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Police Legitimacy in an Urban Context: A Social Welfare Perspective

Abstract

by

JENNIFER MARIE BARTHOLOMEW

Police legitimacy hinges on a citizen’s perception of an obligation to defer to or voluntarily obey legally established authority (Glassman, 1984; Hawdon, 2008; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Weber, 1968) and manifests in a number of ways: citizens obeying the law even when police are absent; heeding police requests or directives; cooperating with crime suppression and prevention efforts; and even working with others in their community to combat crime and address social concerns (Tyler, 2005; Tyler & Fagan, 2008). It has been demonstrated that minorities, the young, low-income populations, and those living in neighborhoods with higher levels of social disorganization (e.g. loitering, public drinking, truancy, etc.) each tend to be more critical of police (Reisig & Parks, 2000; Weitzer, Tuch, & Skogan, 2008) and, therefore, are more likely to resist being co-opted as informants (either reporting crime or providing witness statements) or engaging with fellow citizens to support community-based crime fighting efforts (Tyler, 2005).

The aim of the study was to better understand interpretations of police legitimacy in two primary stakeholder groups: urban, low-income, at-risk citizens and the police officers who serve them. The research was conducted in two phases, first the study assessed the effects of neighborhood attachment and violence exposure on legitimacy, while also exploring the related constructs of legitimacy, satisfaction, and performance. Second, the
proposed research sought to identify common understandings of legitimacy, neighborhood, and expectations of police from a sample of the stakeholder groups. Neighborhood attachment was found to significantly predict police legitimacy in a simple regression model. Scales for exposure to violence, for both victimization and witnessing were not associated with police legitimacy. Analysis of the police legitimacy measure indicated that the scale reduced to two factors rather than the five identified in previous literature. The qualitative analysis noted the need for “respect” might be cited as a common understanding, but both citizens and police held beliefs that alienated one group from the other. Both citizens and police share an unresolved understanding of safety (personal and professional) in the environment.
Chapter 1

Statement of the Problem

Tupac Shakur died at 25. The details of his death mingle with the persona cultivated in his art: grandiose, violent, raw, and tragic. Though sensational, the tale of his death is unimportant here, save for his last interaction. In life, Shakur was no friend of authority, especially the police. In the song *Thug Style* he admitted, tamely, that he “never got along with cops” and, as evidence of this, he often portrayed acts of violence towards the police as self-defense, as responses to a harsh and oppressive authority (Shakur, Cox, Greenridge, Rosser & Rosser, 1994; Pareles, 1996). On the seventh of September 1996, at 11:15 p.m., after having been shot in the torso, pelvis, hand and thigh, Shakur fell out of Suge Knight’s BMW into the arms of Chris Carroll, an officer of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Phillips, 2002; Reed, 2014). After Carroll retired he told the story of that night, this is how it ended:

And he [Shakur] went from struggling to speak, being noncooperative, to an ‘I’m at peace’ type of thing. Just like that [snaps fingers]. . . and that’s when I looked at him and said one more time, ‘Who shot you?’ . . . I thought I was actually going to get some cooperation. (Reed 2014, para. 7)

Tupac Shakur’s last words… “fuck you” (Reed, 2014, para. 7).

It is worth a moment’s pause – gravely injured, asked for a dying declaration, Shakur’s first response was silence, passive noncooperation, and then finally fuck you, unveiled contempt. Note also, Carroll expected cooperation. Nearly 18 years later, Carroll betrayed his disdain for the rebuke. When asked why he was speaking out now, he said he did not want Shakur to be remembered as a “martyr or hero” because he said
“fuck you” to the police (Reed, 2014, para 8). Some may argue that Shakur’s response was part of a carefully cultivated “thug” image. This may be true, but that only makes the exchange more interesting. Despite one’s assessment of Shakur’s authenticity or talent, his *job* was to chronicle the urban environment and reflect, for his demographic, their roles and relationships within it (with particular emphasis on perceived power and powerlessness).

Tupac Shakur’s dying declaration summarizes with crystalline clarity his perception of the legitimacy of police.

For academics, police legitimacy is tough to define because it is not only a theoretical framework for understanding what motivates citizens to voluntarily obey the police, it is also a byproduct (positive or negative) of policing methods, a measurable goal, and an intervention… or, more specifically, set of guiding principles to improve police-citizen relations. Legitimacy is a complex phenomenon because it braids together a set of personal and societal beliefs, attitudes, and values, which are formed, communicated, and reinforced/reformed through the experience of dynamic interactions between citizens and police. The implications of the construct are far reaching and important to the psychosocial and physical well-being of both citizens and police.

Even had Shakur gone on to live a long life, this vignette would still serve as a helpful anecdote (albeit extreme) to demonstrate the consequence of police legitimacy – the exchange was not based on an assessment of satisfaction with police services provided that evening, it was not tied to the conduct of the officer, nor was it the resentment or bravado of an apprehended suspect. If anything, one would expect a victim’s sense of self-interest, desire for retribution, or need for assistance to over-ride
any past impressions of the police. The exchange highlights a belief – the concept of legitimacy – which was formed before and held regardless of the attack. In Shakur’s experiences, perceptions, and actions officers cannot or will not act in a subject’s interest, are not capable of delivering justice, have not been accorded respect, and will not be obeyed.

To begin to build police legitimacy as a social welfare concern, three elements of the construct must be explored and applied to a social work frame: 1) the definition of legitimacy; 2) how it is formed in the community; and 3) the role of police in modern urban environments. Each of these elements, along with the aims of the dissertation research, is examined in this chapter.

**Legitimacy & Social Welfare**

Legitimacy hinges on a citizen’s perception of an obligation to defer to or obey legally established authority (Glassman, 1984; Hawdon, 2008; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Weber, 1968). Acknowledging that citizens may have many different reasons to perceive an obligation to obey the police, some authors further specify that the action of obeying must be voluntary. The individual must believe that the authority is entitled to a level of respect justifying deference, rather than being coerced into compliance by threat of sanction, or harm (Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Tyler & Huo, 2002). Police legitimacy manifests in a number of ways, including but not limited to: citizens obeying the law even when police are absent; heeding police requests or directives; cooperating with crime suppression and prevention efforts; and *even working with others in their community to combat crime and address social concerns* (Tyler, 2005; Tyler & Fagan, 2008).
The last bit above bears repetition because it catapults what some might consider merely a psychological or criminological issue to a social welfare imperative: police legitimacy telescopes beyond interactions with police, to encompass how citizens ally with their neighbors to promote general lawfulness/safety and to communally address problems that have been identified as important.

Explored more deeply, police legitimacy breaks into two, parallel pathways. Generally identified as procedural (aka expressive or normative) and distributive (aka instrumental) justice, each sub-construct emphasizes a different aspect of police-citizen relations (Jackson & Bradford, 2009; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tankebe, 2013). Procedural justice focuses on how an officer interacts with a citizen during a specific encounter and often denotes fairness and respect (officer → citizen) (Gau, 2011; Jackson & Bradford, 2009; Tankebe, 2013). Distributive justice is a little harder to delineate; it encompasses experiences about fairness on mezzo or macro levels (in the neighborhood and community) such as whether a specific neighborhood is over-policed (police force → neighborhood) (Gau, 2011; Hawdon, Ryan & Griffin, 2003; Jackson & Bradford, 2009; Tyler, 2004; Tankebe, 2013). Both procedural and distributive justice may be personal experienced or social transmitted (Tankebe, 2013). Moreover, the sub-constructs are flexible enough to be initiated by either citizens or police, and stable enough to withstand some level of unfavorable outcomes (as might be perceived by the citizen), or the participation of alternate/proxy actors (Tyler, 2005).

To reinforce the operation of different system levels, the sub-construct causal processes are detailed below:
• **Procedural Justice** – if police are fair, respectful, and willing to listen to the citizens they engage with, regardless of how the interaction was initiated (by police or citizens) or *what the outcome is determined to be*, police will be viewed as legitimate, when police are considered legitimate then their authority to maintain social order is viable;

• **Distributive Justice** – if police are unbiased in the delivery of their services, respond quickly, and address crimes or issues important to the citizenry, regardless of how the interaction was initiated (by police or citizens) or the *process by which services were provided*, police will be viewed as legitimate, when police are considered legitimate then their authority to maintain social order is viable.

Research indicates that citizens may bias procedural experiences over distributive in their determination of police legitimacy (Tyler, 2005), so that the full process can be represented as:

• **Police Legitimacy** – if citizens experience or understand positive procedural and distributive relations with police, or if procedural encounters are significantly positive enough to outweigh negative distributive assessments, police will be viewed as legitimate, when police are considered legitimate then their authority to maintain social order is viable. Additionally, when police are considered legitimate, citizens are more inclined to comply with social norms, including obeying laws, and are also more likely to connect with both their neighbors and neighborhoods.
Explored further in the next chapter, it is important to note that most current literature on legitimacy seems to skim past distributive justice in favor of evaluating citizens’ perceptions of experienced officer interventions (see: Murphy, 2014; Tyler & Wakslack, 2004). Further complicating a universal understanding of the construct, other scholars view each pathway as a unique form of legitimacy (see: Gau, 2011). Still other scholars and practitioners attenuate legitimacy as a pathway to perceived satisfaction (see: Hinds, 2009).

Given that existing research finds police respond to citizens differently based on socio-economic status, ethnicity or race, and/or neighborhood characteristics (Brown, 2010; Fagan & Davies, 2000; Reisig & Parks, 2000; Weitzer, Tuch, & Skogan, 2008), this document favors the bifurcated construct, holding that both interpersonal and collective interactions with police shape a citizens’ understanding of legitimacy. More than merely an epistemological debate, the espoused structure of legitimacy becomes crucially important in designing and implementing interventions for both citizen and police.

If a police force were suddenly to become illegitimate, most or all citizens would temporarily or permanently disregard police directives with a moral impunity, even if other state sanctioned authorities were present to uphold the law. Examples may include instances of looting in times of a natural disaster or the deployment of National Guard troops to impose martial law. Rarely, though, at least in the United States, is legitimacy an all-or-nothing proposition.

Although specific incidents (or a history of patterned behavior) will positively or negatively affect a citizens impression of the sub-s or full-construct, the sum of the
community perception of legitimacy can be imagined as plotted on an uni-directional scale with a distribution curve of police forces skewed slightly to the right (hardly any forces evaluated as having no or low-legitimacy but then following a bell curve as the x-axis increases). The reason that very few forces would have truly low scores is because the authority recognized in police is indirectly tied to perceptions of legitimacy in related structures, such as: the larger criminal justice system; local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies; and balancing authorities (e.g. legislative, executive, and judicial branches) (see: Crank & Langworthy, 1992; Livingston, 1997). While citizens have the highest degree of contact with their local police, even if an event were to occur that severely eroded police legitimacy over a large swath of the population, respect for other local, county, state, and/or federal authorities is likely to remain. Those legitimate forces can partner with or displace the illegitimate force until order and legitimacy are restored. Crank and Langworthy (1992) explored the process of “public penance” stemming from unsuccessful policing efforts or catastrophic events and have found that troubled departments often borrow legitimacy from citizen oversight groups or objective investigations/reviews (i.e. by the Department of Justice or FBI; e.g. the Missouri State Troopers assuming control of Ferguson, MO after the killing of Michael Brown in August of 2014).

Finally, legitimacy while stable is not a fixed construct. Evidence indicates some police forces have made conscious efforts to cultivate police-citizen relations. It is less clear if these forces attempted the change as an intentional effort to improve legitimacy or if the gains sought applied to other evaluation metrics. Also, it is unclear if these forces accept or embrace their role as community developers.
Before transitioning, it must be noted that the phrases “police legitimacy” and “legitimacy” are used interchangeably throughout this document as a matter of convenience. Legitimacy is, technically, an umbrella construct that may be applied to any organization imbued with legal authority (see the development of the construct in the next chapter); however, this work excludes detailed consideration of parallel structures or other legitimate authorities in favor of exploring the interactions between the two main law enforcement local-level actors – citizens and police.

**How Legitimacy is Formed**

Inherent in the concept of legitimacy is the idea that the perceptions of citizens matter. Legitimacy is supported only if the “judgments that ordinary citizens make about the rightfulness of police conduct and the organizations that employ and supervise them” (NRC, 2004, p. 291) are positive. The implication is that a police force would be deemed illegitimate without the citizens’ endorsement (Tyler, 2011a). In this regard legitimacy is a reflection of the Rousseau’s (2010) social compact – police exercise authority over citizens, but are simultaneously dependent on citizens for that authority.

An example of symbiosis underlying legitimacy can be understood by briefly examining the related construct of legal cynicism. Legal cynicism corresponds to persistent negative experiences with legal authority, implying overall low legitimacy. It is defined as a “disaffection with police and the legal system” which can lead to “deviant behavior and is antagonistic toward the law” (Anderson, 1999; Carr, Napolitano, & Keating, 2007; Leiber, Nalla, & Farnworth, 1998, p. 450). This deviant behavior then begins to form sub-cultures or an attenuated-culture in which the legal system (including police) is viewed negatively and therefore must rely on greater demonstrations of
authority as it is simultaneously less forthcoming from the local population. As a substitute for the missing legitimacy, the legal system and its coercive sanctioned authority (the police) rely on greater levels of threats of sanctions or use of force to compel compliance to the law (Gau, 2011).

The power citizens hold in the policing process has long been recognized. As early as 1927, police regulations focused on citizen experiences, admonishing officers to “control their tempers, to be civil, orderly, [and] moral…” (Bain, 1939, p. 450). Though pre-dating the current construct of legitimacy, Bain (1939) details the deleterious effect of police adopting a “crime is war” (or an over reliance on the use force) mentality:

The result of this antagonistic, militant attitude, this suspicious, domineering, harsh, discourteous, hard-boiled appeal to fear and force, is that the public tends to regard the policeman as an exhibitionistic bully; a stupid, inefficient coward who is never around when you need him; a grafter and political henchman in collusion with crooks; a “rail-roader” and “framer” of innocent men; an indiscriminate arrester; an inflicter of the third degree; a blustering threatener, over-impressed by his own importance; [and] a disgrace to the law he sworn to enforce. (p.451)

Paradoxically, researchers often fix the definition of legitimacy solely to the understanding of the citizens (see: Murphy, Hinds & Fleming, 2008) while assigning actions to support or erode legitimacy (and interventions to improve legitimacy when interventions are even discussed) solely in the domain of the police (see: Gau, 2011; Murphy, Hinds & Fleming, 2008). This constrains the concept and devalues legitimacy’s
role in shaping community behavior. It produces a *them vs. us* mentality whereby both citizens and police resent the authority the other holds.

While *fuck you vs. yes, officer* may be a litmus test for legitimacy, it is not instructive as to how to change experiences or perceptions of the phenomenon. In order to create change in a community, legitimacy must be understood as dynamic: produced by the understanding of both police and citizens; experienced both personally and collectively for both groups; and generatively defined. Finally, while lost legitimacy is mostly unintentional, the process of positively building the construct should be deliberately undertaken.

**Police and Legitimacy**

At first glance, saddling police with the role of community developer seems incongruous to the historic image of law enforcement. But fighting crime has never been the whole story. After all, most Americans probably think of the old motto “*To Protect and Serve*” as aptly defining police duties – a little bit *cops-and-robbers*, a little bit *Officer Friendly*. Actually, the phrase itself is the remnant of a police-citizen partnership. It originates from 1955 and was the product of a magazine contest to coin a motto for the Los Angeles Police Department’s academy (LAPD, 2014). Over the years it has been widely adopted in LA, in many other jurisdictions nationally as well as on TV; it serves to remind officers and reinforce for citizens the aims of professional policing (LAPD, 2014). Though some academics and practitioners see a focus on service as a new, historical and modern evidence suggests that police understand and revere the duality of their role…

“...there is no greater honor than to serve those in need...”
The imperative then becomes to understand how protection and enforcement balance with service in the modern policing landscape.

While “fighting crime” and “enforcement of laws” are motivating factors in the selection of the profession, Lester (1983), in a study of new police recruits, found these aspects ranked well below the “opportunity to help people in the community” (p. 170; see also White & Escobar, 2008). A study examining police stressors, found responding to situations where a child was injured fell just below killing someone or having a fellow officer killed in the line of duty (ranked #1 and 2), and being physically attacked (ranked #3) (Violanti & Aron, 1995). Family disputes were also represented in the top 20 stressors (Violanti & Aron, 1995). Similar to the sentiment expressed by Chief González, above, police genuinely seem to be concerned about the safety, welfare, and opportunities available in the communities where they work.

A host of research from the 1960s through the 1990s documented that police spend roughly 80-90 percent of their time in non-arrest situations (Birzer, 1999; Kane, 1998; Meadows, 1985; Webster, 1970; Whitaker, 1982). Examining data from a metropolitan police department, Cummings, Cummings and Edell (1965) demonstrated that approximately half of the calls received during the hours selected for the study related to “persistent” or “periodic” personal problems, including calls for health or medical services, problem children, disputes, and inappropriate youth behaviors. Adaptive responses to these non-enforcement issues included three new functions, police
as: 1) navigators of medical or courts systems; 2) providers of information and guidance about the law; and 3) mediation, resolution, and friendly support (Cummings, et al., 1965). The authors conclude that “poor, uneducated people appear to use the police in the way that middle-class people use family doctors and clergymen” (Cummings, et al., 1965, p. 285). Echoing this, Mendelsohn (1970) remarked, “it is probably easier… for a ghetto resident to obtain a needed service from the police than from a teacher, a social worker, a housing inspector, a psychiatrist, or a sanitation man” (p. 748). These older studies are supported by current, local data (see CHMAPD and PAR in Chapter 3). Both the choice of career and range routine activities suggests a need to expand traditional views of police, acknowledging their place in a larger web of social service providers.

**First Social Responders.** Acknowledging the organic acceptance of multifaceted roles, recent literature has begun to identify police as *first social responders* drawing attention to the broad range of issues fielded on any given shift – from youth delinquency to gang violence, domestic violence to child abuse and neglect, and from robbery to assault and homicide (Bartholomew, Singer, González, & Walker, 2013; Prati & Poetrantoni, 2010; Osofsky, 2004). Recent interventions have attempted to marry police and social services with mixed results (see: Buchbinder & Eisikovits, 2008; Cooper, Anaf & Bowden, 2008; Garrett, 2004; Osofsky, 2004; Slaght, 2002). The goal of these initiatives is generally the early identification of at-risk populations (specifically around child abuse and violence exposure) and provision of a portal to mental health services, education and prevention programs, information and referral, and other social interventions (Bartholomew, et al., 2013; Drotar, et al., 2003; Osofsky, Freeman & Aucion, 2004; Peaslee, 2009). At every call for service, police must (potentially) balance
order maintenance with victim support and community development. This creates a new challenge: the need to recast or retrofit policing structures to promote cross-sector partnerships with citizens, peer state agencies, and community-based social welfare organizations (Bercal, 1970; Buchbinder & Eisikovts, 2008; Cooper, Anaf & Bowden, 2008; Garrett, 2004; Harpaz-Rotem, Murphy, Berkowitz & Rosenheck, 2007; Slaght, 2002). The partnerships formed respond, perhaps unintentionally, to both procedural and distributive justice as they encourage officers to engage with citizens, understand personal or social crises, and address issues that are both important to the citizens and, perhaps, exacerbating unsafe activity.

In structurally disadvantaged neighborhoods – those with high levels of concentrated disadvantage (e.g. poverty, welfare utilization, etc.), transience, and racial diversity – citizens experience disproportionate levels of violence and disorder (Brooks, 2000; Skogan, 2008; Warner, 2003). Studies indicate that, when compared to lower-crime and more affluent communities, citizens in high crime neighborhoods expressed lower levels of police satisfaction (Reisig & Parks, 2000; Sampson & Bartusch, 1998). Addressing collective efficacy, but hinting at the cultural attenuation that results from legal cynicism, Sampson and Bartusch (1998) remark:

Perhaps we should not be surprised that those most exposed to the numbing reality of pervasive segregation and economic subjugation become cynical about human nature and legal systems of justice – even as they personally condemn acts of deviance and violence that make life more precarious. (p. 801)
Especially salient for local police working in highly diverse neighborhoods, building legitimacy may be complicated by not only the historical experiences of America’s minority populations, but also by perceived (and/or actual) racial biases of past and current policing methods (e.g. racial profiling, saturation policing, and stop & frisk initiatives; Brown, 2010; Harris, 2013; Tyler, 2005; Tyler & Wakslak, 2004; Walker, 2013; Websdale, 2001). Though there are competing conceptions of the effect race has on legitimacy in the literature (see: Brooks, 2000; Sivasubramanian & Goodman-Delahunty, 2008; Tyler, 2005; Weitzer, Tuch & Skogan, 2008), the general trend of lower levels of trust and satisfaction toward police were enough for the National Research Council (2004) to acknowledge a “profound gulf between the races” (p. 8). A few years earlier, the National Institutes of Justice (2001) reported a mere 31 percent of African Americans “express a great deal of confidence in the police” – this rate is less than half of that expressed by the white population (as cited in Tyler, 2004, p. 90; see also Tyler, 2005). It has also been demonstrated that minorities, the young, low-income populations, and those living in neighborhoods with higher levels of social disorganization (e.g. loitering, public drinking, truancy, etc.) each tend to be more critical of police (Reisig & Parks, 2000; Weitzer, Tuch, & Skogan, 2008) and, therefore, are more likely to resist being co-opted as informants (either reporting crime or providing witness statements) or engaging with fellow citizens to support community-based crime fighting efforts (Tyler, 2005).

**Purpose & Aims**

The purpose of this dissertation research is to twine together an understanding of the role of legitimacy in developing strong police-citizen relations with the macro-level
social work directive of community development. The aim is to explore police legitimacy as understood by everyday people – both police and citizens – in an active police environment. The analysis of similarities and differences in the understanding of key constructs will be used to suggest possible avenues to improve those interactions, easing citizens’ engagement with police while attempting to foster an indigenous commitment to enhanced community safety.

A deeper exploration of legitimacy, as well as the parallel constructs of neighborhood attachment and exposure to violence is presented in the next chapter. By tracing the historical development of legitimacy from Max Weber through to current research, this section seeks to identify limitations and gaps in the current literature. Neighborhood attachment and exposure to violence are approached as secondary concepts, with current literature highlighted only to support connections to legitimacy.

Chapter 3 provides the historical and urban context necessary to fully understand the proposed study (set in the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority, Cleveland, OH). It includes a brief history of American policing and development of housing authority structures. The intersection of police and public housing is briefly discussed through the history of the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority Police Department (CMHAPD), one of the ten largest housing authorities and one of only a handful of public housing police forces in the United States.

The proposed research questions are presented in Chapter 4, and are organized into two broad paths of inquiry: the relationship between neighborhood attachment and exposure to violence, and police legitimacy (quantitative aspect), and the shared understandings of these concepts between citizens and police (qualitative aspect).
concurrent mixed-methods research study conducted is fully described, including: populations targeted, measures, interview protocol construction, data collection processes, and analysis plans.

Chapter 5 presents the research findings, while the final chapter is devoted to drawing overarching conclusions from the work, addressing strengths and limitations of the research, and presenting a plan for future explorations in this field.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

Police Legitimacy

Theoretical Development. Theoretical explorations of police legitimacy draw from the literature of a diverse set of disciplines – sociology, psychology, political science, public administration, and, to a much more limited extent, social work. Unknotting the construct of police legitimacy typically begins with Weber’s (1968) writings on rational legitimacy… and rational legitimacy begins with domination.

Weber. Noting that the motivations to comply with authority are complex, Weber (1968, first published in 1924) observes that “every genuine form of domination implies a minimum of voluntary compliance, that is, an interest (based on ulterior motives or genuine acceptance) in obedience” (p. 212). While some may accept domination for economic gain or as a result of dogmatic teaching, Weber points out that exchange and/or custom are neither necessary nor sufficient motivations for sustained domination and must be supplemented by something more “affectual and ideal” (p. 213). This means that a system of domination (like a government and its agent police forces) must both “establish and cultivate the belief in its legitimacy” (p. 213). Important to the concept of police legitimacy, Weber acknowledges that while subordinate populations may have rights under the law, these rights do nothing to “disprove the quality of dominance” (p. 215) – police may serve citizens, but the element of domination is not eased, creating a permanent tension between needing to, in some way, engender legitimacy, while still recognizing the legal mandate as paramount.
Conceptually, legitimacy emerges as a triptych, comprised of rational, traditional, and charismatic forms (Weber, 1968). The framework of police legitimation falls within the idea that the citizenry must accept the legal authority (*rational legitimacy*) of police to enforce social order. According to Weber, legitimate domination based on legal authority “rest[s] on a belief in the legality of enacted rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands” (Weber, 1968, p. 215). Discussing the function of bureaucracy, Bologh (1984) provides a caution regarding the impersonal nature of legal authority, that while eliminating “personal relations and ties of loyalty as in patrimonialism” (p. 177) legitimacy, in this form, is stripped of both passion and enthusiasm. Legal authority is contextual, limited to those mandates made from the office of the authority. Defining the acceptance of legal authority, Weber (1968) notes that norms are established by “a claim to obedience at least on the part of the members” (p. 217) and then generalized to all within the authority’s jurisdiction. Additionally, the “administration of the law is held to consistent in the application of... rules” (Weber, 1968, p. 217) and the “obligation to obedience” is to the “impersonal order of the law” and not to an individual (Weber, 1968, p. 218).

While Weber’s concept of rational legitimacy is not specific to state bureaucratic systems or the nested systems of police authority, the requisite components of legitimacy are present in modern police forces and the criteria for acceptance are represented in police legitimacy literature (see Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Tyler, 2004; Tyler & Fagan, 2008).

**Procedural Justice & Self-Regulation.** The next leap in the development of police legitimacy evolved from Thibaut and Walker’s (1975) work which differentiated
between procedural justice (the process used to make decisions) and outcome justice (the result of the decision making process). Their work found that an individual’s perception of the quality of their interactions with police, rather than the outcome of those interactions, largely dictates satisfaction (legitimacy as a predecessor of satisfaction; Thibaut & Walker, 1975).

In the intervening years, researchers have further refined the concept of police legitimacy into two distinct tracts: *procedural* and *distributive justice* (presented in the first chapter; Hawdon, Ryan & Griffin, 2003; Jackson & Bradford, 2009; Tyler, 2004). Replicating Thibaut and Walker’s work, procedural justice has been demonstrated to have a deeper impact on individual perceptions of police as legitimate; this finding holds regardless of whether the interaction is citizen or police initiated, and across race and neighborhood characteristics (Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Reisig & Parkes, 2000; Tyler, 2004; Tyler, 2005; Tyler & Fagan, 2008). As evidence to support the differential weight of the sub-constructs, Tyler (2011) notes that even as police forces have become more professional over the last 30 years (equating to a focus on improving instrumental justice) measures of trust and confidence have increased only nominally.

The sub-constructs of legitimacy combine to compel compliance with police directives either by self-regulation or threat of sanctions (Thomas, Walker, & Zelditch, 2001; Tyler, 2004). Tyler (2004) argues that self-regulation, or voluntary cooperation, further strengthens support for focusing on procedural justice as “only minimal levels of societal resources are needed to maintain social order” (p. 88).

*Neo-Durkheim and Culturally Functional Definitions.* Less represented in the literature, but an interesting alternate conception of police legitimacy, the neo-Durkheim
approach switches the frame by positing that the symbolism of police as protectors of social and moral order, and, ultimately, the ability (or failure) of police to prevent the “erosion of values” dictates citizen confidence in police (Jackson & Bradford, 2009, p. 496).

Crank and Langworthy (1992) report police forces that have altered their organizational structure, changing titles, uniforms, etc., lost legitimacy not only with peer law enforcement agencies, but also with citizens. Supported by organizational research, formal structures tend to reflect the mythology of an agency, not necessarily the demands of every-day activities (for example: police tool belt emphasizing “crime fighting” roles rather than neighborhood advocate), and these identifiable markers then become rules for how the profession is expected to act (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Thinking again of the police duty belt, there are few resources available to the police officer on patrol to prevent an erosion of values. In fact, Jackson and Bradford (2009) state that police appear unsuccessful when informal social control, the ability of citizens to engaged in cooperative norm enforcement, is low, noting “when people are concerned about the long-term erosion of neighborhood cohesion and social capital – the police may have already lost the confidence of the communities they serve” (p. 496; see also Herbert, 2006; Loader, 2001).

**POP and COP.** Policing theory directs the method or strategies used to enforce the law and provide service to residents. Problem oriented policing (POP) and community oriented policing (COP) are two of the most popular current methods, and are sometimes described in terms that conflate them with distributive and procedural justice (respectively). These methods were developed independent of the literature on
legitimacy and despite a “face value” link between the philosophies underlying each method and the basic processes outlined earlier, neither POP nor COP are sufficient proxies for the construct.

POP (also called hot-spot, strategic, scientific, or performance management policing) attempts to discern the underlying causes of crime or disorder and develop targeted responses (Braga, et al.; 1999). POP focuses on data analysis for pattern recognition, officer saturation and event profiling to identify and address “hot-spots” (individuals, opportunities, and locations), geographic areas that are disproportionately affected by crime (Boba & Crank, 2008; Braga, et al.; 1999).

An example of a method favoring POP strategies: Broken Windows (theory/methodology) urges police to be more present in structurally disadvantaged neighborhoods, pursuing minor violations in an attempt to improve information social control (Boba & Crank, 2008; Crank, 1994; Wilson & Kelling, 1982; Skogan, 2008). While this and other similar efforts have been shown to have some positive effects (Skogan, 2008), especially in low-income, minority, urban neighborhoods there is a heated debate as to the actual extent to which these methods have improved safety. Because POP strategies largely favor distributive justice, even gains in this area may not be enough to counteract the inevitable loss of procedural justice within the legitimacy construct, as some populations feel disrespected and/or bullied (see: Brown, 2010). In fact, in a reaction essay published in 2002, Paul Chevigny states “the price paid in loss of legitimacy… for the police, as well as the contempt and lack of cooperation, and sometimes even rebellious violence… is too high to justify the marginal gains in deterring or controlling anti-social behavior” (p.155). Thus improved safety (if actually
occurring) can result in lower overall legitimacy (see: Evans, Maragh & Porter, 2003; Harris, 2013; Walker, 2013).

Community oriented policing (COP) is sometimes depicted as eyeing procedural justice goals. Its methodologies attempt to develop shared agenda between police and citizens to address cooperatively determined problems and safety concerns (Goldstein, 1987, Mirsky, 2009; Smith, Novak & Frank, 2001; Stoutland, 2001). The hallmarks of this approach, which blends innovative (police/citizen academies) and traditional (foot patrol) methods, are an open and constructive relationship between police and citizens, and proactive policing postures (relationship development) (Mirsky, 2009; Smith, Novak & Frank, 2001; Stoutland, 2001).

COPs gets complicated when communities identify issues “outside the traditional competence of police” (Skogan, 2008, p. 198). This has the potential to create disconnects between perceptions/interpretations of police concerns by citizens and actual policing priorities. Additionally, COP strategies may place too heavy of a reliance on citizen perception at the risk of alienating other key community stakeholders (particularly in urban neighborhoods where stakeholder groups can vary widely). When working well, COPs has been shown to foster reciprocity (see: Herbert, 2006; Schnebly, 2008; Tankebe, 2013); however, some research suggests that police may be more concerned about “deputizing” citizens to be part of the police body (the eyes and ears of police) without genuine attention focused on how police may better respond to their concerns (Saunders, 1999). This may, for a time, increase expressive legitimacy, but will eventually be found to be inherently disingenuous, with the effect of lowering overall legitimacy.
Both POP and COP run the risk of supporting a uni-directional approach, where police exercise overt or camouflaged authority over citizens (police → citizen) (Herbert, 2006). Additionally, these strategies encompass a broad array of services that may not be standardized across police forces. For example, POP entails detailed analysis of crime statistics, but while COMPSTAT, a specific method of analysis pioneered by the NYPD, is commonly used many other systems adopting various perspectives or proprietary software also abound. There is even less unification around COP definitions and activities (Stoutland, 2001), despite substantial efforts to organize and promote community policing by the Department of Justice (see: Department of Justice’s COPS website).

While initially seen as competing policing strategies, POP and COP are often, in practice, blended. Many police departments adopt strategies to address community need as new problems or issues emerge without consideration of larger methodological concerns. Responsivity is important in a local environment; however, an eclectic approach especially one that is predominantly reflexive, will not usually create a cohesive police vision and may result in confusion for both citizens and officers. This, in turn, may result in lost legitimacy when disconnected directives make it appear that the police (as an organization) are no longer fair in their strategies or able to address community identified priorities.

Though the zeitgeist of a force may be illuminated by its choice to adopt either or both methods, as a construct, legitimacy exists despite the method chosen to pursue police activity. POP and COP taken to an extreme may highlight different components of legitimacy, but in that extreme neither method is viable for an extended period of time.
POP (as distributive) is liable to alienate citizens, while COP (as procedural) is prone to confuse police aims. However, the lack of standardization in the strategies/tactics for both methods makes an assessment of their impact on legitimacy difficult to determine precisely.

**Measurement and Analysis Critique.** This discussion of legitimacy closes with a focus on the practical elements – caution raised in current research regarding the measurement of the construct and how one should align the results from the literature to form more general conclusions. Aligning theoretical constructs presents a specific challenge in synthesizing the empirical literature. The operationalization of variables is a concern, since perspectives among the relevant fields alter definitions to fit competing frames, leaving only thin relations among similar sounding phrases (i.e. structural disadvantage, disorder, etc.). Particularly problematic, most current literature does little to include a neighborhood context, or address the perceptions of minorities within larger samples.

**Measurement Issues.** Legitimacy is a difficult concept to measure. Dr. Tom R. Tyler, a pioneer in the exploration of legitimacy, has developed one of the most comprehensive tools to measure legitimacy, exploring both procedural and distributive justice components, across a multitude of interactions, outcomes, and services provided. The tool (approximately 50 items long) is intended to be administered by trained interviewers via telephone to large populations samples (Tyler, 2011b). While studies may develop new measure or adapt tools from similar constructs to meet specific aims or conform to limitations of the population, research setting, or budget, few tested reliable and valid options exist (exception Hinds & Murphy, 2007). This imposes a significant
limitation on legitimacy research, especially when working with low-literacy populations, or if there is a need for a reduced measure.

**Operationalizations.** This concern highlights broader issue of construct validity. The inadequate explanation of constructs may lead to difficulty interpreting the relationships between variables. Confounding may occur due to overlapping terms making it difficult to draw an inference about any single construct (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2010). This is particularly concerning when “satisfaction measures” are employed to assess legitimacy, as these ideas may not converge to form a single construct. Additionally, terms related to/replacing the sub-constructs of procedural and distributive justice, like expressive and instrumental legitimacy, and normative justice, are employed and broadened to include linguistically and conceptually vague terms like fairness and cooperation (see: Hawdon, Ryan & Griffin, 2003; Tyler, 2005). Though, where presented, Cronbach’s alphas tend to be strong, demonstrating confidence in the reliability of the measures, little attention is paid to demonstrating content validity. More importantly, researchers appear unconcerned with potential nuances or differential definitions of terms for sub-populations.

Most studies employ regression or structural equation modeling, aligning the specified models with the theoretical base; however, omitted descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations impair the ability to determine if the basic assumptions for regression analysis have been met. More importantly, given the wide scope of variables used to predict legitimacy (e.g. smoking cigarettes, drug use, breaking laws, cooperation with police, trust, etc.; Sampson & Bartusch, 1998; Tyler, 2005), it becomes difficult to coalesce unified constructs and to determine if individual studies are supporting previous
research. Additionally, studies uniformly omit socio-economic status variables, especially income, in favor of transient variables (renter vs. own home) and education. Discrepancies (and a lack of consistency) among the independent variables identified hampers the development of the theory in its application to specific sub-populations.

**Neighborhood & Race.** Legitimacy studies tend to be large, sampling a thousand or more citizens in major metropolitan areas (see: Hawdon, Ryan & Griffin, 2003; Tyler, 2005; Sampson & Bartusch, 1998; Weitzer, Tuch, & Skogan, 2008). As such, the designs tend to be cross-sectional and rely on telephone technology. Given the design, the sample frames give rise to significant concerns, especially given the limitations of telephone surveys, in terms of potentially oversampling less transient populations (those with established permanent residents) and older, financially stable populations (land-lines vs. cell phone usage).

A limited number of studies also demonstrate that neighborhood context affects views of police legitimacy (see: Sampson & Bartusch, 1998; Stoutland, 2001; Reisig & Parkes, 2000). The relationship of race to police legitimacy is less clear, with Tyler (2005) finding that measures of both procedural and distributive justice were diminished if citizens felt race was a factor in policing, however, this feeling was true for both whites and minority races (with the exception of Hispanic populations).

While reinforcing that African Americans are generally less satisfied with the police, Reisig and Parks (2000) demonstrated that dissatisfaction is attenuated only slightly with the addition of neighborhood factors in the model. Ultimately, Reisig and Parks found that the quality of life model was modestly stronger than neighborhood context, with both providing greater accuracy and explanation of variance than
experience with police. This finding supports the general police legitimacy literature, and expands support for exploration of race and neighborhood as impacting legitimacy.

The universal application of the theory to the entire population or jurisdiction potentially overlooks differential legitimacy based on racial or neighborhood characteristics, amplifying the sampling concerns. Some studies may not have, or do not document, adequate representation of minority or low-income populations, or those residing in specific neighborhoods experiencing structural disadvantages to determine if alternate understandings of legitimacy are present (see: Tyler, 2005; Weitzer, Tuch & Skogan, 2008; Reisig & Parks, 2000).

Over the last 80 years, just as the concept of police legitimacy has evolved, technological and methodological advancements have driven police to become “efficiency-oriented, [and] crime control-focused,” dramatically altering interactions with citizens (Walker, 1984, p. 78). The night-watchmen patrolling a foot-beat presents a very different face of the force compared with the single-officer patrol or the Special Weapons And Tactics (SWAT) units of today’s highly structured, professional, paramilitary policing organizations. Additionally, the adoption of the Uniform Crime Reports (UCRs) has shunted police attention to a limited number of severe crimes, blurring the importance of protecting “informal neighborhood norms of behavior” (Walker, 1984, p. 78). Despite these changes in policing, perhaps even countervailing the depersonalization of problem oriented policing, the concept of legitimacy remains anchored – citizens must “consent to be led” (Glassman, 1984, p. 221), they must obey police directives in order to preserve the viability of police authority (Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Tyler, 2005; Tyler & Fagan 2008).
Related Constructs

The constructs of neighborhood attachment and exposure to violence are used in the study to further clarify community context and predict legitimacy, both are addressed below.

**Neighborhood Attachment.** Neighborhood attachment theory is used primarily in Criminal Justice literature to denote the investment of residents in their local community as represented by a combination of a community’s physical qualities and the emotional connections residents have within the community (Lewicka, 2011). Neighborhood attachment includes: *attitudinal* (indicating the level of satisfaction – evaluative [physical] and emotional [sentimental] – with the neighborhood as a place to live); and *behavioral* (operating like social capital, these are actions that connect neighborhood residents by providing various forms of support as necessary) forms (Burchfield, 2007; Comstock, et al., 2010; Wallace, 2011). The causal process is as follows:

- **Neighborhood Attachment** – neighborhoods with poor structural composition often experience disruptions or breakdowns in social order as evidenced by increases in various forms of crime, violence, truancy, and delinquency, if residents build relationships with one another that are cooperative (behavioral) and if they individually form a positive outlook toward their neighborhood (either concrete or hopeful; attitudinal), then neighbors are more invested promoting the wellbeing of their community and informal social control will increase among the residents with whom they interact (social network).
The interaction of behavioral and attitudinal attachment results in a stronger connection of residents to their neighborhoods (Burchfield, 2007). The connection, or affective sentiment, of residents is a key variable in reducing social disorder through the enforcement of social norms, represented by informal social control (the ability of a group of people to enforce collective norms). Informal social control is ultimately linked to neighborhood safety and the reduction of social disorder and crime (Drakulich & Crutchfield, 2013; Greenburg, Rohe & Williams, 1982; Shapiro, 1987). It has been shown that neighborhoods with either low structural disadvantage or higher levels of informal social control have much stronger relationships with their police force (Greenburg, Rohe & Williams, 1982).

Burchfield (2007) found that poor neighborhood structural composition was highly correlated with lower levels of informal social control. This relationship was impacted, on the individual level, by the number of moves an individual had (negatively related) and individual home ownership (positively related). Potentially problematic, the author uses crime data to illustrate her argument, specifically homicide reports (which are noted to be accurately reported over time. Such extreme events may mask the nuances of informal social control as exhibited on other forms of social disorder.

**Exposure to Violence.** Exposure to violence literature is in transition. While its affects on children are still studied often, the adult literature has shifted focused to concerns about Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and highlights with increasing frequency the experiences of former service men and women. Researchers are beginning to view exposure to violence – defined as experiencing, seeing, or even hearing about it – violence as a public health concern (Rich, 2009). In youth, there is a clear connection
between exposure to violence (in the home and community) and increased stress, academic difficulties, aggressive behavior, elevated levels of risk taking, anxiety, dissociation, depression, and suicidal ideation (Kliwer & Sullivan, 2008; Lynch, 2003; Margolin & Gordis, 2000; Singer, Anglin, Song, & Lunghofer, 1995; Singer, Flannery, Guo, Miller & Leibbrandt, 2004). Many of these same (or the equivalent) disorders manifest in adults as well (Afari, et. al, 2014).

The impact of exposure to violence may be understood through a stress-coping model. Research indicates that when responding to stressful situation, individuals tend to focus on personal outcomes, like changes in their identity, value, and goals (threat appraisal; Kliwer & Sullivan, 2008; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). When responding to violence as a victim or witness, individuals may focus on personal safety, fear for the safety of others which may, in turn, limit mobility (Kliwer & Sullivan, 2009). While adults and children make different threat assessments based on the type of violence, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) state that the responses to stress reflect how the individual relates to others. Prior literature also indicates that victimization may have a deeper impact on an individual than witnessing violent behavior (Sheets, et al. 1996).

Exposure to violence may impact legitimacy in two ways: 1) in reaction to the event (either as victim or witness) residents may feel that police are unable to protect them from harm; and 2) the withdrawing that is characteristic of the response to violence may decrease informal social control in the community.

The concept of informal social control plays a pivotal role in a variety of theories spanning from social disorder and crime prevention/policing to social capital development. Although informal social control is, at times, blended with the parallel
concept of collective efficacy, both terms capture the idea that social network exchanges form a foundation upon which communities develop shared norms, goals, and values. These shared norms are, in turn, used to regulate members, encourage pro-social behaviors, and address grievances without the involvement of formal system structures (Warner, 2007; Xu, Fiedler & Flaming, 2005; Browning, Fienberg & Dietz, 2004; Sampson & Bartusch, 1998; Kelling & Wilson, 1982). As such, there is a common perception that “socially organized communities are more capable and willing to use social control in a variety of forms” (Warner, 2007, p. 101). However, in neighborhoods with poor structural composition, ability to regulate members breaks down, often because residents begin to disengage with the community (Skogan, 2009). What may be a very personal act of violence (e.g. being the victim of domestic violence in one’s own home) may have a lasting impact on the way an individual behaves in their community. The causal process for informal social control is as follows:

- **Informal Social Control** – When individuals isolate themselves from their neighbors and community, residents stop actively intervening in protective activities (monitoring youth or strangers, attempting to break-up fights, maintaining the external appearance of one’s home, etc.), then community’s sense of identity is negatively affected, and when a community cannot access a unified sense of identity behaviors associated with crime, truancy, and delinquency increase.

When informal social control breaks down, communities tend to rely more heavily on formal authorities. This creates a double threat – when communities cannot police themselves they become more dangerous, police are forced to respond to social crises
(that were not addressed by the community earlier, and linking back to the expanded role of police as noted in the first chapter) and an increasing level of disorder and crime.

**Gaps & Existing Conceptual Models**

In examining both the theoretical and empirical literature it is easy to get lost in the perception that the construct of police legitimacy is structurally damaged – that academics are guilty of felonious malfeasance, promulgating theory that does little to contextualize the interactions between police and citizens or accommodate the fluidity of police work in the community. This is, perhaps, an unforgiving view – just as policing has evolved over the last century and a half, the field’s conception of legitimacy may also need to grow.

Jaccard and Jacoby’s (2010) state that theories are “valued to the extent that they serve as useful guides to the world we experience” and that even flawed theory (or the research that supports it) “tends to be retained until something better comes along” (p. 31). This section explores both opportunities for growth in the theoretical and empirical literature and research questions stemming from this analysis.

A reoccurring critique of police legitimacy (both theoretical and empirical) is that the language of the theory and the operationalization of the constructs are nebulous. Further, the theory assumes, and research tests, only the interactions between police and citizens, ignoring aspects of legitimacy that may be generated through interactions with peer government agencies, businesses, and social services organizations. Acknowledging that organizational legitimacy may be constructed differently, the absence of other stakeholders limits the ability to understand the constraints on police actions as they strive to meet the expectations of multiple populations, creating the illusion that police
are responsible to citizens alone. Moreover, by not incorporating all stakeholder perspectives, it becomes difficult to know how these other organizations might work in concert with police to promote legitimacy, and thereby promote social order.

A central limitation of the construct, research has demonstrated that minority populations and citizens in disadvantaged neighborhoods have lower satisfaction with police, but special populations or circumstances are rarely addressed with most research using education and home ownership as proxies for income level.

It is important to address the apparent lack of clear positive or negative linkages – that the connection between high/low legitimacy and examples of legitimacy promoting/encumbering the effectiveness of American police forces are missing from the current literature. Mendelsohn (1970) cautions that it is naïve to assume that legitimacy alone will shape the effectiveness of police, but that until relations specifically among police and minority citizens improve little else will improve for minority communities. Mendelsohn’s work, identifying negative police perceptions as a factor influencing how police interact with marginalized populations, foreshadows the linkages between police legitimacy and social disorder theories (specifically cultural attenuation) and the ability of police to support community development (Herbert, 2006; Warner, 2003; Warner & Roundtree, 2000). This lack of linkages from theory to community behavior might also explain why theory has not spawned targeted interventions. While it may be assumed that higher levels of expressive and/or instrumental legitimacy imbue a general sense of legitimacy, the theory only provides a set of guiding principles for police-citizen interactions. The absence of intervention testing represent a gap in the literature.
Tankebe (2009) provides the most encompassing critique of the literature, identifying five weaknesses spanning both theoretical and empirical works. He states that current research on legitimacy does not take into account the seriousness of the offence. Moreover, noting a failure “to explore the potential inputs of police self-conception of their power in understanding police-public relations” (p. 15), Tankebe (2009) reflects some of the same criticism as proffered by Mendelsohn (1970) calling for increased understanding of how the biases of police toward the populations they serve effect legitimacy. While Tankebe takes a global perspective which, bias toward minority populations is also a gap in research on legitimacy of American police forces. Tankebe (2009) calls for additional empirical verification “of the validity of the propositions of procedural fairness [expressive justice] in different socio-political settings” (p. 16).

Likely most frustrating to police, the extant literature on legitimacy seems geared to promote academic research rather than community level change. Legitimacy measures produce scores that are then used in regression analyses; however, no effort (at least in the identified literature) to create a scoring system to benchmark appropriate levels or allow interested forces to track it as a performance metric.

**Research.** The dissertation research was not broad enough to address all of the gaps noted here; however, this study attempted to address one significant flaw, most explorations of legitimacy focus on testing residents’ perceptions of legitimacy (residents → police) rather than acknowledging that the interactions between these groups (residents ↔ police) anchors the construct. Studies only occasionally include senior leadership and no studies were located that address legitimacy as understood or evaluated by officers themselves. Little work has been done to determine how understandings of
legitimacy track along the groups/actors most involved in forming the concept in local communities. Additionally, studies addressing legitimacy broadly – across an entire community or metropolitan area – run the risk of missing differences in perception as experienced by marginalized or vulnerable populations.

In part, these logical leaps are fostered by current limitations inherent in the measurement tools, which while helpful in identifying predictors of legitimacy (and conditions where legitimacy may increase or decrease) do not explore the understanding of the construct and are difficult to administer to special populations (notable exception Carr, Napolitano & Keating, 2007).

Finally, this study attempted to connect neighborhood attachment (already demonstrated to be connected to informal social control) and exposure to violence to legitimacy. While neighborhood attachment boasts a tangential connection to the construct, the addition of exposure to violence (already acknowledged to be elevated for low-income populations) was thought to also shape legitimacy.

The research questions in Chapter 4 sought to determine if the posited connection between neighborhood attachment and exposure to violence existed based on neighborhood structure. By turning the attention toward the individuals’ understanding of role and legitimacy, the possibility to evaluate the perspectives of citizens in comparison to police and senior police leadership was opened. Though not establishing an ideal benchmark of legitimacy, the design of the study provided a framework from which interventions to support or improve legitimacy could be created.
Because legitimacy is partially fostered by the environmental context, it is necessary to discuss both the history of policing as well as the development of the housing authority system before presenting the research plan.
Chapter 3

Legitimacy in the Environmental Context

Policing the Community

American policing, at least in a form that would be recognizable as such today, typically dates from the mid-1800s, when watchmen, sheriffs (etymology: shire reeves), and constables were reformed into policing agencies overseen by local government, with defined and limited authority, and recognized territory or jurisdiction (Archbold, 2012). Prior to the establishment of Philadelphia’s first police force (circa 1833), American efforts mirrored those of the British and were largely inefficient, relying on these loosely organized structures to bring criminals to court, collect taxes, and, at times, determine punishment (Archbold, 2012; Johnson, 1981). In fact, most watch groups engaged in activities such as “lighting street lamps, running soup kitchens, recovering lost children, capturing runaway animals…” and other rudimentary social service activities (Archbold, 2012, p. 3). In this system, law enforcement was not the primary priority (Archbold, 2012), and even if it were the gaps in service (day/times available and inconsistent services provided) coupled with a lack of mission reduced its overall value to the average citizen. Private security existed and it was not uncommon to find more organized enforcement around docks, market areas, or related to slaveholders/slave retrieval services (Websdale, 2001). Though these private groups were more “professional,” in that specific services were often contracted, they lacked the service scope and public nature of volunteer watches or sheriff systems.

Coinciding with the second industrial revolution (circa 1850-1920) and the explosive growth of American manufacturing cities, modern policing quickly caught-on
in between 1840 and 1890 (Philadelphia in 1833, Boston in 1845, New York in 1848… and Cleveland 1850 [night watch] and 1866 [24/7 police force]) (Archbold, 2012; Encyclopedia of Cleveland History, 1998 & 2002). Typically, these early organized forces were politically oriented, with chiefs and other senior leadership appointed by parties/elected officials (Kraska & Kappeler, 2014). By the early 1900s, most large cities developed systems of precincts or police districts, dividing larger jurisdictions into manageable units patrolled by officers assigned to and supervised by that precinct (Encyclopedia of Cleveland History, 2002). The segmentation of territory and duties also began the process of professionalization for officers and leadership. Around this time, though much slower to evolve, police forces began to differentiate themselves from political processes, developing into a system where local police chiefs are selected, employed, and report to city governments (Kraska & Kappeler, 2014). This separation lends a stability to the police in spite of political imperatives and electoral processes (this, though, varies by jurisdiction and type of force – sheriffs are elected, but state and federal law enforcement commands are generally not). Finally, social services developments, in the form of scientific charity and indoor/outdoor relief also date to this period (Trattner, 1981), potentially relieving police of the duties provided under the watches and allowing them to focus on the law enforcement role.

While the topological hierarchy remains to the present, what has changed dramatically in the ensuing 100+ years are policing theories (social understanding of deviance, satisfaction, legitimacy), methodologies (POP and COP [below] and specialized units, e.g. SWAT, K9), and technologies (e.g. patrol cars, telephones, 911, single officer patrols, computers, Tasers/non-lethal weapons, etc.).
Public Housing as a Unique Environment

Local environments shape the interactions of police and citizens as much as the selected policing method. Housing authorities, especially those still reliant on estate properties or projects, represent a unique urban environment. These densely packed communities are typically located in the center of cities, often encircled by business or industrial development, and are usually described as structurally disadvantaged neighborhoods (highly concentrated poverty, transience, and racial diversity).

Housing concerns came to the forefront in the United States after WWI (circa 1918) as cities continued to develop and immigrant populations were again drawn to industrialized employment. Additionally, apart from international immigrants, northern cities also faced burgeoning minority communities as part of the Great Migration (typically dated as spanning from the early 1860s to about 1960) which lured decedents of slaves and share-croppers to economic opportunities and less oppressive social systems (Larsen, 2011). These new classes of poor were forced to congregate in tight quarters, seeking out cheap rents, and inhabiting dilapidated buildings of the urban centers. Public housing had been billed as a triple threat/promise – the construction of housing units by the government would clear slums (coinciding with the introduction of germ theory and public health systems, and the growth of the eugenics movement), provide clean and safe housing to deserving working families, and stimulate the lagging construction sector (McCarty, 2011).

The Wagner-Steagall Housing Act (Pub.L. 75–412, 50 Stat. 888, enacted September 1, 1937) provided funds to locally chartered, independent non-profit housing authorities, to build homes/communities for lower-income working families (Stolof, n.d.;
Reid, 2013). The Wagner-Steagall Housing Act envisioned “spring board” communities, where the “submerged” middle-class, struggling from the Great Depression, would be able to prosper in safe, clean housing to then move-on to single-family homes in (what are now considered to be) the inner-suburbs (Larsen, 2011). WWII repurposed the fledgling housing authorities to shelter soldiers (in training or returning disabled veterans) and provide housing to defense industry workers and their families (Larsen, 2011). An enduring link to this era, disabled veterans are still assigned priority for placement in many authorities and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD; established 1965) devotes significant resources to veterans’ programs (HUD, 2014; Larsen, 2011).

It was not until the Housing Act of 1949, that slum areas were targeted – clearing blight – forcing large portions of the urban African American population to seek out public housing (Reid, 2013). This process was continued with ever expanding Urban Renewal programs (circa 1930 – 1960) that demolished large swaths of city neighborhoods. Early housing authority developments were segregated (de facto), and construction of new estates in the 1940s and 1950s were slowed due to racial confrontations about location and resident “suitability” (McCarty, 2011). Then in 1969-71 the Brooke Amendment indicated the preference in public housing to serve the very poor, capping rent at 25% of the family’s income (Larsen, 2011; Reid, 2013; Stolof, n.d.).

The Brooke Amendment was intended to ensure that the very poor could not be priced out of public housing opportunities, but as an unintended consequence housing authorities have faced a Sisyphean funding struggle to recoup the rents needed for fiscal solvency. Federal funding is provided for subsidies, but the majority of the funding
needed for operating expenses is generated from rents paid by residents – to provide perspective CMHA’s (2014) tenant demographic survey identified an average annual income of $6,995 for family units and $7,876 for high-rises (which include senior estates), this calculates to an average annual rent of $1,748 and $1,969 (actual rents may be lower due to family circumstances). Even over the 9,146 units in these classifications (CMHA, 2014), the return for the housing authority is between $15.9 and $18 million… supporting infrastructure and operations for units as old as 75 years. CMHA’s operating expenses, as indicated by their 2012 audit, were $221.5 million with a single year loss of $15.9 million (though it should be noted that depreciation appears as an expense; CMHA, 2013). By targeting the very poor, housing authorities nationally have fallen negligent on repairs and general maintenance: this manifests as a lack of investment in safe and appropriate outdoor lighting (replacement of burned out or damaged lights; see photos in appendices), poor grounds maintenance, the use of sub-par materials in repairs, and vacant units becoming uninhabitable within active estate communities, among other problems (NCSDPH., 1992; see the documentary the Pruitt-Igoe Myth). Further highlighting this resource crisis, in 1989 the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing was convened and through several years of study determined that approximately 6% (about 86,000 units nationally) of public housing stock were “severely distressed” (NCSDPH, 1992). In their 1992 report, the commission placed a price tag of $5.6 billion to make these units habitable or to modernize them appropriately (NCSDPH, 1992).

HUD’s 2015 budget is in excess of $45 billion dollars (for comparison U.S. Department of Defense 2015 budget is approximately $549 billion), with roughly 85% of
that targeted at rental subsidies, capital expenditures, and homeless assistance grants (HUD, 2014). Even the portion directed specifically to housing subsidies ($20 billion) and capital expenses ($1.9 billion) is not solely to support local housing authorities or the estates (HUD, 2014). In fact, HOPE IV, which stemmed from the 1992 commission report, changed the focus of subsidized housing to prefer vouchers given for market-rate rental units integrated throughout the community (National Housing Law Project, 2002). HOPE has provided some funds for estate modernization, with the caveat that local housing authorities cannot build new units in addition to current stock (so modernized units must replace existing units) and it favors a formula that leads to a slight reduction in overall public housing stock (Gotez, 2013; National Housing Law Project, 2002).

An aside regarding terms – nationally housing authority properties configured for multiple families within a cluster of buildings (apartment block, tower, or townhouse) are labeled “housing estates.” This term is used in this document, but it should be noted that it is contentious among the population served and their advocates. Individuals may feel that the term is used ironically given that these are typically less desirable than market-available units and do not meet the dictionary definition of estates (although this may also point to another discrepancy between the ideal and actual of housing authorities).

**CMHAPD**

CMHA serves over 50,000 low-income residents, most are African American and live in single female headed households (CMHAPD, 2009). In 2013, CMHAPD responded to 33,702 call for service (which only represent a portion of on-duty time), with 10,810 calls (32%) for administrative function, domestic disturbance, endangered child, mental health concerns, and attempted suicide (personal communication, G.
Coulter, August 12, 2014, authorized by A. González). CMHAPD, already partnering with human service organizations to expand the range of services offered to residents, has referred between 1,000 and 2,000 adults and youths per-year, over the past four years, to mental health and family-based intervention services (personal communication, J. Burgos, August, 12, 2014, authorized by A. González).

It is unusual for a housing authority to have an independent police force, a detailed web-search along with information from CMHAPD indicated that there may be fewer than 10 nationally (Baltimore, Boston, Cleveland, the District of Columbia, Philadelphia, and Oakland have been identified; personal communication, G. Coulter, August 14, 2014). Even the largest housing authorities (New York, Puerto Rico, and Chicago [largest in terms of units]) do not support dedicated police forces, although the CHAPD was assumed into the Chicago Police Department in 1999 (Garza, 1999). Often it is the local city police departments that undertake policing duties for the housing authority, and in very large jurisdictions, like New York, the city police may have a special branch or unit dedicated to housing authority residents and properties.

No research was found to support one configuration of police forces for housing authorities over the others. However, from a social work perspective, housing authority residents are an “at-risk” or vulnerable population (based on exposure to violence and crime statistics, ethnicity/race, and low-income status). The creation of an independent force, or at a least dedicated branch, may support a deeper understanding of resident needs and the issues specific to micro-communities formed in housing estates, as well as allow greater flexibility for police to implement community policing/relationship building approaches.
In documenting its own history, CMHAPD (2009) outlines the difficulty in carving out a jurisdiction within and crossing-over city boundaries, and also illustrates the benefit of a dedicated housing authority police force. CMHAPD (established in 1985) is considerably younger than CMHA (established 1937). During construction and development, security was provided “by [Cleveland police] officers who served as watchmen” (p. 2) paid by the Public Works Administration. In the 1960s, the Cleveland City Council formally requested that the housing authority conduct a feasibility study due to the strain the estates were putting on the Cleveland Police Department (CPD), which was experiencing a manpower shortage. A security force was eventually established and in 1973 distinctive CMHAPD uniforms and insignia were developed and a Chief of Security was hired. Later in the decade CPD protested their continued policing of the housing authority, leading to a dramatic expansion of the security force in 1980. It was not until late in 1984 that House Bill #129 “allowed CMHA to employ ‘peace officers’ [to] enforce the laws of the state of Ohio and mandate[ed] the same training as other law enforcement officers in the State” thus conferring arrest authority “in all areas owned and operated by CMHA, including those in neighboring cities outside of the City of Cleveland” (p. 2). From 1985 to the present CMHAPD has evolved into a mid-sized, OPOTA certified (Ohio Peace Officer Training Academy), policing force, employing over 75 officers and command level personnel, and nearly 40 protection officers, along with scores of other communications and support staff (CMHAPD, 2013).

Given the need to interact with vulnerable and marginalized citizens, housing authority police departments must be more sensitive to the balance between law enforcement and service provision. Their duties typically extend beyond those of a
“regular” police department to the enforcement of both local, state, and federal ordinances and laws and tenant leases (see Figures 1 and 2 at the end of this chapter). The following example is from CMHAPD (2009) and demonstrates a commitment to the principles of both safety and community inclusion:

The mission of the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority Police Department is to preserve and advance the principles of democracy…uphold the Constitution of the United States of America, the laws of the State of Ohio and the Ordinances of those with which we hold concurrent jurisdiction… Based upon our belief that human life is precious, we place our highest value on the protection of that life…We will provide the community the highest quality police services in an efficient and effective manner…We will involve the community in policing strategies. We will enhance a cooperative spirit expanding communications between the community and the police department through sensitive, courteous, and professional interaction; always mindful of career development for our employees…

Though CMHAPD aligned with CMHA and adopted their mission in 2010 (“The mission of the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority is to be the leader in providing safe quality affordable housing for individuals and families of Cuyahoga County” [CMHAPD, 2010, p. 2; CMHAPD, 2011; T. Burdyshaw, personal communication, August 21, 2014] the longer wording of the 2009 statement provides insight into the balanced role police must take. In 2012 and 2013, the annual report includes neither a police nor housing authority mission, but it must be noted that summaries of CMHAPD’s key units and
functions are included and demonstrate a strong commitment to community perspectives and partnerships.

**Police Assisted Referral.** The Police Assisted Referral (PAR) program creates a conduit for police officers to connect violence-exposed youths and families to case management, violence-prevention education and interventions, and mental health screening services. Spearheaded by the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority Police Department (CMHAPD) and the Partnership for a Safer Cleveland, the collaborative effort includes two local human service providers (Beech Brook and FrontLine) specializing in trauma-informed social work practices, as well as an active research and evaluation partner, the Begun Center at Case Western Reserve University (Begun Center).

Already considered an emerging practice, PAR is founded on three principles: 1) police are first social responders, working with vulnerable or at-risk individuals before other helping professionals; 2) police lack the tools to respond to social crises, nothing on the duty belt addresses these issues; and, 3) police are ready, willing, and able to help, studies demonstrate that 80-90% of police time is spent interacting with citizens in non-arrest situations.

Each year, all police officers receive training, based on state-of-the-science research, to hone the skills needed to interact with families, and identify and refer those in crisis. In the field, police refer families in the course of their normal duties – they provide a referral card and reassure the family that the agency contacting them is trustworthy. The officer then telephones a 24/7 hotline to relay information about the family and the crisis. Within 72 hours a trained social worker contacts the family,
performs a crisis assessment (sometimes in the home), and then works with the family to develop an on-going service plan. Closing the loop, the service partner sends the officer (and Chief) a confirmation letter, letting him/her know that the family has been contacted.

PAR extends policing beyond typical “arrest or walk-away” strategies and provides a path for officers to form productive relationships with the residents they serve. PAR is based on core competencies of the community oriented policing model, and includes in-depth evaluation soliciting resident feedback in order to shape and evolve the program. Beyond the primary service of PAR, the program has been demonstrated to improve interactions between residents and police. In two recent studies (combined n=270) (study 1: Bartholomew, Singer, González & Walker, 2013; study 2: unpublished, personal communication, M. Walker, August 14, 2014), over 40% of respondents indicated their impressions of police had improved based on the interactions during the referral. 95% of respondents felt police were respectful during the PAR interaction (linked to training) and over 90% wanted the program to continue. Moreover, in focus group sessions, officers have indicated that the program gives them piece of mind, knowing that they have linked the family with helping professionals.

Since PAR’s inception in 2010, Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority Police (CMHAPD) have referred approximately, 7,000 individuals (personal communication, M. Walker, August 14, 2014)
Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority Police Department Notice To Violator, Leasing Violations.
Figure 2. Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority Police Department, Basic Citation.
Chapter 4

Methods

The aim of the study was to better understand interpretations of police legitimacy in two primary stakeholder groups: urban, low-income, at-risk citizens and the police officers who serve them. Examining the function of police legitimacy within the scope of a police-driven, human service intervention, the study worked to identify pathways from the theoretical construct of legitimacy to improved police/citizen interactions.

This chapter details the research questions and hypotheses, data sources and collection protocols, and provides a framework for data analysis. The study analyzed quantitative data from the July 2013 PAR survey of referral recipients, which was part of an earlier program evaluation, and then built on those findings with a set of mirrored key informant interviews to provide further context and examples from the field.

Research Questions & Hypotheses

In an effort to address identified gaps in the literature, this study posed a series of linked research questions, assessing the effects of neighborhood attachment and violence exposure on legitimacy, while also exploring the related constructs of legitimacy, satisfaction, and performance (all identified in the literature to be strongly related). Finally, the proposed research sought to identify common understandings of legitimacy, neighborhood, and expectations of police from a sample of the stakeholder groups. The research questions were:
Neighborhood, Violence and Legitimacy.

1. Is there a relationship between citizens’ assessment of police legitimacy, their attachment to neighborhood, and exposure to violence (victim or witness)?
   - Hypothesis 1.1: Higher levels of victimization will be associated with lower police legitimacy scores.
   - Hypothesis 1.2: Higher levels of witnessing violence will be associated with lower police legitimacy scores.
   - Hypothesis 1.3: Higher scores on neighborhood attachment will be associated with higher police legitimacy scores.

RQ1.A: Which has a stronger association with police legitimacy, victimization or witnessing?

While there are no studies exploring exposure to violence and police legitimacy in the literature, an understanding of the deleterious effects of exposure to violence seemed to indicate an inverse relationship. Similarly, literature linking neighborhood attachment and police legitimacy was not located, but understanding the impact neighborhood attachment has on collective efficacy indicated a direct relationship with police legitimacy. Research question 1.A has no corresponding hypotheses because existing literature does not indicate if the locus of exposure has any association with negative outcomes. This question is exploratory.

Shared Understanding.

2. Are the core constructs of police legitimacy understood in both stakeholder groups?
3. How does each group understand its role and function? What does each group define as the role of the other stakeholder? What influences this understanding?

4. Among stakeholder groups, what are the commonly understood community issues? Is there agreement on intensity and importance? What shapes these understandings?

5. What are general suggestions for improved police/community interactions? Do these suggestions align across groups?

No hypotheses are presented for research questions 2-5 as they relate to the qualitative aspect of the study.

**Populations**

The focal population for the study was urban, low-income, at-risk individuals living in CMHA properties who have had recent contact (identified over a three year span) with CMHAPD through the PAR program. Living in high-poverty environments has been linked to higher instances of physical and psychological risk, including: exposure to violence (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2007); adverse health effects and limited access to health and dental care (Boynton-Jarret, Ryan, Berkman & Wright, 2008; National Center for Health Statistics, 2013; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2007); mental health concerns (Hudson, 2005; Rutter, 1985); and premature mortality (Galbardes, Lynch & Smith, 2008).

All citizen participants in this study were initially identified by CMHAPD as having been referred to a human service agency through the PAR program (described in the previous chapter). Typically these referrals stemmed from an instance of domestic violence, broadly defined as violence occurring within the home, which may represent
issues between intimate partners, parents and grandparents, parents and children, or among sibling or youth groups. PAR referrals tend to include all members of the family who were present when the police responded to the event, excluding perpetrators and/or suspects (though these individuals may receive services as part of the family). Therefore, perpetrators and suspects were not included in the sample population.

The July 2013 PAR survey, conducted by the Partnership for a Safer Cleveland, was mailed to 1,126 non-duplicated adults (over age of 18) referred to services between January 2010 and March 2013. Owing to transiency in the population, 261 addresses were undeliverable (i.e. no such address, no forwarding address, returned to sender, etc.), creating a viable sample of 865 individuals. This sample included duplicate households when more than one adult was referred. The survey, containing the neighborhood attachment, exposure to violence, and police legitimacy scales described below, yielded a 25% response rate (n=212). Individuals were given the opportunity to volunteer for future research and 142 provided some form of contact information. Recruitment flyers for the interview component of the study were mailed to all 142 individuals, resulting in 18 contacting the Partnership to indicate that they were interested in participating.

CMHAPD personnel were selected for participation in the interview component of the study by Chief Andrés González and scheduled to participate by Commander William Likes. Those selected included 12 police officers (basic patrol officer), the dispatch supervisor, 2 commanders, and the Deputy Chief. Given the study’s focus on the interaction between police and citizens, ranks/assignments including but not limited to sergeants, lieutenants, detectives, and individuals on special assignments were not included as their job duties involve either limited or specialized contact with citizens.
Due to regulations within CMHAPD demographic information, including age and race, were not collected for police personnel.

Sample sizes and available demographic characteristics for each study component are reported in the Findings section (Chapter 5).

**Quantitative Analysis Plan**

**Data Collection.** Survey data were collected by the Partnership for a Safer Cleveland between July and September 2013 for the purpose of evaluating the PAR program. Using a database provided by CMHAPD, adults receiving referrals between January 2010 and March 2013 were mailed a four page survey booklet. The survey included questions pertaining to program satisfaction, limited demographic information, and the police legitimacy, neighborhood attachment, and exposure to violence measures described below. A full version of the PAR survey with annotated measures/sub-scales is included in the Appendices.

The quantitative analyses below represent data from citizen participants only. Data used for this study were de-identified by the Partnership for a Safer Cleveland before analysis. The quantitative component of this study was reviewed by the Case Western Reserve University Institutional Review Board and determined to be exempt.

**Measures.** The study focused on three measures corresponding to the key constructs of neighborhood attachment, exposure to violence, and police legitimacy. The measures were chosen based on a review of the literature; however special attention was paid to selecting measures appropriate for a mailed, self-report survey to urban, low-income, at-risk residents. Concerns about survey length (with all measures combined), literacy levels, readability, simplicity, etc. were heavily weighted and limited to pool of
potential measures. As such, each measure is an abbreviated or simplified version of another more robust measure. For example, the selected measure for legitimacy (Hinds & Murphy, 2007) draws heavily upon surveys designed by Tyler and various colleagues (see example Tyler, 2011). Tyler’s legitimacy measure contains over 50 questions and is designed to be administered to larger population samples via telephone survey. Likewise, neighborhood attachment draws heavily from various works of Sampson (see: Sampson, 1988; Burchfield, 2007), and reflects aspects of neighborhood attachment as represented in the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN), an NIJ study evaluating the effects of family and neighborhood on adolescent development (PHDCN, nd). Finally, the exposure to violence scale described below is an abbreviated version of Singer and colleagues’ (1995) 18 question Recent Exposure to Violence. The Recent Exposure to Violence scale was first developed to measure associations of exposure to violence in adolescents with trauma symptoms, but has been administered in various formats to both adolescent and adult populations (see: Butcher, Kretschmar, Flannery, Singer, 2012; Chapin, 1999; Chapin, 2004; Flannery, Singer, Wester, 2001).

**Dependent Variable.** This study adopted the police legitimacy measure developed and tested by Hinds and Murphy (2007). The measure included five sub-scales probing satisfaction (M=3.32, SD=0.87) and legitimacy (Cronbach’s alpha=0.75, M=3.54, SD=0.65) through the constructs of procedural (Cronbach’s alpha=0.70, M=3.31, SD=0.59) and distributive justice (Cronbach’s alpha=0.55, M=3.42, SD=0.69, N.B. this is a two item scale and as such the alpha represents a Pearson’s correlation between the items), and police performance (Cronbach’s alpha=0.84, M=3.0, SD=0.65)(pp. 32-33). While the scores produced on each sub-scale are instructive, the
measure has not progressed to identifying cut-points which would indicate acceptable or normed levels of legitimacy.

Each sub-scale was scored on a five-point Likert-type scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) with the exception of the performance sub-scale which uses very poor (1) to very good (5) to agree with the question format.

In the measure, legitimacy (dependent variable regression analysis) was comprised of 4 questions (e.g. confidence and respect). Items were averaged to create a single score for legitimacy. Higher scores on the scale relate to greater perceived legitimacy (range 1-5).

Satisfaction was represented by a single marker item (“I am satisfied with the services provided by the CMHA police”). The item was coded so that higher scores represent higher satisfaction (range 1-5).

Police performance was represented by 3 questions (e.g. how good of a job are police doing to prevent crime?) that were averaged to create a single performance score (range 1-5).

Procedural and distributive justice sub-scales were comprised of 3 and 2 questions respectively. They included items regarding how police treat citizens and make decisions (procedural) and allocation or distribution of police services (distributive). These sub-scales ranged from 1 to 5 and were coded so that higher scores equal greater levels of each construct. Three items (1 procedural and 2 distributive) were reverse coded so that response items would agree with the scale direction.

**Independent Variables.** The neighborhood attachment measure was used with permission from the Center for Court Innovations’ (CCI) and appeared in the 2011
survey administered as a prelude to implementation of Cleveland’s Defending Childhood initiative. The neighborhood attachment scale (Cronbach’s alpha=.83) consisted of five items measured on a four-point Likert-type scale. Four items were scaled strongly disagree (1) through strongly agree (4), and the fifth item was scaled from very unlikely (1) to very likely (4) to match the question form. Items included “I feel safe in my neighborhood” and “People around here are willing to help their neighbors.” Each item was coded so that higher scores indicate higher perceived attachment. Item scores were summed into a single neighborhood attachment score (range 5-20).

Based on Singer, Anglin, Song, and Lunghofer’s (1995) adolescent Recent Exposure to Violence (REVS) measure (Cronbach’s alphas from .68 [victimized at school or in neighborhood] to .87 [witnessed in neighborhood]), the study selected eight questions to measure the degree of violence experienced, whether experienced as a victim or witness, and frequency with which the violence occurred. Though originally designed to measure exposure to violence among multiple domains (i.e. home, school, and neighborhood), this study restricted the questions to omit place due to survey space limitations. While reliability for the full REVS is reported in the literature for studies focusing on both adolescent and adult populations, those Cronbach’s alpha scores are not noted here because of the modifications made to the REVS measure.

The selected items focused on threats of physical harm, lower-levels of violence (e.g. slapping, hitting), being beaten up, and attacked with a weapon (knife). Each level of violence had two questions, one representing victimization (e.g. “In the past year, how often were you threatened with physical harm?”) and witnessing (e.g. “In the past year, how often did you see someone else being threatened with physical harm?”). Each item
was scored on a four-point, Likert-type scale (0=Never, to 3=Often). Initial analysis created sum scores to represent various configurations of violence exposure (total score, dichotomous low exposure and high exposure, or including/omitting each degree level); however, little difference in the proposed relationships to other key constructs was found among these configurations. To simplify the analysis below, this study adopted summed scores across victimization and witnessing separately (both ranging from 4-16).

**Control Variables.** Due to the demographic composition of CMHA residents and PAR referral recipients, the study employed few control variables. Gender and race were not measured since the majority of residents (lease-holders) are African American women. CMHAPD referrals did not indicate race or gender; however a scan of respondents’ names reflected an overwhelming majority of female referrals. Two control variables were included in the analysis: length of residence in the housing authority (≤ 3 years, ≥ 4 years) and contact with CMHA police over the past two years (never, a few times, and frequently).

**Preliminary Analysis.** All statistical analyses were conducted in SPSS 22. Each variable was examined to ensure proper coding direction and assessed for both missing data and outliers. Cases missing data in the dependent variable (legitimacy sub-scale) were removed from the analysis (9 cases removed, n=203). Given the low percentage of cases lost to missing data (10%), and the limited size of the dataset, both in terms of total cases and variables, data imputation was not considered. In order to retain the highest number of cases for each analyses presented, the sample was not constrained to cases with no missing data, therefore the sample size for each statistical test is reported separately, for example, the final sample size for the regression analysis was 193.
Initially, univariate analyses of all variables were conducted on the item level including mean, median, mode, range, and standard deviation.

Scales were created for police legitimacy, performance, satisfaction (single item), neighborhood attachment, and both exposure to violence variables. Univariate analyses were conducted for each scale to determine mean and standard deviation, normal distribution, as well as skewness and kurtosis. Scale skewness and kurtosis were assessed using the ranges identified by Curran, West, and Finch (1996). Transformation of variables with excessive skewness or kurtosis ($\geq 2$ and 7 respectively) was considered prior to inclusion in the multivariate analyses.

Bivariate correlations were conducted among the scales and Pearson’s correlations exceeding 0.8 were considered multicollinear and reported (Allison, 1999). Correlations were considered weak when $\leq 0.29$, moderate between 0.3 and 0.5, and strong between $>0.5$ and 0.8. The statistical significance of the correlation was also examined. Variables with weak, non-significant, or multicollinear correlations were scrutinized to determine if they should be omitted from the regression equation.

**Exploratory factor analysis.** In order to determine the relationship between legitimacy, performance, and satisfaction on the police legitimacy measure an exploratory factor analysis, principal axis factoring extraction method, was conducted. Bivariate correlations and a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy were calculated. To proceed with the factor analysis, a majority of the bivariate Pearson’s correlations must correlate $\geq 0.30$ (Warner, 2008) and the KMO must be moderate or strong ($\geq 0.70$; Pett, Lackey & Sullivan, 2003). At first, factors with an eigenvalue $>1$ were extracted (Costello & Osborne, 2005) and then the procedure was
conducted again constricted to 5 factors to match the measure’s published design. Oblique rotation was selected due to the theoretically predicted correlation among the measure’s items. Communalities were evaluated to determine the proportion of shared variance for each item by factor, and structure matrices were considered to be fair $\geq 0.45$, good or very good between 0.55 and 0.70, and excellent $\geq 0.71$ (Pett, et al., 2003). Factors/sub-scales that did not perform as expected based on the extant literature were reported.

**Reliability.** Finally, a Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for each scale and for the scale with individual items removed. Scale alphas below 0.65 were considered to have low reliability (DeVellis, 2003).

**Power Analysis.** To support the proposed regression models a power analysis was conducted in SPSS to determine the probability of rejecting a false null hypothesis. Preliminary power analysis indicates that at least 76 cases were needed to analyze a main set of three variables (power set at .9 and alpha at .05 with an $R^2$ of .15).

**Research Question 1.**

1. Is there a relationship between citizens’ assessment of police legitimacy, their attachment to neighborhood, and exposure to violence?
   - Hypothesis 1.1: Higher levels of victimization will be associated with lower police legitimacy scores.
   - Hypothesis 1.2: Higher levels of witnessing violence will be associated with lower police legitimacy scores.
   - Hypothesis 1.3: Higher scores on neighborhood attachment will be associated with higher police legitimacy scores.
RQ1.A: Which has a stronger association with police legitimacy, victimization or witnessing?

Ordinary Least Squares regression was used to test hypotheses 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. A single entry method was selected since the relationships among these variables are exploratory and no literature was identified to guide the model specification.

\[
Legitimacy' = b_0 + b_1(\text{length of residency}) + b_2(\text{contact with CMHAPD 2 years}) + b_3(\text{exposure to violence victimization}) + b_4(\text{exposure to violence witness}) + b_5(\text{neighborhood attachment}) + e
\]

Prior to the interpretation of the regression analysis a scatter plot was created to test for linearity, as well as a correlation of the residuals to test for independence of errors.

Qualitative Analysis Plan

Development of Interview Protocols. After a review of the police legitimacy literature, a series of mirrored questions were created to explore experiences of neighborhood (reflecting key concepts of neighborhood attachment); definition and conceptual understanding of police legitimacy; norms and role of police, as well as norms and roles of citizens (tapping generative aspects of legitimacy); and action steps to improve police-citizen interactions in CMHA. Full interview protocols are included in the Appendices.

Though not strictly an ethnographic assessment, the interview protocols were designed to focus on personal and cultural meanings ascribed to the various elements of police legitimacy and neighborhood attachment. In this study, culture refers to the cumulative knowledge, experiences, and beliefs shared among groups based on police/citizen roles. Role may also include, but is not limited to, racial or ethnic, socio-
economic, and/or gender-role interpretations; while the interviewees were informed of their selection based on police/citizen role, no specific direction about other cultural lenses was given. Interviewees could choose to discuss their experiences through these lenses, but protocol questions returned to police/citizen roles. The choice to focus on the police/citizen role was made based on well established findings that demonstrate perceptions of legitimacy are stable over general populations even when controlling for race and socio-economic stats. Throughout the protocol development and data analysis two primary groups are referenced (citizens and police); however, senior police personnel were disaggregated to explore and differentiate the perspective of leadership personnel when findings are present.

The interview protocols contained a series of semi-structured, open ended questions followed by suggested prompts and follow-ups. This method allowed the interviewer latitude to explore relevant meanings underlying the interactions between police and citizens (Creswell, 2008; Fleisher & Krienert, 2009). For example, when exploring the norms and roles of citizenship, the study asked “Do you think people have responsibilities in their own neighborhood?” This question could have been answered with a simple yes or no; however, the protocol then followed-up by focusing on “what those responsibilities are,” “why are they important,” “are they practiced in the neighborhood,” etc. In the actual interview settings, freedom was allowed to pursue questions and explorations unique to the interviewee.

To facilitate a thematic comparison among the groups, each question series was included in the protocol for each group. Minor changes were made to the question forms
to reflect the identity of each group. The questions for the senior police personnel were augmented to specifically probe issues of leadership and leadership development.

The interview protocols were refined with the assistance of Dr. Mark Fleisher to better elicit cultural interpretations and improve interviewee comprehension through careful language choices. Drafts of the protocols were tested over several meetings with Sergeant Jacqueline Burgos (CMHAPD). Additionally, the interview protocols were vetted by Dr. Mark Singer and Chief Andrés González to ensure relevant content and suitability to the police department regulations and requirements. Because a full pilot phase was not possible given limited sample size and availability of resources, the protocols were updated after the first two interviews in each target group.

The interview procedures were approved by the Case Western Reserve University Institutional Review Board (IRB-2014-921).

**Data Collection.** Interviews were conducted between October 2014 and December 2014. Interviews took between 28 and 75 minutes. All interviewees were consented, which included the opportunity to decline participation or refuse to answer any question. Citizens were compensated $20-$30 for their participation. After conducting 8 citizen interviews thematic convergence had been reached, however it was determined that information from both males and younger citizens would strengthen the sample. Follow-up contact with increased incentive amounts was made to volunteers identified from the 2013 PAR study with male first names (researcher’s judgment) and to individuals meeting the selection criteria (PAR referral recipients) suggested by previous interviewees. Per Chief González, no compensation was offered to CMHAPD personnel.
Interviews were conducted in private, quiet locations when possible. Citizens were given the opportunity to choose a convenient location and many requested to be interviewed in their homes. When home interviews occurred, attempts were made to keep the interviews private; however several of the home environments were chaotic with children, grandchildren, and others often in the home or in the room during the interview. Two interviews, totaling 5 interviewees, occurred in groups, limiting the confidentiality of responses among participants. In these instances, each participant was asked if he/she was comfortable with the others joining. Police officers and senior police personnel were interviewed at CMHAPD’s headquarters (5715 Woodland Avenue, Cleveland OH 44104). Officers were interviewed in the SWAT room and while efforts were made to protect confidentiality and limit distractions, several interruptions occurred as personnel accessed the room for equipment, files, or to enter the sergeant’s office. Additionally, officers were interviewed while on-shift, thus wearing duty-gear and monitoring broadcast calls, as well as managing cell phone contacts (community officers are issued CMHAPD cell phones and give that contact information to residents and property managers, while other officers use their personal phones to communicate with each other off-radio). Senior police personnel were interviewed in their offices. On occasion, interviews were paused in order for the individual to respond to immediate police business. CMHAPD interviews generally lasted longer than citizens’ and were more detailed in their description of police/citizen interactions. To ensure themes accurately reflected shared understandings among the population, a follow-up interview was conducted with a selected police officer interviewee. That interview lasted 210 minutes.
Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim, with the audio recording destroyed once the transcription was verified. All qualitative analyses were conducted in NVIVO10. Identifying information – e.g. names mentioned, interviewee name, specific locations – were removed during the transcription process (Creswell, 2008). Additionally, all gender pronouns have been standardized in the reporting phase for police officer and senior personnel – male – in order to protect the confidentiality of minority interviewees. All interview materials, including transcripts and consent forms, have been maintained in secure storage, physical and/or electronic, to maintain confidentiality and protect personal information. The Partnership for a Safer Cleveland and CMHAPD will have access to reported results, but not individual transcripts.

The qualitative analyses below represent data from citizen participants, police officers, and senior police personnel.

**Eligibility.** Citizens opted-in to the study and were eligible to participate if they are over 18 years old and able to converse in English.

Individuals opting-in were contacted to schedule an interview. During the scheduling call, the researcher explained the purpose of the study, provided an opportunity to opt-out, and (if interested) scheduled the interview.

Chief Andrés González selected police personnel to participate. Scheduling of the interviews was coordinated by Commander William Likes to ensure patrol coverage during the interview process. Officers and senior police personnel were given the opportunity to opt-out at the start of the interview with the assurance that individual participation would NOT be reported back to CMHAPD.
Research Questions 2-5.

2. Are the core constructs of police legitimacy understood in both stakeholder groups?

3. How does each group understand its role and function? What does each group define as the role of the other stakeholder? What influences this understanding?

4. Among stakeholder groups, what are the commonly understood community issues? Is there agreement on intensity and importance? What shapes these understandings?

5. What are general suggestions for improved police/community interactions? Do these suggestions align across groups?

Using a phenomenological reduction technique (Moustakas, 1994), each interviewee described his/her interpretation of his/her experiences (in his/her neighborhood and with police/citizens). Data were reduced to invariant constituent phrases (those necessary to understand the construct) and themes – a variation of the van Kaam approach (as cited in Moustakas, 1994) – first by stakeholder group and then for all interviewees (see also: Creswell, 2008 content analysis). Invariant constitute phrases and themes by research question and stakeholder groups were compared to determine the degree of commonality and to identify different understandings among groups. Textual descriptions were constructed for each construct by stakeholder group. Finally, common themes were combined across all groups in a textual description to identify overarching constructs.
Phrases and quotes culled from the interviews were not attributed to any individual and are identified only by stakeholder group. Themes and textual descriptions are aggregated information.
Chapter 5

Findings

This chapter details the results of the quantitative and qualitative assessments undertaken as part of the study, including: sample characteristics; preliminary data analyses; and findings by research question. Encompassing themes, drawn from both aspects of the study, are also explored at the beginning of the Qualitative Analyses section as they inform the relationships between police and citizens in an urban environment.

It must be noted that while citizens were able to differentiate between police forces (e.g. CPD vs. CMHAPD) and were shown CMHAPD prompts the experiences communicated are not solely (and in some cases not even partially) connected to events that involved CMHAPD. Clearer in the interview process, the need to read the data broadly applied equally to the survey information as well. In essence, the first finding was that when constructing a narrative about legitimacy any experience with police – personal or socially transmitted, even fiction and myth – no matter how long ago it was formed has the potential to affect one’s assessment of all police.

Quantitative Analyses

Sample Characteristics. The sample consisted of 203 survey responses (25% response rate, see Methods, Populations). Ages ranged from 20 to 78 (M=35), with a modal age of 23 and 29 (n=193). Half of respondents (51%) had graduated from high school or completed a GED program, 28% has less than a high school education, while 14% had some college and 5% graduated from college (n=194). Twenty-two percent of the sample indicated that they currently had no children under the age of 18 staying with
them (n=196); however, this item was not necessarily indicative of the number of parents with children under 18 years old in the sample. Half (47.4%) have resided in the housing authority for 3 years or less (n=203; control variable). The majority of respondents (62%) indicated contacting the police “a few times” in the past two-years, while 32% had “never” called and 7% made “frequent” calls for service (n=201; control variable). The high percent of respondents who endorsed “never” in this variable was not necessarily incongruous with the study’s target population (individuals who have had recent contact with CMHAPD and have received a PAR referral), but may have represented individuals whose referral event was more than two years prior or where contact with the police was not initiated by the respondent. Gender and ethnicity were not captured.

**Preliminary Data Analyses.** Frequencies and distribution data for all items were examined prior to scale construction. Table 1 displays the descriptive data for all scales used in the study. While, skewness and kurtosis were within the acceptable range for all scales, the victimization (REVs) score was elevated (skew=1.51). Log transformation was considered; however, to preserve the interpretability of the analyses no transformation was performed.

Cronbach’s alphas were calculated to test reliability for each scale except satisfaction (marker item). All alphas met minimum acceptability requirements. Alphas were also calculated for scale if item deleted. Only one item – “people should always follow the directions of CMHA officers even if they go against what they think is right” on legitimacy – was found to produce higher alpha results if deleted (0.90 from 0.88).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Legitimacy</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Attachment</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>5-20</td>
<td>5-20</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Violence (REVS)</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>4-16</td>
<td>4-16</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness Violence (REVS)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4-16</td>
<td>4-16</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bivariate Pearson’s correlations for legitimacy, performance and satisfaction scales were all strongly correlated and approaching multicollinearity (0.75 to 0.78, n=202). Pearson’s correlations for the independent, dependent, and control variables are presented in Table 2. Legitimacy and neighborhood attachment were moderately correlated. Legitimacy and victimization were not significantly correlated and were excluded from the final regression model. Legitimacy and witnessing were significantly correlated but at a weak level; however the correlation was statistically significant justifying its inclusion in the regression model. The control variables, length of residency and contact with CMHAPD, were also not significantly correlated. Therefore, the regression analysis retained neighborhood attachment and witnessing violence only.

Reexamining the Pearson’s correlations for legitimacy, neighborhood attachment, and witnessing violence only, the correlation values did not change, however 7 cases were recouped (n=193).
Table 2. Bivariate correlations – independent, dependent, and control variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Legit</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Witn</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Attachment</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Violence</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness Violence</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
<td>-0.42**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residency</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with CMHAPD</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Listwise n=186

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Exploratory Factor Analysis. Returning to the complete legitimacy measure, a principal axis factoring (PAF) with oblique rotation was conducted including all 13 items, spanning procedural and distributive justice, legitimacy, performance, and satisfaction sub-scales (n=200). Sixty percent of the bivariate Pearson’s correlations exceeded moderate strength (≥0.3), with 5 correlated above 0.80 (“confidence” and “job well done” on legitimacy; “satisfaction” and “job well done” crossing legitimacy and satisfaction; and all the items on the performance sub-scale). Pearson’s correlations for the measure’s items are displayed in Table 3. The KMO was 0.92, exceeding minimum acceptability.

Analysis of eigenvalues, variance, scree-plots, and residuals determined which factors were retained. Unconstrained (eigenvalue=1) 2 factors were retained (factor loadings shown Table 4). Communalities after extraction ranged from 0.08 (“do right”) to 0.82 (“job well done”). After rotation, the first factor accounted for 51% of the variance with the second factor accounting for just an addition 8%. The factors could be labeled procedural and distributive justice aligning with the two root constructs in most
legitimacy models (procedural justice and distributive justice leading to legitimacy); however, it should be noted that 1 item from the procedural justice sub-scale (“do right”) more strongly loaded on the second factor, though not reaching moderate levels. Further, all items from performance, satisfaction, and legitimacy loaded on the procedural justice factor, which indicated that differentiation between procedural justice and performance, and legitimacy and satisfaction are lacking, as identified in the attenuated model (Hinds & Murphy, 2013; procedural and distributive justice as well as performance leading to legitimacy, which then leads to satisfaction). Troubling, the distributive justice factor contains all reverse coded items from the scale (three items: “do right” from the procedural sub-scale and both items from the distributive sub-scale). This may indicate that the wording and construction of the scale, rather than the constructs themselves impacted the factor loading values. The factor correlation matrix indicates that the factors are correlated at -0.45, or a moderate correlation.

Constraining the PAF to 5 factors, to match the model proposed in the literature (Hinds & Murphy, 2007), resulted in the factor loading displayed in Table 4 as well. Communalities after extraction ranged from 0.11 (“do right”) to 0.90 (“job well done” and “work with residents”). After rotation, the first factor accounted for 52% of the variance, the second factor 9%, the third factor 5%, the fourth factor 3%, and the fifth factor an additional 2%, totaling approximately 70% of the total variance.

Forced into five factors, the first three could roughly be identified as legitimacy, distributive justice, and performance, while the last may align with procedural justice (the fourth factor was un-named as it does not correspond to a theoretical construct). Several
**Table 3.** Item correlations Police Legitimacy measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>DR</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>WYK</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>JWD</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>WwR</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect Rights</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust People</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Right</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive Car</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who You Know</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow Cops</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Well Done</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect Police</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important Problems</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Residents</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent crime</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=200

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Note: Shaded cells show sub-scales.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>h&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Factor Loading&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>h&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect Rights (Proc)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust People (Proc)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Right (Proc)</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive Car (Dis)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who You Know (Dis)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence (Leg)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow Cops (Leg)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Well Done (Leg)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect Police (Leg)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important Problems (Per)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Residents (Per)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent crime (Per)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalues             | 6.92 | 1.62 | 6.92 | 1.62 | 0.97 | 0.81 | 0.65 |

n=200

*Note:* Factor Loading<sup>a</sup> were unconstrained and Factor Loading<sup>b</sup> was constrained to five factors.

Bold values represent the highest loading for each analysis, while shaded cells show sub-scale items grouped to one factor.
items on the first, third and fifth factors cross-loaded above 0.4. Satisfaction actually loaded most strongly on the first and third factors (legitimacy and performance). Again, one item from procedural justice (“do right”) loaded on the second factor (distributive justice), but only weakly. The first, third and fifth factors correlate between moderate and strong levels (Table 5).

Regardless of the number of factors extracted, the item “do right” (or fully “CMHA police treat people as if they can only do the right thing when forced to”) under-performs on the scale. Conversely, items from the legitimacy sub-scale, “confidence” and “job well done,” seem to be more powerful (fully “I have confidence in the CMHA police” and “CMHA police do their job well”).

| Table 5. Factor Correlation Matrix, PAF Oblique, Constrained to 5 Factors |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Variable                  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  |
| Factor 1                  | –  |    |    |    |    |
| Factor 2                  | -0.01 | – |    |    |    |
| Factor 3                  | -0.79 | 0.21 | – |    |    |
| Factor 4                  | 0.29 | -0.22 | -0.18 | – |    |
| Factor 5                  | 0.65 | 0.10 | -0.48 | 0.05 | – |

n=200

**Research Question 1.** Is there a relationship between citizens’ assessment of police legitimacy, their attachment to neighborhood and exposure to violence?

- Hypothesis 1.1: Higher levels of victimization will be associated with lower police legitimacy scores.
- Hypothesis 1.2: Higher levels of witnessing violence will be associated with lower police legitimacy scores.
Hypothesis 1.3: Higher scores on neighborhood attachment will be associated with higher police legitimacy scores.

**RQ1.A:** Which has a stronger association with police legitimacy, victimization or witnessing?

As demonstrated in the bivariate correlations presented earlier, neither aspect of exposure to violence (victimization or witnessing) was moderately associated with police legitimacy in the target population and with the scales selected, though the correlation between witnessing and legitimacy was statistically significant. Hypotheses 1.1 was rejected in favor of the null hypotheses – higher levels of victimization were not associated with lower legitimacy scores. Addressing sub-question 1.A, the weak correlation may indicate a stronger association between witnessing and legitimacy when compared to victimization and legitimacy. However, survey conceptualization and design concerns, as well as scale issues identified in the PAF analyses of the police legitimacy measure indicate that findings should be interpreted cautiously (see also Discussion section).

After removing variables with non-significant and weak bivariate correlations, the revised regression equation was:

\[ Legitimacy' = b_0 + b_1(neighborhood\ attachment) + b_2(witnessing\ violence) + e \]

The simple regression (neighborhood attachment and witnessing violence on police legitimacy) included 193 cases (listwise deletion).

Data screening, through residuals scatter plots and scale univariate analyses, confirmed regression assumptions were met. Regression results indicated that
neighborhood attachment significantly predicts police legitimacy while witnessing violence does not (single block entry), $R^2 = 0.17$, $F(2, 190) = 18.89$, $p < 0.000$. A summary of the regression model is presented in Table 6. Hypotheses 1.2 was rejected in favor of the null hypotheses – higher levels of witnessing were very weakly associated with lower legitimacy scores, but witnessing did not predict neighborhood attachment. The regression indicated a failure to reject hypotheses 1.3 – as neighborhood attachment scores increase one unit, police legitimacy scores increase 0.08 of a unit.

Table 6. Regression Summary: Neighborhood Attachment on Police Legitimacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Attachment</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessing Violence</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Analyses

Sample Characteristics. The sample consisted of 12 citizens, 11 CMHAPD officers, and 4 senior police personnel ($n=27$) over scheduled 24 interviews (two group interviews with 5 citizens). Interviews averaged 47 minutes – 37.5 minutes for citizens, 46.5 minutes for police officers, and 57 minutes for senior police personnel (total interview time 18:48:38).

Of the 12 citizens interviewed, nine were women and three were men. Citizen ages ranged from 23 to 51, with a mean age of 37.8 ($n=10$). Three interviewees identified as not having completed high school (one leaving in the 10th grade and two during their middle school years), four had completed high school or obtained a GED, and three had some college. Family configurations varied with only two interviewees indicating that they lived with a spouse. Of the women, three identified adult children
living with them. All 12 interviewees indicated that they were parents or currently parenting, and in many of the home interviews children, grandchildren, and other youngsters identified as part of the family were identified (i.e. son’s girlfriend’s boy). Time spent living in the housing authority ranged from 2 to 51 years, but a full assessment of housing history was not undertaken.

CMHAPD officers averaged 6.75 years on the force (range 2.5 to 23 years), while senior personnel averaged nearly 19. Two of the 15 CMHAPD personnel interviewed were women. Education attainment ranged from high school (5), some college or associates degrees (6), through college degrees (3). All but one interviewee were sworn law enforcement personnel. Two interviewees had grown up in the housing authority, but at least one other acknowledged that close relatives had lived, for at least a portion of time, in CMHA properties. Three indicated that they currently lived in the City of Cleveland. Demographic information was optional and complete descriptive were not provided in all interviews.

**Encompassing Themes.** Before addressing the findings by research question, several meta-themes emerged during the interviews (and survey responses), which provided context helpful to understanding the experiences of and interactions among citizens, CMHA police officers, and senior police personnel.

The themes of neighborhood and safety were consistently noted among all interviewees and framed later findings; however, equally as important was the unresolved nature of the narratives. Within a single interview a resident, for example, may have indicated that the majority of her neighbors were good citizens (a term specifically probed), but also describe being attacked in her apartment, within earshot of neighbors,
without receiving assistance. This tendency to oscillate between positive and negative poles was difficult to capture in a single quote because the different perspectives were alighted in response to questions throughout the interview. When asked about the discrepancies, most interviewees resolved the differences by siding with the more negative or cautious narrative. This will be addressed further in the Discussion chapter, but within this chapter should be noted as an indication of the complexity of experiences described and the fluidity of the environment and relationships within.

*Neighborhood.* CMHA estates form fragile neighborhoods where the connections among residents are strengthened and strained by socio-economic conditions, population concentration, issues of belonging, and perceived dangers.

*Connections.* For citizens, neighborhood manifested in stronger attachments among those in closer proximity (floor, row, or building); however, almost uniformly, citizens expressed a need for balance, being neighborly without being either drawn into conflict/problems or being taken advantage of. It was not uncommon for an interviewee to say “I just don’t do neighbors” or “I pretty much keep to myself” despite attempts by property managers and CMHA to create communal spaces and programs. One citizen described her hesitancy as due to “everybody’s personality is not the same. Everyone’s interest in moral principles and values are not the same. So, it’s too close an environment to get involved with people who may… no, it’s just, it can be a bother.” Another described her struggles as an “outsider”:

I’m the outcast, as far as the projects… this is my first time ever living in the projects, you know. It’s, so you have community, generations and generations. So, when I first got here, you know, they… still let me know, you know, I am just a guest, you know… I’ve been targeted for a lot of stuff, like when I first moved here… my guy friend came, and he went out to his car, he came back, somebody had jumped him. So they knew he was
my friend, you know… that’s when he told me, you don’t deal with nobody around here.

However, immediately preceding she said, “… in the summer, you know, the kids be out. And, we are, actually this is what you call a community.” Then shortly after the passage above, she described in detail her connection to her upstairs neighbor and that woman’s children. Some of the wariness stemmed from the concentration of people in the estates, so that knowing individuals on one’s floor or building was manageable, but connecting with the entire estate/property was unreasonable.

In general, citizens could identify one or more neighbors with whom they shared emotional and resource supports and seemed genuinely interested in protecting young children within their neighborhood. Most remembered instances where they or another adult provided or contributed to providing treats, trinkets, or holiday celebrations, often in an “Auntie” role:

I don’t get much in food stamps, but I buy $50 worth of hot dogs and stuff like that for the kids, because I share… I get a little crew… they call me the warden, not the warden, um… kid security because I… love the kids… and there’s another girl that she got a group of girls and she coach them (cheerleading)... so, we try to keep the kids out the way and do things for them. *Citizen*

This desire to protect the young was balanced with cautious notation that some adults were ill-equipped or neglectful in caring for and disciplining their children. This protective aspect was age-limited, though: teens were generally perceived to be beyond the ability of the adults to protect and guide, and were viewed as potential problems, especially when congregated in the evening and nighttime hours, a view shared by police.
Both groups identified similar characteristics of a good citizen – a communal interest in keeping the physical space neat and tidy, attending to one’s business (or similarly checking one’s drama), being cordial to neighbors, etc. Police descriptions tended to include an interest in safety, reporting problems, and being “productive” members of society. When asked to “ball park” interviewees indicated that more than half, and sometimes as high as 95%, of the residents in CMHA properties were good citizens. Though the percent is not necessarily informative, the relative scale of the estimations, a preponderance of individuals acting as good citizens, is important.

_Perception._ Both citizens and police understand the housing authority environment to be stigmatized by broader populations. One citizen perfectly summarized the sentiments expressed across both groups:

…because the projects itself is like… just, it’s just like saying your name in a sentence with a roach, it’s bad, it’s a stigma… bad to live in the projects. And people usually look down… on you when you live in the projects and I’ve seen people ride through… they can, you know, drive by in a Lexus and take their McDonald’s lunch bag and just throw it cause it’s the projects.

Police expanded the lamentation to include individuals coming or returning to housing authority properties to commit crime and/or cause trouble.

Folded into the burn of the place-based stigma, citizens felt further attacked by general socio-economic biases around employment, education, and intellect (e.g. “people see us as ignorant”). Several mentioned that their neighborhoods were more similar to “middle class” areas because “just about the whole community [works].” Work and education were frequently brought into the conversation, though not solicited in the interview, as many discussed dream careers (e.g. lawyer, nutritionist, human resource
professions) and a desire to further their education (three commenting on wanting to get “their” Ph.D.). While the comparison to middle class neighborhoods may not be founded, the emphasis on a working class identity was deeply tied to themes around respect presented later.

Officers were tuned-in to the struggles of residents, noting the rhythms of the day and season—festivals and celebrations, when people wake up, where they were likely to be found interacting, troubles in the late afternoons with teens, problems with young adults later in the evening. They viewed the properties as neighborhoods struggling to develop or maintain cohesion, acknowledged the value of inter-personal connections among residents and often indicated a desire to see neighbors work together more. When brought back to the physical environment, officers focused somewhat naturally on norms established within the individual estates and the constantly shifting, unstable environment.

It’s its own community. Its own rules… some properties won't tolerate things that other properties do… some older people who are just sick and tired of the yellin’ and screaming and now all of the sudden their biggest concern is the gambling and people drinking outside. They won't tolerate it. They see somebody and they will call. And then you go to some other place and maybe it's younger... it's 100% tolerated. And if you go out and write somebody a ticket, you may have 10 people come out of their houses and start asking you why you're doing that because it's accepted down there for what is it. Officer

…you'll see a group of children playing in a playground, having a great time, with not a care in the world, which you should have when you're 5 years old... umm... you'll see a couple of guys playing basketball or whatever, they're doing it right now and so, to that degree, to that extent, that could be construed as a community, functioning as a community in comparison… and then all the sudden you'll hear shots fired and somebody's down, so it, it does function as a community, it's just a different degree I suppose. Officer
Finally, both groups saw physical elements of building design, upkeep, and grounds-keeping as affecting neighborhood development – newer and especially smaller estates were viewed as more conducive to neighborhood, where older building or those with disinterested management were not.

**Safety.** Citizens and police expressed a complex and shifting perception of safety. Citizens were able to, unsolicited, identify incidents of extreme violence, including a family who experienced the homicide of one of their teens and later (after a move) whose house were shot at repeatedly. For example, one citizen who described her neighborhood as “in between” said this:

I’ve been there 18 years and I had one fight before… sometimes it’s ok, but actually… it’s a lot of people coming in from different neighborhoods into our neighborhood and doing things. Like, these young mothers, they moving these guys in with them and they come in thinking they can run over and take over and stuff like that. A lot goes on, but it be a lot and a lot of people from 30th comes down and they want to take over and stuff like that… and it’s like it’s a group of young guys that stick together they go around which I heard this, I’m not sure that they was raping girls and stuff in their neighborhood. I know one girl that they had stabbed her, cut her in the neck and tried to rape her, but she was a street walker, she was a prostitute and she used drugs…

The acknowledgements of violence emerged amid other layers of the narrative that identified most concerns as small and expressed the idea that CMHA neighborhoods were not materially different from others in the City of Cleveland. Another citizen felt personally safe, and ended by noting that any citizen should use caution:

It’s funny that you ask that because me and my friends always talk about, we talk about some of the safest neighborhoods be in the dangerous spots because nobody’s trying to get in anybody’s way, so it’s really, it’s… like an oxymoron, but for the most part, don’t get me wrong, I got robbed across the street from the house maybe two years ago, but other than that it’s not, it’s really not, I wouldn’t say that it’s too dangerous…
Other residents felt fully able to walk around in their neighborhood, or felt safe within their building, with special reference to minor nuisances only, such as panhandling or teen vandalism (teens pulling down the curfew signs, etc.). Though designed to be an open-ended question, the most frequent single word response was “maybe.”

Likewise, police also had difficulty pinpointing thoughts on safety. While generally affirming, officers, especially senior personnel, tended to rely on a statistical assessment of crime which is, in fact, lower than several Cleveland police districts even if other aspects of the narratives expressed concerns. Additionally, police personnel indicated that most issues with safety stem from non-residents (see also Research Question 4).

I think the majority of our residents are good citizens, it’s the non-residents that come on to the property that are the problems because nine times out of ten when I’m interacting with you, you’re not on the lease there, you don’t stay there, you can’t tell me who you’re down here visiting, your down here to do something dirty. Officer

When referring to their own safety, officers expressed a level of habituation:

Some days I have different feelings about it. Like, if I look at it me, I don’t really think it’s that dangerous, but if I... kinda step out of the box and look at it then I think it is dangerous. So, like, if I’m, I got to work every day and it doesn’t bother me, but then I’ll be talking with my friends and this and that and I’m like, man, maybe it is dangerous...

Officers noted concern from family members, but mostly dismissed that as neighborhood bias, but then noted that friends in law enforcement tended to be less experienced than they. Both citizens and officers, though, strongly identified CMHAPD as dependable (e.g. “they’ll be here like that [snaps]”) and expressed increased feelings of safety
because of the dedicated police force (citizens and police), as well as the loyalty among officers and the willingness to provide backup (police).

For citizens, both groups discussed the idea of retribution as a real phenomenon – hampering citizens’ ability to discipline teens, report crime, or be perceived as close to police. As one officer stated, “it’s a real fear because in their mind they believe that if they get too involved that it will be their house next, or them next as an individual, or their vehicle next. They have to live here.” The need for distance and fear of retribution contributed to the lack of safety, especially in terms of intervening in an active disturbance (e.g. calling when neighbors are fighting or with information about other events).

Nobody seemed to call the police, until I left out running out the door. And I seen a Samaritan and they let me use their phone… but I wish they would, getting involved, you know, just call the police. Don’t go over there and try to be a… a Hercules or something, but just call the police and let them know what’s going on… *Citizen*

Again, though, the narrative is more complex. Police and senior personnel cited the mechanisms in place to reduce this fear (e.g. anonymous tip lines, See Something Say Something campaign), which were generally deemed successful (supported by citizens). There was also an expressed frustration that a citizen’s willingness to report details sometimes depends on whether he or she personally has been victimized (claiming not to know about a neighbor’s burglary, but being more forthcoming when his/her apartment was robbed). As real of a fear as retaliation seemed to be, sometimes motives for lack of intervention were harder to pinpoint:

… out of jail and stuff. Him sitting outside with music on, drinking. I’m in, right here, this is where I live, and he came in that circle… and instead of them calling the police they videotaped this shit. You know, they
videotaped it… so it’s like they turned almost against me! Like I [unintelligible] up, this nigger here came up in here, you know, the neighbor upstairs… woke the baby that door, I mean, literally, he was all in my face! Everything!... I just kept closing my eyes, and it was terrible. And I’ve recently seen the video and, I mean, how long that shit carried on? Y’all can videotape it, why not call the police? Citizen

Some citizens expressed a desire for more individuals to report crime and gave examples of when they notified police, “one time… her boyfriend, I didn’t want them to learn that I called, but yeah, you know, I, if anything I hear it happen, I’m calling. I don’t live by that whatever bullshit code they’re taking about.”

Further, both citizens and police were wary of the potential violations of personal and community safety posed by the other group. Police recognized the potential, and cited personal experiences, for a seemingly well controlled, mundane call to turn into a violent confrontation (either due to the dynamics of the situation itself or because of community violence, e.g. shots fired in communal areas). Citizens noted instances where community safety was violated by police on foot-pursuit with weapons drawn in common areas. This tension was less expressed, but more present for officers, some of whom felt vulnerable – aware of recent high-profile cases and departmental disciplines, which communicated a particular social desire to view police in a negative light.

The phenomenon of “officer baiting” illustrates the tension between both groups. Though no literature was found to support, officer baiting is a situation where a citizen films an officer while attempting to provoke an over-zealous or violent confrontation to post the event on-line later. Some officers indicated that they accept the prevalence of cellular technology and were not fazed by it (one even welcoming body-camera initiatives for officers), while others expressed tension, an edge about potentially not
being seen as wanting or trying to help. The one citizen willing to discuss the issue felt that videotaping incidents was a means to protect her rights or the rights of the individual interacting with the police. Regardless of the motivation the idea of officer baiting, or “drop a cop” campaigns and similar urban phenomenon, ratchets tension for both citizens and police, and police intuitively -- or through training and leadership – recognized their responsibility to de-escalate and provide service:

my point is that almost every single one of us here that wears a uniform wants to help people. We respond to these calls right away. Our response time alone, as I'm sure you're aware of is, almost untouchable in comparison. We want to help these people. I don't know whether somehow in the hiring process they were able to determine, "ok, this person would be more particularly suited in this particular environment because of that"... I'm not sure that goes beyond my knowledge, what I do know is that almost all of us are out here, we want to help people on a daily basis, so we do our job... we do our job and then some. Officer

I don't think it's a safe environment, but it also, along with that, the balance is that we have the opportunity to effectively, positively impact these residents' lives on almost a daily basis, whereas if we didn't respond a lot of time nobody would. Officer

Discussed more in the next chapter, this unsettled perception of safety seemingly has profound repercussions on the functioning of legitimacy and the creation of positive interventions.

*Citizens vs. Residents.* One final note, this dissertation has chosen to label the individuals living in CMHA properties as citizens, but during the interview process often referred to them as residents. While the two terms may seem synonymous, CMHAPD interacts with individuals as both citizens (living within their spatial jurisdiction) and tenant residents. The distinction between the terms is significant since CMHAPD acts as the state-sanctioned authority (state certified and nationally accredited police force) as
well as the administratively-sanctioned authority (assisting to enforce CMHA lease provisions). The term resident was often used by officers to denote lease holders or others identified on the lease. Both citizens and officers acknowledged the power the police have in the process of terminating leases.

**Research Question 2.** Are the core constructs of police legitimacy understood in both stakeholder groups?

Legitimacy is defined as a citizen’s perception of an obligation to defer to or voluntarily obey legally established authority without threats of sanction or force. The construct is typically represented as the product of procedural and distributive justice – fairness and respect communicated by officers and equal treatment or service for the group or focal area.

Surface narratives about legitimacy overlap, but despite using similar terminology, there are sharp differences in the fundamental understanding of legitimacy constructs. Both citizens and officers focused more on the procedural aspects of legitimacy, which is in line with the literature.

Trust emerged as a hesitant construct among citizens. While most indicated that, if needed, they would contact the police (“hell, yeah”) and, more flatly, that they trusted police (“of course I do”). As one citizen explained, “I trust them. I trust CMHA… you know if I call or have a problem they come cause I done had issues with people and they came, you know what I’m sayin’. I trust them pretty well.”

There was a counter-point of “only when absolutely necessary” braided into the theme, though this seemed related to individuals who had bad past experiences with any police officer, or those who were younger or male.
Interviewer: … would you call the police?

Citizen A/Citizen B together: It’s more trouble than it’s worth?

Citizen C: I don’t call, I won’t call. Pretty much under no circumstances.

Citizen A: Yeah, it’s got to be a very violent situation

Citizen B: Very violent.

Citizen A: Very violent situation… [overlapping voices] I mean even if somebody was outside breaking into my car, I would not call the police. What good would it do? It would be a waste of time, they’ll be looking at me, questioning me, being aggressive with me, when I’m the victim, it’s just no point… Group Interview

Cause nobody’s perfect. I mean, if there’s law breaking, if somebody breaks a law I believe they should go to jail, but I don’t think people, a lot of times I think cops just push it, cops just push the issue, exaggerate things and just blow it out of proportion… Citizen

Officer seemed to understand the need for trust and relationship building, both in building connection with citizens –

I like to make people feel comfortable when I leave. Like, my, I've got a couple of calls on me for ahmm, I went there one time to check a baby… it was really a touchy situation…. So I kinda go there and I try to be more, you know, polite to them and not like "Hey, I'm the police... Let me see your baby or you're going to jail." You know, I try to make them feel comfortable. "I've got to do this..." you know, so when I leave they're almost, they're happy with me and their talking, you know… And that's more of a win than getting a huge drug bust, but you need both. Officer

Just everything from your appearance, to where you also have to do your part to make yourself easy to approach in case that somebody does want to talk to you about "Hey, something not right with this guy that keeps walking up and down the street. He keeps looking in the cars." Like you, you gotta make it easy for them to approach you. Officer

Yeah, I do. Cause you don't want individuals be scared to call, so if you, you know, if you keep everybody who you come in contact with you're just rude and you're having bad days and this, that, the other, they're going to be like "I'll handle this myself. I'm not going to call the police." And then things get handled even worse... or end up even worse. Officer
and in building the department, citing truthfulness and honesty more frequently than residents when asked to identify the characteristics of a good officer.

Both groups frequently cited the importance of respect. However, respect when defined by the police tended to be a viewed as a tactic rooted in courtesy while residents kept circling a deeper understanding of both their circumstance and cultural history.

“Sir.. yes, sir... no, sir...” as opposed to “hey, NAME” things of that nature. Telling them why I'm doing what I'm doing as opposed to just doing it, whether it's in those parameters or not, it's a tactic, it's not something that you're necessarily supposed to do, but it helps diffuse the situation. Officer

… talk to me like I'm a woman. You know, with respect! You know, don’t, I won’t get offended, you know, uh, with the derogatory stuff, or just because I’m black, I live in the projects, you, it don’t matter where you live, you know, this place don’t define who you are. Citizen

Respect from most officers, though did seem to address the root of the construct, referring to “golden rule” practices, which were also identified by citizens; however, officers are keenly tuned into dynamics of control in every situation, which changes tone and command, potentially undermining the respect they intend to create.

It's all about respect with these people because they're not going to trust you once you blow it. And that's what I've seemed to notice with these individuals, once you've "Oh, you're that mean officer, I don't want to talk to you. Let me talk to your partner." You know, like I've gotten into it with a couple of people, but I had to do it for the safety of one of the kids… Officer

I think a lot of times we'll come off as being disrespectful when we have to take control of a situation. So if you're yelling and I'm trying to gather information, it's time for you to stop yelling so I'm going to be louder than you are. Whether or not that comes across as being disrespectful, I don't know, but it's our way of handling the situation. And then, you know, some, some days you're off. We have off days just like everybody else. So if you are feeling short fused that day, or you're just irritated, it's best to evaluate yourself and kind of step back and be like, "well, maybe I need to
cool it down a little bit and have a little more patience." But, most of the time it's because we're trying to take control of the situation, they don't particularly care for that. They want to vent right away. *Officer*

Respect, for police, represented an economic exchange (if I show you respect today, if I need you to cooperate tomorrow you’re indebted to comply), but this idea of exchanging respect for cooperation was not reciprocated by citizens. For example, a typical rationale for fostering respectful relationships, “…cause I think if they're comfortable with you, they're going to tell you what's going on at their estate or maybe some of the issues that they wouldn't tell another officer.”

Issues of officer discretion and accumulated charges were addressed by several citizens and just a handful of officers related to trust and respect.

So, therefore, you have people who use their power, their power role with me because you're authority, but I'm still a human being and some people just don't go for disrespect, they don't go for arrogance and somebody being rude to them and ignorant and that's when people go through situations that they say, which is the word that I'm looking for, that their, when they give you UNRULY, when they give you disorderly conduct. It's disorderly because you being disrespectful to me, so I have a disorderly conduct ticket that I have to go and I have to pay court fees and then how I feel about the justice system, I feel like the justice system isn't set up for people, it's not for the people, it's for their pocket. *Citizen*

… you know, we're in low-income housing so, sometime you kind of give them a break. You put the notice on there or you knock on the door and say "Hey, what are you planning on doing with your car... your tags expired two months ago... you want to get that fixed or are you going to have it towed, or what are you going to do?" *Officer*

In a different section of the interview, that same officer seemed to express what citizens desired most:

I think it makes you a better officer when you interact with the residents. Because you have an understanding, you understand what they're going through. Sometimes they tell you what they're going through, you know,
things like that. And then you get to learn about the kids also. So I think it's better that way to have interaction with the residents.

When asked about how he translates the need for understanding to other officers, he said:

You kind of explain to the other officers, “Hey, maybe you shouldn't charge them with that. Maybe you want to do something different” and you can explain what you're talking about. So it helps them understand, because you know the difference because you have a community in the inner-city, lot of things happen. Our job should be to help. It's ok to take people to jail... I've learned this over time… now… I'm talking to people more. I'm figuring out a way not to charge them with something because when you charge young people with stuff it kind of hurts them in the long-run, especially felonies. So by me understanding that... if there' some other way I can get around giving him that felony, maybe a misdemeanor or something like that, or talk to the supervisor, "Hey, maybe we want to do something a little different. Let's talk to his mom, or maybe he's got a probation officer or something like that we can talk to before we slap him with this hard felony" because it hurts him in the long run.

The interview question regarding the definition of legitimacy was confusing for most interviewees and was rephrased to “why do you obey the police?” In response, it was clear that legitimacy, in the formal sense of deference, was foreign to most citizens and officers, with only a handful indicating police as a right and moral authority. Almost universally respondents, both citizens and police, indicated that citizens’ primary motivation to obey police is due to possible sanctions, especially housing or lease violations. Interesting, though, police officers (not senior level personnel) were uncomfortable with the word “obey” (e.g. as sounding harsh or monarchial) preferring to view citizens complying with directives. While the net result of compliance seemed in-line with obeying, many officers seemed uncomfortable with the implied power of obey.

**Research Question 3.** How does each group understand its role and function? What does each group define as the role of the other stakeholder? What influences this understanding?
Police and citizens are separated by a chasm of urban mythology, functional misunderstandings (citizen to police), and a wariness driven by the unresolved safety narrative. Additionally, citizen and police recognize the inherent inequality of power in the relationship, emphasizing citizens as subject to police. This inequality may present barriers related to communication of community needs/desires and seemed to be complicated by a lack of ability to define a role for citizens or the ability to express a reciprocal function toward police.

Mentioned by both groups (though startling) citizens learn erroneous statutes, procedures, loop-holes, or perceptions that create fundamental misunderstandings. These misunderstanding create inherent and almost insurmountable differences/conflict in the police-citizen encounter. Some of these misunderstandings are purely myth:

… if you don’t have a driver’s license then they want to give you a ticket or take you to jail, when realistically the driver’s license is for conducting business on a public highway. That’s what a driver’s license is for. That’s why when you get a job you have to have a driver’s license if you’re gonna be driving. If you, if I’m driving for any personal reason, I’m free to use the public highways as I choose. As I see fit. Citizen

Because cops are sworn in and all of that, but I know that for a police officer to be actually a, a police officer legally, they have to be elected in. They actually need to be elected. I don’t know a police officer who’s ever been elected. You know what I mean? So, it, it, it’s really, I really feel like from the jump they don’t understand why they’re getting on the force, they don’t understand their job while they’re on the force, and by them not knowing their job, and us not knowing what to expect out of them, or us not knowing our rights, then it’s a catastrophe… Citizen

Other aspects may be due to genuine misunderstandings of police procedure, e.g. number of officers needed to respond to a traffic violation or when back-up may be called to the scene of a domestic dispute. Citizens then interpret the number of officers as a separate aggressive act. Additionally, two male citizens interviewed indicated that police
may be utilized by female citizens to control their behavior or punish (one female youth also lamented the bias toward women in domestic disputes and then balanced that with a story of blame wrongly placed on a female for defending herself). Police recognize that citizens genuinely do not understand police work, although they noted that at the point of crisis contact is not a productive time to engage in that discussion.

As I'm explaining all those things it's too much to expect somebody who's never been in the industry, whose only interaction is, you know, on the other side of it, for them to in a matter of minutes understand and accept. We can, we sometimes try to dumb it down, you know "Hey there's three of you guys and four of us, that's why." But sometimes that comes off as "well they just don't want to explain it to me, you don't want to tell me what's going on." And we just don't have time. Unfortunately, part of that constantly being ready to change, umm, when you talk, when you talk to people and you been talking to them for 5 minutes and then you figure out that they have a gun and the whole 5 minutes they've been figuring out a way to get rid of this gun and get out of here. You sort of, that happens to you once or twice, you get into the mindset that "I can't let that happen anymore" so it's business now. I mean, I'm here, we're gonna, I'm gonna figure out if you have anything on you. I'm going to figure out if there's anything that going to hurt me and I'm gonna figure out if you have any warrants that I need to worry about and then once that's done, then I'll relax and I'll talk, I'll answer any question you got, but we got to get thought those things first. Officer

Moving beyond misunderstanding and myth, citizens also seem to create a script for police encounters, assigning roles and behaviors to police that are incongruent with police roles and function. Violations of the script lead to disappointment and agitation. For example, referencing a call for service because of intimate partner violence, citizens want police to understand the history of the relationship, arbitrate the situation, calm tension, and separate the individuals only if necessary. Bad behavior toward the police is sometimes dismissed as “fussing” due to police not fulfilling their role as imagined (police tend to view this as disorderly conduct).
Citizens indicate a belief that “when you call the police they’re gonna arrest somebody” as an unjust inevitability and outside their desired resolution. There’s tension in this finding, though, since residents also claim they want police to do their job “according to the books.”

Officers, while expressing a need to respect the citizens they have contact with, indicated that at a certain moment in interaction they would need to refocus on their job in order to obtain the facts necessary for the incident to move forward in the criminal justice system (example in Research Question 2). The length of time an individual officer will allow to elapse seemed dependent on the citizen and his/her ability to present germane facts, personal temperament, and busyness of the shift. While the adage of “ask, tell, make” came up, most officers recounted experiences of extreme patience and extraordinary kindness to residents.

I want to hear about it. If it takes me 15 minutes to figure out the solution, I'll sit there for an hour to two hours obviously if they’ve got a priority call I'm going to have to leave, so certain things are more important. I'd rather see people succeed. Officer

We can't make the kid go to school, but we can give the kid a kind of pep talk... "Why you don't want to go to school? See that guy over there? Wineheads, he's been there for the last 10 years, do you want to end up like that?" You know you just try to give them encouragement to go to school. Officer

I kind of took that from [ANOTHER OFFICER] because he used to talk about his kids… But once you take on... I mean, I've been here for two years, I've had these programs about since January, so almost a year, I've seen them grow, I've seen them work together as groups. I've seen them succeed… I want the ones that appreciate it, understand, the parents are involved, they know what we're doing. You know, they're calling me telling me how their kids are doing, that's what I like. Officer
Neither citizens nor police were able to adequately express a role for citizens (“do citizens have a responsibility to police?”). Citizens often dismissed the question with a perfunctory “to be respectful” (regardless of whether their narratives indicated this to be congruous with their behavior) or “to be honest.” Police struggle with the idea of residents in a participatory role, limiting their input to “see something, say something” informants. It was interesting to note that neither group identified cooperation as a responsibility; in fact, some officers were clear that cooperation from someone not involved with a crime could legally only be construed as providing one’s name and date of birth.

Particular to the CMHA population, some officers struggle with the role of aid programs (welfare vs. self-sufficiency). Some officers genuinely questioned whether subsidies provided by the government, at their current levels, are the best way to help citizens, especially the young, vs. other improvements to educational systems and/or other social supports. Police, though, genuinely work for the benefit of residents. In fact, most officers mention a “statistic” (no one knew the actual number or if these records were kept) indicating that “most crime” on property is committed by non-residents; only two officers qualified the statement by indicating that while crime may be committed by individuals not on the lease, often individuals are connected (familial ties or intimate partnerships) with residents who invite and, at times, allow the criminal behavior.

Linking to the concept of citizen role, especially as it relates to communicating with police, few residents could identify an officer by name and none asked could identify the Chief of CMHAPD; however, all citizens could detail the process of
registering a complaint, with several indicating that they had previous complaints with either CMHAPD or the Cleveland Police Department.

**Research Question 4.** Among stakeholder groups, what are the commonly understood community issues? Is there agreement on intensity and importance? What shapes these understandings?

This question generated the strongest convergence of police and citizen beliefs. Anti-crime initiatives were discussed equally in both groups. Police self-directed (discretionary) patrols seem to align with citizens’ perceptions of needed enforcement (e.g. unsupervised teens, loud music, gambling, drug activity).

Reflecting a human tendency to focus on issues impacting self, citizens’ narratives were interspersed with a feeling that their problems were the most deserving of attention, but their crime was the least severe (police echoed this sentiment and cited it as a source of frustration). Personal transgressions were diminished in their interviews, while same/similar behaviors on the part of others were considered more significant.

Officers acknowledged a host of possible quality of life issues, along with safety concerns, and indications of criminal acts as the focus of self-directed patrols. These concerns ebbed based on time of day and interest of the individual officer. Drug transactions and weapons offenses were frequently identified, but this may have been due to the severity of these events and their potential danger. Mostly, though, officers acknowledged that self-directed patrol was secondary to broadcast calls, which were noted as the majority of one’s shift.

Citizens noted general positive responses to patrol, especially mounted (unclear which police force engages in mounted patrol), foot, and bike. Bicycle patrol and car
patrol were viewed as creating distance between citizens and police. Officers indicated a willingness to converse with residents while on patrol and cited this as one way in which their patrols responded to the issues and concerns of the community.

No, there's way more in to being an officer that I've figured out, honestly. You got to be able to talk to people, you got to be able to make decisions quickly, you got to be able to, you know, mediate. I mean that's... a lot of police work is just that. So, if you can't de-escalate situations and make executive decisions, then it's not the job for you. You can go out there and be a meat-head all you want, and arrest people, but those... what percentage of calls is that? You know. We get more calls, you know, helping people, so... Knowing information, you might have resources, you know, help them out, what good are you? Officer

Research Question 5. What are general suggestions for improved police/community interactions? Do these suggestions align across groups?

Identifying change-points was perhaps one of the most difficult section of the interview for both citizens and police personnel. Responses tended to group into categories: previously attempted interventions; wanting more of current efforts; and then a host of feasible (or not) forward looking interventions and plans. Police were acknowledged, by both groups as bearing the lion’s share of responsibility in relationship improvement; often, though, respondents (especially citizens) were overwhelmed by what were viewed as current barriers to engage.

Formerly attempted strategies included mini-stations, call-ins, and more foot patrol. Although reassuring to the neighborhood, it was indicated by a senior level administrator, in a follow-up email, that mini-stations were underutilized in CMHA. Residents mentioning them had not used this service when it was in place in the estates and were unaware that most mini-stations were not staffed 24/7. Current strategies, such as neighborhood watches, community meetings, and training for residents were also
suggested; however, when asked none of the citizens indicated that they had attended a Progressive Action Council (PAC) meeting in recent memory. Only one citizen could name a CMHAPD officer, though this may have been a weak litmus test since many felt that lower-levels of rapport building (e.g. talking to an officer on patrol) would suffice to improve the overall relationship. One citizen urged the police to be persistent in transparent messaging:

They could, you just gotta, I would just say get out into the community. You could give out free hot-dogs, you could give out ice cream cones or something, just say that “We're here. We want everybody to be safe and we have your best interests at mind. We don't have any hidden agendas.”

Also popular were suggestions for giveaways and volunteer work, though these were not generally linked to specific messaging and seemed to indicate a general shift in perception of officers. CMHAPD was commended for the depth of programming offered to youngsters in the community, with fishing frequently cited as building positive relationships.

Other suggestions from citizens included more rigorous screening, evaluation, and oversight to protect against officers abusing their authority. Mentoring was also mentioned in order to provide tangible assistance to troubled youth. More community policing was also mentioned; however that was an amorphous term, which citizens could not elaborate.

Surprisingly, two citizens (both young and male) indicated that change needs to be nurtured in the community, strengthening relationships among citizens outside of police interaction.
Officers were generally more willing to engage in this series of questions that either citizens or senior police personnel. The suggestions reinforced the citizen’s and demonstrated some brave thinking. One officer wanted more training and dialogue about race. This suggestion was not presented as a confrontation, but genuinely to educate, especially young officers who have little experience with urban, minority, and low-income populations. Another urged more, and more frequent, transparent communication so that the police force was authoring the narrative rather than media and rumor. Officers mused about potential multi-generational programming to address building social norms for families and youths. Officers also mentioned having smaller estates, specifically mentioning the scatter sites on the Westside. When asked if open dialogs with citizens threatened the authority of the department, one officer remarked, “I think when you give people a voice, that’s not the same thing as being over or under somebody, it’s like being on the same level. Like, at the end of the day we’re all people.”
Chapter 6

Discussion

In closing, this final chapter seeks to draw together several key findings and implications, identify possible avenues of intervention, discuss limitations and strengths of the research, and provide direction for future areas of research.

Key Findings & Implications

Neighborhood. The relationship between citizens and officers is potentially more complex than previous studies have allowed, including not just the interpersonal dynamics already recognized as central to the concept of legitimacy (procedural justice), but also encompassing broader feelings about one’s neighborhood.

In an environment similar to CMHA feelings of neighborhood attachment may be difficult to distill. As indicated by this study, determinations of safety or connection to one’s neighbors may confound simple scale measures. Measures for these constructs are nescient, lacking clinical or diagnostic cut-points for more structured interpretations. While CMHA citizens participating in the survey averaged scores just below the median possible score on the scale (study population $M=11.53$, scale median=12.5) it’s unclear how they might relate to broader populations. Moreover, interviewees were clearly unresolved in their assessments.

Though carrying the burden of neighborhood problems does not ease the process of improving police legitimacy, from a social welfare perspective this is good news! Police legitimacy is, or at least aspects of it are, a community problem… implying its resolution or improvement extends beyond the narrow purview of police forces.
themselves, many of which are now strapped by dwindling budgets and staffing issues, more complicated police technology and protocols, and more stringent oversight. Efforts made to help residents engage with one another, form bonds, and collectively address problems – no matter which organization or entity undertakes the effort – may help citizens view their police force as more legitimate. To a certain extent, this finding parallels some studies on collective efficacy, but rather than shifting the responsibility for building positive informal social controls and social norms on to the citizen population, (when viewed through the lens of neighborhood attachment) other community development organizations become stakeholders as well. This also supports the growing role of police as partners in a multitude of social programs – from the traditional athletic leagues and Explorers to programs viewing police as first social responders in partnership with health and mental health providers.

While significant in the simple model tested, the relationship between neighborhood attachment and police legitimacy may evolve when placed in more robust community models. This study, though, indicates that the current causal process for legitimacy may benefit from being expanded beyond the sub-constructs of procedural and distributive justice, and placed in a community context.

**Measures.** Both the modified exposure to violence scale and the police legitimacy measure yielded unexpected results and warrant further exploration.

**Exposure to Violence.** The lack of association between exposure to violence and legitimacy was unexpected. While neither victimization nor witnessing was correlated to a moderate level, witnessing, with a statistically significant weak correlation, showed more promise as a potential variable of study than did victimization. This lack of
association between the exposure to violence scales and legitimacy may have been due to errors in the survey’s construction, specifically that the place domain of the full REVs scale was omitted due to space. Though speculative, place may have been an especially important aspect of violence exposure given the expected higher than average levels of domestic violence (primary PAR referral reason). It may also be that violence in the community is viewed as within the purview of the police (security is expected in communal areas), while violence in the home is more private and stigmatizing to the victims, thus not considered within the normal duties of officers to prevent. Evidence to support this hypothesis can be found in citizen interviews – citizen interviewees sought intervention from neighbors and family (specifically for those informal supports to contact the police) rather than expecting police to be searching for this type of criminal activity on basic patrol. The relationship between exposure to violence and legitimacy, if one exists, is most likely highly complex; in fact, some researchers have begun to explore under-reporting, desensitization, or habituation that may occur among individuals living in violent environments.

**Police Legitimacy.** Though only the legitimacy sub-scale was used in the regression model, the police legitimacy measure did not perform as expected. The factor analysis showed an unconstrained model with only two factors (roughly procedural and distributive justice) as preferable, a reduction from the five shown in the literature. Constraining the model to five factors demonstrated stronger scale loadings on four (legitimacy, distributive justice, performance, an unnamed factor and procedural justice). The 2 factor model accounted for approximately 60% of the variance while the more complex model accounted for approximately 70%.
Based on the factor loadings alone, the two factor model seems more parsimonious and adheres to the more popularly recognized model of legitimacy (procedural and distributive justice leading to legitimacy, excluding satisfaction and performance). However, indicating other potential problems with the scale, all the negatively worded questions grouped together, crossing distributive and procedural justice and suggesting that the cross loadings might be linked to wording rather than underlying constructs. Though the scale seemed adequate for the survey, it was chosen primarily because it met the needs of the survey and population (wording, question format, length, etc.) and likely needs more testing with American populations, specifically those who have regular contact with the police.

**Respect.** Citizens want respect and, at least conceptually, officers view respect as a crucial aspect of their interactions with citizens and want to provide it.

What seems to happen next is a little like plate tectonic drift – police and citizens on separate continents with their perceptions of role, responsibility and legitimacy shifting over time, creating chasms and conflict. Perceptual shifts are influenced by personal experiences, stories told, and media for BOTH groups and, though often inherently intangible, result in very real barriers to communication and misperceptions of common goals. The need for “respect” might be cited as a common understanding, but becomes words-said unable to manifest tangible actions. Citizens have beliefs about what officers can and cannot do, make assumptions about their motivations, and are well conditioned to fear of abuses of authority. For their part, officers seek to control whatever situation they are in, understand respect in economic terms, are conscious of
being judged by citizens, peers, and supervisory staff, and sometimes have little time to devote to each call regardless of what they may view as quality service.

Some of the beliefs highlighted in the findings are pure myth – dangerous fantasies that taint police/citizen interactions before either party has a chance to speak, seek clarification, or make a conscious decision. Consider the individuals who believed that a driver’s license was not necessary for private use of city streets – from the moment an officer attempts a routine traffic stop, he/she is perceived to be overstepping the bounds of his/her authority. Respect has already been violated and there is no foundation for perceptions of legitimacy. Instructive, one citizen told of an experience of perceived harassment, being detained as part of a narcotics investigation. When asked how an officer should have handled the resulting traffic stop and vehicle search, the interviewee indicated that there was no way that the officer could have acted appropriately because “… well, a good cop wouldn't pull me over. You can't pull me over just because you thought, cause you thought what you thought.” Officers were aware of some myths, but it was unclear, though, if they had considered the possible impact of these urban legends beyond their face value.

Some aspects of these findings are functionally valuable. Most likely developed as a response to those few events that actually carry danger for the officer, officers are conscious of the danger that may emerge with any or every citizen interaction. Unfortunately, all officers interviewed had personal experience with violent suspects or situations. While statistics indicate that only 10-20% of an officer’s time is spent in arrest situations, and it can be inferred that only a small percentage of those situations are actually dangerous, officers must be physically and emotionally prepared at all times.
Even citizens indicated that they viewed the officer’s job as potentially dangerous. Where control became more contentious and, in fact, paradoxical, was when it is culled from either the awareness that one’s actions will be scrutinized and could lead to punishment, or a lack of time to fully connect with citizens in the situation. By seeking to exploit the existing power differential to maintain control, citizens perceive extracurricular authority and are more likely to respond with a lack of respect toward the officer and reluctant to comply with directives… which then necessitates the additional use of tactics, up to and including physical force, to maintain officer safety and control.

Other aspects of the findings are very hard to address head-on – granting that some incidents between police and citizens do indeed represent abuses of police authority, it is sometimes difficult to identify if, when, or why an abuse occurred. For example, one citizen told of police forcing entry into her house as part of a resolution of a neighbor dispute. The retelling of the incident was less than clear, but in the end the officer came around to the interviewee’s understanding that the neighbor was at fault. Assuming the incident happened as described, the need for an officer to enter or search the interviewee’s home would not necessarily have been all that odd – the officer explained the situation, asked permission, and identified what he or she was interested in observing. The tangled narrative might have indicated that the interviewee had embellished the incident to show herself in a more favorable light, and, conversely, the officers and her neighbor in an unfavorable light. The ability to spin yarns or tell tales is common to all people – especially when one can act as an underdog or hero. It was not the intention of the research to validate any narrative in particular, but rather to uncover the understandings of the selected groups. Therefore, the importance of this story was
that the interviewee believed an abuse of authority had taken place regardless of whether or not it had actually occurred, or occurred as related. Officers, understandably, often seek justification to support their actions and focus more on what actually happened, rather than accepting perceptual differences.

Focusing more on the paradox of authority mentioned above, an aspect of the paradox was curiously not mentioned by interviewees, that while citizens fear the police, officers are wary of the citizens’ power as well. From officer baiting to complaints officers acknowledged that some citizen encounters can be career ending. Officers indicated that they must always operate within the parameters of the law, using the best tactics they can to compel compliance. Often officers saw respect as a tactic or strategy, which indicated that they understood the need for citizen compliance as both victim and bystander, but also indicated that they experienced compliance as needing to be coaxed, coached, or paid for. Another hint of the paradox of authority could be found in the lack of ability of both groups to identify clear responsibilities for citizens toward police. Again, police viewed this role as functional (e.g. see something, say something), but some citizens were unable to identify any concrete behaviors, while a few admitted that they had “fussed” the police when upset or angry with their situation. The inability to define a citizen’s responsibility highlighted a common theme: that citizens have little or no agency in their interactions with police and are thus freed from normed reciprocal conduct. Plainly, citizens felt police should respond with respect and professionalism in order to create the sought after outcome, even when the citizen had done little to facilitate the officer’s tasks or demonstrated reciprocal respect. Police were viewed, in their own interpretation and by citizens, as being almost solely responsible for the outcome of the
police/citizen interaction. While in some ways this is correct, officers do exercise and recognize their broad power of discretion, the success of policing is contingent on the will of the citizenry – to report crime, to obey orders, to identify suspects and motivations, and to relay facts. In many instances this is true of micro police/citizen interactions (one officer spoke of citizens deliberately providing mis-information during a foot pursuit) and of broader policing aims, such as safety.

**First Steps.** Finally, the research revealed how difficult it will be to make progress on improving perceptions of police legitimacy. Suggestions from citizens regarding improved relations were stale, focusing on interventions that were either under-utilized or currently in place. When a citizen indicated the need for more community meetings, he/she was asked how many community meetings he/she had attended recently – only one citizen claimed recent attendance, one could name a current officer, and none could name the chief. Some suggestions focused on the police further buying citizen interest with raffles or give-aways. Though well intentioned, many of the suggestions fell into already tried solutions. Police offered suggestions, but, while more innovative, these focused almost exclusively on the agency of the officer and thus may address only part of the problem.

What emerged clearly was the view from both citizens and police that the functionality of their relationship is growing in importance. Citizens seek peace-keeping police for themselves and their close relationships, law and order for those individuals viewed as a danger to the community (when those actions cannot be justified), and a deep sense of personal safety (universal to all human beings). Police seemed to resonate with
the ideas of safety and opportunity for citizens, but saw failures of family and community, and an increasing complex policing environment.

**Potential Interventions**

The study was personally instructive. Initially undertaken with the firm belief that the legitimacy literature did not include roles for community development organizations, neighborhood centers, elected officials and other non-police actors, the process of the project clarified why this bias may exist. Police can be trained, molded by leadership, and respond to outside pressures. In suggesting interventions to address perceptions of legitimacy, concrete tasks can be set forth, measured, and adapted to individual communities. Citizens are not as easy to access and train.

It is important to reiterate that increases in police legitimacy are independent of policing method. Though some authors advocate methods and strategy (e.g. COP, POP, targeted policing, etc.), the quality of the interactions officers and citizens have, whether long-term relationships formed or process based interactions, is the hallmark of perceptions of legitimacy. While COP does focus on forming relationships with communities, and the citizens within, as noted in Chapter 2, any method taken to an extreme runs the risk of violating either the procedural or distributive justice tenets of legitimacy and no single method is sufficient to encompass all the possible pathways to improved legitimacy. At the heart of the matter, police must police and their ability to promote safety in neighborhoods, as demonstrated in this research, is bound to their legitimacy. Neither construct (safety nor legitimacy) stands alone and responsiveness to the local environment – to the local law-abiding community (COP) as well as responding to criminal behavior – is paramount.
As noted in the beginning of Chapter 5, perceptions of police legitimacy are formed based on a mosaic of experiences with police. Thinking of this web of experiences, it is important for each policing entity to work collectively to establish performance standards as a means of universally addressing the problem. While specific protocols and policies necessarily change between departments, and in some large cities police districts, a commitment to assessing perceptions of legitimacy among the citizenry should be a national focus. Further, police departments should consider developing catastrophic event communication plans with qualified public relations consultants. Individual experiences with police are durable in the legitimacy construct, meaning that the effects of lost legitimacy may remain over time, even if the policing behavior has changed. Just as departments invest in protective police technologies (e.g. Kevlar vests, body cams, etc.) a sound communications plan, with trainings/updates/booster is an essential part of a police force’s relationship with their citizens.

Strategies for intervention extrapolated from interviews might include: working with officers to identify career goals and motivations (especially important to combating myths and developing a realistic understanding of residents and their social/economic limitations); movement of individuals through different police units or engagement in new/changing skills to facilitate a deeper connection to the needs of citizens and minimize officer burnout; interaction/socialization with more typical residents (police acknowledged that they do not get the chance to meet “successful” residents… ones who are not in need of service). Officers demonstrated a high degree of commitment to their profession and residents. Expanded training for issues of respect and deeper cultural awareness may also facilitate change. There are barriers inherent in these steps,
especially given the paramilitary nature of modern police forces (e.g. command lead discussion on race would most likely be very guarded); however, partnership among police and human service organizations might provide an avenue for greater training and more open dialogue. Additionally, police work should be valued by municipal, state, and federal entities, with police (most especially patrol officers) earning a wage that is commensurate with the level of skill needed for the position and enabling talented officers to view policing as a long-term profession.

Despite a lack of clear interventions, citizens must better understand local, state and federal laws, the role of police, and guidelines for when calls for service need to be made. Citizens must also be willing to engage and communicate with police beyond knowing how to file complaints. The focus on citizens opens a role for community organizations, not only to provide basic civics instruction, but to help citizens connect with neighbors and develop interpersonal support systems to strengthen neighborhood pro-social ties.

The quantitative results also indicate that expanded partnerships among police and community service organizations, especially around non-policing interventions, may improve legitimacy indirectly. Police providing access to youth development opportunities or working with citizens on projects, etc. may have more of an effect on legitimacy measures than even a sub-construct like distributive justice.

**Strengths & Limitations**

**Strengths.** The study focused on two populations who receive little attention in the police legitimacy literature – low-income, minority, urban citizens and front-line police officers. As cited in previous chapters, minority populations have been shown to
have lower perceptions of the legitimacy of police. This difference attenuates in population studies – literature contends that the pathways to legitimacy (procedural and distributive justice) are the same, regardless of race and socio-economic status. A common understanding of how legitimacy is formed however, does not mean that it is understood universally. Fairness, trust, access to services, and to pull a finding from this research, respect all hinge on granular definitions that are influenced by a myriad of personal, social and historical facts and experiences. The study was designed to probe at least the functional understandings of role and legitimacy in both populations, if not the antecedents to this understanding.

Another element unique to this study was the treatment of the populations as equal. Citizens and police answered the same questions, mostly phrased in the same way, and the findings point to instances where understandings are similar and different. When follow-up occurred it was not to check the veracity of the incidents described, but to identify the process that moved the interaction to a resolution.

While this egalitarianism was imperfect, the study collected a sample of narratives which do not challenge the construct, but seek to inform its next iteration. That next step must be the movement of the construct from a definition (procedural justice + distributive justice = legitimacy) to a more robust model that functions in the context of everyday lives in real-life places, such as neighborhood measures. A further small-step in this study was to explore the ways in which exposure to violence (both victimization and witnessing) and attachment to neighborhood were associated with legitimacy. While exposure to violence was not shown to have an effect in this population, with these measures, the addition of neighborhood attachments as a viable component of the model
challenges the strictures of the construct by extracting legitimacy from being solely in the domain of citizens (to define the problem) and police (to create solutions).

**Limitations.** Several areas of limitation were noted in the study and highlight research decisions which may have affected the findings. These limitations are addressed for each aspect of the study.

**Population.** The sample was restricted to urban, low-income, at-risk individuals living in CMHA properties who had recent contact (identified over a three year span) with CMHAPD through the PAR program and officers from CMHAPD (patrol officers as well as selected senior level personnel; selection bias). These groups were within the broader population of interest; however, because this research focused on residents of a housing authority and members of the specialized police department that serves them, there is the potential that the findings highlight some aspect unique to their relationship and would not generalize to broader populations. Also, given that the majority of the citizens surveyed and interviewed were women, the study may lack voices of men within the housing authority, and did lack male voices in the larger citizen population. While the majority of CMHAPD personnel were men, this bias likely reflects the composition of most police forces in the United States.

Also, the citizen interviews occurred in two phases (late October 2014 and December 2014). Within that time span Cleveland experienced a catastrophic police event – the death of Master Tamir Rice (11-22-14). Police interviews were conducted in November of 2014, prior to the death of Mstr. Rice; however, his death followed a string of nationally highlighted deadly force controversies (Mr. Michael Brown 08-09-14, Mr. Eric Garner 07-17-14). National protests organized on a grass-roots level to demand
justice for each of the deceased as well as potential criminal charges and civil lawsuits were publicized. Within this environment, even the judicial resolution of the Brown and Garner cases fueled controversy and media attention as both grand juries decided not to charge the officer in each case. The publicity around the local protests and national events, most especially those connected to the case of Mr. Brown in Ferguson, MO, were referenced by citizens and officers in several interviews, though directly probed in only one officer interview. These events may have altered perception of both citizens and police, especially along racial fault lines (in each case the officers were Caucasian while the victims were African American; history as a threat to internal validity).

**Quantitative.** Threats to statistical validity arise primarily from the measures used and may be tied to aspects of construct validity. As noted earlier, the measure for exposure to violence may have lacked the critical element of place, which may account for the particularly low relationship between victimization and legitimacy. Further, the measure for police legitimacy did not function completely within the expected parameters either, most notably there was a confluence among the constructs legitimacy, satisfaction and performance with procedural justice (unreliability of measures and inadequate explication of constructs). Though some evidence exists that more than two sub-scales are present, the identified dimensions did not align with previously published work. This evidence may indicate problems with the measure or some special characteristic of the respondents.

Moreover, the quantitative assessment hinges on a temporal sequence placing neighborhood attachment before police legitimacy (ambiguous temporal precedence). While the sequence seems to make intuitive sense, research in this area is lacking. Even
if the temporal sequence is correct, it may be that neighborhood attachment’s relationship to legitimacy is more complicated than presented, perhaps including neighborhood variables as a mediator or moderator for the legitimacy construct.

**Qualitative.** The most significant source of potential error in the qualitative aspect of the study was researcher bias. In order to combat this threat frequent discussion regarding the research’s progress and findings were scheduled with Dr. Mark Singer, committee chairperson, and Dr. Mark Fleisher, committee member, challenging the researcher’s reflections and assumptions.

Additionally, during the interview process, potential findings were tested with subsequent interviewees, for example, while officer baiting was not initially part of the interview it was explored with several officers after it was first mentioned and also discussed with a portion of the citizen interviewees. Further, an adapted member check process, by the re-interview of a researcher-selected police officer, was conducted after all police and citizen interviews had been completed.

Also of concern were interpretation errors and reactivity biases. The interview protocols were constructed with mostly open-ended questions, so that specific answers could be probed to more fully capture the intent and meaning offered by the interviewees. While imperfect, effort was made to give individuals the time and space to answer each question to the best of their ability and, on occasion, an interpretation was offered to the individual during the interview as an attempt to clarify their meaning. Reactivity bias was considered throughout the interview process. Citizens were able to choose the location of their interview and most chose to be interviewed in their home. The rapport established with interviewees was intended to make them feel comfortable with the
interviewer and for most additional time was spent, before and/or after the interview, engaged in pleasant conversation without reference to the study’s aims. Officers seemed less comfortable and several were curious about why or how they had been chosen. Since the selection process of officers was outside of the researcher’s control, no information could be provided. However, only two officers seemed conscious of the recorder throughout the entire interview (gesturing or looking at it while responding to questions). All participants were provided a copy of the informed consent with the researcher’s contact information; however, most of the police participants left the material with the interviewer. A follow-up hand written note was sent to each participant thanking him/her for his/her participation, with a copy of the researcher’s business card enclosed. Only one individual (an officer) made contact, he did not retract any portion of his interview.

**Future Research**

Following the implications detailed above, future research must emphasize practicality in the measurement of the legitimacy construct. As police continue to focus on their relationship with the citizens in their jurisdiction a commitment to assessing legitimacy should develop nationally. With current tools this is both difficult and expensive. Developing a simple, easily surveyed measure would allow police departments to assess this metric more easily. The measure developed by Hinds and Murphy (2007) has several beneficial aspects, but transforming the structure so that it agrees with the bifurcated legitimacy construct (procedural and distributive justice), by eliminating poorly performing questions and addressing wording issues. Once developed, this new measure would need to be tested for both general populations, and
among specific groups. The measure would further need to be scaled or normed so that police could more easily interpret the results.

Legitimacy is a construct that by its very nature involved the environment of the citizen; however, links to community are more prevalent in the distributive justice aspect which is typically discounted in current research. Therefore, future research should pay greater attention to the relationship between procedural and distributive justice, and include relevant community measures, such as neighborhood attachment. By expanding the construct to include environment, ideas for potential intervention points and strategies expand beyond what any particular force could “fix” on their own. Partnering with police on non-typical interventions should also be explored within the framework of legitimacy. Partnership with social service agencies to provide enhanced community training should be explored and studied. Often the perception is that only certain officers are “community oriented police” but social workers and criminologists may be helpful in identifying what basic and advanced training could be offered more broadly for officers to develop or enhance these skills.

Finally, police work and research on policing issues must move beyond the realm of criminology. By examining this construct through a social welfare lens, this study was able to, without focusing on criminogenic behaviors or assessments, bring the voice of low-income, urban residents to the fore. Almost amazingly, police, actual patrol officers, are also not involved enough in research efforts. This divide reinforces those chasms and conflicts identified in Chapter 5. If we, as concerned community citizens (and even our police are citizens themselves) are to develop an accurate assessment of police legitimacy, and if we wish to develop positive and productive dialogue to improve
perceptions of legitimacy, these two populations (police and citizens) must find pathways
to connect. More research needs to focus on those connections – convincing policy
makers that common ground is possible, giving structure to interventions, and ensuring
that all stakeholder groups are represented.
Appendices

A. Annotated PAR Survey – 2013*

B. Interview Protocols for

- Residents
- Police and Community Officers
- Command Level Staff

* Due to the School of Graduate Studies formatting requirements, this document has been modified. Please contact the author for copies of the unaltered documents.
Annotated PAR Survey – 2013

Your opinion is valuable, so please complete the entire survey booklet. Remember, all information provided is confidential. In order to receive your $20 gift card to Walmart, please also return the green form with your name and address.

About how long have you lived in Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority housing?
- Less than a year
- 1 to 3 years
- 4 to 6 years
- 7 to 10 years
- More than 10 years

When you received the referral card, was the police officer respectful?
- Yes
- No

Were you contacted by an agency because you received the referral card?
- Yes
- No (skip to question 5)
- If yes, how did the agency contact you: (check all that apply)
  - In-person, they stopped by my home
  - Over the telephone
  - By mail

After the first contact, did you receive any other help from the agency?
- Yes
- No (skip to question 5)

If yes, what services did you receive? (check all that apply)
- Visits to my home
- Services from that agency
- Referrals to other agencies
- Other: ____________________
- None

Was getting the referral card helpful to you?
- Yes
- No
Do you think all police should be able to give referrals like this?
- Yes
- No

How has your opinion of the police changed as a result of receiving this referral?
- It is better.
- It is the same.
- It is worse.

Do you think this program should continue?
- Yes
- No
- Why or why not?

Not including the time you received the referral card, how often have you had contact, for any reason, with the CMHA police in the past two years?
- Never
- A few times
- Frequently

Is there anything else you’d like to share about your experience getting the referral card?

For the next few questions, think about the neighborhood you live in. Put an “X” in the box that is closest to your opinion.
If there were a fight in front of your home, how likely is it that your neighbors would try to help.

**Neighborhood Attachment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Now please think ONLY about the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority (CMHA) police. Put an “X” in the box that is closest to your opinion.

**Procedural Justice**

- CMHA police are concerned about respecting a citizen’s individual rights.
- CMHA police treat people as if they can be trusted to do the right thing.
- CMHA police treat people as if they only do the right thing when forced to. (R)

**Distributive Justice**

- You are more likely to get away with a traffic offense if you drive a more expensive car. (R)
- It’s not about what you’ve done, but who you are, and who you know, when it comes to the police. (R)

**Legitimacy**

- I have confidence in the CMHA police.
- People should always follow the directions of CMHA police officers even if they go against what they think is right.
- CMHA police do their job well.
- I have great respect for the CMHA police.

**Satisfaction**

- I am very satisfied with the services provided by the CMHA police.
How good a job are the CMHA police doing in dealing with the problems that really concern people in your neighborhood?

How good a job are the CMHA police doing in your neighborhood in working together with residents to solve local problems?

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

**Performance**

**Please tell us how often the following things have happened to you in the past year.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>A few times</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the past year, how often were you threatened with physical harm?

In the past year, how often did you see someone else being threatened with physical harm?

In the past year, how often were you slapped, punched, or hit?

In the past year, how often did you see someone else being slapped, punched, or hit?

In the past year, how often were you beaten up or mugged?

In the past year, how often did you see someone else being beaten up or mugged?

In the past year, how often were you attacked with a weapon?

In the past year, how often did you see someone else being attacked with a weapon?

**Recent Exposure to Violence**
In your opinion, what services are missing for adults or children and youth in your neighborhood?

Is there anything else you would like to share about your experiences with police? (either CMHA or any other police experiences)

Finally, please tell us about you and your household: (optional)

What is your age?

What is the highest grade in school you completed?

How many children under the age of 18 currently stay with you?
Interview Protocols

Interview Protocol – RESIDENTS

Read informed consent to the resident. Ask if there are any questions about the study and get signed document. Leave a copy with the resident (highlighted sections of who to contact with questions or concerns).

**Interview.** FIRST, I’M GOING TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOU LIVE IN. THESE WILL JUST HELP ME TO DESCRIBE WHO I TALKED TO DURING THIS PROCESS, SO THERE ARE NO WRONG ANSWERS. IF YOU DON’T WANT TO ANSWER SOMETHING, JUST TELL ME AND WE CAN MOVE ON. ANY QUESTIONS?

Demographic:

- How old are you?
- How far did you go in school?
  - (Alternate form) What was the highest grade you completed in school?
- How many children do you care for?
  - Children = <18, biological and/or other care arrangements
  - (Alternate form) On a normal night how many children stay at your place?
- Where do you live?
  - Is that in one of the estates? Which one?
  - (Alternate form) Which estate do you live in?
- Do you or the children you care for currently receive any services from helping organizations, other than housing? Something like case management or SNAP (food stamps).
• How long have you lived in CMHA?

Neighborhood:

• Tell me about your neighborhood?
  o What does it look like?
  o (Alternate Form) Describe what it would look like if we were to just walk around near your house.

• Do you know many of your neighbors?
  o Do people around you seem to hang out together? What do they do?

• Is your neighborhood safe?
  o Do you feel like you can walk around – to get to the bus stop or local store – without being hassled?
  o Why? What happens here (safe or unsafe)?

• Do you see CMHAPD on patrol around where you live?
  o Are they around too often, just the right amount of time, or too infrequently?

Exposure to Violence:

• Has anyone threatened you?
  o When?
  o Does this happen often?
  o Did you call the police?
  o Why // why not?

• Has anyone beaten you up?
  o When?
o Does this happen often?

o Did you call the police?

o Why // why not?

OK, I’M GOING TO SHIFT A BIT AND ASK YOU WHAT YOU THINK ABOUT THE POLICE AND PEOPLE IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD. BECAUSE I KNOW THERE ARE A FEW DIFFERENT POLICE DEPARTMENTS IN CLEVELAND, I’D LIKE TO ASK YOU TO THINK SPECIFICALLY ABOUT YOUR INTERACTIONS WITH THE CMHA POLICE FORCE. HERE ARE A FEW PICTURES OF CMHAPD SO YOU CAN REMEMBER WHAT THEIR OFFICERS LOOK LIKE.

LIKE BEFORE, THERE AREN’T ANY RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS AND EVERYTHING YOU TELL ME IS CONFIDENTIAL. IT’S IMPORTANT THAT YOU JUST TELL ME WHAT YOU’RE THINKING. IF I ASK SOMETHING AND IT DOESN’T MAKE SENSE LET ME KNOW. ALSO, IF I ASK SOMETHING YOU DON’T WANT TO ANSWER, JUST TELL ME AND WE CAN MOVE ON. ANY QUESTIONS?

Police: SHOW CMHAPD IDENTIFICATION MATERIAL

- There are some cops you can talk to and some you can’t… what’s difference?
  - So if a cop did all the good things you just mentioned, would that person be the ideal police officer?
  - What else might a great cop do?

- What do you think about the CMHA cops?
  - (Alternate form) The CMHA police officers are good, aren’t they?
• When you talk to a CMHA cop, what do you usually talk about?

• When CMHA cops come into your neighborhood, what sorts of things are they looking for?

  o (Alternate form) What sorts of things do CMHA cops seem to focus on in your neighborhood?

  o Are these things the things you think are important problems?

  o Do the officers you know understand the community and its problems?

• Do you think the CMHAPD officers you know have the knowledge and skills to do a good job?

  o If you could require all cops to be trained to do something or act a certain way, what would it be?

• Do you call CMHAPD if there is a problem in your neighborhood?

  o Why // why not?

  o Do you think they are dependable?

Citizens:

• People talk about the idea of a “good citizen” what do you think about when you hear “good citizen”?

• Do you think people have responsibilities in their own neighborhood?

  o If no, why? How should people be expected to interact?

  o If yes… what do you think those responsibilities are?

  o (Alternate form) What would being a “good citizen” look like?

• Is that how people act around here?

  o How is it the same or different?
Does what you’re saying change if I asked you about kids, teens, adults, elders?

(If difference is noted) Why do you think there’s a difference?

(If not already addressed) Going back to what you said about being a good citizen… what about these responsibilities have to do with police?

Why are these things so important?

(If any) Are these things practiced in the neighborhood?

Action:

Some people think that it’s important for cops to have a good relationship with citizens in their community. Do you think this is true?

Why?

(If yes) What would this help?

Not that you have to do it in real life, but what do you think would make that relationship better?

(Goal is two or three action suggestions) What else? Why would that help?

(If suggestions are too vague) Ok, but let’s focus on something we could do… what action steps would you put out?

Police Legitimacy:

I’m doing this research to try and understand how people in the community think about police and I need your help to sort out one last point. Academic people describe police legitimacy as “when people obey the police because they believe that it is an authority that ought to be followed… something that is right or
proper… and not because of the use of force or power” (Tyler, 2007, p. 10), but do you have a word or expression for what I just read?

○ (Alternate form) How would you describe this idea to people you talk to?

○ (Alternate form) What words or phrases would you use to describe this?
Interview Protocol – POLICE OFFICERS & COMMUNITY OFFICERS

Ask the officer to read the informed consent and summarize, stressing confidentiality procedures. Ask if there are any questions about the study and get signed document. Leave a copy with the office (highlighted sections of who to contact with questions or concerns).

**Interview.** FIRST, I’M GOING TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOU WORK IN. THESE WILL JUST HELP ME TO DESCRIBE WHO I TALKED TO DURING THIS PROCESS, SO THERE ARE NO WRONG ANSWERS. IF YOU DON’T WANT TO ANSWER SOMETHING, JUST TELL ME AND WE CAN MOVE ON. ANY QUESTIONS?

Demographic:

- How old are you?
- What was the highest grade you completed in school?
- Where do you live?
  - Is that a neighborhood like around here?
  - Is that a neighborhood like the one you grew up in?
- How long have you been in law enforcement – this should include any other time you worked in security, with other police forces, or with the military?
  - Why did you decide to become a police officer?
  - Has the experience been what you expected?

Neighborhood:

- Tell me about the neighborhood you work in?
• What does it look like?
  
• (Alternate Form) Describe what it would look like if we were to just walk around near where you patrol.
  
• How many residents do you know well enough to stop and chat with?
  
• How many do you know well enough to ask about their families or talk about what’s going on in their lives?
  
• With the people you feel you can talk to, what are the kinds of things you talk about?
  
• How many do you know just by sight, but not really well enough to talk to?
  
• Is CMHA a safe place to live?
  
• Can residents walk around – to get to the bus stop or local store – without being hassled?
  
• Who would hassle them? Why?
  
• Why? What happens here (safe or unsafe)?

OK, I’M GOING TO SHIFT A BIT AND ASK YOU WHAT YOU THINK ABOUT THE POLICE AND PEOPLE IN CMHA.

LIKE BEFORE, THERE AREN’T ANY RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS AND EVERYTHING YOU TELL ME IS CONFIDENTIAL. IT’S IMPORTANT THAT YOU JUST TELL ME WHAT YOU’RE THINKING. IF I ASK SOMETHING AND IT DOESN’T MAKE SENSE LET ME KNOW. ALSO, IF I ASK SOMETHING YOU DON’T WANT TO ANSWER, JUST TELL ME AND WE CAN MOVE ON. ANY QUESTIONS?
Police Legitimacy:

- I’m doing this research to try and understand how people in the community think about police and how police think about the work that they do. I need your help to sort out an important point. When professors talk about legitimacy they describe it as “when people obey the police because they believe that it is an authority that ought to be followed… something that is right or proper… and not because of the use of force or power” (Tyler, 2007, p. 10), but do you have a word or expression for what I just read?
  - (Alternate form) How would you describe this idea to people you talk to?
  - (Alternate form) What words or phrases would you use to describe this?
- Do you think police think about this <<their phrase>> as they go about their work?
- Is it something you head your superiors talking about?

Citizens:

- People talk about the idea of a “good citizen” what do you think about when you hear “good citizen”?
- Do you think people have responsibilities in their own neighborhood?
  - If no, why? How should people be expected to interact?
  - If yes… what do you think those responsibilities are?
  - (Alternate form) What would being a “good citizen” look like?
- Is that how people act around here?
  - How is it the same or different?
o Does what you’re saying change if I asked you about kids, teens, adults, elders?
  o (If difference is noted) Why do you think there’s a difference?

- (If not already addressed) Going back to what you said about being a good citizen… what about these responsibilities have to do with police?
  o Why are these things so important?
  o (If any) Are these things practiced in the neighborhood?

Police:

- What makes a good police officer?
  o How would they do their job?
  o What characteristics?
  o How would they talk to citizens?

- Do you think cops around here do a good job?
  o Why? What does that look like?

- Do you think most CMHA officers care about the neighborhoods they serve?

- When you go into a neighborhood, what sorts of things are you looking for?
  o Do you think these things are important problems?
  o (If no) Can you give me an example of an important problem? Any others?
  o Do you think CMHAPD understands the community and its problems?

- Outside of making an arrest, do residents even complain to you about CMHAPD? I’m talking about times when you might just be walking through an estate and someone comes up to you and starts talking.
What types of things do they talk to you about?

Do they ever complain to you about something you’ve done?

I’m going to switch gears a little and ask you about the last shift you work.

Describe what you did during that shift?

What shift was it – day, evening, overnight?

Did you walk around or just respond to calls?

Did you talk to any residents outside of arrest situations? What did you talk about?

Action:

Some people think that it’s important for cops to have a good relationship with citizens in their community. Do you think this is true?

Why?

(If yes) What would this help?

Not that you have to do it in real life, but what do you think would make that relationship better?

(Goal is two or three action suggestions) What else? Why would that help?

(If suggestions are too vague) Ok, but let’s focus on something we could do… what action steps would you put out?

Last question… are you a better cop because of the interactions you’ve had with residents?

What have you learned?

(Alternate form) Describe that.
o (Alternate form) What do you do differently? Or think about differently?
Interview Protocol – COMMAND LEVEL STAFF

Ask the interviewee to read the informed consent and explain the study. Confidentiality is a concern since there are only a few individuals at this level, while all quotes will be unattributed, the ability to defer answering a question is important and must be stressed. Ask if there are any questions about the study and get signed document. Leave a copy with the individual (highlighted sections of who to contact with questions or concerns).

**Interview.** FIRST, I’M GOING TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU AND THE CMHA NEIGHBORHOODS. THERE ARE NO WRONG ANSWERS. IF YOU DON’T WANT TO ANSWER SOMETHING, JUST TELL ME AND WE CAN MOVE ON. ANY QUESTIONS?

Demographic:

- What was the highest grade you completed in school?
- Where did you grow up?
  - Is that a neighborhood like around here?
- How long have you been in law enforcement – this should include any other time you worked in security, with other police forces, or with the military?
  - Why did you decide to become a police officer?
  - Has the experience been what you expected?
  - What about your experience in law enforcement has most changed your perspective? Any events or people that changed the way you police or the way you want the officers under you to police?
Neighborhood:

- Tell me about the neighborhood you work in?
  - What does it look like?
- Do you know many of the residents?
  - Do you get to talk to residents often?
  - What are those conversations typically about?
- Is CMHA a safe place to live?
  - Can residents walk around – to get to the bus stop or local store – without being hassled?
  - Why? What happens here (safe or unsafe)?

OK, I’M GOING TO SHIFT A BIT AND ASK YOU WHAT YOU THINK ABOUT THE POLICE AND PEOPLE IN CMHA.

LIKE BEFORE, THERE AREN’T ANY RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS AND EVERYTHING YOU TELL ME IS CONFIDENTIAL. IT’S IMPORTANT THAT YOU JUST TELL ME WHAT YOU’RE THINKING. IF I ASK SOMETHING AND IT DOESN’T MAKE SENSE LET ME KNOW. ALSO, IF I ASK SOMETHING YOU DON’T WANT TO ANSWER, JUST TELL ME AND WE CAN MOVE ON. ANY QUESTIONS?

Police Legitimacy:

- I’m doing this research to try and understand how people in the community think about police and how police think about the work that they do. I need your help to sort out an important point. When academics talk about legitimacy they describe it as “when people obey the police because they believe that it is an
authority that ought to be followed… something that is right or proper… and not because of the use of force or power” (Tyler, 2007, p. 10), but do you have a word or expression for what I just read?

- (Alternate form) What words or phrases would you use to describe this?

- Do you think police think about this <<their phrase>> as they go about their work?

- Is it something you talk about with officers or among others on the command level?

Citizens:

- Can you describe an “ideal” citizen?
  - (If too narrow) What else? How might they interact with other residents? Family? Co-workers?
  - How is this the same or different from what you experience as typical CMHA resident behaviors?
  - Does what you’re saying change if I asked you about kids, teens, adults, elders?
  - (If difference is noted) Why do you think there’s a difference?

- (If not already addressed) Going back to what you said about being a good citizen… what about these responsibilities have to do with police?
  - Why are these things so important?
  - (Alternate form) You mentioned XXX, YYY, ZZZ that seemed to relate to how citizens interact with police… why are these things important?
  - (If any) Are these things practiced in the neighborhood?
Police:

- Describe the “ideal” police officer.
  - How would they do their job?
  - What characteristics?
  - How would they talk to citizens?

- Do you think your officers do a good job?
  - What does that look like? Can you give me an example?

- Do you think most CMHA officers care about the neighborhoods they serve?

- How does CMHAPD typically interact with residents?
  - How often do you interact with residents?
  - About what? When? Why?

- How does the department incorporate residents’ opinions or feedback into its day to day operating procedure?

- When officers patrol, are they trained to look for specific concerns or problems?
  - Who determines what problems are prioritized?
  - When CMHAPD develops a new outreach tool, like the youth fishing program or explorers, who gets to decide what that program focuses on?

Leadership:

- What most influences how you work with and lead officers serving under you?

- What would it take for you to do things differently?

Action:
• Last few questions… research indicates that it’s important for cops to have a good relationship with citizens in their community. Do you think this is true?
  o Why?
  o (If yes) What would this help?

• What do you think would make that relationship better?
  o (Goal is two or three action suggestions) What else? Why would that help?
  o (If suggestions are too vague) Ok, but let’s focus on something we could do… what action steps would you put out?
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