Contents

Professional Issues in Criminal Justice

Volume 6 Numbers 1 & 2 Winter/Spring 2011

Reviewers

Reviewers

Eric L. Sevigny
        University of Pittsburgh

Frank Shanty
        The Cobra Institute

Kathleen Marie Littwin Simon
        Appalachian State University

Barbara A. Sims
        Penn State Harrisburg

Risdon Nichols Slate
        Florida Southern College

Stephen G. Tibbetts
        California State University, San
        Bernardino

Sam Torres
        California State University, Long Beach

John E. Wade
        Southeast Missouri State University

Lorenn Walker
        University of Hawaii School of Business

Julia F. Weber
        Judicial Council of California

John L. Worrall
        University of Texas, Dallas

Jane A. Younglove
        California State University, Stanislaus

Marvin Zalman
        Wayne State University

Editor's Notes

In the lead article of this Winter/Spring issue of *PICJ*, "No Coffee or Latte at This Café: Internet Gambling Establishments, Law Enforcement Perceptions, and Management Issues," Caroline Denning, an intern with the North Carolina Governor's Crime Commission, and Douglas L. Yearwood, Director of the North Carolina Criminal Justice Analysis Center, discuss the newest form of gambling. Media accounts and anecdotal information suggest that Internet gambling within the context of Internet cafés or business centers can entice criminal activity. At a minimum, many consider these establishments a nuisance. In their paper, Denning and Yearwood present the findings of a survey of law enforcement officers that sought to determine whether such establishments do attract crime, to document the nature and extent of criminal activity at these cafes, and to amass the viewpoints of both police and sheriff agency executives regarding these newly emerging gambling centers.

In the second article, "Perceived Roles of Campus Law Enforcement: A Cognitive Review of Attitudes and Beliefs of Campus Constituents," Lieutenant Charles P. Wilson, Rhode Island College Campus Police, and Professor Shirley A. Wilson, Bryant University, discuss the perceptions of the role of campus law enforcement officers. The authors conducted a survey to assess levels of support for arming campus police officers among the campus community and members of the surrounding community and to determine whether race and gender influence community support for further professionalizing campus police services. In addition, they wished to ascertain whether campus and community constituents understand the duties and functions of campus police and the levels of training required to perform those functions. The authors hypothesized that (1) the majority of campus constituents support further professionalization of campus law enforcement agencies; (2) those who agree with the concepts of a formalized professional format for campus law enforcement also agree that campus police officers should be armed while on duty; (3) women, in general, agree that campus officers should be armed, and (4) racial minorities support the arming of campus law enforcement. Indeed, the authors found support for all four of their hypotheses.

The third article is by Petter Gottschalk, Norwegian School of Management. In his article, "Actions on Suspicion of White-Collar Crime in Business Organizations: An Empirical Study of Intended Responses by Chief Financial Officers," Professor Gottschalk discusses white-collar crime and presents results from a survey of chief financial officers (CFOs) who were asked what actions they would take on suspicion of white-collar crime in their organization. Survey results

indicate that the majority of CFOs would communicate and inform others rather than start investigations themselves.

In the final article, "Comparing Urban and Rural Police Views of Bias-based Policing," Ralph Ioimo, J. Bret Becton, Leslie M. Meadows, Rachel S. Tears, and Michael T. Charles address the issue of bias-based policing. Their research project sought to broaden the assessment of bias-based policing beyond traffic stop data by surveying the officers in urban and rural police departments within the Commonwealth of Virginia to determine whether officers are aware of bias-based policing practices in their department or in other departments and whether they perceive bias-based policing to be a problem in their department. The results of their survey found some noteworthy differences between urban and rural officers' perceptions of bias-based policing as well as significant disparities between White and Black officers in their view of issues pertaining to bias-based policing practices.

Cliff Roberson, LLM, PhD
Editor-in-Chief, *PICJ*

Contributing Authors

Volume 6 Numbers 1 & 2, Winter/Spring 2011

J. Bret Becton
University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg

Michael T. Charles
Retired

Caroline Denning
North Carolina Governor's Crime Commission & Elon University

Petter Gottschalk
Norwegian School of Management, Oslo

Ralph Ioimo
Auburn University Montgomery

Leslie M. Meadows
Alabama Training Institute, Montgomery

Rachel S. Tears
Retired

Charles P. Wilson
Rhode Island College Campus Police

Shirley A. Wilson
Bryant University

Douglas L. Yearwood
North Carolina Criminal Justice Analysis Center

No Coffee or Latté at This Café: Internet Gambling Establishments, Law Enforcement Perceptions, and Management Issues[1]

Caroline Denning and Douglas L. Yearwood

The issue of video poker has been a contentious topic in North Carolina for the last half of the decade with the state's legislature passing legislation that effectively outlawed this form of gambling. Recently a new form of gambling has emerged within the context of Internet cafés or business centers. Media accounts and anecdotal information suggest that these cafés are considered a nuisance by many and can entice criminal activity. This paper presents the findings of a law enforcement survey that sought to test these assumptions, document the nature and extent of criminal activity at these cafés, and gather the viewpoints of both police and sheriff agency executives regarding these newly emerging gambling centers. A 25-item questionnaire the authors administered to a randomly selected group of law enforcement administrators obtained a 43% response rate. Survey findings indicate that while violent and property crimes have occurred at these cafés, law enforcement has not seen a dramatic rise in these offenses despite the fact that officials view these establishments in a less than favorable light and view prohibition as the most effective strategy for regulating this form of gambling.

Key Words: Internet ◆ gambling ◆ law enforcement

Gambling in the United States operates within a relatively strict framework of government regulation. Traditionally, these restrictions have applied primarily to brick and mortar gambling establishments, but according to Freese (2005) and Franklin (2001), the evolution of the Internet and technology not only has made gambling more accessible but has provided a loophole for those involved in the gaming and video industry to elude government regulation. The U.S. Department of Justice has maintained that under the 1961 Wire Act, Internet gambling is illegal in the United States (Cornell University Law School Legal Information Institute, 2010). Still, Internet gambling persists and has produced great concern among state and local law enforcement who have sought to prohibit and regulate these activities and operations.

Despite the Federal governments' willingness to prohibit and prosecute Internet gambling cases and operations, the continued prevalence of these activities demands

Caroline Denning is an intern with the North Carolina Governor's Crime Commission and a political science student at Elon University. Douglas L. Yearwood is director of the North Carolina Criminal Justice Analysis Center in Raleigh.

exploration to provide clarification as to how state and local law enforcement agencies should deal with the proliferation of recent gambling enterprises, known as Internet sweepstakes cafés, surfacing around the country, which pose challenges to current state gambling laws. As Internet gambling establishments are fairly recent developments, current definitions of gambling as presented through federal and state statutes do not adequately address these operations, presenting enforcement and prosecution challenges to many state officials and law enforcement.

This paper seeks to examine current federal and North Carolina state gambling law as applied to Internet sweepstakes cafés and present the findings of a statewide survey of sheriff and local police chiefs regarding their perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs surrounding the proliferation of Internet cafés and sweepstakes operations. Additionally, the survey gathered data regarding the amount of reported and perceived criminal activity and nuisance complaints associated with these business types. The survey also sought opinions regarding barriers to effective regulation and solicited viewpoints on proposed legislation in an effort to portray how the state's law enforcement executives perceive and respond to Internet sweepstakes cafés.

Literature Review

The most widely cited federal statute prohibiting Internet gambling is the 1961 Interstate Wire Wager Act, which criminalizes the use of wire communication for the transmission of interstate or foreign commerce of bets and wages or any information assisting in the placing of bets or wages on any sports event or contest. This act makes it illegal for gambling providers to offer or to take bets from gamblers over the telephone lines or through wire devices unless the act is authorized by state government. According to Franklin (2001), the U.S. Department of Justice has applied the term "through wire devices" to prosecute interstate and international transactions over the Internet, and in 2006 the U.S. Second Circuit Court demonstrated the willingness of the federal judiciary to uphold Internet gambling convictions through the 1961 Wire Wager Act. However, some legal scholars disagree with federal lawmakers' interpretations of the statute and are kin to agreement with the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals 2002 ruling (see *Brown v. Mastercard Int'l*, 2004) which construes the statute to apply only to sports betting (Chiang, 2007). Such disagreement has left many in the video and gaming industry to conclude that other forms of Internet gambling may be legal (Manter, 2003), e.g., online casino or online poker, the most popular forms.

A Congressional bipartisan initiative, the SAFE Port Act (2006), passed during the Bush Administration, sequentially attempted to prohibit Internet gambling by enacting the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act (UIGEA) with the aim of reducing the

revenue flowing to illegal Internet gambling operations. Specifically, the act bans the use of credit, check, draft, and electronic funds transfer to place bets with any online gambling operation. The Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act is problematic according to some legal scholars in that it fails to define clearly unlawful Internet gambling and instead relies on pre-existing and already problematic federal law such as the 1961 Wire Act (Conon, 2009). This act prohibits only the transfer of funds from individual bettors in Internet gambling. It does not hold individuals criminally responsibly nor does it make the act of gambling on the Internet explicitly illegal; on the contrary, it makes funding or transacting an individual's bet on the Internet illegal (Suarez, 2006).

This last limitation is especially problematic for state lawmakers, prosecutors, and law enforcement executives who are looking for guidance on how to define gambling properly and effectively as it applies to the Internet. This limitation has become an emerging issue as law enforcement and legislators increasingly expand their efforts to prohibit the rise of local Internet or sweepstakes cafés from springing up across the United States as demonstrated most recently by news and media reports in California, Utah, Florida, Virginia, Texas, and North Carolina (Roberts, 2010; Saulny, 2010). To elude government oversight and regulation, those in the video gaming industry have devised alternate methods of payment by allowing patrons to pay for phone or Internet time to access the computerized games.

Concerns of Federal & State Government

Academic and legal research explaining the proliferation, legality, and, specifically, law enforcement perceptions and best management practices surrounding Internet sweepstakes cafés in the United States is severely limited. However, many academic and legal scholars have produced a wide bed of research and legal commentary on the legality of Internet gambling and the concerns of federal, state, and local law enforcement in regulating or prohibiting traditional online gambling operations.

Findings from the National Gambling Impact Study Commission (1999) estimated that 14.5 million gamblers waged $651 million over the Internet in 1998, doubling from the previous year of 6.9 million gamblers waging $300 million. Compare these figures with the approximately 30 million gamblers who travel to Las Vegas on average each year. The Commission also found that the revenues of companies that produce software for online gambling operators grew from $445.4 million in 1997 to $919.1 million in 1998 (NGIS Commission, 1999). Conon (2009) suggests that these numbers are projected to increase due to the inadequacy of current law enforcement to prohibit an activity that by nature crosses national and state borders and the inability of state courts and lawmakers to clarify the laws prohibiting and/or regulating Internet gambling.

As increasing numbers of individual bettors participate in unregulated or prohibited Internet gambling, one of the primary concerns of government is the reduction of tax revenues collected from legalized gambling operations (Manter, 2003). Discussing the relationship between the U.S. economy and Internet gambling, Hammer (2001) suggests that the increase of individual bettors and wages may also be responsible for a loss of valuable jobs and fees associated with traditional gambling operations.

Conon (2009), Manter (2003), and Franklin (2001) all cite increasing crime—both violent and nonviolent—involving theft, assault, fraud, and money laundering as concerns of state and federal government. Manter (2003) discusses the negative effects of Internet gambling on the consumer credit card industry and the increase of problem gaming in the absence of safeguards to protect against gaming addiction and underage gaming. The National Gambling Impact Study Commission identified additional problems, including the dual protection of anonymity and encryption provided by the Internet and the potential for abuse by gambling operators who can alter, move, or entirely remove sites within minutes as well as the ability of computer hackers or gambling operators to tamper with gambling software to manipulate games to their benefit (NGIS Commission, 1999).

North Carolina State & Municipal Action

In reaction to the pervasive nature of the Internet and illegal Internet gambling operations, several states have already introduced or passed legislation prohibiting Internet gambling (Eggen, 2010). Perhaps making a statement, Nevada criminalized the placing of an Internet bet in 1997. Following suit, Louisiana, Illinois, and Texas all introduced or passed legislation criminalizing the individual, operator/designer, or both for gambling by computer/Internet or for accepting a bet/wager from an individual (Brechbill, 2001). Other states—Minnesota, New York, Missouri, Wisconsin, New Jersey, and North Carolina—have taken steps to prosecute parties involved in online gambling by using pre-existing state statutes. Yet despite current state laws prohibiting online gambling, with the new development of Internet sweepstakes cafés, most states are having difficulty investigating and prosecuting these cases due to inconsistent application/enforcement of state gambling laws, an inability of state legislatures to clarify state gambling laws, and/or difficulty of state officials and law enforcement to determine whether the operations of these businesses constitute gambling under state statutes.

Like many other states, North Carolina's law enforcement officials are having difficulty prohibiting Internet gambling operators who have found a loophole around state statutes (Montpas, 1996; Robertson, 2010). As many media and news reports demonstrate, this difficulty has also been attributed to the inability of the state legislature to clarify state gambling laws. In 2006 the legislature banned the operation of video poker machines

across the state; however, since then North Carolina has witnessed the opening of hundreds of Internet sweepstakes cafés (Browder, 2010c) across the state, which many officials believe are illegal. These cafés operate under a loophole in the 2006 North Carolina State Law (North Carolina General Statutes, G.S. § 14-306), which prohibits the use of any video gaming machine that requires the deposit of any coin or token, or use of any credit card, debit card, or any other method that requires payment to activate any of the games listed (as banned). In response to the spread of these Internet sweepstakes cafés, the legislature amended the bill in 2008 in an attempt to ban the operation of these businesses by expanding the definition in the ban to mean "any game or any game based on or involving the random or chance matching of different pictures, words, numbers, or symbols not dependent on the skill or dexterity of the player" (North Carolina General Statutes, G.S. § 14-306.1A).

As argued by Internet sweepstakes café owners, contrary to the law, patrons pay for Internet time (not to gamble), and the sweepstakes offered on the computer are predetermined, thus arguably eroding federal jurisdiction under the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act and 1961 Wire Wager Act in addition to the definition of gambling as determined by current North Carolina statutes. Such sentiment was reflected when, despite the 2008 amendment to the North Carolina Video Poker ban, a Guilford County Superior Court judge ruled in favor of Internet sweepstakes café owners and operators, deciding that the businesses were not covered by the previous law or amendment and thus not subject to legal action and/or removal by the state (Robertson, 2010).

The judge's ruling, issuing an injunction, has prevented local and state law enforcement from enforcing the 2008 amendment to the 2006 Video Poker ban. Judges in two other counties (including Wake) have also ruled in favor of video game distributors and operators, arguing that the video screens in the Internet cafés are not covered by either the 2006 law or the 2008 amendment because these businesses are designed to market legal products or these games do not meet the definition of gambling as defined by state law. Such rulings pertain to the means through which operators of these businesses market consumer services. In lieu of advertising Keno, Poker, or any other kind of video playing card game, operators of Internet sweepstakes cafés advertise the sale of phone and/or Internet time and provide consumers with the facilities and equipment to check their email, print, and/or fax. Patrons put money on a phone or Internet card resembling a credit card to access these services.

Arguably some patrons do use these services; yet, undercover law enforcement agents and patrons have both reported that most visiting the cafés sit at computer terminals, playing games that resemble slot machines to win cash and prizes (Robertson, 2010). Troubleshooter reports by local news stations have encountered managers of

these establishments directly assisting new patrons in assessing the games. However, in addition to state courts overruling the legislature, state attorneys have also advised the state of the limitations to the 2008 amendment to the 2006 law banning video poker machines across the state, warning officials that to prohibit this form of gambling (sweepstakes) is to also prohibit less controversial forms such as the under-the-cap games by Coca-Cola® and Pepsi and the popular McDonald's Monopoly sweepstakes games (Stasio & Margolis, 2010).

According to media and news reports, local municipalities and county governments in North Carolina have begun their own regulation and temporary banning (moratorium) of these businesses in response to public and government opposition to the operation of these facilities. Because recent court rulings protect these establishments, the primary concerns of local government and municipalities are regulation and re-zoning.

Officials in Elizabeth City have implemented age and hours of operation restrictions in addition to specifications on the number of player terminals in each establishment. In addition to the abovementioned regulations, officials in Wilson have implemented zoning restrictions, limiting the areas in which sweepstakes cafés may operate to commercial and business districts away from homes, schools, and churches (Browder, 2010b). Apex, Pembroke, Fayetteville, Wilmington, Holly Springs, Rocky Mount, Lumberton, and Oxford have either completed or are planning to implement re-zoning in addition to taxing these businesses.

Most recently, the city of Lumberton in Robeson County, implemented a moratorium specifying that until May 2011, existing Internet sweepstakes cafés may not expand and new businesses may not open. Beginning July 1, 2010, operating businesses must pay an annual $5,000.00 privilege license tax in addition to a $2,500.00 fee per computer or operating machine. Pembroke and Fairmont, two other Robeson county municipalities, charge $3,000.00 per computer connected to the Internet and $1,500.00 for those not connected to the Internet (Hottman, 2010).

These municipalities have been able to generate additional revenue in the current economic climate amidst severe budget crunches because current state law does not limit the revenue municipalities can raise through licensure fees. However, such actions taken by local municipalities in North Carolina have prompted some public officials from the General Assembly to support state government regulation and taxation of Internet sweepstakes cafés. The Director of the North Carolina Education Lottery was petitioned by supporters of government regulation to provide an estimate of revenue from video lottery terminals in sweepstakes cafés and reported that revenue generated from the state taxing these establishments could add an estimated $350 million in the first year and $576 million by the fourth year, which could effectively solve many of the state's budget problems (Browder, 2010d).

Local Law Enforcement Reaction

Despite academics' arguments that the prohibition of Internet gambling operations will only exacerbate the negative social and economic effects of online gambling versus eradicating them (Franklin, 2001), North Carolina's sheriffs generally oppose the operation of Internet sweepstakes cafés. Many argue that these operations contribute to increasing financial hardships for low-income customers and families who reside in areas that are often targeted by café owners seeking locations for expanding new business (Clotfelter, 2000; Davis, 2007; Sorg & Schwartz, 2010). They also argue that these businesses serve as hotspots for criminal activity, one consequence of Internet sweepstakes cafés that is largely absent from the tightly regulated and taxed state education lottery. Despite little published research detailing criminal activity associated with Internet sweepstakes cafés in the United States, a fairly recent study (2005) presented an analysis of online gaming crime drawn from 613 criminal cases in Taiwan. This analysis found that 54.8% of online gaming crimes occurred in Internet cafés compared with 30.8% in an offender's home, and of the types of crimes characterized, an overwhelming 73.7% of cases (452 out of 613) involved charges of theft compared with 20.2% of cases involving fraud (Chen, Chen, Hwang, Korba, Song, & Yee, 2005). While theft and fraud were not directly related to gambling on computer terminals, these findings do suggest that criminal activity does occur at these establishments at a greater frequency than at other locations.

As portrayed by local media reports, the general consensus is that most law enforcement officials can do little about the problems with Internet sweepstakes cafés despite the existence of numerous strategies and regulatory provisions (Crisco, 2003). Interviews with North Carolina District and Assistant District Attorneys suggest that part of the problem is ambiguity between the interpretations of judicial officials and the General Assembly's application of gambling laws in North Carolina (Browder, 2010a). In an interview conducted by a Charlotte news station, a Mecklenburg County Assistant District Attorney said that fewer raids by law enforcement will take place in Mecklenburg County until the General Assembly or State Supreme Court clarifies the law, citing a budget crisis that makes it fiscally insensible to prosecute offenses under a law that may be deemed invalid in coming months (Watson, 2010).

Research Objective

This report presents findings from a survey of law enforcement executives regarding their perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs on the emerging growth of Internet cafés and sweepstakes operations. In addition, this study analyzes data on the prevalence of these establishments and on the amount of reported and perceived criminal activity both inside

and outside of these establishments. Opinions regarding the legality of these operations as well as barriers to effective regulation and proposed legislation were also solicited in an effort to portray how the state's law enforcement executives perceive and respond to Internet sweepstakes cafés.

Methods

Survey Instrument

A twenty-five item questionnaire was developed with questions derived from prior research studies as well as the authors' discussions with criminal justice practitioners and other researchers who have investigated the issue of Internet gambling and gaming. The survey questions sought to elicit respondent viewpoints, attitudes, and beliefs regarding Internet gambling and its legality. The authors used a five-point Likert scale to measure participants' perceptions on the extent to which these cafés should be regulated and the most effective methods for effecting regulation. Respondents were also asked to describe and provide data on the number of cafés within their respective jurisdictions, the nature and types of criminal activities and nuisance-related behaviors occurring at and around the cafés, and the extent to which their agencies had made efforts to investigate and/or to close down these establishments and the reasons for these efforts.

Those respondents whose agencies had conducted investigations were also asked to supply data on barriers or obstacles that either hinder or prevent successful investigations and how these could be alleviated or at least minimized in the future. Survey participants were provided with the opportunity through a series of open-ended questions to espouse their opinions on how to manage these operations most effectively from both a legislative and law enforcement perspective and to offer any other ideas and comments about Internet cafés and how these businesses affect their communities.

Survey Sample

All local law enforcement agencies in the state of North Carolina were included in the sampling universe with the exception of universities, company and special police departments, and two sheriffs' offices. These were excluded because their respective patrol jurisdictions did not include any Internet cafés or gambling locations or, in the case of the two sheriffs' offices, they did not provide routine patrol coverage and response services as these were provided by city or county police agencies. State agencies, such as the Highway Patrol, were not included as the regulation or investigation of Internet cafés does not fall within their normal mission or statutory enforcement mandate. The state's Alcohol Law Enforcement Division, which does investigate illegal gambling and

prohibited video poker machines, was not included as the focus of this study was the local community and not an entire region or the state as a whole.

Two separate sampling frames were compiled, with the sheriffs list containing 98 agencies and the local police list containing 347 distinct agencies that were eligible for inclusion in the sample and for possible survey distribution and completion. Each list was divided into quartiles based on the median population or number of residents within the agency's patrol jurisdiction for the sheriffs' offices and local police departments, respectively. The median population coverage for the state's sheriffs' offices was 32,411 residents. This includes only those individuals residing in the county, i.e., outside the city limits. Thus the smallest quartile ranged from 4,290 citizens to 17,907. The second quartile included those offices having jurisdiction over a population of 18,647 to the sample median of 32,411. The third group ranged from the median to 55,653 citizens, with the fourth quartile including those sheriffs' offices that provide law enforcement patrol services to larger counties with populations of between 59,251 and the group high population of 181, 573.

The smallest quartile for the local police list included agencies providing patrol coverage for cities ranging from the group low of 88 to 1,168 citizens. The second quartile included agencies providing coverage for cities and towns with populations between 1,169 to the median of 2,975. The third quartile included police departments from populations of 2,801 to 8,261. The fourth quartile included agencies that provide patrol coverage for cities with populations of between 8,262 and the group high of 728,755.

By using a standard sample size calculator or estimator, with a 5% margin of error and confidence intervals set at 95%, the researchers determined that the study sample to receive a copy of the questionnaire in the mail would comprise 78 sheriffs' offices, or roughly 20 from each population coverage quartile or strata, and 183 local police departments, or approximately 46 from each quartile. Disproportionate stratified sampling was preferred as the researchers' preliminary investigation, and discussions suggested that Internet cafés would be located primarily in mid- to large-sized geographic areas. Consequently, disproportionate stratified sampling would ensure the inclusion of a greater number of agencies providing coverage for these cities and towns versus proportionate sampling based on population, which would have, given the state's rural nature, resulted in the inclusion of far more smaller jurisdictions, which probably do not have as many Internet cafés. Agencies were randomly selected from each quartile until the appropriate and required number was obtained for each of the two law enforcement group samples.

Results and Analysis

A total of 113 surveys were completed and returned by the respondents of the 261 different agencies selected to receive the survey, producing a study response rate of 43%. Of this number, 31 or 27% were submitted by respondents from the state's sheriffs' offices with the remaining 82 or 73% returned by participants from the state's police agencies. These responding agencies were located in 63 of the state's 100 counties. The majority of these agencies were located in the coastal region of the state with 54 (48%) surveys returned by respondents from this area. Respondents from the Piedmont region submitted 41 (36%) surveys with the remaining 18 (16%) coming from agencies in the mountain region.

Survey responses indicated that a total of 359 Internet sweepstakes cafés were in operation within the 63 counties for which data were provided. Of the total number of responding agencies, 66 or 58% reported having sweepstakes cafés within their jurisdiction. Of these 66 agencies, those reporting one café comprised the largest percentage of responding agencies (33%) followed by agencies reporting two cafés (22%) and agencies reporting three cafés (18%). The remaining agencies (27%) reported having more than four cafés in their respective jurisdictions. The average number of cafés, per jurisdiction, was slightly more than five ($M = 5.7$).

Investigations

Respondents from the surveyed agencies were asked to provide information relating to the types of investigations and any difficulties surrounding these investigations relative to Internet sweepstakes cafés. Of the 66 responding law enforcement agencies with cafés in their jurisdictions, 25 or 37.9% reported prior and or current investigations of these businesses with activities ranging from illegal gambling and alcohol to robbery and citizen complaints. Per agency, of the 47 reporting police agencies, 20 or 42.6% reported investigations of these businesses. Of these numbers, 48% of police agencies expressed difficulty with their investigations and attributed these difficulties to several causes, including, but not limited to, owner reluctance, the limitation or vagueness of current state statutes, previous court decisions and injunctions, and the absence of state guidance or cooperation. Based on those investigations, respondents reported that two sweepstakes cafés were shut down for illegal gambling. Of the 19 sheriffs' offices, 5 or 26.3% reported investigations relating to illegal gambling and fraud. Five agencies also reported difficulty performing investigations, voicing similar concerns of police agencies.

As Table 1 depicts, the most commonly occurring investigation was for the suspicion of illegal gambling, which accounted for 13 or 27.1% of the total investigations. Five drug-

related investigations (10.4%) were reported as well as five alcohol-related cases (10.4%). Ten percent of the total investigations were also for fraud-related offenses. Slightly more than 8% of the investigations were for robbery and larceny-theft. Other investigations involved zoning violations, loitering, and drunk and disorderly patrons.

Table 1. *Law Enforcement Investigations by Agency Type*

Offense Investigated	Police	Sheriff	Total Number	Total Percent
Illegal Gambling	9	4	13	27.1
Drug Related	5	0	5	10.4
Illegal Alcohol	4	1	5	10.4
Fraud	4	1	5	10.4
Robbery/Larceny	3	1	4	8.3
Money Laundering	2	1	3	6.3
Other	11	2	13	27.1
Total	38	10	48	100.0

Reported Crime Statistics

Responding to two questions relating to crimes occurring inside the café and outside on the café property, law enforcement agencies were asked to describe the level of crime as having "increased" "stayed the same," or "decreased." Twelve or 18.8% of the total number of reporting agencies reported that crime levels increased inside these businesses compared with reports from 52 or 81.3% of agencies that responded that crime levels stayed the same. Crime on the premise was reported to have increased by 17 or 26.6% of the responding agencies compared with 47 or 73.4% reports that maintained that crime levels remained constant. No agencies reported crime as decreasing on the premise or inside of these businesses. Two agencies did not complete this question; thus, percentages reported throughout reflect a valid percentage calculated to exclude missing responses.

Four or 8.9% of the police department respondents cited an increase in crime versus 41 or 91.1% who responded that crime levels stayed the same inside of these businesses. Regarding crime occurring on the premises outside these businesses, 10 police agencies (22.2%) reported an increase in crime versus 35 or 77.8% who maintained that crime has stayed the same.

Eight or 42.1% of participants from the responding sheriffs' offices reported crime inside these businesses to have increased versus 11 or 57.9% who maintained that crime levels have stayed the same. Seven or 36.8% of these officers reported crime to have increased on the outside premises versus 12 or 63.2% who maintained that crime has stayed the same.

Nearly three-fourths of those agencies with cafés in their areas reported having received complaints or calls for service. The most frequent call related to robbery of these cafés and/or their patrons with 16 agencies (34.8%) reporting this offense at or inside a café. The second most common offense for which complaints or calls for service were initiated was larceny-theft (17.4%) followed by drug- and weapon-related offenses (10.9%). Other offenses included assault/murder (6.5%), gambling addiction related problems (21.7%), and fraud (8.7%). (As respondents were able to answer for multiple offenses, totals do not equal 100 percent.) Refer to Table 2 for a complete list of all reported offenses. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents noted an increase in nuisance-related complaints either within or on the premises of these establishments

Table 2. *Reported Complaints and Calls for Service*

Offense	Number of Responding Agencies	Percent
Robbery	16	34.8
Gambling Addiction	10	21.7
Larceny–theft	8	17.4
Drug/Weapon Violations	5	10.9
Underage Gambling	4	8.7
Fraud	4	8.7
Assault/Murder	3	6.5
Money laundering	1	2.2
Total	51	

Note. The percentages do not equal 100 as each offense type was treated as a separate variable.

More than three-fourths (83.3%) of the 41 survey participants who responded to the question regarding owner involvement were uncertain about the level of criminal involvement on the part of Internet café owners and employees. Seven respondents noted that the owners and employees were not involved.

Opinions

Participants were asked to rank from 1 (least effective) to 5 (most effective) the effectiveness of 10 possible solutions to managing Internet sweepstakes cafés (see Table 3). Prohibiting cafés was ranked as the most effective solution as indicated by a mean score of 4.2, followed by taxing these businesses (*M* = 3.4), employing local license and fee structures (*M* = 3.2), and other types of regulation. Surveillance, re-zoning, and implementing age restrictions and hours of operation controls were ranked as the least effective means of managing Internet cafés.

Table 3. *Mean Effectiveness Ratings for Internet Café Regulation and Management Strategies*

Management Strategy	Number of Respondents	Mean
Prohibit/ Ban	56	4.2
Taxation	54	3.4
License/Fees	54	3.2
Regulate	56	3.2
Age Restrictions	54	2.9
Moratorium	53	2.9
Hours of Operation	54	2.8
Patron ID	55	2.8
Property Surveillance	52	2.7
Re-Zone	54	2.7

Note. 1 = Least Effective   5 = Most Effective.

Based on responses regarding the legality of Internet sweepstakes cafés, more than half (66.7%) of the responding law enforcement agencies whose officers responded to the question disagreed that these businesses are legal and thought the operation of these establishments does violate state law. Thirty-two (48.5%) respondents strongly disagreed that Internet sweepstakes cafés are legal under the current statutes compared with 12 (18.2%) who somewhat disagreed. Only 14 respondents thought that these cafés are legitimate (21.2%) with 8 (12.1%) remaining neutral about the legality of these gaming businesses.

When asked whether taxation of Internet cafés was an appropriate way to reduce the state's budget deficit, the 65 respondents who answered this question were clearly mixed on this issue with 23 survey participants (35.4%) disagreeing that this would mitigate the

current budget crisis. Slightly more than one-quarter remained neutral on this issue (27.7%) with the remaining 24 (36.9%) either strongly or somewhat agreeing that taxation was a viable option.

Responses to recent court rulings and injunctions in several counties were solicited from law enforcement agencies; 38 (58.5%) respondents said they strongly disagreed with recent court rulings favoring Internet sweepstakes cafés as opposed to 3 respondents who indicated they agreed and 7 respondents who indicated they strongly agreed with recent court rulings (15.4%). Less than 15% of the respondents were neutral on this issue.

Court interference in enforcement elicited strong responses from law enforcement. Most respondents agreed that court rulings interfere with enforcement in regard to Internet sweepstakes cafés. Thirty-four or 52% of the responding officers strongly agreed that the court interferes with enforcement as opposed to 4 or 6.2% who strongly disagreed. Less than 20% were neutral when asked about court interference.

Cross-Jurisdictional Comparisons of Responses

In an effort to assess whether substantial or significant differences exist between those respondents who have authority over jurisdictions with a sizeable number of Internet cafés contrasted with participants who reside in areas with fewer cafés, the sample was divided into two groups by using a mean split. The mean number of reported cafés was 5.7; thus, the low café group consisted of respondents from areas with fewer than six cafés, while responses from survey participants from areas with six or more cafés were classified as belonging to the high café group.

While the raw data or frequency counts suggest that investigating gambling at Internet cafés is three times more likely to occur in jurisdictions with a low number of cafés, no significant differences were found to exist between the two groups in terms of investigating these cafés ($p = .371$). Law enforcement agencies did not differ in terms of initiating investigations based upon the prevalence of cafés in their respective jurisdictions: It appears that the number of cafes has no bearing on the initiation of an investigation. Agencies with a large number of cafés did not differ from agencies in areas with a low number of Internet cafés.

These agencies also did not differ significantly in terms of the level of criminal activity within the Internet cafés with both groups more likely to report that crime has remained the same inside the cafés since they opened ($p = .081$). However; significant differences were found to exist between the groups when discussing the reported level of criminal activity outside of the businesses with respondents from areas with fewer than the mean

number of cafés significantly reporting a greater increase of criminal activity on the café premises than those respondents from areas with a high number of cafés ($p = .018$).

Analyzing complaints and calls for service by type of criminal activity only yielded one significant difference between those respondents from areas with a low number of cafés compared with those respondents from areas with a higher number of Internet cafés. The number of respondents from the low café group reporting no robbery complaints was more than three times greater than the number of respondents from the high group reporting no robbery complaints ($p = .017$). Thus robbery appears to become more problematic as the number of cafés within a city or county increases. While not approaching statistical significance, the two groups did differ substantially in terms of citizen-initiated complaints with these events reported as occurring more frequently in jurisdictions with fewer than the mean number of cafés ($p = . 077$). This may indicate a small-town policing phenomenon where citizens are more likely to know law enforcement officers personally and more likely to initiate contact when a problem occurs.

Results indicated that respondents from the two groups differed significantly in terms of their viewpoints surrounding the taxation of Internet cafés. Respondents with fewer cafés in their respective jurisdictions were significantly more likely to agree that taxation is an effective means for lowering the state's budget deficit ($p = .002$). Perceptions on the legality of Internet cafés did not differ significantly with respondents overwhelmingly

Table 4. *Mean Effectiveness Ratings by Café Group*

Management Strategy	Low Café Group	High Café Group
Prohibit	4.1	4.7
Re-Zone	2.9	2.2
Taxation	3.3	3.1
Regulate	3.4	3.6
Patron ID	3.0	1.9*
Hours of Operation	2.9	2.6
Surveillance	2.9	2.1
Moratorium	3.0	2.8
Age Restrictions	2.0	2.6
Licenses & Fees	3.4	2.8

*$p < .05$

agreeing that these establishments are illegal based on their interpretation of the state's statute banning video poker. Respondents viewed Internet cafés as illegal regardless of the number of such businesses in their respective jurisdictions ($p = .448$).

A series of t-tests were conducted to compare respondents from the low and high café jurisdictions on their perceptions regarding the most effective measures or policies for managing Internet gambling businesses. As Table 4 depicts, the perceived effectiveness rankings did not differ significantly by group with the exception of requiring documentation and photo identification of café patrons. This form of regulation and management was significantly more likely to be rated as effective by those respondents from the low café group ($t = 2.21$, $df = 16.08$; $p = .036$).

Discussion and Conclusion

This study documents the existence of criminal and illegal behaviors at or near a random selection of Internet sweepstakes cafés. While further research is needed to track the prevalence and incidence of these crimes precisely, the exploratory data this paper presents reveal that both police and sheriffs' offices have responded to calls for service and citizen complaints at these establishments for violent, nonviolent, and nuisance-related offenses. Thus criminal activity does occur at these types of businesses, which suggests that proponents of these gambling establishments are not completely correct in arguing that these are family-friendly and crime-free areas. While the majority of the respondents did not describe serious increases in the number and types of criminal activity at or near these cafés, the data do indicate that many law enforcement agencies have scrutinized these cafés with a watchful eye as slightly more than one-third of the survey participants also reported ongoing or completed criminal investigations of these cafés.

Findings in this study are consistent with previous claims by academics and law enforcement executives associating crime with online gambling and Internet sweepstakes cafés. Findings in this study were consistent with previous research by Franklin (2001), Manter (2003), and Conon (2009), who all associate online gambling operations with violent and nonviolent crime such as robbery or theft. This research is also consistent with the work of Chen et al. (2005) who found that theft and robbery were far more frequent than charges related to fraud when discussing Internet café related criminal activity.

Law enforcement perceptions and opinions regarding the legality of these cafés is consistent with the prior literature, media accounts, and anecdotal evidence as the commonly held assumption that law enforcement opposes Internet gaming was found to exist among 67% of the respondents. Further support can be found in the fact that outright prohibition was rated as the most effective means for managing these establishments.

The majority of the respondents also expressed viewpoints that recent court rulings and injunctions protecting the legitimacy of Internet gambling parlors or businesses hindered their investigative and order-maintenance abilities.

Study findings indicate few differences in the types of criminal activities, law enforcement perceptions, and management practices based on the number of Internet cafés within a jurisdiction. Significant differences were found to exist when discussing levels of criminal activity outside of the cafés with participants from areas with fewer cafés reporting a greater increase in all types of crime occurring on the outside of the café. Robbery complaints were found to vary significantly by number of Internet cafes with respondents from areas with a large number of cafés reporting more of these complaints. Both groups agreed that Internet cafés are illegal under current state statutes, while those from areas with fewer cafés were slightly (significantly) more likely to view taxation of these businesses in a more favorable light. These respondents were also more likely to prefer requiring café patrons to present proper and valid photo identification as a means of regulating and controlling these businesses.

Manter (2003) and Conon (2009) project that as the number of individual bettors who participate in unregulated or prohibited Internet gambling increases, a concurrent reduction will occur in tax revenues from legitimate gambling operations, such as the state lottery. The increase in the number of illegal bettors may also contribute to an increase in problem gaming in the absence of safeguards to protect against gaming addiction and underaged gaming. This study did not find any support for increasing gambling addiction or underaged gambling as reported by law enforcement officials. While beyond the scope of this research, additional research should be conducted to ascertain the effects of Internet sweepstakes cafés on their patrons. Research should also be directed at determining whether individuals who frequent these establishments also participate in the state's education lottery and/or engage in illegal sports betting or card playing, and, if so, how much time and money they expend on each of these activities.

Note

1. A modified version of this article was published previously by the North Carolina Governor's Crime Commission online at http://www.ncgccd.org/pdfs/internet_cafe.pdf .

References

Associated Press. (2009, February 20). Judge tosses out N.C.'s ban on video poker machines. *News-Record.com*. Retrieved December 3, 2010, from www.news-record.com/content/2009/02/20/article/judge_tosses_out_ncs_ban_on_video_poker_machines

Brechbill, H. (2001). *Internet gambling: Will technological and jurisdictional concerns prevent government prohibition of online gambling?* Retrieved May 26, 2010, from http://daviddfriedman.com/Academic/Course_Pages/21st_century_issues/legal_issues_21_2000_pprs_web/21st_c_papers_2001/brechbill_internet_gambling.htm

Browder, C. (2010a, January 27). Gambling becoming a safer bet in N.C. *WRAL.com*. Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.wral.com/news/local/wral_investigates/story/6899807/

Browder, C. (2010b, February 8). Cities try to crack down on gambling parlors. *WRAL.com*. Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.wral.com/news/local/wral_investigates/story/6988331/

Browder, C. (2010c, March 5). Lawmakers to take aim at 'sweepstakes cafés'. *WRAL.com*. Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.wral.com/news/local/wral_investigates/story/7175661/

Browder, C. (2010d, May 12). Study: Sweepstakes cafés could net N.C. millions. *WRAL.com*. Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.wral.com/news/local/wral_investigates/story/7591471/

Brown v. Mastercard Int'l, Inc. (In re Mastercard Int'l, Inc. Internet Gambling Litig.), 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3056 (E.D. La. Feb. 18, 2004). Also retrieved from http://www.Internetlibrary.com/pdf/In-re-Mastercard-Internet-Gambling-Litigation.pdf

Chen, Y-C, Chen, P. S., Hwang, J-J, Korba, L., Song, R., & Yee, G. (2005). An analysis of online gaming crime characteristics. *Internet Research*, *15*(3), 246–261.

Chiang, J. W. (2007). Don't bet on it: How complying with federal internet gambling law is not enough. *Shidler Journal of Law, Commerce, and Technology*, *4*(2). Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.lctjournal.washington.edu/Vol4/a02Chiang.html

Clotfelter, C. T. (2000). *Do lotteries hurt the poor? Well, yes and no.* Testimony, N.C. House Select Committee on a State Lottery, April 19, 2000. Retrieved May 27, 2010, from http://sanford.duke.edu/news/newsletters/dpn/summer00/lottery.html

Conon, J. (2009). Aces and eights: Why the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act resides in "dead man's" land in attempting to further curb online gambling and why expanded criminalization is preferable to legalization. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, *99*(4).

Cornell University Law School, LII/Legal Information Institute. (2010). *Gambling law: An overview.* Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://topics.law.cornell.edu/wex/gambling

Crisco, R. D. (2003). Follow the leaders: A constructive examination of existing regulatory tools that could be applied to Internet gambling. *North Carolina Journal of Law & Technology, 5*(1). Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://jolt.unc.edu/sites/default/files/crisco_v.pdf

Davis, M. L. (2007, June). *Taxing the poor: A report on tobacco, alcohol, gambling, and other taxes and fees that disproportionately burden lower-income families.* National Center for Policy Analysis (NCPA) Policy Report No. 300. Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/st300.pdf

Eggen, D. (2010, February 7). Internet gambling again in play. *The Washington Post.* Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/06/AR2010020602190.html

Franklin, C. (2001, June 20). Virtual Las Vegas: Regulate or prohibit? *Duke Law & Technology Review.* Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.law.duke.edu/journals/dltr/articles/2001dltr0021.html

Freese, M. (2005). Rolling the dice: Are online gambling advertisers aiding and abetting criminal activity or exercising First Amendment-protected commercial speech? *Fordham Intellectual Property, Media & Entertainment Law Journal.*

Hammer, R. (2001, October 31). Does Internet gambling strengthen the US economy? Don't bet on it. Retrieved from http://www.law.indiana.edu/fclj/pubs/v54/no1/Hammer.pdf

Hottman, S. (2010, May 16). Internet gaming to get costly. *The Robesonian.com.* Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://robesonian.com/bookmark/7443505

Lee, S. (2010, May 24). Judge denies preliminary injunction request in Internet café case. *Ocala.com.* Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.ocala.com/article/20100524/articles/100529865?p=1&tc=pg

Manter, G. (2003, July 11). The pending determination of the legality of Internet gambling in the United States. *Duke Law & Technology Review.* Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.law.duke.edu/journals/dltr/articles/pdf/2003DLTR0016.pdf

Montpas, S. M. (1996). Gambling on-line: For a hundred dollars, I bet you government regulation will not stop the newest form of gambling. *University of Dayton Law Review, 22*(163).

NGIS Commission. (1999). *National gambling impact study commission report.* Washington, D.C.: Author.

North Carolina General Statutes, G.S. § 14-306

North Carolina General Statutes, G.S. § 14-306.1A

Roberts, A. (2010, April 19). Roanoke Co. police explain raids on Internet cafés. *WSLS.com.* Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www2.wsls.com/news/2010/apr/20/police_detail_reasons_why_they_raided_four_interne-ar-364613/

Robertson, G. D. (2010, May 3). Video gaming again on the table for NC lawmakers. *Bloomberg Businessweek.* Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.businessweek.com/ap/financialnews/D9FFEHP81.htm

SAFE Port Act. H.R. 4954 [109th]. (2006). Retrieved June 7, 2010, from *Govtrack.us* Web site: http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=h109-4954

Saulny, S. (2010, May 6). 'Sweepstakes' Cafés Thrive, Despite Police Misgivings. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/07/us/07gambling.html

Security and Accountability for Every Port Act (SAFE Port Act). 31 U.S.C. § 5361–5367.

Security and Accountability for Every Port Act (SAFE Port Act). 109th Cong. Rec, H8540–8569 (2006).

Sorg, L., & Schwartz, J. (2010, February 24). Coming to your low-income neighborhood: A sweepstakes café. *Independent Weekly.* Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.indyweek.com/indyweek/sweepstakes-cafés-coming-to-your-low-income-neighborhood/Content?oid=1300495

Stasio, F., & Margolis, G. (2010, March 19). Internet sweepstakes cafés. *The State of Things* [radio broadcast]. Chapel Hill, NC: North Carolina Public Radio. Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://wunc.org/tsot/archive/2sot0319a10.mp3/view

Suarez, R. (2006, October 16). President Bush signs law banning Internet gambling. *PBS NewsHour.* Retrieved December 3, 2010, from http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/business/july-dec06/gambling_10-16.html

Watson, S. (2010, May 19). Sweepstakes cafes: Video poker's new incarnation? *WCNC.com.* Retrieved from http://www.wcnc.com/home/Sweepstakes-Cafes-Video-Pokers-new-incarnation--94322109.html

Perceived Roles of Campus Law Enforcement: A Cognitive Review of Attitudes and Beliefs of Campus Constituents

Charles P. Wilson and **Shirley A. Wilson**

Constituent perceptions of the role of campus law enforcement agencies and their personnel are important in providing quality, professionalized services to these unique communities. Support for enhancements to professionalized services is tied indelibly to those perceptions. This article seeks to assess levels of support for further professionalizing campus law enforcement services by arming campus police officers and to assess the influence of race and gender on support for those services. The authors used a nine-question survey document to determine that significant levels of support exist both on campus and in the surrounding community for further professionalizing campus law enforcement through arming, and while women were not overwhelmingly in support, racial minorities do support arming campus law enforcement.

Key Words: Campus police ◆ community perception ◆ police-community relations ◆ higher education ◆ police contacts ◆ arming issues

In no other environment are perceptions of the role of law enforcement officers and their authority as convoluted and contested as in the academic setting. Campus police officers are viewed as either a necessary evil or as a means of promoting positive relationships with campus constituents and coping proactively with the advancing spectre of campus crime (Grant, 1993). Constituent perceptions of the role of campus law enforcement agencies and their personnel are important in providing quality, professionalized services to these distinctly unique communities. And support for enhancements to professionalized services is tied indelibly to those perceptions.

Modern campus law enforcement agencies provide many of the same services, and more, that their traditional police counterparts do, albeit in a more microcosmic community. Most of these agencies incorporate the same community oriented policing concepts, provide escort services and student and faculty training sessions in both personal and community safety procedures, and interact directly with members of the campus community in both professional and social settings. As society becomes more complex and crime spreads to every facet of life, institutions across the nation have been

Charles P. Wilson serves with the Rhode Island College Campus Police Department as a patrol shift supervisor. Shirley A. Wilson is associate professor of management at Bryant University in Smithfield, Rhode Island.

charged with the responsibility of providing a safe educational, working, and living environment on campus for employees, faculty, and students alike (Wilson & Wilson, 2001).

Campus police departments have a unique responsibility in the college setting to provide security services that meet both law enforcement and private security standards. Providing security for large numbers of students spread over expansive geographic areas is an inherently difficult task (Newman, 1996). Yet the legitimacy of campus law enforcement, its proper role in the academic setting, questions regarding police liability, and the issue of arming campus officers have remained major arguments in the effort to professionalize police services to the campus community.

Campus police officers are considered as first responders and bear the responsibility for the investigation and response to all campus-related criminal activities, ranging from disturbances to domestic arguments; suspicious persons and vehicles to fights in progress; stolen vehicles to sexual assaults; substance abuse issues to weapons offenses. However, where unarmed officers are called to respond to violence-prone issues, they are universally required to delay their response until assistance can be obtained from local armed law enforcement agencies.

Campus police officers are thrust into a variety of roles and responsibilities. Their roles as peace officers, security guards, policy enforcers, and public relations officers for the institution are intermingled and sometimes conflicting (Foster, 1986). Gone are the days of the custodial guard-type situations, which used to permeate the role of campus law enforcement. Drugs and alcohol abuse, sexual assaults, thefts, domestic violence, and homicides occur just as readily on the nation's college campuses as they do in the roughest neighborhoods of the nation's cities (Leaderman, 1994).

It is no wonder then that campus community members, including not only students, faculty, and staff, but parents, spouses, and residents of the surrounding neighborhoods, may today demand the same level of service from their campus departments as they do from their municipal law enforcement agencies (Atwell, 1988). Yet there is very limited prior research regarding community perceptions of campus police departments and their duties (Johnson & Bromley, 1999). This is particularly true where the issue of the use of firearms by campus law enforcement is concerned.

Perceived Roles of Campus Law Enforcement

Many are not aware of the requirements that have been set in place either by legislative fiat or agency policy for campus law enforcement. Virtually every state has imposed statutory language defining the position, authority, and powers granted to campus police officers at both public and private institutions, with the majority of these statutes covering publicly supported institutions of higher learning. And while the majority leave the issue of

establishing campus law enforcement agencies to college and university controlling agents (Board of Education, Trustees, or Campus President), very few provide strict limitations on allowing campus officers to be armed (RIGL, §16-52-2).

Police agencies, in general, have sought to become more professionalized since the days of the first night watchman. Studies using Hall's 1968 Professionalism Scale concluded that officers possess higher-than-average professionalism attitudes (Carlan & Lewis, 2009). College students aspiring to become law enforcement officers were found to view policing as more of a profession than just an employment source (Bumgarner, 2002), and these concepts of professionalism have expanded to the non-traditional venue of campus policing on a wide scale.

In response to both media attention and growing numbers of violent crimes on campuses, most large colleges and universities have systematically professionalized their public safety departments, so much so that they are now analogous to their local, county, and state counterparts in policing. This transformation has included formalized law enforcement training, the granting of arrest powers, and in most cases the permission to carry firearms while on duty.

Attitudes of Women and Minorities Toward Police

It would appear that the principal research regarding the relationships between women and the police has centered on the effect of survivor services for victims of domestic abuse and rape trauma. While there has been some indication that gender bias exists in the relationships between law enforcement officers and females during traffic stops (Blalock, DeVaro, Leventhal, & Simon, 2007), and police may be inclined to use race and gender as a determining factor when issuing traffic citations (Quintanar, 2009), little information has been presented regarding the perceptions or attitudes of females as they regard the police in other interactions.

As regards the disparate effect that arming campus police would have on students of color, both historical and empirical data have spoken to the lack of trust in police and the criminal justice system in communities of color. Surveys have shown that Blacks are less likely than Whites to trust the police and Whites are more favorably disposed toward law enforcement (Gallup, 1999; Harris, 1999; Jacob, 1971). Carr, Napolitano, and Keating (2007) indicate that variation exists along neighborhood context in terms of the likelihood of police using force: Police are more likely to use force on suspects or engage in misconduct in disadvantaged neighborhoods.

Research has also demonstrated that cynicism is very high among residents of disadvantaged neighborhoods, showing that these residents can have a distinct intolerance for crime even while being negative toward police and the justice system in

general (Anderson, 1993; Sampson & Bartusch, 1998), and there are high levels of dissatisfaction with police among residents of poor neighborhoods (Carr, Napolitano, & Keating, 2007; Huang, Wilson, & Vaughn, 1996; Smith, Graham, & Adams, 1991). Nearly 9 out of 10 Black residents questioned in previous surveys said they thought the police often engaged in brutality against Blacks, and almost two-thirds said police brutality against members of minority groups is widespread (Barry & Connelly, 1999).

Campus Policing vs. Traditional Law Enforcement

The precepts of campus law enforcement that dictate its differences from traditional policing are its ability to relate, specifically, to the atmosphere of trust, respect, and perceptually safe havens that our colleges and universities so carefully embrace and expose their communities to. This capacity is most glaringly identified through those specific and definitively non-law enforcement related activities campus police perform: working directly with student groups as advisors and mentors; participating in student-managed affairs and events; coordinating efforts with housing officials; and providing such quality-of-life services as assisting with student lock-outs, stalled or disabled vehicles, and so on. These service-type activities, not found in traditional law enforcement circles, are what clearly mark the community policing programs of campus law enforcement as more successful than those of their traditional counterparts. They are, in fact, the staples of campus policing without which no campus agency can truly operate or survive.

During the 2004–2005 school year, 74% of the 750 law enforcement agencies serving four-year universities and colleges with 2,500 or more students employed sworn law enforcement officers. These officers had full arrest powers granted by a state or local government. The remainder employed non-sworn security officers only. Nearly all public campuses (93%) used sworn officers compared with less than half of private campuses (42%). Two-thirds (67%) of campus law enforcement agencies surveyed used armed patrol officers during the 2004–2005 school year. Armed patrol officers were used at nearly 9 in 10 agencies that employed sworn officers and at nearly 1 in 10 agencies that relied on non-sworn officers only (Reaves, 2008).

Hiring policies for campus law enforcement officers directly mimic those in place for their municipal counterparts and in many cases exceed them. Generally, a higher percentage of campus police departments require a minimum two-year degree and previous full-time service in a position having authority for arrest, search and seizure, and protection of life and property when compared with their municipal counterparts (Bromley, 1998). Nearly all campus law enforcement agencies require extensive background checks and mandatory training programs that either meet or significantly exceed those of their public counterparts.

Likewise Sloan (1992) found that campus police entities have evolved to resemble their municipal counterparts in both structure and operation, with the size of many of today's college campuses paralleling or surpassing that of many small municipalities.

About two-thirds (69%) of campus law enforcement agencies have incorporated community policing into their campus security policy. Most agencies (59%) assign patrol officers to specific geographic areas on campus. About half have upgraded technology to support community policing efforts (51%) and collaborated with citizen groups, using their feedback to support community policing strategies (47%). And nearly 57% of all campus agencies had some form of written policy pertaining to racial profiling (Reaves, 2005).

And so, how are these arbiters of campus justice and safety actually perceived by their constituents in terms of professionalization and the need to provide increased or better services? The alignment of campus police and university goals is paramount. This perspective must be maintained because the success and health of the college or university depends on the organization's effectiveness in accomplishing goals aligned with an educational function (Striegel & Cox, 1994).

Literature Review

To date, while numerous items have been published regarding the issue of weapons on campus, several dealing specifically with the need to arm campus law enforcement officers (Connor, 2003; Harnisch, 2008; Jacobson, 1995; Jiao, 2001; Karp, 2001; Kopel, 2009; McBride, 2009; Miller, Hemenway, & Wechsler, 1999; Reaves, 2005; Siebel, 2008; Smith, 1989; Vanbenthuysen, 1976; Waddington, 1988; Wilson & Wilson, 2001), little has been written concerning the perceptions of campus constituents regarding campus law enforcement services (Benedict, Brown, & Bower, 2000; Chackerian, 1974; Grant, 1993; Hurst & Frank, 2000; Miller & Pan, 1987; Shipman, 1994). The vast amount of literature written regarding weapons on campus has spoken to strong opposition to allowing students to have weapons, and almost all literature dealing with the issue of arming of campus law enforcement officers has dealt not with opposition to that level of professionalization but rather with those issues related to its implementation. In fact, it has been suggested that campus police have a legitimate need to carry weapons on duty in light of the increase in campus crime, especially that committed by off-campus persons (Vanbenthuysen, 1976). Also, recent government-sponsored research has indicated that the percentage of campuses using armed personnel for patrol actually increased from 66% to 72% between 1995 and 2005, with two-thirds (67%) of all campuses surveyed having armed officers (Reeves, 2005).

Wada, Patten, and Candela (2010) indicate that no studies have determined whether a campus police officer and "mainstream" police officer's perceived legitimacy levels

differ. Skogan (2005) found that although there are many determinants of people's attitudes and assessments of policing, none is more important for policy than the quality of service rendered.

A gap in the literature then appears to be information regarding the perceptions of campus constituents regarding the need to professionalize campus law enforcement and the services it provides and how these perceptions are viewed in terms of both the race and gender of the constituent. Only a few have investigated this issue as it pertains to race (Mbuba, 2010; Peek, Lowe, & Alston, 1981; Rusinko, Johnson, & Hornung, 1978; Waddington & Braddock, 1991) and fewer still as it pertains to gender.

Methods

The research for this article was conducted in the State of Rhode Island for its singular status of having the only public college campus law enforcement agencies in the nation that do not maintain armed campus police officers. The project was designed to elicit campus and community perceptions of the need to professionalize these agencies by granting them permission to carry weapons during the normal course of their duties. Specifically, the research was geared to determine whether campus and community constituents understood the duties and functions of campus police, levels of training required to perform those functions, and attitudes toward arming. The authors hypothesized that (1) the majority of campus constituents agree with efforts to professionalize campus law enforcement agencies further; (2) those who agree with the concepts of a formalized professional format for campus law enforcement also agree that campus police officers should be armed while on duty; (3) women, in general, agree that campus officers should be armed, and (4) racial minorities support the arming of campus law enforcement officers.

In the context of this study, campus community members comprised students, faculty, and staff as well as parents, spouses, and residents of the surrounding neighborhoods, as all are inherent stakeholders in campus safety.

Data Collection

A survey questionnaire was developed that elicited information regarding the respondents' gender, race, and response to questions pertaining to comparative issues between campus police and more traditional law enforcement agencies on such topics as power and authority, training, hiring procedures, performance of duties, access to standard police technology, and use of firearms on duty. The questionnaire in its final form was administered to 500 faculty, staff, and students at the three state education institutions. It was also placed on a donated Internet site, the location for which was published to an

email list of 1,500 Rhode Island residents, which included students, faculty, staff, parents, spouses, and community members, thus providing a total population of 2,000 possible respondents. Persons taking the written survey were not advised of the website location.

Participants were presented with nine questions. Two questions requested information pertaining to the participants' race and sex, and six questions asked whether they agreed, disagreed, or had no specific opinion on variables regarding police power and authority, law enforcement training, hiring procedures, performance standards, access to technology, and the ability to carry firearms. A final question was presented for those persons who disagreed with the ability to carry firearms, allowing these respondents to provide a brief response as to the reason for their disagreement. Each of the first eight questions required a response to complete the survey, and participants were allowed only one attempt to respond. The online survey was made available for a period of 30 days. A final sample of 380 respondents was obtained, giving a 19% overall response rate.

Results

The predominant arguments against arming campus law enforcement officers were that (1) they do not have the requisite experience for this level of professionalism; (2) armed campus officers will ultimately have a disparate effect on students of color; (3) they do not perform in the same substantive manner as more traditionally employed law enforcement personnel; (4) they do not have the proper training for this level of enhancement; and (5) weapons are not needed on the college campus.

Each of these arguments may, and should, more appropriately be considered in terms of the methodology of hiring, training, and performance standards that are expected for campus law enforcement to achieve.

An analysis of the data collected indicates that campus constituents were in strong agreement that campus police officers should meet the same training (80.3%), hiring (84.2%), and performance standards (77.1%) as traditional law enforcement officers. Also, 61.1% of all respondents agreed that, if campus police officers are held to the same hiring, training, and performance standards as more traditionally employed law enforcement officers, they should be armed while in the normal course of their duties. This, therefore, is believed to prove the first two hypotheses of this study.

When considering the influence of gender on the issues of training, hiring, and performance, 81.4% of males and 78.3% of females agreed that campus police should receive the same training levels; 88% of males and 78% of females agreed they should meet the same hiring standards; and 83% of males and 68% of females agreed they should be held to the same performance standards as their more traditional counterparts.

Where race was considered on these same issues, it is notable that, where Blacks were concerned, 82% agreed they should meet the same training standards, 73.3% agreed they should meet the same hiring standards, and 73.3% agreed they should meet the same performance standards as their public counterparts. In fact, for non-white Hispanics, percentages were higher relating to training (83.3%) and hiring (90%) than for Blacks.

As regards the arming of campus police officers, 71.3% of males agreed they should be armed, while only 44.1% of females were in agreement. Racially, 64% of Whites, 57% of Blacks, and 53.3% of non-White Hispanics agreed that, as long as campus police met the same standards of training, hiring, and performance, they should be armed during the normal course of their duties.

Discussion

It appears clear that significant levels of support exist for enhancing the professional status of campus law enforcement officers and their agencies to include the arming of campus police. And while women and racial minorities both expressed support for the arming of campus law enforcement officers, the percentage of racial minorities supporting arming (57% for Blacks and 53.3% for non-white Hispanics) was significantly higher than for women in general (44.1%). Males generally were in significant support for the arming of campus law enforcement officers (71.3%).

The relationship between racial minorities and their support for arming seems also to be in direct contrast to their reported levels of trust for police in general. Nonetheless, the data appear to be clear that, provided campus law enforcement officers are held to the same professional standards of training, hiring, and performance as their more traditional counterparts, racial minorities support arming campus police. In fact, it may be significant to note that while Blacks were less likely to support arming than Whites, their level of support for arming (57%) was only slightly lower than the level of support for arming among the entire sample (61.1%).

Campus constituents today, regardless of their involvement with that community, recognize, desire, and deserve the same levels of professional acumen that is inherent in the standards accepted throughout the greater law enforcement community. Their perceived value of campus law enforcement and safety services appears no less stringent than that held for their public counterparts. Most notably, racial minorities and females appear to have strong levels of approval for the further professionalization of campus law enforcement personnel and services. And while females had much lower levels of acceptance of armed law enforcement officers on campus, racial minorities had much higher levels of acceptance for armed campus police officers than expected originally.

These findings illustrate the relevance of studies of perceptions of the role of campus law enforcement. Specifically, they demonstrate the value of such studies in terms of informing academic administrators and legislative leaders of the true concerns of campus constituents and the need to address these issues more appropriately and adequately. The use of sworn law enforcement personnel in the campus setting without the further enhancement of their training, procedures in hiring, and the establishment of clearly defined professional performance standards can lead only to costly litigation. Where campus law enforcement officers are empowered with statutory authority and responsibility, they become nothing more than a lawsuit waiting to be filed. And it must be accepted that the arming of campus law enforcement officers fits well within the concept of professional law enforcement standards in both training and performance.

Lastly, it must be noted that these findings add empirical support to the thesis that campus law enforcement officers should be armed during the normal course of their everyday duties, even while recognizing that each campus community has different needs and expectations of its campus safety forces. Conventional wisdom, however, holds that where these officers are expected to provide the same services and perform in the same manner as their more public counterparts, they should be provided with the same tools.

References

Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence and the moral life of the inner city.* New York: Norton.

Atwell, R. M. (1988). *Memorandum regarding campus security.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Barry, D., & Connelly, M. (1999, March 16). Poll in New York finds many think police are biased. *The New York Times.*

Benedict, W. R., Brown, B., & Bower, D. J. (2000). Perceptions of the police and fear of crime in a rural setting: Utility of a geographically focused survey for police services, planning, and assessment. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 11*(4), 275–298.

Blalock, G., DeVaro, J., Leventhal, S., & Simon, D. (2007). *Gender bias in power relationships: Evidence from police traffic stops.* Working paper 10. Cornell University ILR School.

Bromley, M. L. (1998). Comparing campus and municipal police: The human resource dimension. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 21*(3), 534–546.

Bumgamer, J. (2002). An assessment of the perceptions of policing as a profession among two-year and four-year criminal justice and law enforcement students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 13*, 313–334.

Carlan, P. E., & Lewis, J. A. (2009). Professionalism in policing: Assessing the professionalization movement. *Professional Issues in Criminal Justice, 4*(1) 39–58. Retrieved December 12, 2010, from http://www.picj.org/vol4_1.aspx .

Carr, P. J., Napolitano, L., Keating, J. (2007). We never call the cops and here is why: A qualitative examination of legal cynicism in three Philadelphia neighborhoods. *Criminology, 45* (2), 445–480.

Chackerian, R. (1974). Police professionalism and citizen evaluation: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 13*, 486–500.

Connor, J. A. (2003). Arming campus police. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal, 33*(5), 18–20, 22.

Foster, J. (1986). Professionalism and campus police officers. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 10*(2), 222–235.

Gallup, G. (1999). *The Gallup poll: Public opinion 1999.* Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources.

Grant, S. A. (1993). Students respond to "campus cops." *School Safety*, 15–17.

Hall, R. H. (1968). Professionlization and bureaucratization. *American Sociological Review, 33*, 92–104.

Harnisch, T. L. (2008). *Concealed weapons on state college campuses: In pursuit of individual liberty and collective security.* Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Higher Education Policy Brief, AASCU Policy Matters.

Harris, L. (1999). *The Harris poll: March.* New York: Louis Harris.

Huang, W. Wilson, S., & Vaughn, M. S. (1996). Support and confidence: Public attitudes toward the police (pp. 31–45). In T. J. Flanagan & D. R. Longmire (Eds.), *Americans view crime and justice: A national public opinion survey.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hurst, Y. G., & Frank, J. (2000). How kids view cops: The nature of juveniles' attitudes toward the police. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 28*(3), 189–202.

Jacob, H. (1971). Black and white perceptions of justice in the city. *Law and Society Review, 6*, 69–89.

Jacobson, J. S. (1995). The model campus police jurisdiction act: Toward broader jurisdiction for university police. *Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems, 39.*

Jiao, A. Y. (2001). Should campus police officers be allowed to carry guns? Arguments for and against arming the campus police. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal, 31*(4), 15–17.

Johnson, R. P., & Bromley, M. (1999). Surveying a university population: Establishing the foundation for a community policing initiative. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 15*(2), 133–143.

Karp, H. (2001, April). How safe is your kid at college? *Readers' Digest,* 82–89.

Kopel, D. B. (2009). Pretend 'gun-free' school zones: A deadly legal fiction. *Connecticut Law Review, 42*(2), 515–584.

Leaderman, D. (1994). Forewarned is fore-armed: The crime awareness and campus security act. *Case Western Law Review, 43,* 525.

McBride, J. (2009). Should campus police be armed? *Law and Order, 57*(6), 23–24.

Mbuba, J. M. (2010). Attitude towards the police: The significance of race and other factors among college students. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice,* 8(3), 201–215.

Miller, J. L., & Pan, M. J. (1987). Student perceptions of campus police: The effects of personal characteristics and police contacts. *American Journal of Police, 6,* 27–44.

Miller, M., Hemenway, D., & Wechsler, H. (1999, July). Guns at college. *Journal of American College Health, 48,* 7–12.

Newman, J. A. (1996). Civil liability and campus police. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal, 26*(1), 3–7.

Peek, C. W., Lowe, G. D., & Alston, J. P. (1981). Race and attitudes toward the police: Another look. *Journal of Black Studies, 11*(3), 361–374.

Quintanar, S. (2009). *Man vs. machine: An investigation of speeding ticket disparities based on gender and race.* Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University, Department of Economics Working Paper Series.

Reaves, B. (2008). *Campus law enforcement, 2004–2005.* Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Studies Special Report, NCJ 219374.

Rhode Island General Laws, § 16-52-2, Appointment of Campus Police.

Rusinko, W., Johnson, K., & Hornung, C. (1978). The importance of police contact in the formulation of youths' attitudes toward the police. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 6,* 53–67.

Sampson, R.J. & Bartusch, D.J. 1998. Legal cynicism and (subcultural?) tolerance of deviance: The neighborhood context of racial differences. *Law and Society*, 32, 777–804.

Shipman, M. (1994). Perceptions of campus police: Newsgathering and access to public records. *Newspaper Research Journal*, *15*, 2–13.

Siebel, B. (2008). The case against guns on campus. *Civil Rights Law Journal*, 18(2), 319–337.

Skogan, W. G. (2005). Citizen satisfaction with police encounters. *Police Quarterly*, *8*(3), 298–321.

Sloan, J. (1992). The modern campus police: An analysis of their evolution, structure, and function. *American Journal of Police*, *11*(1), 85–104.

Smith, D. A., Graham, N., & Adams, B. (1991). Minorities and the police: Attitudinal and behavioral questions. In Michael J. Lynch and E. Britt Patterson (Eds.). *Race and criminal Justice*. New York: Harrow and Heston.

Smith, M. C. (1989). Cops or watchmen? Policy considerations in the role of campus security. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, *19*(1), 38–39.

Striegel, D., & Cox, T. C. (1994). A qualitative analysis of police-citizen contacts at a private university. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, *24*(1), 28–35.

Vanbenthuysen, H. E. (1976). Campus police: Armed does not mean dangerous. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, *6*(6), 11–16.

Wada, J. C., Patten, R., & Candela, K. (2010). Betwixt and between: the perceived legitimacy of campus police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *33*(1), 114–131.

Waddington, P. A. J. (1988). *Arming an unarmed police: Policy and practice in the metropolitan police.* Paper delivered at Midwestern Legislative Conference of the Council of State Governments, Lombard, IL.

Waddington, P. A. J., & Braddock, Q. (1991). "Guardians" or "bullies"?: Perceptions of the police amongst adolescent Black, White and Asian boys. *Policing and Society*, *2*, 31–45.

Wilson, C. P., & Wilson, S. A. (2001). The arming of campus police: A study of the use and deployment of armed campus police officers in the New England area and resultant implications for legislative change in the state of Rhode Island. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, *30*(4), 27–32.

Actions on Suspicion of White-Collar Crime in Business Organizations: An Empirical Study of Intended Responses by Chief Financial Officers

Petter Gottschalk

White-collar crime can be defined in terms of the offense as well as the offender. Defined in terms of the offense, white-collar crime means financial crime against property for personal or organizational gain. Defined in terms of the offender, white-collar crime means financial crime committed by upper class members of society for personal or organizational gain. These individuals are wealthy, highly educated, and socially connected, and they are typically employed by and in legitimate organizations. This paper reports results from a survey of chief financial officers (CFOs) who were asked what actions they would take on suspicion of white-collar crime in the organization. Survey results indicate that the majority of CFOs would communicate and inform others rather than start investigations themselves.

The most economically disadvantaged members of society are not the only ones committing crime. Members of the privileged socioeconomic class are also engaged in criminal behavior. The types of crime may differ from those of the lower classes and include lawyers helping criminal clients launder their money, executives bribing public officials to achieve public contracts, and accountants manipulating balance sheets to avoid taxes. Another important difference between the two types of offenders is that the elite criminal is much less likely to be apprehended or punished due to his or her social status (Brightman, 2009).

The term *white-collar crime* expresses different concepts depending on perspective and context. In this research, white-collar crime is defined as financial crime committed by white-collar criminals. Thus, the definition includes characteristics of the crime as well as the criminal. Financial crime generally describes a variety of crimes against property, involving the unlawful conversion of property belonging to another to one's own personal use and benefit, more often than not involving fraud but also bribery, corruption, money laundering, embezzlement, insider trading, tax violations, cyber attacks, and the like (Henning, 2009). Criminal gain for personal benefit seems to be one of the core characteristics of financial crime.

Petter Gottschalk is professor of information systems and knowledge management in the Department of Leadership and Organizational Management at the Norwegian School of Management.

This paper is concerned with the following research question: *How will the chief financial officer (CFO) react when suspicion of white-collar crime emerges?* Results from a survey of CFOs in Norway are applied to answer this research question.

Literature Review

White-collar crime such as fraud, theft, and corruption occur within business companies (Acquaah-Gaisie, 2000; Toner, 2009). Company board and top management are responsible for preventing such crime (Aldama, Amar, & Trostianki, 2009; Baer, 2008) as well as avoiding becoming involved themselves.

White-collar crime can be defined in terms of the offense, the offender or both. If white-collar crime is defined in terms of the offense, it means crime against property for personal or organizational gain. It is a property crime committed by non-physical means and by concealment or deception (Benson & Simpson, 2009). If white-collar crime is defined in terms of the offender, it means crime committed by upper class members of society for personal or organizational gain. These individuals are wealthy, highly educated, and socially connected, and they are typically employed by and in legitimate organizations (Hansen, 2009).

Defined in terms of both perspectives, white-collar crime has the following characteristics:

- White-collar crime is crime against property for personal or organizational gain committed by non-physical means and by concealment or deception. It is deceitful, it is intentional, it breaches trust, and it involves losses.

- White-collar criminals are individuals who are wealthy, highly educated, and socially connected, and they are typically employed by and in legitimate organizations. They are persons of respectability and high social status who commit crime in the course of their occupation.

Edwin Sutherland introduced the concept of white-collar crime in 1939. According to Brightman (2009), Sutherland's theory was controversial, particularly because many of the academicians in the audience fancied themselves as members of the upper echelon of American society. Despite Sutherland's critics, his theory of white-collar criminality served as the catalyst for an area of research that continues today.

Brightman's (2009) definition of white-collar crime differs slightly from Sutherland's. While societal status may still determine access to wealth and property, Brightman argues that the term white-collar crime should be broader in scope and include virtually any nonviolent act committed for financial gain, regardless of one's social status. For example, access to technology, such as personal computers and the Internet, now allows individuals

from all social classes to buy and sell stocks or engage in similar activities that were once the bastion of the financial elite.

In Sutherland's definition of white-collar crime, a white-collar criminal is a person of respectability and high social status who commits crime in the course of his occupation. This definition excludes many crimes of the upper class, such as most cases of murder, adultery, and intoxication, as these are not customarily a part of their business procedures (Benson & Simpson, 2009). It also excludes lower class criminals committing financial crime, as Brightman pointed out (2009).

What Sutherland means by respectable and high social status individuals is not quite clear, but we can assume in today's business world he would mean business managers and executives. They are for the most part individuals with power and influence that is associated with respectability and high social status. Part of the standard view of white-collar offenders is that they are mainstream, law-abiding individuals. They are assumed to be irregular offenders, not people who engage in crime on a regular basis:

> Unlike the run-of-the-mill common street criminal who usually has had repeated contacts with the criminal justice system, white-collar offenders are thought not to have prior criminal records (Benson & Simpson, 2009, p. 39).

When white-collar criminals appear before their sentencing judges, they can correctly claim to be first-time offenders. Therefore, very few white-collar criminals are put on trial, and even fewer upper class criminals are sentenced to imprisonment, which is in contrast to most financial crime sentences among financial criminals appearing in the justice system who are not wealthy, highly educated, or socially connected.

White-collar criminals are not entrenched in criminal lifestyles as common street criminals. Although they are typically individuals employed by and in legitimate organizations, according to Hansen (2009), individuals or groups that commit occupational or elite crime do so more for their own purposes or enrichment, rather than for the enrichment of the organization on a whole, in spite of supposed corporate loyalty.

In a business setting, white-collar crime constitutes a significant challenge to the communication climate within a company. To what extent does relevant information reach CFOs and other decision makers in advance and while the crime is being committed, and to what extent do relevant facts reach CFOs and other decision makers after the fact? Typically, white-collar criminals are protected from being reported upon by others in the company who may be aware of the crime—especially subordinates who are afraid of the personal consequences. The threshold for bringing forward incriminating evidence is usually quite high. People who communicate their suspicions about such individuals may

do so at considerable personal risk to their careers. In the aftermath of the Enron case, such actions were labeled CLAs, short for Career Limiting Activities. Companies who are eager to receive information about white-collar crime thus need to create a communication climate in which employees can report such matters with limited risk of repercussion. When interpreting the data from this study, we also take into account what they convey about the risk involved in bringing forward information about possible white-collar crime.

Methods

The five hundred largest business companies in terms of annual sales were identified in Norway for our empirical study of white-collar crime. These companies employed, on average, 1,100 persons. A paper letter was mailed to the chief financial officer (CFO), asking him or her to fill in the questionnaire found on a website, which the CFO could access by using a password in the letter. Initially, 50 respondents filled in the questionnaire, representing a response rate of 10%. After a reminder was mailed to the sample, 61 more respondents filled in the questionnaire, for a total of 111 respondents, representing a response rate of 22%. In addition, there were 28 incomplete responses, thereby creating a total response rate of 28%.

The survey research was carried out from January to March 2010. The average number of employees in the CFO-responding companies is 1,671 persons. The largest company that had a CFO response has 30,000 employees. All letters were mailed to the CFO, and most of the respondents were CFOs, but some were CEOs and financial controllers.

The average age of respondents was 46 years, and they had on average 4.8 years of college and university education after high school. Most respondents were men; only 19 women were among the 111 respondents who completed the questionnaire.

The open-ended question in the CFO questionnaire about actions on suspicion of white-collar crime was formulated as *How will you proceed on suspicion of white-collar crime in your company?*

A total of 91 respondents provided answers to this open-ended question. As stated earlier, there were 28 incomplete questionnaires, and 111 usable questionnaires. We consider usable questionnaires to be all responses where the quantitative parts were completed. Here in the qualitative part, only 91 responses were provided. Responses were classified by applying content analysis (Riffe & Freitag, 1997). In the first round of questionnaire text reading, the author identified potential topics and clustered them into the following three main actions:

1. *Investigation.* On suspicion of white-collar crime, the CFO will initiate investigations.

2. *Confrontation.* On suspicion of white-collar crime, the CFO will confront the suspect.

3. *Communication.* On suspicion of white-collar crime, the CFO will inform others.

Results

Examples of investigation statements respondents provided include:

- Check available documentation for transactions and contracts.

- Collect evidence, then proceed to confrontation.

- Start by investigating locally, then escalate the case depending on relevance.

Examples of confrontation statements respondents provided include:

- Confront person directly.

- Confront person and possibly file police report.

- Fire person and report to police.

Examples of communication statements respondents provided include:

- Contact chairman of the board or external auditor.

- Contact executive management and, possibly, external advisor and police.

- Inform compliance leader and, possibly, board members.

Among the initial responses of 45 completed questionnaires, the following distribution was identified:

- 16 of 45 respondents would investigate the case, thus a rate of 36% for investigation.

- 2 of 45 respondents would confront suspect, thus 4% for confrontation.

- 27 of 45 respondents would inform others internally and/or externally, thus 60% for communication.

Among the 46 completed questionnaires received after the reminder, the following distribution was identified:

- 18 of 46 respondents would investigate the case, thus a rate of 39% for investigation.

- 1 of 46 respondents would confront the suspect, thus 2% for confrontation.

- 27 of 46 respondents would inform others internally and/or externally, thus 59% for communication.

Because the changes from the initial responses to the responses post-reminder are marginal, we conclude that non-respondents would tend to provide the same answers; therefore, we assume that the total sample would end up in a distribution where (1) most prefer the action of communication, (2) some prefer the action of investigation, and (3) few prefer the action of confrontation.

Among the total of 91 respondents who provided responses to the open-ended question of actions, the total distribution is as follows:

- 34 of 91 respondents would investigate the case, thus a rate of 37% for investigation.

- 3 of 91 respondents would confront the suspect, thus 3% for confrontation.

- 54 of 91 would inform others internally and/or externally, thus 59% for communication.

It is interesting to note that very few of the respondents related their response to a specific white-collar crime, and the questionnaire did not identify particular types of white collar crime. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that most respondents formulated their response so the organization is the victim rather than the offender.

Discussion

White-collar crime is not as visible as conventional crime and detection is difficult. For instance, in a homicide case, there is generally a body and forensic evidence. In the case of financial crime, Hansen (2009) argues that accounting and computer forensics are currently the investigators' best tools in detection and are implemented in most white-collar investigations in recent years. Applications of science and technology to white-collar crime cases is increasing, and advances in technology have led to a greater dependence on expert testimony in white-collar crime cases, keeping in mind that expert opinion cannot be given with absolute certainty.

Perhaps, Hansen (2009) argues, due to the financial resources elite individuals and corporations who are brought to justice have available to defend their cases combined with an aversion to negative publicity, plea bargaining prior to charges is more intense compared with that in conventional crime cases. Formal charging is more likely to be viewed as a failure by prosecutors because of the larger number of resources prosecutors

must divert to prosecute white-collar crime cases. (Prosecutors have to be capable of handling top-level lawyers paid by white-collar criminals in the backroom.) Also due to the greater stigma attached to jail or prison time for elites, these individuals may be reluctant to negotiate a plea bargain if incarceration is included in the deal. On the other hand, it is not unusual for convicted defendants to decide suddenly to cooperate in investigations to receive leniency at sentencing.

Regulation played a major role in the waves of white-collar crime that have struck many developed economies. During the 1980s, deregulation in many countries led to creative financial schemes, some legitimate, but others clearly criminal. Insider trading was rarely investigated or prosecuted by regulatory agencies, even though it was and is illegal. Deregulation is viewed as a culprit in allowing bad accounting practices, including the practice of hiding losses or debts, as in the case of Enron, as well as overstating profits and assets. Regulation in response to major corporate crimes is like closing the barn door after the sheep have all escaped. It is a difficult task to rein in malfeasance, particularly if the monetary reward continues to outweigh sanctions (Hansen, 2009).

According to Hansen (2009), self-regulation does not appear to be a solution either. Much of evaluation, either by external groups or internally, is ceremonial. For example, managers at a technology company may have only a rudimentary knowledge of chemistry, biology, or computers, employing technological experts to do the core work of the company. In other examples, a conflict of interest exists, as in the case of Arthur Andersen, which served as both auditor and paid consultant to Enron. In addition, certifiable standards have not proved successful. One reason is the frequent disconnect between certification and consistent compliance.

Self-regulation in terms of private policing of economic crime does not appear to be a solution either. Williams (2005, pp. 193–195) identified five barriers to this kind of governability:

1. *Secrecy, low visibility, and discretionary justice* lead to informal negotiations, easy termination, loose coupling between investigations and formal legal frameworks, and potential privileges for some individuals but not others.

2. *Multiple legal standards and forum shopping* lead to legal and procedural standards that tend to vary on a case-by-case basis, depending on the specific legal avenue or forum that is selected.

3. *Multiple legal actors* with distinct credentials and qualifications apply a variety of different professional and quasi-professional codes, standards, and obligations.

4. *Multiple stakeholders and interest groups* tend to have conflicts of interest. However, to speak of accountability and governance, one is inevitably required to adopt a particular point of view.

5. *Public-private dichotomy* leads to a liberal legal tradition, where the distinction between public and private remains an enduring feature of legal thought. It hinges on two related principles that bear directly on the activities of internal investigators. The first is that corporations enjoy the same legal rights as individuals and are thus defined as private legal actors. The second is that fundamental limits to the authority and jurisdiction of the state preclude unnecessary interventions and incursions into the private realm.

Similar to both Hansen (2009) and Williams (2005), Schneider (2006) studied privatizing economic crime enforcement by exploring the role of private sector investigative agencies. A financial investigate agency refers to an accounting-based, private sector organization that provides investigative, risk management, consulting, and litigation support services addressing economic crime. Schneider found that in addition to having significant potential in fighting crime, privatization has the danger of complicating law enforcement (2006).

A special kind of self-regulation is self-protection, where protection potentially is achieved by educated actors. An example is investor protection by weaknesses of initial public offerings (IPO). Solaiman (2009) argues that it is generally understood that investment knowledge empowers investors to protect themselves from the culpability of issuers, their professionals, and intermediaries who are called gatekeepers. Investors' ability to make prudent investment judgments for allocation of resources is regarded as an important element in every market economy.

Private policing of financial crime will have to build on organizational justice as perceived by organizational members. Scott, Colquitt, & Paddock (2009) found that a quarter century of research on organizational justice has revealed a great deal about how employees react to justice rule adherence and violation on the part of their managers. Employees evaluate justice along a number of dimensions: fairness of decision outcomes, fairness of decision-making processes, adequacy of explanations, and perceived sensitivity of interpersonal communication.

These dimensions are part of what Rodell and Colquitt (2009) call anticipatory justice: distributive justice, procedural justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice. The effects of anticipatory justice have been explored in the context of organizational change. Change is a natural component of employees' working lives, and employees may experience a variety of changes during their organizational tenure, ranging from large-scale

changes in the form of organizational relocations or mergers to new policies such as fringe benefit bans.

As part of their research on anticipatory justice, Zapata-Phelan, Colquitt, Scott, and Livingston (2009) studied procedural justice and intrinsic motivation among employees. What stands out most from the results of their study is the significant relationship between procedural justice and intrinsic motivation. The relationship was supported by using a self-report measure as well as reference motivation to both specific tasks and multifaceted tasks in terms of overall job duties. Such relationships tend to influence the role and performance of financial investigative agencies.

Schneider (2006) recommends that public policies and programs be developed that nurture an increased and more formal role for financial investigative agencies within the context of a partnership with government agencies. In Norway, a public debate in the media indicated that the role of financial investigative agencies should be reduced and more resources should be made available to the police (Føler meg rettsløs, 2009).

Receiving relevant and reliable information about white-collar crime is a considerable challenge within the business community. The white-collar criminal normally enjoys a higher degree of social protection than the ordinary, blue-collar criminal. The threshold for bringing forward information about a possible criminal act is higher due to the powerful social position of the criminal. Thus, there is a great need to develop a communication climate where even this kind of information is brought forward.

Conclusion

Fifty-four of 91 responding CFOs in Norway would inform others internally and/or externally about the occurrence of criminal activities within the organization; thus 59% of respondents would choose the option of communication rather than investigation or confrontation. Whether this is the "right" or "wrong" reaction certainly depends on the situation. For example, in cases of corruption and fraud, communication seems to be a more relevant and certainly more responsible option because the CFO does not have direct access to evidence. In other cases, such as fake invoicing and accounting manipulation, the CFO should probably choose investigation, because the CFO has direct access to evidence. Future research might explore such a contingent approach to actions on suspicion of white-collar crime in business organizations.

References

Acquaah-Gaisie, G. (2000). Fighting public officer and corporate crimes. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 8(1), 12–20.

Aldama, L. R. P., Amar, P. A., & Trostianki, D. W. (2009). Embedding corporate responsibility through effective organizational structure. *Corporate Governance*, 9(4), 506–516.

Baer, M. H. (2008). *Corporate policing and corporate governance: What can we learn from Hewlett-Packard's pretexting scandal?* New York University Public Law and Legal Theory Working Papers, Paper 73, New York University School of Law, NY.

Benson, M. L., & Simpson, S. S. (2009). *White-collar crime: An opportunity perspective, criminology and justice series.* Routledge, NY: New York.

Brightman, H. J. (2009). *Today's white-collar crime: Legal, investigative, and theoretical Perspectives*, Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, NY: New York.

Føler meg rettsløs, tygd på og spyttet ut (Feeling without justice, chewed on and spit out). (2009, August 25). *Dagens Næringsliv* [Norwegian Financial Times newspaper]. No. 195, p. 1.

Freeman, R. E., & Phillips, R. A. (2002). Stakeholder theory: A libertarian defense. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *12*(3), 331–349.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Hansen, L. L. (2009). Corporate financial crime: social diagnosis, and treatment. *Journal of Financial Crime*, *16* (1), 28–40.

Henning, J. (2009). Perspectives on financial crimes in Roman-Dutch law: Bribery, fraud, and the general crime of falsity. *Journal of Financial Crime*, *16*(4), 295–304.

Riffe, D., & Freitag, A. (1997). A content analysis of content analyses, twenty-five years of journalism quarterly. *Journalism Mass Communication Quarterly*, *74*, 873–882.

Rodell, J. B., & Colquitt, J. A. (2009). Looking ahead in times of uncertainty: The role of anticipatory justice in an organizational change context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(4), 989–1002.

Schneider, S. (2006). Privatizing economic crime enforcement: Exploring the role of private sector investigative agencies in combating money laundering. *Policing & Society*, *16*(3), 285–312.

Scott, B. A., Colquitt, J. A., & Paddock, E. L. (2009). An actor-focused model of justice rule adherence and violation: The role of managerial motives and discretion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(3), 756–769.

Shankman, N. A. (1999). Reframing the debate between agency and stakeholder theories of the firm. *Journal of Business Ethics, 19*(4), 319–334.

Solaiman, S. M. (2009). Investor protection by securities regulators in the primary share markets in Australia and Bangladesh, *Journal of Financial Crime*, *16*(4), 305–333.

Toner, G. A. (2009). New ways of thinking about old crimes: Prosecuting corruption and organized criminal groups engaged in labour-management racketeering. *Journal of Financial Crime*, *16*(1), 41–59.

Williams, J. W. (2005). Governability matters: The private policing of economic crime and the challenge of democratic governance. *Policing & Society*, *15*(2), 187–211.

Zapata-Phelan, C. P., Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & Livingston, B. (2009). Procedural justice, interactional justice, and task performance: The mediating role of intrinsic motivation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *108*, 93–105.

Comparing Urban and Rural Police Views of Bias-based Policing

Ralph Ioimo, J. Bret Becton, Leslie M. Meadows, Rachel S. Tears, and Michael T. Charles

Police departments all over the United States are addressing the issue of bias-based policing. Assessment of bias-based policing has focused traditionally on officer and citizen interaction during traffic stops. This research project sought to broaden the assessment of bias-based policing beyond traffic stop data by surveying officers in urban and rural police departments within the Commonwealth of Virginia to determine whether they are aware of bias-based policing practices in their department or in others. Our research found that while a large number of officers indicated that bias-based policing is not a problem, a significant number of them believe it is a problem. In addition, significant differences in the perception of bias-based policing exist between White officers and minority officers in both urban and rural police departments throughout the Commonwealth. This article reports our findings and explores these differences in-depth.

Key Words: Racial profiling ◆ Bias-based policing ◆ Racial prejudice ◆ Urban policing ◆ Rural policing ◆ Community oriented policing

The issue of biased-based policing and racial profiling began to capture the attention of practitioners and researchers alike because of a number of highly publicized events involving racial bias-based policing/racial profiling (Harris, 2002; Martin, 1999). Until recently, research focused on reviews of secondary data—primarily, traffic citations and arrest reports—or surveys of citizens' perceptions. Most of the research in this area examined traffic stops as the source of data, and from this data the researchers drew conclusions as to the extent of biased policing.

Lundman and Kaufman (2003) argue that secondary data and citizen self-reports are a valid means of measuring the effects of race, ethnicity, and gender on citizen reports of traffic stops and police actions; however, these sources do not take into consideration other factors that may explain what appears to be biased police actions. Lundman and

Kaufman recognize that current research in biased policing has limitations; therefore, they recommend use of triangulated data from police reports, citizen reports, and reports of trained observer, a method that has also been promoted by other researchers (Pfaff-Wright & Tomaskovic-Devey, 2000; Riksheim & Chermak, 1993; Sherman, 1980; Singleton & Straits, 1999; Weitzer, 1999; Weitzer & Tuch, 2002). One important consideration missing from previous research is that police do more than make traffic stops, and bias-based policing has a potential to present itself in other areas equally. As an example, bias can exist in how police treat minority citizens who become victims of crime. The authors of this article believed that solely evaluating traffic stops to determine the extent of bias-based policing ignores all other potential situations for biased-based policing to occur. They recognized a need for additional research that assesses bias-based policing in other areas of police service.

To this end, this research provides a completely different approach to the study of bias-based policing. In reviewing the literature, the researchers could not find any substantial research project that looked at biased-based policing from the police officers' perspective. Wanting to understand the biased-based or racial profile issue from a broad perspective, the researchers focused on both citizens and officers.

The researchers conducted focus group meetings with citizens and separate focus group meetings with police officers in six Virginia cities to determine the extent bias-based policing or racial profiling was an issue.. From these meetings, the researchers developed two separate questionnaires that they administered to both citizens and officers throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia. The researchers' approach was to compare the views of each toward this highly controversial topic. A summary of the citizens' views appears in an early article (Ioimo, Becton, Meadows, Tears, & Charles, 2008). In this article the researchers specifically compare the views of the rural police agencies of Virginia with those of the urban police agencies.

While this extensive study addressed many other issues relating to bias-based policing, this article focuses on the assessment of police officers' views of bias-based policing and racial profiling in both rural and urban environments. In this component of the study, the researchers assessed the differences in responses between urban and rural police officer views. This article describes what we learned.

Literature Review

Traffic Stops
As stated previously, a review of past research shows that researchers focus primarily on traffic stops as a means of assessing bias-based policing practices. This past research also has relied on citizen self-reports, and little research has been done that incorporates

the police view. Police traffic stops are attractive to researchers for many reasons. Secondary data are available for evaluation. Traffic stops often lead to negative encounters with minority citizens. Perhaps the most compelling reason relates to complaints from Blacks and Latinos that police stop these groups more frequently even when they have done nothing wrong. Some refer to this situation as "Driving While Black" (Harris, 1997, 1999; Lamberth, 1998; Lundgren & Kaufman, 2003; Martin, 1999; Rice, Reitzel & Piquero, 2004).

Some researchers believe that the war on drugs fosters negative encounters with minorities (Coker, 2003; Harris, 1999; Harris, 2002). The basis of racial profiling is the premise that minorities commit most drug offenses (Coker, 2003). The premise is factually untrue, but it has nonetheless become a self-fulfilling prophecy (Coker, 2003; Harris, 1999)[1]. Because police look for drugs primarily among Blacks and Latinos, they find a disproportionate number of them with contraband. This perception creates the profile that results in more stops of minority drivers (Coker, 2003; Harris 1999; Harris, 2002).

The difficulty appears to be in defining exactly what is bias-based policing. While researchers find that police stop Blacks, Latinos, and other races more frequently, it is difficult to say with any degree of certainty that these stops are because of bias policing tactics. We know from other research that not only are minorities stopped more frequently, but police subject them to searches at a rate ranging from two to two-and-a-half times that for Whites (Traffic-stop data fails to clear up profiling question, 2003).

Most of the research focusing on traffic stops concludes that racial bias exists based on the analysis of the proportion of minorities stopped compared with other groups or the population as a whole. McMahon, Garner, Davis, and Kraus (2002) raised this issue in their study, stating that too often researchers base their conclusions on comparing preliminary data on traffic stops with the demographics of the jurisdiction. Melchers (2003) points out that the assumption that proportions of minority drivers stopped by police should be identical to their proportions within the population has two problems. The first relates to the use of population data and the second to the assumption of randomness in police vehicle stops. Melchers also points out that comparing incidence to population inevitably creates the false impression that any group with some number of members who are stopped frequently is over-represented as a whole. This creates serious statistical errors. When the nominator and the base in a rate do not have the same units of count, or when the units of counts are insufficiently interrelated, this is a base error. Base errors lead to false conclusions about the analyzed data. Melchers also points out that large errors in interpretation can occur when researchers use incidence statistics to infer prevalence. This is an aggregation error. The combination of base errors and aggregation errors leads to faulty findings. The publication of these findings leads to false

assumptions, and agencies develop corrective measures based upon these incorrect assumptions (McMahon et al., 2002; Melchers, 2003).

Actions taken in response to these faulty findings can prove costly to the local, regional, and even state government (Melchers, 2003). For example, to address these issues, many police departments took costly measures such as mounting video cameras on patrol cars to track officer stops.

One valuable measure some agencies initiated in response to research findings is specialized training to address racial profiling. Some researchers have found that cultural diversity training heightens awareness of the historical and contemporary plight of minorities and sensitizes officers to their own covert and even overt forms of prejudice and discrimination (Coderoni, 2002; Meehan & Ponder, 2002). However, study findings suggest that a focus on individual attitudes and behavior misses the underlying societal and occupational structural problems that produce racial profiling (Meehan & Ponder, 2002). Meehan and Ponder found that even the most racially sensitive officers engaged in what is perceived as racial profiling, although it is not clear that prejudicial attitudes or intentions motivated officer behavior (2002). What is clear is that curtailing racial profiling requires the commitment from top management (Coderoni, 2002).

Some police departments have undertaken a significant effort to collect data on traffic stops and field interviews to determine whether police officer's actions are bias-based. In some instances, departments require by law that officers track whom they stop, the purpose for the stop, and the result of the encounter. While accurate and meaningful data collection on traffic stops may have some social science and management value, many researchers recognize that much of the research accomplished to date has major pitfalls (Kruger, 2002; Fridell, Lunney, Diamond, Kubu, Scott, & Laing. (2001) and believe it is critically important that this research occur properly or it can lead to misrepresentations and drive a bigger wedge between the police and the communities they serve (Gold, 2003; Kruger, 2002; Smith & Alpert, 2002; Wortley & Tanner, 2003).

Good science requires that researchers distinguish carefully between situations in which the police are using race and where they are finding race (Gold, 2003). Police officers make stops based upon traffic violations or in search of known offenders. Biased officers can use the first reason to stop a vehicle because the driver is Black or Latino; that is very different from stopping a person who fits the description of a person the police are looking for, who happens to be Black. Statistics on police stops must exclude stops involving the police looking for a racially identified perpetrator (Gold, 2003; Walker, 2001). Gold also points out another circumstance in which there can be greater than random contact with visible minorities. If police activity is stepped-up in response to community concerns about local drug pushers or local speeders and that community is more heavily

populated with visible minorities, statistics will be skewed toward more police-minority interactions even though police are giving greater attention to that area only in response to community concerns (Gold, 2003).

During our on-site meetings with the various Virginia police agencies, the officers raised this very point as an issue. The areas of highest demand for police service tend to be in minority communities. The calls-for-service logs of the agencies we visited support this claim. If citizens in minority communities call for police service more frequently than other portions of the community because of criminal activity, then it makes sense that police will likely engage a higher number of people in that area. This contact includes more traffic stops, more field interviews, and more arrests. Still, much of the current literature infers that police contact should be proportionate to population demographics and ignores all other intervening variables.

The Relationship Between Community Oriented Policing, Crime Reduction, and Bias-Based Policing

The views the Virginia police agencies expressed during our discussions may have larger support. In an article printed in the *TELEMASP* (Texas Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics Program) *Bulletin* (2002), the author stressed that police deploy to where the police are needed; thus, more traffic stops occur in areas of high service demand (Interpreting racial profiling data, 2002). The author makes the point that research has shown that deployment patterns significantly influence racial proportion of traffic stops (Interpreting racial profiling data, 2002). In Richmond, Virginia, the average Part I crime rate (the eight major crimes specified by the FBI) is 45% higher in majority Black census tracts compared with majority White census tracts (Smith & Petrocelli, 2001). And analysis shows that Richmond police stop more Black citizens. Officers in other cities also stop minorities at higher, disproportional rates than they do Whites (Carter, Katz-Bannister, & Schafer, 2001). The *TELEMASP* author states that because police go to where the crime is occurring and take a proactive approach to preventing crime and identifying suspects, more minorities are stopped. The author further states that no one suggests that deploying the police proportional to crime or call-for-service demand constitutes racial discrimination, and the opposite would be the case if the police deployed absolutely proportionately across a jurisdiction, ignoring crime rates and demand for service. The quality of police service in minority neighborhoods would plummet, and criminal victimization would increase if deployment occurred proportionately (Interpreting racial profiling data, 2002).

Proactive policing encourages officers to get involved with the communities they service—even with events and incidents that are outside the scope of policing but of interest to the community. Proactive policing is supported and promoted by community oriented policing. The premise of community oriented policing is service. Service is a different concept from crime fighting. There is growing support for the concept of police as service organizations. The problem is in police achieving a service mentality.

Agencies that establish a culture primarily focused on crime reduction foster an attitude focused on reducing crime by any means necessary and, in many cases, target people based on race, biases, and stereotypes (Davis, 2001). As a result, these agencies are more likely to experience bias-based policing and increases in incidences of officer misconduct. Davis points out phrases such as the "War on Drugs," "War on Crime," "Scorched Earth," and "Zero Tolerance" may contribute to a culture of intolerance toward the community that the police serve and a "we versus them" mentality, which ultimately contributes to poor community relations.

Laws Enacted to Prevent Racial Profiling

The concern of many researchers is that traffic stops become the pretext for police motivated by other concerns such as observation of drivers and passengers for signs of drug use or possession (Harris 2002; Lamberth, 1998; Lundman & Kaufman, 2003; Meeks, 2000; Rubinstein, 1973). Police may stop vehicles in an area known to be a high drug use area, searching for signs of drugs. If the driver does not show signs of being under the influence of drugs, the officer lets the driver go without a citation. Minorities may exit from these stops with the view that the police did not have a reason for the stop and argue that if they did not violate a traffic law, then the reason for the stop was the person's race or color (Lundman & Kaufman, 2003). Laws are being enacted to address this issue.

Some states, such as Texas, passed legislation requiring agencies to keep data on traffic stops. Texas, Minnesota, Maryland, and other states are enacting legislation that makes racial profiling illegal and in some instance, a felony. The State of New Jersey has already made racial profiling by police a felony (New Jersey, 2003). This law addresses the crime of official deprivation of civil rights, making it illegal for law enforcement officers to use race, color, religion, ethnicity, handicap, gender, age, or sexual orientation to discriminate against any individual (New Jersey, 2003). However, this law creates confusion as to when these elements can be considered a legitimate part of investigations and as a part of normal patrol functions.

The courts have sent mixed signals at best on the issue of probable cause for traffic stops. While the Fourth Amendment protects all of us against unlawful searches and seizures, the courts have provided support to police officers stopping someone on mere

suspicion of wrongdoing. In *United States v. Arvizu*, the Supreme Court held that the Fourth Amendment does not prohibit investigatory stops as long as the facts and circumstances lead to a reasonable suspicion the driver is engaged in criminal activity (Pelic, 2003).

In other words, officers can stop vehicles without a traffic violation. In *Whren v. U.S.* 517 U.S., 806 (1996), the Supreme Court ruled that it is lawful for police to stop and search a vehicle as long as they have a legitimate excuse to stop the vehicle. Since *Whren*, the court has supported this decision through other cases. *Ohio v. Robinette*, 519 U.S. 33 (1996) provided that officers do not have to tell the subject that he or she can refuse the officer the authority to search a vehicle. *Maryland v. Wilson*, 519 U.S. 408, 410 (1997) gave officers the authority to order everyone out of a car even in the absence of a safety issue. These cases provide legitimacy to an officer's stopping and searching a vehicle without a real basis for doing so.

Other case law also supports this assertion: *United States v. Sokolow, United States v. Cortez*, and *United States v. Brinoni-Ponce* all support that an officer may make an investigatory stop if the totality of the circumstances leads to a reasonable suspicion that criminal activity is afoot (Pelic, 2003).

Such legal decisions make the identification of biased policing practices more difficult. Scholars criticize the reasonable suspicion analysis for encouraging racial profiling and permitting an officer to stop a vehicle for any reason (Pelic, 2003). Critics complain that this invites racial profiling, because it uses stereotypes and profiles (Harris, 1997). Others contend that racial profiling is not encouraged and certainly not allowed in a reasonable suspicion analysis (Pelic, 2003).

At one time, the Supreme Court permitted race as a factor (Brignoni-Pounce, 422 U.S. at 885). Additional confusion was recently interjected into this bias-based policing issue when the Justice Department adopted a new policy banning racial profiling in all federal law enforcement agencies, except in cases that involve identification of possible terrorism suspects (Justice dept. bars race profiling, 2003). This confusion strongly suggests that the concept of racial profiling remains poorly defined and arbitrarily used.

Attempts to Define Bias-based Policing

So much of what we learned in reviewing the work of other researchers is that the data do not support the broad-based conclusions that the findings represent biased policing practices. A number of people perceive bias-based policing to exist on a large scale, but the evidence does not support these perceptions (Kruger, 2002; Melchers, 2003; McMahon et al., 2003). The issue of bias-based policing is confusing to most officers and

to some extent, citizens. During our on-site meetings with police officers, we were often asked, "What do you mean by bias-based policing practices?" This was a legitimate question because most people cannot define bias-based policing (Malti-Douglas, 2002; Smith & Albert, 2002). Racial bias is just one of the many forms of bias. Religious bias, sexual bias, cultural bias, and other forms of bias are also part of the social equation in which police find themselves engulfed.

To add to the confusion, as previously stated, the U.S. Justice Department adopted a new policy banning racial profiling in all federal law enforcement agencies except in cases that involve identification of possible terrorism suspects (Justice dept. bars race profiling. 2003). This raises many questions. Why is it permissible to use race as a discriminator where terrorism is involved and not in other serious crimes? Since September 11, 2001, the arrests and detention of hundreds of people has created considerable controversy. Many of these people would not have been subject to this treatment were it not for ethnic characteristics, and the government has not yet provided evidence linking them to terrorist activities. Furthermore, it is not likely that ethnic profiling will be any more useful or constitutional than racial profiling (Rudovsky, 2002).

Prior to the 1970s, racial prejudice was still the basis for many state and local laws, and many police administrators and police officers argued publicly that racial prejudice was appropriate and reasonable (Engel, Calnon, & Bernard, 2002). Modern research is no longer consistent with earlier research on the extent to which race per se directly influences police decisions (Engel, Calnon, & Bernard, 2002; Sherman, 1980; Zatz, 1987). This recent research suggests that police officers' behavior is predicated primarily on legal and situation-specific factors, and the influence of race and other extra-legal factors is diminishing (Mastrofski, Worden, & Snipes, 1995; Riksheim & Chermak, 1993; Engel, Calnon, & Bernard, 2002). During our on-site visits with the various departments, we often heard that the officers do not look at race as an issue. They indicated that individual's behavior was the determining factor for stopping individuals.

Methods

This article describes what we learned about the differences between urban and rural police agencies' views of bias-based policing in the Commonwealth of Virginia, focusing on a significant research question that we attempted to answer, which was:

> *Do rural and urban police agencies differ in the way they deal with*
> *biased-based policing or racial profiling?*

To address this question the researchers held focus group meetings with various police departments and conducted a survey of the officers at both urban and rural police departments throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Development of Police Survey

The researchers developed an Officer Questionnaire survey instrument based upon the comments and recommendations the officer focus groups provided. The Officer Questionnaire included instructions on completing the survey, general information regarding the project as a whole, and 45 survey questions. We pre-tested the instrument with 50 officers and command staff in the Montgomery (Alabama) Police Department. The research staff, in a meeting with a number of officers and command personnel, reviewed the completed surveys. These meetings were held so the researchers could discuss issues of survey content, question presentation, difficulties in completing the survey, survey instructions, method of distribution and collection of completed surveys, and various other survey process issues. After the pilot test, we made changes, and the survey was prepared for mailing to both urban and rural Virginia police departments. The authors mailed the survey to all police departments in Virginia.

Urban Police Department Sample

We mailed 3,437 surveys to seven urban departments. We received 1,265 surveys from these departments, representing a 37% response rate. Respondents to the survey from the urban departments were 87.8% male and 12.2% female. Moreover, 83% reported their race as White, 11.6% as Black, and 5.2% as Other, which included American Indian, Aleut, Eskimo, Asian Pacific Islander, and Other. Respondents included upper level management, mid-level management, and officers. These response rates closely coincide with the demographic breakdown of urban police departments within the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Rural Police Department Sample

We classified rural departments as those in areas with a population of 2,000 or less. The rural agencies represented a stratified random sample, which was selected to ensure inclusion of the racial mixture of the Commonwealth's population. Forty-four rural departments received the police survey. We sent 773 surveys to officers in these 44 rural departments. We received 321 valid survey returns from 24 rural departments, resulting in a 42% response rate.

Respondents to the rurally distributed survey were 82.5% male and 17.5% female. Moreover, 87.5% reported their race as White, 10.9% reported their race as Black, and

1.5% reported their race in a category that included American Indian, Aleut, Eskimo, Asian Pacific Islander, and Other. Respondents included upper level management, mid-level management, and officers. The number closely corresponded with the demographic breakdown of the rural departments within the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Results

Analyses were run on various police officer survey items to reveal any differences in responses from officers in urban departments compared with officers in rural departments. What follows is a description of those analyses categorized by survey item themes. Chi-square is the statistical measure we used to compare the various responses between officers in the rural and urban departments.

Urban and Rural Officer Demographics

Three percent of urban officers indicated their rank as that of Senior-Level Management (i.e., Chief, Deputy Chief, Major, and Captain), 17.4% indicated a rank of Mid-Level Management (i.e., Lieutenant and Sergeant), and 79.3% indicated a rank at the Officer Level (i.e., Corporal and Officer).

Overall, officers in rural and urban police departments were very similar in gender, age, and race; however, officers in urban departments reported a greater percentage of officers who had obtained more education. Table 1 reflects the educational differences between urban and rural police departments as obtained from our study.

Table 1. *Urban and Rural Police Educational Levels*

Education Level	Urban (N = 1,233)	Rural (N = 321)
GED	1.3%	2.2%
High School Diploma	9.5%	27.7%
Completed Some College	29.3%	39.3%
Associate's Degree	17.8%	15.9%
Bachelor's Degree	36.4%	12.1%
Master's Degree	4.7%	1.2%
PhD	0.6%	0.0%
Did Not Report Education Level	0.4%	1.2%

Bias-Based Policing Knowledge and Training

When asked to evaluate the bias-based policing training that officers received in Virginia, urban and rural officers responded similarly, with the majority of officers evaluating the training as "average" (57.3% of urban officers, 47.4% of rural officers). It should be noted that somewhat large percentages of officers in both urban and rural departments reported that no bias-based policing training was provided (16.9% and 28.7%, respectively). A number of agencies within Virginia do not provide any form of bias police training, which can account for the large number reporting not having received any training. Manpower shortages in many of the agencies has limited the amount of training; therefore, many newly hired officers have not received this training. In urban departments, responses followed a similar pattern regardless of race with the majority of officers evaluating the training as "average" (57.9% of White officers, 54.5% of Black officers, and 53.1% of Other officers). The difference between White officers and Other officers evaluating the training as "average" and "poor" was significant ($p < .043$). Minority officers in urban departments reported having no bias-based policing training at a higher rate than White officers (24.5% of Black officers, 23.4% of Other officers, and 15.4% of White officers). Officers in rural departments were somewhat impressed with the quality of their training with 48.4% of White officers, 40% of Black officers, and 40% of Other officers rating the training as "average," and 21.7% of White officers and 22.9% of Black officers rating it as "excellent." As with urban departments, minorities in rural departments reported receiving no training at a higher rate (23.1% for White officers, 34.3% for Black officers, and 60% for Other officers).

Officers were asked whether all supervisors were required to attend training to assist them in identifying officers and staff who might be engaging in bias-based policing practices. In response to this question, the majority of both urban and rural officers (50.4% and 51.1%, respectively) reported that they did not know. A greater percentage of urban officers (37.8%) compared with rural officers (26.5%) responded affirmatively, and a greater percentage of rural officers (21.8%) compared with urban officers (10.3%) responded negatively. In urban departments, 42.1% of Senior-Level Management, 49.3% of Mid-Level Management, and 35.1% of Officers answered affirmatively. A significant difference between the affirmative responses of management and officers were found in urban departments ($p < .000$). In rural departments, 44.8% of Senior-Level Management, 29.1% of Mid-Level Management, and 23.7% of Officers answered affirmatively. A significant difference between affirmative responses among management and officers were found in rural departments ($p < .000$). These findings suggest that urban departments provide more in-service training, specifically to officers and middle managers than do rural agencies. Because all officers are required to attend academy training, the

initial training for officers is equal throughout the state. However, it is common for rural agencies to have less access to in-service training in comparison with their urban counterparts due to such issues as financing and officer scheduling. Additional efforts need to be extended to ensure that all command staff receive such training.

Nearly half (44.5%) of rural officers reported that they believed that more bias-based policing training should be required in their department compared with only 28.8% of officers in urban departments who felt similarly. In urban departments, White officers were less likely (22.3%) to indicate that more training should be required in comparison with minority officers (77% for Black officers and 42.6% for Other officers). This difference was significant between White officers and both Black and Other officers ($p < .000$ and $p < .006$, respectively). In rural departments, similar results were found (43.2% for White officers, 68.8% for Black officers, and 80% for Other officers). The difference between Black and White officers was significant ($p < .006$).

This desire for additional training on bias-based policing by rural officers is not surprising given the larger percentage of rural officers, compared with urban officers, who reported that such training was not available in their departments. In fact, compare this report with that of many officers from urban departments, who during focus group meetings, expressed to the researchers that they had more bias-based police training over the last few years than they wanted and they did not want to attend any more training on the issue. These officers indicated that bias-based policing is excessively discussed and they did not feel that further training would make a difference. Such comments suggest at least three alternatives: (1) the issue of bias-based policing is resolved; (2) some officers have received sufficient training on this issue, as it is provided currently; or (3) continued training for these officers would provide little added benefit. Because the first alternative has yet to be accomplished, the second and third alternatives remain. The comments of those officers in urban departments who indicate they have received sufficient training suggest the need for departments to support training on policies, supervision, and police culture. That training should emphasize a zero tolerance for police bias. Further, instruction should include more robust training on police bias and not be limited to issues of cultural diversity and racial profiling. Training alone achieves only so much toward addressing bias-based policing. Training is not always the answer, nor is it ever the final solution. Proper management must lead, or training serves no purpose.

Bias-Based Policing Policies and Practices
More officers in urban areas (62.7%) reported that their department has a written bias-based policing policy compared with officers in rural areas (48%). In urban departments, 84.2% of Senior-Level Management, 78.6% of Mid-Level Management, and 58.4% of

Officers answered affirmatively. A significant difference in affirmative responses between management and officers was found in urban departments ($p < .000$). In rural departments, 51.7% of Senior-Level Management, 55.7% of Mid-Level Management, and 45.9% of Officers answered affirmatively with a significant difference between upper management and officers ($p < .015$) and middle management and officers ($p < .021$) in rural departments.

Two important issues to consider regarding the responses to this question: (1) it is obvious that there is confusion among the ranks as to whether a policy exists; and (2) fewer rural departments have bias-based policing policies in place compared with their urban counterparts. It should be understood that these two conditions are not unique to the Commonwealth of Virginia. These shortcomings exist throughout the police profession. The senior researchers have discovered such discrepancies in numerous police agencies. This, however, does not mitigate the condition but further demonstrates the need for all departments to have policies on bias-based policing, for improved training in departmental policies, and for enhanced efforts to ensure that rural and urban agencies receive the requisite training needed for a modern police agency.

When asked how written policies were shared with departmental members, the majority of urban officers (52%) reported that policies were shared through training. This percentage is more than twice the percentage of rural officers (20.9%) reporting similarly. Conversely, the most popular method of training reported by rural officers was the distribution of the written bias-based policing policy with officers' signatures indicating proof of training (27.1%). Only 18.6% of urban officers indicated that their departments used this method.

It is not unexpected that the majority of rural departments do not have a written bias-based policing policy. In fact, it is encouraging that so many do, as rural departments can be as small as one or two officers, and they are frequently resource-poor. Both rural and urban departments need to provide such policies to their officers so officers are made aware of the department's position on bias-based policing and thoroughly trained on the policy and its implementation. Further, while it is not surprising that rural departments rely on distribution of the policy with the officers' signature as proof of training more frequently than urban agencies, it does not negate the poor training standard such a method produces.

Urban and rural officers differed in the percentage of officers who indicated that they believe officers in their department currently practice bias-based policing. Twenty-three percent of urban officers compared with 13.7% of rural officers indicated they believe such practices exist in their departments. It should be noted that 41.4% of urban respondents and 59.2% of rural respondents reported that they do not believe that officers in their departments practice bias-based policing. In urban departments, a greater percentage of

minorities reported believing bias-based policing is practiced in their department: 20.2% of White officers, 41.3% of Black officers, and 26.6% of Other officers answered "Yes." White and Black officers in urban departments differ significantly ($p < .000$) in response to this question. In rural departments, a similar trend occurs with 12.8% of White officers, 20% of Black officers, and 20% of Other officers answering "Yes." White and Black officers in rural departments also differ significantly ($p < .014$) in response to this question.

In urban departments, 34.2% of Senior-Level Management, 15.8% of Mid-Level Management, and 24% of Officers reported that they believe officers in their department currently practice bias-based policing. Significant differences between Mid-Level Management and Officers were found in urban departments ($p < .001$) and between Mid- and Senior-Level Management ($p < .022$). In rural departments, 24.1% of Senior-Level Management, 13.9% of Mid-Level Management, and 12.1% of Officers answered affirmatively. Significant differences between upper management and officers ($p < .000$) and middle management and officers ($p < .011$) were found in rural departments.

It is of interest to note that in both urban and rural departments, managers were more likely to report that they believed officers in their departments currently practice bias-based policing than were officers. Certainly, there is a disconnect between officer perceptions and management perceptions, especially at the senior management level. There could be any number of reasons for this disconnect between management and officers; however, such a variance strongly suggests the need for additional research in this area.

Differences between rural and urban officers were also found when officers reported the extent to which they believed bias-based policing was an issue for their departments. Specifically, 21.2% of urban officers reported that bias-based policing was "somewhat" of an issue and 2.4% reported that it was a "serious" issue for their department. Only 11.5% of rural officers reported that bias-based policing was "somewhat" of an issue and 0.9% reported that it was a "serious" issue for their department. Collectively, 23.6% of urban officers compared with only 12.4% of rural officers reported that bias-based policing was at least "somewhat" of an issue for their department. In urban departments, 17.2% of White officers, 49% of Black officers, and 23.4% of Other officers reported bias-based policing was at least "somewhat" of an issue for their department. Officers of all races in urban departments differed significantly (p-values ranged from .000 to .002) in indicating that bias-based policing is "not an issue" or "somewhat" of an issue. In rural departments, 8.2% of White officers, 37.1% of Black officers, and 20% of Other officers reported bias-based policing as at least "somewhat" of an issue. White officers differed significantly from both Black ($p < .000$) and Other ($p < .035$) officers in rural departments. The lack of adequate in-service training on bias-based policing practices might account, in part, for the large disparity between White and Black officers.

In urban departments, 39.5% of Senior-Level Management, 20.9% of Mid-Level Management, and 20.4% of Officers reported bias-based policing as at least "somewhat" of an issue for their department. Officers differed significantly from Senior-Level Management ($p < .014$) and Mid-Level Management ($p < .023$). and Senior-Level Management differed significantly from Mid-Level Management in urban and rural departments (p-values ranged from .028 to .046) in response to this question. In rural departments, 17.2% of Senior-Level Management, 6.3% of Mid-Level Management, and 12.6% of Officers reported bias-based policing as at least "somewhat" of an issue. In rural departments, Senior-Level Management differed significantly from Mid-Level Management ($p <. 046$) in response to this question.

Several reasons are likely why, overall, rural officers perceive the issue of bias-based policing to be less of a problem for a department compared with their urban counterparts. It could simply be due to the fact that fewer minorities actually live in many of these jurisdictions; hence, the issue does not present itself on a regular basis. It is also generally believed that small police agencies have a closer relationship with citizens in their jurisdictions, especially sheriffs' offices. The office of sheriff is, with few exceptions, an elected office. Also, many smaller departments hire locals who have grown up in the area and know the people they serve. Finally, additional research efforts designed to understand better the relationships between the police and the public in urban and rural areas and how these relationships effect police services would be valuable to both urban and rural agencies.

Twenty-six percent of urban officers and 25.5% of rural officers reported that they believe that officers in *other* Virginia police departments practice bias-based policing. It should be noted that the majority of officers responding to this question in both urban and rural departments indicated that they did not know whether officers in other departments practice bias-based policing (59.7% and 60.7%, respectively). Furthermore, only 12.7% of urban and 11.8% of rural officers responded definitively that such practices do not occur in other Virginia police departments. In urban departments, Black officers were much more likely to report that other departments practice bias-based policing (24.1% for White officers, 40.6% for Black officers, and 23.4% for Other officers). Significant differences between Black officers and White officers ($p < .000$) and Black officers and Other officers were found ($p < .009$). In rural departments, responses by race were more similar with 25.6% of White officers, 25.7% of Black officers, and 20% of Other officers answering affirmatively. In urban departments, 34.2% of Senior-Level Management, 26% of Mid-Level Management, and 25.6% of Officers answered affirmatively. In rural departments,

31% of Senior-Level Management, 31.6% of Mid-Level Management, and 22.2% of Officers answered affirmatively.

While the majority of both urban and rural officers reported that they had not witnessed bias-based policing activities by other officers in their department (81.5% and 88.5%, respectively), 16.5% of urban officers and 9.7% of rural officers reported having witnessed such activities. In urban departments, Black officers reported witnessing bias-based policing at the highest rate (36.6%) followed by Other officers (20.3%) and White officers (13.8%). Black and White officers differed significantly ($p < .000$) in response to this question. In rural departments, Other officers reported witnessing bias-based policing at the highest rate (40%) followed by Black officers (17.6%) and White officers (8.3%). In urban departments, 7.9% of Senior-Level Management, 13% of Mid-Level Management, and 17.9% of Officers answered affirmatively. In rural departments, 25% of Senior-Level Management, 10.1% of Mid-Level Management, and 6.9% of Officers answered affirmatively. These data clearly suggest that bias-based policing exists within the Commonwealth of Virginia.

While it is relatively easy to ignore statements by individual and group outsiders regarding the presence of bias-based policing in the Commonwealth of Virginia, the reports of such concerns by organizational insiders are not as easily dismissed. It is important, however, to keep in mind those officer responses could be limited to a single incident, and/or any number of respondents could be referring to the same incident. For this reason, it is not possible to determine with accuracy precise numbers or percentages of perceived or reported witnessing of bias-based policing by officers in Virginia.

Urban and rural officers were very similar in their response when asked whether they ever avoided taking necessary action due to concerns that it would be perceived as bias-based policing behavior. More than 70% of both urban and rural officers reported that they "never" avoided taking necessary action (76.5% and 74.8%, respectively). Surprisingly, 19.3% of urban officers and 19% of rural officers responded that they "sometimes" avoided taking necessary action, and 2.1% of urban and 1.9% of rural officers responded that they "always" avoided taking necessary action that might be perceived as bias-based policing. In urban departments, 75.3% of White officers, 86% of Black officers, and 73.4% of Other officers indicated that they never avoided taking necessary action due to perceptions of bias. White officers differed significantly from both Black and Other officers on all three possible responses with p-values ranging from .001 to .003. In rural departments, 74.6% of White officers, 77.1% of Black officers, and 60% of Other officers responded that they never avoided taking necessary action due to perceptions of bias. White officers and Black officers differed significantly ($p < .047$) when comparing those who responded "never".

Discovering that officers avoided taking necessary action in urban and rural areas because they were concerned that it would be perceived as bias-based behavior is a serious issue for the police and the communities they serve that must not be ignored.. Interestingly, this fear was present regardless of officer race. A number of White, Black, and Other officers reported that there were times when they avoided taking necessary action due to a concern that it would be perceived as bias-based behavior. Departments and communities must realize the effect of their decisions in declaring certain police actions as biased-based, address possible negative outcomes, and make informed decisions on how best to deal with unwanted results.

Enforcement of Bias-Based Policing Policies

Among those respondents who said their department has a bias-based policing policy, considerable percentages of both urban and rural officers reported that bias-based policing policies were enforced in their departments, although they are less vigorously enforced in rural departments compared with urban departments. Specifically, 35% of urban officers reported that such policies are "somewhat" enforced and 36.6% reported that policies are "vigorously" enforced. This results in 71.6% of officers in urban areas reporting that bias-based policies are at least "somewhat" enforced. In rural departments, 23.1% of officers reported that such policies are "somewhat" enforced and 32.7% reported that policies are "vigorously" enforced. This results in 55.8% of officers reporting that such policies are at least "somewhat" enforced.

In urban departments, 34.3% of White officers, 39.9% of Black officers, and 35.9% of Other officers indicated that such policies are "somewhat" enforced, while 39.8% of White officers, 22.4% of Black officers, and 17.2% of Other officers reported that they were "vigorously" enforced. Significant differences were found between all racial groups with p-values ranging from .000 for "somewhat" enforced to .039 for "vigorously" enforced. In rural departments, 21% of White officers, 37.5 of Black officers, and 40% of Other officers reported that such policies are "somewhat" enforced while 35.6% of White officers, 11.4% of Black officers, and 20% of Other officers indicated they are "vigorously" enforced. Significant differences were found between White and Black officers and Black and Other officers with p-values ranging from .005 for "somewhat" enforced to .024 for "vigorously" enforced.

In urban departments, 21.1% of Senior-Level Management, 35.5% of Mid-Level Management, and 35.9% of Officers indicated that such policies are "somewhat" enforced while 63.2% of Senior-Level Management, 48.8% of Mid-Level Management, and 32.9% of Officers reported that they were "vigorously" enforced. Significant differences were found between officers and management reporting that policies are "somewhat" and

"vigorously" enforced with p-values ranging from .000 to .001. In rural departments, 13.8% of Senior-Level Management, 21.5% of Mid-Level Management, and 25.1% of Officers indicated that such policies are "somewhat" enforced while 48.3% of Senior-Level Management, 34.2% of Mid-Level Management, and 30.9% of Officers reported that they were "vigorously" enforced.

It is interesting to note that managers, overall, believe that policies are enforced more than officers do. The important point is that officers at all levels should report that policies are vigorously enforced. From an organizational perspective, there is no legitimate reason to have a policy that is not enforced.

To assess departmental support of bias-based policing practices, officers were also asked whether their department supports such practices unofficially. While the majority of both urban officers (55.9%) and rural officers (48.3%) responded negatively, 12.1% of urban and 15.9% of rural officers indicated that their department does support such practices unofficially, and 30.2% of urban and 33.6% of rural officers reported that they do not know whether their department supports bias-based policing practices. In urban departments, 11.2% of White officers, 16.8% of Black officers, and 15.6% of Other officers answered affirmatively. White officers differed significantly from Black and Other officers collectively (p < .000). In rural departments, 15.3% of White officers, 22.9% of Black officers, 0% of Other officers answered affirmatively. White officers and Black officers differed significantly (p < .041) in affirmative response to this question. In urban departments, 2.6% of Senior-Level Management, 7.9% of Mid-Level Management, and 13.4% of Officers answered this question affirmatively. Significant differences were found between officers and both levels of management combined who answered affirmatively (p < .000). In rural departments, 13.8% of Senior-Level Management, 20.3% of Mid-Level Management, and 15% of Officers answered this question affirmatively. Significant differences were found between officers and upper management (p < .000).

The finding that both urban and rural officers at all levels reported that bias-based policing is supported unofficially is discouraging. The fact that it was reported in substantial numbers in both areas by officers and both levels of management is further distressing. It is perhaps most disappointing to find that both levels of management reported that unofficial support exists as they perceive the condition. Certainly, this is an issue needing further research.

When asked whether they believed that any Virginia police department officially supports bias-based policing, 11.6% of responding urban officers and 14.3% of rural officers answered "Yes," 47.7% of urban and 44.2% of rural answered "No," and 38.9% of urban and 40.2% of rural indicated that they did not know. In urban departments, 10.8% of White officers, 18.2% of Black officers, and 9.4% of Other officers answered affirmatively.

White officers differed significantly from both Black ($p < .000$) and Other ($p < .001$) officers in response to this question. In rural departments, 13.2% of White officers, 22.9% of Black officers, and 29% of Other officers answered affirmatively. White and Black officers differed significantly ($p < .045$) in response to this question. In urban departments, 2.6% of Senior-Level Management, 9.3% of Mid-Level Management, and 12.4% of Officers answered this question affirmatively. Significant differences were found between officers and management with p-values ranging from .000 to .005. In rural departments, 27.6% of Senior-Level Management, 12.7% of Mid-Level Management, and 13.5% of Officers answered this question affirmatively.

It is troublesome that officers at all levels in both urban and rural areas reported that they "believe that any Virginia police department officially supports bias-based policing." As with other questions in the survey, these responses do not allow for precise clarification of the issues at hand. They do, however, present a heretofore unsubstantiated view of bias-based policing conditions.

As non-supervisory police officers, survey respondents were asked what they would do if they witnessed an officer engaging in bias-based policing practices. In rural departments, 24.6% of White officers, 34.3% of Black officers, and 0% of Other officers indicated that they would "talk to the officer," 29.9% of White officers, 25.7% of Black officers, and 80% of Other officers indicated that they would "report the officer's behavior to a supervisor," 1.1% of White officers, 2.9% of Black officers, and 0% of Other officers indicated that they would "ignore the incident," 0.4% of White officers, 0% of Black officers, and 0% of Other officers indicated that they would "report the incident only if it occurs again," and 7.1% of White officers, 8.6% of Black officers, and 0% of Other officers indicated that they were "not sure what [they] would do."

Black officers and Other officers collectively differed significantly when comparing those who would "talk to the officer" to those who would "ignore the incident" ($p < .046$) and those who would "report the officer's behavior to a supervisor" to those who would "report the incident only if it occurs again" ($p < .015$).

Table 2 depicts management's response to this question for both urban and rural agencies surveyed.

Responses between urban and rural departments indicate the need for the same actions discussed in the previous section regarding this issue: Efforts need to be extended to train officers and supervisors in urban and rural departments better on actions they should take when they observe bias-based policing practices.

Table 2. *Management Response to Witnessed Bias-based Policing*

Action	Urban		Rural	
	Mid-Level Management (*N* = 214)	Senior Management (*N* = 33)	Mid-Level Management (*N* = 79)	Senior Management (*N* = 29)
Counsel	24.7%	18.4%	29.1%	27.6%
Recommend Training	11.6%	2.6%	7.6%	17.2%
Conduct Formal Investigation	38.1%	63.2%	39.2%	37.9%
Ignore	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Not Sure	2.3%	0.0%	3.4%	3.8%
Question Not Applicable	2.6%	6.0%	8.9%	3.4%
Did Not Respond	20.7%	7.2%	11.8%	10.1%

Urban and rural officers differed in their responses to a question regarding their beliefs on the treatment of minority individuals by minority officers. Significant differences were found between all three racial groups with *p*-values ranging from .000 to .002. In rural departments, 11% of White officers, 34.3% of Black officers, and 40% of Other officers reported that they believe minority officers are more fair in dealing with minorities. Only the difference between White and Black officers in rural departments was significant ($p < .000$). In urban departments, 10.5% of Senior-Level Management, 6% of Mid-Level Management, and 11.5% of Officers answered affirmatively. A significant difference ($p < .000$) between Officers and Mid-Level Management was found. In rural departments, 17.2% of Senior-Level Management, 16.5% of Mid-Level Management, and 12.6% of Officers answered affirmatively.

Interestingly, the issue of officer fairness was not perceived by officers in the focus groups to be problematic. This might be because most White officers do not perceive a difference in treatment. Of course, what occurs in the mind of an individual officer is known only to him or her, and the true underlying reason for an officer's action is, similarly, known only to that officer. Further, officers often work alone and do not observe their fellow officers in all enforcement situations.

Black and White officers agreed in officer focus groups that Black officers were often treated more harshly by Black citizens than were their White counterparts. Black officers reported that they believed that to be true because Black citizens would ask for consideration (i.e., non-enforcement action on the part of the Black officer). When

consideration was not forthcoming, some Black citizens would berate the officer with racial epithets and slurs in expression of their anger toward the officer for "not helping a brother out." Needless to say, such behavior on the part of Black citizens toward Black officers is injurious to the officer's concept of self and often difficult for the officer to understand. In our discussions with officers, it was clear that regardless of their race, they were there to help both members and non-members of their race. For both Black and White officers, accusations of bias or verbal criticism for performing their job to protect citizens, while seen as a part of the job, was nonetheless hurtful.

There is another aspect to a question that asks, "Do you believe that minority officers are more fair in their dealings with minorities?" Such a question has a potential inherent bias-based policing factor. For example, if Black or Other officers grant requests for special consideration from members of their own race, is this not bias-based policing? Is such a situation any different from a White officer granting a similar request from a White citizen? Any number of acceptable or unacceptable reasons might sway the officer's decision not to enforce the law, and it is likely that others will never know that reason. Furthermore, it is unlikely that everyone would agree with the reason the officer gives for not enforcing the law in a particular situation. The reader should consider these issues when assessing the responses to this question.

The officers' response to this question suggests the following: (1) follow-up research on this subject is needed for a better understanding of the issue of bias-based policing when officers deal with members of their own race; (2) training on bias-based policing should address the issue of minority bias-based policing, considering that the criminal justice literature is essentially silent on this issue; and, (3) in the end, citizens must rely on the integrity of their officers to act within the law but also be compassionate without the fear of being labeled biased.

Bias-Based Police Data Collection and Distribution
The survey revealed differences between rural and urban officers' beliefs regarding bias-based policing data collection. Specifically, 42.1% of rural officers reported that they believe that the police should collect bias-based policing data compared with only 26.4% of urban officers reporting similar beliefs. Several explanations are possible for this difference between urban and rural officers. It is likely that officers in rural departments in Virginia are less concerned about the time or funds needed to accomplish the data collection task. It also is likely that officers in rural departments have not had the experience with data collections issues or media implications nor are they aware of the methodological failings and resultant problems that data collection has caused for larger departments. However, regardless of the actual reasons for this discrepancy, it is possible

that requiring officers to collect bias-based policing data would meet less resistance in rural areas of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

In urban departments, 23.3% of White officers, 49% of Black officers, and 25% of Other officers reported that they believe the police should collect such data. Significant differences were found between White officers and Black officers ($p < .000$) and between Black officers and Other officers ($p < .002$) in rural departments. In urban departments, 40.2% of White officers, 57.1% of Black officers, and 40% of Other officers reported believing that the police should collect such data. Only the difference between White and Black officers' responses was significant ($p < .018$) in rural departments.

In urban departments, 34.2% of Senior-Level Management, 30.7% of Mid-Level Management, and 25.2% of Officers answered affirmatively. A significant difference ($p < .013$) between officers and middle management was found. In rural departments, 51.7% of Senior-Level Management, 49.4% of Mid-Level Management, and 38.2% of Officers answered affirmatively.

When posed with the question of whether they believed that the police department shares information openly with the public, 65% of urban officers responded favorably compared with 57% of rural officers responding similarly. In urban departments, 68.2% of White officers, 50.3% of Black officers, and 45.3% of Other officers believed that the police share information openly. Significant differences were found between White officers and both Black and Other officers ($p < .000$ and $p < .001$, respectively). In rural departments, 60.1% of White officers, 37.1% of Black officers, and 20% of Other officers believed that the police department shares information openly with the public. A significant difference was found between White officers and Black officers ($p < .018$).

In urban departments, 86.8% of Senior-Level Management, 79.1% of Mid-Level Management, and 61% of Officers believed that the police department shares information openly with the public. A significant difference was found between officers and management ($p < .000$ and $p < .004$). In rural departments, 58.6% of Senior-Level Management, 67.1% of Mid-Level Management, and 53.1% of Officers answered affirmatively. A significant difference was found between officers and middle management ($p < .027$).

Small differences were found among rural and urban police officers on the topic of their beliefs regarding the media's honest portrayal of bias-based policing incidents. Specifically, the majority of both urban (79.6%) and rural officers (68.2%) reported that they believe the media is not honest in the portrayal of such incidents. Similarly, 6.9% and 8.7%, respectively, reported that they believed the media was honest, but a larger percentage of rural (22.4%) compared with urban officers (11.9%) indicated that they did not know. It is clear that even in the rural areas of Virginia, a large number of police officers at all levels do not think that the media is honest in their portrayal of bias-based

policing incidents. In urban departments, only 6.4% of White officers, 11.2% of Black officers, and 4.7% of Other officers believed the media portrays bias-based policing incidents honestly. A significant difference ($p < .002$) was found between White and Black officers responding to this question. In rural departments, only 6.8% of White officers, 25.7% of Black officers, and 0% of Other officers believed the media portrays bias-based policing incidents honestly. A significant difference ($p < .000$) was found between White and Black officers responding to this question. In urban departments, 10.5% of Senior-Level Management, 7% of Mid-Level Management, and 6.7% of Officers believed that the media portrays bias-based policing incidents honestly. A significant difference ($p < .013$) between officers and middle management was found. In rural departments, 0% of Senior-Level Management, 10.1% of Mid-Level Management, and 9.7% of Officers answered affirmatively.

Despite the small differences between urban and rural officers on the topic of the media and their portrayal of bias-based policing incidents, the majority of both urban (83.2%) and rural (76%) officers reported that they believed that the police department should hold the media and other members of the community responsible for the dissemination of misinformation. Perhaps more surprising than the fact that the vast majority of officers at all levels believe that the media and other members of the community should be responsible for the dissemination of misinformation is the fact that some officers (34%) do not believe that the media and other members of the community should be held to a similar standard as the police.

Police Officers Working Cooperatively With the Community
When asked whether they believed it would be possible for community members to openly discuss racial issues, urban and rural officers responded similarly: 56% of urban and 57.6% of rural officers indicated that they believed it would be possible. This finding was somewhat of a surprise to the researchers. It was originally thought by some that officers in rural areas would find it easier than officers in urban areas to address issues in an open manner. It is generally held that small rural communities are more sociable and friendlier and that people know one another throughout the community; however, it is also held that rural areas are less integrated, more isolated and closed, and generally conservative. Further, many rural communities also have a legacy of discrimination and racial bias. Finally, individuals living in rural areas are less likely to encounter other cultures and beliefs on a regular basis. Quite simply, when the issue of race is raised, regardless of location, it can be a highly sensitive issue. This, again, suggests that rural and urban communities have similar problems with regard to racial issues and their ability

to discuss such issues openly. Of course, the good news is that the majority of officers in both urban and rural areas believe that such discussions can occur.

In urban departments, 56% of White officers, 55.9% of Black officers, and 56.3% of Other officers believed that it is possible for members of the community to discuss racial issues honestly and openly. In rural departments, 57.7% of White officers, 57.1% of Black officers, and 60% of Other officers answered affirmatively to this question. In urban departments, 60.5% of Senior-Level Management, 62.8% of Mid-Level Management, and 54.4% of Officers answered affirmatively. A significant difference ($p < .003$) between officers and middle management was found. In rural departments, 65.5% of Senior-Level Management, 60.8% of Mid-Level Management, and 55.6% of Officers answered affirmatively. Interestingly, officers in both urban and rural communities were more convinced than upper level managers that such discourse could occur.

Regarding police officers and community members working cooperatively to develop workable solutions to address a bias-based policing problem, 69.3% of urban officers, compared with 76% of rural officers, indicated that they believed this would be possible. Moreover, a similar percentage of urban (28.1%) and rural (23.7%) officers indicated that they did not know or believe that working cooperatively on such an issue would be possible. Rural officers did show a slightly stronger belief that a cooperative effort between the police and the community would result in a successful outcome. It is encouraging to note that in both urban and rural settings, the police generally agree that cooperation would be successful.

In urban departments, 70.4% of White officers, 69.2% of Black officers, and 53.1% of Other officers answered affirmatively to this question. There was a significant difference between the responses of Other officers and both White ($p < .001$) and Black ($p < .011$) officers. In rural departments, 75.4% of White officers, 80% of Black officers, and 80% of Other officers answered affirmatively to this question. In urban departments, 89.5% of Senior-Level Management, 80.5% of Mid-Level Management, and 66.2% of Officers answered affirmatively. A significant difference ($p < .013$) between Officers and Mid-Level Management was found. In rural departments, 89.7% of Senior-Level Management, 75.9% of Mid-Level Management, and 75.4% of Officers answered affirmatively.

Summary and Conclusion

In summary, analysis of the survey responses from officers in rural departments compared with officers in urban departments highlighted some noteworthy differences.

First, officers in rural departments, compared with officers in urban departments, reported receiving less bias-based training and were less likely to report that their departments had a written bias-based policing policy. Rural department officers,

compared with their urban colleagues, reported a desire to have additional bias-based policing training and policies developed within their departments with greater frequency.

Second, a larger percentage of urban officers, compared with rural officers, reported that they believed that bias-based policing was an issue for their departments. Despite this difference, both urban and rural officers appear to hold similar beliefs regarding the presence of bias-based policing in other Virginia police departments, which is that it does occur.

Third, rural officers, compared with urban officers, appear more inclined to believe that police departments should collect data on bias-based policing incidents. This finding could be indicative of workload differences between urban and rural departments or officer experiences with bias-based policing issues.

Finally, chi-square analyses revealed significant differences between management and officers in response to several of the survey questions. These differences were more profound between mid-level management and officers. Significant differences were also found among White, Black, and Other officers in regard to issues such as the existence of training, whether more training should be required, the practice of bias-based policing in Virginia, and cooperation between the police and the community. Moreover, as with the differences among the police ranks, the disparity in perceptions among the races is just as great. While some of this disparity could be attributed to experience and culture, these findings indicate that more training and research on the bias-based policing issue is needed.

In reviewing the works of other researchers, it becomes clear that much more research is necessary if we are ever to gain a true perspective of bias-based policing issues in the United States. The research to date focuses on statistics and citizen reports. While we found surveys intended to assess actions police chiefs have taken to alleviate bias-policing practices (Fridell et al., 2001), we were unable to find any survey intended to measure the officers' perspective. In addition, the research to date focuses on traffic stops and ignores other critical tasks officers perform daily where bias policing would have a much bigger effect on police-community relations.

Most of the research completed to date focuses on Blacks and proclaimed police bias. Hispanics also claim to experience a disproportionate number of stops. Hispanics fall within a unique category. Hispanics are more favorable toward police than are Blacks but less favorable than Whites (Dunham & Alpert, 2001; Weitzer & Tuch, 2002; Carter, 1983; Cheurprakobkit, 2000). As was learned during our on-site reviews with the various departments, the Hispanic population within the Commonwealth of Virginia is growing at a rapid rate. Hispanics are the fastest growing group in the U.S and represent the largest minority in the U.S. The U.S. Census bureau reports 1.7 million Black Hispanics and 36.3 million White-Hispanics (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002). These growing Hispanic populations

have differing effects on bias-based policing issues. A recent study looked at how Black Hispanics and White Hispanics view racial profiling, and the researchers found important race/ethnic differences. Black Hispanics were more likely to believe that racial profiling was widespread, and that they were racially profiled more than were white Hispanics (Rice, Reitzel, & Piquero, 2004). The Rice et al. research suggests the necessity to carefully look at Black Hispanics and White Hispanics and compare their opinions with that of Black non-Hispanic and White non-Hispanics.

Another significant issue the authors found is that research tends to focus on police and ignores, almost entirely, the potential for other biased criminal justice practices among District Attorneys, the Courts, and Corrections officers. During our on-site focus group meetings, many of the legitimate concerns raised were not incidents of bias-based policing but pertained to actions of the District Attorney or the judge. The authors recommend that future research projects explore bias-based actions of these components of the criminal justice system.

Finally, Virginia is considered part of the southern region of the United States. The authors believe similar studies in other parts of the country could prove significant.

Note

1.   Harris points out that Blacks constitute 13% of the United States' drug users; 37% of those arrested on drug charges; 55% of those convicted; and 74% of all drug offenders sentenced to prison (1999).

References

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2001, February). *Contacts between police and the public: Findings from the 1999 national survey.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Carter, D. L. (1983). Hispanic perception of police performance: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *13*, 487–500.

Carter, D. L., Katz-Bannister, A. J., & Schafer, J. (2001). *Lansing police department MATS data: Six month analysis.* Retrieved February 27, 2011, from http://www.lansingmi.gov/Lansing/police/docs/traffic_stop/mats_6_month_Report.pdf

Cheurprakobkit, S. (2000). Police-citizen contact and police performance: Attitudinal differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanics. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *28*, 325–336.

Coker, D. (2003). Foreword: Addressing the real world of racial injustice in the criminal justice system. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, *93*(4), 827–852.

Coderoni, G. R. (2002). The relationship between multicultural training for police and effective law enforcement. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, *71*(11), 16–19.

Dateline NBC. (2004, April 9). What is a consent search? *MSNBC Interactive* [online news]. New York: MSNBC. Retrieved December 23, 2010, from http://msnbc.msn.com/id/4703573

Davis, R. L. (2001). National organization of Black law enforcement executives: Bias-based policing. *Women Police*, *35*(2) 9–15.

Dunham, R. G., & Alpert, G. P. (2001). The foundation of police role in society. In R.G. Dunham & G. P. Alpert (Eds.). *Critical Issues in Policing* (4th ed, pp. 1–16). Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.

Engel, R. S., Calnon, J. M., & Bernard, T. J. (2002). Theory and racial profiling shortcomings and future directions in research. *Justice Quarterly*, *19*(2), 249–272.

Farrell, A., McDevitt, D. J., Bailey, L., Andresen, C., & Pierce, E. (2004, May 4). *Massachusetts racial and gender profiling study*. Boston, MA: Institute on Race and Justice, Northeastern University.

Fridell, L., Lunney, R., Diamond, D., Kubu, B., Scott, M., Laing, C. (2001). Racially biased policing: A principled response. *Police Executive Research Forum*. Retrieved February 27, 2011, from http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/files/ric/Publications/RaciallyBiasedPolicing.pdf

Gold, A. D. (2003). Media hype, racial profiling, and good science. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *43*(3), 391–399.

Harris, D. A. (1997). Driving while Black and all other traffic offenses: The Supreme Court and pretextual traffic stops. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 87, 544–582.

Harris, D. A. (1999). *Driving while Black: Racial profiling on our nation's highways*. NY: American Civil Liberties Union.

Harris, D. A. (2002). *Profiles in injustice: Why racial profiling cannot work*. NY: The New Press.

Interpreting racial profiling data. (2001, November-December) . *TELEMASP Bulletin*, 1–7.

Justice dept. bars race profiling, with exception for terrorism. (2003, July 15). *Criminal Justice Newsletter*, p. 6.

Kruger, K. J. (2002). Collecting statistics in response to racial profiling allegations. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, *71*(5), 8–12.

Lamberth, J. (1998, August 16). Driving while Black: A statistician proves that prejudice still rules the road. *Washington Post*, p. CO1.

Lundman, R. J., & Kaufman, R. L. (2003). Driving while Black: Effects of race, ethnicity, and gender on citizen self-reports of traffic stops and police actions. *Criminology, 41*(1) 195–220.

MacDonald, H. (2001, Spring). The myth of racial profiling. *City Journal, 11*(2). Retrieved December 23, 2010, from http://www.papillonsartpalace.com/mythof.htm

Malti-Douglas, F. (2002). Review essay/the "p" word: Profiling. *Criminal Justice Ethics, 21*(2), 66–73.

Martin, V. (1999, July 13). Driving while Black is part of the burden of being Black. *Baltimore Sun*, p. A11.

Maryland v. Wilson, 519 U.S. 408, 410 (1997)

Mastrofski, S. D., Worden, R. E., & Snipes, J. B. (1995). Law enforcement in a time of community policing. *Criminology, 33*, 539–563.

McMahon, J., Garner, J., Davis, R., & Kraus, A. (2002). *How to correctly collect and analyze racial profiling data: Your reputation depends on it!* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Meehan, A., & Ponder, M. E. (2002, September). Race and place: The ecology of racial profiling African American motorists. *Justice Quarterly, 19*(3), 399–430.

Meeks, K. (2000). *Driving while Black*. New York: Broadway Books.

Melchers, R. (2003). Do Toronto police engage in racial profiling? *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice. 45*(3), 347–366.

New Jersey: New law makes race profiling a felony. (2003, March 14). *Crime Control Digest*, p. 7.

Ohio v. Robinette, 519 U.S. 33 (1996)

Pelic, J. (2003). United States v. Arvizu. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 93*(4), 1033–1056.

Pfaff-Wright, C., & Tomaskovic-Devey, D. (2000). *Self-reported police speeding stops: Results from a North Carolina record check survey*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Rice, S. K., Reitzel, J. D., & Piquero, A. R. (2004, March). *Shades of brown: Perceptions of racial profiling and the intra-ethnic differential*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Las Vegas, NV.

Riksheim, E., & Chermak, S. M. (1993). Causes of police behavior revisited. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *2*, 353–382.

Rubinstein, J. (1973). *City police*. New York: Farrar, Strauss & Giroux.

Rudovsky, D. (2002). Breaking the pattern of racial profiling. *Trial*, *38*(8), 28–36.

Sherman, L. W., (1980) Causes of police behavior: The current state of quantitative research. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *17*, 69–100.

Smith, M., & Petrocelli, M. (2001). Racial profiling? A multivariate analysis of police traffic stop data. *Police Quarterly*, *4*, 4–27.

Singleton, R., & Straits, B. (1999). *Approaches to social research* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, M., & Alpert, G. (2002). Searching for direction: Courts, social science, and the adjudication of racial profiling claims. *Justice Quarterly*, *19*(4), 673–704.

Traffic-stop data fails to clear up profiling question. (2003). *Law Enforcement News, 29* (591, 592), 6.

U.S. Census Bureau. Economic census 2002. Retrieved February 27, 2011, from http://www.census.gov/econ/census02/ .

Walker, S. (2001). Searching for the denominator: Problems with police traffic stop data and an early warning system solution. *Justice Research and Policy*, *3*(1), 63–95.

Weitzer, R. (1999). Citizens' perceptions of police misconduct: Race and neighborhood context. *Justice Quarterly*, *16*, 819–846.

Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S.A. (2002). Perceptions of racial profiling: Race, class, and personal experience. *Criminology*, *40*(2), 435–457.

Whren v. U.S., 517 U.S., 806 (1996).

Wortley, S., & Tanner, T. (2003). Data, denials, and confutations: The racial profiling debate in Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *45*(3), 367–389.

Zatz, M. S. (1987). The changing forms of racial/ethnic biases in sentencing. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *24*, 69–92.