

URBAN DISADVANTAGE, SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION AND RACIAL
PROFILING: AN ANALYSIS OF ECOLOGY AND POLICE OFFICERS' RACE-
SPECIFIC SEARCH BEHAVIORS

By

ERIN C. LANE

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2005

Copyright 2005

by

Erin C. Lane

This is dedicated to Aunt Cheryl and Grandpa Lane

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In my studies at the University of Florida I have come in contact with a number of individuals who have made positive contributions to my learning and development as a graduate student. Dr. Beeghley was so influential; he guided me through my senior year and directed me to the right resources when I was trying to put together a senior thesis. He has had a profound impact on my life, and I am truly grateful.

I thank Alex Piquero for his patience and guidance, as he was instrumental in helping me write and publish my senior thesis. Jodi Lane provided me with the tools and guidance I needed to get things done and keep it all organized. Matt Nobles kept me focused and somehow always knew what was going on. He was always ready to help. I am forever grateful to Karen Parker, who helped me develop my research focus and guide me through my graduate career. The care and expertise she provided are invaluable.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their support. They never gave up and their persistence helped me get where I am today. My stepmother, Cheryl, my grandmother, Aunt Jan, Uncle Perry, Uncle Paul, and had so much confidence in me. My sisters, Kristin and Michelle, kept me motivated by always acting so impressed when I informed them of my research. I thank my father for everything I have, his consistency, love, concern, support, determination, and his wealth of knowledge.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ABSTRACT	viii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	6
Public Perception Literature	7
Actual Police Behavior	9
Neighborhood Context and Police Behavior	13
3 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES.....	17
Origins of Urban Disadvantage Perspective.....	17
Development of Urban Disadvantage Perspective	20
Urban Disadvantage and Racial Profiling Linkages	23
Origins and New Perspectives in Social Disorganization Theory.....	24
Social Disorganization and Racial Profiling Linkages.....	26
Additional Hypotheses	27
4 DATA AND METHODS	29
Unit of Analysis.....	29
Miami Data	30
Citizen Contact Data.....	30
Dependent Variable	31
Census Data	32
Urban Disadvantage Indicators	33
Social Disorganization Indicators.....	33
Officer Data	34
Crime Data.....	35

5	RESULTS	38
	Principle Component Analysis	38
	Analytic Method	39
	Total Sample Analysis.....	40
	Analysis by Area Type	44
6	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	50
APPENDIX		
A	PRINCIPLE COMPONENTS ANALYSIS AFTER VARIMAX ROTATION	57
B	DESCRIPTIVES: MEANS AND (STANDARD DEVIATIONS) FOR VARIABLES IN SEARCH MODELS FOR NON-DISADVANTAGED AND DISADVANTAGED.....	58
	LIST OF REFERENCES	59
	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	64

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>page</u>
4-1 Descriptive statistics: Means (and standard deviations) for variables in race-specific search models.....	37
5-1 Seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) coefficients (and standard errors) for the total sample.....	41
5-2 Seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) coefficients (and standard errors) for non-disadvantaged and disadvantaged areas.....	46

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

URBAN DISADVANTAGE, SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION, AND RACIAL
PROFILING: AN ANALYSIS OF ECOLOGY AND POLICE OFFICERS' RACE-
SPECIFIC SEARCH BEHAVIORS

By

Erin C. Lane

December 2005

Chair: Karen F. Parker

Major Department: Criminology, Law and Society

Racial profiling by police officers has become a popular subject in the field of criminology in the recent past, gaining extensive coverage in the literature. The study of racial profiling varies greatly in scope and research method, resulting in three primary forms in the literature, including measurement of citizen perceptions of police practices, citizen self-report data on contacts with police, and actual police stop data. However, findings from research in these veins vary greatly, often failing to take into account ecological context and neglecting to incorporate theory as a factor guiding research. This research seeks to compensate for these deficiencies and add to the literature by enhancing our understanding of racial profiling through theory-based research. Using data collected from more than 61,000 police stops in Miami Dade County, I will examine a number of factors that may influence race-specific search behaviors independently for neighborhoods of high and low disadvantage in an attempt to explore and compare the

contributions of urban economy/disadvantage and disorganization theories to the study of racial profiling.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Minorities in general, and specifically black males, are drastically overrepresented in the criminal justice system (Walker, 2001). Scholars agree that a primary cause of this disproportionality may stem from law enforcement officers' use of race as the key determinant for stopping, interrogating, searching, and/or arresting individuals of minority group status. Support for the salience of this phenomenon has been presented countless times through various forms of empirical research (Hagan and Albonetti, 1982; Harris, 1997; Lamberth, 1997; Walker et al., 2000; Brown, 2001; Engel et al.' 2002; Weitzer and Tuch, 2002; Zingraff et al., 2002; and Lundman and Kaufman, 2003).

The act of racial profiling by police officers, defined as the process by which law enforcement agents use race as the key factor in determining whether to stop, search, cite, and/or arrest minority group members, has recently become a prominent focus within the field of criminology (Engel et al., 2002). We know that the practice of racial profiling exists, but why? What factors cause police officers to use race as a primary determinant in making the decision to conduct stops and searches?

Leading scholars have advanced many reasons for officers' more punitive behavior toward minority individuals. One of the more popular explanations concerns crime statistics, which show that African Americans are more likely to commit crime, particularly violent crime, than individuals of other races. However, these rates may be misleading, and should be analyzed beyond face value (Walker, 2001). For example, conviction rates of African Americans are proportionately higher than that of other racial

groups. The simple fact that racial profiling elicits such public reaction forces individuals to consider alternatives to these rather basic measures of arrest, conviction, sentencing, and incarceration. For example, African Americans living in high crime areas typically have more frequent contact with police due to the increased presence of police officers, and are, therefore, more likely to have their criminal activity discovered (Krivo and Peterson, 1996). Some research has indicated that African Americans and other minorities are more likely to drive vehicles with broken taillights, cracked windshields, and other equipment violations, giving officers more reason to make a traffic stop, and again increasing the likelihood that contraband or criminal activity is detected (Mac Donald, 2003). Still, other scholars cite the underlying *laizze faire* brand of racism that exists today in the United States as a primary factor causing high rates of racial profiling (Brown, 2001; Massey et al., 1994; Wilson et al., 2004).

What seems to be less salient in this research is an explanation of police officers' decisions to conduct race-specific searches subsequent to traffic stops, relative to neighborhood characteristics. While a small number of studies do take into account officers' behavior relative to ecological conditions, findings have been inconsistent. Therefore, it is still unclear how and to what degree contextual factors may contribute to higher rates of African American searches as compared to that of whites. Findings from this small body of literature have, however, consistently demonstrated that police officers decision-making processes are affected by neighborhood conditions, being more likely to handle suspects more punitively in neighborhoods with high poverty and crime levels, and equate neighborhood characteristics with that population residing in these neighborhoods (Robison, 1936; Werthman and Piliavin, 1967; Bayley and Mendelsohn,

1969; Lundman, 2004; Meehan and Ponder, 2004; and Engel and Calnon, 2004).

Further, researchers have found that officers often judge seriousness of a situation based on the neighborhood context (Terrill and Reisig, 2003).

Two perspectives have been consistently successful in explaining the relationship between ecology and crime – urban disadvantage and social disorganization (Bursik, 1988; Massey, 1990; Wilson, 1987; and Sampson and Wilson, 1995). These perspectives are highly interrelated, as urban disadvantage perspective finds its origins in the social disorganization tradition. The primary difference is that the urban disadvantage perspective posits that racial discrimination in housing markets is the primary contributing factor to the concentrated disadvantage of poor African Americans, resulting in pronounced racial residential segregation across the United States. This type of discrimination caused a clustering of minorities living in extreme social isolation and poverty (Massey, 1990). Conversely, the social disorganization perspective holds that high crime rates and other negative neighborhood conditions are the result of the inability of residents to realize common goals and, therefore, are unable to regulate the activity of youth or other at-risk groups within their communities. This cause of this social distance can be found in neighborhood instability, residential mobility and communication barriers, and the like (Sampson, 1988; and Sampson and Wilson, 1995).

Neighborhoods with concentrated disadvantage have higher crime rates because the social isolation they are subjected to, in combination with lack of access to legitimate employment, creates a sort of sub-cultural tolerance of criminal behavior (Cullen and Agnew, 2003). In effect, this sub-cultural tolerance leads to higher crime rates and therefore to higher levels of police presence, resulting in increased rates of stops,

searches, arrests and incarceration in these areas. These conditions perpetuate a cycle of crime and poverty geographically concentrated in urban neighborhoods (Rose and Clear, 1998). As a result of racial residential segregation, there exists a greater social distance between officers and residents of highly disadvantaged areas. By this reasoning, due to the prejudice that is perpetuated through discrimination in housing markets, police officers will be more likely to treat African Americans more punitively.

Social disorganization theory explains concentrated disadvantage as a result of a lack of informal social control, stemming from high residential mobility, population heterogeneity, concentrated poverty, and family dissolution (Bursik, 1988; and Sampson and Wilson, 1995). These characteristics developed in response to significant changes in the urban economy beginning in the 1970s. After the relocation of many manufacturing jobs into suburban areas and overseas, inner city residents were left without access to employment. Coupled with the exodus of many working- and middle-class African Americans from inner cities, so began the existence of the underclass (Wilson, 1987). Essentially, residents of these neighborhoods lack communication and are unable to realize their common goals and interests, and thus are unable to maintain informal social control over local youth and other residents (Sampson, 1988; Sampson and Wilson, 1995; and Cullen and Agnew, 2003). As a result of residents being incapable of community-level regulation, more formal social control is necessary to maintain social order, and therefore, more police officers are dispatched to these areas due to higher prevalence of criminal activity (Bursik, 1988).

This paper uses these perspectives to guide the research design in examining the relationship between police officers' race-specific search practices and ecological

context, uncovering the dynamics of race, context, and police behavior. Using the urban disadvantage and social disorganization perspectives, this research seeks to extend explanations of racial profiling at the census tract level, using citizen contact and officer data from more than 61,000 traffic stops in Miami-Dade County, collected by the Miami-Dade Police Department during a six-month period in 2001. Further, both crime data relevant to geographic location and census tract data from the 2000 Census will be used to provide a clearer picture of the reality of racial profiling and race-specific stops and searches by police in Miami-Dade County.

In the next section, I review supporting literature on racial profiling, including research from each type of methodology. Following that, I review the central tenants of urban disadvantage and social disorganization perspectives, finishing with a brief discussion of revitalizations of the latter. In the next section, I report details on the data set used, as well as research methodology. Finally, I present a discussion the findings of the research and suggest direction for future research in the study of racial profiling.

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Racial profiling is the process by which law enforcement agents use race as the key factor in determining whether to stop, search, cite, and/or arrest individuals of minority status (Engel et al., 2002). The phrase ‘driving while black’ was coined in the early 1990s as the US began to see a rise in public awareness of and concern about discriminatory practices by police officers (Harris, 1997). This increase can be partially attributed to highly publicized cases of racial discrimination by members of our justice system, particularly the heinous beating of Rodney King and the events that took place in Los Angeles following the acquittal of the officers responsible for such abuses of power (Brown, 2001). However, the recent growth of this body of literature is not indicative of the true beginnings of this phenomenon; evidence of the existence of racial profiling has long been documented.

Research dating back as early as 1936 cites evidence that police used race as a key factor in their decision-making processes (Robison, 1936). Further, official data on citizen approval ratings of police practices documented since 1967, show that the relationship between minority citizens and police is at best, strained (Werthman and Piliavin, 1967; and Walker et al., 2000). Racial profiling has become one of the most common explanations for this differential treatment of minorities by police officers, thus illustrating the importance of research in this area (Harris, 1997; Lamberth, 1997; Walker et al., 2000; Brown, 2001; Weitzer and Tuch, 2002; Lundman and Kaufman, 2003; and Lundman, 2004).

Three distinct forms of research on the subject matter have consistently appeared in the literature. Citizen public perceptions have been used to measure prevalence of racial profiling and perceptions of the overall legitimacy of police behavior (Hagan and Albonetti, 1982; Weitzer and Tuch, 2002; and Lundman and Kaufman, 2003). The second form of research focuses on actual police behavior by counting and analyzing data from actual traffic stops and searches, but findings from this research have been relatively inconsistent (Lamberth, 1997; Spitzer, 1999; and Harris, 1997). The final perspective is the most recently developed and consequently provides the smallest body of literature; it focuses on racial profiling behavior relative to neighborhood context. Specifically, this vein analyzes neighborhood characteristics and compares them with rates of racial profiling behavior by officers (Robison, 1936; Werthman and Piliavin, 1967; Smith, 1986; Fagan and Davies, 2000; and Terrill and Reisig, 2003). It is this last group of literature we seek to expand with this research. A brief review of each form of literature follows.

Public Perception Literature

Hagan and Albonetti (1982) pioneered the study of citizen perceptions of police behavior and racial profiling. In their analysis of the United States' Department of Justice survey on public perceptions of police practices, they found evidence that being a member of a minority group significantly increases the likelihood of perceptions of injustice. Of particular interest is their finding that African Americans scored an average of 13 points higher than whites on the "perceptions of injustice" scale. This indicates that relationships between police and minority citizens suffer from some external aggravating factors, most likely racial profiling and differential treatment (Hagan and Albonetti, 1982).

In 2002, Weitzer and Tuch conducted a study measuring citizen perceptions of racial profiling, including citizen approval/disapproval of police use of the practice, prevalence rates, citizen perceptions of the utility of the practice, and personal experience with police officers among others. The researchers used characteristics of respondents including race, gender, age, type of neighborhood (urban vs. rural), past experiences with police, and so forth, to check for patterns in citizen perceptions of police. The results indicated first that 94.3% of African Americans and 84.4% of whites disapproved of the use of racial profiling as a method of crime prevention by police officers. Results also showed that African Americans were 3 times more likely than whites to hold negative opinions of local law enforcement agents, and 4 times more likely to have negative opinions of state law enforcement. Race and personal experience with police officers had the strongest influence on attitudes toward the police, with minority members being more likely to hold negative opinions. Finally, African Americans who had some form of contact with police officers within the past 12 months from the time of the interview were significantly less likely than their white counterparts to believe they had been treated fairly by police officers; 16.6% of the sample was eligible for this comparison. Findings revealed that 26.1% of African Americans felt they had been treated unfairly, compared with 7% of whites. The authors concluded that perceptions of racial profiling vary by race, class, and gender; the most significant indicators of negative perceptions were race and personal experience (Weitzer and Tuch, 2002).

Lundman and Kaufman (2003), using data from a nationally representative survey, searched for a relationship between race and ethnicity of drivers and police decisions to conduct traffic stops. The authors used the National Crime Victimization Survey, a

nationally representative survey that among other things includes information on citizen encounters with police, to perform their analysis. The results indicated that African Americans report being stopped more often than both Whites and Hispanics. The results further indicated that African Americans stopped by police were significantly more likely to believe that the officer's reason for the traffic stop was illegitimate or based on extra-legal factors (Lundman and Kaufman, 2003). This type of research lends credence to the study of racial profiling, but public perceptions are sometimes less credible than analyses of actual police behaviors.

Actual Police Behavior

The New Jersey Turnpike study (Lamberth, 1997) is one such study that accounts for actual police stop behavior. The researchers first determined the racial composition of the driving population on a set section of the Turnpike to establish a base line, and then determined the racial composition of speeding drivers. The researchers found that although African Americans composed 13.5% of all motorists and only 15% of all speeding motorists, they accounted for 35% of persons stopped and/or searched by law enforcement officers. African Americans were 4.85 times more likely to be stopped or searched by police. Further inquiry based on police records indicated that African Americans composed 73.2% of all arrests during a 3.5-year period, making them 16.5 times more likely to be arrested as compared to drivers of other races (Lamberth, 1998).

In 1999, Spitzer, in cooperation with the New York Attorney General's Office (1999), released the results of a year long study of stop and frisk practices of New York Police Department officers. They found that although African Americans represented only 25.6% of the population, they composed 50.6% of all persons stopped by officers. Hispanics were also over-represented compared to their proportion of the population;

they composed 23.7% of the population and 33% of persons stopped. This pattern persisted even after researchers controlled for the differential rates at which minorities commit crimes. The researchers concluded that there was a clear over-representation of minorities being stopped by police as compared to their proportion of the population (Spitzer, 1999).

Chambliss (1994) conducted a study in which assistants observed behaviors of police officers assigned to the Rapid Deployment Unit of Washington D.C.'s police department. Although this research was not originally intended to be used to explain racial profiling, the observations collected were disturbing enough to merit further analysis. Data on police behaviors observed by researchers during ride-alongs were collected and analyzed, illustrating the level of disparity in treatment of minorities by police officers. In general, police officers were found to treat African Americans more harshly during traffic stops. Officers were also quoted admitting to the use of racial profiling and reliance on pre-textual factors used to stop minority drivers in certain areas of Washington D.C. Although the paper is without statistical analysis, the observations made were disconcerting and illustrate that, at least in South Central Washington D.C., racial profiling was openly practiced; officers were relatively unconcerned with concealing their methods of policing (Chambliss, 1994).

Harris (1997) conducted a study examining racial profiling activity of police officers in three of the largest metropolitan areas of Ohio based on court records. The researchers compared court record violator rates of African American and white motorists with their respective percentages of the population to gauge disproportionality of police stop practices. The results indicated that African Americans were at least 2 times

more likely to be stopped as compared to whites, a clear indication of racial profiling (Harris, 1997).

With the intent of gauging the effectiveness of a drug interdiction initiative along a stretch of highway of Interstate 95 in Florida, the Orlando Sentinel conducted a study of police stop practices (Cole, 1999). Each police car was equipped with video camera so that researchers could collect detailed information of each stop. Data from 1,100 stops were captured on video and reviewed by researchers. The videos provided clear evidence that approximately 70% of drivers stopped were African American, while they composed less than 5% of the driving population along that specific stretch of highway. The disparity in this study is significant and shows officers propensity to stop minorities more often than whites while attempting to stop drug trafficking (Cole, 1999).

Some research on actual police stop behavior has found variations in support for different types of police action. For example, Smith and Petrocelli (2001) analyzed data collected by the Richmond, Virginia, Police Department on traffic stops, checking for patterns of racial profiling in police traffic stop behaviors. The data consisted of both officer and citizen static characteristics and officers' work histories. Using multivariate analysis, the researchers found that the proportion of traffic stops of minority members, and particularly African Americans, was significantly higher than their proportion of the population. African Americans accounted for 51% of the population of licensed drivers, but accounted for more than 64% of all police traffic stops. Minorities accounted for nearly 78% of all arrests subsequent to traffic stops, and 63% of those ticketed or arrested in the sample. Interestingly, however, they found no significant disparity between search and seizure rates and driver's race (Smith and Petrocelli, 2001).

One problem with the measurement of actual police stop behavior is that research studies have yielded inconsistent results, at times finding no evidence of racial profiling by officers. After compiling information on all police traffic stops conducted during a 4-month period, researchers in cooperation with the Florida Highway Patrol (2000) found that Florida Highway Patrol officers were stopping minorities at a rate almost equivalent to their proportion of the population. While the largest amount of disparity occurred with Hispanics, composing 12% of the population and 17.9% of all persons stopped, African American motorists were stopped at a rate almost equal to their percentage in the population. The findings of this study, however, may be explained by subject reactivity, the concept that individuals change or modify their behavior when they have knowledge that it is being monitored. The bottom line is, though, that there is little evidence of racial profiling among officers employed by the Florida Highway Patrol (Florida Highway Patrol, 2000).

Cordner et al., in collaboration with the San Diego Police Department, conducted an examination of police practices based on police-reported data on traffic stops, searches of vehicle, and vehicle search hit rates. Results showed that vehicles of only Hispanic drivers were more likely than vehicles of whites to be searched. Researchers found no evidence of disparity in search rates between whites and African Americans. It should be noted, however, that vehicle searches of whites were 2 times more likely to yield search hits as compared to vehicle searches of Hispanics. While the white/African American disparity was not significant, higher search rates of Hispanics remains an indicator of racial profiling (Cordner et al., 2000).

Preliminary findings of a study conducted by Zingraff et al. and the North Carolina State Highway Patrol were released in 1998. To assess the prevalence of racial profiling among its officers, the North Carolina State Highway Patrol collected police-reported data on search and hit rates of motorists on North Carolina's highways. While the occurrence of searches by officers was rare, data indicated that African Americans were more likely to be searched than whites, at rates of 13 searches per 10,000 written warnings or tickets vs. 8 searches per 10,000 written warnings or tickets, respectively. Discovery of contraband occurred in 33% of searches of whites, while only 26.3% of searches of African Americans resulted in a hit. There is clear evidence of disparity; however, it may be the result of a small sample size (n=826 searches out of 906,758 written warnings or citations) (Zingraff et al., 2000).

Neighborhood Context and Police Behavior

A small body of research exists which has documented factors influencing police behavior. A consistent finding from this body of literature is that police behavior is affected by the characteristics of neighborhoods in which officers work. It is important to examine the ecological characteristics of urban disadvantage research shows that there is extreme variation in the structural characteristics between predominantly African American and predominantly white neighborhoods.

Robison (1936) examined the relationship between delinquency and the accuracy of its measurement through official police data. Results suggested that the decision to arrest youth by police officers was made after considering two factors, severity of rule-breaking behavior and the juvenile's moral character. The latter factor, she argued, was determined primarily by place of residence, with arrests more likely to result when a juvenile suspect claimed residence in a poor area (Robison, 1936).

Werthman and Piliavin (1967) conducted a study in which they observed and interviewed police officers in the San Francisco Police Department to analyze factors influencing police behavior. According to the researchers, police actions are influenced by the ecological composition of their patrol area due to officers' tendencies to define geographic locations as suspicious in general. Further, the researchers proposed and supported the assertion that neighborhood residence was a primary indicator in police decisions to select potential law violators (Werthman and Piliavin, 1967). Bayley and Mendelsohn (1969) found similar evidence in support of the ecological influence on police behavior. Specifically, they found that there existed a greater social distance between the police and the poor, which often resulted in more punitive and/or aggressive behavior toward citizens in lower-class areas. They further noted that police attributed an individual's presence in a poor or low class neighborhood to the individual's level of threat, and therefore treated them more punitively (Bayley and Mendelsohn, 1969).

Using data from the Police Services Survey, Smith (1986) examined the effects of various community characteristics on police behaviors. The neighborhood characteristics included crime rates, racial composition, poverty levels, and other socioeconomic factors. The author found that officers were significantly more likely to use force against African Americans. That effect, however, was mediated by neighborhood context, with individuals stopped in minority neighborhoods being more likely to be treated coercively. These individuals were 3 times more likely to be arrested than individuals encountered outside minority neighborhoods (Smith, 1986).

Fagan and Davies (2000) analyzed patterns of police "stop and frisk" practices of the New York City police department. Using measures of social disorganization (i.e.,

broken windows, graffiti, etc.), or what the author referred to as “Broken Windows” theory, as well as structural characteristics, including racial composition and poverty levels, Fagan attempted to find racial bias in police decisions to “stop and frisk” individuals. The author’s hypothesis, that measures of social disorganization and structural characteristics are the most significant indicators race-specific “stop and frisk” practices by police, was confirmed. The results indicated that African Americans and Hispanics were significantly more likely to be “stopped and frisked” by police officers. Further, the standards required by law to justify stopping these minority groups more often were not met or were borderline unconstitutional. “Stop and frisk” practices were concentrated in poor neighborhoods with large minority populations. Researchers concluded that police focus on regulating the poor in poor areas. Due to racial composition of poverty in the United States, African Americans and Hispanics are overrepresented in police “stop and frisk” practices (Fagan and Davies, 2000).

Terrill and Reisig (2003) also examined neighborhood context relative to police use of force using data collected from 2 US cities. Their findings were consistent with that of other research in this vein. The authors found that officers were more likely to treat young, male, lower class suspects with more force. More significantly, findings demonstrated that police officers were significantly more likely to use force when in contact with suspects in neighborhoods with high crime rates and with high levels of concentrated disadvantage. The significance of this finding remained even after controlling for behavior of the suspect (Terrill and Reisig, 2003).

The consistency of the findings in this form of research indicates that police officers may very well be influenced by contextual factors of the neighborhoods where

they encounter suspects. While the cited research tends to focus on use of force and coercion by officers, it demonstrates that officer behaviors vary across neighborhoods, based on context, with officers acting more punitively toward suspects in low class, high crime, minority neighborhoods. Accordingly, in the next chapter I provide a discussion of theories linking officers' racial profiling behaviors to neighborhood conditions.

CHAPTER 3 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Origins of Urban Disadvantage Perspective

Urban disadvantage perspective finds its origins in the work of William Julius Wilson. In his book, *The Truly Disadvantaged* (1987) he describes how the changing structure of the urban economy of the 1970s combined subsequently with the development of a cultural value of weak labor force attachment contributed to the rise in poverty, and specifically, its concentration in inner city communities. Wilson argues that the extreme rise in the concentration of poverty was caused by three inter-related factors; (1) the changing economic structure from goods producing to service producing, (2) the relocation of manufacturing jobs into suburban areas and overseas, and (3) the out-migration of working- and middle-class African Americans from the inner-city to the suburbs (Wilson, 1987; and 1992).

During the 1970s the United States, particularly the Midwest and Northeast regions began experiencing drastic shifts in the local manufacturing-focused economies. The advancements made in technological industries contributed to these changes, as did the motivation to secure cheaper labor. Both technological and service industries experienced significant growth at the same time that the industrial sector was declining. This radically decreased the number of manufacturing jobs available to the poor, unskilled, undereducated minorities living in inner cities.

Another contributing factor to the creation of the underclass was the relocation of manufacturing jobs from the inner city to suburban areas and overseas. The outcome was

a spatial mismatch between the unskilled, undereducated industrial workers of the inner city and the physical locations of potential employment. Such great distance between place of residence and place of employment resulted in the inability of poor inner city manufacturing workers to maintain employment in that field and significantly reduced the number of potential job opportunities available (Wilson, 1987; and 1992).

Inner city unemployment rates soared as its residents did not have access to the education, training and skills required to gain employment in the technological industry. High unemployment rates coupled with intermittent economic recessions created a loose labor market, with too few jobs for too many people. Consequently, wages for unskilled service workers were significantly reduced, making it difficult for inner city African Americans to support a family. As Erbe (1975) explained, the decline of proper functioning of local institutions directly affects the quality of the local education system. Loss of employment caused this decline, leaving residents of inner city neighborhoods educationally unprepared to handle the shift; they simply did not have the same access to training and quality education that others outside the inner city had. This further contributed to the already weak labor force attachment of African American males (Wilson, 1987; and 1992).

The decentralization of the labor market clearly had the effect of decreasing opportunity for employment of African Americans residing in inner cities in general, as measured by the ratio of available employment to people and the average commute time to and from places of employment. Moreover, the newly created loose labor market and the subsequent decrease in wages for what was left of available inner city jobs contributed to the ever-increasing social isolation of the underclass and intra-class

segregation of African Americans. This was evidenced through a comparison of less-educated African Americans living in inner cities and less-educated African Americans living in the suburbs; less-educated African Americans living in the suburbs tend to receive higher wages as compared to those living in the inner city. Inner city residents were forced to take employment for wages barely large enough to provide for families (Wilson, 1992).

Finally, the social and economic changes brought about by the Civil Rights movement for a short time provided more access to housing markets outside urban areas for working- and middle-class African Americans. Access to housing markets outside the inner city led to the out-migration of working- and middle-class African Americans, thus leaving a concentration of poor African Americans socially isolated from conventional role models. Social isolation of the poorest minorities caused substandard socialization; inner city residents were no longer exposed to positive, hard-working African American role models. This hindered their ability to see that there was opportunity beyond the inner city, that there was a possibility for upward mobility for those who are determined to improve their situation. Therefore, they adapted to what they believed was the only way of life.

The effects of this concentration of poor, unskilled and undereducated African Americans resulted in the continued deterioration of access to employment opportunities and networks, decreased the already substandard quality of education and diminished the number of marriageable partners, thus contributing to higher levels of family dissolution, and further aggravating the weak labor attachments of inner city residents. These factors together work to produce what Wilson termed the underclass, poverty-stricken groups of

minorities living in inner cities lacking access to employment, education, social networks and conventional role models (Wilson, 1987).

Development of Urban Disadvantage Perspective

Massey (1990), in cooperation with Denton and Eggers, finds support for Wilson's theory of the inner city underclass and factors contributing to the concentration of poverty, but argues that the primary cause of the rise in concentrated poverty among African Americans was due to high levels of racial residential segregation (Massey, Eggers and Denton, 1994). While excluding the influence of African American out-migration due to lack of significance in statistical analyses, they theorized that additional factors including the African American poverty rate, intra-racial residential segregation by class, and most significantly, levels of African American/white residential segregation acted to create the underclass. The residential preferences of whites worked to eliminate any chance of racial integration.

The goal of the researchers was to identify potential inter-relationships between these factors and their influence on the negative social conditions representative of African American, poverty-ridden, inner city neighborhoods as outcomes. Examples of negative social conditions include high crime rates, decreased neighborhood social networks, low social control, increased rates of out-of-wedlock births, lack of availability of marriageable partners, increased unemployment rates, higher percentages of female-headed households, concentrated poverty, and so forth (Massey, 1990; Massey & Eggers, 1990; Massey, Gross and Eggers, 1991; Massey, Eggers and Denton; 1994).

The fact that the concentration of poverty increased during the 1970s has consistently been confirmed empirically. According to Massey and colleagues, the answer to explaining the concentration of poverty disproportionately experienced by

African Americans lies in racial residential segregation stemming from discrimination in housing markets. The interaction between high levels of racial residential segregation and inequality in income distribution created a concentration of poverty within the poorest African American neighborhoods. Massey claimed that Wilson's concept of the out-migration of working- and middle-class African Americans did not explain why the concentration effects disproportionately affected African Americans. He posits that while more African Americans became upwardly mobile in the 1970s and 1980s, there was not in fact a mass exodus of these classes out of urban areas. Although the degree of African American intra-class segregation did increase, it was still much lower than the intra-class segregation experienced by other comparable minority groups. Furthermore, results from multivariate analysis show that the tendency for African Americans of opposing classes to live in areas segregated from each other is not related to the rates of African American poverty concentration in inner cities (Massey, 1990).

In general, African Americans experience higher levels of poverty than whites, a condition that is consistent throughout the majority of cities in the United States. When racial residential segregation is imposed, shifts in the economy are disproportionately concentrated in poor minority neighborhoods. The absorption of the negative effects resulting from a downward economic shift by already poor minority neighborhoods acts to exacerbate the already meager fiscal situations of residents in small geographic locations, thus concentrating levels of poverty and creating an urban underclass (Massey, 1990).

To support his claims, Massey performed a series of simulated experiments to examine the effects of an imposed downward economic shift on both racially segregated

and non-segregated hypothetical cities generally representative in racial composition and economic situation of the majority of U.S. cities. He confirmed the hypothesis that the concentration of poverty would be more equally distributed in areas with low levels of racial segregation, as compared to areas with high levels of racial segregation. Findings included the discovery that when income deprivation was applied to racially segregated areas, some whites were actually better off economically, whereas all African Americans were worse off, regardless of class (Massey, 1990). The results indicated that as racial residential segregation increases, the absorption of downward economic shifts becomes more concentrated within poor minority neighborhoods.

In their 1994 study of the causes of concentrated poverty in urban centers, Massey, Eggers and Denton found evidence that the strongest effect on the level of African American poverty came from the earnings that African American workers could expect to receive in manufacturing and services. Higher income levels in these industries translate into lower levels of poverty; unfortunately, the reciprocal was reality for the vast majority of urban residents. Further, they found that the concentration of poor African Americans in urban areas was significantly and negatively impacted by any shifts in the economy. Racial residential segregation played a compelling role in the concentration of poverty and its endogenous, interacting components including income inequality, majority prejudice toward African Americans and racial discrimination in housing markets (Massey, Eggers and Denton, 1994).

Urban disadvantage perspective has been applied to help understand the relationships between property and drug crime, homicide, and racial profiling. One study used urban disadvantage perspective in an analysis of property crime levels, finding that

as levels of segregation within given areas increases, so too do levels of property crime (Akins, 2003). Using census data from 1990, Krivo and Peterson (1996) found that racial differences in structural disadvantage was linked to higher rates of violent crime (Krivo and Peterson, 1996). Parker and Pruitt (2000) analyzed race-specific homicide rates relative to poverty and poverty concentration. Their finding that these factors differentially affected rates of black and white homicide provides support for urban disadvantage perspective (Parker and Pruitt, 2000). Finally, Meehan and Ponder found that as measures of urban disadvantage decreased, African Americans were subject to higher rates of stops by police (Meehan and Ponder, 2004).

Urban Disadvantage and Racial Profiling Linkages

The key component of urban disadvantage perspective is that concentrated disadvantage was created out of racially motivated discrimination in the housing markets, due to white preferences to not live in integrated neighborhoods. African Americans are significantly more likely to live in areas of concentrated disadvantage as compared to whites; even the poorest whites are significantly less likely to live in areas of concentrated disadvantage. The absence of whites in poor, high crime areas may lead officers to equate African Americans with higher levels of criminal activity; the areas African Americans inhabit often have significantly higher crime rates, so officers may be more likely to believe that they are involved in crime. Consequently, as measures of urban disadvantage increase, police officers will be more likely to use race as a primary discriminatory factor in their decisions to conduct searches. Research has shown that increases in the levels of urban disadvantage increase levels of political dislocation, which can have the effect of creating strained relationships between African Americans and police officers. High rates of unemployment may increase the likelihood of contact

with police; this may have the effect of increasing levels of racial profiling. It then follows that areas with higher levels of disadvantage will experience higher search rates of African Americans as compared to that of whites in the same areas. Based on these assumptions, we derive the following hypotheses on the relationship between urban disadvantage and racial profiling:

- Hypothesis One: As indicators of concentrated disadvantage increase, search rates of African Americans will also increase.
- Hypothesis Two: As indicators of concentrated disadvantage increase, white search rates will not increase.

Should evidence be found in support of these hypotheses, the evidence will also lend support to the urban disadvantage perspective in explaining higher rates of African American searches by police officers in neighborhoods of high disadvantage in comparison to that of low disadvantage neighborhoods.

Origins and New Perspectives in Social Disorganization Theory

Social disorganization theory finds its origins in the work of Shaw and McKay, pioneers of the study of social processes through observation. The central tenets were extracted from Burgess's concept of the division of cities. Essentially, a central city can be dissected into 5 distinct zones— Zone 1 is the business or industrial zone, Zone 2 is the transition zone inhabited by poor immigrants, ready to leave the area at the first opportunity. Zone 3 is composed of working class domiciles, while Zone 4 is characterized by middle class neighborhoods and Zone 5 inhabited by commuters (Cullen and Agnew, 2003). The researchers believed that if this dissection of a central city was in fact indicative of the maturation process of a real urban center, then rates of delinquency would be highest in zone 2, the zone in transition (Shaw and McKay, 1942).

To provide evidence for their theory, Shaw and McKay mapped the location of every juvenile delinquent in Chicago's urban center, according to police records, and then computed delinquency rates over time. The hypothesis that delinquency rates would be highest in zone 2 was confirmed. The authors concluded that delinquency rates were generally stable over time, regardless of race or ethnicity of the dominant population in a given time period. This evidence supported the assertion that it is not characteristics of the individuals inhabiting the area, but characteristics of the area itself that increased delinquency rates. According to Shaw and McKay, social disorganization refers to the breakdown of social institutions within a community. Factors contributing to this breakdown included high rates of family disruption, ethnic heterogeneity, and residential instability (Cullen and Agnew, 2003).

It was not until the mid-1980s that social disorganization theory began to regain popularity, taking the focus off of micro-level theories of crime prevalent after the 1970s. Robert J. Sampson was one of the pioneers of the new social disorganization perspective. Drawing on the work of Shaw and McKay, Sampson proposed that the cause of high crime rates in areas of concentrated disadvantage was due to the neighborhood's lack of ability to exercise informal social control, e.g., dispersing a group of loitering teenagers. While Sampson agreed that the breakdown of community controls was rooted in structural conditions, he further argued that instead of a natural process of large urban city maturation, variation in levels of disorganization are closely linked to racial inequality.

This revised form of social disorganization has been used throughout criminological literature. Specifically, Sampson et al., (2001) found that concentrated

disadvantage in combination with low levels of informal social control and kinship networks increased rates of homicide. Snell (2001) found that poor urban neighborhoods suffered from higher crime rates, as explained by higher levels of disorder and lower levels of friendship and kinship networks (Snell, 2001). Lowenkamp et al., (2003) replicated a prior experiment by Sampson and Groves, analyzing crime rates in the UK; their results provided further support for the validity of this perspective (Lowenkamp et al., 2003).

Gibson, Zhao, and Lovrich found that as perceptions of high levels of collective efficacy increased, fear of crime and victimization were significantly decreased (Gibson et al., 2002). Lane and Meeker (2003) used the perspective to investigate fear of crime levels in urban neighborhoods (Lane and Meeker, 2003). Another study conducted by Browning (2002) extended the perspective to intimate partner violence, showing that higher levels of collective efficacy and informal social control resulted in lower levels of violence among partners, and further increased the likelihood that female victims would report violence to police (Browning, 2002). Finally, Sun et al., (2004) applied social disorganization to their analysis of perceptions of police and local government, finding that as concentrated disadvantage increased, perceptions of police became more negative (Sun et al., 2004).

Social Disorganization and Racial Profiling Linkages

According to social disorganization perspective, residents of highly disorganized areas lack the ability to unite and realize common goals and initiatives; lack of these social networks leads to a breakdown of informal social control, and thus higher crime rates. As a result, neighborhood residents must rely on formal social control, specifically, police officers. Higher rates of police presence increase the likelihood of traffic stops,

and consequently, the rates of searches. Officers' perceptions of neighborhood characteristics may also influence behavior independent of crime rates. For example, a concentration of poverty as manifested by vacant housing units, and unsupervised youth "hanging out" on streets are each indicators of social disorganization that may cause an officer to become suspicious of local residents. The presence of these indicators may lead officers to believe residents, regardless of race, are more likely to be involved in crime, and therefore are less likely to practice racial profiling. Therefore, we theorize that as measures of social disorganization increase rates of both African American and white searches will increase. There should be no racial disparity in search rates in highly disadvantaged neighborhoods.

- Hypothesis Three: As indicators of social disorganization increase, we expect to find an increase in search rates regardless of race.
- Hypothesis Four: The impact of social disorganization indicators on search rates will not differ by racial group.

The validation of these hypotheses would point to the efficiency of social disorganization perspective in explaining higher rates of searches in highly disorganized neighborhoods for both white and African American residents.

Additional Hypotheses

Research on police behavior has shown that officers have a tendency to act more punitively toward minority group members, particularly African Americans. To be sure, police during the 1960s and 1970s shot and killed 7 African American suspects for every 1 fatal shooting of a white suspect (Alpert and MacDonald, 2001). Research findings vary, but have shown that officers are more likely to use force or brutality on suspects being arrested or showing disrespect (Terrill and Reisig, 2003). Further research notes that African Americans are more likely to have a disrespectful demeanor while in contact

with police (Terrill and Mastrofski, 2002, and Mastrofski, Reisig, and McCluskey, 2002).

Therefore, it follows that officers may exhibit higher levels of use of force with African Americans as compared to whites.

- Hypothesis Five: As police use of force reports increase, so too will African American search rates, but will have no impact of white searches.

CHAPTER 4 DATA AND METHODS

It is the goal of this research to determine whether there is a clear link between characteristics of a geographic location and officers' race-specific search behaviors. In an attempt to compare the contributions of both urban disadvantage and social disorganization perspectives to an explanation of racial profiling in context, this research will use indicators of urban disadvantage and social disorganization to test whether they independently explain higher rates of either race-specific or class-specific searches based on characteristics of the census tracts. To allow for an appropriate analysis of these factors, data include actual police-citizen contact data, census data including measures of various census tract characteristics, and crime data specific to the census tracts under study in Miami-Dade County.

Unit of Analysis

Given this paper's focus on urban disadvantage, social disorganization and macro-level characteristics influencing race-specific search behaviors of police officers, all data included are aggregated to the census tract level. This allows for a clearer picture of neighborhood characteristics. Miami-Dade County is composed of 348 census tracts. While the census tract is not explicitly considered a neighborhood, census tracts have been used in extant research as the unit of analysis because they are more likely to correspond to actual community boundaries (Krivo and Peterson, 1996, and Land et al., 1990).

Miami Data

Miami-Dade County offers a particularly ideal domain in which to study racial profiling because of the area's divergent racial and ethnic make-up. The Miami-Dade population is composed of approximately 68% white residents and 22% African American residents; further, approximately 54% of all residents are of Hispanic origin. The ethnic diversity of the area under study has also increased by 8.3% from 1990 to 2000 and continues to grow (Parker et al., 2004). Table one lists descriptive statistics of the Miami-Dade area as well as that of all variables used in this analysis.

This data set was compiled by the Miami-Dade Police Department in cooperation with academic researchers in an effort to detect and identify patterns of racial profiling in police behaviors. The data were collected from April 1, 2001 to October 31, 2001. Composed of 66,109 traffic stops, the data set includes geo-coding of stop locations, citizen characteristics, reason for stop, and the events that transpired after the initial stop, aggregated to the census tract. However, due to the inability to geo-code some incidents, the original sample is reduced by 7.3%, $n = 61,255$.

Citizen Contact Data

It was necessary to collect information on all stops that occurred in Miami census tracts during the data collection period. The Miami-Dade Police Department does not require information to be collected on each stop. Instead, they require police officers to call in a specific code to dispatch when making a traffic stop. Unfortunately, this does not allow for the collection of information as detailed as is necessary to study racial profiling. To get a clear picture of the events that occurred before, during and after the police stop, it would be necessary for officers to record detailed information on each stop made.

To alleviate this issue, the local City Commission appointed an Advisory Board to help determine proper information to be used for inclusion on the Citizen Contact Forms, forms that each officer would be required to complete after making a traffic stop. With suggestions from the academic research group, the Advisory Board determined the information to be included on the Citizen Contact Forms based on the two primary forms of data considered necessary; the research group needed to know who was being stopped and the outcomes of those stops. Examples of information collected on Citizen Contact Forms included reason for making the stop, driver race, driver age, driver residence, and numerous other details pertinent to the detection of racial profiling.

The officers of Miami-Dade County collected a total of 86,232 Citizen Contact Forms. Due to consistency and training issues, the forms collected during February and March were not analyzed. The forms analyzed were those collected between April 1, 2001 and October 31, 2001. They were sent to Miami-Dade Police Department Headquarters where county employees entered the data by hand. Forms that contained incorrect or missing data were returned to the officers as needed and re-collected. A series of recoding and recurrent validity testing ensures the quality and consistency of the cards with actual police records. As a result, officials could not include only 118 forms. This analysis includes data from 66,109 Citizen Contact Forms, and is reduced to 61,255 traffic stops after accounting for missing data.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable is limited to the natural logs of two racially disaggregated counts of search rates per 10,000 – log of black searches per 10,000 and log of white searches per 10,000. The former is computed as the log of the total number of black searches divided by the black population per 10,000. The latter is computed as the log of

the total number of white searches divided by the white population per 10,000. To get a clear indication of search behaviors, all forms of searches were included in the analysis; each search-related variable is coded as 1 = Yes and 2 = No. The survey included a number of search-related variables, including search of person, search by consent, inventory search, search of vehicle, search of driver, and search of passenger. It was necessary to use the log of these rates because of the high variation about the means of each indicator. In using the log of the search rates, the distributions become more normal, and thus more appropriate for linear regression analysis. Further, the use of the natural log reduces heteroscedasticity among variables (Land et al, 1990, and Ousey, 1999). To avoid zero counts as being counted as missing data, one unit was added to each incident with a zero count, and then transformed to the natural log, again equaling zero.

To calculate race-specific indicators, variables selected for analysis include the following: race, coded as 1 = American Indian or Alaska Native, 2 = Oriental/Asian, 3 = Black, 4 = Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and 5 = White. The data were arranged to select out only searches with a code of 3 for black searches, and 5 for white searches. Appendix A defines the operational properties of each variable used in the analysis.

Census Data

The measures included in this data set were retrieved from the 2000 Census, downloaded from the Census Bureau webpage (www.factfinder.census.gov), and Miami-Dade County and modified to accommodate this research. The data are used to estimate social, economic, and demographic measures at the census tract level, which have been used as indicators in the measurement of the urban disadvantage perspective and social disorganization theory.

Urban Disadvantage Indicators

Variables commonly used to reflect urban disadvantage are employed in this research and include race-specific measures of percent persons living below poverty level, defined as percentage of white/black persons living below the poverty level in the total population, and race-specific measures of percent not employed, age 16 and over, defined as percent white/black not employed age 16 and over in the total population. Each of these measures have been included in analysis of urban disadvantage in extant research (Land et al., 1990; Ousey, 1999; Parker and McCall, 1999; and Stretsky et al., 2004). Percent of black and white female-headed households with children under the age of 18 is defined as the number of racially disaggregated households that are female-headed with children under the age of 18. This final measure was included as a disadvantage indicator because it is a condition that is nearly unique to African American families; African Americans are more than twice as likely to experience the condition of female headship, as compared to whites. It is appropriate to include female-headed households with children under 18 in this index, as opposed to its inclusion as a measure of social disorganization (Land et al., 1990; and Ousey, 1999).

Social Disorganization Indicators

Indicators of social disorganization include percent of Spanish-speaking population speaking English not well or not at all, percent Hispanics in the total population, residential mobility, percent of vacant housing units, and percent persons who journey to work 25 minutes or more, and are defined below. Percent Spanish-speaking population speaking English not well or not at all, age 5 and above is defined as the percentage of Spanish-speaking persons speaking English not at all or not well in the total population, ages 5 and above. Percent Hispanics in the total population is defined as the percentage

of individuals of Hispanic descent in the total population. These measures are included to provide a better understanding of potential communication issues among residents and therefore, a lack of potential for collective efficacy and informal social control.

Residential mobility is defined as having a different residence within the past 5 years. This variable is used as an indicator of neighborhood residential stability. According to Sampson, neighborhood instability weakens the ability and desire of residents to understand their collective goals (Sampson, 1987). As residential mobility increases, it becomes more likely that the neighborhood experiences higher levels of disadvantage. Percent of vacant housing units is defined as the percentage of vacant housing units as compared to the total number of housing units.

Percent persons who journey to work 25 minutes or more is defined as percent persons of a given census tract who travel to work 25 minutes or more. This measure was included to account for local social disorganization through a lack of available local employment. According to Wilson, the relocation of manufacturing jobs to the suburbs caused unemployment rates to increase substantially, due to inner city workers' geographic proximity to available employment (Wilson, 1987). Therefore, this measure is computed as an indicator of social disorganization.

Officer Data

The Miami data set also includes information on officers employed by the Miami-Dade Police Department during the time of the study. Information on each of the 1,659 officers in the citizen contact database was included; examples consist of race, age, rank, sex, and the like. Data are also provided by Professional Compliance Bureau, which includes information on disciplinary actions, complaints and use of force reports, limited to the previous 5 years (1997-2000), and aggregated to the census tract. All identifiers

were removed from the data set to ensure anonymity. We include use of force reports, defined as the rate of use of force reports an officer has received within the past 5 years. As was the case with the dependent variable, it was necessary to use the natural log of the rates of use of force reports due to significant variation about the mean.

Crime Data

Crime data was provided by the Miami-Dade Police Department, spanning 5 years from 1997 to 2001. This data set includes both Part I and II crime arrests for the time span. The file contains data on 121,763 cases, and includes the following information: incident date, Uniform Crime Report coding, UCR descriptions, details of the incident, incident location, police district and grid information, and census tract identifiers. Using the crime data, I calculated the total and race-specific rates per 10,000 for each type of crime based on the arrest records spanning that time period, all of which are aggregated to the census tract level; the types of crimes include homicide, violent, property, and drug crimes, as well as a total crime rate.

Homicide rate per 10,000 is a racially disaggregated measure of violent crime, and is defined as the black/white homicide rate per 10,000. Research has consistently shown a link between racial composition of a given neighborhood and violent crime rates (Robison, 1936; Werthman and Piliavin, 1967; Smith, 1986; and Parker and McCall, 1999). If an officer knows that he or she is making a stop in an area with higher homicide rates, the officer may be more likely to act in a more punitive fashion, as manifested by a search.

Racially disaggregated rates of arrest were also included as controls, and are defined as rates at which an arrest was made of a black or white per 10,000 stops. The arrest rates were calculated from the variable, Arrest Made, and coded as 1 = Yes, and

2 = No. All types of police arrests are included, with the exception of custody arrest, in which an individual is not truly arrested, but taken into police custody.

Percent of males in the total population is used as a control measure due to their increased likelihood of participation in criminal activity and an increased likelihood of arrest by police officers as compared to females. It is defined as the percentage of males in the total population.

Finally, we control for the rate investigative stops, defined as stop resulting from officer suspicions, to detect tendencies for police to be more suspicious in certain contexts as compared to others. We created a variable to compute the percentage of investigative stops; all investigative stops were computed from the variable Reason for stop, coded as 1 = investigative, 2 = traffic violation, 3 = equipment violation, 4 = BOLO (be on look-out), 5 = other, 6 = hazardous moving violation, and 7 = non-hazardous moving violation.

Table 4-1 Descriptive statistics: Means (and standard deviations) for variables in race-specific search models

	Total Sample N = 265	
	Black	White
<i>Dependent Variable</i>		
Log Search Rates per 10,000	1.57 (1.82)	1.46 (1.52)
<i>Contextual Variables</i>		
<i>Urban Disadvantage Indicators</i>		
Urban Disadvantage Index	48.89 (30.63)	28.19 (19.77)
<i>Social Disorganization Indicators</i>		
Hispanic Immigration Index	70.79 (41.57)	71.23 (41.75)
Residential Mobility		49.06 (12.57)
% Vacant Housing Units		7.63 (8.04)
% Who Travel to Work > 25 Minutes or More		51.46 (10.66)
<i>Officer Conduct Variables</i>		
Log Officer Use of Force Report Rates		4.27 (1.87)
<i>Control Variables</i>		
Homicide Rate Per 10,000	0.71 (3.65)	0.49 (3.88)
Arrest Rate	19.11 (50.57)	19.75 (117.11)
% Males in Total Population		48.09 (4.85)
Investigative Stop Rate		40.39 (73.44)
<i>Population Composition of Miami- Dade County</i>		
% White Population		67.527 (30.121)
% African American Population		22.338 (29.871)
% Hispanic Population		54.364 (29.112)

CHAPTER 5 RESULTS

Principle Component Analysis

Structural indicators tend to be highly correlated. Therefore, to avoid problems with multicollinearity, we performed a principle components analysis on indicators of urban disadvantage and social disorganization (Land, et al, 1990, Parker and McCall, 1999, and Stretsky, Schuck and Hogan, 2004). The factor loadings produced separate, theoretically distinct indices of each perspective. Further, the factor loadings were the same for both white and black models. The principle components analysis matrix after varimax rotation is provided in Appendix B.

The urban disadvantage index includes three measures of disadvantage that are consistent with extant literature as indicators of urban disadvantage, disaggregated by race (Krivo and Peterson, 1996; Wilson, 1987; Massey and Eggers, 1990; Massey, 1990; and Ousey, 1999). The race-specific measures of percent living below poverty level, percent not employed, age 16 and over, and percent of female-headed households with children under 18. All were highly correlated and thus loaded together, creating the black and white disadvantage indices.

The Hispanic immigration index was created from the loadings of the following measures related to the Hispanic population: percent Spanish-speaking population speaking English not well or not at all, age 5 and above, and percent Hispanics in the total population. Therefore, two conceptually distinct indices emerged from the analysis

and are treated as independent variables in the multivariate models: The Urban Disadvantage Index, disaggregated by race, and Hispanic Immigration Index.

Analytic Method

This analysis contains two separate models estimated theoretically in white and black indicators on race-specific search rates in the total sample. As was stated previously, it was necessary to perform log transformations for some variables so that their distributions were more normal, and to reduce heteroscedasticity among independent variables, thus making the data more appropriate for linear regression analysis. Each of the model regression equations is estimated from the same unit, which may result in cross-equation error correlations. Therefore, seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) was chosen as the most appropriate test for the analysis. This method uses generalized least squares to estimate each individual model regression equation. It is designed to account for correlations in error terms across equations so that comparisons between models can be made without encountering issues with collinearity while using measures taken from the same sampling unit (Greene, 1996, Land et al., and Ousey, 1999). Finally, I employed a Breusch-Pagan test of independence to ensure that heteroscedasticity among variables would not be significant enough to affect analysis. The test revealed no evidence of heteroscedasticity ($\chi^2 = 1.619, p > 0.05$).

Because the theoretical arguments and hypotheses propose differences across racial groups, it is necessary to conduct a test for race-specific differences in the magnitude of the effects of each indicator on black and white models. Essentially, we needed to conduct a test measuring the variance of the effects of indicators across the models. To obtain this information we computed the F statistic through the SUR analysis, which measures the significance of the differences of coefficients across models. It is necessary

to employ such a test because other options of statistical analysis tend to be negatively biased; this effect appears because certain types of analysis commonly used simply compare regression coefficients (Paternoster, et al., 1998). The results from the seemingly unrelated regression analysis and F test are reported below in Table 2. A brief explanation of findings follows.

Total Sample Analysis

Turning first to indicators related to urban disadvantage, we see that the disadvantage index in the black model was found to have a negative but non-statistical effect on the rate of black searches. This finding is contrary to the predictions of Hypothesis 1 that higher scores on the index would result in higher rates of searches of African Americans. Hypothesis 2, that increased levels of urban disadvantage would have no effect on rates of white searches, was also not supported by the results of the analysis. Again, we find that the reciprocal of Hypothesis 2 was the outcome. The results show a positive and significant relationship between the rates of white searches by police and the white disadvantage index. That is, as levels of white urban disadvantage increase, the rate of police searches of white drivers also increases. Further, the F statistic reveals that the difference in these coefficients across models is statistically significant.

We now consider the hypotheses related to the social disorganization perspective. While we offer multiple measures of social disorganization, no measures reach statistical significance in the black models. Only one measure was found to have a significant impact on rates of white searches – percent vacant housing units. In disorganized areas, whites are not likely to be searched by police, meaning that as the percentage of vacant housing units increase, the rate of white searches by police actually decrease. Hypothesis

Table-5-1 Seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) coefficients (and standard errors) for the total sample

	Black	White	Coeff. Comparison F (and P) Values
<i>Contextual Variables</i>			
<i>Urban Disadvantage Indicators</i>			
Urban Disadvantage Index	-0.001 (0.002)	0.008** (0.003)	4.90* (0.027)
<i>Social Disorganization Indicators</i>			
Hispanic Immigration Index	-0.004 (0.002)	-0.003 (0.002)	0.37 (0.541)
Residential Mobility	0.013 (0.008)	0.000 (0.057)	1.95 (0.162)
% Vacant Housing Units	-0.008 (0.013)	-0.019* (0.009)	0.59 (0.443)
% Who Journey to Work 25 Min. +	0.005 (0.009)	-0.008 (0.006)	1.67 (0.196)
<i>Officer Conduct Variables</i>			
Log of Officer Use of Force Report Rate	0.177* (0.072)	0.402** (0.052)	6.94** (0.008)
<i>Control Variables</i>			
Homicide Rate Per 10,000	0.039 (0.025)	0.019 (0.016)	0.45 (0.501)
Arrest Rate	0.021** (0.002)	0.002** (0.001)	82.38** (0.000)
% Males in Total Population	0.012 (0.025)	-0.013 (0.019)	0.69 (0.405)
Investigative Stop Rate	0.006** (0.002)	0.007** (0.001)	0.26 (0.612)
Constant	-1.003 1.326	0.505 0.996	
Model Chi Square	219.930	396.280	
RMSE	1.283	0.957	
R Square	0.452	0.598	

* P < 0.05 ** P < 0.01

3, that these factors will increase both black and white search rates, is therefore not supported by the analysis. However, we do find some evidence supporting Hypothesis 4 that these factors will impact the black and white models similarly. The F statistics show that social disorganization indicators do not differentially affect the white and black models. That is, measures of disorganization have a similar effect on rates of black and white searches.

The log of officer use of force reports has a significant and positive effect on rates of both black and white searches. Its effect on white search rates is stronger than its effect on black search rates, however, giving us 99% confidence and 95% confidence respectively that as reports of use of force increase, so too do rates of white and black searches by police. Therefore, Hypothesis 5 is partially supported; while officer use of force reports do have a positive and significant effect on the black search rate, it also was found to increase white search rates. However, there is clear evidence of racial variance in the impact of these coefficients concerning the relationship between force and race-specific search rates. The F statistic shows that the impact of police use of force rates differs significantly by race.

Concerning the controls, we find that the homicide rate per 10,000 does not impact rates of race-specific searches, and there is no evidence of racial variance in the way homicide rates affect each model. The arrest rate was highly significant in both models, giving 99% confidence that as arrest rates increase, so too will rates of race-specific searches. However, this effect may have an indirect relationship the impact of inventory searches, a procedure always completed upon all arrests. That is, when an officer conducts a search during a traffic stop, the decision to search was based on the officer's

discretion. An inventory search is part of police arrest protocol, which is not considered a search that can be motivated by racial bias, and thus may inflate the actual rates of race-specific searches by officers. Interestingly, the arrest rate differentially affects rates of race-specific searches, a finding that should be investigated in future research. We find that the percentage of males in the total population had no effect on race-specific searches by police, and this measure was without evidence of racial variance. Finally, the investigative stop rate had a positive and significant effect on searches by police in both models. That is, when an officer makes a stop for investigative purposes, it increases the likelihood of a search for whites and blacks alike. However, the impact of this control does not differ by race.

In summary, the findings from the preliminary analysis provide modest support for both urban disadvantage and social disorganization hypotheses. The urban disadvantage index was found to have a statistically significant, positive effect on white searches by police, while having a negative and non-significant effect on black searches. None of the social disorganization measures used in the current analysis resulted in statistical significance in the black model. A single measure of social disorganization, percent vacant housing units, was found to have a negative impact on rates of white searches. However, consistent with the social disorganization hypotheses, we found evidence of racial invariance. That is, social disorganization measures affect both black and white search rates similarly. Finally, turning to police use of force reports, we found that the hypothesis was partially confirmed. This finding suggests that increases in use of force reports have a positive and significant impact on not only rates of black searches, but also rates of white searches by police.

Analysis by Area Type

To check for differences across types of areas, disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged, a supplemental analysis was conducted, using the same set of hypotheses from the primary analysis. The disadvantaged model selected out census tracts having at least 30% of African American residents living below the poverty level. The non-disadvantaged areas were composed of those tracts with less than 30% of African Americans living below the poverty level. Poverty level cut-off points vary in the literature, but researchers have typically used a percentage between 20% defined as low, and 40%, defined as extreme. Therefore, a high African American poverty level of 30% was used as the cut-of point to distinguish disadvantaged areas from non-disadvantaged areas (Wilson, 1987, Massey, 1990, Massey and Eggers, 1990, Krivo and Peterson, 1996, and Stretesky, Schuck, and Hogan, 2004). Disaggregating the data by area type resulted in $n = 95$ disadvantaged census tracts, and $n = 170$ non-disadvantaged census tracts. Descriptive statistics for the supplemental analysis are listed in Appendix C. The results from the SUR analysis and F tests are given in Table Three.

The focus on African American poverty is consistent with urban disadvantage and social disorganization perspectives in that structural factors causing concentrated poverty are said to disproportionately affect this minority group as compared to structural effects on whites. Therefore, we find it appropriate to disaggregate census tracts based on the proportion of African American residents living in poverty in a given census tract for both the black and white models. It allows for the isolation of these areas in which African Americans are affected disproportionately by factors that create conditions conducive to high poverty concentrations.

Concerning the urban disadvantage indicators in the non-disadvantaged model, we find that neither is significantly affected by the urban disadvantage index. Again, we see that these findings do not support Hypothesis 1, that urban disadvantage indicators will have a significant, positive impact on search rates of African Americans. However, results do lend some support to Hypothesis 2, that white searches will not be affected by increases in urban disadvantage. The F statistic further reveals no evidence of racial variance. That is, differences between coefficients illustrate that the impact of the urban disadvantage index does not differ by racial group.

For measures of social disorganization, we find that the impact of these indicators on race-specific searches is not statistically significant, with the exception of percent vacant housing units. The coefficients are identical for percent of vacant housing units in the white model, while no other significant relationships were identified. The black model again, shows no significant relationships among social disorganization indicators and rates of black searches. These findings are contrary to the predictions of Hypothesis 3, which states that as social disorganization indicators increase, so too will rates of race-specific searches by police. However, the F statistic reveals that no indicators differentially affect the white and black models, which lends some support to Hypothesis 4 that the impact of social disorganization indicators will not differ by racial group.

The log of officer use of force reports has a different relationship to rates of black and white searches by police in non-disadvantaged areas. The black model indicates no significant relationship between police use of force and rates of black searches. However, the white search rate is significantly affected by the indicator, giving 99% confidence that as police use of force reports increase, so too do rates of white searches

Table-5-2 Seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) coefficients (and standard errors) for non-disadvantaged and disadvantaged areas

	Non-Disadvantaged Areas N = 170			Disadvantaged Areas N = 95		
	Black	White	Coeff. Comparison F (and P) Values	Black	White	Coeff. Comparison F (and P) Values
<i>Contextual Variables</i>						
<i>Urban Disadvantage Indicators</i>						
Urban Disadvantage Index	0.003 (0.006)	-0.002 (0.006)	0.09 (0.765)	0.008 (0.006)	0.009* (0.005)	0.00 (0.968)
<i>Social Disorganization Indicators</i>						
Hispanic Immigration Index	-0.006 (0.004)	-0.003 (0.002)	0.72 (0.395)	-0.002 (0.003)	0.000 (0.003)	0.36 (0.549)
Residential Mobility	0.013 (0.009)	-0.001 (0.006)	2.36 (0.125)	-0.002 (0.013)	0.019 (0.012)	1.54 (0.214)
% Vacant Housing Units	-0.001 (0.017)	-0.019* (0.010)	0.98 (0.322)	-0.017 (0.019)	-0.015 (0.019)	0.01 (0.932)
% Who Journey to Work 25 Min. +	0.013 (0.011)	-0.011 (0.007)	3.34 (0.067)	-0.011 (0.013)	0.003 (0.013)	0.60 (0.438)
<i>Officer Conduct</i>						
Log of Officer of Use of Force Report Rates	0.160 (0.106)	0.447** (0.065)	5.77* (0.016)	0.175* (0.091)	0.293** (0.089)	0.93 (0.334)
<i>Controls</i>						
Homicide Rate Per 10,000	0.059 (0.063)	-0.061 (0.102)	1.01 (0.314)	0.029 (0.025)	0.027 (0.018)	0.01 (0.934)
Arrest Rate	0.022** (0.003)	0.011** (0.002)	9.83** (0.001)	0.020** (0.003)	0.002** (0.001)	30.34** (0.000)
% Males in Total Population	0.005 (0.051)	0.026 (0.031)	0.14 (0.705)	0.034 (0.028)	-0.047 (0.027)	4.59* (0.032)
Investigative Stop Rate	0.005* (0.003)	0.005** (0.002)	0.00 (0.974)	0.007** (0.002)	0.009** (0.002)	0.38 (0.538)
Constant	-1.011 2.533	-1.119 1.569		-1.449 1.704	0.777 1.506	
Model Chi Square	122.570	239.080		126.640	199.510	
RMSE	1.362	0.839		1.063	1.038	
R Square	0.416	0.585		0.569	0.677	

* P < 0.05 ** P < 0.01

by police. Finally, we see that the F coefficient is significant; officer use of force reports do, in fact, differentially affect the black and white models. Again, we do find partial support for Hypothesis 5 in the differential effects of this indicator on rates of black and white searches.

The homicide rate per 10,000 was found to have no effect on rates of race-specific searches. The arrest rate was found to have a highly significant effect on both rates of race-specific searches, while the F statistic reveals significant differences in the impact of arrest rates by racial group. Percentage of males in the total population had no effect on race-specific searches, and no racial differences in its influence were identified. The investigative stop rate was found to positively influence the rates of black and white searches. The investigative stop rate has a slightly stronger, but statistically non-significant, positive impact on rates of white searches by police, as compared to its influence on the black search rate. However, the F statistic reveals no evidence of variation by race.

Similar to findings from the primary analysis, we find that the urban disadvantage index has a positive and significant relationship to rates of white searches; however, we do see a slight reduction in significance from the primary model to the current model. No significant relationship between the disadvantage index and rates of black searches was identified. Further, based on the statistic from the F test, we see no evidence that the disadvantage index differentially affects the black and white models. Again, these findings lend no support to Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2.

Indicators of social disorganization have no significant effect on either race-specific search rates. These results are in opposition to Hypothesis 3 that both black and white

search rates will increase. However, we again find support for Hypothesis 4, as there is no evidence of a differential effect of the indicators on either model.

Finally, we find significant the influence of the log of officer use of force report rates for each model. The relationship between the indicator and black searches is positive and significant, with 95% confidence. As in previous models, we see that the influence of officer use of force reports is stronger for white search rates, in this case yielding 99% confidence that as use of force report rates increase, white searches by police will also increase. However, we do not see a difference in the way this indicator affects each model. The F statistic reveals that the impact of officer use of force reports similarly affects both black and white search rates, a finding we do not see in the non-disadvantaged model.

The impact of two controls in the disadvantaged areas is slightly different from the non-disadvantaged areas. Consistent with findings from the non-disadvantaged areas, we see that homicide rate per 10,000 has no significant influence on race-specific searches, without evidence of racial variance. The arrest rate is continuous across models as well, having a highly significant impact on rates of black and white searches, while showing considerable evidence of racial variance. However, the percentage of males in the total population, while having no impact on searches, was found to have a different influence on each model. An additional difference was found in the impact of the investigative stop rate on black searches by police, as the coefficient increased in significance for the black model, while the impact on white searches was the same as in the non-disadvantaged model. Racial variance, however, was again not identified.

Results from the supplemental analysis were similar to findings from the preliminary analysis. The urban disadvantage index had a significant and positive effect on rates of white searches, but not black searches, in the disadvantaged model only, while the index had no statistically significant impact in the non-disadvantaged model. We again see no significant impact of social disorganization indicators on black search rates in both disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged areas or on the white search rates in disadvantaged areas. However, we see positive statistical significance in the impact of percent vacant housing units on rates of white searches by police in the non-disadvantaged models.

Finally, we see a decrease in the impact of officer use of force reports for black search rates in the non-disadvantaged model. We also find statistical significance in the magnitude of the F statistic, meaning that the impact of use of force reports is different based on racial group. The disadvantaged model also yields results similar to those from the preliminary analysis; use of force provides a 95% confidence interval for its impact on black search rates, and a 99% confidence interval for its impact on the white searches, as well as a change in the F statistic indicating no evidence of racial variance. That is, the impact of use of force reports on black and white search rates by police becomes more similar in the disadvantaged model.

CHAPTER 6 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The goal of this research was to determine the effects of urban disadvantage and social disorganization on racial profiling as manifested through a police search subsequent to a traffic stop. For the analysis, we compared indicators of social disorganization and an urban disadvantage index to police rates of black and white searches. Overall, the results indicate that these perspectives do not significantly contribute to our knowledge of the causes of racial profiling.

The urban disadvantage index significantly influenced white search rates in the total sample, while it had no impact on search rates of African Americans. This is the case across each black model; the findings held when relationships were estimated by non-disadvantaged and disadvantaged area types, thus exhibiting the robustness of the findings from the analysis. The F statistic generated shows that the impact of the urban disadvantage index differs by race. This is also consistent with findings from previous studies, which included similar measures. Krivo and Peterson (2000) found in their analysis of black and white structural conditions and homicide rates, that concentrated disadvantage was 1 of only 2 variables that had significant racial differences. Perhaps this is a result of a significantly lower likelihood for whites to live in concentrated disadvantage (Krivo and Peterson, 2000). It then follows that when whites do live in areas of concentrated disadvantage, their economic and social situations are at their worst. Therefore, a possible explanation of this finding may be that white searches by police increase with increases in concentrated disadvantage because when whites

experience conditions such as these, the impact of disadvantage is exacerbated, resulting in whites living in the poorest and most dangerous communities.

The measures of social disorganization showed no statistically significant impact on the black model, while percent vacant housing units had a negative and significant impact on rates of white searches by police. Krivo and Peterson (1996) found that higher vacancy rates as well as higher rates of rental occupancy have positive effects on rates of property crime. Moreover, this effect was found to have a more significant impact on white neighborhoods than in predominantly black neighborhoods with extremely low numbers of professional residents. This finding again points to the extremely different structural living conditions of poor whites and poor blacks. As I explained above, the likelihood of poor whites to live in the poorest areas is so low that when this condition does occur, whites are living in the worst of areas. It may be more common to find a higher number of professionals, who tend to be more stable in their living situations, residing in more populated, poor white neighborhoods because of a higher likelihood of better education, and thus, better jobs. However, in the worst conditions, whites are residing in areas composed of residents of the lowest socioeconomic status, therefore, having a lower likelihood of professional residents, and thus higher levels of vacancy (Krivo and Peterson, 1996).

Looking at the descriptive statistics from the supplementary analysis (see Appendix C), we see that African Americans are more likely to be searched by officers in non-disadvantaged areas, while whites are more likely to be searched in disadvantaged areas. These statistics are in opposition to the assumptions of the hypotheses, that indicators consistent with each neighborhood type would have a strong influence on black searches,

but not white searches in the case of urban disadvantage, or that they would have a similar effect on both black and white search rates in the case of social disorganization.

Police officers have a great deal of discretion in the field; the decisions they make concerning law enforcement are shaped by, among other things, past experiences. Police officers are trained to look for things that are out of the ordinary (Smith, Makarios, and Alpert, Forthcoming). African Americans are more likely to reside in areas having characteristics that typify urban disadvantage, while only 2% of the poorest whites live in neighborhoods with an extreme concentration of poverty (Wilson, 1987, and 1992). It then follows that a white person in a particularly poor or predominantly African American neighborhood may prompt an officer to suspect criminal activity, and subsequently stop and search that individual because they don't fit (Smith, Makarios, and Alpert, forthcoming). Therefore, we may expect an increase in white searches as we move into more disadvantaged areas, as is illustrated in the supplementary models.

As I stated before, it is not likely that whites live in areas of concentrated poverty and high crime. When whites do reside in these areas, it is possible that they are put in a different social class, separate from poor whites living in more affluent neighborhoods. Perhaps the social distance between these two groups created by the difference in neighborhood residence is enough to influence police suspicions and thus, increase white search rates.

The racial threat hypothesis offers another potential explanation for the results. It claims that the percentage of minorities in a given area is positively related to the level of formal social control. If segregation is imposed and minority groups are concentrated in certain areas, they become less of a threat, resulting in less police activity (Liska and

Chamlin, 1984, and Terrill and Mastrofski, 2002). Perhaps police focus more on whites in these areas because they come to expect certain types of suspicious or criminal behaviors from blacks in disadvantaged areas. Black crime becomes commonplace, making officers less sensitive to African American presence, and thus more attentive to suspicious behaviors of whites.

The benign-neglect hypothesis argues that larger African American populations have a higher likelihood of intra-racial crimes, which are less likely to be handled via legal response. This is because intra-racial crimes do not pose a threat to the majority (Liska and Chamlin, 1984, and Smith and Holmes, 2003). Again we see potential for more focus on white crime in areas of high disadvantage. According to Black's theory of law, whites are higher in status than African Americans because they compose the majority. We may therefore see higher levels of legal response to suspicious behaviors of whites because higher status elicits more law (Doyle and Luckenbill, 1991).

The officer use of force report rate was found to be significant in both the white and black models. However, we see that it has a stronger impact on white search rates, and as demonstrated by the F statistic generated, there is significant variation in the way this variable affects whites and African Americans. The racial difference in the impact of this variable is contradictory to existing literature on the determinants of use of force and neighborhood context. Consistent with extant literature, we hypothesized that higher rates of officer use of force reports would increase the likelihood of African American search rates, but not white search rates. Numerous studies show that officers are more likely to use force against minority suspects than whites (Smith, 1986, Smith, 1987, Liska

and Chamlin, 1984, Doyle and Luckenbill, 1991, Terrill and Mastrofski, 2002, Terrill and Reising, 2003, and Smith and Holmes, 2003).

Turning to the supplementary analysis we see that in the non-disadvantaged models, use of force rates show no impact on African American searches, while it has a significant impact on white searches. The disadvantaged models show that both search rates are influenced by use of force rates, but there is a stronger impact in the white model. Perhaps these findings reflect levels of aggression in police officers. As previously stated, officers look for things that are out of the ordinary. It may make sense that a majority of officers are searching African Americans in more affluent neighborhoods because they are less likely to take residence there. However, it appears that for a white to be searched in an affluent area, it takes a particularly aggressive officer to make that decision – one that has a higher occurrence of use of force reports.

The findings of the non-disadvantaged models may be imparted to the total sample models and the disadvantaged models. Essentially, all officers are doing their jobs by stopping and searching African Americans, but only some officers are searching whites. This may be evidence of racial profiling because it assumes African Americans are committing crimes, as evidenced by higher rates of use of force when initiating the search of a white suspect, while it is less likely for the search of an African American to be conducted by officers who have high rates of use of force.

The potential contributions of this research are many. This is one of only a small number of studies on racial profiling conducted using such a large data set, containing such detailed information on police officers, citizens, and stop information. Further, the data were gathered using a combination of sources outside of the individual level data,

including the 2000 census, and the Uniform Crime Report, allowing for a more thorough investigation of the problem (Lundman, 2004). This research is theory-based, which is unique to this field. Extant research has generally neglected to incorporate theory prior to statistical analysis (Engel, Calnon and Bernard, 2002). As a theory-based research paper, the units of analysis were ultimately determined by tenets of social disorganization and urban disadvantage in an attempt to explain the differential behaviors of police relative to neighborhood context. This research also provides a comparison between the effects of each context-related perspective, and may help to support one over the other in explaining racial differences in search rates.

In designing this analysis, it was often difficult to discern which indicators were more consistent with each perspective. Perhaps future research should consider using measures of social disorganization that are more distinct from those of urban disadvantage. Community characteristics such as collective efficacy may be one avenue that can provide a clearer dichotomy between the two perspectives. Further, taking into account characteristics of community-level institutions may provide an improved conceptualization of a community's organization.

This study used racially-disaggregated measures of search rates by police as an indicator of racial profiling. Due to the actual number of searches conducted during the period of data collection, the counts for searches were low. Indeed, the counts were so low and varied so significantly across census tracts that the natural log had to be used to make the data appropriate for the regression analysis. The act of conducting a search is highly discretionary for police officers because it is the officer alone who takes into account various circumstances, conditions or cues that may warrant a search. Therefore,

looking at arrest rates as indicators of racial profiling as well as stop rates could provide a clearer picture of racial profiling by police officers.

Perhaps racial profiling is a phenomenon that needs to be studied through more micro-level theories. Future research should attempt to include more data on the static characteristics of officers, and that of citizens stopped. The inclusion of an interview component may help to inform the perspectives officers and citizens. Further, the data were taken from a single geographical area, Miami-Dade County. Not only is this area unique because of its ethnic make-up, but it is also a southern city, which may present quite different characteristics and conditions from those in other regions of the US. Further, research should focus on the comparison of a number of cities from different regions to prevent regional bias. Future research should also seek to include in its analysis a Hispanic component, especially when studying an area so ethnically diverse.

APPENDIX A
PRINCIPLE COMPONENTS ANALYSIS AFTER VARIMAX ROTATION

Variables	Black Model		White Model	
	<u>Component</u>		<u>Component</u>	
	1	2	1	2
% Spanish-speaking population who speak English not well or not at all, age 5 and above	0.97		0.96	
% Hispanics in Total Population	0.96		0.97	
% White non-Hispanics living below poverty level				0.9
% White non-Hispanic not employed, age 16 and over				0.79
% White female-headed household with children < 18				0.53
% Black persons living below poverty level		0.91		
% Blacks not employed, age 16 and over		0.90		
% Black female-headed household with children < 18		0.61		
Eigen Values	2.15	1.79	1.9	1.73
% Variance Explained	43.01	35.69	38.09	34.49

APPENDIX B
 DESCRIPTIVES: MEANS AND (STANDARD DEVIATIONS) FOR VARIABLES IN
 SEARCH MODELS FOR NON-DISADVANTAGED AND DISADVANTAGED

	Non-Disadvantaged N = 170		Disadvantaged N = 95	
	Black	White	Black	White
<i>Dependent Variable</i>				
Log of Search Rates per 10,000	1.71 (1.90)	1.50 (1.34)	1.39 (1.64)	1.42 (1.77)
<i>Contextual Variables</i>				
<i>Urban Disadvantage Indicators</i>				
Urban Disadvantage Index	31.33 (19.35)	23.85 (12.23)	80.67 (19.72)	37.07 (27.28)
<i>Social Disorganization Indicators</i>				
Hispanic Immigration Index	71.29 (38.97)	71.78 (39.15)	69.57 (46.13)	69.96 (46.32)
Residential Mobility		47.57 (12.56)		51.79 (11.95)
% Vacant Housing Units		6.65 (7.99)		9.57 (7.68)
% Who Travel to Work > 25 Minutes +		52.05 (10.67)		51.14 (9.86)
<i>Officer Conduct Variables</i>				
Log of Officer Use of Force Report Rates		4.45 (1.76)		3.93 (1.95)
<i>Control Variables</i>				
Homicide Rate Per 10,000	0.44 (1.54)	0.26 (1.61)	1.25 (5.83)	0.96 (6.21)
Arrest Rate	21.61 (57.52)	9.21 (33.78)	14.67 (35.14)	38.77 (192.66)
% Males in Total Population		47.96 (2.26)		49.14 (4.38)
Investigative Stop Rates		39.43 (71.66)		44.10 (77.44)
% White Population		72.56 (27.47)		57.95 (32.09)
% African American Population		18.30 (27.40)		31.45 (33.08)
% Hispanic Population		56.16 (27.42)		51.49 (31.45)

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Akins, S. 2003. Racial segregation and property crime: Examining the mediating effect of police strength. *Justice quarterly*, 20, 675-695.
- Alpert, G., and Dunham, R. 1988. *Policing multi-ethnic neighborhoods: The Miami study and findings for law enforcement in the United States*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Alpert, G. P., and MacDonald, J. M. 2001. Police use of force: An analysis of organizational characteristics. *Justice quarterly*, 18, 393-409.
- Bayley, D.H., and Mendelsohn, H. 1969. *Minorities and the police: Confrontation in America*. New York: Free Press.
- Borg, M. J., and Parker, K. F. 2001. Mobilizing law in urban areas: The social structure of homicide clearance rates. *Law & society review* 35, 435-466.
- Browning, C. R. 2002. The span of collective efficacy: Extending social disorganization theory to partner violence. *Journal of marriage & family*, 64, 833-850.
- Bursik, R. J. 1988. Social disorganization and theories of crime and delinquency: Problems and prospects. *Criminology*, 26, 519-551.
- Chambliss, W. 1994. Policing the ghetto underclass: The politics of law and law enforcement. *Social problems* 41, 177-194.
- Cole, D. 1999. Is public concern about feral police using racial profiling justified? *Insight on the news* 15, 24-27.
- Cordner, G., Williams, B., and Zuniga, M. 2000. *Vehicle stop study: Mid-year report*. San Diego, CA: San Diego Police Department.
- Cullen, F. T., and Agnew, R. 2003. *Criminological theory: Past to present*. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Doyle, D. P. and Luckenbill, D. F. 1991. Mobilizing law in response to collective problems: A test of Black's theory of law. *Law & society review*, 25, 103-116.
- Engel, R.S., Calnon, J.M., and Bernard, T. 2002. Theory and racial profiling: Shortcomings and future directions in research. *Justice quarterly*, 19, 249-274.
- Fagan, J., and Davies, G. 2000. Street stops and broken windows: Terry, race, and disorder in New York City. *Fordham urban law journal*, 28, 457-504.

- Florida Highway Patrol. 2000. *Race study of the Florida highway patrol* [Online]. Available: www.fhp.state.fl.us.
- Gibson, C. L., Zhao, J., and Lovrich, N. P. 2002. Social integration, individual perceptions of collective efficacy, and fear of crime in three cities. *Justice quarterly*, 19, 537-564.
- Greene, W. H. 1996. *Economic analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Guerra, S. 1992. Domestic drug interdiction operations: Finding the balance. *Journal of criminal law & criminology*, 82, 1109-1992.
- Hagan, J., and Albonetti, C. 1982. Race, class, and the perception of criminal injustice in America. *American journal of sociology*, 88, 329-355.
- Harris, D. A. 1997. "Driving while black" and all other traffic offenses: The Supreme Court and pretextual traffic stops. *Journal of criminal law & criminology*, 87, 544-582.
- Jacobs, D., and Kleban, R. 2003. Political institutions, minorities, and punishment: A pooled cross-national analysis of imprisonment rates. *Social forces*, 82, 725-755.
- Kane, R. J. 2002. The social ecology of police misconduct. *Criminology*, 40, 867-897.
- Krivo, L. J. and Peterson, R. D. 1996. Extremely disadvantaged neighborhoods and urban crime. *Social forces*, 75, 619-650.
- Krivo, L. J. and Peterson, R. D. 2000. The structural context of homicide: Accounting for racial differences in process. *American sociological review*, 65, 547-559.
- Lamberth, J. (1998). Driving while black: A statistician proves that prejudice still rules the road. Hartford. [Online] Available: www.hartfordhwp.com/archives/45a/192.html.
- Land, K. C., McCall, P. L., and Cohen, L. E. 1990. Structural covariates of homicide rates: Are there any invariances across time and social space? *American journal of sociology* 95, 922-963.
- Lane, J., and Meeker, J. W. 2003. Fear of gang crime: A look at three theoretical models. *Law & society review*, 37, 425-456.
- Liska, A. E., and Chamlin, M. B. 1984. Social structure and crime control among macrosocial units. *American journal of sociology*, 90, 383-395.
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Cullen, F. T., and Pratt, T. C. 2003. Replicating Sampson and Groves's test of social disorganization theory. *Journal of research in crime & delinquency*, 40, 351-373.

- Lundman, R. 2004. Driver race, ethnicity, and gender and citizen reports of vehicle searches by police and vehicle search hits: Toward a triangulated scholarly understanding. *Journal of criminal law & criminology*, 94, 309-349.
- Lundman, R., and Kaufman, R. 2003. Driving while black: Effects of race, ethnicity, and gender on citizen self-reports of traffic stops and police actions. *Criminology*, 41, 195-221.
- MacDonald, H. 2003. *Are cops racist?* Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.
- Massey, D. S. 1990. American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass. *American journal of sociology*, 96, 329-357.
- Massey, D. S., and Denton, N. A. 1988. Suburbanization and segregation in US metropolitan areas. *American journal of sociology*, 94, 592-626.
- Massey, D. S., and Denton, N. A. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Massey, D. S. and Eggers, M. L. 1990. The ecology of inequality: Minorities and the concentration of poverty, 1970-1980. *American journal of sociology*, 96, 1153-1188.
- Massey, D.S., Eggers, M. L. and Denton, N. A. 1994. Disentangling the causes of concentrated urban poverty. *International journal of group tensions*, 24, 267-316.
- Mastrofski, S. D., Reisig, M. D., and McCluskey, J. D. 2002. Police disrespect toward the public: An encounter-based analysis. *Criminology*, 40, 519-552.
- Meehan, A. J. and Ponder, M. C. 2002. Race and place: The ecology of racial profiling African American motorists. *Justice quarterly*, 19, 399-430.
- Morenoff, J. D., Sampson, R. J., and Raudenbush, S. W., 2001. Neighborhood inequality, collective efficacy, and the spatial dynamics of urban violence. *Criminology*, 39, 517-558.
- Ousey, G. 1999. Homicide, structural factors, and the racial invariance assumption. *Criminology*, 37, 405-426.
- Parker, K. F., and McCall, P. L. 1999. Structural conditions and racial homicide patterns: A look at the multiple disadvantages in urban areas. *Criminology*, 37, 447-477.
- Parker, K. F., Stults, B., and Rice, S. K. 2005. Racial threat, concentrated disadvantage and social control: Considering the macro-level sources of variation in arrests. Manuscript in preparation.
- Paternoster, R., Brame, R., Mazerolle, P., and Piquero, A. R. 1998. Using the correct statistical test for the equality of regression coefficients. *Criminology*, 36, 859-866.

- Robison, Sophia M. 1936. *Can delinquency be measured?* New York, Pub. for the Welfare Council of New York City by Columbia University Press.
- Rose, D. R. and Clear, T. R. 1998. Incarceration, social capital, and crime: Implications for social disorganization theory. *Criminology*, 36, 441-479.
- Russell, K. 2001. Racial profiling: A status report of the legal, legislative, and empirical literature. *Rutgers race & the law review*, 61, 1-16.
- Sampson, R. J. 1987. Urban black violence: The effect of male joblessness and family disruption. *American journal of sociology*, 93, 348-382.
- Sampson, R. J., and Raudenbush, S. W. 1999. Systematic social observation of public spaces: A new look at disorder in urban neighborhoods. *American journal of sociology*, 105, 603-651.
- Sampson, R. J. and Wilson, W. J. 1995. Toward a theory of race, crime, and urban inequality. In J. Hagan and R.D. Peterson (Eds), *Crime and inequality*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Smith, B. W., and Holmes, M. D. 2003. Community accountability, minority threat, and police brutality: An examination of civil rights criminal complaints. *Criminology* 41, 1035-1063.
- Smith, D. A. 1986. The neighborhood context of police behavior. In A.J. Reiss and M. Tonry (Eds), *Communities and crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, D. A. 1987. Police response to interpersonal violence: Defining the parameters of legal control. *Social forces*, 65, 767-782.
- Smith, M., and Petrocelli, M. 2001. Racial profiling?: A multivariate analysis of police traffic stop data. *Police quarterly*, 4, 4-27.
- Smith, M. R., Makarios, M., and Alpert, G. P. 2005. Differential suspicion: Theory and gender effects in the traffic stop context. Manuscript in preparation.
- Snell, C. 2001. *Neighborhood structure, crime, and fear of crime: Testing Bursik and Grasmick's neighborhood control theory*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.
- Spitzer, E. 1999. *The New York City Police Department's "stop and frisk" practices: A Report to the people of the state of New York from the Office of the Attorney General*. Albany: New York Attorney General's Office.
- Stretesky, P. B., Schuck, A. M., and Hogan, M. J. 2004. Space matters: An analysis of poverty, poverty clustering, and violent crime. *Justice quarterly*, 21, 817-841.

- Sun, I. Y., Triplett, R. A., and Gainey, R. R. 2004. Social disorganization, legitimacy of local institutions, and neighborhood crime: An exploratory study of perceptions of the police and local government. *Journal of crime & justice*, 2, 33-60.
- Terrill, W., and Mastrofski, S. D. 2002. Situational and officer-based determinants of police coercion. *Justice quarterly*, 19, 215-248.
- Terrill, W., and Reisig, M. D. 2003. Neighborhood context and police use of force. *Journal of research in crime & delinquency*, 40, 291-321.
- Walker, S. 2001. Searching for the denominator: Problems with police traffic stop data and early warning system solution. *Justice research & policy*, 3, 63-95.
- Walker, S., Spohn, C., and DeLone, M. 2001. *The color of justice: Race, ethnicity, and crime in America*. 2nd ed. United States: Wadsworth.
- Ward, J. 2002. Race, ethnicity, and law enforcement profiling: Implications for public policy. *Public administration review*, 62, 726-735.
- Weitzer, R., and Tuch, S. 2002. Perceptions of racial profiling: race, class, and personal experience. *Criminology*, 40, 435-457.
- Werthman, C. and Piliavin, I. 1967. Gang members and the police. In D. Brodura (Ed) *The police: Six sociological essays*. New York: John Wiley.
- Wilson, G., Alpert, G., and Dunham, R. 2004. Prejudice in Police Profiling. *American behavioral scientist*, 47, 896-909.
- Wilson, W. J. 1987. *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, W.J. 1992. Another look at the truly disadvantaged. *Political science quarterly* 106, 639-658.
- Zingraff, M., Mason, H. M., Smith, W., Tomaskovic-Devey, D., Warren, P., McMurray, H., and Fenlon, C. R. 2000. *Evaluating North Carolina state highway patrol data: Citations, warnings, and searches in 1998*. North Carolina State University.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

In May of 2003, I received my Bachelor of Arts in sociology from the University of Florida. My senior thesis, Correlates of female juvenile delinquency, was published in December of 2003 in *The International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*. The completion of my senior thesis allowed me to graduate with highest honors. I plan to pursue my PhD in criminology at UF, continuing my research on racial discrimination, social structure and crime, and race and poverty issues.