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ABSTRACT

Culture Clash: Making the Case for a New Paradigm in Police Cultural Training

by

Hal S. Edwards

Dr. Richard McCorkle, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Criminal Justice
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Hiring standards in most police agencies result in most officer candidates having little, if any, meaningful exposure to the "oppositional" culture of the urban, minority poor. Given the current popularity of the Community Oriented Policing paradigm—with its emphasis on positive police/community relations—current police hiring and training practices handicap police agencies in their efforts to gain the trust of urban, minority communities. A content analysis of United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division investigations under the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14141) was found to support the hypothesis that the interface between the police and urban males is problematic and that cultural training was identified as a training inadequacy in police departments, both large and small.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

A clash of cultures between the police and the policed is occurring on the streets of America's poor urban communities. The police and the young males within these communities share an ethos that includes bravery in the face of danger, physical as well as mental toughness, an almost manic need for respect and a shared sense of social isolation. Given the volatile nature of these shared sub-cultural characteristics, conflict would be inevitable, both groups unwilling to lose respect or display weakness during street encounters.

It could be said that the police and their urban minority counterparts are essentially two at-risk populations. The police are at-risk for abuse of their authority, civil rights violations, self-imposed social isolation, and perhaps most damaging, a loss of respect and trust in those communities most needing their services. Conversely, young, poor, urban males are at-risk for criminal behavior, poverty, police abuse, and perhaps most damaging in their case, a sense of hopelessness borne of the oppressive disadvantages present in America's inner-cities.

This clash of cultures forms a formidable barrier to the success of Community Oriented Policing (COP) strategies. Essentially an attempt to reconnect with communities alienated by decades of "professional" policing, COP requires effective communication and cooperation between the police and the communities they serve (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1994). Historically, American police/community relations have been most problematic within poor, urban, primarily minority communities. Beset by a variety of social ills—high crime, unemployment and hopelessness—poor minority communities in America have often borne the brunt of aggressive, paramilitary style policing, couched in the language of war. Paralleling the development of "professional" policing has been the emergence of a hard-core urban "underclass," characterized by both a distinctive subculture and socioeconomic isolation from mainstream America (Massey & Denton, 1993; Wilson, 1987, 1996).

As the socioeconomic conditions in America’s inner cities have worsened, further alienating poor minorities from the mainstream (Wilson, 1996), police training, and cultural training in particular, have failed to keep pace. Commonly referred to as "diversity," "cultural," "cultural competency," or "multi-cultural training," cultural training in its most basic form seeks to educate police officers on the cultural nuances of non-white ethnic groups (Shusta et al., 1995). Modern cultural training has changed little since the 1940’s and continues to encompass three main principles (Shusta et al., 1995):

1. Race relations training for line staff.
2. Development of formal contacts with black leaders accompanied by efforts to hire additional minority officers.
3. Establishment of guidelines for handling civil disorder.

Despite the fact that cultural training has been a part of police training for sixty years, the
relationship between the police and minorities continues to be strained, indeed the majority of major civil disturbances in America have occurred as a result of avoidable police-citizen contacts (Shusta et al., 1995).

This research questions the efficacy of current police hiring practices by examining the extent to which police selection and training protocols produce a workforce lacking in racial/gender diversity, insufficiently trained to relate to the most problematic segments of their communities—the urban, often ethnic, poor. This research will show that any attempt to truly achieve Community Oriented Policing must overcome the “iron triangle” of resistance endemic to American police agencies. The sides of this triangle include a conservative ideology and concomitant resistance to change, a police subculture that could be described as pathological in so far as it intensifies the social distance between the police and the communities they are sworn to protect and serve, and lastly, minimal training in cultural competency, a necessary and critical ingredient in achieving community trust (Kappeler et al., 1998).

This project will focus on shortcomings in one aspect of police training—cultural competency. The findings presented will “make the case” for broadening the scope of cultural training beyond the traditional “laundry list of characteristics” approach to include the “street culture” of the urban, minority poor. This new paradigm in cultural training must also include non-enforcement contact with community members for extended periods as a way to both bridge the social gap between the police and the poor, and humanize populations that are too often painted with the broad brush of criminality.

This project will begin with a brief history of American policing, followed by a literature review focusing on the relevant aspects of policing—hiring/selection,
subculture, training and the cultural milieu of the hard-core urban “underclass.” The
literature review will be followed by case studies of United States Department of Justice
(USDOJ) Civil Rights Division investigations of twelve municipal police agencies. The
purpose of this analysis is to test the hypothesis that current forms of cultural training are
inadequate, and that there is a continuing need for more effective police cultural
competency training. United States Census (2000) data has been analyzed for each of the
sample cities to test for structural conditions conducive to the development of an
“oppositional” culture. This research will conclude with suggestions for a cultural
training curricula designed to engender effective communications between the police and
the hard-core urban poor.

A Brief History of American Policing

The earliest organized policing in America occurred during the colonial era wherein
colonists adopted the English model of policing. Sheriffs, Constables, and the [citizen]
night-watch performed a variety of duties, many of which were civic in nature (e.g.,
reporting fires, street lamp repair) (Uchida, 2001). The duties of these early law enforcers
were largely reactive, with little effort given to preventive measures (Uchida, 2001). With
the advent of industrialization and larger cities in America came the need for greater
social control similar to that in England where Sir Robert Peel had organized the London
Metropolitan Police (Uchida, 2001). Peel was ahead of his time in recognizing the need
for his officers to gain the respect of the public through the fair and judicious use of their
authority in maintaining order. Peel’s officers did not carry guns, wore low-key (blue) uniforms, “were even-tempered and reserved.....restrained and polite” (Uchida, 2001, p.21).

Rather than adopt the complete English policing model, early American police departments selectively chose to emulate the English practice of random patrol as a means to prevent crime. An important difference between the English and American policing models was the source of their authority. The London police were characterized by a centralized legitimacy with their authority rooted in the government. In America, legitimacy was decentralized, necessitating that the individual officer establish his authority with the citizenry. Individualized authority necessitated that officers “win the respect of the citizenry by knowing local standards and expectations” (Uchida, 2001, p.24). American police officers were free to tailor their enforcement activities to the particular needs of the neighborhoods within their beats with the end result being that “different police behavior would occur in different neighborhoods” (Uchida, 2001, p. 24), a situation not unlike today.

Due to primitive communications equipment, limited mobility and minimal supervision, police activity in 19th century America was highly discretionary and characterized by a variety of social service duties not directly related to crime fighting (von Hoffman, 1992). Widespread corruption was synonymous with this era as police departments were often no more than enforcement arms of municipal political machines. In response to these excesses and inequities, a group known as the Progressives launched an attempt to reform American policing. The origins of the professional model of policing were evident in the three part Progressive agenda. First, there was to be greater
centralization. Second, reformists argued for increased authority for chiefs as a means to ensure political autonomy. Third, reforms dictated higher personnel standards, and a narrowing of the police function to duties related to crime fighting (Uchida, 2001). Though the Progressive movement made some inroads against graft and corruption, police agencies generally remained ill-trained and subject to the whims of local politicians (Uchida, 2001).

In the wake of the failure of the Progressive movement, a number of police chiefs began advocating the adoption of a professional model of policing. The move towards professionalism, which began in 1910 and is still [arguably] the most prevalent policing model, has isolated the police from the public, particularly minority communities (Uchida, 2001). The professional model encompassed the ideal that police were experts, the only ones qualified to perform the crime fighting function. Increased use of motorized patrol, combined with an emphasis on number of arrests and rapid response to calls took precedent over community relations. Despite the fact that hiring standards were raised and training improved, the goal of attracting college graduates was not (and has not been) achieved (Hawley, 1998; Baro and Burlingame 1999). The 1960's were particularly problematic for the police, largely due to their ineffective and often inflammatory response to civil unrest resulting from the civil rights and anti-war movements. It was during this decade that a hardening of African-American attitudes towards the police occurred because they were perceived as an instrument of a government “that denied blacks equal justice under the law” (Uchida, 2001, p. 31).

In response to these troubling events, in 1965 President Lyndon Johnson convened The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (1968) to identify the root causes of
the social unrest that plagued America. Popularly known as the Kerner Commission, this group of distinguished researchers identified racism, unemployment, discrimination in housing and employment, and inequities in the criminal justice and social service systems as being the root causes of America's racial unrest (Uchida, 2001). Reforms suggested by the Kerner Commission included a mandate for increased criminal justice research, increased coordination between criminal justice agencies and tougher hiring standards for police personnel (Uchida, 2001).

In the decades since the 1960's, the police have effectively “circled the wagons,” isolating themselves from the communities they have sworn to protect and serve. In a biography by former Los Angeles Police Chief Darryl Gates, the former Chief, discussing the influence of mentor and long-time Los Angeles Police Chief Bill Parker described this process succinctly:

When Parker explained how the police were a minority, with all the injustices heaped upon a minority, I began to have a sense, finally of what police officers were all about. The public, Parker would lecture, with its typically American underdog sympathies, automatically placed the police in a no-win situation. The amount of force necessary to restrain someone might, for instance, be judged by an onlooker as being greater than was appropriate to the situation. This happened, he said, because the public’s perception of the situation, and what was needed to deal with that situation, were entirely out of sync with the reality.

The reality—how the suspect behaved, what he said, whether he was under the influence of narcotics or alcohol, what he might have already done that led to the use of force—could not be accurately judged by an onlooker at a distance. ‘When violence has occurred, there is the inevitable attempt to blame the police,’ Parker said.

Misunderstood, the police banded together and, like a true minority, developed instinctively a minority’s mentality: Us Against Them (Gates & Shah, 1992).
Former Chief Parker's observations are all the more interesting when one considers the fact that he was the incumbent Los Angeles Police Chief during the tumultuous events of the 1960's, a period of frosty relations between the LAPD and Los Angeles' African-American community (Uchida, 2001, Gates & Shah, 1992).
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Police hiring practices have changed little in the past 40 years. Minimal applicant requirements for most agencies include U.S. Citizenship, graduation from high school (or a GED), a "clean" arrest record (i.e. no felony convictions), limited drug use, a decent credit history, and a background indicative of a law-abiding lifestyle. Candidates must complete a battery of tests that usually include a written component, physical fitness/agility test, oral interview and psychological and physical exams. Those that make it through the hiring process are then required to attend academy training, the content of which varies slightly from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. To this day, most police academies have a stress component encompassing a degree of military regimen. Though some progress has been made towards a more balanced curriculum, most academies continue to focus on the enforcement aspects of policing with very limited time spent on the socio-cultural issues that are so much a part of COP (Shusta et al., 1995).

This two part literature review will begin with a review of research suggesting, that white (particularly male) officer candidates hold negative racial stereotypes commonly found in the United States. Moreover, those drawn to police work are known to possess certain personality traits such as authoritarianism and a concomitant disdain for out-groups—those that do not adhere to conventional norms and values. Examples of out-groups include criminal offenders, homosexuals, racial minorities, and substance abusers.
The current state of police cultural training will also be reviewed along with a discussion of how the police subculture reinforces racial stereotyping, authoritarianism, and attitudes towards out-groups. The second part of this review will focus on the "street culture" of the urban poor and illustrate similarities with the police subculture.

Racial Attitudes in American Society

Despite substantive gains in the decades following the civil rights movement, police agencies nationwide remain predominantly white and male (Reaves and Hickman 2002; Walker 1985; United States Commission on Civil Rights 2000). A recent Bureau of Justice Statistics report listed the mean sworn personnel percentages of the ten largest American municipal police agencies: 17.75% Hispanic, 15.4% female, and 12.82% African-American (Reaves & Hickman, 2002). Perhaps more troubling is the fact that based on 1990 U.S. census data and 1992 Bureau of Justice Statistics data, few cities with majority minority populations had police departments reflective of the ethnic and gender diversity in those communities (Uchida, 2001).

The significance of the continued lack of police workforce diversity becomes apparent when one examines the racial attitudes extant in the larger population from which these officers are drawn. Smith (1990), in his secondary analysis of General Social Survey (GSS) data, operationalized white's feelings and opinions regarding the attributes of minorities as ethnic images. This research sought to answer two questions: (1) "What are the images that people have towards several...ethnic groups on various dimensions or

---

2 Presently conducted biennially (annually prior to 1991), the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), located at the University of Chicago, conducts the General Social Survey (GSS). The purpose of the GSS is to measure trends, behaviors and attitudes in American society. GSS data is collected via personal interviews lasting an average of 90 minutes. Sample size for the 1990 GSS cited in this research was 3,000, with a response rate of 74%. See: [www.norc.org](http://www.norc.org)
characteristics;” and (2) “do the images people have about ethnic groups influence other attitudes and behaviors toward the groups.” (Smith, 1990, p.1). Results of his research (Table 1) show that Americans generally view minorities negatively on a number of important characteristics. Minority group (including southern whites) scores were subtracted from the (non-southern) white score for each characteristic. The listed scores are the variation from the (non-southern) white mean. If for instance, Whites scored 4 on the Rich/Poor characteristic and Hispanics scored 7, the Hispanic score for Rich/Poor would be -3, the negative score indicating that Hispanics scored closer to the negative characterization.

The findings of Bobo and Kluegel (1991), in another secondary analysis of the 1990 GSS data, provide further support for the assertion that even though whites reject discrimination in principle, they still harbor negative stereotypes towards blacks and Hispanics. Bobo and Kluegel (1991) found that, “Blacks, Hispanics and Asians were rated as less intelligent, more violence prone, lazier, less patriotic and more likely to prefer living off welfare than whites” (1991, p.28). This negative stereotyping is accompanied by a lack of support for policies promoting integration such as school busing, open housing laws, and strong affirmative action programs (Bobo and Kluegel, 1991).

Smith and Sheatsley (1984) and Smith (1988) also acknowledge that, although advances have been made in American race relations, whites will only go so far. Specifically, Smith (1988) found that most black/white interracial contact occurs in the workplace or in public places and that “there is little truly voluntary (italics in original) contact between blacks and whites” (Smith, 1988). In essence, whites were found to
Table 1  Images of Groups Compared to Whites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean (Variance from non-southern white score)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich/Poor</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>+0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So. Whites</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-working/ Lazy</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>+0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So. Whites</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Prone/ Not Violence-Prone</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>+0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So. Whites</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent/ Intelligent</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>+0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So. Whites</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Supporting/ Live-off Welfare</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>+0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So. Whites</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpatriotic/ Patriotic</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So. Whites</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maintain an insulating layer of social distance from blacks as evidenced by their unwillingness to send their children to schools over 50% black, and the small number of whites that had had black dinner guests. Smith and Sheatsley (1984) found that younger whites, as well as those with advanced education and higher socio-economic status (SES), had higher levels of racial tolerance. However, whites were found to “draw the line” (p.53) at the idea of compensating blacks for past inequities or using racial quotas or “special assistance” (p.53) to even the playing field.

Using GSS data, Arthur and Case (1994) tested the hypothesis that race and/or class would affect support of police use of force. Specifically, Arthur and Case (1994) hypothesized that; “males, whites, those with higher socio-economic status, and those who support the existing political structure of advantages and disadvantages (political conservatives) would be expected to be more likely to support the use of force by police than females, blacks, and those with lower socioeconomic statuses” (p.169). Arthur and Case (1994) examined response to the question of approval for police “hitting” a person for the period 1973 to 1991. Results of this study indicated that whites’ support for police use of force held at close to 80% during the 1970’s declining to 70% by 1991. Conversely, black’s support for police use of force increased from 40% to 60% from 1973 to 1990, then dropped to 40% from 1990 to 1991. Women were also found to be less supportive of police use of force.

Arthur and Case (1994) found that those supportive of police use of force were also more likely to believe that poor people were lazy and that the government should do less to help the poor. They were also more in favor of capital punishment and to report that courts treatment of criminals is too lenient. They also believed that blacks are more
violent than whites. Arthur and Case (1994) concluded that, "Those who see blacks, poor people, criminals and pornography users as different types of beings from themselves (violent, lazy and immoral) are more likely favor police violence" (p.178).

The News Media and Racial Stereotyping

The American news media contributes to the formation of race and class stereotypes by inferring that minorities, particularly African-American males, are more violent and criminogenic than whites. Gilliam and Iyengar (2000), in a content analysis of television crime news stories in Los Angeles found that minorities were more often depicted as suspects in violent crimes. Perhaps more troubling was their finding that crime news, in general, was characterized by a "racialized" (p.561) crime script with two key elements: "crime is violent and perpetrators of crime are non-white males" (p.560). Gilliam and Iyengar (2000) then tested the impact of crime scripting on a random sample of Los Angeles residents. Study participants viewed different versions of a fifteen minute newscast video that either depicted no suspect, a white suspect, or a black suspect. They were then asked to complete a questionnaire testing their ability to remember the particulars of the news story.

Subjects in this experiment were most accurate in their recall of a black suspect. Overall, results of this experiment indicated that crime script exposure had a significant influence on participant's attitudes towards crime and race, with the racial element being the dominant cue. Specifically, support for punitive crime policies and a strengthening of "new" racism occurred in white respondents. Conversely, exposure to the crime script

---

3 Defined as a "hidden" or "underground" racism characterized by: "(1) a denial that discrimination against African-Americans continues; (2) a sense that blacks have violated traditional American values of hard
lowered blacks' "support for punitive criminal justice policies" and reduced "their willingness to accept negative characterizations of their group" (p.570).

Racial Attitudes and Police Recruits

The findings presented above strongly suggest that minorities are held in low regard by whites, particularly white males. The prevalence of this negative racial imagery suggests that white police candidates, particularly males, are more likely to be "contaminated" by potentially troublesome levels of negative stereotypy towards minorities prior to entering the police service. White's prejudice towards blacks has been especially problematic in the United States due to the history of black/white relations, and the real, as well as symbolic, role the police have played in that troubled history.

These findings provide support for adding additional measures of tolerance to police hiring regimens. The literature on American racial attitudes discussed in this research suggests that white police candidates, particularly conservative males, are at-risk for possessing a potentially problematic baseline level of racial prejudice—against blacks and Hispanics in particular. Given the positive effects on racial attitudes of social contact (Robinson, 1980), a measure of social distance, such as the Bogardus Social Distance Scale could be added to existing psychological testing regimens. The Bogardus scale utilizes a series of questions structured such that the intensity of association increases with each question. The presumption being that a respondent's willingness to accept a particular level of association presupposes their willingness to accept all of the work and self-reliance; (3) a perception that blacks make illegitimate demands; and (4) the belief that blacks receive undeserved benefits from government." (2000: 566)
associations preceding it (Babbie, 1998). Examples of these types of questions are as follows:

1. Are you willing to permit Hispanics to live in your country?
2. Are you willing to permit Hispanics to live in your community?
3. Are you willing to permit Hispanics to live in your neighborhood?
4. Would you be willing to let a Hispanic live next door to you?
5. Would you let your child marry a Hispanic?

Implementation of this testing protocol would require longitudinal research to determine an appropriate minority acceptance level. Obviously, candidates unwilling to permit minorities to reside in the same neighborhood would be unacceptable as police officer candidates. The findings of Smith (1988) and Robinson (1980) suggest that whites that have had a substantive amount of voluntary social contact with minorities could be the most desirable police candidates. Again longitudinal research designed to measure the success or failure of officers selected under this protocol should accompany the use of the Bogardus scale.

The preceding evidence supports the use of additional screening measures designed to "weed-out" police candidates unsuitable for the unique requirements of Community Oriented Policing. Indeed, it is the public's expectation that the police accomplish their mission free of extra-legal biases, racism being perhaps the most significant. To suggest that white males are unique in harboring prejudices would be unfair, as blacks, women, and other minorities certainly harbor prejudices and are no doubt affected by negative stereotyping in the larger society as well. Minority prejudice towards whites is especially relevant—given the topic of this research—due to the fact that minority residents (particularly young males) of poor inner city neighborhoods harbor a reciprocal amount of negative imagery towards the police (Carter, 2002). What white members of the police
work group, particularly males, must be cognizant of is that in their interactions with the urban minority poor, they carry the burden of overcoming the difficult history of black/white relations in America and the police role in that history.

Racial Stereotyping and the Police Decision Making Process

Oberweis and Musheno (1999) posit that police, by virtue of their coercive powers, are “authoritative directors and choreographers who mark and divide citizens” (1999, p.904). The ramifications of negative racial stereotyping are aptly illustrated in their examination of the impact of citizen characteristics on police decision making. Based on field interviews with predominantly white officers at a municipal police department in the western United States, Oberweis and Musheno (1999) concluded that: “When police come into contact with citizens, they render moral judgments and concoct actions as they tag people with identities and project identities of their own” (1999, p.898). What this means is that certain types of citizens are often painted with a broad brush of criminality based on innocuous characteristics such as manner of speech or clothing style. These assumptions are made at a distance (often from the interior of a patrol car), with little or no meaningful social contact. Two examples from this study are illustrative of the ramifications of the type of stereotype-based decision making common in policing:

An officer identified as “Craig” stated that:

(Police) are not necessarily prejudiced on the basis of skin color or religion....they are prejudiced against the ‘criminal element.’ At the time he was telling me this, an older car—maybe an '88 Pontiac Grand Am—drove past. It lacked hub caps and had some parts of a different color, indicating a visit to the junk yard to repair damage. ‘There’s a criminal’s car,’ Craig said.
Picking out criminals is like a prejudice, he told me, but it's not exactly that. Criminals are not likely to drive around in a Lexus. If they are, those are the hard ones to catch. (Oberweis & Musheno, 1999 p. 907)

In another situation, a Hispanic officer, aware of a "small-time" [Hispanic] marijuana dealer's difficult family circumstances (wife and child, younger siblings residing with his family, inadequate income) sought a less legalistic response to a shooting incident that was essentially self defense on the part of the drug dealer. The [Hispanic] officer's viewpoint was based on his being less socially distant from this individual because he had, "seen people that have worked hard during their lifetimes" (p. 915). In this case, the supervisors' response is illustrative of the social distance existing between whites and minorities:

The supervisors did not share the officer's view that Francisco should go free. The officer himself points to the intersection of race, ethnicity, and class in narrating the discrepancy of opinion. The supervisors were adamant that Francisco be arrested. I didn't care for that idea. I think [that] to them, Francisco was seen as a semi-literate Hispanic. These were white supervisors making the decision (italics in original). The connection between the officer and Francisco in this story demonstrates the division among officers across other identity dimensions and the alternative connections that the officer might make as daily decisions are being made and citizens are being identified as criminal or not criminal. (Oberweis & Musheno, 1999, p. 915)

Oberweis and Musheno (1999) conclude that cop decision making is based on "moral discourse" rather than "legal discourse" (p. 919) and that: "... cops use crude notions of 'badness' in combination with broad categorizations, denying the uniqueness of individuals, and enfolding them into social categories already marked for exclusion and the invocation of coercion (e.g., homeless vs. homeowner; illegal alien vs. citizen)" (p.918).
The Police Personality

When one considers the personality characteristics of those attracted to police work—combined with the aforementioned cultural biases extant in the larger society—the root cause of the crude, uninformed, moralistic stereotyping endemic to policing becomes apparent. Though some debate exists over whether there is a distinct “police personality” (Walker 1986; Carter 2002; Harper et al. 1999), there are certain personality typologies more prevalent in the police work group. Police psychologist Michael D. Roberts has found that in [unpublished] studies of 10,000 police officer applicants, sixty two percent were of the “Alpha” personality type, as measured by the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) (Gough & Bradley, 1996).

The CPI Three Vector Model characterizes the Alpha personality as being steadfast, strong-willed and authoritarian (Gough & Bradley, 1996). Positive Alpha personality traits include instigation of constructive social change, natural leadership ability and excellence in scholarship (Gough & Bradley, 1996). Consistent with the authoritarian component of their personalities, Alphas believe that those that violate societal rules should be disciplined, with force, if necessary and they view those not conforming to conventional values (e.g. out-groups) with hostility (Adorno et al., 1950). Las Vegas (Nevada) Metropolitan Police Department Psychologist, Dr. Harrison Stanton describes

---

4 First theorized as a personality construct by Adorno et al. in The Authoritarian Personality (1950), Harper Bros., N.Y., authoritarians are characterized nine personality traits: 1) Conventionalism: Rigid adherence to conventional, middle-class values. 2) Authoritarian submission: Submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the in-group. 3) Authoritarian aggression: Tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values. 4) Anti-intraception: Opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender-minded. 5) Superstition and stereotypy: The belief in mystical determinants of the individual’s fate; the disposition to think in rigid categories. 6) Power and toughness: Preoccupation with dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension; identification with power figures, exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness. 7) Destructiveness and cynicism: Generalized hostility, vilification of the human. 8) Projectivity: The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses. 9) Sex: Exaggerated concern with sexual “goings-on.”
Alphas as being sensation seeking “Hunters,” attracted to policing for the adventure and excitement stereotypically associated with policing.\(^5\)

In a cross-cultural comparison of police personality typology, Harper et al. (1999) utilized the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) to assess a sample of English, Scottish and American police officers. The sample was divided between Scotland, an American southern state and a police district in Metropolitan London. Recognized as one of the “premier personality scales in the world” (p.5), the 16PF had been validated by Eber (1991) in an unpublished study of American police applicants. Harper et al. (1999) report that Eber (1991) found “…a clear statistical [personality] profile characterized by self-discipline or ‘Control,’ and ‘Tough Poise,’ and ‘Low Anxiety’” (p.5). As the name implies, the 16PF is a measure of sixteen primary personality dimensions, including the five basic personality dimensions recognized by contemporary personality psychologists.

Harper et al. (1999) found that when compared to the general public, police in the three cultures, “were a little warmer, a little less insecure, and more self-sufficient than would be indicated by the norms for the general public; but their scores on Dominance\(^6\) were a defining characteristic for police…” (p.9). Though there were few cross-cultural differences within the police work group, a marked difference was noted between the police and the general public on six dimensions; Boldness, Impulsivity, Dominance, Emotional Stability, Tension, and Self Discipline (see Table 2).

In a study supportive of the questionable effectiveness of current police hiring processes in selecting officers suitable for COP, Reming (1988), found striking

\(^5\) March, 2003 personal interview with author.
\(^6\) Defined as: “Self-assertive, aggressive, competitive. Forceful and direct, tends to tell others just what one thinks of them. Do it their way.” (Harper et al., 1999, p.6).
personality similarities between “Supercops” and “Habitual Criminals.” Utilizing a personality inventory of his own design, the “Reming’s Response Disposition Inventory” (RDI), Reming (1988) administered his inventory to a sample of subjects divided equally into four groups: “Supercops,” Habitual criminals, average police officers, and average citizens. “Supercops” were defined as officers who performed at or above the 90th percentile as indicated by self-initiated felony arrests (e.g. “hunting” ability) in the area they worked for a period of three months. Habitual criminals were defined as criminals with at least five felony arrests and were surveyed while incarcerated in the Los Angeles County Men’s Central Jail. Instrument validity was established by administering the inventory to a sample of supercops and average policemen. Reming (1988) reported a Correlation of .84 between their scores and productivity. Results of this study indicated that supercops and habitual criminals had similar responses to identical stimuli and shared several personality traits, specifically:

...dispositions toward control, aggressiveness, vigilance, rebelliousness, high energy level, frankness in expression, intense personal relationships, high self-esteem, feelings of uniqueness, extroversion, sociability, jealousy, possessiveness of sexual partner, tendency not to change opinions easily, philandering and a tendency to avoid blame (Reming, 1988 p.166).

As evidenced in the preceding studies, the personality characteristics endemic to today’s officers, though perhaps well-suited for the enforcement oriented professional model of policing, are clearly anathema to community oriented policing.

---

7 A “self-report inventory” of “250 adjectives and brief descriptions that were thought to describe both supercops and criminals” (p. 164). These descriptors were based on the author’s observations (besides holding a PhD. in clinical psychology, Reming is a Lieutenant with the LAPD).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16 PF Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boldness</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.526</td>
<td>0.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsivity</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>Ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>16.68</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.557</td>
<td>0.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-disc.</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.401</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05 N=682 England n=42 US n=129 Scotland n=511

*The 16PF norm means and standard deviations for the general population are shown in the first column and are not statistically compared with the three study groups. The P values are the results of comparing the mean scores for the three study group.

The Clinical Analysis Questionnaire Manual (1997) defines the personality dimensions in Table 2 as follows:

**Boldness:** adventurous, bold energetic. Likes being the focus of attention in a group. Enjoying is more important than winning. Quick decision maker.

**Impulsivity:** happy go lucky, lively, enthusiastic. Likes popular music, has more friends than most people, enjoys parties, shows, travel, change and variety.

**Dominance:** most important if certain other items are high. Self-assertive, aggressive, competitive. Forceful and direct, tends to tell others just what one thinks of them. Do it their way.

**Emotional stability:** the lower the score the higher the anxiety; the higher the score the more resources available to handle stress. High scores are not easily distracted and tend to be satisfied.

**Tension:** easily upset and slow to calm down, sleeping difficulty, quick to anger, may be caused by situational factors.

**Self-discipline:** strong control over one’s behavior and emotional life, compulsive.

---
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Police Academy Training

The literature reviewed thus far suggests that police candidates are both at-risk for a potentially problematic level of racial stereotyping and are likely to possess a highly conventional, if not conservative, world view. Having completed the testing/screening process, police candidates must then complete a highly structured academy training regimen. Despite the popularity of COP and the federal funds available to police agencies that have “officially” implemented COP programs (King & Lab, 2000), the content of today’s police academies has changed little since the reform era of the 60’s and 70’s. Haarr (2001), based on a curricula review of 22 U.S. police agencies found that, “More than 90% of basic academy training time is spent on task-oriented training that instructs police recruits in the basic repetitive skills and conditioned responses associated with the reactive nature of the traditional model of policing” (p. 405).

Enforcement oriented topics such as defensive tactics, patrol procedures, weapons training and physical fitness continue to predominate today’s police academies (Haberfeld, 2002). Though the importance of these topics cannot be denied, their prevalence has the effect of reinforcing the idea that policing is a dangerous occupation, requiring physical toughness, weapons proficiency and a “warrior” mentality (Kappeler et al., 1998). This [training] bias towards enforcement activities and preparation for physical, as well as armed combat, comes at the expense of topics such as communication skills and cultural competency.

In most states, police academy training standards are established by Peace Officer Standards and Training (P.O.S.T.) commissions. An examination of the standards in California, New York and Illinois are illustrative of the bias towards “hard” policing...
skills in the typical American police academy (Dunham & Alpert, 2001, p.299). The breakdown of training hours illustrated in Figures 1-3, indicate that substantially less academy training time is spent on human relations training (HU.RELA), while substantially more time is devoted to weapons, defensive tactics, physical training (FORCE), and patrol procedures (ENFORCE). The academy curricula displayed are not all-inclusive and have been edited to better illustrate the aforementioned curriculum biases.

Indeed, closer examination of these curricula show that cultural/diversity training, as a component of human relations training (described as, “police, citizen relations” in Illinois) receives an even smaller portion of the training pie, with officers mandated to receive 24 hours in California, 5 hours in New York, and 6 hours in Illinois. Even though these are minimal training standards—giving agencies the latitude to provide increased training as needed—these statistics provide evidence of the low priority accorded the humanistic component of policing. Given the limited amount of time devoted to culture related topics, one would hope that these courses would utilize up-to-date methodologies, unfortunately, this is not the case in most jurisdictions.

To the extent cultural training exists in academy, as well as in-service training curricula, it continues to follow the awareness/diversity model dating back to the 1940’s (Shusta, et al., 1995). Blakemore et al. (1995) in their critique of police cultural training methods, describe it as a “profit-oriented business” (p.71) utilizing “canned” programs...to transfer ‘known’ blocks of information about specific groups…” (p. 71). Characteristics of this type of training often include cultural “guide-books,” lists of racial

---

9 These POST training mandates can be accessed through the following websites: California: www.post.ca.gov, New York: www.criminaljustice.state.ny.us, Illinois: www.ptb.state.il.us
Figure 1
California POST Training Requirements

Figure 2
New York POST Training Requirements
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fau-pas and the use of civilian race/gender “experts” to teach the classes (Swanson et al., 2001). Blakemore et al. (1995) point out that this standardized, culture specific approach results in profiling minorities, “into a set of common practices, beliefs, behaviors, attitudes” (p.74), in other words, a more refined type of stereotyping.

The traditional awareness/diversity model has a place in police training due to a need to educate officers regarding the ramifications of violating federal discrimination statutes as well as departmental anti-discrimination policies. Additionally, deaths have occurred due to cultural unawareness (Shusta, e al., 1995). Blakemore et al. (1995) suggest police cultural training be “didactic and experiential, encouraging officers to ‘connect’ with the communities they seek to understand” (p.71).
The Police Subculture

Upon completion of academy training, new officers are socialized into a world that has been the topic of numerous literary as well as cinematic works.\(^\text{10}\) The “tough guy” image portrayed in many of these accounts is not far off the mark in that the police subculture is characterized by a type of hyper-masculinity, reinforced by a preoccupation with the [perceived] dangers of the job (Herbert, 1998). This macho attitude is often accompanied by an acute sense of distrust and self-imposed social distancing from those outside of the police work group (Herbert, 1998; Carter, 2002). The end result of this mindset is an “us against them” outlook combined with a feeling that the public lacks an understanding of the hardships and difficulties the police face on a daily basis (Herbert, 1998; Carter, 2002).

Police hostility towards the public is most intense when directed towards “out-groups,” those defined by society as deviating from mainstream morals, values, and behaviors (Kappeler et al. 1998; Carter 2002). Out-groups include law-violators, homosexuals, the poor, and in many cases, racial minorities. Not coincidentally, these characteristics are consistent with the authoritarian aggression component of the authoritarian personality type (Adorno et al. 1950, Altemeyer 1988).

As a result of the much publicized beating of motorist Rodney King by L.A.P.D. officers in 1990, independent commissions were convened to investigate the inner workings of both the L.A.P.D., and the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department

\(^{10}\) The novels of Joseph Waumbaugh, the television series “Adam-12,” and feature length movies such as “Magnum Force” and “Training Day” are but a few examples.
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These reports have provided a rare glimpse into the cultural milieu of two highly regarded metropolitan police agencies—cultures fraught with racism and bias. Given the paucity of cultural training provided to the officers of these agencies, it should come as no surprise that any inroads towards out-group tolerance made in the academy setting are swiftly undone by exposure to the workplace subculture. A quote from an unidentified officer testifying before the Christopher Commission is illustrative of this process:

> It starts with roll call, where you are repeatedly told you must be careful because these people tend to be more aggressive and carry guns...that aggression and force are the only things these people respond to. (p.76)

The results of an internal survey of sworn and civilian staff conducted by the L.A.S.D. Service Oriented Policing Committee (SOP) further illustrates the tolerance contravention occurring as a result of police workplace subculture exposure. Twenty six percent of those surveyed (N=3,764) reported a decrease in ethnic tolerance since joining the department, with 30% of whites, and 14% of other ethnic groups reporting ethnic tolerance decreases (Kolts, 1992). Kolts (1992) found that the L.A.S.D. was, “not effectively addressing important internal racial issues and tensions” (p. 297). Though these findings support the negative influence of the police subculture, the effect of exposure to out-groups is an important consideration in both determining the source of police cultural biases, and the development of appropriate training strategies.

---
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In a longitudinal study of police personnel conducted in Australia, Wortley and Homel (1995) found that police recruits' ethnocentrism and authoritarianism increased with post-academy "field" (street) experience, and that officers working in predominantly Aboriginal districts, “became significantly more ethnocentric” (p. 305). Wortley and Homel’s (1995) finding that ethnic (non-white) officers experienced the same rate of increased ethnocentrism as white officers suggests a degree of race-neutrality in the development of [police] work related biases. Interestingly, this same study found that, “...female participants were generally less ethnocentric and authoritarian than males” (Wortley & Homel, 1995, p. 310). The findings of this study are particularly relevant given the fact that the Australian police have had a troubled relationship with Aboriginal communities, mirroring the difficulties the American police have had with African-American communities (Wortley & Homel, 1995). Aborigines have died while in police custody, clashed on the streets with the police, been shot accidentally by the police, and subjected to the same aggressive policing tactics used in African-American communities (Wortley & Homel, 1995).

In many ways, the American police subculture exhibits the ethos of the violent cultural traditions of the antebellum American south and Western Europe (Butterfield, 1995). Consistent with this cultural model, a culture of honor, police officers attach a great deal of importance to respect for authority, the law, and the officer as an individual. In fact, research indicates that, “police officers feel that lack of respect for the police is
America's primary law enforcement problem" (Carter, 2002, p. 197). In a twist of irony, the communities having the most problematic relationship with the police possess many of the same cultural attributes.

The Culture of the Streets

The decades since the American civil rights movement of the 1960's have seen the rise of a hard-core urban subculture in many of America’s largest cities (Wilson, 1996; Massey & Denton, 1993). Made up primarily of blacks and Hispanics, these communities have been plagued by increasing levels of social, as well as economic isolation from mainstream America (Massey & Denton, 1993). Competing explanations for the rise of the urban minority “underclass” exist, with Wilson (1987), and Massey and Denton (1993) providing two of the more compelling theories. Wilson (1987) posits that the social, educational, and economic gains resulting from the 1960’s civil rights movement were most beneficial to the African American middle and upper classes.

With the removal of impediments to employment, educational and housing opportunities, the African American middle and upper classes departed historically black, urban neighborhoods for the surrounding suburbs, leaving behind the most disadvantaged (Wilson, 1987). The subsequent transformation of the U.S. economy from a labor-intensive manufacturing economy, to a high-tech service economy has resulted in the exportation of manufacturing jobs overseas (Wilson, 1996). The shuttering of steel mills, auto plants and factories has reduced or eliminated the high-wage, low-skill jobs formerly available to urban minority males (Wilson, 1987). This downturn in manufacturing and the accompanying job losses have contributed to the economic decline of America’s
inner-cities, causing a rippling effect, negatively impacting schools and other social services (Wilson, 1987, 1996).

The end result of these shifts in the American economy has been the proliferation of highly impoverished, urban minority communities characterized by, “family instability, welfare dependency, crime, housing abandonment, and low educational achievement” (Massey & Denton, 1993, p.130). Contributing to the breakdown of the moral fiber of these urban communities has been a longstanding and troublesome level of segregation that persists despite federal legislative attempts—such as the Fair Housing Act of 1968 and the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988—to eliminate de facto segregation (Massey & Denton, 1993). Indeed, Massey and Denton (1993) assert that “…one third of all African Americans in the United States live under conditions of intense racial segregation” (p.77). Massey and Denton (1993) blame what they describe as, “American Apartheid” on inadequate Federal policy making to redress longstanding American socioeconomic inequities.

Regardless of one’s theoretical alignment, the fact that a significant number of American minorities live in crime plagued, impoverished conditions cannot be disputed. The deleterious effects of life in structurally disadvantaged neighborhoods have been well documented (Sampson & Laub, 1993). Massey and Denton (1993) assert that segregation has, “…created the structural conditions for the emergence of an oppositional culture that devalues work, schooling, and marriage…that stresses attitudes and behaviors that are antithetical and often hostile to success in the larger economy” (p. 8).

Based on extensive ethnographic research conducted in Philadelphia, Anderson (1999), builds on Miller’s (1958) earlier research on gang delinquency and lower class culture by
providing a contemporary analysis of the cultural milieu endemic to many of America’s impoverished urban minority communities. Anderson (1994, 1999) describes a, “code of the streets,” encompassing a set of values and informal social rules governing behavior. These rules extend to the use of violence to redress grievances, both real and imagined.

A finding that should be of utmost importance to the police is Anderson’s (1994, 1999) finding that the majority of the families living within low-income urban neighborhoods are in fact “decent,” and “committed to middle-class values” (Anderson, 1994, p.1). Anderson (1999) asserts that young people from “decent” families must adopt the dress, speech and mannerisms of the “street” in order to survive the social mandates of the inner-city. Conversely, families with a hard-core, “street” orientation are frequently single-parent, female headed households (Anderson, 1999; Wilson, 1987; Butterfield, 1995). These families are often characterized by parental involvement in criminal behavior, disproportionate use of corporal punishment, and a home life, “fraught with anger, verbal disputes, physical aggression, even mayhem” (Anderson, 1999, p. 49). Gottfredson and Hirshci (1990), as well as others, have established a correlation between ineffective child rearing and criminal/delinquent behavior resulting from lack of self-control. The results of this earlier research provides a theoretical basis in support of Anderson’s (1994, 1999) assertions. Given the police’ propensity to stereotype and paint those living within low-income communities with the broad brush of criminality (Oberweis & Musheno, 1999), developing the ability to discern those that are “decent” from those that are “street,” should be a cultural training priority.

As a result of a longitudinal study of adolescent urban street corner groups (both black and white) in low-income neighborhoods in a “large eastern city” (p.6), Miller (1958)
identified six lower class *Focal Concerns* (see Appendix I). A number of interesting parallels can be drawn between Miller's (1958) Focal Concerns, Anderson's (1999) Code of the Streets, and the police subculture (Herbert, 1998), (Table 3). Three of Miller's (1958) focal concerns, *Toughness, Excitement, and Autonomy* are directly related to police sub-cultural normative orders identified in Herbert's (1998) ethnographic research on the Los Angeles Police Department.

Table 3
*Shared Sub-cultural Characteristics of the Police and Urban Street-Oriented Males*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Urban Street-Oriented Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toughness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Isolation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A closer examination of these similarities reveals the volatility and potential for violence characterizing the relationship between the police and those imbued in the culture of the "street." Within the context of lower class culture, Miller (1958) defines toughness as: "physical prowess, skill; ‘masculinity’; fearlessness, bravery, daring" (p.7). The hard-core "street" oriented males described by Anderson (1994, 1999) exhibit toughness by conveying a message, "that nothing intimidates them; whatever turn the encounter takes, they maintain their attack..." (1994, p. 15). Young men with this orientation do not fear the threat of incarceration, rather they feel that: "The toughening-up one experiences in prison can actually enhance one’s reputation on the streets" (Anderson, 1994, p. 15; Butterfield, 1995). Herbert's (1998) police sub-cultural
normative order of *Adventure/Machismo* encompasses toughness, embodied by the “hard-charging” officer, “willing to rush into dangerous situations,” and “seek out dangerous suspects like gang members” (p. 356). As previously discussed, the disproportionate amount of training time accorded physical fitness and defensive tactics reinforces the message to new recruits that policing is physically dangerous, requiring bravery and the ability to handle physical confrontation.

Miller’s (1958) lower class cultural focal concern of *excitement* encompasses: “thrill; risk, danger; change, activity” (p. 7), characteristics shared with Herbert’s (1998) police sub-cultural normative order of *Adventure/ Machismo*. Herbert (1998) describes officers enjoying the “thrill of the hunt” (p. 356), and hard charging officers seeking the, “adrenaline high that accompanies handling a potentially hazardous call” (p.356).

Miller (1958) defines *autonomy* as: “freedom from external constraint; freedom from superordinate authority; independence” (p.7). Anderson (1994, 1999), Massey and Denton (1993) and Wilson (1987) describe urban minority males as possessing a deep-seated alienation from mainstream society, the response to this alienation has been the development of a culture in opposition to mainstream American values and norms. This opposition extends to law-abiding behavior, as many illegal activities are normative within low-income urban communities (e.g. drug dealing, various forms of violence, theft) (Anderson, 1999; Butterfield, 1995, Miller, 1958).

For the police, *autonomy* is perhaps best exemplified by the conflict between the external controls of administrative polices and directives from “the brass,” (Lieutenants and above), and the internal controls and norms of the workgroup (e.g. squad, or team, usually supervised by a Sergeant) (Swanson et al., 2001). Carter (2002) describes officers
as being, “irritated by minor organizational rules, ... 'legal technicalities,' and long-winded, sociological explanations” (p. 193). Herbert (1998) describes this process as officers working the street being able to, “exercise discretion as they best see fit” (p. 354) based on, “the accumulated wisdom that comes with street savvy, not the stodgy rules promulgated by management cops” (p. 354). An extreme example of this type of autonomy is best exemplified by the LAPD Rampart Division scandal.

Located a few miles west of downtown Los Angeles, the Rampart Division was (and still is) home to numerous, primarily Hispanic, gang members (Report of the Independent Review Panel, 2000). With a departmentally sanctioned mandate to clean-up the Rampart area gang problem, the Rampart anti-gang unit (Community Resources Against Street Hoodlums, or CRASH) exercised a degree of autonomy and lawless behavior that ultimately resulted in perhaps the worst case of police abuse of authority in the history of the LAPD (Report of the Independent Review Panel, 2000). The investigation into this incident uncovered widespread criminal behavior—planted evidence, excessive force, perjury, theft—all of this occurring largely due to lack of management oversight (Report of the Independent Review Panel, 2000).

Within lower class culture, Miller (1958) describes a dichotomy wherein the need for autonomy is expressed overtly in the form of a “...strong and frequently expressed resentment of the idea of external controls, restrictions on behavior, and unjust or coercive authority” (p. 12). Despite this overt statement of a desire for autonomy, Miller (1958) points to behavior patterns as being indicative of a covert need for external control. Miller points to lower class individuals seeking restrictive environments—armed forces, prisons, mental hospitals—as an expression of the covert desire for, “highly
restrictive social environments wherein stringent external controls are maintained over their behavior” (p.12).

In an interesting twist of irony, both the police and those invested in the oppositional culture of the streets attach a great deal of importance to respect. Anderson (1994, 1999) describes the need for respect as a, “form of social capital” (p.66) resulting from the denial or unavailability of other forms of capital. The importance attached to the idea of respect occurs as a direct result of the disadvantaged social conditions and dysfunctional family life extant in low-income minority communities (Anderson, 1994, 1999). Children raised within this type of environment quickly learn that power and influence is accorded those with violent reputations, ready to fight at a moments notice (Anderson, 1994, 1999). Even children from “decent” families learn that: “A person’s public bearing must send the unmistakable, if sometimes subtle, message that one is capable of violence, and possibly mayhem, when the situation requires it, that one can take care of oneself” (Anderson, 1999, p.72).

This “campaign” for street respect extends to material possessions: “Jackets, sneakers, gold jewelry, even expensive firearms, reflect not just taste…but also the willingness to possess things that may require defending” (Anderson, 1999, p.73). In “Going For Bad” (p.14), Anderson (1994) describes a process wherein the most socio-economically dispossessed young men develop a fearlessness extending to death and law enforcement: “Many are uncertain about how long they are going to live and believe they could die violently at any time….street oriented boys are much more concerned about the threat of ‘justice’ at the hands of a peer than at the hands of the police” (p.15). The concept of the “bad man,” willing to use violence in response to any insult, real or perceived
(particularly against whites), has a long history in America’s African American communities (Butterfield, 1995). Butterfield (1995) describes this history succinctly:

All this violence was not simply pathology. It grew out of the old white Southern code of honor, an extreme sensitivity to insult and the opinion of others. But where antebellum whites believed they were above the law, blacks at the turn of the century realized they were outside of the law. The law was in the hands of the white man, the oppressor, and consequently, violence was the only alternative to resolving quarrels. (p.63)

Respect, is without doubt, a central tenet of the police subculture. Police officers expect citizens to respect both the law, and their authority as enforcers of the law (Carter, 2002). Carter (2002) asserts that officers, “attach symbolic importance to their uniform, especially when their authority is challenged…” (p.198). Whereas street oriented males wear distinctive clothing and often possess firearms as symbols of their readiness to revert to violence, the police wear uniforms and gun belts bristling with weaponry as symbols of their ability to do the same. Herbert (1998) describes disrespect for police authority as being an, “anathema to officers” (p.359) that can result in violence.

An extreme example of the treatment accorded those disrespectful of police authority is exemplified in the beating administered to Rodney King at the end of his vehicular pursuit with officers of the Los Angeles Police Department in 1991. Herbert (1998) found that officers increased the intensity of their patrols in areas where their authority had been resisted as a way to, “reestablish a sense of police control over an unruly space” (p.360).

The sub-cultural similarities discussed thus far illustrate the potentially volatile relationship between the police and “street” oriented urban males. These similarities extend to manner of dress, as both groups wear distinctive clothing, and perhaps most

---

13 Mr. King was beaten severely by the officers, all the while being videotaped by a nearby resident.
problematic, both groups more often than not, possess firearms. The fact that homicides involving firearms have been the leading cause of death for African-American males ages 15 through 19 since 1969, and that African-American juveniles were six times more likely than white juveniles to be homicide victims is stark testament to the prevalence of firearms within African-American communities (Kelley, et al., 1997). In a finding supportive of the relationship between violence and respect (Anderson, 1994, 1999), the United States Department of Justice (USDOJ, 1999) found that two-thirds of juvenile respondents to a nationwide survey reported that they carried firearms for “protection and respect” (p.7), and that 9 percent of the respondents felt that: “It is okay to shoot someone who disrespected you” (p.7).

The goal of the preceding literature review has been to establish the need for police cultural training extending beyond the boundaries of the traditional racial characteristics approach. This paper will now seek to answer the research questions of whether there is evidence of a problematic relationship between the police and urban minorities and whether insufficient cultural training was identified as part of that problem.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The sample of this study comprised 12 municipal police departments subjected to United States Department of Justice (USDOJ) Civil Rights Division investigations under the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14141). The relevancy of utilizing Section 14141 complaints as a measure of police/ community relationships can be found in the legislative roots of Section 14141. The Police Accountability Act (PAA) of 1991, though never enacted into law, was developed as a result of congressional concerns over the Rodney King beating and evidence of widespread, often race-based harassment and misconduct by law enforcement agencies nationwide (USDOJ). The 1991 PAA is significant because the content of Section 14141 was drawn from the first two sections of the PAA (USDOJ).

Agencies chosen for this analysis were culled from public records readily available on the USDOJ (Civil Rights Division) website.\footnote{http://www.usdoj.gov} The USDOJ was utilized as an informational source due to the fact that agencies under investigation by the USDOJ Civil Rights Division are subjected to thorough, unbiased investigations of practices, policies, and procedures by Department of Justice investigators unaffiliated with the jurisdiction under scrutiny. Investigative techniques commonly include: Interviews with all levels

\footnote{http://www.usdoj.gov}
police agency staff, review of policies, procedures and other relevant documents, attending in-service and academy training classes, interviews with police union officials, members of the community and review of internal investigations conducted by the agency in question. Public access to this type of police malpractice information would be nearly impossible to obtain directly from these agencies due to the confidentiality of internal investigations.

The sample is made up of the following agencies: Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles, California; Detroit Police Department, Detroit, Michigan; Buffalo Police Department and Schenectady Police, Buffalo and Schenectady, New York; Cleveland, Cincinnati, Columbus, and Steubenville Police Departments, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Columbus, and Steubenville, Ohio; Miami Police Department, Miami, Florida; Washington Metropolitan Police, Washington D.C., Portland Police Department, Portland, Maine; Pittsburgh Police Department, Pittsburgh Pennsylvania. These cities were chosen because they are regionally representative and include cities ranging from large (Los Angeles) to small (Steubenville) in size. They were also chosen due to the recency of the investigations and settlements (1997-2003). Cities such as Cincinnati and Detroit were of particular interest due to their having had a history of difficult relations between the police and African Americans (Kerner, 1968).

United States Code (U.S.C.) Section 14141 empowers the U.S. Attorney General, based on probable cause, to initiate a civil action against law enforcement, or other criminal justice agencies that deprive persons of constitutional rights, privileges, or immunities (USDOJ). Civil remedies enacted under the provisions of Section 14141 are
defined as providing, “appropriate, equitable and declaratory relief to eliminate the pattern or practice” (USDOJ).

Data Limitations

Assessing the need for cultural/diversity training in police agencies is a difficult proposition given the insular nature of American policing. Uncensored access to the inner workings of police agencies usually occurs as the result of scandal (e.g., Rodney King, LAPD Rampart) and is supported by legal mandate. The measures utilized in this study—the content of federal investigations—suggest that public concern over police practices in the sample jurisdictions had met some critical threshold. Identifying this threshold—the degree to which a community will tolerate police abuse and/or misconduct—exceeds the scope of this research.

Other questions left unanswered revolve around the race/gender characteristics of the officers generating the complaints, these questions include: Are complaints against these agencies generated by “a few bad apples,” or are they indicative of a more widespread level of incompetence? Are white male officers more likely to generate complaints related to culture/diversity than female, Latino, and/or African American officers? Macro-level demographic statistics for agency personnel (for agencies reporting such information) have been included in this analysis to shed some light on this question. Again, a more finite analysis, requiring access to internal police investigation records, would be required to determine whether white officer’s relations with minorities in these communities were more problematic than non-whites. Another question arising from this data, related to the idea of a community police abuse threshold, is whether these cases in
fact represent the tip of an iceberg of more widespread police authoritarian aggression visited upon America's minority communities?

Analysis Strategy

A fundamental question sought to be answered by this analysis is whether shortcomings in cultural diversity training have been identified within police departments subject to federal scrutiny under Section 14141. The content of these investigations generally cover a wide range of police activities (e.g., use of canines, video cameras, citizen complaint procedures, etc.), many of which exceed the purpose of this research.

Due to the broad scope of many of the investigations, selected aspects of investigative findings, memorandums of agreement, complaints and resolutions were chosen. In order to test the hypothesis that the police/minority community relationship was problematic in the sample cities, Department of Justice investigative findings were analyzed for training and/or policy deficiencies in the following areas; culture/diversity, force, and Fourth Amendment rights. The choice of these variables was not based on order of importance by DOJ investigators, but rather as their being “red light” indicators of difficult police/citizen relations.

Culture/diversity, as operationalized within this research, is the police relationship with ethnic minorities and other groups not of the majority (e.g., mentally ill, homosexuals). Force was chosen as being suggestive of both a breakdown in communication resulting from the clash of the male dominated police and street subcultures, and a manifestation of authoritarian hostility toward out-groups consistent with the CPI Alpha personality type (most prevalent in policing). The validity of physical
force as being indicative of out-group hostility becomes evident when one considers the historical context of acts committed against populations vilified as the enemy during wartime.

Shortly after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, tens of thousands of Americans of Japanese descent were rounded up and placed in concentration camps for the duration of the war (Takaki, 1989; Weglyn-Nishiura 1996). This occurred despite overwhelming evidence of Japanese American loyalty towards the United States and with little protest from their fellow American citizens (Nishiura-Weglyn, 1996). During the Vietnam war, unspeakable atrocities were committed against those identified as the “enemy,” perhaps the most well publicized being the execution of women, children and the elderly at the village of My Lai 4 (Karnow, 1983; Langguth, 2000).

In describing Lt. William Calley, one of the protagonists in the massacre, Langguth (2000) explains how the Vietnamese were dehumanized during Calley’s training by being referred to as “gooks,” “slants,” or “dinks” (Langguth, 2000). As a result his training, Calley learned that, “…you could never trust a Vietnamese. Any one of them might do you in” (Langguth, 2000, p.498). In effect, the Vietnamese of My Lai 4 became “symbolic assailants” occupying an “assailant geography,” an entire community perceived as threatening (Crank, 1999). The implications of this process of dehumanization and the accompanying use of excessive force becomes apparent when one considers the actions of police units given a mandate to aggressively police high-crime minority neighborhoods.
The shooting of unarmed West African immigrant Amadou Diallo in 1999 by the New York Police Department’s Street Crimes Unit (SCU)\(^{15}\) and the beatings and other abuses of the LAPD’s Rampart area anti-gang unit (Community Resources Against Street Hoodlums, CRASH)\(^{16}\) provide examples of the degree to which police will inflict undue force on those identified as the “enemy.” Research suggests that African-American, and to a lesser extent, Hispanic males have been culturally defined as threatening the status quo, a threat that has resulted in aggressive, war-like policing (Miller, 1996; Parenti, 1999).

The link between Fourth Amendment (Search and Seizure) violations and cultural conflict becomes evident when the nature of these police/citizen contacts is considered. Under the landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Terry v. Ohio* (1968), justification for police decisions to stop-and-frisk have been based on the individual officer’s reasonable suspicion, based on facts articulated and observed—by the officer—that the person in question may be involved in criminal behavior and may be armed and dangerous. The officer’s training and experience have been recognized by the courts as relevant factors in determining what behaviors are sufficient to arouse reasonable suspicion. In *Terry*, and subsequent Fourth Amendment cases, the Supreme Court has conceived a “raceless world...a constructed reality in which most police officers do not act on the basis of consideration of race, the facts underlying a search or seizure can be evaluated without examining the influence of race...” (Thompson, 1999, p.962).

\(^{15}\) Four white officers fired a total of 41 shots, striking Diallo 19 times as he was trying to remove his wallet from his pocket. The officers were subsequently acquitted of any wrong doing. See: *Learning From the Diallo Case*, New York Times, Editorial Desk, May 5, 2001, p.1 Available: http://www.nytimes.com

\(^{16}\) Rampart CRASH was given a broad mandate to aggressively address gang activity in the densely populated, largely Hispanic Rampart neighborhood adjacent to downtown Los Angeles. Operating with little supervisory oversight, officers assigned to this unit committed a variety of illegal acts to include theft, beatings of suspects, and perjury. See: Parks, Bernard, C., (March 1, 2000) *Los Angeles Police Department Board of Inquiry into the Rampart Area Corruption Incident, Public Report* Available: www.lapd.org

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Given the discretionary nature of many police/citizen contacts, the idea that somehow race, and what society has defined as the “symbolic assailant…persons who signal danger, based upon dress, mannerisms, or language” (Carter, 2002, p. 199), is somehow disregarded during the police decision making process is naïve in the extreme. In order to test for socio-demographic conditions conducive to the development of an oppositional “street” culture within the sample municipalities, U.S. Census (2000) data have been analyzed for the presence of both racial segregation and an accompanying threshold poverty rate of 30 to 40 percent. The use of census tract data and poverty thresholds in the 30th to 40th percentile as a measure of “ghettoization” (and the accompanying “street” cultural milieu) have been utilized by Wilson (1996), Massey and Denton (1993), and Jargowsky and Bane (1991). Given these measurement parameters, it is expected that USDOJ investigations of police activity will be associated with cities characterized by segregated populations of impoverished minorities.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Demographic statistics for both the cities and police departments in this analysis (Tables 4 & 5) support findings in the literature (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2000) that police misconduct and disparate treatment of minorities is not limited to agencies dominated by white males. Despite their having minority workforce percentages exceeding those of whites, Detroit, Miami, and Washington D.C. have been subjected to Section 14141 investigations.

Census tract maps for the municipalities in this analysis, depicting racial segregation as well as individual poverty rates (Figures 4-41), provide graphic evidence of the alarming degree of segregation in many of America's largest cities. Notably, Massey and Denton (1993) have previously identified Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, and Los Angeles as being “hypersegregated” (p.76) along five dimensions:

...blacks may be distributed so that they are overrepresented in some areas and underrepresented in others, leading to different degrees of unevenness; they may also be distributed so that their racial isolation is ensured by virtue of rarely sharing a neighborhood with whites. In addition, however, black neighborhoods may be tightly clustered to form one large contiguous enclave or scattered about in checkerboard fashion; they may be concentrated within a very small area or settled sparsely throughout the urban environment. Finally, they may be spatially centralized around the urban core or spread out along the periphery.
Table 4
Demographic profiles of municipalities with police agencies subjected to USDOJ Civil Rights Division investigations (U.S. Census, 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/State</th>
<th>%White</th>
<th>%Black</th>
<th>%Hispanic (of any race)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, OH.</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, OH.</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, OH.</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, NY.</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady, NY.</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, FL.</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA.</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI.</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, ME.</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steubenville, OH.</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics indicate minority population greater than white population.

Table 5
Percent of full-time sworn employees in 1997 by race/ethnicity and gender for agencies selected for analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/State</th>
<th>%Male</th>
<th>%Female</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Black</th>
<th>% Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, OH.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, OH.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, OH.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, NY.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady, NY.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, FL.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data for this table drawn from Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) 1997 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics Survey (LEMAS).

**1993 LEMAS statistics indicated the Portland, Maine, Police department was 92.9% male, 7.1% female, and 100% white. Demographic data unavailable for Steubenville, Ohio Police Department.

***Italics indicate minority population greater than white population.
Table 6 illustrates Massey and Denton’s (1993) dimensions of black segregation in nine of the cities represented in the present analysis. Massey and Denton’s (1993) dimensions of segregation are readily apparent in the population distribution of minorities within the cities represented in the present analysis (Figures 4-41). Current (2000) U.S. Census data suggests that despite the passage of time, America is still a nation divided, racially, as well as economically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Uneveness</th>
<th>Isolation</th>
<th>Clustering</th>
<th>Centralization</th>
<th>Concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington D.C.</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hypersegregation threshold: 60+

A city by city analysis of the specifics of DOJ investigative findings suggests that police agencies operating in segregated municipalities continue to have problematic relationships with minority communities. Racial groups utilized to measure segregation were limited to African Americans and whites due to their constituting the majority population in most of the sample cities and the historical significance of conflict between African Americans and the police (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders...
Hispanics were included in the analysis of Los Angeles and Miami due to their substantial population percentages, 46.5% and 65.8 % respectively. The Hispanic/ Latino population in the remainder of the cities ranged between 7.9% (Washington D.C.) and 1% (Steubenville, Ohio), an insignificant number for the purposes of this analysis. Individual analyses are followed by census tract maps illustrative of the degree of segregation, as well as individual poverty rates in each city.

Los Angeles

The largest city in this analysis, Los Angeles, California has a population of 3,694,820 (U.S. Census, 2000). Forty six percent (1,734,036) of Los Angeles’ population is white, eleven percent (415,195) is African American and forty six percent (1,719,073) is Hispanic or Latino of any race (U.S. Census, 2000). As depicted in Figure 4, Los Angeles’ white population is concentrated in the northern and western portions of the city, outlying suburban areas. Figures five and six provide evidence of both clustering and concentration as homogeneous neighborhoods of African Americans and Hispanics can be found in the south central and eastern portions of Los Angeles respectively.

The graphic representation of individual poverty levels in Figure 7 indicates that many of Los Angeles’ ethnic enclaves are “ghettoized,” with poverty rates exceeding Wilson (1996), Jargowsky and Bane (1991) and Massey and Denton’s (1993) recognized threshold of 30 to 40 percent. Indeed several neighborhoods fall within the range of 52-100 percent. These concentrations of impoverished minorities in neighborhoods characterized by the structural inequities endemic to low-income areas are no doubt characterized by an “oppositional” or “street” culture (Wilson, 1996; Jargowsky and
Bane, 1991). Against this backdrop, the LAPD has been the subject of repeated investigations into its treatment of minorities (Report of the Independent Commission on the Los Angeles Police Department, 1991).

With the LAPD still reeling from the fallout from the Rodney King beating incident and subsequent civil unrest in 1992, another scandal, perhaps the worst in the agency’s history, was uncovered in 2000 involving the Rampart Division anti-gang unit (Report of the Rampart Independent Review Panel, 2000). Located a few miles west of downtown Los Angeles (Figure 6), the gang infested, predominantly Hispanic Rampart area has the highest population density of the city, with 33,790 people per square mile in an area totaling 7.9 square miles (Report of the Rampart Independent Review Panel, Executive Summary, 2000). The investigation into this incident uncovered serious criminal activity perpetrated by police officers, occurring largely due to a breakdown in supervision and management (Report of the Rampart Independent Review Panel, 2000). Subsequent to the Rampart scandal, an investigation of the LAPD was initiated by the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice (DOJ) under 42 U.S.C., Section 14141. The results of this investigation indicated that LAPD was, “engaging in a pattern or practice of excessive force, false arrests, and unreasonable searches and seizures in violation of the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution” (Lee, 2000).

In a letter to Los Angeles Mayor James K. Hahn summarizing the DOJ findings, Acting Assistant Attorney General (Civil Rights Division) Bill Lann Lee (2000) reported that:
...the LAPD's pattern or practice of police misconduct includes: the unconstitutional use of force by LAPD officers, including improper officer-involved shootings; improper seizures of persons, including making police stops not based on reasonable suspicion and making arrests without probable cause; seizures of property not based on probable cause; and improper searches of persons and property with insufficient cause (p.1).

As a result of this investigation, the LAPD is currently under a Federal Consent Decree affecting many aspects of its operations. Many training shortcomings, including cultural diversity, were identified as requiring significant and ongoing improvement. The content of cultural diversity training was specified to include, "...training on interactions with persons of different races, ethnicities, religious groups, sexual orientations, persons of the opposite sex, and persons with disabilities, and also community policing..."^17.

---

Figure 5  African American population distribution in Los Angeles, CA., 2000

Figure 6  Hispanic population distribution in Los Angeles, CA., 2000
Detroit

As indicated in Table 7 and illustrated in Figures 8 and 9, Detroit, Michigan is one of the most highly segregated large cities in the United States (Massey and Denton, 1993). With a total population of 951,270, Detroit is one of the few cities in America with a majority minority (African American in this case) population of 775,772 (81.6%) (U.S. Census, 2000). Detroit’s whites are clustered and highly concentrated on the south side of the city (Figure 9). As depicted in Figure 10, the majority of neighborhoods characterized by “ghetto” levels of poverty (exceeding 30 to 40 percent) coincide with high concentrations of African Americans, necessary precursors for the “street” or “oppositional culture” of urban minority neighborhoods. Though police activity and deployment were not addressed in this investigation, the literature is supportive of the assertion that areas of highly concentrated poverty, would be characterized by high crime.
rates (e.g., narcotics sales and use, gang activity) and an accompanying intensification of police activity in the form of increased patrols, gang enforcement, narcotics raids, etc. (Parenti, 1999; Miller, 1996).

The results of the DOJ investigation of the Detroit Police Department (DPD) under 42 U.S.C., Section 14141 reveal a department with few force options, inadequate force reporting procedures and external complaint procedures lacking important checks and balances. These shortcomings were outlined in a March 6th, 2002 letter to City of Detroit Corporate Counsel Ruth Carter from DOJ Special Litigation Chief Steven H. Rosenbaum. With officers limited to carrying firearms and chemical spray, there exists the possibility of “the use of excessive force in situations where chemical spray may be an inappropriate option, but the use of deadly force is not justified” (Rosenbaum, 2002a).

Deficiencies in DPD force policies were noted including officers, “not required to report uses of force other than uses of firearms and chemical spray, unless the use of force results in a visible injury or complaint of injury” (Rosenbaum, 2002a, p.2). Other policy shortcomings included lack of supervisory evaluation of force incidents. The absence of sufficient procedural guidelines in a critical area such as force is suggestive of an organizational environment wherein illegal violence against out-groups could be easily justified or covered-up. Shortcomings were also noted in in-service training with additional annual training mandated for: use of force, legal developments, diversity, police integrity and force de-escalation techniques as a way to avoid or minimize the use of force. Though the DOJ investigative findings do not elaborate on the specific shortcomings or content of “diversity” training relevant to this investigation, given the history of police/community relations in Detroit (Kerner, 1968), and the degree
socioeconomic segregation (Figures 8-10), it would be safe to infer that a cultural conflict exists between the police and low-income urban minorities.

Figure 8  White population distribution in Detroit, MI, 2000

Figure 9  African American Population Distribution in Detroit, MI, 2000
Figure 10  Individual poverty rates in Detroit, MI, 2000

Buffalo

The population distribution of Buffalo, New York continues to be characterized by the “hypersegregation” described by Massey and Denton (1993). Figures 11 and 12 graphically illustrate a city racially divided, with highly concentrated enclaves of African Americans and whites. An illustration of individual poverty rates (Figure 13) indicates that Buffalo’s most impoverished neighborhoods, those exceeding the 30 to 40 percent “ghettoization” threshold (Wilson, 1996; Jargowsky and Bane, 1991) are either ethnically heterogeneous or predominantly African American. The correlation between ethnic heterogeneity, poverty, and the concomitant development of a cultural milieu at odds with mainstream society is well established in the criminological research literature (Shaw and McKay, 1942, 1969; Sutherland, 1947; Wilson, 1987; Akers, 2000).
The focus of the Department of Justice (DOJ) investigation into the Buffalo Police Department (BPD) concerned the use of “Chemical Agent Propellant” (CAP) spray—a type of chemical irritant used to subdue resistant subjects. In a September 2002 DOJ Memorandum of Agreement with the City of Buffalo, notable training deficiencies included, “use of verbal de-escalation techniques as an alternative to the use of CAP spray and other uses of force…” and “…periodic training in integrity and ethics. This training shall cover the duties of truthfulness, the importance of avoiding misconduct, and professionalism” (Boyd, 2002, p.4).

The DOJ investigation of the BPD gave no indication that racial tension, or race as a general issue, was problematic. At best, the findings with regards to force and the need for de-escalation techniques are suggestive of too much discretion, a situation wherein officers are guided by their personal beliefs and feelings, rather than objective reasoning and sound policies. Given the topic of the present research, the implication is that absent sufficient policies and procedures related to force, police officers will be unduly influenced by personal racial stereotypes and race biased threat assessments, Crank’s (1999) “symbolic assailants.”
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Figure 11  White population distribution in Buffalo, N.Y., 2000
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Figure 12  African American population distribution in Buffalo, N.Y., 2000

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Schenectady

Despite its small size—total population, 61,821—the racial distribution of Schenectady’s population is marked by a significant level of racial segregation (Figures 14 and 15). The majority of Schenectady’s African Americans are both clustered and centralized within the center of the city (Figure 15). As illustrated in Figure 16, census tracts exceeding individual poverty levels of 30 to 40 percent (the aforementioned “ghetto” threshold) are either substantially African American (33.5-44%, Figure 15), or substantially white (Figure 14). The race-neutrality of the socio-cultural effects of poverty in the development of a distinct set of lower-class values and cultural norms has been established in the criminological literature by Miller (1958) and landmark juvenile delinquency research conducted in the 1950’s by Glueck and Glueck, cited and discussed by Sampson and Laub (1993).
The findings of the DOJ investigation of the Schenectady Police Department (SPD) under 42 U.S.C., Section 14141 included significant shortcomings in use of force policy. Indeed, SPD force policy was found to be couched in "...vague language and undefined terms" (Brown-Cutlar, 2003a). This lack of procedural mandate resulted in officers utilizing force as they saw fit:

One officer we spoke with informed us that some uses of force were based on the personal style of an officer and that in a situation where he would question an individual at a distance, another officer would 'yoke' the individual, and yet another officer would force the individual against a wall with his hand twisted behind his back (Brown-Cutlar, 2003a, p.6)

In addition to these policy shortcomings, the DOJ recommended additional in-service training in the following areas: "use of force, search and seizure, legal developments, and police integrity" (Brown-Cutlar, 2003a, p. 31). Specific recommendations regarding the use of force included, "...de-escalation techniques that can help them (police officers) avoid using force or minimize the amount of force used, rather than focusing solely on when an officer is legally justified in using force" (Brown-Cutlar, 2003a, p.31). Though no mention of race or treatment of African Americans was mentioned in the DOJ findings, one could speculate that those that were "yoked," were likely persons perceived by officers to be dangerous—low income minority males.
Figure 14  White population distribution in Schenectady, NY, 2000

Figure 15  African American population distribution in Schenectady, NY., 2000
Columbus

A comparison of Figures 17 and 18 graphically illustrates that Columbus, Ohio (711,470, U.S. Census, 2000) is highly segregated. While high concentrations of whites can be found in the surrounding suburbs, Columbus’ African American’s are clustered in highly concentrated neighborhoods within the central city. Many of these inner-city ethnic enclaves are characterized by poverty levels exceeding 30 to 40 percent, again indicative of “ghettoization.” The level of racial and economic segregation within this city (Figures 17-19), and the fact that the Columbus Police Department is 87 percent male and 85 percent white (Table 6) suggests that friction between the police and minorities would be inevitable, a fact confirmed by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ).
The results of the DOJ investigation of the Columbus Division of Police (CDP) indicated that its officers were, "...engaged in a pattern or practice of using excessive force, making false arrests and lodging false charges, and conducting improper searches and seizures in violation of the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution" (Lee, 2003, p.1). Many of the victims of these abuses were found to be engaged in "ordinary, routine" (Lee, 2003, p.1) activities at the time they were accosted by the police. Additionally, officer misconduct was often "...triggered by the officer's perception that the victim in some way disrespected (italics not in original) the officer, although often the victim's conduct in fact is relatively or completely innocuous" (Lee, 2003, p.1). Not surprisingly, police abuse victims were usually young African Americans, females, or lower class whites. With regards to training, the CPD was found to have "inadequate academy and in-service training," (p.2) lacking a means to review effectiveness.

![White population distribution in Columbus, OH., 2000](Figure 17)
Figure 18  African American population distribution in Columbus, OH., 2000

Figure 19  Individual poverty distribution in Columbus, OH., 2000
Cleveland

With a total population of 478,403 (U.S. Census, 2000), Cleveland, Ohio has a majority African American population of 51 percent and a minority white population of 41.5 percent. Cleveland's African Americans are clustered and concentrated on the northeast side of the city, while whites are concentrated in the southwest (Figures 20 and 21). Indeed a border of sorts separates Cleveland's African American and white populations. An examination of Cleveland's individual poverty rates (Figure 22) indicates that the most impoverished neighborhoods (again, using the 30 to 40 percent "ghettoization" standard) are either predominantly African American or somewhat heterogeneous (Figures 20-22). Another matter of significance given the present analysis, is the fact that the Cleveland Police Department is not representative of the community it serves (Table 6), a shortcoming identified at least thirty six years ago (Kerner, 1968).

The DOJ investigation of the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) revealed several shortcomings, including; force documentation and investigation, traffic and pedestrian stops, and inadequate cultural diversity training. Based on a review of force investigations for the period 1998-2000, DOJ investigators revealed an alarming level of investigative incompetence. Findings included failure to document interviews of victims, suspects, police or civilian witnesses (Rosenbaum, 2002b). Other shortcomings included failure "to document the location of all physical evidence, perform standard gunshot residue tests, locate other forensic evidence, or take relevant photographs" (Rosenbaum, 2002b, pp.4-5). If this weren't enough, several of the investigations were found to have been investigated by the supervisor involved in the incident (Rosenbaum, 2002b).
With regards to traffic and pedestrian stops, the DOJ has suggested the CDP implement procedures designed to obtain and track demographic data of those stopped by the police. The DOJ has suggested that in designing this initiative, the CDP utilize “diverse” members of the community as well as police staff. Data to be collected includes; “race/ethnicity and date of birth of person stopped, the basis for the stop, whether a search or frisk of the person or vehicle was conducted, whether the search was consensual” (Rosenbaum, 2002b, pp.12-13), and a number of other variables related to the nature of the police/citizen contact. The DOJ has recommended that the CDP “audit recruit and in-service training and provide in-service cultural diversity training” (Rosenbaum, 2002b, p.16). During their observation of CDP in-service training courses DOJ investigators saw that officers were ignoring the lecturer and working on crossword puzzles and reading the newspaper (Rosenbaum, 2002b). The findings of this investigation suggest that the CDP is both at-odds with Cleveland minorities, and loath to implement policies designed to foster police accountability.
Figure 20  White population distribution in Cleveland, OH., 2000

Figure 21  African American population distribution in Cleveland, OH., 2000
Cincinnati

With a total population of 331,285, Cincinnati, Ohio’s 175,492 (53%) whites are concentrated in sprawling suburban areas outside the center of the city (Figure 23). Cincinnati’s 142,176 (42.9%) African Americans are concentrated within the inner-city core (Figure 24). In a pattern typical of the cities constituting this analysis, the highest levels of individual poverty (exceeding the 30-40 percent “ghettoization” threshold) are found within neighborhoods that are either predominantly African American or somewhat ethnically heterogeneous (Figure 25). Despite the fact that workforce diversity shortcomings were identified within the Cincinnati Police Department (CPD) as long ago as 1968 (Kerner, 1968), the CPD has yet to achieve a police force representative of its community. Current Bureau of Justice Statistics (1997) indicate the CPD as being 83% male, 73% white, and 26% African American (Table 6).
The DOJ investigation into the policies and practices of the Cincinnati Police Department (CPD) has resulted in a Memorandum of Agreement between the City of Cincinnati, its police department and the Federal Government (Ashcroft, 2002). Consistent with the majority of the agencies in this analysis, DOJ investigators noted shortcomings in force policy, force documentation, the citizen complaint process and training. The nature of the use of force policy deficiencies within the CPD are suggestive of an overly aggressive policing style. Suggested force policy revisions included, "...de-escalation techniques, such as disengagement, area containment, surveillance, waiting out a subject, summoning reinforcements or calling in specialized units..."\(^\text{18}\)

Other DOJ mandates designed to reign-in the CPD included procedural limitations and better accountability of chemical spray deployment, canine use, "beanbag" (low-lethality) shotguns and 40 millimeter foam rounds (Ashcroft, 2002). Training mandates included; "proper use of force decision making...the Fourth Amendment and other constitutional requirements...scenarios that illustrate proper use of force decision making...de-escalation techniques...threat assessment...additional training on interacting with people with mental illness," and "handling citizen complaints with an emphasis on interpersonal skills" (Ashcroft, 2002, p.21). Again the sum total of these findings are suggestive of an overly aggressive, militaristic style of policing, at-odds with Federal Community Oriented Policing initiatives.
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Figure 23  White population distribution in Cincinnati, OH., 2000

Figure 24  African American population distribution in Cincinnati, OH., 2000
Figure 25 Individual poverty levels in Cincinnati, OH., 2000

Steubenville

Despite its small size, the city of Steubenville, Ohio exhibits socio-demographic conditions predictive of the development of an “oppositional” or “street culture.” With a total population of 19,015 (U.S. Census, 2000), Steubenville is the least populous municipality in this analysis. Steubenville’s limited number of African Americans (3,281/17.3%) are clustered within the central core of the city within ethnically heterogeneous neighborhoods (Figure 27). On the other hand, Steubenville’s whites are concentrated in the racially homogeneous outlying suburban areas (Figure 26). A comparison of Figures 26 and 27 indicates that neighborhoods with the highest percentage of African Americans (50.6%) contain an almost equal number of whites (45.3%). As depicted in Figure 28, the ethnic heterogeneity of these neighborhoods coincides with the highest poverty levels (exceeding the 30 to 40 % “ghettoization” ratio). Given the physical separation and
isolation of Steubenville’s poorest whites and African Americans, one could predict
difficulties with the police/community interface, a prediction confirmed by the USDOJ.

The content of the Consent Decree between the City of Steubenville Police
Department (SPD) and the federal government suggests a problematic relationship
between the police and the city’s minorities. The Department of Justice (DOJ) found that
the SPD, “engaged in a pattern or practice of conduct that deprives persons of rights,
privileges, or immunities secured and protected by the Constitution and laws of the
United States…” (Zealey et al., 1997). Additionally, the City of Steubenville and its
Director of Public Safety were found to have, “caused and condoned this conduct through
inadequate policies and failure to train, monitor, supervise, and discipline police officers,
and to investigate alleged misconduct” (Zealey et al., 1997).

An examination of DOJ training mandates provides further evidence of the difficult
relationship between the SPD and Steubenville’s African American community.
Department of Justice recommendations included: “…leadership training, which shall be
mandatory for all supervisors, and shall include command accountability, integrity, and
cultural diversity” (Zealey et al., 1997, p.3). Additional training mandates included entry-
level and in-service training on the following topics:

Cultural diversity. This training shall be by qualified instructors, and
shall include, at a minimum, training on police interactions with
persons from different racial, ethnic, and religious groups, and
persons of the opposite sex. The City also shall provide training in
communications skills and avoiding improper racial, ethnic, and
sexual communications.

Uses of force, including verbal de-escalation techniques as an
alternative to the use of force and other tactics for avoidance of
confrontation. Such training also shall cover the proper application
of various types of force, as well as examples of situations that do
not require the use of force but may be mishandled, resulting in force being used (for example, individuals verbally challenging an officer’s authority or asking for an officer’s identifying information).

Integrity and ethics. This training shall cover the duties of truthfulness and reporting misconduct by fellow officers, the importance of avoiding misconduct, professionalism, and the duty to cooperate in misconduct investigations (Zealey et al., 1997, p.3).

The results of the Steubenville investigation provide evidence of a conflict between the police and minorities that is not limited to America’s largest cities. The Steubenville investigation suggests that African Americans are at-risk for police abuse anywhere in America.

Figure 26 White population distribution in Steubenville, OH., 2000
Figure 27  
African American population distribution in Steubenville, OH., 2000

Figure 28  
Individual poverty levels in Steubenville, OH., 2000
Miami

The city of Miami, Florida has a total population of 362,470 (U.S. Census, 2000). Of that population, the largest minority group, 238,351 (65.8%) is Hispanics or Latinos of any race (U.S. Census, 2000). African Americans constitute 22.3% of Miami’s total population (U.S. Census, 2000). The spatial distribution of these groups follows a pattern of segregation consistent with the other cities within this analysis. Miami’s whites occupy racially homogenous neighborhoods on the south side of the city (Figure 29). African Americans are concentrated in the northern portion of the city (Figure 30), and Hispanics can be found in large concentrations adjacent to the whites in south Miami (Figure 31). A graphic depiction of individual poverty levels (Figure 32) indicates that a substantial number of Miami’s African American neighborhoods exceed the 30 to 40 percent “ghettoization” ratio, a prerequisite for the development of a “street,” or “oppositional” culture.

The DOJ investigation of the Miami Police Department under 42 U.S.C., Section 14141 occurred at the request of both Police Chief Raul Martinez, and Mayor Manuel Diaz (Rosenbaum, 2003). Preliminary results of the DOJ fact finding have found notable shortcomings in use of force policies and reporting, search and seizure guidelines and force training. Procedural shortcomings related to the use of force resulted in a “lack of specific guidance,” that could “lead officers to believe they are justified in using force in situations in which it would be unreasonable or unnecessary” (Rosenbaum, 2003, p.3). With regards to search and seizure, lack of procedural guidelines resulted in officers exercising too much discretion in stop and frisk citizen encounters. Department of Justice investigators reported observing, “…officers making coercive stops in crime suppression
sweeps without it being clear to us that those stops were based on reasonable suspicion that a crime had been or was about to be committed" (Rosenbaum, 2003). This procedural vacuum enabled officers to apply their own subjective standards in effecting Terry stops (Rosenbaum, 2003).

Training recommendations included “de-escalation and regrouping techniques in addition to tactics, to encourage them (police officers) to assess every situation to determine if continued action on their part is the most advisable course” (Rosenbaum, 2003, p.21). Other training shortcomings included training staff emphasis of the officer’s threat perception in deadly force situations, rather than the objective reasonableness standard. Consistent with the other agencies in this analysis, the Miami findings are suggestive of an over-reliance on the use of force, combined with an absence of procedural guidelines and lack of accountability in force reporting and investigation.

Figure 29 White population distribution in Miami, FL., 2000
Figure 30  African American population distribution in Miami, FL., 2000

Figure 31  Hispanic population distribution in Miami, FL., 2000
Given the history of race relations within the United States, it should be to no one’s surprise that the nation’s capital is sharply divided along racial lines between African Americans and whites (Figures 33 and 34). As depicted in Figure 35, many of Washington D.C.’s African American neighborhoods are plagued by critical (exceeding 30-40%) levels of individual poverty. Besides being one of the few cities in this analysis with a majority minority population, Washington D.C., with Detroit and Miami are the only agencies with police forces that are majority minority. Despite a substantive level of minority workforce representation, the Washington Metropolitan Police (MPD) has been subjected to investigation by the USDOJ. The fact that these majority minority agencies have been the subjects of DOJ investigations begs the question of whether negative attitudes towards out-groups in minority officers occurs as a result of exposure to the
negative influences of the police subculture (Carter, 2002; Herbert, 1998), out-group contact (Wortley and Homel, 1995), or some combination of the two.

In a step similar to that taken in Miami, the Washington Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) was investigated under 42 U.S.C., Section 14141 at the request of Police Chief Charles Ramsey and Mayor Anthony Williams. Results of the DOJ investigation indicated MPD officers were engaged in a “pattern or practice of use of excessive force and avoidable force” (Yeomans, 2001, p.2). Fourteen percent of the force incidents investigated in the DOJ sample involved off-duty uses of force in conjunction with alcohol consumption at bars and nightclubs (Yeomans, 2001). Fully twenty-two percent of incidents involving firearms were justified because the suspect either “reached into his waistband” or was allegedly armed (Yeomans, 2001). Disturbingly, post-incident searches of these suspects proved that they were unarmed and an additional twenty-two percent of firearms cases “involved officers firing their weapons at moving vehicles” (Yeomans, 2001, p.2).

Consistent with other agencies in this analysis, “serious shortcomings” (Yeomans, 2001, p.2) were found in the use of force investigative process. Mishandled evidence, lack of impartiality, and insufficient training were just a few of the noted shortcomings (Yeomans, 2001). Force training was found to be “uncoordinated,” lacking in oversight, “disjointed and, at times, in conflict with applicable law and MPD policy” (Yeomans, 2001, p.6). These findings are suggestive of a climate within the MPD wherein excessive force was tolerated, if not condoned.
Figure 33 White population distribution in Washington D.C., 2000

Figure 34 African American population distribution in Washington D.C., 2000
Pittsburgh

Despite its having a police department close to being representative of the city’s African American population (27.1 and 26% respectively), the Pittsburgh Police Department (PBP) has been the subject of a USDOJ civil rights investigation. Analysis of the spatial distribution of Pittsburgh’s minority poor (primarily African Americans), sheds some light as to the root causes of the police behaviors necessitating DOJ intervention. Pittsburgh’s African Americans are clustered in a patchwork of isolated, highly concentrated neighborhoods (Figures 36 and 37) that coincide with levels of poverty in excess of 30-40 percent (Figure 38).

The DOJ investigation of the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police (PBP) resulted in the finding that the City, as well as its police department were in violation of 42 U.S.C., Section 14141. The specifics of the DOJ findings included evidence of the following:
(1) PBP officers engage in a pattern or practice of the use of excessive force and of making false arrests and performing improper searches and seizures; (2) PBP officers use racial epithets or racially insensitive language against African-Americans; (3) the municipal defendants fail properly to investigate complaints of misconduct; (4) the municipal defendants fail adequately to discipline officers who engage in misconduct; and (5) the PBP fails properly to supervise its officers (Patrick, 1997).

As a result of these findings, the PBP has been placed under a Federal Consent Decree to eliminate these patterns and practices of police behavior. The specifics of this decree include mandated cultural diversity training designed to instruct officers on, “how to relate to persons from different racial, ethnic, and religious groups, and persons of the opposite sex” (Katz-Pinzler et al., 1997, p.7). Other mandated training topics included “verbal de-escalation techniques as an alternative to the use of force” and “integrity and ethics” (Katz-Pinzler et al., 1997, p.7). These findings suggest a troublesome degree of hostility between the PBP and Pittsburgh’s minority residents—a recurring theme throughout this analysis.

Figure 36 White population distribution in Pittsburgh, PA., 2000
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Figure 37  African American population distribution in Pittsburgh, PA., 2000

Figure 38  Individual poverty levels in Pittsburgh, PA, 2000
Portland

Of the cities in this analysis, Portland, Maine is the most ethnically homogeneous, with a majority white population of 91.3 percent (58,638) (Figure 39, U.S. Census, 2000). Portland’s miniscule African American population (Figure 40), the second largest minority group behind Asians (3.1%/ 1,982), constitutes but 2.6 percent (1,665) of the population (U.S. Census, 2000). Nowhere in the city of Portland do poverty rates even approach the “ghettoization” level of 30-40 percent (Figure 41). Given this level of ethnic homogeneity, one would expect a trouble-free relationship between the police and the community. This has not been the case.

Findings of the DOJ investigation into the Portland (ME) Police Department (PPD) under 42 U.S.C., Section 14141 are indicative of an agency mired in reform era policing. Department of Justice investigators found that, “interviews with community advocates indicate that over-reliance on...traditional enforcement methods leads to miscommunication and distrust between officers and citizens” (Brown-Cutlar, 2003b, p.19). Deficiencies in force policies were identified, as well as search and seizure guidelines and procedures (Brown-Cutlar, 2003b). The fact that the DOJ suggested that the PPD “require mandatory reporting of certain categories of field stops” (Brown-Cutlar, 2003b, p.7) and that these stops be audited “to ensure that improper or discriminatory searches and seizures are addressed through appropriate corrective action and discipline” (Brown-Cutlar, 2003b, p.8) is suggestive of disparate treatment of minorities in “stop and frisk” situations. Additional concerns identified by the DOJ included improvements to citizen complaint procedures and investigations and improved use of force training to
include, “verbal de-escalation and other tactics officers can use to avoid, or minimize, the use of force” (Brown-Cutlar, 2003b, p.14).

Figure 39 White population distribution in Portland, ME., 2000

Figure 40 African American population distribution in Portland, ME., 2000
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Figure 41 Individual poverty distribution in Portland, ME., 2000

Analysis Summary

Summary results of the individual analysis of sample investigations (Table 7) provide evidence supportive of the assertion that the interface between the police and minority communities is indeed problematic. All of the agencies in the twelve cities comprising these case studies were found by the USDOJ to have training and/or policy shortcomings related to the use of force. A notable commonality in force deficiencies was the absence or lack of force de-escalation techniques and instruction. Deficiencies related to Fourth Amendment rights were the second most prevalent, and fifty percent \((n=6)\) of the agencies in this analysis were found to have culture/diversity training shortcomings.

Cities identified as having cultural training deficiencies, Los Angeles, Columbus, Cleveland, Steubenville, and Pittsburgh also possess the necessary precursors for an “oppositional” or “street” culture; concentrated ethnic poverty and Massey and Denton’s
five threshold measures of “hypersegregation” (e.g., unevenness, isolation, clustering, centralization and concentration, Table 6).

Table 7
Summary statistics of police training inadequacies revealed as a result of USDOJ 42 U.S.C. Section 14141 Investigations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Culture/Diversity</th>
<th>Force</th>
<th>4th Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steubenville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demographic characteristics of the police departments within these case studies (Table 5), combined with the economic and spatial isolation of the races within the sample cities (Figures 4-41) provide support for the assertion that the nature of the relationship between the police and urban minorities is characterized by a clash of male-dominated cultures.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Despite the passing of 36 years, the echoes of Otto Kerner and his esteemed colleagues are found within this project. In perhaps the most comprehensive 20th century examination of the relationship between the police and America’s African American communities, the Kerner Commission (1968) both defined and described the gulf between these two groups. Many of Kerner’s (1968) findings were indeed prophetic:

A University of California at Los Angeles study of the Watts area found that 79 percent of the Negro males believed police lack respect for or use insulting language to Negroes and 74 percent believed police used unnecessary force in making arrests (p.302).

...the stopping of Negroes on foot or in cars without obvious basis. These, together with contemptuous and degrading verbal abuse, have great impact in the ghetto. As one Commission witness said, these strip the Negro of the one thing that he may have left—his dignity, ‘the question of being a man’ (p.304).

Kerner (1968) found that young African American males, “eager to demonstrate their own masculinity and courage” (p.303) would often taunt and provoke the police, “reinforcing their hostility towards Negroes in general” (p.303). Kerner (1968) found that limited police knowledge of African American communities led to a failure, “...to understand the effects of their actions...”(p.303), and the widespread use of “stop and frisk or field interrogation reports,” without the ability to differentiate between, “genuinely suspicious behavior, and behavior which is suspicious to a particular officer
merely because it is unfamiliar” (p.304). Perhaps of greatest significance to the topic of this research is the Kerner Commission’s (1968) assertion that:

Loss of contact between the police officer and the community he serves adversely affects law enforcement. If an officer has never met, does not know, and cannot understand the language and habits of the people in the area he patrols, he cannot do an effective police job. His ability to detect truly suspicious behavior is impaired. He deprives himself of important sources of information. He fails to know those persons with an ‘equity’ in the community—homeowners, small businesses, professional men, persons who are anxious to support proper law enforcement—and thus sacrifices the contributions they can make to maintaining community order (p.305).

Additional findings included procedural shortcomings related to the handling of citizen complaints, police/citizen contacts, and use of force, virtually the same shortcomings found in the contemporary investigations cited in this research.

Given the penchant for American police organizations to describe themselves as “quasi” or “paramilitary,” with a military rank structure, regimented training, battle dress uniforms (BDU’s), and arsenals of armored vehicles, helicopters and assorted high-power weapons, an interesting parallel can be drawn between the two institutions. Both the military, and many American police organizations, possess a level of institutional conservatism that has left them unable to respond to the needs of both modern warfare and modern policing.

The police, with their continued emphasis on preventive patrol, “get tough” crime fighting tactics and antiquated training curricula focused on enforcement tactics, have been largely ineffective in their efforts to gain the respect and trust of minority communities—necessary ingredients for community oriented policing. The military, with its bias towards large-scale, conventional warfare, and the idea that lesser equipped...
enemies will surrender in the face of the “shock and awe” of U.S. military might will also fail to gain the hearts and minds of those they wish to pacify.

What the American police are lacking are sophisticated strategies to address today’s crime problems. The foundation for these strategies should be the hiring of candidates suitable for modern, community oriented policing. As previously mentioned, measures of racial tolerance and social contact should be included in hiring regimens. The need for diversity in police organizations should extend to ideology. For too long, American police organizations have been dominated by those clinging to the outdated idea that the rule of law and threat of punishment will deter crime. Many of those in America’s urban ghettos feel that they are outsiders, physically and economically excluded from mainstream society, with no desire to assimilate.

Once suitable candidates are found, they should then be provided with substantive, meaningful, cultural competency training designed to bridge the culture gap between the police and minority communities. A critical, yet overlooked aspect of current police cultural training is an analysis of the shared subcultural attributes and ethos of male police officers and their urban minority male counterparts. Police officers must be made aware of the potential volatility of the interface between these two male-dominated groups, both possessed of a disproportionate need for respect, toughness, physicality and machismo.

The sociology of the urban socio-cultural milieu should form the basis of this training. Police officers must understand the history and social forces within urban minority communities. A key component of this new cultural training paradigm should be extended contact with the urban ethnic poor as part of the initial training process. Police
departments are very good at encouraging potential applicants to participate in “ride-alongs” to get to know the nature of police work. These one-sided programs only expose officer candidates to the police perspective.

Ride-alongs should extend to contact with the real people that live within communities that have had the most troublesome relationship with the police. Officer candidates must be cognizant of the fact that human beings live in America’s ghettos, not animals. The negative effects of deindividuation and dehumanization have been aptly illustrated in the work of Zimbardo et al. (1973) in the landmark Stanford Prison Experiment conducted in 1971. Utilizing a mock prison setting, sadistic behaviors—committed against other student participants—were elicited from otherwise “normal” college students as a result of the roles they played in the experiment—guards or prisoners—to the extent that the experiment had to be terminated after six days (Zimbardo et al., 1973). The situationist perspective asserts that otherwise average persons can be persuaded to behave in “evil ways” (Zimbardo, 2004, p.1) due to the influence exerted by situational variables. These variables (extant in the police subculture) include anonymity, the wearing of a uniform to alter ones appearance, an “us versus them” orientation towards outgroups, and negative labeling of those that differ from the majority conception of normalcy (Zimbardo, 2004).

The fact that majority minority police departments such as Detroit, Miami and Washington D.C. have been investigated for civil rights violations related to the use of force (presumably against minorities) supports Zimbardo’s (2004) theoretical framework and points toward the need for more extensive training in intercultural contact. Essentially, police officers must un-learn the imprecise and skewed societal definition of who is criminogenic. This training must be supported by an organizational cultural shift.
away from the quasi-military, us against them mentality commonly found in police organizations, towards a more sophisticated emphasis on human relations and cross-cultural competency. The importance of Zimbardo's (2004) theoretical framework becomes evident when one considers the social milieu of the urban inner city.

As discussed by Anderson (1999), the majority of those residing in low income minority communities are not involved in criminal behavior. They are the working poor, many of whom support the police and aspire to achieve conventional measures of success. These people attend church, hold their children accountable and deserve to be treated with respect and dignity, a fact lost on "mercenary" cops hired from the suburbs or other cities, having had little, if any contact with the urban poor. By painting low income communities with the broad brush of criminality—and treating people accordingly—the police prevent themselves from establishing vital relationships with members of the community that could otherwise assist them in their attempts to quell crime.

Cultural training in its present form, long-winded lectures by academic "race experts," or the presentation of "specimens" from local minority enclaves are limited in their effectiveness and carry the potential of reinforcing existing stereotypes. Police recruits should be required to participate in "live-alongs" with low-income minority host families as a part of their academy training. Training should be only one part of a broader organizational initiative to place increased value on community service, rather than enforcement. Value must be accorded to service activities and positive community contacts and relationships.
Non-enforcement related community service should be an integral part of the promotional process and/or made a prerequisite for transfer to other assignments. The relegation of culture competency training to annual lectures, or mandated training for those who violate workplace “diversity” rules will do nothing to address the powerful day to day influence of the negative stereotyping endemic to the police subculture. The message within police organizations should be that in order to succeed, officers must demonstrate an ability to work effectively, in a positive manner, with all facets of the community, particularly those that are most different from them.

Opportunities for additional research on this topic abound as many questions have been left unanswered. This analysis has been broad in scope, encompassing a cursory examination of investigative content in a number of varied municipalities. A more finite individual case study would no doubt shed light on the specifics of the interrelationship between a particular police agency and the minority community within that city. Implementation of the training suggestions within this research would be best accomplished with an accompanying longitudinal study, such as that undertaken by Wortley and Homel (1995), in order to test the efficacy of these training methods. The goal of this project has been to “make the case” for a new paradigm in police cultural training, a goal that has hopefully been achieved.
APPENDIX I
Focal Concerns of Lower Class Culture (Miller, 1958)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Perceived Alternatives (state, quality, condition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trouble</td>
<td>Law-abiding behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law-violating behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Toughness</td>
<td>Physical prowess, skill; “masculinity”; fearlessness, bravery, daring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weakness, ineptitude; effeminacy; timidity, cowardice, caution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Smartness</td>
<td>Ability to outsmart, dupe “con”; gaining money by “wits”; shrewdness, adroitness in repartee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gullibility, “conability”; Gaining money by hard work; slowness, dull-wittedness, verbal maladroitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Excitement</td>
<td>Thrill, risk, danger, change, activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boredom; “deadness,” Safeness; sameness, Passivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fate</td>
<td>Favored by fortune, being “lucky”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ill-omened, being “unlucky”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Autonomy</td>
<td>Freedom from external constraint; freedom from superordinate authority; independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of external constraint; presence of strong authority; dependency, being “cared for”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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