Nova Southeastern University
College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences
Department of Justice & Human Services

Suspicion, Suspicion:

Police Perceptions of Juveniles as the "Symbolic Assailant"

by
Andrea R. Coleman
A Dissertation Presented to the
Institute for the Study of Human Service, Health, and Justice
of Nova Southeastern University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Nova Southeastern University
2018

Approval Page

This applied dissertation was submitted by, Andrea R. Coleman, under the direction of the persons listed below. It was submitted to the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Nova Southeastern University.

Approved: _____ Date: 8-6-18
Committee Chair's Signature

Approved: _____ Date: 8-12-18
Committee Member's Signature

Approved: _____ Date: 8/12/18
Committee Member's Signature

Approved: _____ Date: 8/22/18
Tammy Kushner, Psy.D.,
Executive Director of Administration

Acknowledgments

I dedicate this dissertation study to my mother, Dorothy E. Coleman who assured me the end would come. Without her encouragement and support completing the study would have been exponentially more difficult. I also dedicate this study to my grandparents the late Mr. Isaac F. Coleman, Sr. and the late Mrs. Dorothy Robinson Coleman. The value and love of learning you instilled in your children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren have and will endure for many more generations.

Thanks to my dissertation committee Dr. Tina Jaeckle, Chair, Dr. Marcelo Castro, and Dr. Abigail Tucker. Dr. Castro made statistics an enriching experience which now serves as the foundation for prospective research, while Dr. Tucker enhanced my knowledge of juvenile justice, especially comparative juvenile justice. Finally, my committee chair, Dr. Jaeckle provided steady guidance when I needed it the most.

Also, thanks to Valerie LaMotte, Connecticut's former Juvenile Justice Specialist, and Dr. Ron Sabatelli at the University of Connecticut's Center for Applied Research in Human Development (CARHD). Their assistance with obtaining the Effective Police Interactions with Youth Pretest Survey instrument, responses, and additional information was invaluable.

Abstract

Suspicion, Suspicion:
Police Perceptions of Juveniles as the "Symbolic Assailant"

Andrea R. Coleman, 2018: Dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, College of Arts of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Justice and Human Services.
Descriptors: "symbolic assailant," police, juveniles, race, gender, offense type

Jerome Skolnick's (2011) "symbolic assailant" is a result of police attributing particular demeanor, gestures, language, and a style of dress to people they believed were most likely to commit violent crimes. The challenge became when police applied these characteristics to specific groups such as juveniles. Literature published before and after Skolnick (2011) indicated police were more likely to stop, arrest, interrogate, or surveille juveniles based on their demeanor, gestures, style of dress, lack of respect, deference to authority, the severity, and remorse for their offenses in addition to race.
However, current research indicated race, gender, and Socioeconomic Status (SES) determined if police perceived juveniles as the symbolic assailant regardless of offense type. The current research also suggested the symbolic assailant is the foundation for related theories such as racial profiling and the "juvenile offender type-script."

Thus, this dissertation sought to determine if juveniles' demeanor, gestures, race, gender, and offense type predicted if police perceived them as having characteristics analogous to the symbolic assailant. The researcher conducted a nonexperimental predictive correlational research design analyzing secondary data from Connecticut's Effective Police Interactions with Youth's Pretest Survey. The results showed weak to moderate relationships between the predictor and criterion variables such as police believed juveniles' fidgeting, pacing, and mouthing off as signs of guilt indicated a weak relationship. The strongest predictor was a combination of race and offense type as the patrol officers responded all races and ethnicities were most likely to carry weapons equally in the past 30 days, which differed from the current symbolic assailant and related literature.

Table of Contents

Tables

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

Background

Jerome Skolnick introduced the concept "symbolic assailant" in his seminal book first published in 1996 and most recently in 2011. Skolnick (2011) defined the symbolic assailant as potential suspects most likely to commit violent crimes because of their demeanor (e.g., if they are acting “suspiciously” or are “out of place”), gestures, language, and style of dress. The symbolic assailant was a result of Skolnick’s (2011) observations of the "Westville" police department of how police, as a part of their "working personality," attribute characteristics to certain people. These attributes are not intrinsically wrong due to police's experience, and exposure to nonviolent and violent other crimes as having some suspicion is part of a ‘”healthy attitude”’ (Skolnick, 2011; 41; Bolton, 2011). Challenges arise when police apply the symbolic assailant disproportionately to specific groups such as juveniles. Skolnick (2011) said police readily identified juveniles as the symbolic assailant because they typically wore leather jackets, boots, blue jeans, had motorcycles, and paced in a defined area.

Earlier literature by Piliavin and Briar (1964), Black and Reiss (1970), Werthman, Piliavin, and Bordua (1967), and Lundman, Sykes, and Clark (1978) indicated police were likely to arrest and interrogate juveniles based on their demeanor and deference to police authority. Police officers were also just as likely to arrest juveniles due to lack of respect, the severity of their offenses, and whether they showed remorse, in addition to race; thus, race and ethnicity were not the most salient variables. Earlier research from Chesney-Lind (1977) and Visher (1983) suggested police perceptions of female juveniles

differed significantly from males as they thought of them less as symbolic assailants but in a more paternalistic manner. Conversely, Yoder, Muñoz, Whitbeck, Hoyt, and McMorris' (2005) recent research indicated police biases instead were more prevalent than juveniles' demeanor and style of dress, particularly for racial and ethnic minorities, which led to arrests. Bell (2017) said police were more suspicious of White (non-Hispanic) juveniles[1], however, the suspicion led to traditional policing strategies such as questioning or verification before they used any force including arrests. Conversely, police linked race and ethnicity to the symbolic assailant assuming African American males were criminogenic bypassing traditional policing strategies using excessive force leading to arrests.

Andersen's (2015) current research found the symbolic assailant's characteristics influenced police actions as they perceived racial and ethnic minority juveniles as a "symbolic threat." Sealock and Simpson (1998) suggested police created an archetype of racial and ethnic minority juveniles per the symbolic assailant resulting in the "juvenile offender type-script." Further, LaMotte, Oulette Sanderson, Anderson, Kosutic, Griggs, and Garcia (2010) and Sanderson, Kosutic, Griggs, and Anderson (2008) found negative police interactions and encounters were mostly due to juveniles' demeanor, gestures, and style of dress, particularly for racial and ethnic minorities. Paulhamus, Kane, and Piquero (2013) said the symbolic assailant, in part, is the precursor or framework for racial profiling.

Though the current research varied on how and to what extent police applied the symbolic assailant and if it is the foundation for other theories, the most common theme

[1]The literature referred to White juveniles by race only, so the researcher categorized them as White (non-Hispanic) pursuant to 28 CFR Part 31.303(j)(6) which captures race and ethnicity.

was police go beyond suspicion relying upon shorthand characteristics entrenched in stereotypes and biases. Whether the biases are implicit or explicit, police depend upon them to determine who is most likely to commit crimes regardless of offense type. Thus, this study attempted to establish which variables were most likely to predict police perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant. The following sections in this chapter served as the background for this study including its relevance and significance, current and previous attempts to address the problem of police applying the symbolic assailant to juveniles, how the study contributed to the current research, and its feasibility. The researcher also discussed the problem statement indicating the extent of juveniles' contact with police nationwide and from Connecticut via referrals to court by race, gender, and offense type. In this Chapter, the researcher also presented the goal of this dissertation, identified barriers and issues, key definitions and terms, and concluded with a summary.

Relevance and Significance of Study

The proposed study is relevant because it examined why there is a problem with police perceptions of juveniles as the symbolic assailant. Police perceptions affect juveniles more adversely compared to adults because they believed police unfairly stopped, questioned, and arrested them more due to their demeanor, gestures, style of dress, and previous contact in addition to their race. Liberman, Kirk, and Kim (2014) and Wiley and Esbensen's (2016) findings indicated initial juvenile arrests led to a higher likelihood of reoffending and increased juveniles' perceptions that police labeled them. Juveniles, primarily racial and ethnic minorities, perceived police labeled them,

especially if the contact frequently occurred in socioeconomically depressed communities. For example, if an officer was suspicious of an African American juvenile dressed a certain way and "acting out of place" the officer may assume a crime will commence. Even if the juvenile appears "out of place" in a community, there could be a logical explanation such as he does not live there. Because police are suspicious, they may approach the juvenile and conflict could ensue which could lead to an arrest, use of force, referral to court, or another formal contact. Thus, disproportionately applying the symbolic assailant to racial and ethnic minorities, including their known or perceived Socioeconomic Status (SES), is relevant and significant as police assumed these juveniles would or have committed more crimes compared to White (non-Hispanic) juveniles.

Juveniles are also adversely impacted compared to adults due to adolescent brain development. Bonnie, Johnson, Chemers, and Schuck (2013) asserted adolescence is a rapid period of change and is characterized by "poor self-control, increased risk-taking, emotional dysregulation, and susceptibility to peer and environmental influences" (116). Juveniles often act on impulse versus obtained plans, and in group settings, they tend to be followers rather than leaders as they are "developing a sense of self-identity and new peer relationships outside of the familial structure" (Bonnie et al., 2013; 117; Steinberg, 2004). Juveniles' impulsive behavior stems from the prefrontal cortex in the frontal lobe of the brain and is responsible for setting priorities, organizing plans, forming strategies, controlling impulses, and apportioning attention.

The development of the prefrontal cortex is vital to criminal and delinquent behavior as it prohibits the ability to plan, adapt to social environments, and determine consequences of behaviors (Weinberger, Elvevåg, & Giedd, 2005; Steinberg, 2004; Dahl

& Lewin, 2002). As some juveniles engage in criminal and delinquent behavior, a key mitigating factor is the prefrontal cortex which governs how and why they carry out these behaviors. Because of juveniles' impulsivity, poor self-control, and increased risk-taking, they react differently to police encounters and interactions compared to adults. Hence, when stopped, police may perceive juveniles' reactions as an indication of committing offenses when it could be their reactions are age appropriate.

Attempts to Address Research Problem

Although police perceptions of juveniles, especially as the symbolic assailant, is a far-reaching problem, there have been few recent attempts to address it. Most efforts emphasized how juveniles perceived and responded to police, particularly African Americans and Hispanic or Latinos in urban areas. Juveniles' perceptions of police included: procedural justice and legitimacy in different contexts such as detention and correctional facilities, schools and their communities and how social bonds, particularly commitment to school, significantly affected their attitudes (Feinstein, 2015; Gau & Brunson, 2010; Weitzer & Brunson, 2009; Rengifo & McCallin, 2017; Feinstein, 2015; Payne, Hitchens, & Chambers, 2017). Other studies included the role of interracial police encounters, juveniles who lived in rural areas, and perceptions of police based on their gender (Flexon, Lurgio, Greenleaf, & Gibson, 2016; Stewart, Morris, & Weir, 2014).

Earlier studies by Wodern (1999) and Bazemore and Senjo (1997) primarily focused on how police applied the symbolic assailant disproportionately to African Americans resulting in racially biased police stops, different styles of policing (e.g., community policing), and how police treated juveniles differently compared to adults.

Bell's (2017) research is one of few current studies on how the symbolic assailant evolved suggesting police apply the characteristics differently by race and gender. Liederbach (2007) is also one of few recent studies concentrating on street-level encounters with juveniles in suburban and rural areas finding similarities and differences between nonurban and urban police officers in how they interacted with juveniles, which the researcher discussed further in Chapter 2 of this dissertation.

Another attempt to address how police perceived juveniles was via Connecticut's Effective Police Interactions with Youth training curriculum (Sanderson et al., 2008). The governor-appointed Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC) developed a training curriculum for police with the goal of decreasing the likelihood of contact with police would lead to an arrest or referral to court for all juveniles, but mainly for racial and ethnic minorities. Police responses from the curriculum's vignette exercise of juveniles dressed in different styles of clothing and displaying different demeanors were comparable to the symbolic assailant. Officers were assigned to small groups and instructed to write down their initial thoughts of juveniles in pictures as if they encountered them while on patrol. For example, police described a female African American youth wearing a blouse and smiling as "well-dressed," "happy," "polite," "respectful," "law or rule-abiding" and "studious."

On the other hand, police described an African American male youth wearing a black leather jacket, gold chains, a ball cap to the back, and not smiling, as: "suspicious," a "gang-banger," "moody," "disrespectful," and a "late-adolescent." Police also said the African American male youth "would probably give a cop a hard time if stopped on the street." However, when officers saw the same photo of the African American male youth

smiling, wearing a suit, eyeglasses, and waiving, they described him as "happy," "articulate," "independent," "outspoken," "well-dressed," and "approachable" (Connecticut Public Television, 2013).

When officers saw a picture of a White (non-Hispanic) male youth dressed in a t-shirt, not smiling, wearing a black toboggan cap and earbuds against the backdrop of a brick wall, they described him as an "inner-city youth," and a "drug addict." They also described him as a "troublemaker," "skateboarder," and a "high-school dropout." Again, when shown the same picture of the White (non-Hispanic) youth in a black suit with a colorful tie and smiling police described him as a "wiseguy," "artsy," "a musician," "educated," "well-dressed," and "happy" (Connecticut Public Television, 2013). As the small groups continued to present their descriptions, they realized all the pictures were of the same youths with different styles of dress, demeanors, and placed against different backdrops such as brick walls and storefronts. The vignette exercise's goal was to demonstrate how youths' demeanor, gestures, style of dress, and community context shaped police perceptions.

Contribution to the Field of Study and Feasibility Statement

Because few studies addressed this issue, and given that the image of juveniles and the stereotypes along with it change continually, this dissertation study can make a potential contribution to the research on current police perceptions of juveniles as the symbolic assailant due to significant gaps in this research. Liederbach (2007) confirmed the lack of research stating, "Despite the importance of cops within the juvenile system, research concerning police and their interactions with youthful offenders has often been

relegated to the periphery of juvenile justice scholarship" (107). Thus, this study attempted to explore the notion of the symbolic assailant as part of a continuum supporting Sealock and Simpson's (1998) juvenile offender-type script. In other words, police apply the symbolic assailant to juveniles initially, and extra-legal variables (e.g., race, gender, SES, and location) along with legal variables such as offense type, validated their initial suspicion. The researcher anticipated this study's results offered a broader view of the symbolic assailant and its interaction with demeanor, gestures, race, gender, and offense type, particularly for violent and nonviolent offenses. Another gap the researcher addressed was how and where juveniles have contact with police contributes to police perceptions of them per the symbolic assailant and related theories. For instance, as the vignette exercise demonstrated, community context also contributed to police suspicion and perceptions of juveniles (Bell, 2017; Liederbach, 2007; Shook & Goodkind, 2009; Sanderson, Kosutic, Griggs, & Anderson, 2008). By addressing this gap, this study's findings could be generalizable to different geographical locations and settings.

This study was feasible because of data from Connecticut's Effective Police Interactions with Youth training curriculum and subsequent evaluation. Although collected in 2007, the data demonstrated how police perceived juveniles, in part, similar to the symbolic assailant due to juveniles' demeanor, gestures, style of dress, and deference to authority. This study was also feasible due to the availability of national referrals to court data national and from Connecticut by age, gender, race and ethnicity, and offense type, including violent and nonviolent offenses. Nationwide data and Connecticut's data are pertinent to this dissertation study because they demonstrated the

extent of juveniles' contact with police for court referrals. Lastly, the study was more feasible because the researcher performed various statistical tests of Connecticut's Effective Police Interactions with Youth Pretest Survey data and analyzed the results which were more cost-effective than collecting original data and allowed additional time for analyses.

Problem Statement

The problem of the symbolic assailant arose per Skolnick's (2011) observations of the "Westville" police department in the mid-1960s as police described certain juveniles dressed in black leather jackets and motorcycle boots as "toughs" or punks." Also, walking, specifically "strutting," was a "possible preamble to a later attack" (43). Skolnick (2011) compared these shorthand attributes to Adams' (1963) various criteria for selecting people for field interrogations. Like the symbolic assailant Adams' (1963) criteria (as cited in Skolnick, 2011) included: (1) Look for the unusual; (2) Persons who do not "belong" where they are observed; (3) Automobiles which do not "look" right; (4) Suspicious persons known to the officers from previous arrests, field interrogations, and observations; (5) Any person observed in the immediate vicinity of a crime very recently committed or as reported "in progress"; and (6) Known troublemakers near large gatherings (42).

Per Skolnick's (2011) observations and his inclusion of Adams' (1963) criteria, this was a research-worthy problem that should be undertaken to strengthen the juvenile symbolic assailant research. First, the study explored if the available data suggested police perceive juveniles as the symbolic assailant. Secondly, the researcher examined if

police perceived juveniles as the symbolic assailant by their demeanor, gestures, race, gender, and offense type (e.g., nonviolent versus violent). To support the problem statement, the researcher discussed juvenile referrals to court data nationwide and from Connecticut.

Juveniles' Contact with Police: National Data

Race and ethnicity. To support the problem statement, the researcher discussed the extent of juveniles' contact with the police nationwide for referrals to court[2]. As shown in Table 1, in 2014 there were 974,900 referrals to court, primarily generated by police, for delinquency offenses (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2017; Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2017). Of the 974,900 referrals to court, racial and ethnic minorities comprised over 56% of all referrals (n = 552,600). African Americans comprised the highest percentages at 36% (n = 350,100) followed by Hispanic or Latino juveniles at 18% (n = 175,900). The relative rate showed police referred African Americans to court six times compared to White (non-Hispanic) youth.

Gender. In addition to differences by race and ethnicity, the trend was also prevalent by gender. Male juveniles comprised most of the delinquency referrals to court at 72% (n = 705,100) compared to females at nearly 28% (n = 269,900). The relative rate for African American male juveniles was three times, and police referred Hispanic or Latino male juveniles one time compared to White (non-Hispanic) males (Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2017). Also shown in Table 1, while female juveniles represented 28% of

[2] The researcher selected referrals to court instead of arrests because police generated most of them and juveniles first point of formal contact with police in Connecticut is a court referral after an initial encounter or interaction.

all referrals to court compared to males, racial and ethnic minority females represented 53% of all referrals (n = 269,800) compared to White (non-Hispanic) females at 46% (n = 122,900). African American females also comprised the highest percentage of all racial and ethnic minority females at 56% (n = 96,000) followed by Hispanic or Latino females at slightly under 16% (n = 42,500). Similar to African American male juveniles, police referred African American females to court at a relative rate of three times compared to White (non-Hispanic) female juveniles. Although Hispanic or Latino juveniles typically had the second highest relative rates compared to White (non-Hispanic juveniles), Native American or Alaskan Native females had the second highest relative rate at 1.3. Overall, the relative rate for racial and ethnic minorities for referrals to court was 3.2.

Offense type by demographics. Like referrals to court by race and gender, the trend continued by offense type. Male juveniles comprised 83% (n = 47,700) of referrals to court for violent crimes such as robbery, aggravated assault, and larceny-theft. Male juveniles also comprised most referrals for nonviolent offenses such as disorderly conduct, liquor violations, and vandalism. Conversely, the percentages for female juveniles for nonviolent offenses was 28% (n = 69,700). Again, racial and ethnic minority male juveniles represented most of the referrals to court for violent offenses at 73% (n = 34,300). As shown in Table 2, African American male juveniles had the highest percentage of all racial and ethnic minorities at 72% (n = 25,100) for violent offenses followed by Hispanic and Latino male juveniles at 24% (n = 8,200) (Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2017). The effect size for Native American or Alaskan Natives was higher compared to African Americans and Hispanic or Latinos, as the latter comprised less than 2% of all female juveniles ages 10-17 (Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2017). Moreover,

racial and ethnic minority male juveniles referrals to court for violent offenses were over three times compared to White (non-Hispanic) male juveniles. Comparing male racial and ethnic minorities to White (non-Hispanic) males, African Americans had the highest relative rate for violent offenses at 15.0, followed by Hispanic or Latinos at 3.0, and Native American or Alaskan Natives at 2.0.

Similarly, female racial and ethnic minorities referrals were slightly over three times (n = 6,900) compared to White (non-Hispanic) females (n = 2,600). The relative rate for African American females was 8.0 followed by Native American or Alaskan Natives and Hispanic or Latino female juveniles at 1.0 for violent offenses (Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2017). Because the relative rate was 1.0 for Native American or Alaskan Natives and Hispanic or Latino female juveniles, there was no disproportionality compared to White (non-Hispanic) females. The relative rates for nonviolent offenses for female racial and ethnic minorities were much lower compared to violent offenses at two times compared to White (non-Hispanic) females. African American male juveniles had the highest relative rate for nonviolent offenses at 3.5 followed by Hispanic or Latino males at 1.4. The relative rate for racial and ethnic minority females was slightly higher than males for nonviolent offenses at 1.7. African American female juveniles had the highest relative rate at 3.4 times followed by Native American or Alaskan Native females at 1.3 times.

Table 1.

National Juvenile Referrals to Court by Race and Gender

Race and Ethnicity	Total	Percent	Males	Percent	Females	Percent
Referrals to Court						
All Races and Ethnicities	974,900	100%	705,100	72%	269,800	28%
White (non-Hispanic)	422,400	43%	299,500	31%	122,900	29%
African American	350,100	36%	254,100	73%	96,000	27%
Relative Rate	(6.0)		(3.0)		(3.0)	
Hispanic or Latino	175,900	18%	133,400	76%	42,500	24%
Relative Rate	(2.0)		(1.1)		(0.9)	
Native American or Alaska Native	15,600	1.6%	10,400	67%	5,200	33%
	(2.4)		(1.1)		(1.3)	
All Racial and Ethnic Minorities	552,600	56%	397,900	72%	143,700	26%
Relative Rate	(3.2)		(1.7)		(1.5)	

Note: There is no Relative Rate for White (non-Hispanic) juveniles because they are the comparison group which assumes there is no disproportionality. Thus, the comparison rate is 1.0. The researcher did not include Asian Pacific Islander juveniles because their contact with the juvenile justice system was negligible.

Table 2.

National Juvenile Referrals to Court by Offense Type, Race, and Gender

	Total	Percent	Males	Percent	Females	Percent
Violent Offenses						
All Races and Ethnicities	57,200	100%	47,700	83%	9,500	17%
White (non-Hispanic)	15,900	28%	13,300	84%	2,600	16%
African American Relative Rate	30,400 (15.0)	53%	25,100 (7.0)	83%	5,300	17% (8.0)
Hispanic or Latino Relative Rate	9,600 (3.0)	17%	8,200 (2.0)	85%	1,400 (1.0)	15%
Native American or Alaska Native Relative Rate	600 (2.0)	1%	500 (1.0)	83%	100 (1.0)	17%
All Racial and Ethnic Minorities	41,800 (6.6)	73%	34,300 (3.3)	82%	6,900 (3.3)	18%
Nonviolent Offenses	Total	Percent	Males	Percent	Females	Percent
All Races and Ethnicities	249,700	100%	180,000	72%	69,700	28%
White (non-Hispanic)	99,900	40%	70,600	71%	29,300	29%
African American Relative Rate	92,200 (7.0)	37%	65,600 (4.0)	71%	26,600 (3.0)	29%
Hispanic or Latino	51,400 (3.4)	21%	39,500 (2.0)	77%	11,900 (1.0)	23%
Native American or Alaska Native	3,600 (2.3)	1.4%	2,300 (1.0)	64%	1,300 (1.3)	36%

Note: There is no Relative Rate for White (non-Hispanic) youth because they are the comparison group which assumes there is no disproportionality. Thus, the comparison rate is 1.0. The researcher did not include Asian Pacific Islander juveniles because their contact with the juvenile justice system was negligible.

Juveniles' Contact with Police: Connecticut's Data

To support the problem statement from a state perspective, the researcher discussed the extent of juveniles' contact with the police via referrals to court in Connecticut. The researcher selected Connecticut because it was the only known state which researched police perceptions of juveniles similar to the symbolic assailant via the Effective Police Interactions with Youth training curriculum and subsequent evaluation. Secondly, Connecticut's referrals to court data contained more demographic data (e.g., age, race and ethnicity, and gender), offense types, and the geographical location of referrals (e.g., city, suburban, or rural).

Race and ethnicity. Demonstrating the extent of referrals to court in Connecticut as shown in Table 3, there were 9,928 delinquency referrals for juveniles ages 10 to 17 in 2015. Racial and ethnic minorities comprised 63% (n = 6,219) of all referrals as African Americans had the highest percentage at 35% (n = 3,491) followed by Hispanic or Latinos at 27% (n = 2,660). The percentage of referrals to court for White (non-Hispanic) juveniles was 37% (n = 3,609) which was comparable to African Americans. Thus, racial and ethnic minorities were referred to court at a relative rate of 2.8 times compared to White (non-Hispanic) juveniles which was slightly below the national rate of three times. Disaggregating the relative rates by race and ethnicity, police referred African Americans to court almost five times compared to White (non-Hispanic) juveniles though, again, the percentages were similar (i.e., 35% and 37%). Even though the percentages were similar, the relative rate showed disproportionality. African American juveniles comprised 12% of the total population of all youth in Connecticut (N= 45,533) whereas, White (non-Hispanic) youth comprised 62% (N = 370,663) (Office of Juvenile Justice and

Delinquency Prevention, 2017; Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2017).

Further, also shown in Table 3, African Americans' relative rate at 4.9 was almost twice the national relative rate. The relative rate of Hispanic and Latino referrals to court is slightly over two times compared to White (non-Hispanic) juveniles and is more than half the rate compared to African Americans as the latter comprise 20% of the total population of youth (N = 76,823). To achieve statistical parity (i.e., no disproportionality) police would refer 3,990 fewer racial and ethnic minorities to court (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2016). Connecticut's relative rate of 2.8 for referrals to court (n = 6,219) for racial and ethnic minorities is almost twice the national rate of 1.6 (n = 552,600) (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2017; Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2017).

Gender and offense type. In addition to differences by race and ethnicity, this trend also occurred by gender in Connecticut. As shown in Table 3, male juveniles made up 71% of the delinquency referrals to court (n = 7,048) compared to females at 29% (n = 2,880) in 2015. Male juveniles also comprised most of the referrals to court for violent offenses such as possession of a weapon on school grounds, the sale of a controlled substance, and robbery. On the contrary, females represented most of the nonviolent offenses such as breach of peace, simple assault, shoplifting, and disorderly conduct (Connecticut Office of Policy Management, 2017). The percentages for referrals to court for male juveniles in Connecticut and nationally were similar at 71% and 72%. For female juveniles, the national percentage of 28% was slightly lower compared to Connecticut at 29% (Connecticut Office of Policy Management, 2017; Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2017).

Table 3.

Referrals to Court by Race and Gender in Connecticut

Race and Ethnicity	Total	Percent	Males	Percent	Females	Percent
Referrals to Court						
All Races and Ethnicities	9,928	100%	7,048	71%	2,880	29%
White (non-Hispanic)	3,609	37%	1,335	37%	2,273	13%
African American	3,491	35%	-	-	-	-
Relative Rate	(4.9)					
Hispanic or Latino	2,660	18%	-	-	-	-
Relative Rate	(2.2)					
All Racial and Ethnic Minorities	6,219	63%	-	-	-	-
Relative Rate	(2.8)					

Note: Dashes indicate unavailable data. There is no Relative Rate for White (non-Hispanic) youth because they are the comparison group which assumes there is no disproportionality. Thus, the comparison rate is 1.0. The researcher did not include Asian Pacific Islander juveniles because their contact with the juvenile justice system statewide is negligible.

Dissertation Goal

To illustrate the Problem Statement, national data and those from Connecticut showed juveniles had extensive contact with police which framed the goal of this dissertation study. Thus, the goal of the dissertation (i.e., what the work will accomplish) was to determine what combination of variables (e.g., demeanor, gestures, race, gender, and offense type) predicted, via correlation, which juveniles police perceived as the symbolic assailant. The goal was measurable because the researcher identified the best set of predictor variables as a component of nonexperimental predictive correlational

research design.

Barriers and Issues

Though the researcher discussed the relevance and significance of police perceptions of juveniles as the symbolic assailant, there were several barriers and issues to conducting this research. To establish which variables best-predicted police perceptions of juveniles as the symbolic assailant was complicated because most of the research does not focus on street-level contact, so, it was hard to know how police perceived and interacted with juveniles in real time. To resolve this issue, the researcher could have conducted a qualitative study which would include participating in ride-a-longs and conducting interviews with officers. Due to time and fiscal constraints, this solution was not possible for various reasons (e.g., selecting a police department, obtaining permission from administrators to participate in the ride-a-longs, and selecting patrol beats). Subsequent ride-a-longs would also be prohibitive but necessary to determine if police perceptions changed due to secondary or repeated contacts with specific juveniles and if there were differences by race, gender, and offense type.

Relatedly, Liederbach (2007) suggested researchers' presence during the police interaction could alter juveniles' reactions. For instance, juveniles could act differently if the researcher is taking notes during the encounter which could contribute to or increase the level of distrust between juveniles and police. Also, because most of the research does not focus on street-level interactions with juveniles, and the researcher conducted secondary data analyses, it was difficult to ascertain if police behaviors' impacted formal actions, such as the use of force, arrests, interrogations, and referrals to court. In other

words, do police perceptions and interactions with juveniles lead to or contribute to formal actions per the symbolic assailant attributes?

Another barrier was the age of the data the researcher for the secondary analyses. Although Connecticut published the evaluation of the Effective Police Interactions with Youth training curriculum in 2008 and the subsequent article in a peer-reviewed journal in 2010, the researchers collected the Pretest Survey data in 2007. Since the data are ten years old, officers' responses to the Pretest and the curriculum's vignette exercise may be dated. To address this barrier, the researcher made a case for analyzing these data as they provide a rich source of information on how police perceived juveniles based on legal and extra-legal variables such as offense type, race, demeanor, and gestures. Additionally, these are the only known data that captured police perceptions of juveniles statewide comparable to the symbolic assailant characteristics. Because of these issues and barriers, this dissertation study was of adequate difficulty to warrant dissertation-level work and reward. The research was rewarding because it aimed to demonstrate how police perceptions of juveniles' possible or real criminality influenced their encounters and interactions even though they did not occur in real time.

Definition of Terms

Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)- Pursuant to Section 223(a)(22) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act Pub. L. No. 93-415 (1974) participating states shall "address juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and system improvement efforts designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, the disproportionate number of juvenile members of minority

groups, who come into contact with the juvenile justice system." Participating states receive Title II Formula Grant funds from the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to achieve and maintain compliance.

Juveniles- Denotes contact with the criminal and juvenile justice systems instead of youth in general.

Juvenile Arrests- Youth are arrested when law enforcement agencies apprehend, stop, or otherwise contact them and suspect them of having committed a delinquent act. Delinquent acts are those that, if an adult commits them, would be criminal, including crimes against persons, crimes against property, drug offenses, and crimes against the public order (Feyerherm, Snyder, & Villarruel, 2009).

Juvenile Referrals to Court- When an alleged delinquent youth is sent forward for legal processing and received by a juvenile or family court or juvenile intake agency, either because of law enforcement action or upon a complaint by a citizen or school (Feyerherm, Snyder, & Villarruel, 2009).

Justice by Geography- Juveniles, in general, and particularly racial and ethnic minorities, may be processed differently in juvenile justice systems in one jurisdiction than in another in the same state (Leiber, Richetelli, & Feyerherm, 2009).

Juvenile Interrogations- Formal interviews of juveniles conducted by police after an arrest and or while in custody. Juveniles must be afforded Due Process during the police interviews and have parental consent to answer questions and can occur in schools (Feld,

2013).

Relative Rate (Index)-Statistical method based on the chi-square distribution test comparing the rates of juvenile justice contact experienced by different groups of juveniles such as race and ethnicity, gender, and offense type (Feyerherm, Snyder, & Villarruel, 2009).

Summary

In Chapter 1, the researcher introduced Skolnick's symbolic assailant from his seminal book published initially in 1964 and most recently in 2011. The symbolic assailant is a person police believed might commit a violent crime due to their demeanor, gestures, language, and style of dress. Because police confront real or probable violence frequently, using shorthand techniques to identify potentially violent suspects is acceptable (Skolnick, 2011; Bolton, 2011). However, challenges can arise when police excessively apply the symbolic assailant to specific groups such as juveniles.

Earlier literature by Piliavin and Briar (1964), Black and Reiss (1970), Werthman and Piliavin (1967), and Lundman et al. (1978), found police were more likely to arrest and interrogate due to juveniles' demeanor and style of dress. The earlier research also indicated police arrested juveniles because of deference to authority, lack of respect, offense severity, and race due to police's initial suspicion. Further Chesney-Lind (1977) and Visher (1983) found police viewed female juveniles as the symbolic assailant differently, especially runaways and those who were younger, to protect them from the potential dangers of being on the street. On the contrary, current research by Bell (2017), Jones-Brown (2007), and Yoder at al. (2005) indicated police go beyond suspicion and

their explicit and implicit biases determine whether they perceived juveniles as the symbolic assailant, particularly racial and ethnic minorities. Other researchers suggested Skolnick's (2011) symbolic assailant, in part, was the precursor to racial profiling which expanded the current research. Other similar constructs and theories are racial profiling, the minority or symbolic threat hypothesis, the juvenile offender type-script, and police encounters and interactions with juveniles (Andersen, 2015; Sealock & Simpson, LaMotte et al. 2010; Sanderson et al., 2008; Paulhamus et al., 2013; Kane & Cronin, 2011). Although the researchers' findings varied on how and to what extent police applied the symbolic assailant to juveniles, the most common theme was police go beyond suspicion and relied on race and ethnicity, gender, and SES.

While the common theme in the current research concluded police go beyond suspicion when applying the symbolic assailant, there have been few attempts to address this problem. Much of the recent researchers' findings focused on how African American and Hispanic or Latino males in urban areas perceived police in various milieus. These contexts included procedural justice, police legitimacy, in detention and secure correctional facilities, schools, and communities (Feinstein, 2015; Gau & Brunson, 2010; Rengifo & McCallin, 2017). The few researchers who have addressed police perceptions of juveniles are older and focused on how police application of the symbolic assailant led to racially biased police stops impacting African Americans, how they juveniles treated differently compared to adults, and the impact of community policing (Worden, 1999; Bazemore & Senjo, 1997).

Due to the few attempts to address the police perceptions of juveniles, the researcher contributed to the research by theorizing how the symbolic assailant was part

of a continuum per Sealock and Simpson's (1998) juvenile offender type-script. For example, police applied the symbolic assailant to juveniles due to initial suspicion, but legal and extralegal variables validate or invalidate the initial suspicion. First, the study explored whether the available data suggest police perceived juveniles as the symbolic assailant. Secondly, the study examined if police perceived juveniles as the symbolic assailant due to their demeanor, gestures, race, gender, and offense (e.g., nonviolent versus violent).

To support the problem statement, the researcher discussed juvenile referrals to court data nationwide and from Connecticut. For instance, police referred to court over three times compared to White (non-Hispanic) juveniles (Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2016; 2017). In Connecticut, police referred racial and ethnic minorities to court at a relative rate of 2.8 times compared to White (non-Hispanic) juveniles, which was slightly below the national rate of 3 times (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2017). The researcher selected Connecticut because it is the only known state that has researched and evaluated police perceptions and interactions with juveniles similar to the symbolic assailant characteristics. Built on the problem statement, the goal of this dissertation was to determine what variables best predicted, via correlation, whom police designated as the symbolic assailant.

Although the researcher established this dissertation study's goal, there were barriers and issues. One barrier and or issue was most of the symbolic assailant research does not focus on street-level contact. Consequently, it was difficult to assess how police interacted and perceived juveniles in real-time, and if their perceptions led to an arrest, interrogation, referral to court, or other formal action. Another barrier or issue was the

age of the data as police officers' responses could have changed over time since the researchers in Connecticut collected these data in 2007. Because of this study's barriers and issues the research was of sufficient difficulty. To illustrate the literature, the researcher presented a theoretical literature review in Chapter 2. The theoretical literature review included the earlier and current literature and related constructs and theories which better explained and expanded the symbolic assailant as a phenomenon.

Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Background

As the researcher discussed in Chapter 1, Skolnick (2011) suggested police developed "shorthand" characteristics to identify people who displayed certain demeanor, gestures, language, and a style of dress as indicators of whether they would commit violent crimes, thus, creating the symbolic assailant. Since police face possible violence daily, they make inferences about certain people. Challenges arose when police applied the characteristics toward groups such as juveniles. To underscore Bell (2017) said: "The symbolic assailant need only suggest danger either through the display of a weapon or "insolence in the demeanor signaled by the way one walks, or dresses" (9).

To establish how police applied the symbolic assailant, the researcher conducted a theoretical literature review identifying and critiquing different theories to explain this phenomenon (Denney & Tewskbury, 2013). The researcher reviewed forty peer-reviewed articles, four book chapters, an entire book, and then sorted the materials categorizing the most relevant literature for analysis and review. The constructs and theories for critique expanding the symbolic assailant were racial profiling, the symbolic or minority threat thesis, the juvenile offender type-script, and police encounters and interactions with juveniles. The researcher selected these theoretical constructs because they focused primarily on juveniles, examined characteristics analogous to the symbolic assailant by demeanor, gestures, race, gender, offense type, and suggested the symbolic assailant, in part, was the foundation for some of these theories. First, the following theoretical review presented the earlier and current literature on the symbolic assailant. Second, the review

presented literature analogous to the symbolic assailant including how it intersected with race, gender, offense type, and extra-legal variables such as SES and geographical location. Finally, the researcher synthesized the symbolic assailant and comparable research and presented the research question for the methodological design discussed in Chapter 3.

The Juvenile Symbolic Assailant

The early symbolic assailant researchers suggested police ascribed the same characteristics to adults and juveniles, particularly demeanor, gestures, language, and style of dress. Black and Reiss (1970) examined juveniles' demeanor, like how adults would respond, to establish if they were "contrite about their infractions," respectful toward police, or feared an arrest and or interrogation. Also, Black and Reiss (1970), building on Piliavin and Briar's (1964) work, said if juveniles were respectful or were afraid of arrest police thought they were law-abiding or "at least salvageable" (210). On the contrary, juveniles who police perceived as disrespectful or indifferent were most likely to be viewed as "tough guys" or "punks" who deserved arrest (Piliavian & Briar; 1964; 210). If police thought of juveniles as tough guys, their demeanor earned them other negative monikers depending on the severity of the offense.

Black and Reiss (1970) also concluded the relationship between the police and juveniles as the symbolic assailant was more complex than presented by Piliavin and Briar (1964) due to extreme behavior of very deferential and very respectful. In the average encounter with police, the average demeanor of juveniles fell between the two extremes. Juvenile suspects were civil toward the police in 57% of the encounters, very

deferential in 11% of the encounters, and antagonistic in 16% of them (n = 281). Werthman et al. (1967), Haller (1976), Black (1980), and Baumgartner (1988) also found when police interactions were problematic it was due to juveniles real or perceived lack of respect, showing little or no remorse for the crimes, and acting indifferent or difficult. These encounters and interactions were also intense because police surveilled and stopped juveniles more compared to adults. Surveillance and harassment occurred more in urban areas because juveniles tended to congregate in concentrated locations such as street corners.

Examining how police viewed juveniles as the symbolic assailant by race and ethnicity, Werthman et al. (1967), Black and Reiss (1970), Lundman et al. (1978), and Smith, Visher, and Davidson (1984) found police arrested African American juveniles for more serious offenses. However, there were no significant differences for less serious offenses, but when police did arrest juveniles, race was a mediating variable by their demeanor at the time of arrest. Werthman et al. (1967), Black and Reiss (1970), Lundman et al. (1978), and Smith et al. (1984) operationalized African American males' demeanor based on their style of dress, so they were treated more harshly compared to similarly-situated White (non-Hispanic) juveniles. While police mostly attributed the symbolic assailant to African American males for more serious offenses, especially while on patrol, their views differed for interrogations. For example, a police officer interrogated a White (non-Hispanic) 17-year old male juvenile accused of statutory rape of a 15-year old girl. The officer labeled him as a "stud" and he "probably had knocked up a half dozen girls" (Piliavin & Briar; 1964; 211). Therefore, the officer thought the juvenile lacked remorse, did not show deference to authority, and his demeanor appeared

lackadaisical.

While Piliavin and Briar's (1964) research indicated there were no significant differences by race for juvenile interrogations, Werthman et al. (1967), Black and Reiss (1970), Lundman et al. (1978) and Smith et al. (1984), acknowledged police prejudice and bias toward African American juveniles. For instance, police believed African American juveniles, particularly males, had no respect for authority, committed crimes because they were "out for kicks," and again, lacked remorse. Some patrol officers said they were not racists until they became police due to their experiences (213). Additionally, most of the known earlier literature focused on male juveniles except for Chesney-Lind (1977) and Visher's (1983) research which found, in part, that police applied the symbolic assailant differently to female juveniles who were younger, runaways, and homeless. Police believed they should have controlled and "protected{female juveniles}from the temptations of the street" (Chesney-Lind, 1977; 126; Visher, 1983). Hence, police felt more paternalistic toward female juveniles because they needed to protect them from harm.

Black and Reiss (1970), Werthman et al. (1967), and Pilavin and Briar (1964), Lundman et al. (1978), and Smith et al. (1984) did discuss the role of race in police designating juveniles as symbolic assailants. While Skolnick (2011) did not specifically examine race, police's initial suspicion due to juveniles' demeanor, style of dress, remorse for their crimes, and deference authority were just as or more salient. Conversely, current literature by Bell (2017) suggested police go beyond initial suspicion regardless of offense type, and race was the main predictor variable of juveniles as the symbolic assailant. Bell (2017) also said individual facts and contexts determined what

made a likely suspect suspicious per the symbolic assailant and were also rooted in Adams' (1963) field interrogation criteria. These criteria included but were not limited to: Are you waiting in a deserted area at night? Are you dressed as a delivery person but don't have a truck? Are you a lone male sitting in a car near a playground with a book in your lap (21)? Even if police identified a White (non-Hispanic) juvenile as a symbolic assailant, they were more likely to use standard investigatory techniques which may not have led to use of force or an arrest. However, police perceived African American males as initially dangerous even if they were not acting suspiciously. Because police thought African American males were dangerous, they did not conduct typical investigations as they did for White (non-Hispanic) males. Bell (2017) said in part:

> The white symbolic assailant Skolnick identified was only suspicious; suspicion led to investigation-questioning or other verification…some Black youths-are not just suspicious, but also threatening, prompting police to use deadly force to subdue…about whom they have little, if any, actual evidence of lawbreaking or dangerousness (19).

Jones-Brown (2007) also examined police perceptions of young African American males as the symbolic assailant despite structural transformations of communities and policing practices. Police viewed young African American males as the symbolic assailant if they believed they were out of place in a specific location, if they displayed real or alleged lack of deference to authority, were disrespectful, and other extralegal variables. Jones-Brown's (2007) also found increased use of police force did not achieve immediate objectives such as crime prevention or apprehensions. Because some police were not well versed on specific laws, they carried out enforcement activities on what they thought was their jobs which, in part, was to identify people who would commit crimes based on the symbolic assailant which exacerbated the effect. Like Bell's

(2017) findings, Jones-Brown (2007) said police suspicions often led to excessive stops, arrests, use of force, and prolonged detentions. Jones-Brown's (2007) findings somewhat reflected the earlier research regarding the salience of juveniles' deference to authority and lack of respect.

Examining the symbolic assailant by gender, Yoder et al. (2005) differed from Chesney-Lind's (1977) and Visher's (1983) earlier research. Yoder et al. (2005) suggested police were more likely to arrest racial and ethnic female juveniles for less serious offenses (e.g., running away) compared to White (non-Hispanic) females as police bias was the most salient factor. African American female juveniles were arrested more because police perceived them as deserving of arrest because of their behavior. There was no race effect for a male runaway and homeless juveniles as they were both arrested more compared to females. However, police arrested African American males disproportionately compared to White (non-Hispanic) males especially for serious offenses such as those related to gang involvement. Yoder et al. (2005) also referred to Piliavin and Briar (1964), Smith et al. (1984), and Visher (1983) saying, in part, that a juvenile suspect's demeanor and physical appearance did influence if police decided to arrest.

The early symbolic assailant researchers mostly indicated that, while race was an essential factor, demeanor, gestures, deference to police authority, lack of remorse, and the severity of offenses determined whether police designated juveniles as symbolic assailants. Conversely, in the current literature, the inverse relationship was evident as race and ethnicity determined if police designated juveniles as symbolic assailant along with their demeanor, gestures, and style of dress regardless of offense type. The earlier

literature by Chesney-Lind (1977) and Visher (1983) found police acted more paternally toward the female juvenile symbolic assailant. While Yoder at al. (2005) found police views changed over time and, they were more lenient with White (non-Hispanic) female runaway juveniles they deemed as the symbolic assailant while they arrested African American females more. Overall male juveniles were arrested disproportionately compared to females regardless of the offense type, and police arrested African American male juveniles more.

Though there were differences between the early and current symbolic assailant literature the common themes were that race impacted police perceptions of juveniles as the symbolic assailant, especially for African American males, and demeanor, gestures, style of dress, and frequent interactions also impacted these perceptions. Due to the early and current symbolic assailant literature, other researchers began to build on these common themes further explaining and expanding the phenomenon. The researcher discussed in the following sections the symbolic assailant's related constructs and theories which also included police encounters and interactions with juveniles.

The Juvenile Symbolic Assailant: Related Constructs and Theories

The researcher identified several constructs to explain further and expand the symbolic assailant literature. For example, Paulhamus et al. (2013) theorized the symbolic assailant, along with Maanen's (1978) "asshole" provided a framework or laid the groundwork for racial profiling. Researchers have well documented the extent of racial profiling in various contexts (e.g., communities, traffic stops, use of force) by age, gender, race, and offense type, within criminal justice organizational structures (e.g.,

police and prosecutors), and geographic areas (e.g. urban, suburban, and rural) (Higgins, Gabbidon, & Vito; 2010; Skolnick, 2007; Wilkins & Williams, 2009; Walker, Spohn, & DeLone, 2012; Ryberg, 2011; Welch 2007; Davis, 2007; Alpert, Dunham, & Smith, 2007). Racial profiling occurred when police and other criminal justice stakeholders assumed people are or will be criminogenic due to race and ethnicity. However, the difference between racial profiling generally and the symbolic assailant, according to Paulhamus et al. (2013), is police are trained to review "departures from the normal" identifying racial and ethnic minorities who looked "out of place" due to various factors. Theoretically these "hunch judgments" helped police identify criminal suspects including those who were most likely to commit felonies or violent crimes (240). Police justified profiling practices because they believed they were a predictive method to arrest and detain potential suspects.

Vera Sanchez and Rosenbaum (2011) interviewed police to determine their perceptions of residents in African American and Hispanic and Latino communities. They found, in part, police did not believe they racially profiled residents because the communities were homogenous. The police racialized African American communities more compared to Latino communities because they thought crime was higher for African American juveniles who showed less deference to police and were more disrespectful compared to older residents. Like Paulhamus et al. (2013), Vera Sanchez and Rosenbaum's (2011) findings indicated how racial profiling intersected with the symbolic assailant as police were more likely to attribute the lack of deference and disrespect to younger African Americans whom they viewed as potential suspects in part due to their demeanor.

Relatedly, the symbolic or minority threat thesis indicated racial and ethnic minority juveniles symbolized behaviors such as lack of discipline and aggressiveness. Police and other criminal justice system stakeholders perceived these juveniles as dangerous and or drug offenders who failed to abide by middle-class norms; therefore, the stakeholders should exercise more formal control over them (Andersen, 2015; Leiber, Johnson, Fox, & Lacks, 2007). Andersen (2015) examined if racial and ethnic minority juveniles were more at risk of arrest due to the relative size of their population and economic inequality. Andersen's (2015) findings partially suggested police believed racial and ethnic minority juveniles were symbolic threats in jurisdictions with lower populations. Conversely, higher populations of racial and ethnic minorities moderated their likelihood of arrest. Anderson (2015) said "…as the relative size of the Black population increases, racial disparities in hazard of arrest are mitigated. In other words, racial disparities in risk of arrest are most pronounced among youth residing in predominately non-Black communities" (911). The symbolic or minority threat thesis further explained the symbolic assailant because police looked for visual cues to determine whom they thought would commit a crime. The significant difference between the symbolic assailant and the symbolic or minority threat thesis, however, is that with the latter, police relied primarily upon race followed by visual cues such as behavior.

Like Andersen (2015), Sealock and Simpson (1998) also suggested police thought African American juveniles were symbols of criminality according to verbal and non-verbal behaviors. The notable difference between Andersen (2015) and Sealcok and Simpson (1998) is implicit bias was more salient than suspicion in assigning "types" to certain people. Instead of primarily relying on what police observed due to their

experiences like with the symbolic or minority threat thesis, Sealock and Simpson (1998) said extra-legal factors such as SES were just as relevant as initial suspicion. Subsequently, police applied the symbolic assailant characteristics and extra-legal variables concurrently creating the offender script (e.g., violent, lower-class African American male or middle-class White (non-Hispanic) female). Expanding Sealock and Simpson's discussion on the intersection between the symbolic assailant and the juvenile offender type-script by location, Bell (2017) also said young African American males' behavior in certain places validated police's initial suspicion. Bell (2017) stated, "Contrast the level of detail needed in Skolnick's original formulation of symbolic assailant—location of the suspects' behavior and activity in which the suspect is engaged with the requirement for the Black symbolic assailant—blackness" (20). So, location and juveniles' behavior during police encounters and interactions also predicted if police deemed them as symbolic assailants. Relatedly, the researcher discussed in the next section how encounters and interactions with juveniles and geographical location impacted police's perceptions.

The Juvenile Symbolic Assailant: Police Encounters and Interactions

Another theory expanding the symbolic assailant was police encounters and interactions with juveniles. As discussed in Chapter 1, Connecticut developed the Effective Police Interactions with Youth curriculum to address interactions between police and youth generally and with racial and ethnic minorities. The evaluators' findings partly showed the curriculum enhanced patrol officers' knowledge of youth behavior overall and provided better strategies for interacting with them (LaMotte et al., 2010;

Sanderson et al., 2008). The officers said the vignette exercises also helped them understand how they assumed interactions with juveniles would be difficult because they thought juveniles were disrespectful, would give them a hard time if stopped on the street, and their style of dress. Police initial responses from the vignette exercises were consistent with Baumgartner (1988), Black (1980), Haller (1976), and Werthman et al.'s (1967) earlier findings that juveniles who were less respectful along with their demeanor, indicated an offense would ensue. Jaggers, Young, and Church (2014) also discussed the nature of police interaction with juveniles in community contexts such as schools, gang involvement, and their attitudes toward police. They examined how police discretion could lead to abuse and overreach with racial and ethnic minority juveniles and whether deference to authority or the lack thereof, contributed to subsequent arrests.

Although Piliavin and Briar (1964) and Werthman et al.'s (1967) studies were older, their findings were similar to Jaggers et al. (2014). Piliavin and Briar (1964) and Werthman et al.'s (1967) findings were similar to Jaggers et al. (2014) because they concluded the more juveniles showed deference, the less likely police arrested them, thereby increasing the likelihood of positive interactions. Also, Thurau's (2009) findings partly suggested police encounters and interactions with juvenile could lead to arrest because of an authoritarian framework implying juveniles behaved like adults, they understood the consequences of their actions, and juveniles posed the same risks and threats as adults. Thurau's (2009) partial findings were similar to the earlier symbolic assailant research and Worden's (1999) more recent study since police treated juveniles like adults, they viewed any adverse actions as lack of respect for their authority. Thurau's (2009) findings were also consistent with the literature on how police perceived

certain behaviors as signs of guilt, when they were due to adolescent brain development (Bonnie et al., 2013; Steinberg, 2004; Weinberger, Elvevåg, & Giedd, 2005; Steinberg, 2004; Dahl & Lewin, 2002).

While the Effective Interactions with Youth vignettes were helpful, a barrier, as discussed in Chapter 1, was there was insufficient research on how police would interact with juveniles in real-time. To assess how police encountered and interacted with juveniles in real-time, Liederbach (2007) used systematic social observation (SSO) methods to examine the type of police encounters with juveniles age 13 to 17 years (n = 138) in 20 suburban and rural jurisdictions. Overall, police were most likely to encounter and interact with juveniles as either suspects or disputants. Despite these encounters, police were less likely to arrest juvenile suspects since the action was informal (e.g., citations and verbal warnings). Even though police did not arrest most juveniles, they sometimes subjected them to some physical force, questioned, or threatened to arrest them. Liederbach's (2007) findings were most consistent with Sealock and Simpson's (1998) juvenile offender type-script as police perceived White (non-Hispanic) male juveniles more positively decreasing the likelihood of an arrest. Since Liederbach's (2007) observations occurred in real-time, he showed that while White (non-Hispanic) juveniles committed 71% of all offenses, they only represented 60% of those arrested. Furthermore, most of the police encounters and interactions with juveniles in rural areas were for traffic stops, and these stops were less problematic compared to urban areas because they were less densely populated.

Summary

In this theoretical literature review, the researcher discussed the symbolic assailant literature and identified and critiqued racial profiling, the symbolic or minority threat thesis, the juvenile offender type-script, and police encounters and interactions with juveniles. Again, Skolnick (2011) developed the symbolic assailant based on his observations of police officers and found that, as part of their working personality, they developed shorthand characteristics of would-be perpetrators of violent crimes. This shorthand rested on the use of language, gestures, style of dress, and general demeanor. As police are encouraged to be suspicious of possible suspects due to the real and perceived threat of danger, the challenge becomes if the suspicion excessively affected specific groups such as juveniles.

The earlier symbolic assailant literature by Black and Reiss (1970), Werthman et al. (1967), Piliavin and Briar (1964), Smith et al. (1984), Black (1980), and Baumgartner (1988) found juveniles' demeanor, style of dress, gestures, deference to police authority, whether they were remorseful, offense severity, in addition to race, determined whether police perceived them as symbolic assailants. Though race was a factor, the seriousness of the offense and how juveniles responded mattered more as White (non-Hispanic) male juveniles were also arrested an interrogated and deemed symbolic assailants. Examining the symbolic assailant by gender, Chesney-Lind (1977) and Visher (1983) found police applied the characteristics differently to younger female runaway and homeless juveniles as they were more likely to be arrested for protection from the impending dangers of living on the streets.

On the contrary, Bell (2017), Jones-Brown (2007), Yoder et al. (2005), and

Sealock and Simpson (1998) found race and ethnicity, gender, and SES determined how police perceived juveniles going beyond initial suspicion. Bell (2017) went further saying even if police designated White (non-Hispanic) juveniles as the symbolic assailant they would conduct typical investigations including questioning and verifying facts. However, African American juveniles were not just suspicious but also menacing which lead to various police actions such as the deadly use of force. Similarly, Jones-Brown (2007) found police increased their use of force of African American juveniles as the symbolic assailant. While police increased the use of force, the practice did not prevent crime or increase the apprehension of other suspects. Although the early and current symbolic literature differed on the salience of race, the findings indicated overall police did consider it as a factor in perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant.

Because the symbolic assailant researchers discussed juveniles' demeanor, gestures, style of dress, respect and deference to police authority, and other variables, other related constructs and theories emerged. For instance, Paulhamus et al. (2013) considered the symbolic assailant, along with Van Maanen's (1978) the asshole, the foundation of racial profiling as police made quick judgments due to suspicion and suspects' demeanor towards them. Police believed these quick judgments predicted who was most likely to commit crimes, therefore, justifying racial profiling. Vera Sanchez and Rosenbaum's (2011) partially found police did not believe they racially profiled African American communities because they were homogenous, and younger males were more criminogenic and disrespectful compared to older residents.

Paulhamus et al. (2013) and Vera Sanchez and Rosenbaum's (2011) findings showed how racial profiling interconnected with the symbolic assailant as police were

more likely to attribute the characteristics to African American juveniles. Andersen (2015) also discussed how police viewed African Americans as symbols of criminality via the symbolic or minority threat thesis because they failed to abide by middle-class norms and were aggressive and dangerous. African American juveniles also seemed to pose more of a symbolic threat in jurisdictions with lower populations compared to those with higher populations. The symbolic or minority threat thesis explained the symbolic assailant because police relied on visual cues to determine which juveniles would most likely to commit crimes. Though similar based on visual cues, the symbolic assailant, and the symbolic minority threat thesis differed as racial and ethnic minorities personified the symbolic assailant and extra-legal variables such as demeanor were not as relevant.

Sealock and Simpson (1998) also suggested African American juveniles symbolized criminality however implicit bias led police to assign certain "types" leading to the creation of the juvenile offender type-script. Instead of relying on police observations and experiences like with the symbolic assailant and minority or threat thesis, SES was just as relevant. In other words, because police developed the juvenile offender type-script, African American juveniles in socioeconomically depressed communities then became the symbolic assailant. The reverse phenomenon occurred with the juvenile offender type-script for White (non-Hispanic) juveniles, particularly for females, as police viewed them more positively if they lived in middle-class communities. Sealock and Simpson's (1998) findings somewhat supported Chesney-Lind (1977) and Visher's (1983) earlier research as police viewed White (non-Hispanic) female juveniles more favorably in particular contexts. Bell (2017) and Jones-Brown (2007) also believed location was critical to police as the structural changes in

socioeconomically depressed communities increased formal action (e.g., uses of force, arrests, stops, surveillance, and prolonged detentions).

As Sealock and Simpson (1998), Bell (2017) and Jones-Brown (2007) discussed the role of location in police augmenting the symbolic assailant creating the juvenile offender type-script, how police interacted with juveniles also expanded the symbolic assailant. Also discussed in Chapter 1, police responses to the Effective Police Interactions with Youth's vignette exercise were consistent with Baumgartner (1988), Black (1980), Haller (1976), and Werthman et al.'s (1967) earlier literature. The responses were consistent because police perceived juveniles as less respectful based on their demeanor, gestures, and style of dress. Jaggers et al.'s (2014) also concluded the more juveniles showed deference to authority during interactions the less likely police were to arrest them, and in so, doing made the interactions more positive which is also more consistent with Piliavin and Briar (1964) and Werthman et al. (1967).

Thurau (2009) partly concluded tense police encounters and interactions with juveniles occurred because police treated juveniles like adults viewing them just as threatening, and thinking they understood the consequences of their behavior. Thurau's (2009) findings were also more consistent with the adolescent brain development literature explaining how police perceived typical adolescent behavior as an indication of guilt (Bonnie et al., 2013; Steinberg, 2004; Weinberger, Elvevåg, & Giedd, 2005; Steinberg, 2004; Dahl & Lewin, 2002). Since police treated juveniles like adults, they viewed any negative demeanor as a lack of deference to their authority which is consistent with Black and Reiss (1970), Werthman et al. (1967), Smith et al. (1984) earlier and Worden's (1999) more recent research.

As the researcher discussed in Chapter 1, Connecticut's Effective Police Interactions with Youth's training vignette exercises helped police understand how they perceived juveniles; these exercises did not occur in real-time. Liederbach (2007) is one of the few recent researchers who observed how police interacted with juveniles in real-time and found police were less likely to arrest in rural areas opting for informal sanctions such as citations and verbal warnings. While they were less likely to arrest, police did subject juveniles to some physical force and threatened to arrest them. Like Sealock and Simpson's (1998) reverse relationship of the symbolic assailant via the juvenile offender type-script of African American male juveniles, police perceived White (non-Hispanic) males more positively during the interaction decreasing the likelihood of arrest even though they committed most of the offenses.

The early and recent symbolic assailant literature sufficiently explained and expanded Skolnick's (2011) original theory by examining how police applied the characteristics at different points of formal contact (e.g., stops, arrests, surveillance, detentions, and use of force) and how race, gender, offense type impacted their decisions. The related constructs and theories also sufficiently explained how the police applied the symbolic assailant by race, gender, offense type, various extra-legal variables (e.g., SES, schools, communities, and gang involvement), and the nature of their encounters and interactions with juveniles. Although the literature adequately explained the symbolic assailant overall, there are gaps which the researcher discussed in the following section.

Gaps in the Research

Even though the symbolic assailant research provided sound arguments about the

extent of police suspicion, there were several gaps. First, while there was a wealth of research on the symbolic assailant as police arrested stopped, interrogated, used force, and detained racial and ethnic minorities more frequently compared to White (non-Hispanic) juveniles, there was no known research on the extent of other races, mainly Hispanic or Latino juveniles. As discussed in Chapter 1, much of the research focused on Hispanic or Latino's perceptions of police, or police perceptions of their neighborhoods and communities (Rengifo & McCallin, 2017; Gabbidon, Higgins & Potter, 2011; Vera Sanchez & Rosenbaum, 2011). In some jurisdictions, formal police actions are probably just as prevalent for Hispanic or Latino male juveniles as it is for African Americans. Although Vera Sanchez and Rosenbaum's (2011) qualitative study examined how police perceived Hispanic or Latino communities, they compared them to African American communities. Relatedly, while there was some research on police perceptions of female juveniles as the symbolic assailant, it was sparse, and primarily focused on minor offenses. The researcher believed the research mainly focused on minor violations such as running away for female juveniles because the rates were higher compared to males.

Another gap in the research was it did not adequately demonstrate the extent of geographic location as a predictor of whether police applied the symbolic assailant to juveniles. Skolnick (2011), Bell (2017), and Jones-Brown (2007) briefly discussed how police directed suspicion toward those who look "out of place" in specific communities. Andersen (2015) also briefly discussed how the relative size of African American juveniles in communities affected the extent to which police perceived juveniles as a symbolic threat. Sealcok and Simpson (1998) also examined how police included SES as a variable to develop the juvenile offender type-script and Liederbach's (2007) research

discussed the role of geography, mainly how police perceived juveniles in rural and suburban communities. However, the research did not thoroughly examine how location impacted police decisions to arrest or other formal actions against juveniles. To address this gap, the researcher posited the justice by geography construct would further expand the symbolic assailant research because of the granular focus on where police have contact with juveniles (e.g., urban, rural, suburban) (Krisberg, Litsky, & Schwartz, 1984; Feld, 1991, 2010, 2013). Also, geographical locations could impact police actions (e.g., stops, arrests, interrogations, surveillance, and referrals to court), and illustrate differences by race, gender, and offense type. Especially, since Skolnick (2011) discussed the role of police believing likely suspects as looking out of place in specific communities. Due to these identified gaps, the researcher formulated this study's research question from the literature's arguments.

Research Question

The researcher established the goal of this dissertation study in Chapter 1 and reviewed the literature to explain and expand the symbolic assailant. The next step was to develop a measurable research question. The researcher developed the question per Piliavin and Briar (1964), Black and Reiss (1970), Werthman et al. (1967), Lundman et al. (1978), and Smith et al.'s (1984) earlier literature. The researcher also included current literature by Bell (2017), Jones-Brown (2007), Yoder et al. (2005), and Sealock and Simpson (1998). Therefore, the research question is: What combination of factors including demeanor, gestures, race, gender, and offense type, are most likely to correlate to police perceptions of juveniles as the symbolic assailant? The research question is the

methodological basis for this study which the researcher discussed in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3: METHODOLOGY

Participants

The target population and intended participants of this study were state and local patrol officers of various ages who completed Connecticut's Effective Police Interactions with Youth Pretest Survey in 2007. The researcher selected patrol officers by age due to the range of 22 to 60 years old, which presumably, would provide a more representative sample of how police perceived juveniles. For example, younger officers might be less likely to perceive juveniles as potential suspects because they are closer in age (e.g., a 22-year-old officer interacting with a 16-year-old juvenile) compared to an older officer. As stated throughout this study, the Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC) developed the Effective Police Interactions with Youth curriculum to assess police's views of juveniles, primarily racial and ethnic minorities, and included strategies to effectively interact with them while on patrol.

The researcher selected Connecticut's Pretest Survey, a component of the curriculum because it is the only known instrument measuring how police, in part, perceived juveniles similar to Skolnick's (2011) symbolic assailant (e.g., demeanor, language, gestures, and style of dress). As discussed throughout this study, much of the literature on perceptions focused on how juveniles, particularly African Americans and Hispanic or Latinos in urban areas, perceived police regarding procedural justice and legitimacy, in different institutional contexts, interracial police encounters, and views of

police by their gender (Feinstein, 2015; Gau & Brunson, 2010; Weitzer & Brunson, 2009; Rengifo & McCallin, 2017; Feinstein, 2015; Payne, Hitchens, & Chambers, 2017).

Demographics. The researcher analyzed secondary data from the Pretest Survey which included 470 patrol officers[3] from 48 departments. Demographically, 87% of the police officers were male (n = 407), 13% were female (n = 61), and the mean age was almost 36 years old (m = 35.5). White (non-Hispanic) police officers comprised nearly 84% of the sample (n = 393) followed by African Americans at 7% (n = 34), and Latino and Hispanic officers at 6% (n = 28). Police officers who listed their race as Other comprised 1% of the sample (n = 6) followed by Asians at .4% (n = 2), and Native Americans at .2% (n = 1).

While the patrol police officers were mostly White (non-Hispanic) males, years of experience was more evenly spread. Officers with 10 to 20 years of experience comprised 27% of the sample (n = 129) followed by 25% with 5 to 10 years' experience (n = 118), and 23% with 2 to 5 five years' experience (n = 109). Officers with fewer than two years' experience comprised nearly 15% of the sample (n = 68) followed by those with more than 20 years at 9% (n = 44). Even though police years of experience were spread evenly across time, most had little experience interacting with juveniles regularly and or did not work in specialized units or divisions. Only 4.3% of officers had more than three years' experience interacting with youth followed by 1.7% with one to two years' experience and 1.3% with zero to six months of experience.

---

[3] The sample included the control and the treatment group (i.e., the patrol officers who subsequently participated in the Effective Police Interactions with Youth Training). The researcher included both groups because all patrol officers completed the Pretest Survey. The researcher did not include any posttest data from the treatment group as the goal was to assess officers' initial perceptions of juveniles without any treatment.

Human subjects. Because the researcher conducted secondary data analyses of the Pretest Survey, there were no human subjects. However, the original data files included police officers' Personable Identifiable Information (PII) such as first and last names, age, and gender. To ensure the security of PII, the researcher asked the University of Connecticut's Center for Applied Research and Human Development to modify the data files and remove officers' first and last names. To ensure the security of the modified data files, the researcher saved them on a flash drive and exported from the Statistical Software Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to Microsoft Excel. The researcher uploaded the modified file to the cloud-based storage Microsoft One Drive in case there was damage to the SPSS and Excel files. The One Live account is password protected, and the researcher receives notices via email of suspected unusual activity. To ensure additional security, the researcher marked the data files private which requires an additional password.

Instruments

Connecticut's Effective Police Interactions with Youth Pretest Survey contained seven demographic questions such as the officers' department, age, gender, race and ethnicity, years of police experience overall and years of experience as a youth officer. The instrument also included 19 multiple choice and true and false questions designed to measure officers' general knowledge about youth, their attitudes regarding police and youth interactions, and their perceptions of youth in various contexts (Sanderson et al., 2008). Among those 19 questions measuring patrol officers' knowledge, five questions asked officers about equal treatment of diverse juveniles who had contact with the

juvenile justice system. Additionally, seven questions asked officers about adolescent brain development, and another seven asked about effective strategies for interacting with youth. Sanderson et al. (2008) measured patrol officers' attitudes on a 10-point Likert scale, as 1 was strong disagreement and 10 was strong agreement. While Sanderson et al. (2008) did not develop the Survey to address police perceptions of juveniles as the symbolic assailant specifically, several questions were most similar to the characteristics (e.g., pacing, fidgeting, and mouthing off and venting in non-dangerous situations). Therefore, the researcher selected questions number 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 15, and 17 for data analyses due to their comparability to the symbolic assailant. The selected questions concentrated on juveniles' demeanor, gestures, race, gender, offense type, and police officers' knowledge of national research regarding racial and ethnic minorities contact with the juvenile justice system (see Pretest Survey in Appendix A).

Because the selected Pretest Survey questions were analogous to the symbolic assailant, the researcher expected the patrol officers to select correct answers. For example, question 4 asked which groups of juveniles were most likely to have carried a weapon in the past 30 days. The choices were African Americans, Hispanic or Latinos, White (non-Hispanic) juveniles, African American and Hispanic or Latinos, or all races and ethnicities carried weapons about equally. Per the current symbolic assailant and related literature, the expected correct answer was African American juveniles were most likely to have carried a weapon in the past 30 days (Bell, 2017; Jones-Brown, 2007; Paulhamus et al., 2013; Andersen, 2015; Yoder et al., 2005; Sealock & Simpson).

For question 6 the Survey asked, per national research, which of the following factors contributed to more juvenile justice system contact for racial and ethnic

minorities. The choices were the tendency for racial and ethnic minorities to commit violent crimes more frequently than White (non-Hispanic) juveniles, the tendency of racial and ethnic minorities to commit more nonviolent crimes than White (non-Hispanic) juveniles, policies and practices such as staffing levels and patrol locations, the first two answers (i.e., a or b), or all the above. The expected correct response was racial and ethnic minorities' contact with the juvenile justice system, per the national research, was the tendency for them to commit more violent crimes than White (non-Hispanic) juveniles. The expected response was also more consistent with the current symbolic assailant and related literature (Bell, 2017, Jones-Brown, 2007; Paulhamus et al., 2013; Andersen, 2015; Yoder et al.; Sealock & Simpson, 1998). Question 10 asked if males were more likely than females to escalate faster, once becoming aggressive, hold a grudge, get into a physical fight, or ostracize peers. The expected correct answer was males were more likely to get into a physical fight compared to females which was also more consistent with the early symbolic assailant and related literature that primarily focused on juveniles' gender (Chesney-Lind, 1977; Visher, 1983).

Question 14 is the most comparable to the symbolic assailant juvenile characteristics as it asked if adolescent behaviors such as pacing, fidgeting, and mouthing off were generally signs of guilt, distress, or disrespect. Again, per the current symbolic assailant and related literature, the expected answer was guilt, particularly if the juveniles were racial and ethnic minority males (Bell, 2017; Jones-Brown, 2007; Paulhamus et al., 2013; Yoder et al., 2005; Sealock & Simpson, 1998). Question 15 asked which of the following statements about racial and ethnic minorities disproportionate contact with the juvenile justice system was false. The choices were disproportionate contact was a

national problem, evidence of disproportionate contact existed in the police, courts, and corrections, and police officers in Connecticut transported racial and ethnic minorities and White (non-Hispanic) juveniles to detention at similar rates regardless of offense type. The expected correct answer was police statewide transporting racial and ethnic minorities and White (non-Hispanic) juveniles to detention at similar rates regardless of offense type was false.

Finally, question 17 asked if letting juveniles "vent" in non-dangerous situations involved all except the following: expecting some disrespect, gently touching the juvenile's arm to show concern, separating distressed juveniles from their peers, or giving them time to think. The expected correct answer was all statements were true except gently touching a juvenile's arm to show concern. The other statements were behaviors and gestures expected per the earlier symbolic assailant literature (Skolnick, 2011; Werthman et al.,1967, Haller, 1976; Black, 1980; Baumgartner, 1988).

Procedures

Research design. The researcher conducted a nonexperimental predictive correlational research design to test the research question. The predictive correlational research design was appropriate for this study because it allowed the researcher "to anticipate or predict the outcome based on the analysis of the relationship between two variables" while including extant data (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2013; 103). The rationale for selecting a nonexperimental predictive correlational research design was it demonstrated what combination of variables (e.g., juveniles' demeanor, gestures, race, gender, and offense type (violent or nonviolent)), did or did not best correlate to police,

based on their age, perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant. To carry out this design the researcher first identified predictor variables (i.e., a combination of factors) and the criterion variable (i.e., police perceptions by their age of juveniles as the symbolic assailant) from the research question.

Statistical test. The next step was to decide what statistical test would show which combination of variables did or did not best correlate to the patrol officers' perceptions by their age of juveniles as the symbolic assailant. The researcher determined there was a natural dichotomous nominal criterion variable (i.e., police do or do not perceive juveniles as the symbolic assailant) and more than one natural dichotomous nominal predictor variable (i.e., there are or no combination of factors). As a result, the most appropriate statistical test was the Phi correlation which measures the degree of association between two binary variables. As shown in Table 4, for example, the natural dichotomy of gender is police are most likely to perceive male or female juveniles as the symbolic assailant. As stated above, the Phi correlation was also appropriate because existing data is a common source for correlational research.

Table 4.

Phi Correlation: Predictor and Criterion Variables

Predictor Variables	Criterion Variable
Juveniles' demeanor and gestures or no demeanor or gestures Racial and ethnic juveniles or White (non-Hispanic) juveniles Male or female Nonviolent or violent offenses	Police by their age perceive juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not

Research design procedures. To carry out the correlational predictive design, the researcher conducted Huck's (2012) steps for hypothesis testing. Further, the researcher obtained the SPSS files of the patrol officers' survey responses from the University of Connecticut's Center for Applied Research in Human Development (CARHD). The final files did not contain Personally Identifiable Information (PII) as the Research Team assigned dummy identifications to each officer. The data files only contained general demographic data such as officers' age, gender, race, years of experience including as a youth officer, and the survey responses. The researcher reviewed the data and ran the Phi correlation test in SPSS on the officers' responses by their age with questions 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 15, and 17 as, again, they were the most analogous to the symbolic assailant. The researcher then analyzed the results to determine the strength of association between the combination of variables (i.e., race and ethnicity, gender, and offense type) and if police perceived juveniles as the symbolic assailant.

Data Analysis

Level of significance. The level of statistical significance is the degree of risk the researcher was willing to take to reject the H_0 when it is true. To test whether the researcher accepted the H_0, the researcher repeated the procedures for the remaining predictor variables (e.g., race, gender, and offense type) to accept or reject the H_0. If the researcher rejected the H_0 for one or more of the other predictor variables' obtained values and compared them to the correlation coefficient critical values and the H_0 was true, a Type I error would occur (i.e., rejecting the H_0 when it is true). If the researcher accepted the H_0 for one or more of the predictor variables' obtained values, compared them to the correlation coefficient critical values, and the H_0 was false, a Type II error would occur (Salkind, 2014; Trochim et al., 2016; Huck, 2012). Hence, the H_0 is: There is no combination of factors including demeanors, gestures, race, gender, and offense type most likely to correlate to police perceptions of juveniles as the symbolic assailant.

Statistical method. As stated above, the researcher analyzed the patrol officers' Pretest Survey responses by selecting Phi and Cramer's V in SPSS to determine the degree of association between police by their age perceived juveniles as the symbolic assailant due to their demeanor, gestures, gender, race and ethnicity, and offense type. For example, if the SPSS output showed 300 patrol officers responded that juveniles' "pacing, fidgeting, and mouthing off are generally signs of disrespect," yielding an obtained value of $r_\phi = .80$, this alone would indicate a strong relationship between juveniles' demeanor and gestures and police perceiving them as the symbolic assailant. The researcher would then compare the obtained value ($r_\phi = .80$) to the correlation coefficient critical value table to complete the hypothesis testing. To do so the researcher

would decide the degrees of freedom (v), which is 467 (i.e., n -2 or 469-2), and if the hypothesis is one-tailed or two-tailed. The researcher selected the two-tailed hypothesis because it anticipates an effect without predicting a negative or positive direction, which aligns with the research question and the H_0 (Trochim, Donnelly, & Arora, 2016; Salkind, 2014).

Since the researcher chose the "standard" .05, as the α, the next step was to locate the critical value in a correlation coefficient table corresponding to the v of 467. Most correlation critical value tables do not have approximate values after 100, so the researcher picked 400 because it was less than the next value of 500. Thus, the correlation coefficient critical value in this example was .098 at an $\alpha = .05$ with a two-tailed hypothesis. The researcher then compared the obtained value of .080 to the critical value of .098. Since the obtained value was less than the critical value, the researcher must accept the H_0 which says are there is no combination of factors most likely to correlate to police perceptions of juveniles' demeanor and gestures as the symbolic assailant. The researcher also determined the Phi coefficient of determination (r^2) to measure if the variance in the criterion variable (i.e., police by age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not) was due to the variance in the predictor variables (i.e., demeanor and gestures or not, racial and ethnic minorities or White (non-Hispanic), male or female, and nonviolent and violent). In this example, the r^2 of .80 is .064, which means 64% of the variation in the patrol officers by their age perceived juveniles as the symbolic assailant if they were fidgeting, pacing, and mouthing as signs of disrespect while 36% of the variation was not due to these demeanors and gestures.

Summary

The researcher conducted a nonexperimental predictive correlational research design using Connecticut state and local patrol officers Pretest Survey responses (N = 470) to determine if any combination of factors most likely correlated to police, based on their age, perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not. The researcher chose the nonexperimental predictive correlational research design because it allowed prediction of the outcome of a relationship between two variables and examining existing data from surveys is common (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2013). To test the research question, the researcher performed the Phi correlation because there was one natural dichotomous nominal criterion variable (i.e., police by their age do or do not perceive juveniles as the symbolic assailant) and several natural dichotomous nominal predictor variables (i.e., there are or no combination of factors). The researcher also calculated the Phi coefficient of determination to measure if the variance in the criterion variable explained the variance in the predictor variables. The next step was to choose the level of statistical significance (α =.05) with a two-tailed hypothesis which anticipates an effect without predicting a negative or positive direction. Using Huck's (2012) criteria for hypothesis testing, the researcher accepted or rejected the H_0 by comparing the obtained values to the correlation coefficient's critical values. Overall, this chapter discussed the methodological design for this study including the participants, instruments, statistical testing, and procedures. Next, Chapter 4 presented the results of these methods.

Chapter 4: RESULTS

Skolnick (2011) developed the symbolic assailant positing police assigned specific characteristics to people they believed were most likely to commit violent crimes. These characteristics were primarily due to potential suspects' demeanor, gestures, language, and style of dress, in addition to race and ethnicity. The task in this chapter was to present the results of the statistical procedures discussed in Chapter 3. The researcher conducted the Phi correlation (r_ϕ)[4] to determine what combination of factors correlated to patrol officers, based on their ages, perceiving juveniles as having characteristics similar to the symbolic assailant. To calculate the r_ϕ, the researcher measured the patrol officers by their age to the anticipated correct answers of the selected Pretest Survey questions. The researcher also calculated the Phi coefficient of determination (r^2) to determine if the variation in *y* (i.e., criterion variable of patrol officers' perceptions by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not) explained the variation in *x* (i.e., predictor variables of demeanor and gestures or not, racial and ethnic minorities or White non-Hispanic juveniles, male or female, and nonviolent or violent). The researcher then carried out Huck's (2013) hypothesis testing to accept or reject the H_0. Finally, the researcher presented the officers' responses to the selected Pretest Survey questions by race and gender and summarized the results.

Demeanor and gestures. The researcher hypothesized the combination of variables most likely to correlate to patrol officers by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not, was their demeanor and gestures, gender, race and ethnicity,

[4] To researcher selected Field (2013) and Salkind to (2014) to interpret the degree and strength of the Phi correlation.

and offense type (i.e., nonviolent or violent). The Phi correlation for question 14 yielded a weak correlation ($r_\phi = .38$, $p > .05$) between the patrol officers' perceptions by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant and demeanors and gestures of fidgeting, pacing, and mouthing off as signs of guilt. The expected correct answer was these gestures and demeanor were signs of guilt. To determine if the variance in *y* (i.e., patrol officers perceptions by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not) explained the variation in *x* (i.e., juveniles' demeanor and gestures of fidgeting, pacing, and mouthing off were signs of guilt), the researcher calculated the r^2 of .38 which was 0.144. Thus, 14% of the variation in *y* explained the variation in *x.* However, 86% of the remaining variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x* but explained the variation in other variables (e.g., fidgeting, pacing, and mouthing off were signs of distress or disrespect).

For question 17, the Phi correlation yielded a moderate correlation ($r_\phi = .50$, $p > .05$) between patrol officers by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant and letting them vent in non-dangerous situations involved all but gently touching their arms to show concern. The officers selected the correct answer because they were asked to identify the incorrect statement from those listed. The r^2 of .50 was 0.25, meaning 25% of the variation in *y* (i.e., patrol officers by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not) explained the variation in *x* (letting juveniles "vent" in non-dangerous situations denotes all but gently touching a juvenile's arm to show concern). Thus, 75% of the variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x* but did explain the variation in other variables (e.g., expecting some disrespect, separating juveniles from their peers, and giving them time to think).

The researcher then partially tested the H_0 by comparing the obtained value of juveniles' demeanor and gestures of pacing fidgeting and mouthing off as signs of guilt, ($r_\phi = .38$), and not gently touching a juvenile's arm to show concern when venting in non-dangerous situations ($r_\phi = .50$), to the correlation coefficient critical value table. The *v* was 456 (i.e., n -2 or 458-2) and 453 (455-2) at an $\alpha = .05$. The researcher compared the obtained values of .38 and .50 to the critical value of .098. Since the obtained values were higher than the critical value, the researcher rejected the H_0. Overall, demeanor and gestures were weak and moderate predictors of whether the patrol officers by their age perceived juveniles' pacing, fidgeting, and mouthing off as signs of guilt as the symbolic assailant and touching a juvenile's arm to show concern when venting in non-dangerous situations was not the best option. However, the total remaining variations of 86% and 75% in *y* did not explain the variations in *x* for questions 14 and 17. Thus, the researcher could only explain 14% and 25% of the variations in *y* by the variations in *x*.

Gender. The Phi correlation yielded a moderate correlation ($r_\phi = .48$, $p > .05$) between patrol officers by their age perceiving male juveniles as escalating faster once becoming more aggressive compared to females, which was not the expected correct answer. The correct answer was males were more likely to get into a physical fight compared to females. The researcher posited the correlation might have been stronger if the patrol officers selected males escalated faster once becoming more aggressive or they were more likely to get into a physical fight instead of the selecting both responses almost equally. The r^2 of .48 was 0.23, meaning 23% of the variation in *y* (i.e., patrol officers by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not) did not explain the variation in *x* (i.e., male juveniles were more likely to get into a physical fight

compared to females). So, 77% of the remaining variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x* but did explain the variation in other variables (e.g., males were likely to get into a physical fight, hold a grudge, or ostracize peers). Further, the officer's responses somewhat supported the earlier and current literature as males were more likely to commit violent offenses compared to females and were more likely to escalate faster once becoming aggressive (Chesney-Lind, 1977; Visher, 1983; Yoder et al., 2005). For the hypothesis testing, the *v* was 453 at an α =.05. Comparing the obtained value of .48 to .098, the researcher again rejected the H_0.

Race and offense type. As stated in Chapter 3, the researcher selected questions 4, 6, and 15 from the Pretest Survey because they were most comparable to patrol officers' perceptions of racial and ethnic minority juveniles by offense type (i.e., nonviolent or violent).[5] The Phi correlation yielded a strong correlation ($r_\phi = .70$, $p < .05$) between patrol officers by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant and all races and ethnicities carrying weapons equally in the past 30 days, which was not the expected correct answer for question 4. The anticipated correct answer was patrol officers perceived African American juveniles were most likely to have carried a weapon in the past 30 days. To substantiate the correct answer, as discussed throughout this study, the symbolic assailant and related researchers suggested police perceived African American males as violent and aggressive, thereby criminogenic and needing formal control of the police (Bell, 2017; Jones-Brown, 2007; Andersen, 2015; Yoder et al., 2005; Sealock & Simpson, 1998). The r^2 of .70 was 0.49, meaning 49% of the variation in *y* (i.e., patrol officers by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not) explained the

[5] Some questions solely focused race and ethnicity such as 15. Whereas, others focused on both race and ethnicity and offense types such as four and six.

variation in *x* (i.e., all races and ethnicities were most likely to have carried weapons in the past 30 days). While the correlation was strong, the remaining 51% variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x* but did explain the variation in other variables (e.g., African Americans, or African American and Hispanic or Latinos were most likely to have carried weapons in the past 30 days). Hence, the strength of the correlation is slightly misleading because it contradicted the current symbolic assailant and related literature and as more than half the variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x*.

Further, the correlation ($r_\phi = .39$, $p > .05$) was weak between patrol officers by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant and police in Connecticut transporting racial and ethnic minorities and White (non-Hispanic) juveniles to detention at similar rates regardless of the offense type, which was the correct answer. The r^2 of .39 was 0.15, meaning 15% of the variation in *y* (i.e., patrol officers by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not) explained the variation in *x* (i.e., police in Connecticut transported racial and ethnic minorities and White (non-Hispanic) juveniles to detention at similar rates regardless of offense type was false). Thus, the remaining 85% variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x* but did explain the variation in other variables (e.g., disproportionality of racial and ethnic minorities in the juvenile justice system is a national problem, or evidence of disproportionality was in the police, courts, and corrections). Partially testing the hypothesis the *v* was 453 and 428 at an of $\alpha = .05$. Comparing the obtained values of .70 and .39 to .098, the researcher rejected the H_0.

Additionally, there was a moderate correlation ($r_\phi = .53$, $p > .05$) between patrol officers by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant and factors contributing most to racial and ethnic minorities' contact with the juvenile justice system

per the national research. The expected correct answer was the tendency for African American juveniles to commit more violent crimes than White (non-Hispanic) juveniles. The r^2 of .53 was 0.28, which means 28% of the variation in *y* (i.e., patrol officers by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not) explained the variation in *x* (i.e., the factors most contributing to racial and ethnic minorities' contact with the juvenile justice was the tendency for them to commit more violent crimes than White (non-Hispanic) juveniles). However, 72% of the remaining variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x* but did explain the variation in other variables (e.g., the factors most contributing to racial and ethnic minorities' contact with the juvenile justice was the tendency for them to commit more nonviolent crimes than White (non-Hispanic) juveniles). Partially testing the hypothesis, the *v* was 444 at an of $\alpha = .05$ and comparing the obtained value of .53 to .098, the researcher again rejected the H_0. While two of the Phi correlations for race and offense type were strong and moderate, the variations of in *y* attributed to the variations in *x* were 49% and 28%. As a result, 51% and 72% of the remaining variations in *y* did not explain the variations in *x* as other variables explained the variations.

Officer Pretest Survey Responses by Demographics

Officers' responses by race and ethnicity. As noted in Chapter 3, the researcher did not select a sampling method due to the low numbers of patrol officers of different racial and ethnic groups. Although the numbers were low, the researcher wanted to know if there were any practically significant differences from the selected Pretest question responses. The best method to demonstrate any differences was to run a frequency

distribution in SPSS, compare total percentages by race and gender and analyze the practically significant differences only. As shown in Appendix B, there were few differences in the officers' responses by race and ethnicity for juveniles' demeanor and gestures. For example, 82% (n = 9) of Other races[6] replied juvenile behaviors such as pacing, fidgeting, and mouthing off were signs of distress instead of guilt and disrespect followed by 75% of White (non-Hispanic) officers (n = 294) and Hispanic and Latino officers at 72% (n = 21). African American officers had the lowest percentage at 63% (n = 21). These percentages were similar to question 17 as officers responded allowing juveniles to vent in non-dangerous situations meant they should expect some disrespect, separate distressed juveniles from their peers, and give them time to think.

When asked what would make an interaction better or worse interacting with juveniles, more than 30% of officers responded telling juveniles they were doing their jobs while another 30% advising them to calm down would make the situation worse. Examining officers' responses regarding juveniles' gender, 50% of Other races, 46% of White (non-Hispanic) and 44% of African American officers replied boys escalate faster and become more aggressive compared to girls. Thirty-five percent (n = 10) of Hispanic or Latino officers answered boys were more likely to get into a physical fight compared to girls.

Another notable response showed most officers replied all races and ethnicities were most likely to have carried weapons equally within the last 30 days. White (non-Hispanic) officers had the highest percentage at 71% (n = 278) followed by Hispanic or Latinos at 62% (n = 18), Other races at 64% (n = 7), and African Americans at 60% (n = 21). These responses contradicted the current literature as it primarily concluded police

[6] The researcher combined Asian and Native American officers due to their low numbers.

perceived racial and ethnic minorities, especially African American males, as the symbolic assailant regardless of their offense type (Bell, 2017; Jones-Brown, 2007; Sealock & Simpson, 1998). Additionally, more than 30% of all races, except Others at 50% (n = 5), responded national research found racial and ethnic minority juveniles committed nonviolent and violent offenses more frequently compared to White (non-Hispanic) juveniles. They also thought policies and practices such as staffing, and patrol locations contributed to racial and ethnic minorities disproportionate contact with the juvenile justice system. Additionally, most responded officers in Connecticut did not transport White (non-Hispanic) and racial and ethnic minority juveniles to detention at similar rates regardless of offense type. Other races had the highest percentage at 78% (n = 5) followed by Hispanic or Latinos at 65% (n = 17), White (non-Hispanic) officers at 64% (n = 237), and African Americans at 60% (n = 21). Although there was a slight difference between White (non-Hispanic) and African American officers regarding how police perceived juveniles, generally, the difference between Hispanic or Latino officers was more significant. Overall, all races and ethnicities of officers responded to the selected Pretest Survey questions similarly.

Officers' responses by gender. Like the percentages for officers' race and ethnicity, there were only slightly practically significant differences by gender. For example, as shown in the second table in Appendix B, 71% of male (n = 284) and female officers (n = 62) responded all races of juveniles were most likely to have carried weapons equally in the past 30 days. There was only a small, but not a significant difference, for question 14 as 75% of male officers (n = 304) and 73% of female officers (n = 45) thought pacing, fidgeting, and mouthing off were signs of distress instead of

guilt and disrespect. The most notable difference was the responses for question 17 as 76% of male officers (n = 304) responded gently touching a juveniles' arm in non-dangerous situations was not the best option compared to 68% of females (n = 41). For question 6, 37% of male officers (n = 145) thought racial and ethnic minority juveniles tended to commit nonviolent and violent crimes more frequently per the national research compared to 41% of female officers (n = 24).

Summary

The researcher hypothesized the combination of variables most likely to correlate to police perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant, per Skolnick's (2011) construct, were their demeanor and gestures, gender, race and ethnicity, and offense type (i.e., nonviolent or violent). The researcher conducted the Phi correlation (r_ϕ) to determine if the combination of variables correlated to the patrol officers by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not. The researcher also calculated the Phi coefficient of determination (r^2) of the correlations to determine if the variation in *y* explained the variation in *x*. For juveniles' demeanor and gestures, there was a weak correlation ($r_\phi = .38$, $p < .05$) as police by their age thought fidgeting, pacing, and mouthing off were not signs of guilt which was the anticipated correct answer. The r^2 was 14% which meant the variation in *y* (i.e., patrol officers' perceptions by their age of juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not) explained the variation in *x* (i.e., juveniles' fidgeting, pacing, and mouthing off as signs of guilt). However, 86% of the remaining variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x.* In other words, the variation in *y* was explained by the variation in other variables (e.g., juveniles' fidgeting, pacing, and

mouthing off as signs of distress or disrespect).

A moderate correlation ($r_\phi = .50$, $p < .05$) showed the patrol officers by their age responded touching a juveniles' arms to show concern in non-dangerous situations when venting was not the best option which was the expected correct answer. The r^2 was 25%, which meant the variation in *y* explained the variation in *x*. However, 75% of the variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x* but explained the variation in other variables (e.g., expecting some disrespect from juveniles, separating them from their peers when distressed, or giving them time to think). Partially testing the H_0, the obtained values were higher than the critical values, so the researcher rejected it. For gender, there was also a moderate correlation ($r_\phi = .48$, $p < .05$) between the patrol officers by their age perceiving males as escalating faster once becoming more aggressive compared to females which was the incorrect answer. The r^2 was 23% as the variation in *y* explained the variation in *x*. Conversely, 77% of the variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x* but explained the variation in other variables (e.g., males hold a grudge, get into physical fights, or ostracize peers more likely than females). Partially testing the hypothesis, the obtained value was higher than the critical value, so the researcher rejected the H_0.

For race and offense type, there was a strong correlation ($r_\phi = .70$, $p > .05$) as the patrol officers by their age thought all races and ethnicities were most likely to have carried a weapon equally in the past 30 days which was the incorrect answer. The r^2 was 49%, so the variation in *y* explained the variation in *x*. Although the correlation was strong, there were several issues. First, the officers' responses contradicted the current symbolic assailant and related literature as the researchers suggested police perceived African Americans, particularly males, as the symbolic assailant, a symbolic threat, and

needing police control (Bell, 2017; Jones-Brown, 2007; Andersen, 2015; Sealock & Simpson, 1998). Secondly, the remaining 51% variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x* but did explain the variation in other variables (e.g., African Americans or African American and Latino and Hispanics were most likely to have carried weapons in the past 30 days). As a result, the strong correlation was misleading because it contradicted the current symbolic assailant and related literature and more than half of the variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x*.

Also, there was a weak relationship ($r_\phi = .39$, $p < .05$) as patrol officers thought the statement that police statewide transported racial and ethnic minorities and White (non-Hispanic) juveniles to detention equally was false which was the correct answer. The r^2 was 15%, so the variation in *y* did explain the variation in *x*. But, 85% of the remaining variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x,* but did explain the variation in other variables (e.g., disproportionality within the juvenile justice system for racial and ethnic minorities is a national problem, or evidence of disproportionality was evident in police, the courts, and corrections). Again, partially testing the H_0, the obtained values exceeded the critical values, so the researcher rejected it. Overall, the strength of the correlations for race and ethnicity and offense type varied between the predictor variables and the criterion variable. The highest correlation was between patrol officers by their age did not perceive racial and ethnic minorities, particularly African Americans, as most likely to have carried a weapon in the past 30 days which means, in this context, they were not symbolic assailants.

Although the degree of relationships between the predictor and criterion variables differed along with the variation in the criterion variable due to the variation in the

predictor variables, there were minor differences in the patrol officers' Pretest Survey responses demographically. For example, 65% of Hispanic or Latino (n = 17), 64% of White (non-Hispanic) (n = 237), and 60% of African American officers (n = 21) thought police did not transport juveniles by race to detention at similar rates regardless of offense type. When there was a notable difference in the responses, African Americans mostly had either higher or lower percentages compared to White (non-Hispanic) and Hispanic or Latino officers. For example, examining juveniles' demeanor and gestures, 75% of White (non-Hispanic) (n = 294) officers and 72% of Hispanic or Latino officers (n = 21) thought fidgeting, pacing, and mouthing off were signs of distress guilt and disrespect, whereas 60% of African Americans (n = 21) thought so.

Like race, there were only slight differences in the officers' Pretest Survey responses by gender. The most notable difference was 41% of female officers (n = 24) thought racial and ethnic minorities committed more nonviolent and violent crimes compared to White (non-Hispanic) juveniles according to national research which was higher than male officers at 37% (n = 145). While researcher discussed the Phi correlation and hypothesis testing results in this chapter, Chapter 5 summarized this dissertation study including providing an overview, elaborating on the statistical and practical results, linking the statistical and practical findings to the symbolic assailant and related literature, discussing the limitations and implications of the study's findings, and recommending future research.

Chapter 5: Summary

Jerome Skolnick introduced the symbolic assailant in his seminal book first published in 1966 and most recently in 2011. Skolnick (2011) posited the symbolic assailant was a person most likely to commit a violent crime due to their demeanor, gestures, language, style of dress in addition to race and ethnicity. Per Skolnick's (2011) observations, police attributed to these characteristics to people due to real and potential danger they frequently encountered. Ascribing these characteristics to certain people was not wrong due to their experiences as having some suspicion is part of a "healthy attitude" (Skolnick, 2011; 41; Bolton, 2011). However, problems arose when police attributed these characteristics disproportionately to specific groups such as juveniles. Skolnick (2011) said police easily identified juveniles because they generally wore leather jackets, boots, blue jeans, had motorcycles, and paced in specific areas.

Literature published before and soon after Skolnick (2011), found police were more likely to arrest juveniles due to their demeanor and whether they showed respect in addition to race (Black & Reiss, 1970; Werthman et al. 1967; Haller, 1976; Black, 1980; Baumgartner, 1988). Regarding gender, the earlier researchers found police treated female juveniles more paternalistically and less as the symbolic assailant (Chesney-Lind, 1977; Visher, 1983). Conversely, current literature suggested juveniles' race and ethnicity were the most salient variables and suggested the symbolic assailant, in part, was the foundation for related theories such as racial profiling (Bell, 2017; Jones-Brown, 2013; Paulhamus et al., 2013). Thus, the researcher summarized the dissertation study providing an overview, linking the statistical and practical findings to the symbolic assailant and related literature and elaborating on the results, discussing the limitations

and implication of the study's findings, and making recommendations for future research.

Dissertation Study Overview

The researcher discussed the background such as the study's relevance and significance, previous attempts to address the research problem, anticipated contributions to the field of study, the feasibility statement, and the problem statement. The researcher also included the study's goal, barriers and issues, and definitions and terms (e.g., DMC, Justice by Geography, and the Relative (Rate) Index). This dissertation study was relevant because the researcher examined how police perceptions negatively impacted juveniles more compared to adults. Juveniles believed police stopped, questioned, and arrested them because of their demeanor, gestures, style of dress, previous contact, and their race and ethnicity. Racial and ethnic minorities juveniles believed police labeled them especially if they had frequent contact with them in socioeconomically depressed communities. For example, Liberman et at. (2014) found initial juvenile arrests led to a higher likelihood of reoffending thereby increasing juveniles' perceptions police labeled them.

This study was also significant due to adolescent brain development research which showed this period of juveniles' lives as a time for rapid growth and change. Juveniles tend to act impulsively, have difficulty with long-term planning, adapting to social environments, and foreseeing the consequences of their behaviors (Bonnie et al., 2013; Steinberg, 2004; Weinberger, Elvevåg, & Giedd, 2005; Steinberg, 2004; Dahl & Lewin, 2002). Adolescent brain development was relevant to this study because if juveniles acted impulsively, police might have perceived them as suspicious or guilty of

committing an offense and stop them, and in so doing, increase the likelihood of negative interactions and formal actions such as an arrest or referral to court. Although this dissertation study was relevant and significant, there have been few attempts to address the problem of police perceptions of juveniles. Most researchers studied how juveniles perceived and responded to police, mainly African American and Hispanic or Latinos in urban areas. The research also focused on juveniles' perceptions of police via procedural justice and legitimacy and in different institutional (e.g., detention and correctional facilities) and community contexts (e.g., communities and social bonds). Other studies addressed the role of interracial police encounters, and perceptions of police by their gender (Feinstein, 2015; Gau & Brunson, 2010; Weitzer & Brunson, 2009; Rengifo & McCallin, 2017; Feinstein, 2015; Payne, Hitchens, & Chambers, 2017).

Worden (1999) and Bazemore and Senjo (1997) are two of the few studies focusing on how police applied the symbolic assailant disproportionately to African Americans in racially biased police stops, in community policing, and how they treated juveniles differently compared to adults. Bell's (2017) study is one of the few recent studies that addressed the evolution of the symbolic assailant suggesting police apply the characteristics differently by race and gender. Liederbach (2007) is also one of few recent studies that concentrated on street-level encounters with juveniles in suburban and rural areas. Sanderson et al. (2008) more recently evaluated Connecticut's Effective Police with Interactions with Youth training which proposed to decrease the likelihood of police contact that could lead to a referral to court, particularly for racial and ethnic minorities.

Since few studies addressed this issue and the image of juvenile stereotypes perpetually change, this dissertation study can contribute to the research on police

perceptions of juveniles as the symbolic assailant due to existing significant gaps. Liederbach (2007) confirmed the gaps in the research saying, in part, "Despite the importance of cops within the juvenile justice system, research concerning police and their interactions...has often been relegated to the periphery of juvenile justice scholarship" (107). This dissertation study was also feasible due to the availability of data from the Effective Police with Interactions Pretest Survey and referrals to court data nationwide and in Connecticut. Although collected in 2007 the Pretest Survey data demonstrated the degree to which police perceived juveniles, in part, similar to the symbolic assailant per their demeanor and gestures, gender, race and ethnicity, and offense type (i.e., nonviolent and violent). Because the study is relevant, significant, and feasible, the researcher presented the problem statement with Skolnick's (2011) inclusion of Adams' (1963) criteria for police field interrogations because they were partially the basis for the symbolic assailant as a construct.

The researcher then discussed the extent of juveniles' referrals to court nationally and in Connecticut by race and ethnicity, gender, and offense type. For example, as shown in Table 1, racial and ethnic minority juveniles comprised 56% of all referrals to court (n = 552,600) in 2014. African Americans had the highest percentage at 36% (n = 350,100) followed by Hispanic or Latino juveniles at 18% (n = 175,900). Because African Americans comprised 36% of all referrals to court, they were referred to court six times compared to White (non-Hispanic) juveniles (Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2017). Differences was also prevalent by gender as males comprised most of the delinquent referrals to court at 72% (n = 705,100) compared to females at 28% (n = 269,900). Thus, police referred African American juveniles to court three times compared to White (non-

Hispanic) males. While female juveniles comprised only 28% of all referrals to court, racial and ethnic minority females represented 53% (n = 269,800), compared to White (non-Hispanic) females (n = 122,900) at 46%. Similar to African American males, the relative rate for African American female juveniles was three times compared to White (non-Hispanic) female juveniles. These trends continued for offense type as male juveniles comprised 83% (n = 47,700) of all referrals to court for violent offenses such as robbery and aggravated assault. Male juveniles also comprised most of the referrals for nonviolent offenses such as disorderly conduct and vandalism. Once more, racial and ethnic minorities represented 73% (n = 34,300) with African Americans comprising the largest percentage at 72% (n = 25,100) followed by Latino or Hispanic juveniles at 24% (n = 8,200). Though African American males had the highest percentage followed by Hispanic or Latinos, the effect size for Native American or Alaska Natives was higher because they comprised less than 2% of all juveniles (N = 580,900) (Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2017).

In Connecticut, racial and ethnic minority juveniles represented 63% (n =6,219) of all referrals to court in 2015. African Americans had the highest percentage at 35% (n = 3,491) followed by Hispanic or Latino juveniles at 27% (n = 2,660). The percentage of White (non-Hispanic) juveniles was 37% (n = 3,609) which was comparable to African Americans. However, African Americans were overrepresented at referrals to court because they only comprised 12% of the total youth population (N = 45,533). Hence, police referred racial and ethnic minorities to court 2.8 times compared to White (non-Hispanic) juveniles (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2017; Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2017). As shown in Table 3, to achieve statistical parity

(i.e., no disproportionality) police would refer 3,900 fewer racial and ethnic minority juveniles to court. When comparing state and national relative rates, police referred racial and ethnic minorities to court 2.8 times (n = 6,219) in Connecticut which is almost twice the national rate at 1.6 (n = 552,600) (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2017; Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2017). Like national data, male juveniles in Connecticut represented 71% of the delinquency referrals to court (n = 7,048) compared to females at 29% (n = 2,880). Males also comprised most violent offenses such as possession of a weapon on school grounds and robbery. Also similar to national data, female juveniles comprised most nonviolent offenses such as shoplifting and disorderly conduct (Connecticut Office of Policy Management, 2017).

Discussing the extent of juveniles' referrals to court nationally and in Connecticut, showed juveniles' extensive contact with police emphasizing the dissertation study's goal, which was to determine what combination of variables correlated to police perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not. Although the national and state data provided context for this study's goal, the primary barrier was most symbolic assailant and related research did not focus on police officers' street-level contact with juveniles. Therefore, it was difficult to determine how police interacted and perceived juveniles when they stopped them and if these interactions led to formal action such as a referral to court. Also stated previously, another barrier was the age of the Pretest Survey data as officers' attitudes could have changed since 2007. The researcher made a case for analyzing the Pretest Survey data because they are only known source that gauged how police perceived juveniles even though their perceptions did not occur in real-time.

To test which combination of factors most likely to correlate with police perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant, the researcher conducted a nonexperimental predictive correlational research design and the Phi correlation (r_ϕ) to test patrol officers' Pretest Survey responses by their age. The researcher selected the Phi correlation because the criterion (i.e., police by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not) and the predictor variables (e.g., male or female, demeanor and gesture or not, and nonviolent and violent offenses or not) were naturally dichotomous. Because the variables were dichotomous, the researcher anticipated the patrol officers would select correct answers to the selected Survey questions. The researcher discussed the design procedures such as stating the research question, the null hypothesis (H_0), selecting the level of significance ($\alpha = .05$), and collecting and analyzing the data. The researcher also calculated the Phi coefficient of determination (r^2) to determine if the variation in *y* (i.e., police by their age perceived juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not) explained the variation in *x* (i.e., demeanor and gestures or not, racial and ethnic minorities or White non-Hispanic juveniles, male or female, and nonviolent or violent). Finally, the researcher selected the Huck's (2012) criteria for hypothesis testing by comparing the obtained values to the calculated values of the correlation critical values table and accepting or rejecting the H_0.

Findings Linked to the Symbolic Assailant and Related Literature

Police by their age perceived juveniles' fidgeting, pacing, and mouthing off as signs of guilt yielded a weak correlation ($r_\phi = .38$, $p > .05$) demonstrating a slight relationship. The r^2 of .38 was 0.144, meaning 14% of the variation in *y* explained the

variation in *x.* So, 86% of the variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x.* However, other variables explained the variation (e.g., juveniles' fidgeting, pacing, and mouthing off were signs of distress or disrespect). Because the correlation was weak and 86% of the variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x*, the officers responses somewhat differed from the early symbolic assailant literature as fidgeting, mouthing off, pacing, and venting were signs of guilt and lack of deference for police (Black & Reiss, 1970; Werthman et al., 1967; Haller, 1976; Black, 1980; Baumgartner, 1988). Although 86% of the variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x*, the researcher rejected the H_0 because .38 was higher than the critical value of .098.

Police perceptions of juveniles by gender resulted in a moderate correlation (r_ϕ = .48, $p > .05$) also indicating a slight relationship. The patrol officers by their age thought males escalated faster once becoming aggressive compared to females which was not the expected answer. The r^2 was 0.23, meaning 23% of the variation in *y* (i.e., police officers by their age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant or not) explained the variation in *x* (i.e., males escalated faster once becoming aggressive compared to females). However, 77% of the variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x,* but other variables explained the variation (e.g., males physically fought or ostracized their peers). The patrol officer's responses regarding juveniles' gender also slightly supported the earlier and current literature. For instance, males were more likely to commit violent offenses compared to females and were more likely to escalate faster once becoming aggressive (Chesney-Lind, 1977; Visher, 1983; Yoder et al., 2005). While 77% of the variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x*, the researcher rejected the H_0 because .48 was higher than the critical value of .098.

Although the correlation to police officers by age perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant by race and offense type resulted in strong, moderate, and weak correlations, as discussed in Chapter 4, the strong correlation contradicted the current symbolic assailant and related literature. For example, the correlation was strong ($r_\phi = .70$, $p < .05$) between the patrol officers by their age not perceiving racial and ethnic minorities as the symbolic assailant because they responded all races were most likely to have carried weapons in the past 30 days. As stated throughout this study, the current symbolic assailant and related literature found police perceived African Americans, particularly males, as dangerous and violent even if they were not acting suspiciously. Further, if police stopped African American males, they were less likely to conduct standard investigations, more likely to think they symbolized a threat, and categorized them as offenders due to current and previous contacts and their real or perceived low SES. These perceptions persisted despite structural transformations of communities and increasing the likelihood of negative encounters and interactions (Bell, 2017; Andersen, 2015; Sealock & Simpson, 1998; Jones-Brown, 2007; Thurau, 2009). Again, though the correlation was strong, the r^2 was .049, which meant 49% of the variation in *y* explained the variation in *x*, however, the remaining 51% variation in *y* did not explain the variation in *x*. Other variables explained the variation such as African Americans, Hispanic or Latinos, or African American and Hispanic or Latino juveniles were most likely to have carried a weapon in the past 30 days. Like juveniles' demeanor and gestures and gender, the researcher rejected the H_0 because .70 was higher than the critical value of .098.

Because race and ethnicity in how police perceived juveniles is a complex issue, and the officers' responses differed from the current symbolic assailant and related

literature, the researcher posited their responses were due to social desirability bias (i.e., responses do not reflect true feelings or beliefs) (Grimm, 2010; Lalwani, Shrum & Chiu, 2009). If so, the officers may have perceived juveniles overall, and especially racial and ethnic minorities, more as the symbolic assailant than their responses suggested. To demonstrate, Grimm (2010) stated in part, "The bias in responses…becomes a major issue when the scope of the study involves socially sensitive issues such as politics, religion, and environment…" (228).

Beyond determining the r_{ϕ}, calculating the r^2, and rejecting the H_0, the descriptive statistics showed practical significance. For example, 75% of the patrol officers (n = 349) thought juveniles fidgeting, pacing, and mouthing off were signs of distress instead of guilt and disrespect. Ninety-five percent (n = 298) said telling juveniles they were doing their jobs and to calm down were more likely to make an interaction worse than better. Almost half the officers thought males became aggressive faster than females 46% (n = 213), while nearly the other half thought males were more likely to fight 44% (n = 204). The officers' responses regarding juveniles' race and ethnicity also showed practical significance because they differed significantly from the current symbolic assailant and related literature. For instance, 71% (n = 328) answered all races and ethnicities most likely carried weapons equally in the past 30 days.

Moreover, the patrol officers mostly thought national research found racial and ethnic minority juveniles tended to commit more nonviolent and violent crimes compared to White (non-Hispanic) juveniles and police practices such as staffing levels and patrol locations contributed to disproportionate contact with the juvenile justice system. Staffing levels and patrol locations supported Liederbach (2007) and Feld's (2014) findings as

geographical location intersected with race impacting how police interacted with juveniles often leading to arrests and interrogations. Though the officers' responses were similar by race and ethnicity and gender, these descriptive statistics showed practical significance because the patrol officers thought male juveniles were more likely to engage in aggressive and violent behavior compared to females which could affect how they perceived and interacted with them.

Limitations

Though there were practical significance and policy implications, there were also limitations such as a threat to internal validity like maturation. Maturation occurs due to "the natural of changing, growing, and learning over time" (Edmonds and Kennedy, 2013; 5). For instance, Sanderson et al., (2008) administered the Pretest Survey again within three and five months but did not do so after 2007. Therefore, the patrol officers' perceptions of juveniles could have changed over time due to various factors (e.g., more or less training or attitudinal shifts). History was also a threat to internal validity as it occurs when events during the treatment and posttest possibly influence the outcome such as officers changing jobs (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2013). Also discussed as a barrier, the Pretest Survey was limited because no further research showed if police's encounters and interactions with juveniles resulted in arrests or referrals to court. The Survey also did not include scenarios like the vignette exercise from the curriculum training. Even though the vignette exercise did not occur in real-time, officers perceived juveniles differently due to their demeanor, gestures, and in different community contexts which could have demonstrated how they interact with juveniles while on patrol. Sanderson et al., (2008)

should have included the photos in the Pretest Survey and asked the patrol officers to react and compare the responses to officers who participated in the training's vignette exercise. Additionally, Sanderson et al. (2008) did not develop the Survey to address the symbolic assailant although many of the questions were comparable to the characteristics. Therefore, it may have been challenging for the patrol officers to identify exact behaviors that indicated juveniles would commit nonviolent or violent offenses which could have reinforced the symbolic assailant construct.

Another limitation was the homogeneity of the patrol officers by race and ethnicity and gender. Because 84% of the patrol officers were White (non-Hispanic) (n = 393) and 87% were male (n = 407), the responses might have differed compared to other jurisdictions with more diverse police. However, one noted difference was 61% (n = 21) of African American and 62% (n =18) of Hispanic or Latino officers thought all races and ethnicities of juveniles were most likely to have carried weapons in the past 30 days compared to 71% (n = 278) of White (non-Hispanic) officers. Again, social desirability bias could have been more of a factor for White (non-Hispanic) officers as they did not want to appear to have explicit biases against racial and ethnic minority juveniles.

Recommendations for Future Research

Although the symbolic assailant and related literature provided wide-ranging findings on the extent of police suspicion and their encounters and interactions with juveniles, there are recommendations for further research. First, researchers should examine how police apply suspicion to other racial and ethnic groups such as Hispanic or Latino juveniles. Vera Sanchez and Rosenbaum (2011) examined how police perceived

Hispanic or Latino communities, however, they compared them to African American communities instead of solely focusing on Hispanic or Latino communities. In some jurisdictions, formal actions (i.e., arrests, interrogations, and referrals to court) are probably just as prevalent for Hispanic or Latino juveniles, particularly males, as it is for African Americans. For instance, in this study, the researcher demonstrated Hispanic or Latino juveniles' disproportionate contact with police nationally and in Connecticut. Relatedly, the research on police perceptions of female juveniles as the symbolic assailant was sparse and primarily examined minor offenses. Researchers should study if police perceptions of female juveniles per Yoder et al. (2005) and Sealock and Simpson's (1998) findings changed or remained the same.

Another recommendation for further research is to determine if geographic location is a predictor of whether police applied the symbolic assailant to juveniles. Skolnick (2011), Bell (2017), and Jones-Brown (2007) briefly discussed how police applied suspicion to people who look "out of place" in specific communities while Andersen (2015) emphasized the relative size of African American juveniles in the community affected if police perceived them as a symbolic threat. Similarly, Liederbach (2007) and Feld (2014) focused on how geography contributed to police perceptions of juveniles in rural, suburban, and urban communities. Feld's (2014; 2010) research would expand the symbolic assailant literature due to the granular focus on where police have contact with juveniles (e.g., urban, rural, suburban). Since a third of the Connecticut patrol officers thought policies and practices, staffing, and patrol patterns contributed to racial and ethnic minorities disproportionate contact, including justice by geography as a predictor variable could show if there is a relationship to the symbolic assailant.

The final recommendation is to administer the Pretest Survey again to patrol officers in Connecticut to compare the responses from 2007. Even though the research on police perceptions of juveniles overall and as the symbolic assailant is still limited, expanded research on adolescent brain development and how police perceive and interact with juveniles, may show differences in the responses. Because the Pretest Survey contained questions about adolescent brain development at a time when the research was emerging, re-administering the Pretest Survey might show any attitudinal changes. As discussed throughout this study, because Sanderson et al. (2008) did not develop the Pretest Survey to address the symbolic assailant specifically, the patrol officers responses suggested they might have had difficulty identifying specific behaviors that fit the construct. Future research could build upon the Pretest Survey and design an instrument that includes demeanors and gestures such as fidgeting, pacing, and mouthing off, and how police use suspicion to identify whom they think will most likely commit crimes. To underscore the role of suspicion Skolnick (2011) said: "The police are indeed specifically trained to be suspicious, to perceive events or changes in the physical surroundings that indicate the occurrence or probability of disorder" (44).

Also, the researcher anticipated the Phi correlation results would expand Sealock and Simpson's (1998) juvenile offender type script where SES and race and ethnicity intersected resulting in police perceiving juveniles as the symbolic assailant. However, the combination of predictor variables did not include SES even though there was a related question on the Pretest Survey. The researcher decided not to include the question because it did not contain the juvenile's race and ethnicity or gender. The question only asked if officers should speak with a juvenile's mother because she probably has the

primary child-rearing responsibility. Additional research should also include SES as a predictor variable to also determine if there is a relationship to the symbolic assailant and, if so, to what extent. If studied, these recommendations would not only contribute to the symbolic assailant and related literature but also to the overall study of police encounters and interactions with juveniles.

While the research is limited, the literature did discuss current training for police such as Connecticut's Effective Police Interactions and other interventions such as the Youth and Baltimore Outward Bound Police Insight Program. In the Baltimore Outward Bound Police Insight Program, officers and youth participated in various group activities with the goal of improving the quality of encounters and interactions (Broaddus Scott, Gonsalves, Parrish, Rhodes, Donovan, & Winch, 2013). Nebraska's De-Escalating Juvenile Aggression Training Program curriculum's goal was to teach selected police officers how youth adolescent development can contribute to juveniles' aggressive behavior, appropriate methods to handle them, and verbal skills needed to de-escalate aggressive behaviors (Herz, 2001). Further, the Chicago Police Department's Crisis Intervention Team for Youth (CIT-Y) Training teaches police officers how to respond to youths with mental, emotional, or behavioral disorders and use de-escalation techniques to reduce trauma for them, their families, and the officers (Skorek & Westley 2016). Researchers emphasized the need for more study of police and youth interactions saying, "Despite the importance and prevalence of such interactions, limited research has been dedicated to understanding the dynamics of encounters between police and youth" (Development Services Group, 2018; 1; Thurau, 2009). Thus, the researcher also recommends more study and implementation of these and other training programs to

assist officers with improving their encounters and interactions, including how to appropriately respond to juveniles when they are exhibiting distress or other behaviors.

References

Adams, T. F. (1963). Field interrogation. *Police*, 7, 26-29.

Alpert, G. P., Dunham, R. G., & Smith, M. R. (2007). Investigating racial profiling by the Miami-Dade Police Department: A multimethod approach. *Criminology & Public Policy*, *6*(1), 25-55.

Andersen, T. S. (2015). Race, ethnicity, and structural variations in youth risk of arrest: evidence from a national longitudinal sample. *Criminal justice and behavior*, *42*(9), 900-916.

Bazemore, G., & Senjo, S. (1997). Police encounters with juveniles revisited: An exploratory study of themes and styles in community policing", Policing: An International Journal of *Police Strategies & Management*, *20*(1), 60-82.

Bell, J. (2017). The Symbolic assailant revisited. Mauer School of Law. Indiana Legal Studies Research Paper Number 371. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2955845

Bolton, M. J. (2011). Premature Exuberance: Police, Profiling, and African Americans in a Postracial Society. *Public Administration Review*, 71(5), 791-795.

Bonnie, R. J., Johnson, R. L., Chemers, B. M., & Schuck, J. (Eds.). (2013). Reforming juvenile justice: A developmental approach. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Broaddus, Elena T., Kerry E. Scott, Lianne M. Gonsalves, Canada Parrish, Evelyn L. Rhodes, Samuel E. Donovan, and Peter J. Winch. 2013. “Building Connections Between Officers and Baltimore City Youth: Key Components of a Police-Youth Teambuilding Program.” *OJJDP Journal of Juvenile Justice* 3(1):48–62.

Brown, R. A., Novak, K. J., & Frank, J. (2009). Identifying variation in police officer behavior between juveniles and adults. *Journal of criminal justice*, *37*(2), 200-208.

Brunson, R. K., & Weitzer, R. (2011). Negotiating unwelcome police encounters: The

intergenerational transmission of conduct norms. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *40*(4), 425-456.

Connecticut Office of Policy and Management. (2017). Facts and Figures on Connecticut's Juvenile Justice System. Retrieved from http://www.ct.gov/opm/cwp/view.asp?a=2974&Q=471654

Connecticut Public Television (Producer). (2013). The Color of Justice. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ArPuTG_X4dg

Dahl, R. E., & Lewin, D. S. (2002). Pathways to adolescent health sleep regulation and behavior. Journal of adolescent health, 31(6), 175-184.

Denney, A. S., & Tewksbury, R. (2013). How to write a literature review. *Journal of criminal justice education*, *24*(2), 218-234.

Development Services Group, Inc. (2018). "Interactions between Youth and Law Enforcement." Literature review. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Retrieved from https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Interactions-Youth-Law-Enforcement.pdf

Edmonds, W. A., & Kennedy, T. D. (2013). *An Applied Guide to Research Designs: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Feld, B. C. (1991). Justice by geography: Urban, suburban, and rural variations in juvenile justice administration. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 156-210.

Feld, B. C. (2007). Unmitigated punishment: adolescent criminal responsibility and LWOP sentences. *JL & Fam. Stud.*, *10*, 11.

Feld, B. C., & Schaefer, S. (2010). The right to counsel in juvenile court: Law reform to deliver legal services and reduce justice by geography. Criminology & public policy, 9(2), 327-356.

Feld, B. C. (2013). *Kids, cops, and confessions: Inside the interrogation room*. New York, NY: NYU Press.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Feinstein, R. (2015). A qualitative analysis of police interactions and disproportionate minority contact. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, *13*(2), 159-178.

Feyerherm, W., Snyder, H., & Villarruel, F. (2009). Identification. Retrieved from https://www.ojjdp.gov/compliance/dmc_ta_manual.pdf

Formula Grants Consolidated Regulation, 28 CFR Part 31. (1996). Retrieved from https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=f50e08250abd483914ff0d99d050bfd4&mc=true&node=sp28.1.31.a&rgn=div6

Flexon, J. L., Greenleaf, R. G., Dariano, D. S., & Gibson, D. (2016). An examination of police stops and youths' attitudes toward police: Do interracial encounters matter? *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, *14*(1), 21-39.

Gau, J. M., & Brunson, R. K. (2010). Procedural justice and order maintenance policing: A study of inner-city young men's perceptions of police legitimacy. *Justice Quarterly*, *27*(2), 255-279.

Grimm, P. (2010). Social desirability bias. In Jagdish N. Sheth (Ed.) and Naresh Malhotra (Ed.), *Wiley international encyclopedia of marketing volume 1*. DOI: 10.1002/9781444316568

Gudjonsson, G. H. (2003). *The psychology of interrogations and confessions: A handbook*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Huck, S. W. (2012). *Reading statistics and research*, *6th edition*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Jaggers, J., Young, S., & Church, W. T. (2014). Police work with juveniles. In W.T.

Church, T.D. Springer, & A.R. Roberts (Eds.), *Juvenile Justice Sourcebook, Second Edition* (pp. 149-164). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, Pub. L. No. 93-415 (1974)

Krisberg, B., Litsky, P., & Schwartz, I. (1984). Youth in confinement: Justice by geography. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *21*(2), 153-181.

LaMotte, V., Ouellette, K., Sanderson, J., Anderson, S. A., Kosutic, I., Griggs, J., & Garcia, M. (2010). Effective police interactions with youth: A program evaluation. *Police Quarterly*.

Lalwani, A. K., Shrum, L. J., & Chiu, C. Y. (2009). Motivated response styles: the role of cultural values, regulatory focus, and self-consciousness in socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(4), 870.

Leiber, M., Richetelli, D., & Feyerherm, W. (2009). Assessment. Disproportionate minority contact technical assistance manual. Retrieved from https://www.ojjdp.gov/compliance/dmc_ta_manual.pdf

Liederbach, J. (2007). Controlling suburban and small-town hoods: An examination of police encounters with juveniles. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *5*(2), 107-124.

Liberman, A. M., Kirk, D. S., & Kim, K. (2014). Labeling effects of first juvenile arrests: Secondary deviance and secondary sanctioning. *Criminology*, *52*(3), 345-370.

Lundman, R. J., Sykes, R. E., & Clark, J. P. (1978). Police control of juveniles: A replication. *Journal of Research in Crime and delinquency*, *15*(1), 74-91.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2017). Disproportionate Minority Contact Web-Based Data Entry System. Retrieved from https://www.ojjdp.gov/dmcrri/login.aspx?ReturnUrl=%2fdmcrri%2f

Payne, Y.A., Hitchens, B.K., Chambers, D.L. (2017). “Why I Can't Stand Out in Front of My House?”: Street-Identified Black Youth and Young Adult's Negative Encounters With Police. DOI: 10.1111/socf.12380.

Paulhamus, M., Kane, R. J., & Piquero, A. R. (2013). State of the science in racial profiling research. Race, Ethnicity, and Policing: New and Essential Readings, 239-258. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Piliavin, I., & Briar, S. (1964). Police encounters with juveniles. American journal of sociology, 70(2), 206-214.

Puzzanchera, C., & Hockenberry, S. (2016). National disproportionate minority contact databook. Retrieved from https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/dmcdb/index.html

Puzzanchera, C., & Hockenberry, S. (2017). National disproportionate minority contact databook. Retrieved from https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/dmcdb/index.html

Rengifo, A. F., & McCallin, M. (2017). "You do not Get Respect if You Give No Respect": How Black and Latino Youth Make Sense of Encounters with Police. *Sociological Focus*, 50(1), 66-80.

Rodriguez, N. (2013). Concentrated Disadvantage and the Incarceration of Youth Examining How Context Affects Juvenile Justice. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *50*(2), 189-215.

Ryberg, J. (2011). Racial profiling and criminal justice. *The Journal of Ethics*, *15*(1-2), 79-88.

Salkind, N. J. (2014). *Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics 5th edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sanderson, J., Kosutic, I., Griggs, J., and Anderson, S. (2008). *Effective Police Interactions with Youth: Training Evaluation*. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut.

Sealock, M. D., & Simpson, S. S. (1998). Unraveling bias in arrest decisions: The role of juvenile offender type-scripts. *Justice Quarterly*, 15(3), 427-457.

Shook, J. J., & Goodkind, S. A. (2009). Racial disproportionality in juvenile justice: The interaction of race and geography in pretrial detention for violent and serious offenses. *Race and social problems*, 1(4), 257-266.

Skolnick, J. H. (2011). Justice without trial: Law enforcement in democratic society. New Orleans, LA: Quid pro books.

Skorek, Rebecca R., and Christine Devitt Westley. 2016. *Evaluation of Chicago Police Department's Crisis Intervention Team for Youth (CIT-Y) Training Curriculum: Year 2*. Chicago, Ill.: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Steinberg, L. (2004). Risk taking in adolescence: what changes, and why? *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1021*(1), 51-58.

Stewart, D. M., Morris, R. G., & Weir, H. (2014). Youth perceptions of the police: Identifying trajectories. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *12*(1), 22-39.

Tapia, M. (2010). Untangling race and class effects on juvenile arrests. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *38*(3), 255-265.

Donnelly, J., & Trochim, W. (2007). The research methods knowledge base. Mason, OH: Atomic Dog Publishing.

Trochim, W., Donnelly, J. P., & Arora, K. (2015). *Research methods: The essential knowledge base*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Thurau, L. H. (2009). Rethinking how we police youth: Incorporating knowledge of adolescence into policing teens. *Child. Legal Rts. J.*, *29*, 30.

United States Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2017). Disproportionate Minority Contact Web-Based Data Entry System. Retrieved from https://www.ojjdp.gov/dmcrri/login.aspx?ReturnUrl=%2fdmcrri%2f

Vera Sanchez, C. G., & Rosenbaum, D. P. (2011). Racialized policing: Officers' voices on policing Latino and African American neighborhoods. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, *9*(2), 152-178.

Walker, S., Spohn, C., & DeLone, M. (2012). *The color of justice: Race, ethnicity, and crime in America*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Weinberger, D. R., Elvevåg, B., & Giedd, J. N. (2005). The adolescent brain. *Washington, DC: National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy*.

Welch, K. (2007). Black criminal stereotypes and racial profiling. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *23*(3), 276-288.

Werthman, C., Piliavin, I., & Bordua, D. J. (1967). The police: Six sociological essays.

Wilkins, V. M., & Williams, B. N. (2009). Representing blue: Representative bureaucracy and racial profiling in the Latino community. *Administration & Society*, *40*(8), 775-798.

Wu, Y., Lake, R., & Cao, L. (2015). Race, social bonds, and juvenile attitudes toward the police. *Justice Quarterly*, *32*(3), 445-470.

Yoder, K. A., Muñoz, E. A., Whitbeck, L. B., Hoyt, D. R., & McMorris, B. J. (2005). Arrests among homeless and runaway youths: The effects of race and gender. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 28(1), 35-58.

Appendix A

Effective Police Interactions with Youth Pretest Survey

Name: _____

Department: _____

Gender: _____Male _____ Female

Age: _____

Race/Ethnicity (check one): _____ Black, non-Hispanic _____ Hispanic
_____ White, non-Hispanic _____ Asian
_____ Native American _____ Other

Years of Police Experience:

Fewer than 2 years	_____	10 – 20 years	_____
2 – 5 years	_____	More than 20 years	_____
5 – 10 years	_____		

Years of Experience as a Youth Officer or a School Resource Officer:

No experience	_____	1-2 years	_____
0-6 months	_____	2-3 years	_____
6 months – 1 year	_____	More than 3 years	_____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read the questions below. Circle **ONE** response choice for each question.

1. It may be difficult to tell the age of an adolescent by looking at him or her. A good strategy for police to use when approaching youth is to:

   a. Start by asking them their age.
   b. Go by their size and height.
   c. Assume that they are younger than they appear.
   d. Assume that they are older than they appear.

2. What part of your communication has the greatest effect on what youth actually hear when you interact with them?

   a. The words you say.
   b. Body language (facial expression, posture, eye contact, gestures).
   c. Tone of voice (tone, pace, pitch, volume).

d. They are all equally important.

3. Which group of youth is **most** likely to play on a sports team?

   a. Black youth.
   b. Hispanic youth.
   c. White youth.
   d. Black and Hispanic youth.
   e. They all play on sports teams about equally.

4. Which group of youth is the **most** likely to have carried a weapon in the past 30 days?

   a. Black youth.
   b. Hispanic youth.
   c. White youth.
   d. Black and Hispanic youth.
   e. They all carried weapons about equally.

5. There are many differences in the way adults and adolescents think and react. Which of the following statements is **false**?

   a. Adolescents are better able than adults to weigh consequences.
   b. Adolescents are more likely than adults to interpret facial expressions as angry.
   c. Adults are less likely to be influenced by peers when making decisions.
   d. Adolescents are more likely than adults to revert to childish behavior when distressed.

6. According to national research, which of the following factors contributes to more juvenile justice system contact for minority youth:

   a. The tendency of minority youth to commit crimes more frequently than white youth.
   b. The tendency of minority youth to commit more violent crimes than white youth.
   c. Police policies and practices such as staffing levels and patrol locations.
   d. A and B.
   e. All of the above.

7. Which of the following statements is likely to make the situation **worse** rather than better when dealing with youth?

   a. “I’m just doing my job.”
   b. “You need to calm down.”
   c. “I know you don’t want to hear this, but…”
   d. “I need to see your hands, so I know you don’t have a weapon.”

8. Which of the following effects of drinking alcohol is greater for adolescents than for adults?

    a. Motor skill impairment.
    b. Intoxication.
    c. Learning and memory impairment.
    d. Sedation.
    e. All of the above.

Please turn the page.

9. Which of the following statements is true of adolescent decision-making?

    a. Adolescents take longer than adults to make decisions in stressful situations.
    b. Adolescents tend to focus on long-term payoffs when making decisions.
    c. Adolescents process information faster than adults in dangerous situations.
    d. Emotions have less impact on adolescent than on adult decision-making.

10. Boys are more likely than girls to do which of the following?

    a. Escalate faster, once becoming aggressive.
    b. Hold a grudge.
    c. Get into a physical fight.
    d. Ostracize peers.

11. Which of the following statements about youth culture is **false**?

    a. Youth culture provides adolescents with a sense of physical and emotional safety.
    b. Youth culture provides youth with a creative outlet but serves no developmental purpose.
    c. Youth culture is a coping mechanism that helps youth handle the stresses of growing up.

12. R.R.I. stands for which of the following?

    a. Racial Response Information.
    b. Relative Rate Index.
    c. Release Report Investigation.
    d. I have never heard of this acronym.

13. Which of the following statements is **not** a benefit of improved police/youth relations?

    a. More investigative information from youth.
    b. Better youth attitudes toward police.
    c. More system involvement for youth.
    d. Increased community support for police departments.

14. Adolescent behaviors such as pacing, fidgeting, and mouthing off are generally signs of:

    a. Guilt.
    b. Distress.
    c. Disrespect.

15. Which of the following statements about disproportionate minority contact with the juvenile justice system (DMC) is **false**:

    a. DMC is a national problem.
    b. Evidence of DMC has been found in police, court, and corrections components of the system.
    c. In Connecticut, police officers transported minority and white juveniles to detention at similar rates regardless of the type of offense.

Please turn the page.

16. When communicating with family members, officers should speak to the youth's mother first since she probably has primary child-rearing responsibility.

    True or False

17. Letting youth "vent" in non-dangerous situations involves all of the following **except**:

    a. Expecting some disrespect.
    b. Gently touching the youth's arm to show you are concerned.
    c. Separating distressed youth from peers.
    d. Giving youth time to think.

18. All of the following are typical of adolescents **except**:

    a. They have less ability to calm themselves down.
    b. They may act based upon impulse with little or no advance planning.
    c. They tend to believe that bad things "can't happen to me."
    d. They need less sleep than younger children and adults.

19. Youth surveys have identified many youth suggestions for how officers can improve police/youth relations. Which of the following is **not** one of those suggestions?

    a. Fund more D.A.R.E. programs.
    b. Be more approachable and get out into the community more.
    c. Tell youth why you are arresting them and what will happen next.
    d. Explain to youth who witness an arrest why you are arresting the person.

Please turn the page.

INSTRUCTIONS: On a scale from 1 to 10, please circle the number that BEST reflects your opinions about the following statements.

1. Young people are positive assets to my community.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Strongly disagree									Strongly agree

2. It is important for police officers to build relationships with youth.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Strongly disagree									Strongly agree

3. As a patrol officer, I can help eliminate unequal treatment of minority youth.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Strongly disagree									Strongly agree

4. Interactions between patrol officers and youth have **little** impact on the lives of youth.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Strongly disagree									Strongly agree

5. I have the skills necessary for interacting effectively with youth.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Strongly disagree									Strongly agree

6. I feel comfortable starting a conversation with youth that I don't know.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Strongly Disagree									Strongly agree

7. Patrol officers can have a positive impact on youth without taking time away from their enforcement activities.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Strongly disagree									Strongly agree

End of Pre-test

Appendix B

Patrol Officers' Pretest Survey Responses Race and Ethnicity and Gender

Selected Pretest Survey Responses	White (non-Hispanic) (n = 393)	African American (n = 34)	Hispanic or Latino (n = 28)	Other Races (n = 11)
Q4 Response. They {all races) carried weapons equally.	(n = 278) (71%)	(n = 21) (60%)	(n = 18) (62%)	(n= 7) (64%)
Q6 Response. All of the above (i.e., the tendency for minority youth to commit crimes and violent crimes more frequently, and police policies and practices such as staffing and patrol locations).	(n = 146) (38%)	(n = 10) (31%)	(n = 8) (28%)	(n = 5) (50%)
Q7 Response. You need to calm down (i.e., which statement is likely to make the situation worse rather than better dealing with youth).	(n = 134) (35%)	(n = 10) (31%)	(n = 9) (31%)	(n = 5) (45%)
Q10 Response. {Boys}Escalate faster, once becoming more aggressive.	(n = 180) (46%)	(n = 15) (44%)		(n = 5) (50%)
Q10 Response {Boys}Get into a physical fight.			(n = 10) (35%)	
Q14 Response. Distress (e.g., behaviors such as pacing, fidgeting, and mouthing off are signs of).	(n = 294) (75%)	(n = 21) (63%)	(n = 21) (72%)	(n = 9) (82%)
Q15 Response. In Connecticut, police officers (did not} transport minority and White juveniles to detention at similar rates regardless of the type of offense.	(n = 237) (64%)	(n = 21) (60%)	(n = 17) (65%)	(n = 7) (78%)
Q17 Response. All statements are true except Gently touching the youth's arm to show you are concerned. (i.e., letting youth vent in non-dangerous situations).	(n = 290) (75%)	(n = 23) (64%)	(n = 21) (72%)	(n = 7) (70%)

Patrol Officers' Pretest Survey Responses by Gender

Selected Pretest Survey Responses	Male Patrol Officers (n = 408)	Female Patrol Officers (n = 62)
Q4 Response. They {all races) carried weapons equally.	(n = 284) (71%)	(n = 44) (71%)
Q6 Response. All of the above (i.e., the tendency for minority youth to commit crimes and violent crimes more frequently, and police policies and practices such as staffing and patrol locations).	(n = 145) (37%)	(n = 24) (41%)
Q7 Response. You need to calm down (i.e., which statement is likely to make the situation worse rather than better dealing with youth).	(n = 134) (33%)	(n = 21) (35%)
Q10 Response. {Boys}Escalate faster, once becoming more aggressive.	(n = 183) (46%)	(n = 30) (49%)
Q14 Response. Distress (e.g., behaviors such as pacing, fidgeting, and mouthing off are signs of).	(n = 304) (75%)	(n = 45) (73%)
Q15 Response. In Connecticut, police officers (did not} transport minority and White juveniles to detention at similar rates regardless of the type of offense.	(n = 250) (66%)	(n = 36) (63%)
Q17 Response. All statements are true except Gently touching the youth's arm to show you are concerned. (i.e., letting youth vent in non-dangerous situations).	(n = 304) (76%)	(n = 41) (68%)