Although American citizens have deep suspicions about state power (Bayley, 1976; Lipset and Schneider, 1983), studies show that the public generally holds positive attitudes toward the police (Apple and O’Brien, 1983; Dean, 1980; Erez, 1984; Furstenberg and Wellford, 1973; Hindelang, 1974; White and Menke, 1978; Zamble and Annesley, 1987). Even so, these sentiments are not displayed equally across all sectors of the social order. In particular, minorities appear to evaluate law enforcement less favorably (Albrecht and Green, 1977; Bordua and Tift, 1971; Carter, 1985; Decker and Wagner, 1981; Hindelang, 1974; Jacob, 1971; Jefferson and Walker, 1993; Parks, 1984; Peek et al., 1981; Percy, 1980; Reasons and Wirth, 1975; Scaglion and Condon, 1980; Skogan, 1978; but see Brandl et al., 1994). In response to this uneasy relationship, many of the current community policing ventures have been undertaken in minority neighborhoods in hopes of building residents’ confidence in the police and willingness to be coproducers in the fight against crime (Goldstein, 1987; Skolnick and Bayley, 1988:26; Wycoff, 1988).

Although research has consistently found that African-Americans (and other minorities) view the police less favorably than whites, the existing literature is limited in two ways. First, many studies report the relationship between single variables of interest and confidence in the police with no controls introduced (Albrecht and Green, 1977; Carlson and Sutton, 1979; Flanagan and Maguire, 1992; Hindelang, 1974; Jefferson and Walker, 1992, 1993; Klyman and Kruckenber, 1974; Komanduri et al., 1990; Mirande, 1980). Second, multivariate studies
generally include only a limited range of variables in the analysis. Some studies, for example, include controls only for other socio-demographic variables (e.g. age, gender, income) (Apple and O’Brien, 1983). Even more elaborate studies consider only a limited number of nondemographic factors, such as contact with the police (Dean, 1980; Mastrofski, 1981; Scaglion and Condon, 1980) and having been a crime victim (Brandl and Horvath, 1991; Koenig, 1980; Percy, 1986). It is possible, therefore, that these models are misspecified – that the effects of race on police attitudes might be accounted for by factors not incorporated into the analysis.

In this regard, the current study considers the impact of a range of variables on confidence in the police. Some of these variables have been examined infrequently, if at all, in prior research. The analysis includes, for example, measures of crime experiences and of conservative political orientation. Building on the research tradition that suggests that crime-related reactions are shaped by the social context that surrounds individuals (see, for example, Skogan, 1990), we also assess the effects of neighborhood disorder and informal collective security on confidence in law enforcement. In particular, we explore whether these contextual conditions help to explain the relationship between race and confidence in the police.

Two aspects of “crime experiences” are investigated: fear of crime and having been a crime victim. The assumption is that when crime is more salient in a person’s life, confidence in the police is undermined. Previous research has found that victimization experiences tend to increase negative attitudes toward the police (Apple and O’Brien, 1983; Homant et al., 1984; Koenig, 1980; Parks, 1984; Smith and Hawkins, 1973).

Second, we investigate whether crime ideology influences assessments of the police. We hypothesize that, since support for the police is often a plank in “law and order” conservative political platforms, a conservative crime ideology would enhance confidence in the police. Some evidence exists to support this hypothesized relationship (Larsen, 1968; Zamble and Annesley, 1987).

Third, we explore whether perceptions of community social and physical disorder – sometimes called “incivility” – lessen citizens’ confidence in the police (see Covington and Taylor, 1991; Lewis and Salem, 1986; Skogan, 1987). It is plausible that social disorder (e.g. noisy neighbors, loitering by rowdy teenagers) and physical disorder (e.g. graffiti, deteriorating property) send a message that law enforcement has lost control over or consciously abandoned the community. In short, the “broken windows” are not going to be fixed by the police (Wilson and
Kelling, 1982). If this is the case, then such incivility may serve as a daily cue that the police cannot be trusted to provide protection.

Fourth, we examine how confidence in the police is affected by “informal collective security” – whether neighbors can be relied on to provide protection (see Luxenburg et al., 1994; McDowall and Loftin, 1983; also Smith and Uchida, 1988). The nature of this relationship is far from clear, but two competing hypotheses can be proposed. On the one hand, it is possible that confidence in one’s neighbors breeds confidence in the police; or, stated in the alternative fashion, those who feel abandoned by their neighbors may also feel abandoned by the police. On the other hand, informal collective security may mean that the police are seen as superfluous, a second line of defense that is too distant to make a difference; or, alternatively stated, if confidence in neighbors is lacking, it may be that citizens see the police as more critical to their safety and thus invest more positive affect in law enforcement. If so, the relationship between informal collective security and confidence in the police would be nonexistent or even inverse.

We should note, however, that the data set did not contain a measure of “contact with the police”. Previous research has indicated that negative evaluations of contacts with the police generally foster negative global attitudes toward law enforcement, while positive evaluations of police contacts tend to have a less substantial positive impact on global attitudes (Brandl et al., 1994; Brown and Coulter, 1983; Dean, 1980). This omission, however, is unlikely to account fully for the results reported below. Existing studies reveal that the strength of the relationship between the contact variables and attitudes is moderate and accounts for only a modest amount of the explained variation. In contrast, in the current study two contextual variables have strong relationships with the police confidence measure, even with a range of factors controlled. Of course, future research should examine whether, and if so to what extent, including contact with the police in an analysis might cause the findings we report to be revised.

**METHOD**

**Sample**

The data for the present research were drawn from a larger study of crime-prevention issues in an urban environment. Questionnaires were mailed to 1,000 randomly selected residents in the city of Cincinnati in
the fourth quarter of 1992. Adjusting for residents who had moved, had undeliverable addresses or were deceased, the final sample size was 934. Guided by Dillman’s (1978) Total Design Method, the respondents were contacted five times: an initial mailing of the questionnaire, a reminder letter, two additional mailings of the questionnaire and a final telephone call to those who had not responded. Half of the households contacted received instructions that an adult female over the age of 21 should complete the survey; the other half were instructed to have the survey completed by a male over the age of 21. In the end, 539 usable surveys were returned, a response rate of 57.7 percent.

The sample had a mean age of 47.2, was 56.7 percent female, was 79.3 percent white (17.5% African-American, 3.4% “other” nonwhites), and had a mean family income of $35,259. The sample was closely representative of the Cincinnati population for age and gender, but it underrepresented minorities and lower-income people. Since previous research suggests that minorities and the poor are less supportive of law enforcement, the results reported here may overestimate levels of confidence in the police (Erez, 1984; Furstenberg and Wellford, 1973; Hindelang, 1974; Parks, 1984; Percy, 1980; Scaglion and Condon, 1980).

**Measures**

The coding and items comprising each of the measures used in the study are presented in Appendix A. Below we present an overview of the dependent variable and independent variables in the analysis.

**Dependent Variable**

*Confidence in the police* was measured by a five-item measure, which assessed whether respondents believed that police were responsive, cared about the neighborhood’s safety, maintained order and were able to protect residents against crime. The respondents were asked to use a six-point Likert scale ranging from “very strongly disagree” to “very strongly agree” to rate the five items. A high score indicates high confidence in the police. The Cronbach alpha for the scale is 0.77.

**Independent Variables**

Information was collected on five demographic variables: age, gender, education, household income and race (see Appendix A). The race variable is coded as 1 = white and 0 = nonwhite. For purposes of
analysis, minorities in the “other category” (3.4%) were grouped with African-Americans. This was done because an examination of cross-tabular relationship revealed that confidence toward the police among these minorities was more similar to African-Americans than to whites.

The analysis also included three crime-related variables. First, *crime victimization* was measured by seven items to which the respondents answered either yes (for a victimization) or no (if no victimization had taken place). Six items listed specific common property or violent crimes (e.g. “someone broke into your house”), while the seventh encompassed victimizations not specifically named (i.e. “some other crime not listed here happened to you”). This measure assessed victimizations that had occurred in the “last two years”. The scale was scored as the number of offenses for which the respondent had been victimized.

Second, *fear of crime* was assessed by asking the respondents, “Think back to those times when you might have felt afraid or worried that you might be a crime victim. How many times have you felt afraid in the last month?” This phrasing was chosen because, unlike measures of fear typically used in the research, it assesses whether people actually experienced worry over the potential of crime victimization (see Ferraro and LaGrange, 1987).

Third, based on previous research (Browning and Cao, 1992; Cullen et al., 1985; Dunaway and Cullen, 1991; McGarrell and Flanagan, 1987), we employed a five-item *conservative crime ideology scale*, with a Cronbach alpha of 0.80. In general, the scale measures support for “get tough” policies, a belief that offenders are afforded too many rights, and a belief that crime is due to permissiveness in American society. The respondents rated these items using a six-point, agree-disagree Likert scale.

Finally, two community context variables were included in the analysis. First, the concept of *community disorder* – “incivility” – was measured with eight items drawn from Skogan (1987, 1990). These items encompassed physical disorder (e.g. “garbage or litter on the street”) and social disorder (e.g. “groups of teenagers hanging out on the corners or in the street”). The respondents were asked to state whether each of the eight disorderly conditions of their community were “1 = not a problem”, “2 = some problem”, or “3 = a big problem”. The reliability coefficient for this scale was 0.88.

The concept of *informal collective security* was measured by three items regarding the willingness of neighbors to assist in providing
protection from crime. The items were rated using a six-point, agree-disagree Likert scale. The reliability was 0.69.

RESULTS

To assess public confidence in the police, we first examine the descriptive data on the public’s overall level of confidence in the police items. Second, to explore sources of confidence in the police, we present the results of multivariate analyses.

Overall Level of Confidence in the Police

Five survey items were used to measure public confidence in the police (see Appendix A). As shown in Table 1, the distribution of responses to these items reveals that the citizens sampled expressed confidence in the police.

In four of the five items, a substantial majority of the respondents agreed (“agree a little” through “strongly agree”) that the police are responsive (79.2%), do a good job maintaining order (74.7%), care about the safety of residents (84.3%), and do a good job protecting people from crime (81.9%). For each item, the respondents avoided selecting the most favorable response (“strongly agree”); nonetheless, the most commonly selected response, the “agree” category (39.7% to 47.5%), was the second most supportive response option. Finally, the mean level of agreement for four of the five confidence measures is above four on the six-point response scale that ranges from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” (4.15 to 4.46).

Less confidence was evident, however, in the responses to the fifth confidence item: “There are not enough police in my neighborhood to deal with crime”. The respondents were almost evenly divided in their judgment of whether police staffing levels were sufficient to control their neighborhood’s crime. It is difficult to assess why this item elicited less supportive responses than items 1 to 4, but one possible reason can be noted. Even though the respondents may have felt that police officers come when called, care, and do a good job (items 1 to 4), some citizens still may have preferred that police have more of a physical presence in their neighborhoods so as “to deal with crime”. In this regard, previous research suggests that one of the most common concerns of citizens is the lack of street-level personnel in their neighborhoods (Maguire and
Table 1
PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE POLICE (PERCENTAGES REPORTED$^a$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Disagree a Little (3)</th>
<th>Agree a Little (4)</th>
<th>Agree (5)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. When people in my neighborhood call the police, they come right away (mean = 4.33; std = 1.2)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The police do a good job in my neighborhood in making sure that no one disturbs the peace (mean = 4.15; std = 1.22)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The police care a lot about the safety in my neighborhood (mean = 4.46; std = 1.14)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The police do a good job in protecting me against crime (mean = 4.25; std = 1.09)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. There are not enough police in my neighborhood to deal with crime (mean = 3.393; std = 1.348)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Due to rounding errors, some percentages do not equal 100%
Pastore, 1994:192; US Department of Justice, 1977:39-40). Further, a major “selling point” of community policing is that officers are more visible to residents.

Precise comparisons of these findings with the results of prior studies are not possible. Studies of public assessments of the police have used a diversity of measures that tap a rather wide variety of attitudes. Some surveys enquire about respondents’ global satisfaction with the police, while others ask respondents to evaluate a variety of more specific police tasks and officer characteristics (see Brandl et al., 1994). Nonetheless, the general pattern of results reported here is consistent with previous research: Overall, citizens in our sample, as in other samples, express favorable sentiments toward the police.

One final note is in order concerning the public’s confidence. For each confidence measure, the mean confidence level of white respondents exceeded the mean of nonwhites, although in only two situations do the differences achieve a conventional level of significance ($p < 0.05$). Although nonwhites did express lower levels of confidence, their responses still indicated overall confidence in the police (a scale mean of 4.229). This finding is consistent with existing research, which has found that while minorities express less favorable attitudes toward the police than do whites, they still possess favorable attitudes.

Sources of Confidence in the Police

To assess whether various demographic, crime-related and contextual variables influence confidence in the police, we undertook three multivariate analyses (see Table 2). In each equation, the confidence in the police scale was the dependent variable. A correlation matrix was also computed; no correlations among the independent variables were high enough to suggest the presence of multicollinearity (see Appendix B).

Equation 1 examines only the impact of respondents’ demographic variables on confidence in the police. The equation reveals that respondents’ race is significantly related to the confidence measure, with whites expressing more confidence in the police than nonwhites.

In addition, the respondents’ gender, age and income were statistically significant determinants of confidence in the police. Specifically, females and older individuals were more likely to express higher levels of confidence than were males and younger respondents.
Income level was also positively related to confidence in the police. The respondents’ educational level, however, was not significant.

Equation 2 reveals that the influence of race (and of the other demographic variables) on confidence remains statistically significant even after controlling for the effects of three crime-related variables. Age, gender and income also retained statistical significance. Equation 2 also reveals that two of the three crime-related variables are significant: being afraid of crime and having been a crime victim in the last two years both reduce confidence in the police. Holding a conservative crime control ideology, however, was not statistically significant.

Two additional findings relative to Equation 2 are worthy of mention. First, the proportion of variance explained by Equation 2 ($R^2 = 0.149$) is almost twice that explained by Equation 1 ($R^2 = 0.079$). This finding suggests that the crime-related variables in this equation contribute substantially to our ability to predict public confidence in the
police. Second, the standardized regression coefficients for the variables indicate that fear of crime and recent victimization experiences exert a larger effect on confidence in the police than do any of the demographic variables.

In Equation 3, the final and most complete model we present, two contextual variables are introduced: citizen perceptions of neighborhood disorder and informal collective security. When these variables are included, the effect of race on confidence in the police is no longer significant. In fact, of the eight variables brought forward from Equation 2, only the respondents’ gender remains statistically significant.

The two community context variables, first included in Equation 3, are both significant determinants of confidence in the police. Perceptions of community disorder exerted a significant negative effect on confidence: As citizens’ perceptions of incivility increased, confidence in the police decreased. Additionally, the standardized regression coefficient for this variable reveals that perceptions of disorder had the largest effect of all the variables included in this equation.

The second contextual variable, perceptions of the willingness of neighbors to assist the police, had a significant positive effect on public confidence: As perceptions of informal collective security increase, confidence in the police also increases. The effect of this variable on confidence in the police was the second largest of the included variables.

Finally, the variance explained by variables in Equation 3 ($R^2 = 0.389$) substantially exceeds that explained by Equation 2 ($R^2 = 0.149$). The community context variables, therefore, appear to have both statistical and substantive significance for the explanation of public confidence in the police.

**DISCUSSION**

This study represents an attempt to understand more clearly the relationship between race and public confidence in the police. Although the initial analysis (reported in Equation 1) revealed a significant race effect, the introduction of contextual factors eliminated this relationship. For our sample, then, respondents’ race is not a significant determinant of confidence in the police.

Furthermore, results for Equation 3 support the proposition that the community context is the most important determinant of public confidence in the police. Specifically, citizens’ perceptions of disorder
exerted the strongest impact on confidence. Thus it appears that citizens hold the police at least partially responsible for the disorder – the “broken windows” – in their neighborhoods. Whether the police are capable of containing the types of incivilities that appear to undermine public confidence is a matter that remains open to debate. In any case, our respondents appear to perceive the police as the government’s first-line representative, responsible for controlling neighborhood disorder.

In addition to perceptions of disorder, the effects on confidence of the other community context variable – informal collective security, or the willingness of neighbors to provide protection from crime – were significant and positive. As proposed in the introduction, this finding suggests that confidence in neighbors breeds confidence that the police will provide protection – that is, informal collective security encourages feelings of formal collective security (see McDowall and Loftin, 1983). More broadly, this finding suggests that neighborhood social integration may provide a supportive context in which residents are reminded that they are not isolated individuals cut off from the larger social order. In short, social bonds may encourage their identification with and positive evaluation of formal institutional arrangements.

When viewed together, the findings on race and community context yield an important conclusion: Attitudes toward the police may not be regulated by a person’s race per se, but by the social context in which the person is situated. Accordingly, past research, which typically has reported that minorities appraise law enforcement less favorably, may be in need of revision. Given that race became nonsignificant when contextual variables were controlled, it is possible that much of the existing research, which did not include contextual variables, has based findings on misspecified models.

A further comment about our conclusions on community context is in order: our measures of neighborhood context were perceptual rather than objective indicators. This qualification, however, does not mean that the results reported are unimportant. Indeed, research using objective indicators, such as crime rates, has generally found that these measures explain very little of the variation in citizens’ attitudes toward the police (Stipak, 1979). In contrast, perceptions of neighborhood conditions may well be more salient to respondents than less proximate, objective conditions. If so, research indicates that these beliefs about local community conditions are more likely to be “cognitively accessed” (Fazio and Williams, 1986), which in turn may cause them to influence attitudes toward the police. Furthermore, the impact of these perceptions
may be especially important where the problem is one that the public considers within the function and control of the police (Percy, 1986; Stipak, 1979). For similar reasons, the public’s beliefs about the level of collective informal control within the community are likely to exert a much greater effect than actual measures of citizen participation.

An additional and consistent finding was the significant influence of respondents’ gender on confidence in the police: even with a range of factors controlled, females were more likely than males to express confidence in the police. This finding is consistent with several prior studies (Apple and O’Brien, 1983; Thomas and Hyman, 1977). It has been suggested that women hold more positive sentiments because they generally have contact with the police that is less antagonistic than the contact that typically occurs between males and the police. Compared with males, females are more likely to make service requests of the police and are less likely to be involved in situations in which the police are acting against them. Because (as noted) our data set did not contain measures of citizen contacts with the police, we were unable to explore whether differential police contact can account for the gender gap in confidence in law enforcement.

In connection with this point, we should state again that existing research suggests that citizens’ experiences with the police influence their evaluations of the overall quality of police performance (Brown and Coulter, 1983; Dean, 1980; Mastrofski, 1981; Parks, 1984; Scaglion and Condon, 1980). Even so, the model presented in Equation 3 in Table 2 performs well: The explained variance by the model’s variables \( R^2 = 0.386 \) exceeds the variance explained in prior studies that have included police contact variables (see, for example, Brandl et al., 1994; Dean, 1980). It remains an empirical question, of course, whether police-citizen contact measures will significantly increase the explained variance or specify the relations reported here. In the absence of this or other research, however, our study suggests that an accurate understanding of the public’s attitudes toward the police must include an assessment of the social context in which citizens reside.

Finally, the impact of neighborhood problems on confidence in the police should be of special concern to law enforcement administrators. Even though many neighborhood problems are not susceptible to control or even regulation by the police, citizens’ perceptions of these problems provide salient information that appears to influence their confidence in the police. Thus, improving citizens’
attitudes is likely to be a challenging task for police agencies to undertake successfully.

NOTES

A previous version of this paper was presented at the 1994 meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Miami. Address correspondence to: Liqun Cao, Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI 48197.

1. Dean (1980) in her study estimated a series of regression equations using a variety of contact variables. When the number of “bad” and “good” contacts are included as two variables the $R^2$ increased from 0.091 to 0.155. When citizen evaluations and the nature of the contact are included (request for information, response to a victimization, stopped by the police) the $R^2$ increased to 0.165.

2. We suggest that perceptions of informal collective security influence confidence in the police because information about informal collective security is likely to be received on a daily basis. However, because our data are not longitudinal, we cannot rule out the possibility of reverse (or reciprocal) causal ordering between informal and formal collective security.

3. It should be noted that there are also research findings suggesting that gender is not a significant predictor of attitudes toward the police (Boggs and Galliher, 1965; Brandl et al., 1994; Brown and Coulter, 1983).
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Appendix A:

Summary of Measures Used in the Analysis

Independent Variables

1. Race
   - 1 = whites; 0 = nonwhites

2. Age
   - Natural age in years at the time of the survey

3. Gender
   - 1 = male, 0 = female

4. House Income
   - 1 = $2,000 and below; 2 = 2,001 to 6,000; 3 = 6,001 to 10,000; 6 = 20,001 to 25,000; 7 = 25,001 to 30,000; 8
     = 30,001 to 35,000; 9 = 35,001 to 40,000; 10 = 40,001 to 45,000; 11 = 45,001 to 50,000; 12 = 50,001 to
     55,000; 13 = 55,001 to 60,000; 14 = 60,001 to 70,000; 15 = 70,001 to 80,000; 16 = 80,001 to 90,000; 17 =
     90,001 to 120,000; 18 = $120,001 and above

5. Education
   - 1 = did not graduate from high school; 2 = graduated from high school; 3 = some years of college; 4 =
     graduated from college; 5 = finished one or more years of graduate school

6. Informal Collective Security
   - A combination of three items: (a) The people in my neighborhood watch one another’s home when no one
     is home. (b) In my neighborhood, people will call the police right away if they think a crime is being
     committed. (c) If some criminal was trying to rob me, my neighbors wouldn’t just stand there and watch, but
     would come help me out. 1 = very strongly disagree; 2 = strongly disagree; 3 = disagree; 4 = agree; 5 =
     strongly agree; and 6 = very strongly agree
7. Community Disorder
A combination of eight items: How much of a problem is each of the following: (a) noisy neighbors – people who play loud music, have late parties, or have noisy fights; (b) garbage or litter on the streets or sidewalks; (c) people not keeping up their houses or apartments – like not painting or fixing windows that break; (d) groups of teenagers hanging out on the corners or in the streets; (e) people selling or using illegal drugs in the neighborhood; (f) vandalism – like kids breaking windows or writing on walls or things like that; (g) teenage gangs who commit crime; (h) people who say insulting things or bother people as they walk down the street. 1 = not a problem; 2 = some problems; 3 = big problem

8. Fear of Crime
Think back to those times when you might have felt afraid that you might be a crime victim. How many times have you felt afraid of crime in the last month? 1 = once; 2 = two to three; 3 = three to five; 4 = more than five

9. Victimization
A combination of seven items. In the last two years, have any of the following crimes been committed against you: (a) someone broke into your house; (b) had property stolen from your house or yard; (c) someone stole, broke into, or vandalized your car; (d) someone held you up on the street and robbed you; (e) someone threatened to beat you up or threatened you with a knife, gun, or other weapon; (f) someone actually beat you up; (g) some other crime not listed here happened to you. 1 = yes; 0 = no

10. Conservative Crime Ideology
A combination of five items: (a) stiffer jail sentences are needed to show criminals that crime does not pay; (b) juvenile criminals are treated too leniently by the courts; (c) crime has increased in recent times because society has become too permissive; (d) these days, criminals have too many legal rights; and (e) if we really cared about crime victims, we would make sure that criminals were caught and given harsh punishment. 1 = very strongly disagree; 2 = strongly disagree; 3 = disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree; and 6 = very strongly agree
Dependent Variable

Confidence in the Police
A combination of five items: (a) when people in my neighborhood call the police, they come right away; (b) the police do a good job in my neighborhood in making sure that no one disturbs the peace; (c) the police care a lot about the safety of the people in my neighborhood; (d) the police do a good job in protecting me against crime; and (e) there are not enough police in my neighborhood to deal with crime. 1 = very strongly disagree; 2 = strongly disagree; 3 = disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree; and 6 = very strongly agree

Appendix B:
CORRELATION MATRIX OF VARIABLES IN ANALYSIS (N = 539)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Confidence in Police</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Race</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Age</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gender</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Household Income</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Education</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Informal Collective Security</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Community Disorders</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fear of Crime</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Victimization</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Conservative Ideology</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>