officer are first displayed followed by a review of citizen-versus-officer perception of what increases, decreases, or has no effect on citizens' satisfaction with officers' actions, language, and demeanor.¹³

Univariate Results

Citizen Satisfaction. The majority of citizens reported that they were overall very satisfied (N=31; 86%) or satisfied (N=4; 11%) with the responding officer. Only one citizen (3%) reported being overall dissatisfied with their responding officer. The following results reveal how the officers' actions, language, and demeanor affected the citizen's satisfaction with their responding officer.

In terms of citizen perceptions of officer actions, the majority of citizens reported being very satisfied (N=31; 86%) or satisfied (N=5; 14%). As for citizen perceptions of officer language, the majority of citizens reported being very satisfied (N=30; 83%) or satisfied (N=6; 17%). Turning to citizen perceptions of officer demeanors, the majority of

¹² Due to the small sample size, only actual numbers are reported (i.e. not percentages) for officers. Note, one officer did not provide demographic data.

¹³ For officers only, respondents were also able to respond with "depends on the situation" as their responses were based on their personal perceptions while citizen responses were based on a singular interaction.

citizens reported being very satisfied (N=31; 86%), satisfied (N=4; 11%), or dissatisfied (N=1; 3%).

Table 4. Citizen satisfaction with officers overall (n=37).

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Overall	31 (86.11%)	4 (11.11%)	1 (2.78%)	0
Action	31 (86.11%)	5 (13.89%)	0	0
Language	30 (83.33%)	6 (16.67%)	0	0
Demeanor	31 (86.11%)	4 (11.11%)	1 (2.78%)	0

Note. While 37 citizens participated in this study, one participant skipped this section of the survey resulting in rows totaling 36 as opposed to the full sample of 37 citizens.

Next, detailed qualities of officer actions, language, and demeanor – as perceived by citizens – are featured in terms of citizens’ satisfaction with the reporting officer.

Actions. Of the 37 responding citizens, the majority (N=16; 64%) indicated that the officer not making an arrest had no effect on their satisfaction with the officer. The majority of citizens (N=17; 71%) further indicated that the officer arriving quickly increased their satisfaction with the officer. The majority of citizens (N=16; 67%) indicated that the officer allowing them to express concern increased their satisfaction with the officer. Nearly half of the citizens (N=10; 46%) indicated that the officer actively investigating the scene increased their satisfaction with the officer. The majority of citizens (N=14; 61%) also indicated that the officer providing them comfort increased their satisfaction with the officer. Half of the citizens (N=10; 50%) indicated that the officer not questioning witnesses had no effect on their satisfaction with the officer.

Finally, a third of the citizens (N=5; 31%) indicated that the officer considering their opinion when making an arrest decision had no effect on their satisfaction with the officer.

Taken together, citizens were more satisfied with responding officers who arrived quickly, allowed the citizen to express their concerns, and who provided comfort.

Interestingly, citizens were not always more satisfied when an arrest was made, when the officer investigated the scene, questioned witnesses, or considered their opinion when making an arrest. See Appendix I to review Table 5.

Language. Of the 37 responding citizens, about half (N=11; 55%) indicated that their satisfaction with the officer was not affected by the lack of victim service information being discussed. Similarly, the majority of citizens (N=15; 79%) indicated that their satisfaction with the officer was not affected by the lack of medical service information being discussed. Nearly half of the citizens (N=9; 45%) indicated that their satisfaction with the officer was not affected by the lack of safety information being discussed. Over a third of citizens (N=7; 37%) who were told about their rights believed that this increased their satisfaction with the officer, while the same number of citizens indicated that not being told about their rights had no effect on their satisfaction with the officer. Half of the citizens (N=10; 50%) indicated that being told about the next steps in the criminal justice system increased their satisfaction. The majority of citizens (N=14; 70%) indicated that officers not blaming them for what happened had no effect on their satisfaction with the officer. Two-thirds of citizens (N=12; 63%) indicated that asking the citizen if they had any questions increased their satisfaction with the officer. About half of the citizens (N=9; 47%) indicated that their satisfaction with the officer was unaffected

by the officer not repeating their questions back to them. The majority of citizens (N=12; 60%) indicated that officers not using “swear” words had no effect on their satisfaction with the officer. The majority of citizens (N=13; 62%) indicated that saying something to make the citizen feel better increased their satisfaction with the officer. The majority of citizens (N=12; 62%) indicated that saying something to make them feel better increased their satisfaction with the officer. Finally, half of the citizens (N=10; 50%) indicated that their satisfaction with the officer was unaffected by the officer not telling them that reporting to the police was a good thing.

In sum, citizens were more satisfied with responding officers who discussed the next steps in the criminal justice system, asked if they had any questions, and said something to make them feel better. Interestingly, citizens’ satisfaction seemed unaffected by the lack of discussion regarding victim service information, medical service information, and safety information. Further, the citizens’ satisfaction was unaffected by officers’ lack of blaming language, repeating citizen questions back to them, using “swear” words, and not telling them that reporting to the police was a good thing. See Appendix J to review Table 6.

Demeanors. Of the 37 responding citizens, the majority (N=16; 73%) indicated that their satisfaction with the officer increased if the officer was respectful. Similarly, the majority of citizens (N=14; 70%) reported that their satisfaction increased if the officer listened to them. Once again, the majority of citizens (N=12; 71%) indicated that their satisfaction increased if the officer made eye-contact with them. Nearly half of citizens (N=8; 42%) indicated that the responding officer did not appear rushed and that this had no effect on their satisfaction with the officer. Nearly three-fourths of citizens

(N=14; 74%) indicated that appearing concerned increased citizen satisfaction with the officer. Similarly, the majority of citizens (N=15; 71%) indicated the officer appearing interested in helping increased citizen satisfaction with the officer. Once again, the majority of citizens (N=15; 71%) indicated that the officer appearing to believe the citizen increased citizen satisfaction with the officer. Over three-fourths of citizens (N=16; 76%) indicated that, regardless of if the officer treated them fairly. Similarly, the majority of citizens (N=15; 71%) indicated that, regardless of if the officer was honest, their satisfaction increased. Finally, the majority of citizens (N=16; 76%) indicated that, regardless of if the officer was helpful, their satisfaction increased.

In sum, citizens were more satisfied with responding officers who were respectful, listened, made eye-contact, appeared concerned, appeared interested in helping, appeared to believe the citizen, provided fair treatment, were honest, and were helpful. The only demeanor that had no effect on nearly half of the citizens' satisfaction was if the officer appeared rushed.¹⁴ See Appendix K to review Table 7.

Next, this section details officers' perceptions of the effects their actions, language, and demeanor had on citizens with whom they interacted.

Actions. Of the eight responding officers, four indicated that the effect of making an arrest on a citizens' satisfaction depends on the situation. Further, five of the officers indicated that they believed arriving quickly would increase a citizen's satisfaction. Similarly, six of the officers indicated that they believed allowing the citizen to express concern would increase citizen satisfaction. Five of the officers also indicated that they

¹⁴ Due to this being the only negatively worded factor, it is possible that there was some confusion as to the meaning of the phrase "appeared rushed".

believed investigating the scene would increase citizen satisfaction. Further, five of the officers believed that providing comfort to the citizen would increase that citizen's satisfaction with the officer. Officers were almost evenly split on their beliefs regarding questioning witnesses. That is, three officers indicated they believed questioning witnesses would increase a citizen's satisfaction, two indicated they believed questioning witnesses would have no effect on a citizen's satisfaction, and three indicated that citizen satisfaction would depend on the situation when questioning witnesses. Finally, five officers indicated that they believed considering a citizen's opinion when making an arrest decision would depend on the situation.

Taken together, many officers believe that citizens' satisfaction with an officer would increase if the officer arrived quickly, allowed the citizen to express concern, investigated the scene, and provided comfort. Interestingly, many officers' perception of citizen satisfaction derived from the actions of making an arrest and considering citizens' opinions when making an arrest decision depended on the situation. Finally, there appeared to be no consensus among officers on the effect of questioning witnesses on citizen satisfaction, though no officer indicated that they believed doing so would decrease a citizen's satisfaction with the officer. See Appendix L to review Table 8.

Language. Of the eight responding officers, most (N=6) believed that telling a citizen about victim services would increase citizen satisfaction with the officer. There was no consensus among officers about the effect of telling citizens about medical services on a citizen's satisfaction with the officer. Specifically, three officers believed that this language would increase citizen satisfaction, three believed it would have no effect on citizen satisfaction, and three believed it would depend on the situation. Four of

the officers believe that telling citizens about safety information will increase citizen's satisfaction with the officer. Similarly, four believe that telling citizens about their rights will increase their satisfaction. While four of the officers believe that telling the citizen about the next steps in the criminal justice system will increase citizen satisfaction the other four officers believe that it will decrease citizen satisfaction. Further, while six of the officers indicated that they avoid using language that would blame the victim, three indicated that they believe doing so has no effect on citizens' satisfaction with the officer. While five of the officers believe that asking citizens if they have any questions will increase citizen satisfaction with the officer, three officers indicated they believe repeating a citizen's question back to them will increase their satisfaction with the officer and another three indicated that it would depend on the situation. Three of the officers indicated they believe it depends on the situation whether using "swear" words will affect citizens' satisfaction with the officer. Six of the officers indicated that they believe saying something to make a citizen feel better will increase that citizen's satisfaction with the officer. Finally, while four officers indicated they believe that telling citizens reporting to the police was a good thing will increase citizen satisfaction with the officer, the other four indicated that they believe it would depend on the situation.

In sum, responding officers believe that telling citizens about victim services, safety information, and citizen rights, asking if the citizen has any questions, and saying something to make the citizen feel better all increase citizens' satisfaction with the officer. Further, responding officers believe that the effects of avoiding blaming language and the use of "swear" words would depend on the situation. Finally, officers were mixed on the effects of telling citizens about medical services, telling citizens about the next

steps in the criminal justice system, and telling citizens that reporting to the police was a good thing. See Appendix M to review Table 9.

Demeanor. Of the eight responding officers, six indicated that they believe being respectful will increase a citizen's satisfaction with the officer. Similarly, six of the officers believe that listening will increase citizen satisfaction with the officer. Further, five of the officers believe that making eye-contact with the citizen will increase that citizen's satisfaction with the officer. Four of the officers believe that appearing rushed will decrease the citizen's satisfaction with the officer. Seven of the responding officers believe that appearing concerned will increase the citizen's satisfaction with the officer. Similarly, seven of the responding officers believe appearing interested in helping will increase citizens' satisfaction with the officer. Five of the responding officers indicated that appearing to believe the citizen will increase citizen satisfaction with the officer. Six of the officers believe that appearing to provide fair treatment will increase citizen satisfaction with the officer. Further, five of the responding officers believe that appearing honest will increase citizen satisfaction with the officer. Finally, five of the officers believe that appearing helpful will increase citizen satisfaction with the officer.

Taken together, officers believe that being respectful, listening, making eye-contact, avoiding appearing rushed, appearing concerned, appearing interested in helping, appearing to believe the citizen, appearing to be fair, appearing honest, and appearing helpful will all increase citizens' satisfaction with an officer. See Appendix N to review Table 10.

Overall Summary of the Actions, Language, and Demeanors. In sum, citizens and officers were in agreement regarding the effects officers' actions, language, and

demeanor can have on citizen satisfaction with the officer. Further, citizens appear to find the actions, language, and demeanors of officers to increase their satisfaction, though interestingly, the absence of many of the actions, language, and demeanors tended to have no effect on citizen satisfaction with the officer. Finally, responding officers appeared aware of what factors may increase or decrease a citizen's satisfaction with the officer, though many officers indicated that situational factors play a large role in determining how the display of many of these actions, language, and demeanors would affect citizens' satisfaction. The implications of these results will be discussed in further detail in the Discussion section in Chapter Five.

Observation Results

Observations of Citizens. Observations of the citizens encountered on ride-alongs indicates a relatively even split between citizens exhibiting satisfaction and those exhibiting dissatisfaction with officers. These observed differences in satisfaction were most notable by citizen age. In terms of age, it was observed that elderly citizens appeared to be especially welcoming of officers' presence and behaved courteously toward officers. For example, several of the elderly citizens offered a seat and beverages to the officer when entering their homes. On the other hand, younger citizens appeared more likely to behave contentiously towards officers, even when the citizen placed the call for service. In fact, it was the younger adults who appeared to distrust the police, wanted to rush the process, and were vocal about the police "not doing their jobs". For example, it was much more common for younger citizens to block their doorway to keep the officer from entering or seeing inside their household. These age-graded observations are in line with previous research where older citizens reported higher satisfaction with

officers than younger groups (Dai & Jiang, 2016; Kusow, Wilson, & Martin, 1997). Note that there was no recording of citizens under the age of 18 given that the study focused on adults. Therefore, possible patterns of officer satisfaction among youth could not be determined and are outside the scope of this study.

Observations revealed that many citizens appeared to either misunderstand or have different expectations of the responding officers' role. For example, I began to appreciate officers' frustrations through my own observations of citizens' lack of understanding regarding the role of police officers. Many citizens did not seem to understand the role of a police officer, nor what an officer can and cannot do in given situations. It is possible that many of the citizens' dissatisfaction ratings were a direct result of being unaware of the limitations that the departmental guidelines and local laws set in place for officers. For example, some citizens wanted officers to remove an ex-partner or friend from their home. Due to the local tenant laws, officers may not remove an individual from a housing unit if they have lived there for a set period of time as they are considered to have established residency. Another related example would be the man who reported a recurring traffic violation (i.e. parking within 30 feet of a stop sign). After being told there was nothing that could be done - the offending individual was not present at the time of our arrival, the man asked if he could legally make a citizen's arrest the next time it occurred. Another citizen complained about how long it took an officer to arrive to her scene (i.e. a car accident). My observations revealed that there were higher priority calls put ahead of hers by dispatch (e.g. a dispute and a domestic/disorderly call) and there was increased traffic due to the rain that day. In this case, the traffic call for service did not permit the officer to expedite travel time by using lights and sirens, and

that misunderstanding may have contributed to the citizen's dissatisfaction with the officer. Further highlighting the lack of knowledge that some citizens have regarding officers' jobs, it is not necessary for an officer to be present at the scene of a car accident. Citizens can simply exchange information and report to their insurance companies as officers do not write reports for accidents unless the accident turns into a hit and run or the accident results in a fatality.

Observations of Officers. In all, all but one officer I rode along with displayed satisfactory actions, language, and demeanor. Initial contact with citizens felt nearly scripted with each interaction beginning with a brief introduction "Hello, my name is Officer John Smith with the Prince George's County Police Department. Can you tell me what happened?" and following a routine set of follow-up questions. From my observations alone, I noted no officer demographic factors (e.g. race, age, rank) that corresponded with differential actions, language, or demeanor from officers during later interactions with citizens. The following is a summary of my perceptions regarding 23 individual interactions with the eight officers whom I rode along with and who also completed their survey. The Observational Workbook I used to document my observations included a series of quantitative data as well as qualitative handwritten notes. The following first presents my observations quantitatively and then each observation is qualitatively expanded upon.

Allowing the citizen to express concern (N=18; 78%) was the most common action displayed by officers based on my observations. From my observations, this was one of the most natural actions as one of the first questions asked by the officers was "Can you tell me what happened here?" While I did not record this question as the officer

“expressing concern”, not interrupting the natural progression of the citizen going into too much detail, going off-topic, or starting to interject opinions and feelings as opposed to just stating the facts indicated to me that the officer was allowing the citizen to ‘express concern’.

None of the officers *provided comfort* to citizens, according to my observations. Although prior literature shows that citizens report increased satisfaction with an police interaction if they were provided comfort (Callanan et al., 2012; Foley & Terrill, 2008; Kelly, 1984; Murray, 1982; Rook, 1982), it was methodologically difficult to measure the expression of comfort during these calls for service. For example, it would be inappropriate in most any situation for an officer to make physical contact with a citizen, such as via a hug or pat on the back. Difficulties in defining *providing comfort* are further discussed in Chapter 5.

Table 11. Observed frequency of the actions displayed by the officers (N=23).

	Actions Observed
Make an arrest	1 (4%)
Arrive quickly	15 (65%)
Allow the citizen to express concern	18 (78%)
Investigate the scene	6 (26%)
Provide comfort	0
Question witnesses	8 (35%)
Consider citizen’s opinion when making an arrest decision	1 (4%)

Telling the citizen about the next steps in the criminal justice system (N=18; 78%) was the most common language displayed by officers based on my observations. It was very common for officers to explain to citizens that what they needed to do next was go to the Magistrate’s Office to file their complaint or the proper paperwork (e.g. in cases of

domestic disputes the complainant must have an Emergency Protective Order before an officer can go forward with removing a partner from a cohabitating household). As will be discussed later, citizens will often call the police regarding situations where an officer can do no more than create a case number and provide the relevant information which the citizen must then use in order for the criminal justice system to respond properly.

Table 12. Observed frequency of the language displayed by the officers (N=23).

	Language Observed
Tell citizen about victim services	1 (4%)
Tell citizen about medical services	1 (4%)
Tell citizen about safety information	5 (22%)
Tell citizen about his/her rights	12 (52%)
Tell citizen about the next steps in the criminal justice system	18 (78%)
Blame citizen for what happened	3 (13%)
Ask citizen if he/she had any questions	9 (39%)
Repeat questions back to him/her	0
Use “swear” words	3 (13%)
Say something to make the citizen feel better	2 (9%)
Tell citizen that reporting to the police was a good thing	0

None of the officers *repeated citizen questions back to him/her*, according to my observations. First, this is likely a reflection of the limited instances recorded of officers asking if “he/she had any questions” (N=9; 39%). Second, it is likely that many citizens would find a repetition of their questions as annoying or patronizing, as opposed to as a tool to clarify what is being asked. Similarly, none of the officers *told the citizen that reporting to the police was a good thing*, according to my observations. Based on personal conversations with citizens and officers alike, there seemed to be a general distrust of the police by citizens in the county. Therefore, I initially anticipated that officers would want to verbally acknowledge citizens for reporting calls for service. It is possible that officers may not be aware of the positive consequences resulting from

telling citizens that reporting was a good thing to have done. Indeed, 4 of the 8 officers reported that they believed that the effect of *telling the citizen that reporting to the police was a good thing* on a citizen's satisfaction would "depend on the situation". Although data were not gathered to expand upon officers' perceptions of these varying situations, it may be that officers believe there are certain situations in which calling the police falls outside of their role as an officer. It is also possible that officers are trying to avoid their language being interpreted as patronizing.

I recorded only one instance of an officer *telling citizens about victim services*. Many (N=8; 40%) citizens said that they received this information, but my perception is that this did not occur very often. When an officer would explain how to go the Magistrate's office to file a Protective From Abuse (PFA) for a domestic case, for example, I considered that to be *telling citizens about the next steps in the criminal justice system*; it is possible that citizens did not interpret this factor the same way. Telling a citizen about victim services, to me, was providing a hotline number or handing out a victim services pamphlet (an action I only witnessed once).

Being *respectful* (N=21; 91%) was the most common demeanor displayed by officers based on my observations. As previously discussed in the literature review, demeanor can encompass both actions and language. Recall, for the purposes of this study, demeanor refers to the citizens' perceptions of the officer's attitude. Similarly, in the case of my observations, demeanor refers to my perceptions of the officer's attitude. Therefore, I interpreted actions such as wiping one's feet or removing headwear when entering a citizen's home, and language such as "sir" and "ma'am" when speaking to a citizen as signs of respect.

Officers were least likely to *appear rushed*, based on my observations of their displayed demeanors. My observations revealed that officers did not appear rushed in almost all interactions with citizens (N=21; 91%). This was characterized by patiently listening to the citizen (e.g. not interrupting the citizen's recounting of the events) and not making anxious movements (e.g. tapping their pen or foot, checking their watches, or interrupting the citizen). Recall that demeanor can sometimes encompass both actions and language and that, for the purposes of this portion of the study, demeanor refers to my perceptions of the officer's attitude.

In sum, the most consistent action I observed officers engage in was *allowing the citizen to express concern* (N=18; 78%), the most consistent language observed was *telling the citizen about the next steps in the criminal justice system* (N=18; 78%), and the most consistent demeanor exhibited among officers involved *respectful* demeanor (N=21; 91%). Conversely, the least consistent action observed across officers was *providing comfort* (N=0), the two language factors that were not observed among officers were *repeating citizen questions back to him/her* and *telling the citizen that reporting to the police was a good thing*, and the least consistent demeanor across officers was *appearing rushed* (N=4; 21%).¹⁵

To contextualize some of the above, several of the above actions, language, and demeanors listed above may have been more or less common depending on the type of call for service. For example, investigating the scene was not necessary at the call I

¹⁵ These observations come solely post-Pilot Study as no Observational Data was recorded during that time period (e.g. August 1, 2019 to September 1, 2019) per a request from the Prince George's County Police Department.

observed where the citizen was complaining about threatening text messages they had received. Further, officers would not use language referring citizens to medical services if the citizen’s call was for a property crime such as a hit-and-run where the citizen was not in the vehicle at the time of the event. It is important to keep such context in mind when reviewing the use – or lack of use – of some of these actions, language, and demeanor that officers have otherwise indicated as important to display to increase citizen satisfaction.

Table 13. Observed frequency of the demeanors displayed by the officers (N=23).

	Demeanors Observed
Respectful	21 (91%)
Listen	19 (83%)
Made eye-contact	16 (70%)
Appear rushed	2 (9%)
Appear concerned	3 (13%)
Appear interested in helping	17 (74%)
Appear to believe citizen	19 (83%)
Fair treatment	19 (83%)
Honest	17 (74%)
Helpful	17 (74%)

What was most telling about how an officer was likely to interact with citizens during the ride-along was how candid the officer was in our discussions about certain types of calls for service. For example, officers often expressed frustration, and correspondingly displayed unsatisfactory actions, language, and demeanor during calls for service, with citizens who were intoxicated, under the influence, or involved in a domestic situation. For example, a few officers verbally expressed their dislike of responding to domestic disturbances as they believed they would end up being sent out to that location again for the same offense in the future. Officers’ frustrations about victims

often returning to their abusers, which causes the officer to respond to the location multiple times, is also supported by research documenting that domestic violence victims often return to their abuser (Postmus & Hahn, 2007; Slabbert, 2017). Some officers referred to these calls for service as “frequent fliers” meaning these citizens made calls for service often. Naturally, responding repeatedly to “frequent fliers” was observed to be frustrating for some officers. However, the negative attitudes expressed with having to go to these certain calls was a strong indicator that the officer would later exhibit negative actions, language, or demeanor with most citizens, especially those labeled “frequent fliers” by the officer himself.

My observations revealed that a strong indicator of an officer’s display of satisfactory actions, language, and demeanors was the way the officer treated children and adolescents. juveniles. Officers who carried toys for children they encountered during calls for service were observed as displaying more satisfactory actions, language, and demeanors during calls for service overall. For example, one officer who I observed displaying consistently satisfactory actions, language, and demeanors throughout the shift had a box of stuffed animals that he presented to a child during a traffic stop. Further, officers who “did not want to get a young kid in trouble when they were just being a dumb kid” was observed displaying more satisfactory actions, language, and demeanors during calls for service overall. As another example, an officer whom I had noted several times displaying satisfactory actions, language, and demeanors responded to a call for a suspicious vehicle which turned out to be occupied by several teenagers. Instead of giving the teens several citations, the officer decided to let them go with a warning, even joking with them that he did the same thing when he was their age. Notably, this

particular officer's use of "swear" words with these teens elicited laughs and a calmer demeanor from the teens. While research indicates using "swear" words typically leads to citizen dissatisfaction with officers (Baseheart & Cox, 1993; Patton et al., 2017), the teenagers were observed to interpret this language as a sign of comradery and mutual respect as opposed to authoritative language. Although I was not able to document observations of the person who placed the call for service in this case because this person was not available when the officer responded, it is possible that this person might have rated the use of *swear words* – and, similarly, the overall laissez-faire attitude of the officer - as having decreased their satisfaction with the officer. Certainly, officers who respond to calls for service must delicately negotiate interactions with a wide range of people, personalities, expectations, situations, and degrees of risk.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

Discussion

The purpose of this research was to examine holistically police interactions with non-offending citizens. This study assessed the factors that both parties perceived affected citizens' perceptions of the interactions. In other words, surveys were disseminated to both police officers and the citizens with whom those officers came into contact. For citizens, the surveys assessed the actions, language, and demeanors the officer displayed during the interactions that either increased or decreased their satisfaction with the officer. For officers, the surveys asked which of those same actions, language, and demeanors they actively used with citizens and whether they believe these factors increased or decreased citizens' satisfaction with the encounter. In addition to these surveys, I recorded observations which allowed for an "outsider", third party assessment of each citizen-police interactions that took place.

Review of Findings in the Context of Prior Literature

Officer and Citizen Perceptions of Citizen Satisfaction. First, the results from the satisfaction section of the surveys revealed that the majority of citizens were satisfied with the officers who responded to their calls for service. Further, survey results reflect generally positive actions, language, and demeanors being displayed by the officers, according to citizens' responses. Consistent with prior research, this study also found that citizen satisfaction was positively affected when an officer arrived to the scene quickly (Brandl & Horvath, 1991; Skogan, 2005), allowed the citizen to express their concerns (Skogan, 2006; Tewksbury & West, 2001), and provided comfort (Callanan et al., 2012;

Foley & Terrill, 2008). Relatedly, this study also found that found citizen satisfaction increased with responding officers who discussed the next steps in the criminal justice system (see also Ekman & Seng, 2009; Johnson, 2007) and asked if they had any questions (e.g., Hodgson, 2005). Also in line with extant research, citizens in the current study were satisfied with officers who were respectful (Bradford, Stanko, & Jackson, 2009; Tewksbury & West, 2001), listened and made eye-contact (Butterworth & Westmarland, 2015; Hinds, 2009; Robinson & Strohshine, 2005), appeared concerned and appeared interested in helping (Skogan, 2006; Tewksbury & West, 2001), appeared to believe the citizen (Campbell et al., 2001; Venema, 2016), and who provided fair treatment and were honest (Hickman & Sampson, 2003; Skogan, 2005; Skogan, 2006; Tyler, 2005). These findings work to further promote the importance of this line of research by highlighting the importance of such factors when actively working to increase citizens' satisfaction with officers.

Second, this study found important results regarding officers' understanding of citizens' expectations. For example, officers indicated that they believe satisfaction with an officer will increase if the officer arrives quickly, allows the citizen to express concern, investigates the scene, and provides comfort. Officers further believe that telling citizens about victim services, safety information, and citizen rights, asking if the citizen has any questions, and saying something to make the citizen feel better all increase citizens' satisfaction with the officer. Finally, participating officers believe that being respectful, listening, making eye-contact, avoiding appearing rushed, appearing concerned, appearing interested in helping, appearing to believe the citizen, appearing to be fair, appearing honest, and appearing helpful all increase citizens' satisfaction with an

officer. These findings are all very important in that it appears that the participating officers were generally aware of the preferences of citizens when it comes to how the officer acts, the language they use, and the demeanors they display.

Observation Results. The observational data were found to be very valuable to this study. While the observations determined that most citizens were satisfied with the responding officer, some of the unsatisfactory factors were not reported by the citizens. It is possible that those citizens who were dissatisfied were less likely to complete the survey (participation bias). Another possibility is that these citizens did not perceive certain actions, language, or demeanors to be unsatisfactory. For example, in one instance an officer used “swear” words in front of a citizen; I noted this, but the citizen would later indicate that the officer did not use “swear” words during their interaction on her survey. It is possible that the citizen did not notice the utterance. It is also likely that she was aware of the use of the “swear” word but forgot by the time she took the survey. It is further likely that she did not think it was worth mentioning because the word was aimed not at herself, but rather at a witness who had been found to be lying to the police.

As previously noted, older citizens were observed to be more welcoming of police officers than were younger citizen respondents. My initial perception was that it is possible that with age comes manners. Yet it is also possible that there are differences in generational views of deference versus defiance of the police. Although it is beyond the scope of this project, there has been a history of researchers looking into the differential experiences of various groups (e.g. Blacks and LatinX versus Whites, and Millennials versus Boomers) and their views of the police (see: Bradford, 2011; Smith, Lopez Bunyasi, & Smith, 2019; Weitzer, 2017; White, Weisburd, & Wire, 2018). Future

researchers should review if a general acceptance of the police by the elderly is due directly to age or an effect of younger generations' views of the police. This is even more pertinent at the time of this writing as younger generations become more vocal – and even are engaging in nationwide protests – voicing support for the Black Lives Matter movement against police brutality.

Women and children surprised me the most in how they reacted to my presence. In general, women spoke directly to me when recounting their stories, especially in cases of domestic situations. There were several instances where women would only make eye-contact with me when giving their statements to the police. In one domestic situation, a woman who was told by police that there was nothing that could be done about removing her partner from the house, motioned towards the male officer, seemingly hoping I could help translate the situation as a fellow female. My interpretation of this situation was that, although the officer was providing accurate information, his dismissive attitude and raised voice was negatively communicated and interpreted as such by the citizen. When children were present during calls for service, I observed that many took an instant liking to me. At one domestic situation, a boy of approximately five years of age came right up to me and hugged my leg and did not remove himself until the interaction was over. In another instance, a boy of about eight years of age came up to me and asked if I was a police officer (noting my lack of uniform). When I said I was not, he told me that it was a good thing because police “scared” him. He too, did not leave my side until the interaction was over. With both women and children, it is unknown if my sex led to these individuals being more comfortable, or if my lack of uniform made me appear more approachable to certain citizens.

During the Pilot Study, I attempted to make it apparent that I was not affiliated with the police department while also wanting to come across as professional, so I wore business casual clothing (e.g., blazer and slacks). This was later changed to a more casual attire after the reactions I received from some citizens (e.g. blouse and jeans). For example, one woman was adamant that I must be from Child Protective Services (CPS) due to the way I was dressed and the clipboard I carried. Another individual started to barricade themselves inside their home as they believed me to be from Emergency Petition Service (EPS), a crisis response organization typically called for individuals experiencing a potential mental health emergency. Upon my arrival at the department (and therefore before introductions were made) officers, on the other hand, typically believed I was a potential applicant or a detective. After switching to the more informal dress code, I experienced less hesitation in general; however, one officer still did ask if I was from Internal Affairs.

The observations also helped me, as a researcher, to better gain an understanding of what the officers' experiences were like in their day-to-day routine. For example, there were multiple times that no calls for service came through during my ride-along. This left me with lots of time sitting in the patrol car with no productivity towards the project. While I was personally entertained getting to speak with the officers during this downtime, I can imagine officers' ennui when a lack of service calls happens multiple times throughout a workweek. This was contrasted by the many shifts where calls for service would come back-to-back with plenty more calls for service writing on the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD). With this came the non-stop activity with little time for breaks or report writing before going to the next scene. I can also imagine that this

causes a different type of exhaustion and frustration for officers facing this type of work multiple times throughout a workweek. In fact, prior research shows that organizational stressors (e.g. rules directing police conduct and workload) and occupational stressors (e.g. high speed chases and witnessing the injury or death of a co-worker) significantly impact police officers and their work (Brown & Campbell, 1990 ; Dabney et al., 2013; Singh, 2017).

I also witnessed firsthand the dangers experienced by officers. During my time with the police department, I witnessed extremely intoxicated individuals and those with severe mental illnesses, both types of individuals whose actions are unpredictable. For example, one intoxicated individual quickly left the room while officers were conversing with him, leading them to suspect that he was potentially going for a weapon. Although the citizen did not retrieve a weapon, the swift change in tension among officers was clearly noticeable. Another intoxicated citizen had loss control of their bodily functions and could not be easily removed from the establishment he was banned from. This, as opposed to a direct physical threat, posed a hazardous situation for all on scene.¹⁶ One example where I witnessed officers dealing with mental illnesses was a man known in the community to be off of his medication who had begun damaging vehicles in a residential parking lot. His aggressive and unpredictable behavior resulted in him needing to be restrained. As he became aware of what was happening, I observed that he began to

¹⁶ I would actually come across this citizen twice during the study; both times he was extremely intoxicated. Interestingly, I would come to find out that this individual was murdered weeks after our last encounter.

struggle and spit at officers as well as emergency personnel who had arrived. One officer received a minor injury while one appeared to have saliva on them.¹⁷

There were several instances where I was not approved to leave the vehicle for my own safety. For example, there was one call for service where an intoxicated individual began making fervent hand movements which resulted in them being tasered. When we arrived on scene, I was not allowed to exit the vehicle until officers had restrained the suspect and ensured no other potentially dangerous individuals would appear. Another instance where, not only was I unallowed to exit the vehicle, the vehicle I occupied was moved around the corner to ensure my safety. This was during an instance of a possible suicide attempt where the individual was known to own firearms. I was not allowed on the scene because officers were unsure if the individual would be in possession of firearms at the time of our arrival and were further unsure if the individual would use the firearms against the officers attempting to help her. Another instance where I was not allowed to exit the vehicle was in certain domestic situations if the caller had advised that the suspect had a weapon. This was not always the case, however, and was at the sole discretion of the hosting officer.

There were other occasions where it could be perceived that my safety was at risk during my ride-alongs. I was in attendance for several “priority calls”, which are calls that are emergent either due to the severity or on-going nature of the event. It is these calls where the officer turns on their emergency lights, uses their sirens, and drives over the speed limit. Numerous times I experienced speeds over 80 miles per hour, and a few

¹⁷ Note: the “spitting incident” occurred during my earlier ride-alongs, pre-COVID-19 outbreak.

times exceeding 100 miles per hour. The danger mostly comes from citizens not knowing what to do when an officer is “running priority” and tries to pass them. I witnessed several close calls for car accidents either due to individuals pulling out in front of officers or from citizens not pulling off the to the side of the road when officers indicated that they needed to pass.

I also quickly became aware of how prevalent the idea of being involved in a shooting is on the minds of officers. During my very first ride-along I was told about the three buttons that will immediately send an alert to all radios in the event my ride-along officer was incapacitated. This officer also told me that the only place on a vehicle that can withstand bullets is the engine block and that was where I was to hide in the event a shooting occurred. During a different ride-along, an officer suddenly stopped his vehicle in the middle of a residential street and gave me the following scenario: he had just been shot, I have pushed the signal button and dispatch needs to know my location; what were our closest intersections? I looked around and had to admit I could not see the street signs. This was something his training officer did to him during his rookie period; I attempted to be as aware as possible of street signs for the remainder of my ride-alongs.

It should be noted that the Observation Workbook only reflects when an officer *did* display one of the listed actions, language, and demeanors. Due to the fast-pace of the ride-alongs, there were oftentimes where I was unable to note whether an officer had the opportunity to display one of the listed actions, language, or demeanor, and therefore was only able to note when the officer displayed one of those factors. For example, at times it was out of the officer’s control how quickly they could respond to a call for service and, therefore, may appear that they did not arrive quickly when they got to the scene as

quickly as was possible. It would be difficult to note the difference between the officer taking their time to respond versus being unable to get to a given scene immediately as I was not in constant possession of the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD). Further, the Observation Workbook does not reflect that the officer did the opposite of the listed actions, language, or demeanors. For instance, the fact that only 70% (N=16) of the interactions indicate that the officer “Made eye-contact” does not mean that the remaining 30% (N=7) of the interactions exhibited an officer avoiding eye-contact. Rather, there were times where recording such a demeanor was impossible. An example would be a call where there is the possibility of a weapon on scene. Since in these cases I was not initially allowed to leave the vehicle, there were times where an encounter would fully take place without me leaving the vehicle for my safety. The observational data is supported by notes taken either in the field, during inactive periods, or as part of a summary reflection of the entire ride-along, depending on the ability to do so.

In reviewing these results, it would appear that citizens know what they expect when interacting with the police in terms of satisfactory actions, language, and demeanors. Similarly, officers seem to be aware of what citizens expect from them during these encounters, though they are likely to believe that situational factors are to blame for differences in citizen opinions. It is further important for researchers to note the reactions of all groups involved. First, citizens seemed relatively accepting of my presence and of the presence of officers. However, there was an air of hesitancy from the citizens towards both myself and the police. This may reflect not only current political issues, but how one is immediately perceived when approaching someone during a time of heightened vulnerability (i.e. not long after a victimization or the witnessing of a crime

has occurred).¹⁸ Second, police officers were initially hesitant to accept me. Distrust of researchers is common amongst police officers, which researchers should not take personally and rather should work to ease the concerns of their respondents.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

Though this study took steps to expand the current literature on satisfactory citizen-police interactions in unique ways, there are limitations to this study which are acknowledged and should be addressed in future research. First, a selection bias among the participants was possible. Among citizen participants, it was possible that only those who were extreme in their satisfaction with the officer (e.g., either very satisfied or very dissatisfied) agreed to take the survey. Similarly, it was possible that the officers most concerned with citizen satisfaction agreed to participate in the survey. As a participant under observation, it is also possible that officers may have changed their actions, language, and demeanor due to the researcher's presence (e.g., Hawthorne effect). However, my observations do not show evidence of a Hawthorne effect among officers given that there were times that inappropriate behavior was displayed by officers in front of me. Specifically, there were instances where officers displayed actions, language, and demeanors that I perceived as contributing to a citizen's dissatisfaction with that officer. As illustrated in the results, some officers did not allow citizens to express concerns and appeared to rush citizens. Some officers further treated some citizens with extreme disrespect. For example, I witnessed one officer kick a citizen who was intoxicated. I also witnessed another officer minimize the account of an alleged domestic victim to the

¹⁸ Recall, this project concluded before the killing of George Floyd.

accused citizen in front of the person who had made the original call for service.¹⁹ Finally, I witnessed an officer who would go out of his way to berate individuals loitering outside businesses and film them using Snapchat accompanied by explicit language. Taken together, it is my perception that officers, overall, were not changing the way they conducted themselves due to the presence of a researcher. This project relied upon self-report surveys as the primary source of data. While some researchers believe that the use of this method in surveying victims can gain greater insight into victims' experiences than can official data (Langton, Planty, & Lynch, 2017), others dispute its validity due to false reporting (Junger-Tas & Marshall, 1999; Lynch & Addington, 2010). This potential limitation was minimized due to the anonymity of both officer and citizen surveys.

From a research perspective, citizens were unpredictable. Most citizens were respectful and willing to listen to the project description. As can be deduced by the return rate, many citizens were initially willing to participate. Given the number of citizens that accepted the survey versus the number of surveys received, it is possible that many citizens simply forgot to complete or return the survey, rather than being unwilling to participate.

One of the most difficult factors to assess while completing this project was deciding who was approachable. Intoxication or appearing to be under the influence of some narcotic was extremely prevalent and led to many calls for service that were unusable for the purposes of this project. In fact, one of the first codes I learned during my ride-alongs was the verbal numeric code for a "possibly intoxicated individuals"

¹⁹ Note: these two examples are from officers not hosting me as a ride-along, but who were aware of my presence and the nature of my project.

being at a scene. This was unfortunate, not just due to the loss of potential respondents, but due to the fact that an intoxicated person is likely to have a very unique experience with and perception of an officer's actions, language, and demeanor (see: Dai, Frank, & Sun, 2011; Engel, 2003; Reisig et al., 2004; Schuller & Stewart, 2000; Stewart & Maddren, 1997). An important issue to acknowledge in providing surveys to those who appear intoxicated or under the influence is the respondent's ability to give consent (Bond, 2004; Cohen, 2002; Davis, 2020). However, the inability to give consent due to intoxication has come under question, with research pointing to respondents being able to understand the research purpose and the voluntariness of becoming involved (Morán-Sánchez et al., 2016). Further, exclusions based on intoxication likely under-represents minority respondents, as well as those from lower socio-economic backgrounds (Humphreys & Weisner, 2000). Previous research has suggested including intoxicated individuals and having a "teach-then-test" method of assessing ability to comprehend and consent (Aldridge & Charles, 2008; Davis, 2020). That is, researchers may consider explaining the research and informed consent policy and then test the potential respondent to see if they understand the procedures. Other research has further suggested waiting for the respondent to "sober up" or utilizing a method to determine level of inebriation (McCrary & Bux, 1999). Due to obvious constraints, this would not be possible for the current project.

From a research perspective, officers were also unpredictable in their willingness to participate. Police officers are known to be wary of outsiders, especially researchers. This was expected and later realized/actualized. Oftentimes I would leave a roll call with no volunteers to host me as a ride-along. It was no secret that officers were hesitant to

have a researcher in the patrol car with them; almost all of the officers I rode with mentioned being hesitant to take me on at first and almost every officer told me about previous bad experiences with researchers that either they themselves had experienced or heard from a fellow officer in the department. Part way into each ride-along, there was an almost palpable relaxation on the part of the officer as they seemed to realize that I was not there to get them in trouble or point out what they were doing wrong. At the end of many of these ride-alongs, officers vocalized how different the experience was than what they had expected.

Suggestions for Future Research

As with any survey, there are imperfections that can be improved in future replications of the project. For instance, the style of the survey may have been confusing for some respondents. Citizens were asked to indicate whether an officer displayed any of the listed actions, language, and demeanor. An arrow visually then directed them to indicate whether this display increased, had no effect, or decreased their level of satisfaction with the officer. Even with the bolded arrow directing citizens to the next column, several surveys were left incomplete specifically when indicating if a factor affected their satisfaction.

Some confusion may also have been avoided if citizen surveys included extra options, as noted by the numerous “write-in” responses for some of the questions. For one, the first question, which asked, “Why were the police called” with response options being “a) violent crime, b) property crime, c) disorder problem, and d) other” may have been better answered with a free-write line. A few citizens seemed to not know the difference between different crime types. For example, one citizen asked on-scene what a

disorder problem meant, while another citizen responded “c) Other: someone stole my car keys”. Second, question two asked, “Were you the victim or witness to the crime?” with response options being “a) victim and b) witness”. An option for “c) other” should have been provided as this was a common response. For example, one citizen had called the police for a crime against their under-age grandchild and had not seen what had occurred directly. Another citizen indicated that they were a witness to a crime (i.e. speeding) and then became a victim (i.e. their car was then hit when the driver lost control of their vehicle). Third, questions asking whether or not the responding officer did, said, or displayed any of the listed actions, language, and demeanors should have provided a “not applicable” option. Several citizens wrote in “N/A” while others left certain questions blank. This would have been interesting to capture those citizens who recognized then that the action, language, or demeanor would not have been appropriate or necessary at the time. Fourth, there was some difficulty in properly capturing a “comforting” demeanor in the survey. Recall, while 74% (N=17) of the citizens indicated that their responding officer provided comfort, I recorded no instances of an officer comforting a citizen.²⁰ From my perspective, comforting can be seen through a combination of overt actions and language. For example, comforting behavior could include a hug or a pat on the shoulder, however these are likely frowned upon actions for a uniformed officer. Comforting could also be shown verbally through saying “it will be ok”, however making such promises as a law enforcement officer is also likely discouraged. Future researchers may want to instead switch “provide comfort” with

²⁰ This does not mean that I found all of the officers appearing uncomfortable. Recall, observations were recorded when officers *did* display one of the listed actions, language, or demeanors.

“comforting” (a demeanor) due to difficulties defining it clearly. Providing comfort may, in fact, may be more a perception (i.e. comforting) of several actions and language, as opposed to an action as previously defined (i.e. provide comfort). Finally, for the demographic questions, future researchers may want to consider including a “Wish not to respond” option as this may encourage respondents to fill out some of the questions as opposed to leaving them all blank.

There were two potentially important factors that were not addressed in the original surveys but possibly could have provided further helpful context for respondents’ answers to satisfaction-related questions. First, a question that was not included in either the citizen or officer surveys was “How many people were on scene?” with response options for number of citizens and number of officers present. This information may have shed light on how the presence of others – both citizens and officers alike – may affect the respondents’ perceptions of the interaction. For example, citizen respondents may see the presence of many officers as a reflection that their call was important. Conversely, an officer respondent may see the presence of many citizens on scene as a potential for danger or disruption. Another important factor that was not addressed in this project was the location of the calls for service. Did the call for service occur in higher crime areas or with greater examples of victim-offender overlap? This could be important for citizens who may be witnessing higher rates of crime and, therefore, more police presence. For officers, this could affect their behavior as they subconsciously react to responding to certain areas within their beats.

The length of the survey questions could also be altered for future replications of this project. It may have been clearer for respondents if there were more to the action,

language, and demeanor bullets for them to indicate. For example, many of the demeanors are one-word responses, such as “helpful” or “listen”. Expanding on these may have made the survey easier to comprehend for some respondents. However, it is also possible that a more simplistic way of asking some of the questions may have been favorable given the average education level of citizens in the county.

For several reasons the project faced some setbacks resulting in a relatively small sample size. For example, during the data collection period, holds were placed on the study by the agency for periodic reviews of officers’ participation to ensure the protection their employees’ anonymity. After five months of data collection, I also reevaluated officer participation and made the decision to increase the number of days I attended roll calls – from two to three days a week to six to seven days a week - in hopes of increasing respondent participation. Another delay was the result of being a sole researcher on the project. Issues with scheduling along with instances of being physically unable to attend ride-alongs due to temporary illness further delayed the data collection process. Had there been multiple researchers working on collecting this data, interruptions in the time spent attending role calls and ride-alongs would have been greatly reduced. Further, relying solely on voluntary ride-alongs led to multiple roll call attendances where no ride-alongs occurred. Further, the majority of the data collection process being conducted during colder months was likely the cause for the experienced drop in calls for service, therefore leading to less interactions with citizens to provide the survey (Linning, Andresen, & Brantingham, 2017; Mares & Moffett, 2019; Schinasi & Hamra, 2017). These winter dates also saw the increase of illness for officers, resulting in staffing shortages which in turn decreased the number of available ride-along volunteers. Finally, the COVID-19

pandemic also disrupted my data collection. Holds were enacted, retracted, and then re-enacted on my attendance as the police department and my committee reviewed safety concerns and procedures for my increased exposure to the general public. Eventually, the project was permanently cancelled due to health concerns and therefore all future ride-alongs were cancelled.

Future research may want to evaluate processes that would increase officer and citizen participation. For example, future researchers who collect county-wide data should also consider attending roll calls in only the districts with the highest rates of calls for service to maximize their exposure to more citizens. Similarly, researchers may consider working with multiple jurisdictions to further increase the chances of participation by both citizens and officers. Future researchers may also consider offering incentives for participating to officers and citizens alike (see: Erwin & Wheelright, 2002; Young et al., 2019).

Related to the small sample size is the exclusion of certain populations. Due to certain restrictions, this project did not disseminate surveys to citizens who were under 18 years old, who appeared intoxicated or under the influence, or who were injured. While this serves as a safeguard for protected populations, this does limit the potential sample. This exclusion also loses potentially important information regarding how such populations perceive their treatment by officers. Future research may consider implementing some type of parental consent form (i.e. for those victims and witnesses who are under the age of 18) and follow-up procedures for those who are unable to consent at the time of the interaction (i.e. those who were perceived to be intoxicated or under the influence or those who were injured).

Policy Implications

This study illustrates the importance of officer-citizen interactions, and this has the potential to develop policy implications for citizen-police interactions. Previous research has reviewed how police officers can increase citizen satisfaction with the police. Some research indicates that when officers being seen working alongside community members to address local issues is a strong predictor for citizens' high satisfaction with the police (Gill et al., 2014; Yuksel & Tepe, 2013; Weitzer & Tuch, 2005). Similarly, citizens who perceive a strong police presence in their neighborhoods also reported high levels of satisfaction with the police (Lord, Kuhns, & Friday, 2009).

Officers may also increase citizen satisfaction with law enforcement by working directly with citizens through direct follow-ups with citizens. Indeed, victims of crime report higher satisfaction with the police when proper follow-up investigations take place (Aihio, 2017; Myhill & Bradford, 2012; Poister & McDavid, 1978). Those studies have found that quality follow-up can be more important than the initial investigation itself. This is extremely important as victims' satisfaction with the police tend to decrease over the stages of the criminal justice system. The quality of these follow-ups are also important in maintaining citizen satisfaction. Indeed, satisfactory conversations between citizens and officers are characterized by greater citizen declarations and less question-and-answer back and forth between the officer and the citizen (Foley & Terrill, 2008; Glauser & Tullar, 1985; Schafer & Bonello, 2001).

Another area where police departments may be able to increase citizen satisfaction is the public's access to information. The public's access to information comes in two primary forms (1) the media and (2) the government website. Regarding the

media, research indicates that media over-attentiveness to the negatives related to police work, such as crime stories as well as incidents of police misconduct, generally decreases citizen satisfaction (Graziano, 2019; Weitzer & Tuch, 2005). Police departments can also increase citizen satisfaction by maintaining relationships with their local media providers. It is also important for police departments to release information regarding local crime and police misconduct in a timely manner, but also making sure to release correct details so as not to spread misinformation. Regarding governmental websites, availability of information about local services and quality of the government website has been shown to increase satisfaction with officers' communication effectiveness (Ho & Cho, 2017). More specifically, Ho and Cho found that regular updates to Kansas City Police Department's social media sites (e.g. Facebook and YouTube) may have increased citizen satisfaction among the younger respondents (i.e. aged 35 and under).

The above-mentioned policy recommendations may reflect a need for training review and additions for police departments and their training academies. First, training that pays special attention to communication techniques with citizens could likely increase satisfaction with officers in that area (Lum et al., 2012). Specifically, departments could also likely see increases in citizen satisfaction if officers avoided treating victims and witnesses as they do offending persons. It is important to not speak to citizens with a demeanor of authoritarianism. Instead, departments could more likely increase citizen satisfaction by training officers to talk to victims and witnesses with compassion and with keeping the citizens needs at the forefront (Skogan, 2005; Skogan, 2006; Tyler, 1990). Third, departments with some knowledge regarding how to interact with and talk to the media could likely see increases in citizen satisfaction with their

officers (Ho & Cho, 2017). Departments may also see increase in citizen satisfaction by being aware of the effects that social media plays in citizens' perceptions of the police. Engaging the public through news outlets and social media is a useful tool easily implemented within any given department. Such tools could be Facebook and Twitter pages, still popular with younger generations and gaining popularity with older generations. Another useful tool is Nextdoor, a monitored site that allows those within a specific neighborhood to "exchange helpful information" with one's "trusted connections".

Final Thoughts

In the end, this project contributes to the current literature on citizen-police interactions in two major ways. First, this study serves to further highlight those ways in which law enforcement can increase citizen satisfaction with the police by being aware of the effects of their own actions, language, and demeanors. Second, the study also shed light on the possibility that officers may see citizen satisfaction as something outside of their control.

The importance of this topic has become even more vital from the time the project started. The original inspiration for this study came from a curiosity regarding what officers were trained in that specifically related to their interactions with citizens. With the outlined results, it appears that there are many ways that officers can increase the likelihood that citizens will leave the interaction satisfied with the officer. Not captured within this project was a reflection on the systemic racism within law enforcement that overshadows the perception of the police by people of color. Indeed, recall that a recurring theme within officers' responses was that situational factors often influence

citizen satisfaction. It should be recognized as equally possibly true, then, that situational factors may influence citizens' reactions to police officers when an interaction occurs. It is not just the responsibility of policymakers to influence a change given that researchers can also play an important role in uncovering ways in which such changes are possible. Indeed, the current police reforms – and other calls for police reforms – will be key for improving citizen-police interactions (Arizona State University, 2020).

REFERENCES

- Aihio, N. (2017). *Improving victim satisfaction in volume crime investigations: The role of police actions and victim characteristics* (Doctoral dissertation, London South Bank University).
- Aldridge, J. & Charles, V. (2008). Researching the intoxicated: informed consent implications for alcohol and drug research. *Drug and alcohol dependence, 93*(3), 191-196.
- American Psychiatric Association (APA). (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*. Arlington: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Apple, N. & O'Brien, D. (1983). Neighborhood racial composition and residents' evaluation of police performance. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 11*(1), 76-84.
- Apsler, R., Cummins, M.R., & Carl, S. (2003). Perceptions of the police by female victims of domestic partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 9*(11), 1318-1335.
- Arizona State University. (2020). Transforming policing and criminal justice: An open letter from faculty members of ASU's School of Criminology & Criminal Justice. <https://ccj.asu.edu/content/transforming-policing-and-criminal-justice-open-letter-faculty-members-asu%E2%80%99s-school>
- Baseheart, J.R. & Cox, T.C. (1993). Effects of police use of profanity on a receiver's perceptions of credibility. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 9*(2), 9-19.
- Bittner, E. (1967). The police on skid-row: A study of peace keeping. *American Sociological Review, 699-715*.
- Bond, T. (2004). Ethical guidelines for researching counselling and psychotherapy. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research, 4*(2), 10-19.
- Bradford, B. (2011). Convergence, not divergence?: Trends and trajectories in public contact and confidence in the police. *The British Journal of Criminology, 51*(1), 179-200.
- Bradford, B., Stanko, E.A., & Jackson, J. (2009). Using research to inform policy: The role of public attitude surveys in understanding public confidence and police contact. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice, 3*(2), 139-148.
- Bradley, D. (2009). *Education and training*. In A. Wakefield & J. Fleming (Eds.), *The Sage Dictionary of Policing* (pp. 100–102). Los Angeles: Sage.

- Brandl, S.G., Frank, J., Wooldredge, J., & Watkins, R. C. (1997). On the measurement of public support for the police: A research note. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 20(3), 473-480.
- Brandl, S. G., & Horvath, F. (1991). Crime-victim evaluation of police investigative performance. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 19(2), 109-121.
- Breslau, N., Kessler, R. C., Chilcoat, H. D., Schultz, L. R., Davis, G. C., & Andreski, P. (1998). Trauma and posttraumatic stress disorder in the community: the 1996 Detroit Area Survey of Trauma. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 55(7), 626-632.
- Brewin, C. R., Andrews, B., & Rose, S. (2000). Fear, helplessness, and horror in posttraumatic stress disorder: Investigating DSM-IV Criterion A2 in victims of violent crime. *Journal of Traumatic Stress: Official Publication of The International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies*, 13(3), 499-509.
- Brodeur J.P. & Dupont B. (2006). Knowledge workers or ‘knowledge’ workers? *Policing & Society* 16: 7–26.
- Brown, S.E. (1984). Police responses to wife beating: Neglect of a crime of violence. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 12(3), 277-288.
- Brown, J. M., & Campbell, E. A. (1990). Sources of occupational stress in the police. *Work & Stress*, 4(4), 305-318.
- Brown, K., & Coulter, P.B. (1983). Subjective and objective measures of police service delivery. *Public Administration Review*, 43(1), 50-58.
- Butterworth, K., & Westmarland, N. (2015). Victims’ views on policing partner violence. *European Police Science and Research Bulletin*, 60.
- Buzawa, E.S., Austin, T. L., Bannon, J., & Jackson, J. (1992). Role of victim preference in determining police response to victims of domestic violence. *Domestic violence: The changing criminal justice response*, 255-269.
- Buzawa, E.S., & Buzawa, C.G. (Eds.). (1996). *Do arrests and restraining orders work?* Sage Publications.
- Buzawa, E.S., & Buzawa, C.G. (2003). *Domestic violence: The criminal justice response*. Sage Publications.
- Callanan, M., Brown, A., Turley, C., Kenny, T., & Roberts, J. (2012). Evidence and practice review of support for victims and outcome measurement. *Ministry of Justice Research Series*, 19, 12.
- Campbell, R., Sefl, T., Barnes, H.E., Ahrens, C.E., Wasco, S.M., & Zaragoza-Diesfeld, Y. (1999). Community services for rape survivors: Enhancing psychological well-

- being or increasing trauma? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67(6), 847.
- Campbell, R., Ahrens, C.E., Sefl, T., Wasco, S.M., & Barnes, H.E. (2001). Social reactions to rape victims: Healing and hurtful effects on psychological and physical health outcomes. *Violence and Victims*, 16(3), 287-302.
- Campbell, R., Wasco, S.M., Ahrens, C.E., Sefl, T., & Barnes, H.E. (2001). Preventing the “second rape”: Rape survivors' experiences with community service providers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(12), 1239-1259.
- Carbone-Lopez, K., Slocum, L.A., & Kruttschnitt, C. (2016). “Police wouldn’t give you no help”: Female offenders on reporting sexual assault to police. *Violence Against Women*, 22(3), 366-396.
- Cao, L., Frank, J., & Cullen, F.T. (1996). Race, community context and confidence in the police. *American Journal of Police*, 15(1), 3-22.
- Chandek, M.S. (1999), “Race, expectations, and evaluations of police performance: An empirical assessment”. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, Vol. 22.
- Cohen, P. J. (2002). Untreated addiction imposes an ethical bar to recruiting addicts for non-therapeutic studies of addictive drugs. *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 30(1), 73-81.
- Conaway, M.R. & Lohr, S.L. (1994). A longitudinal analysis of factors associated with reporting violent crimes to the police. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 10(1), 23-39.
- Connolly, J. (2008). Rethinking police training. *The Police Chief*, 75(11), 18-20.
- Correia, M.E., Reising, M.D., & Lovrich, N.P. (1996). Public perceptions of state police: An analysis of individual-level and contextual variables. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24(1), 17-28.
- Crank, J.P. (2014). *Understanding police culture*. Routledge.
- Dabney, D. A., Copes, H., Tewksbury, R., & Hawk-Tourtlot, S. R. (2013). A qualitative assessment of stress perceptions among members of a homicide unit. *Justice Quarterly*, 30(5), 811-836.
- Dai, M., Frank, J., & Sun, I. (2011). Procedural justice during police-citizen encounters: The effects of process-based policing on citizen compliance and demeanor. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(2), 159-168.

- Dai, M., & Jiang, X. (2016). A comparative study of satisfaction with the police in the United States and Australia. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 49(1), 30-52.
- Davis, C. N. (2020). Guidelines and recommendations for training ethical alcohol researchers. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 14(1), 52.
- Davis, J.R. (1990). A comparison of attitudes toward the New York City police. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 17(4), 233-243.
- Dawson, M. & Dinovitzer, R. (2001). Victim cooperation and the prosecution of domestic violence in a specialized court. *Justice Quarterly*, 18(3), 593-622.
- Decker, S.H. (1981). Citizen attitudes toward the police: A review of past findings and suggestions for future policy. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 9(1), 80-87.
- Dillman, D.A. (2016). Moving survey methodology forward in our rapidly changing world: A commentary. *Journal of Rural Social Sciences*, 31(3), 160.
- Dugan, L., Nagin, D.S., & Rosenfeld, R. (2003). Exposure reduction or retaliation? The effects of domestic violence resources on intimate-partner homicide. *Law & Society Review*, 37(1), 169-198.
- Earley, M. (2009). Developing reflective researchers. *Teaching Research Methods in the Social Sciences*, 103-110.
- Ekblom, P. & Heal, K. (1982). *The police response to calls from the public* (Vol. 9). London: Home Office.
- Ekman, M.S. & Seng, M.J. (2009). On-scene victim assistance units within law enforcement agencies. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 32(4), 719-738.
- Engel, R. S. (2003). Explaining suspects' resistance and disrespect toward police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31(5), 475-492.
- Engel, R.S. (2005). Citizens' perceptions of distributive and procedural injustice during traffic stops with police. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42(4), 445-481.
- Erez, E. & Tontodonato, P. (1992). Victim participation in sentencing and satisfaction with justice. *Justice Quarterly*, 9(3), 393-417.

- Ericson, R.V. & Haggerty, K.D. (1997). *Policing the risk society*. Clarendon Studies in Criminology.
- Erwin, W. J. & Wheelright, L. A. (2002). Improving mail survey response rates through the use of a monetary incentive. (Practice). *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 24(3), 247-256.
- Estrich, S. (1987). *Real rape*. Harvard University Press.
- Feeny, N.C., Zoellner, L.A., Fitzgibbons, L.A., & Foa, E.B. (2000). Exploring the roles of emotional numbing, depression, and dissociation in PTSD. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 13(3), 489-498.
- Fielding, N. (1988). *Joining forces: Police training, socialization, and occupational competence*. London: Routledge.
- Foa, E.B., Chrestman, K.R., & Gilboa-Schechtman, E. (2008). *Prolonged exposure therapy for adolescents with PTSD emotional processing of traumatic experiences, therapist guide*. Oxford University Press.
- Foa, E.B., & Rothbaum, B.O. (2001). *Treating the trauma of rape: Cognitive-behavioral therapy for PTSD*. Guilford Press.
- Foley, T., & Terrill, W. (2008). Police comfort and victims. *Victims and Offenders*, 3(2-3), 192-216.
- Fontana, A. & Frey, J. (1994). Interviewing: The art of science. *The Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 361-376.
- Fox, R.J., Crask, M.R., & Kim, J. (1988). Mail survey response rate: A meta-analysis of selected techniques for inducing response. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 52(4), 467-491.
- Frank, J., Brandl, S.G., Cullen, F.T., & Stichman, A. (1996). Reassessing the impact of race on citizens' attitudes toward the police: A research note. *Justice Quarterly*, 13(2), 321-334.
- Frazier, P.A., & Haney, B. (1996). Sexual assault cases in the legal system: Police, prosecutor, and victim perspectives. *Law and Human Behavior*, 20(6), 607.
- Friedman, L.N. (1985). The crime victim movement at its first decade. *Public Administration Review*, 790-794.
- Gainey, R.R., & Payne, B.K. (2009). Gender, victimisation, perceived risk and perceptions of police performance in disadvantaged neighbourhoods. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 11(3), 306-323.

- Garcia, V. & Cao, L. (2005). Race and satisfaction with the police in a small city. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(2), 191-199.
- Garofalo, J. (1977). *The police and public opinion: An analysis of victimization and attitude data from 13 American cities* (Vol. 3). US Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service.
- Gau, J.M. (2014). Procedural justice and police legitimacy: A test of measurement and structure. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(2), 187-205.
- Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., Vitter, Z., & Bennett, T. (2014). Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: A systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 10(4), 399-428.
- Glauser, M. J. & Tullar, W. L. (1985). Citizen satisfaction with police officer/citizen interaction: Implications for the changing role of police organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70(3), 514.
- Graziano, L. M. (2019). News media and perceptions of police: a state-of-the-art-review. *Policing: An International Journal*.
- Greenman, S. (2010). *Using Procedural Justice to Explore the Relationship between Victim Satisfaction with Police and Victim Participation in Prosecution* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Greenwood, P.W. & Petersilia, J. (1975). *The criminal investigation process volume I: Summary and policy implications*. Department of Justice.
- Hansen, N.B., Hansen, M., Nielsen, L.H., & Elklit, A. (2017). Positive or negative change in outlook on life following sexual assault and associations to PTSD severity. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 32(1), 36-45.
- Hart, B. (1993). Battered women and the criminal justice system. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 36(5), 624-638.
- Hattendorf, J. & Tollerud, T.R. (1997). Domestic violence: Counseling strategies that minimize the impact of secondary victimization. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 33(1), 14-23.
- Hickman, L.J., & Simpson, S.S. (2003). Fair treatment or preferred outcome? The impact of police behavior on victim reports of domestic violence incidents. *Law & Society Review*, 37(3), 607-634.
- Hilden, M., Schei, B., Swahnberg, K., Halmesmäki, E., Langhoff-Roos, J., Offerdal, K., ... & Wijma, B. (2004). A history of sexual abuse and health: A Nordic

- multicentre study. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*, *111*(10), 1121-1127.
- Hindelang, M.J. (1974). Public opinion regarding crime, criminal justice, and related topics. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *11*(2), 101-116.
- Hinds, L. (2009). Public satisfaction with police: The influence of general attitudes and police-citizen encounters. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, *11*(1), 54-66.
- Hirschel, D., Lumb, R., & Johnson, R. (1998). Victim assessment of the police response to burglary: The relative effects of incident, police action, outcome and demographic variables on citizen satisfaction. *Police Quarterly*, *1*(4), 1-20.
- Ho, A. T. K., & Cho, W. (2017). Government communication effectiveness and satisfaction with police performance: A large-scale survey study. *Public Administration Review*, *77*(2), 228-239.
- Hodgson, B. (2005). Angry or what? Experiences of being a crime victim. *British Journal of Community Justice*, *3*(3).
- Holmstrom, L.L. & Burgess, A.W. (2017). *The victim of rape*. Routledge.
- Huey, L., & Ricciardelli, R. (2015). 'This isn't what I signed up for': When police officer role expectations conflict with the realities of general duty police work in remote communities. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, *17*(3), 194-203.
- Humphreys, K. & Weisner, C. (2000). Use of exclusion criteria in selecting research subjects and its effect on the generalizability of alcohol treatment outcome studies. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *157*(4), 588-594.
- Hurst, Y.G. & Frank, J. (2000). How kids view cops: The nature of juvenile attitudes toward the police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *28*(3), 189-202.
- Ingram, J.R. (2010). *The influence of workgroups on occupational attitudes of the police: A multilevel examination*. Michigan State University.
- Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Hough, M., Myhill, A., Quinton, P., & Tyler, T.R. (2012). Why do people comply with the law? Legitimacy and the influence of legal institutions. *British Journal of Criminology*, *52*(6), 1051-1071.
- Jermier, J.M., Slocum Jr, J.W., Fry, L.W., & Gaines, J. (1991). Organizational subcultures in a soft bureaucracy: Resistance behind the myth and facade of an official culture. *Organization Science*, *2*(2), 170-194.

- Johnson, I.M. (2007). Victims' perceptions of police response to domestic violence incidents. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(5), 498-510.
- Jones, R. (2007). *Citizens' perceptions of 'the police'*. Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections Southern Illinois University Carbondale.
- Junger-Tas, J., & Marshall, I. H. (1999). The self-report methodology in crime research. *Crime and Justice*, 25, 291-367.
- Kelly, D.P. (1984). Delivering legal services to victims: An evaluation and prescription. *Justice System Journal*, 9, 62.
- Kennedy, D.B., & Homant, R.J. (1983). Attitudes of abused women toward male and female police officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 10(4), 391-405.
- Kerstetter, W.A. (1990). Gateway to justice: Police and prosecutorial response to sexual assaults against women. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (1973), 81(2), 267-313.
- Kesteren, J.V., Dijk, J.V., & Mayhew, P. (2014). The international crime victims surveys: A retrospective. *International Review of Victimology*, 20(1), 49-69.
- Klomek, A.B., Marrocco, F., Kleinman, M., Schonfeld, I.S., & Gould, M.S. (2008). Peer victimization, depression, and suicidality in adolescents. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 38(2), 166-180.
- Koster, N.S.N., Kuijpers, K.F., Kunst, M.J., & Van der Leun, J.P. (2016). Crime victims' perceptions of police behavior, legitimacy, and cooperation: A review of the literature. *Victims & Offenders*, 11(3), 392-435.
- Koster, N.N., Kuijpers, K.F., Kunst, M.J.J., & Van der Leun, J.P. (2018). *Crime victims and the police: Crime victims' evaluations of police behaviour, legitimacy, and cooperation: A multi-method study* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Kusow, A.M., Wilson, L.C., & Martin, D.E. (1997). Determinants of citizen satisfaction with the police: The effects of residential location. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 20(4), 655-664.
- Langton, L., Planty, M., & Lynch, J. P. (2017). Second major redesign of the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). *Criminology & Public Policy*, 16, 1049.
- Laxminarayan, M.S. (2012). *The heterogeneity of crime victims: Variations in procedural and outcome preferences*. (Doctoral dissertation, Wolf Legal Publishers).
- Linning, S. J., Andresen, M. A., & Brantingham, P. J. (2017). Crime seasonality: Examining the temporal fluctuations of property crime in cities with varying

- climates. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 61(16), 1866-1891.
- Logan, T.K., Evans, L., Stevenson, E., & Jordan, C.E. (2005). Barriers to services for rural and urban survivors of rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(5), 591-616.
- Lord, V. B., Kuhns, J. B., & Friday, P. C. (2009). Small city community policing and citizen satisfaction. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*.
- Lum, C., Telep, C.W., Koper, C.S., & Grieco, J. (2012). Receptivity to research in policing. *Justice Research and Policy*, 14(1), 61-95.
- Lynch, J. P. & Addington, L. A. (2010). Identifying and addressing response errors in self-report surveys. In *Handbook of quantitative criminology* (pp. 251-272). Springer, New York, NY.
- Madigan, L. & Gamble, N.C. (1991). *The second rape: Society's continued betrayal of the victim*. Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Maier, S.L. (2008). "I Have Heard Horrible Stories..." Rape Victim Advocates' Perceptions of the Revictimization of Rape Victims by the Police and Medical System. *Violence Against Women*, 14(7), 786-808.
- Mares, D. M. & Moffett, K. W. (2019). Climate change and crime revisited: An exploration of monthly temperature anomalies and UCR crime data. *Environment and Behavior*, 51(5), 502-529.
- Martin, M.E. (1997). Policy promise: Community policing and domestic violence victim satisfaction. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 20(3), 519-531.
- Mastrofski, S.D. (1999). *Policing for people*. Washington D.C.: Police Foundation.
- Mastrofski, S.D., Snipes, J.B., & Supina, A.E. (1996). Compliance on demand: The public's response to specific police requests. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 33(3), 269-305.
- Mazeika, D., Bartholomew, B., Distler, M., Thomas, K., Greenman, S., & Pratt, S. (2010). Trends in police research: A cross-sectional analysis of the 2000–2007 literature. *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal*, 11(6), 520-547.

- McAulliffe, D., & Coleman, A. (1999). Damned if we do and damned if we don't': Exposing ethical tensions in field research. *Australian Social Work*, 52(4), 25-31.
- McCluskey, J.D. (2003). *Police requests for compliance: Coercive and procedurally just tactics*. LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.
- McCluskey, J.D., Mastrofski, S.D., & Parks, R.B. (1999). To acquiesce or rebel: Predicting citizen compliance with police requests. *Police Quarterly*, 2(4), 389-416.
- McCluskey, J.D., McCluskey, C.P., & Enriquez, R. (2008). A comparison of Latino and White citizen satisfaction with police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36(6), 471-477.
- McCrary, B. S. & Bux Jr, D. A. (1999). Ethical issues in informed consent with substance abusers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67(2), 186.
- McNamara, J.H. (1967). *Uncertainties in police work: The relevance of police recruits' background and training*. In D. Bordua (Ed.), *The police: Six sociological essays* (pp. 163-252). New York: John Wiley.
- Morán-Sánchez, I., Luna, A., Sánchez-Muñoz, M., Aguilera-Alcaraz, B., & Pérez-Cárceles, M. D. (2016). Decision-making Capacity for Research Participation among Addicted People: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 17(1), 3.
- Murphy, K., & Cherney, A. (2011). Understanding cooperation with police in a diverse society. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 52(1), 181-201.
- Murphy, K., Hinds, L., & Fleming, J. (2008). Encouraging public cooperation and support for police. *Policing & Society*, 18(2), 136-155.
- Murphy, K., Tyler, T.R., & Curtis, A. (2009). Nurturing regulatory compliance: Is procedural justice effective when people question the legitimacy of the law? *Regulation & Governance*, 3(1), 1-26.
- Murray, J. (1982). The role of the police in informing crime victims. In *National Symposium on Victimology*.
- Myhill, A. & Bradford, B. (2012). Can police enhance public confidence by improving quality of service? Results from two surveys in England and Wales. *Policing and Society*, 22(4), 397-425.
- Nix, J., Pickett, J.T., Baek, H., & Alpert, G.P. (2017). Police research, officer surveys, and response rates. *Policing and Society*, 1-21.

- Palmer, C. (2001). Ethnography: A research method in practice. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(4), 301-312.
- Paoline III, E.A. (2001). *Rethinking police culture: Officers' occupational attitudes*. LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC. El Paso, TX.
- Paoline III, E.A. (2003). Taking stock: Toward a richer understanding of police culture. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31(3), 199-214.
- Paoline III, E.A. (2004). Shedding light on police culture: An examination of officers' occupational attitudes. *Police Quarterly*, 7(2), 205-236.
- Paras, M.L., Murad, M.H., Chen, L.P., Goranson, E. N., Sattler, A. L., Colbenson, K. M., ... & Zirakzadeh, A. (2009). Sexual abuse and lifetime diagnosis of somatic disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA*, 302(5), 550-561.
- Pate, T., Ferrara, A., Bowers, R.A., & Lorence, J. (1976). *Police response time: Its determinants and effects*. The Police Foundation. Washington, D.C.
- Paternoster, R., Bachman, R., Brame, R., & Sherman, L.W. (1997). Do fair procedures matter? The effect of procedural justice on spouse assault. *Law & Society Review*, 31, 163.
- Patterson, B. M. (2011). Science of Trauma and Recovery, In *Survivors of Sexual Assault*.
- Patton, C.L., Asken, M., Fremouw, W.J., & Bemis, R. (2017). The influence of police profanity on public perception of excessive force. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 32(4), 340-357.
- Peak, K. (1990). A research note on successful criminal justice survey research: A "personal touch" model for enhancing rates of return. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 4(3), 268-276.
- Percy, S.L. (1980). Response time and citizen evaluation of police. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 8(1), 75-86.
- Pico-Alfonso, M.A., Garcia-Linares, M.I., Celda-Navarro, N., Blasco-Ros, C., Echeburúa, E., & Martinez, M. (2006). The impact of physical, psychological, and sexual intimate male partner violence on women's mental health: Depressive symptoms, posttraumatic stress disorder, state anxiety, and suicide. *Journal of Women's Health*, 15(5), 599-611.
- Poister, T. H., & McDavid, J. C. (1978). Victims' evaluation of police performance. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 6(2), 133-149.

- Postmus, J. L., & Hahn, S. A. (2007). The collaboration between welfare and advocacy organizations: Learning from the experiences of domestic violence survivors. *Families in Society*, 88(3), 475-484.
- Priest, T.B., & Carter, D.B. (1999). Evaluations of police performance in an African American sample. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(5), 457-465.
- Ratcliffe, J.H., Groff, E.R., Sorg, E.T., & Haberman, C.P. (2015). Citizens' reactions to hot spots policing: Impacts on perceptions of crime, disorder, safety and police. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 11(3), 393-417.
- Reisig, M. D., McCluskey, J. D., Mastrofski, S. D., & Terrill, W. (2004). Suspect disrespect toward the police. *Justice Quarterly*, 21(2), 241-268.
- Reisig, M.D., & Strohshine, M. (2001). The effects of expectancy disconfirmation on outcome satisfaction in police-citizen encounters. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 24(1), 88-99.
- Reiss, A.J. (1973). *The police and the public* (Vol. 39). Yale University Press.
- Robinson, A.L., & Strohshine, M.S. (2005). The importance of expectation fulfilment on domestic violence victims' satisfaction with the police in the UK. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 28(2), 301-320.
- Rook, M.J. (1982). Design and evaluation of victim service programmes. In *National Symposium on Victimology*.
- Rosenbaum, D.P. (1987). Coping with victimization: The effects of police intervention on victims' psychological readjustment. *Crime & Delinquency*, 33(4), 502-519.
- Rosenfeld, R., Jacobs, B.A., & Wright, R. (2003). Snitching and the code of the street. *British Journal of Criminology*, 43(2), 291-309.
- Schafer, J. A., & Bonello, E. M. (2001). The citizen police academy: Measuring outcomes. *Police Quarterly*, 4(4), 434-448.
- Schafer, J. A., Huebner, B. M., & Bynum, T. S. (2003). Citizen perceptions of police services: Race, neighborhood context, and community policing. *Police Quarterly*, 6(4), 440-468.
- Schinasi, L. H. & Hamra, G. B. (2017). A time series analysis of associations between daily temperature and crime events in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *Journal of Urban Health*, 94(6), 892-900.

- Schiraldi, G. R. (2009). *The post-traumatic stress disorder sourcebook*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schuller, R. A. & Stewart, A. (2000). Police responses to sexual assault complaints: The role of perpetrator/complainant intoxication. *Law and Human Behavior*, 24(5), 535-551.
- Scott, J. (2013). *Victims of crime: The experience of criminal justice activities*. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Semukhina, O. (2014). Unreported crimes, public dissatisfaction of police, and observed police misconduct in the Volgograd region, Russia: A research note. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 305-325.
- Sims, B., Yost, B., & Abbott, C. (2005). Use and nonuse of victim services programs: Implications from a statewide survey of crime victims. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 4(2), 361-384.
- Singh, A.P. (2017). Coping with work stress in police employees. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 32(3), 225-235.
- Skogan, W.G. (1990). *The police and the public in England and Wales: A British Crime Survey report*. Home Office and Planning Unit Report; London.
- Skogan, W.G. (2005). Citizen satisfaction with police encounters. *Police Quarterly*, 8(3), 298-321.
- Skogan, W.G. (2006). Asymmetry in the impact of encounters with police. *Policing & Society*, 16(02), 99-126.
- Skogan, W.G., & Frydl, K. (2004). *Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The evidence*. National Research Council. National Academies Press.
- Skogan, W.G., Van Craen, M., & Hennessy, C. (2015). Training police for procedural justice. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 11(3), 319-334.
- Slabbert, I. (2017). Domestic violence and poverty: Some women's experiences. *Research on social work practice*, 27(2), 223-230.
- Smith, C. W., Lopez Bunyasi, T., & Smith, J. C. (2019). Linked fate over time and across generations. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, 7(3), 684-694.
- Stewart, A. & Maddren, K. (1997). Police officers' judgements of blame in family violence: The impact of gender and alcohol. *Sex Roles*, 37(11-12), 921.

- Strang, H., & Sherman, L.W. (1997). The victim's perspective. *Australian Institute of Technology*.
- Stroshine, M.C. (1999). Race, expectations and evaluations of police performance: An empirical assessment. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 22(4), 675-695.
- Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T.R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review*, 37(3), 513-548.
- Taylor, T.J., Turner, K.B., Esbensen, F.A., & Winfree, L.T. (2001). Coppin' an attitude: Attitudinal differences among juveniles toward police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29(4), 295-305.
- Tewksbury, R. & West, A. (2001). Crime victims' satisfaction with police services: An assessment in one urban community. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 14(4), 271-285.
- Thacher, D. (2003). Order maintenance reconsidered: Moving beyond strong causal reasoning. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 94, 381.
- Thomas, C.W. & Hyman, J.M. (1977). Perceptions of crime, fear of victimization, and public perceptions of police performance. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 5(3), 305-317.
- Tyler, T.R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. New Haven. CT: Yale University.
- Tyler, T.R. (2005). Policing in black and white: Ethnic group differences in trust and confidence in the police. *Police Quarterly*, 8(3), 322-342.
- Tyler, T.R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities. *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 6, 231.
- Tyler, T.R., & Murphy, K. (2011). Procedural justice, police legitimacy and cooperation with the police: A new paradigm for policing. *CEPS Briefing Paper Series*.
- Venema, R.M. (2016). Making judgments: How blame mediates the influence of rape myth acceptance in police response to sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260516662437.
- Waddington, P.A.J. (1993). Calling the police interpretation of, and response to, calls for assistance from the police. *Police Foundation Great Britain*.
- Watson, C. (2014). *Preventing and responding to sexual and domestic violence against men*. The Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces.
- Webb, V.J. & Marshall, C.E. (1995). The relative importance of race and ethnicity on citizen attitudes toward the police. *American Journal of Police*, 14(2), 45-66.

- Weiss, K.G. (2010). Too ashamed to report: Deconstructing the shame of sexual victimization. *Feminist Criminology*, 5(3), 286-310.
- Weitzer, R. (2017). Theorizing racial discord over policing before and after Ferguson. *Justice Quarterly*, 34(7), 1129-1153.
- Weitzer, R. & Tuch, S. A. (2005). Determinants of public satisfaction with the police. *Police Quarterly*, 8(3), 279-297.
- Wemmers, J.A. (1998). Procedural justice and Dutch victim policy. *Law & Policy*, 20(1), 57-76.
- Wemmers, J.A., Van der Leeden, R., & Steensma, H. (1995). What is procedural justice: Criteria used by Dutch victims to assess the fairness of criminal justice procedures. *Social Justice Research*, 8(4), 329-350.
- White, C., Weisburd, D., & Wire, S. (2018). Examining the impact of the Freddie Gray unrest on perceptions of the police. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(4), 829-858.
- Whitehead, T. (2006). Workbook for descriptive observations of social settings, acts, activities & events. *Cultural Ecology of Health and Changes: Ethnographically Informed Community and Cultural Assessment Research Systems (EICCARS) Workbooks*, 1-11.
- Williams, J. E. (1984). Secondary victimization: Confronting public attitudes about rape. *Victimology*.
- Wilson, J.Q. (1978). *Varieties of Police Behavior: The Management of Law and Order in Eight Communities, With a New Preface by the Author*. Harvard University Press.
- Wilson, S. & Jasinski, J.L. (2004). Public satisfaction with the police in domestic violence cases: The importance of arrest, expectations, and involuntary contact. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28(2), 235-254.
- Wilson, J.S., West, M.J.F., Messing, J.T., Brown, M.S., Patchell, M.B., & Campbell, J.C. (2011). Factors related to posttraumatic stress symptomatology in women experiencing police-involved intimate partner violence. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 34(3).
- Winkel, F.W. & Vrij, A. (1990). Interaction and impression formation in a cross-cultural dyad: Frequency and meaning of culturally determined gaze behaviour in a police interview-setting. *Social Behaviour*.
- Woods, S.J., Hall, R.J., Campbell, J.C., & Angott, D.M. (2008). Physical health and posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms in women experiencing intimate partner violence. *The Journal of Midwifery & Women's Health*, 53(6), 538-546.

- Wu, Y., Sun, I.Y., & Triplett, R.A. (2009). Race, class or neighborhood context: Which matters more in measuring satisfaction with police? *Justice Quarterly*, 26(1), 125-156.
- Xie, M., Pogarsky, G., Lynch, J. P., & McDowall, D. (2006). Prior police contact and subsequent victim reporting: Results from the NCVS. *Justice Quarterly*, 23(4), 481-501.
- Yegidis, B.L. and Renzy, R.B. (1994), Battered women's experiences with a preferred arrest policy, *Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 60-70.
- Young, B., Bedford, L., das Nair, R., Gallant, S., Littleford, R., Robertson, J. F., ... & ECLS Study Team. (2019). Unconditional and conditional monetary incentives to increase response to mailed questionnaires: A randomized controlled study within a trial (SWAT). *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*.
- Yuksel, Y. & Tepe, F. (2013). Citizen satisfaction with police and community policing. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(14).
- Ziegenhagen, E.A. (1976). The recidivist victim of violent crime. *Victimology*.

APPENDIX A

MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING

Hello Ms. Gagnon,

My names is [REDACTED] I work with the Prince Georges County Police Department, in the Office of the Chief. It has come to my attention that you are interested in partnering with the Prince George's County Police Department for your dissertation project at Arizona State University. Chief Stawinski readily accepts the opportunity to collaborate with you, on this endeavor and has requested that I assist with the process. In order to guide you toward appropriate office within the police department, I will need to know what types of information you will need and then I can place you in touch with a liaison in that location that can assist. If there are any additional questions or information you need from me please let me know. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

[REDACTED]

APPENDIX B

OFFICER ATTITUDES, LANGUAGE, AND DEMEANOR (OALDS)

Survey About Police-Citizen Interactions

Please mark an "X" on the line that best captures how you view police officers.

	None	Few	Some	Most
1) How many citizens in your district would call the police if they saw something suspicious?	_____	_____	_____	_____
2) How many citizens in your district would give information about a crime if they knew something and were asked about it by the police?	_____	_____	_____	_____
3) How many citizens in your district are willing to work with the police to try to solve neighborhood problems?	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
4) Officers have reason to be distrustful of most citizens.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5) My direct supervisor's approach tends to discourage me from giving extra effort.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6) My direct supervisor is not the type of person I enjoy working with.	_____	_____	_____	_____
7) My direct supervisor looks out for the personal welfare of his/her subordinates.	_____	_____	_____	_____
8) My direct supervisor will support me when I am right even if it makes things difficult for him/her.	_____	_____	_____	_____
9) In order to do their jobs, officers must sometimes overlook search-and-seizure laws and other legal guidelines.	_____	_____	_____	_____
10) Enforcing the law is by far an officer's most important responsibility.	_____	_____	_____	_____
11) A good officer is one who patrols aggressively (e.g. stops cars, checks out people, runs license checks, and so forth).	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	Very Likely
12) When an officer does a particularly good job, how likely is it that command staff will publicly recognize his/her performance?	_____	_____	_____	_____
13) When an officer gets written up for a minor violation of the rules, how likely is it that he/she will be treated fairly by his/her direct supervisor?	_____	_____	_____	_____
14) When an officer contributes to a team effort rather than look good individually, how likely is it that command staff will recognize it?	_____	_____	_____	_____

15) How often do you think that officers should be expected to do something about:				
	Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

Neighbor disputes? _____

Family disputes? _____

Public nuisances? _____

Nuisance businesses? _____

Parents who don't control their kids? _____

Litter and trash? _____

16) How frequently would you say there are good reasons for not arresting someone who has committed a minor criminal offense? _____

Please mark an "X" on the line that best reflects how you treat victims and witnesses and how that affects their satisfaction.












17) Do you actively attempt to **DO** any of the following when interacting with citizens?

What effect do you believe this has on the citizen's satisfaction with the interaction?

	Yes	No		Increases	Decreases	No Effect	Depends on the Situation
Make an arrest	_____	_____		_____	_____	_____	_____
Arrive quickly	_____	_____		_____	_____	_____	_____
Allow the citizen to express concerns	_____	_____		_____	_____	_____	_____
Investigate the scene	_____	_____		_____	_____	_____	_____
Provide comfort to the citizen	_____	_____		_____	_____	_____	_____
Question witnesses	_____	_____		_____	_____	_____	_____
Consider the citizen's opinion when making an arrest decision	_____	_____		_____	_____	_____	_____

18 Do you actively attempt to SAY any of the following when interacting with citizens?

What effect do you believe this has on the citizen's satisfaction with the interaction?

	Yes	No		Increases	Decreases	No Effect	Depends on the Situation
Tell the citizen about victim services	—	—		—	—	—	—
Tell the citizen about medical services	—	—		—	—	—	—
Tell the citizen about safety information	—	—		—	—	—	—
Talk to the citizen about their rights	—	—		—	—	—	—
Tell the citizen about the next step in the criminal justice process	—	—		—	—	—	—
Blame the citizen for what happened	—	—		—	—	—	—
Ask the citizen if they had any questions	—	—		—	—	—	—
Repeat questions back to the citizen	—	—		—	—	—	—
Use "swear" words	—	—		—	—	—	—
Say something to make the citizen feel better	—	—		—	—	—	—
Tell the citizen that reporting to the police was a good thing	—	—		—	—	—	—

19 Do you actively try to **DISPLAY** any of the following when interacting with citizens?

What effect do you believe this has on the citizen's satisfaction with the interaction?

	Yes	No		Increases	Decreases	No Effect	Depends on the Situation
Respect	___	___		___	___	___	___
Listening	___	___		___	___	___	___
Make eye-contact	___	___		___	___	___	___
Appear rushed	___	___		___	___	___	___
Show concern	___	___		___	___	___	___
Show interest in helping	___	___		___	___	___	___
Show belief	___	___		___	___	___	___
Fair treatment	___	___		___	___	___	___
Honesty	___	___		___	___	___	___
Helpfulness	___	___		___	___	___	___

Yes No

20) Did you receive academy training from Prince George's County Police Department?

___ ___

21) Did you receive academy training from any other police department?

___ ___

22) Please mark with an "X" all of the topics that you recall being covered during your in-service training:

Report writing	___	Nonlethal weapons	___
Patrol procedures	___	Ethics/Integrity	___
Investigations	___	Health/Fitness	___
Traffic accident investigations	___	Communications	___
Emergency vehicle operations	___	Professionalism	___
Basic first aid/CPR	___	Stress prevention/management	___
Computers/Information systems	___	Criminal/Constitutional law	___

Defensive tactics	_____	Traffic law	_____
Firearms skills	_____	Juvenile justice law/procedures	_____
Use of force	_____		

		Yes	No
23) Did any of your training discuss how to properly interact with victims?	_____	_____	_____
24) Did any of your training discuss how to properly interact with witnesses?	_____	_____	_____

Is there anything else you would like to say about how police officers interact with citizens? Please use this extra space:

Please answer the following questions about your demographic information:

- 25) What is your race?
 - a. White
 - b. Black
 - c. Hispanic
 - d. Asian
 - e. Other (please specify): _____
- 26) What is your gender?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
 - c. Other (please specify): _____
- 27) What is your sexual orientation?
 - a. Straight
 - b. Gay/Lesbian
 - c. Other (please specify): _____
- 28) What is your marital status? (please select all that apply)
 - a. Single
 - b. In a relationship/Engaged
 - c. Married
 - d. Separated/Divorced
 - e. Widowed
- 29) What is your age? ___ years
- 30) What was the highest level of education you completed?
 - a. High school diploma/GED
 - b. Some college/Associate's degree
 - c. College/University
 - d. Graduate/Law/Medical School
- 31) What is your household income?
 - a. Under \$20,000
 - b. \$20,000 - \$50,000
 - c. \$50,001 - \$80,000
 - d. \$80,001 - \$100,000

e. Over \$100,000

32) How long have you been a police officer? ___ years

Thank you for taking this survey!

APPENDIX C

CITIZEN ACTION, LANGUAGE, DEMEANOR SURVEY (CALDS)

Survey About Police Officers

Please answer these questions about the police officer you met with.

- 1) Why were the police called?
 - a. Violent crime
 - b. Property crime
 - c. Disorder problem
 - d. Other (please specify): _____
- 2) Were you the victim or witness to the crime?
 - a. Victim
 - b. Witness
- 3) Were you the one who called the police?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
- 4) Did you want the police to be called?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
- 5) What was the sex of the officer who spoke with you?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
 - c. I Don't Know
- 6) What was the race of the officer who spoke with you?
 - a. Black
 - b. White
 - c. Hispanic
 - d. Asian
 - e. Other (please specify): _____
 - f. I Don't Know

Please mark an "X" on the line that best shows how satisfied you were with how the officer treated you.

	☺ Very Satisfied	😊 Satisfied	☹ Dissatisfied	☠ Very Dissatisfied
7) Overall, how satisfied were you with:				
the police officer?	_____	_____	_____	_____
how the officer acted?	_____	_____	_____	_____
what the officer said to you?	_____	_____	_____	_____
the officer's demeanor?	_____	_____	_____	_____

8) Did the officer **DO** any of the following?

	Yes	No		☺ Increased	😐 No Effect	☹ Decreased
Make an arrest	_____	_____	➡	_____	_____	_____
Arrive quickly	_____	_____	➡	_____	_____	_____

Allow you to express concerns	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Investigate the scene	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Provide comfort	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Question witnesses	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Consider your opinion when making an arrest decision	—	—	➔	—	—	—

9) Did the officer SAY any of the following?

What effect did this have on your satisfaction with the interaction?

	Yes	No		😊 Increased	😐 No Effect	😞 Decreased
Tell you about victim services	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Tell you about medical services	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Tell you about safety information	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Tell you about your rights	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Tell you about the next step in the criminal justice process	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Blame you for what happened	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Ask you if you had any questions	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Repeat your questions back to you	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Use “swear” words	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Say something to make you feel better	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Tell you that reporting to the police was a good thing	—	—	➔	—	—	—

10) Did the officer **DISPLAY** any of the following?

What effect did this have on your satisfaction with the interaction?

	Yes	No		😊 Increased	😐 No Effect	😞 Decreased
Respect	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Listening	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Made eye-contact	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Appear rushed	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Appear concerned	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Appear interested in helping	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Appeared to believe you	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Fair treatment	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Honesty	—	—	➔	—	—	—
Helpfulness	—	—	➔	—	—	—

Please mark an "X" on the line that best reflects how you feel about police and crime in your area.

	Very Likely	Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Very Unlikely
11) In the future, how likely are you to call the police?	—	—	—	—
12) In the future, how likely do you think it is that you will experience:				
A violent crime?	—	—	—	—
A property crime?	—	—	—	—
A disturbance problem?	—	—	—	—
Other crime?	—	—	—	—
13) How afraid are you of:	Very Afraid	Afraid	Somewhat Afraid	Unafraid
Violent crime?	—	—	—	—
Property Crime	—	—	—	—
Disturbance problems?	—	—	—	—
Other crime?	—	—	—	—

Please mark an "X" on the line that best reflects your past experience.

14) Have you ever been a victim of:	Yes	No
Violent crime?	_____	_____
Property Crime	_____	_____
Disturbance problems?	_____	_____
Other crime?	_____	_____
15) Have you ever been interviewed by the police before this crime:	Yes	No
As a victim?	_____	_____
As a witness?	_____	_____
As a suspect?	_____	_____
16) Do you have any family members that are/were police officers?	_____	_____
17) Do you have any friends that are/were police officers?	_____	_____

Please mark an "X" on the line that best reflects what you think about police officers.

18) How are the police viewed by:	☺ Positive	☹ Neutral	☹ Negative	
You?	_____	_____	_____	
Your family?	_____	_____	_____	
Your friends?	_____	_____	_____	
19) How many citizens in your neighborhood would call the police if they saw something suspicious?	None	Few	Some	Most
	_____	_____	_____	_____
20) How many citizens in your neighborhood would give information about a crime if they knew something and were asked about it by the police?				
	_____	_____	_____	_____
21) How many citizens in your neighborhood are willing to work with the police to try to solve neighborhood problems?				
	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
22) Officers have reason to be distrustful of most citizens.	_____	_____	_____	_____
23) In order to do their jobs, officers must sometimes overlook some laws and legal guidelines.	_____	_____	_____	_____
24) Enforcing the law is by far an officer's most important job.	_____	_____	_____	_____
25) A good officer is one who patrols aggressively (e.g. stops cars, checks out people, runs license checks, and so forth).	_____	_____	_____	_____
26) How often do you think that officers should be expected to do something about:				
	Never	Sometimes	Often	Always
Neighbor disputes?	_____	_____	_____	_____
Family disputes?	_____	_____	_____	_____
Public nuisances?	_____	_____	_____	_____
Nuisance businesses?	_____	_____	_____	_____
Parents who don't control their kids?	_____	_____	_____	_____
Litter and trash?	_____	_____	_____	_____
27) How often would you say there are good reasons for not arresting someone who has committed a minor criminal offense?	_____	_____	_____	_____

Is there anything else you would like to say about how police treat people? Please use this extra space:

Please answer the following questions about your demographic information.

- 28) What is your race?
a. White
b. Black
c. Hispanic
d. Asian
e. Other (please specify): _____

- 29) What is your gender?
a. Male
b. Female
c. Other (please specify): _____
- 30) What is your sexual orientation?
a. Straight
b. Gay/Lesbian
c. Other (please specify): _____
- 31) What is your marital status? (please select all that apply)
a. Single
b. In a relationship/Engaged
c. Married
d. Separated/Divorced
e. Widowed
- 32) What is your age? ___ years
- 33) What was the highest level of education you completed?
a. Grade 0-4
b. Grade 5-8
c. Grade 9-11
d. High school diploma/GED
e. Some college/Associate's degree
f. College/University
g. Graduate/Law/Medical School
- 34) What is your household income?
a. Under \$20,000
b. \$20,000 - \$50,000
c. \$50,001 - \$80,000
d. \$80,001 - \$100,000
e. Over \$100,000
- 35) Are you currently employed? Yes No
_____ _____
- 36) Are you currently a college/university student? Yes No
_____ _____

Thank you for taking this survey!

APPENDIX D

OBSERVER WORKBOOK²¹

²¹ The workbook is actually eight pages long. The pages were included to provide an example to the reader. The second page is intentionally left blank as a free-write space for the researcher.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Make an arrest																				
Arrive quickly																				
Allow the citizen to express concerns																				
Investigate the scene																				
Provide comfort																				
Question witnesses																				
Consider citizen's opinion when making an arrest decision																				
Tell citizen about victim services																				
Tell citizen about medical services																				
Tell citizen about safety information																				
Talk citizen about your rights																				
Tell citizen about the next step in the criminal justice process																				
Blame citizen for what happened																				
Ask citizen if he/she had any questions																				
Repeat citizen's questions back to him/her																				
Use "swear" words																				
Say something to make citizen feel better																				
Tell citizen that reporting to the police was a good thing																				
Respectful																				
Listen																				
Made eye-contact																				
Appear rushed																				
Appear concerned																				
Appear interested in helping																				

Appeared to believe citizen																				
Fair treatment																				
Honest																				
Helpful																				

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY
BLANK

APPENDIX E

IRB STUDY APPROVAL

APPROVAL: EXPEDITED REVIEW

Kathleen Talbot
 Criminology and Criminal Justice, School of
 602/496-2347
 katefox@asu.edu
 Dear Kathleen Talbot:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	Citizen-Police Encounters: Utilizing Satisfaction Responses in Guiding Police Training
Investigator:	Kathleen Talbot
IRB ID:	STUDY00009039
Category of review:	(7)(b) Social science methods, (7)(a) Behavioral research
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRB Protocol, Category: IRB Protocol; • Observation Workbook_AG_9_3_18_AG.pdf, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions); • recruitment script_citizen.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials; • MOU_supplementary , Category: Off-site authorizations (school permission, other IRB approvals, Tribal permission etc); • Department Memo of Understanding, Category: Off-site authorizations (school permission, other IRB approvals, Tribal permission etc); • ConsentForm_officer.doc.pdf, Category: Consent Form; • Officer Survey.pdf, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions); • Consent Form_citizen, Category: Consent Form; • recruitment script_officer.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials; • Citizen Survey.pdf, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions);

On 12/11/2018 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

The IRB approved the protocol from 12/11/2018 to 12/10/2019 inclusive. Three weeks before 12/10/2019 you are to submit a completed Continuing Review application and required attachments to request continuing approval or closure.

If continuing review approval is not granted before the expiration date of 12/10/2019 approval of this protocol expires on that date. When consent is appropriate, you must use final, watermarked versions available under the "Documents" tab in ERA-IRB. In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc: Analisa Gagnon
Analisa Gagnon

APPENDIX F

OFFICER CONSENT FORM

Informed Consent

Title: “Citizen-Police Encounters: Assessing Officer Understanding of Citizen Satisfaction”

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the Study: To use actual citizen and police officer feedback regarding citizen-police encounters to offer informed training instruction to police officers.

What You will be Asked to do in the Research Study: If you decide to be in this study, you will be asked to answer questions about your perceptions regarding your own personal interactions with citizens. The researchers conducting this study are not associated with the police department and your individual answers to the survey questions will not be shared with the department’s staff. **PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE SURVEY AND DO NOT GIVE THE SURVEY TO ANYONE OTHER THAN THE RESEARCHERS.**

Time Required: Between 30 minutes and 1 hour, depending on your pace.

Confidentiality: All of your answers will be anonymous. No one will be able to link your answers to you since we will not know your name. Your answers will be coded with numbers and these codes cannot be traced to you. The results of the study will present patterns of how everyone answered. It will not focus on any one person’s answers.

Voluntary Participation and Right to Withdraw From the Study: There are no benefits or rewards for participating in this study. This study will in no way affect how you are treated by your superiors. One potential risk that you may experience by participating in this research is that some of the questions might make you feel uncomfortable or may be upsetting to you. To minimize this risk, you may talk with the Psychological Services Division at 301-883-6250. Also, you do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer, and you can stop participating at any time. No one will be upset or angry if you decide not to participate or if you stop participating at any time for any reason.

Whom to Contact if you Have Questions About the Study: Analisa Gagnon or Dr. Kate Fox, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 411 N. Central Ave., Suite 600, Phoenix, AZ, 85004-0685; Telephone: (304) 207-0714; Email: agagnon2@asu.edu

Whom to Contact About Your Rights as a Research Participant in the Study: The Social Behavioral Institutional Review Board at (480) 965-6788 or by email at research.integrity@asu.edu

Agreement: By completing and turning in the survey you will consent to participate in this study. This informed consent description is yours to keep.

Thank you for your time!

APPENDIX G

CITIZEN CONSENT FORM

Informed Consent

Title: “Citizen-Police Encounters: Assessing Officer Understanding of Citizen Satisfaction”

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the Study: To use actual citizen and police officer feedback regarding citizen-police encounters to offer informed training instruction to police officers.

What You will be Asked to do in the Research Study: If you decide to be in this study, you will be asked to answer questions about your perceptions regarding your own personal interactions with police officers. The researchers conducting this study are not associated with the police department and your individual answers to the survey questions will not be shared with the department’s staff. **PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE SURVEY AND DO NOT GIVE THE SURVEY TO ANYONE OTHER THAN THE RESEARCHERS.** Participants must be 18 years or older to participate.

Time Required: Between 30 minutes and 1 hour, depending on your pace.

Confidentiality: All of your answers will be anonymous. No one will be able to link your answers to you since we will not know your name. The results of the study will present patterns of how everyone answered. It will not focus on any one person’s answers.

Voluntary Participation and Right to Withdraw From the Study: There are no benefits or rewards for participating in this study. This study will in no way affect how you are treated by the criminal justice system. One potential risk that you may experience by participating in this research is that some of the questions might make you feel uncomfortable or may be upsetting to you. To minimize this risk, you may talk with the Behavioral Health Division by dialing 2-1-1. Also, you do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer, and you can stop participating at any time. No one will be upset or angry if you decide not to participate or if you stop participating at any time for any reason.

Whom to Contact if you Have Questions About the Study: Analisa Gagnon or Dr. Kate Fox, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 411 N. Central Ave., Suite 600, Phoenix, AZ, 85004-0685; Telephone: (304) 207-0714; Email: agagnon2@asu.edu

Whom to Contact About Your Rights as a Research Participant in the Study: The Social Behavioral Institutional Review Board at (480) 965-6788 or by email at research.integrity@asu.edu

Agreement: By completing and turning in the survey you will consent to participate in this study. This informed consent description is yours to keep.

Thank you for your time!

APPENDIX H

RIDE-ALONG PROGRAM APPLICATION AND GENERAL RELEASE

GUIDELINES FOR RIDE-ALONG PARTICIPANTS

In order to facilitate this program the following guidelines have been established.

- You must be appropriately attired, in such a manner that will in no way reflect upon or have a negative bearing on you, the program or the Department. The following types of clothing are not accepted: jeans, shorts, sweat shirts, tee shirts, tennis shoes, and sandals.
- You must arrange for transportation to and from the Police District facility.
- You are encouraged to ask questions about police work. However, bear in mind that your police partner cannot conceivably know about every event that has occurred in the police district.
- In order to comply with the Department's policies and procedures, you must use the safety belts and other safety equipment in the police vehicle. Certain police calls are considered inherently dangerous and your police partner may respond to the call after dropping you off at a safe place. Wait for a pick-up police vehicle at the specific location at which you are dropped off, if this becomes necessary.
- You may observe an event on your ride, which could require your appearance in court as a witness.
- A waiver of liability form is attached and is required to be executed by yourself and one of your parents and/or legal guardians (if under 18 years of age) prior to a ride-along. In essence, it releases the Prince George's County Government from liability for any injury or other disability you might sustain during the ride.
- Participation in the Ride-Along Program is normally limited to two sessions. This limitation is necessary for the Department to accommodate the many requests received for ride-along participation. Authorization for additional ride-alongs may only be granted by the Chief of Police.

RIDE-ALONG PROGRAM APPLICATION

FULL NAME:		
RACE:		DOB:
ADDRESS:		
NAME OF SCHOOL OR EMPLOYER:		
HOME PHONE:		BUSINESS PHONE:
HAVE YOU EVER PARTICIPATED IN THE POLICE RIDE-ALONG PROGRAM BEFORE?		
IF SO, AT WHAT STATION?		HOW MANY TIMES?
ARE YOU CURRENTLY UNDER A DOCTOR'S CARE?	YES	NO
ARE YOU CURRENTLY TAKING ANY MEDICATIONS?	YES	NO
WHAT KIND OF MEDICATION?		
HAVE YOU READ AND UNDERSTOOD THE WAIVER FORM? (Bring Waiver with completed Application)	YES	NO
STATE THE REASON YOU WISH TO RIDE IN A POLICE VEHICLE:		

Date	Signature of Applicant
Date	Signature of Command Officer
APPROVED ()	
REJECTED ()	
	DATE OF RIDE: _____
	TIME PERIOD OF RIDE: _____
	OFFICER CONDUCTING RIDE-ALONG: _____
ID:	_____

GENERAL RELEASE

KNOW ALL MEAN BY THESE PRESENCE, that I, _____

Being full age, inconsideration of the privilege hereafter mentioned, do hereby release and forever discharge the STATE OF MARYLAND and PRINCE GEORGE’S COUNTY, their agencies, employees, and their successors, and assign from all debts, claims, demands, damages, actions and causes of action whatsoever which I now have or may hereafter and which may arise by reason of the privilege permitted me by the CHIEF OF POLICE to become a passenger in a police vehicle. The undersigned understands and agrees for the considerations aforesaid, that he will not in any manner hinder or attempt to assist any law enforcement officer in the

performance of his official duties, which may occur or ensure during the time he is accompanying an officer on his rounds.

Witnessed that for the consideration aforementioned, undersigned does hereby exonerate and covenant and to hold harmless the STATE OF MARYLAND and PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, their agencies, employees and their successors and assigns for any injury or damage resulting by reason of the privilege permitted me as hereinabove set fourth.

WAIVER AGREEMENT: I have read and will comply with the above provisions.

SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT AND/OR PARENT

Signature of Witness

Date:

Valid for the following date(s):

APPENDIX I

TABLE 5

Table 5. Descriptive statistics of citizens' perceptions of the effects of officer's actions on their satisfaction.

Citizens (n=37; 82.22%)		
	Action Occurred	Action Did Not Occur
Make an arrest		
Increased satisfaction	1 (4%)	7 (28%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	16 (64%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	1 (4%)
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Arrive quickly		
Increased satisfaction	17 (71%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	6 (25%)	1 (4%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Allow the citizen to express concern		
Increased satisfaction	16 (67%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	8 (33%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Investigate the scene		
Increased satisfaction	10 (46%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	7 (32%)	5 (22%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Provide comfort		
Increased satisfaction	14 (61%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	3 (13%)	6 (26%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Question witnesses		
Increased satisfaction	5 (25%)	2 (10%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	3 (15%)	10 (50%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Consider citizen's opinion when making an arrest decision		
Increased satisfaction	3 (19%)	4 (25%)

Had no effect on satisfaction	4 (25%)	5 (31%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0

APPENDIX J

TABLE 6

Table 6. Descriptive statistics of citizens' perceptions of the effects of officer's language on their satisfaction.

	Citizens (n=37; 82.22%)	
	Language Occurred	Language Did Not Occur
Tell citizen about victim services		
Increased satisfaction	7 (35%)	1 (5%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	1 (5%)	11 (55%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Tell citizen about medical services		
Increased satisfaction	1 (5%)	3 (16%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	0 (0%)	15 (79%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Tell citizen about safety information		
Increased satisfaction	7 (35%)	2 (10%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	2 (10%)	9 (45%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Tell citizen about his/her rights		
Increased satisfaction	7 (37%)	2 (11%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	3 (16%)	7 (37%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Tell citizen about the next steps in the criminal justice system		
Increased satisfaction	10 (50%)	2 (10%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	5 (25%)	3 (15%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Blame citizen for what happened		
Increased satisfaction	0	5 (25%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	1 (5%)	14 (70%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Ask citizen if he/she had any questions		
Increased satisfaction	12 (63%)	0 (0%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	5 (26%)	1 (5%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Repeat questions back to him/her		

Increased satisfaction	8 (42%)	1 (5%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	1 (5%)	9 (47%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Use “swear” words		
Increased satisfaction	0	7 (35%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	1 (5%)	12 (60%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Say something to make the citizen feel better		
Increased satisfaction	13 (62%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	4 (19%)	4 (19%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Tell citizen that reporting to the police was a good thing		
Increased satisfaction	9 (45%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	1 (5%)	10 (50%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0

APPENDIX K

TABLE 7

Table 7. Descriptive statistics of citizens' perceptions of the effects of officer's demeanors on their satisfaction.

	Citizens (n=37; 82.22%)	
	Demeanor Occurred	Demeanor Did Not Occur
Respectful		
Increased satisfaction	16 (73%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	6 (27%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Listen		
Increased satisfaction	14 (70%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	6 (30%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Made eye-contact		
Increased satisfaction	12 (71%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	5 (29%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Appear rushed		
Increased satisfaction	4 (21%)	7 (34%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	8 (42%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Appear concerned		
Increased satisfaction	14 (74%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	4 (21%)	1 (5%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Appear interested in helping		
Increased satisfaction	15 (71%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	6 (29%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Appear to believe citizen		
Increased satisfaction	15 (71%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	6 (29%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Fair treatment		
Increased satisfaction	16 (76%)	0

Had no effect on satisfaction	5 (%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Honest		
Increased satisfaction	15 (71%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	6 (29%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Helpful		
Increased satisfaction	16 (76%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	5 (24%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0

Note. Several citizens skipped questions regarding officer demeanor resulting in several cells not equaling an N of 37.

APPENDIX L

TABLE 8

Table 8. Descriptive statistics of officer's perceptions of the effects of their actions on citizens' satisfaction.

	Officers (n=8; 17.78%)	
	Action Occurred	Action Did Not Occur
Make an arrest		
Increased satisfaction	0	1 (14%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	4 (57%)	2 (28.57%)
Arrive quickly		
Increased satisfaction	5 (71%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	1 (14%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	1 (14%)	0
Allow the citizen to express concern		
Increased satisfaction	6 (75%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	2 (25%)	0
Investigate the scene		
Increased satisfaction	5 (63%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	1 (13%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	2 (25%)	0
Provide comfort		
Increased satisfaction	5 (63%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	3 (38%)	0
Question witnesses		
Increased satisfaction	3 (38%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	2 (25%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	3 (38%)	0
Consider citizen's opinion when making an arrest decision		
Increased satisfaction	1 (13%)	0

Had no effect on satisfaction	1 (13%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	1 (13%)	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	5 (63%)	0

APPENDIX M

TABLE 9

Table 9. Descriptive statistics of officer's perceptions of the effects of their language on citizens' satisfaction.

	Officers (n=8; 17.78%)	
	Language Occurred	Language Did Not Occur
Tell citizen about victim services		
Increased satisfaction	6 (75%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	1 (12%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	1 (13%)	0
Tell citizen about medical services		
Increased satisfaction	3 (38%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	1 (13%)	1 (13%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	3 (38%)	0
Tell citizen about safety information		
Increased satisfaction	4 (50%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	3 (38%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	1 (13%)	0
Tell citizen about his/her rights		
Increased satisfaction	4 (50%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	2 (25%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	2 (25%)	0
Tell citizen about the next steps in the criminal justice system		
Increased satisfaction	4 (50%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	0
Decreased satisfaction	4 (50%)	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	0
Blame citizen for what happened		
Increased satisfaction	1 (14%)	1 (14%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	3 (42%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	1 (14%)
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	1 (14%)
Ask citizen if he/she had any questions		

Increased satisfaction	5 (63%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	0
Decreased satisfaction	1 (13%)	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	2 (25%)	0
Repeat questions back to him/her		
Increased satisfaction	3 (38%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	1 (13%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	1 (13%)
Satisfaction depends on the situation	3 (38%)	0
Use “swear” words		
Increased satisfaction	0	1 (13%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	2 (25%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	1 (13%)
Satisfaction depends on the situation	1 (13%)	3 (38%)
Say something to make the citizen feel better		
Increased satisfaction	6 (75%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	1 (13%)	1 (13%)
Tell citizen that reporting to the police was a good thing		
Increased satisfaction	4 (50%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	4 (50%)	0

APPENDIX N

TABLE 10

Table 10. Descriptive statistics of officer's perceptions of the effects of their demeanors on citizens' satisfaction.

	Officers (n=8; 17.78%)	
	Demeanor Occurred	Demeanor Did Not Occur
Respectful		
Increased satisfaction	6 (75%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	2 (25%)	0
Listen		
Increased satisfaction	6 (75%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	2 (25%)	0
Made eye-contact		
Increased satisfaction	5 (63%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	1 (13%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	2 (25%)	0
Appear rushed		
Increased satisfaction	0	1 (13%)
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	2 (25%)
Decreased satisfaction	0	4 (50%)
Satisfaction depends on the situation	0	1 (13%)
Appear concerned		
Increased satisfaction	7 (88%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	1 (13%)	0
Appear interested in helping		
Increased satisfaction	7 (88%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	1 (13%)	0
Appear to believe citizen		
Increased satisfaction	5 (63%)	0

Had no effect on satisfaction	1 (13%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	2 (25%)	0
Fair treatment		
Increased satisfaction	6 (75%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	0
Decreased satisfaction	1 (13%)	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	1 (13%)	0
Honest		
Increased satisfaction	5 (63%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	1 (13%)	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	2 (25%)	0
Helpful		
Increased satisfaction	5 (63%)	0
Had no effect on satisfaction	0	0
Decreased satisfaction	0	0
Satisfaction depends on the situation	3 (38%)	0
