Visible Minority Status and Confidence in the Police: A Quantitative Review

Hannah Lister - V00975072
Sociology 376: Quantitative Research Methods
Dr. Eugene Emeka Dim
April 11, 2025

INTRODUCTION

It is widely understood that race plays a large factor in an individual's experiences with the police (Hayle et al., 2016). Police are historically and currently known to racially profile individuals and disproportionately arrest and deploy violence against people of colour (Government of Canada, 2021; Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2022). In Canada, Indigenous peoples are consistently overrepresented in statistics of police-deployed force (Government of Canada, 2021; Victoria Police Department, 2025), and make up a disproportionate portion of Canada's incarcerated population (Malakieh, 2020; Statistics Canada, 2021a). Black people are similarily subject to abuses at the hands of the police (DeAngelis, 2021; Holmes, 2020), as are other visible minorities as a function of systemic racism and colonialism (Dukes & Kahn, 2017). The police system relies on public approval to function properly (Ibrahim, 2020). For example, if there is widespread distrust in the police, then individuals are far less likely to call 911 in the event of an emergency (Bolger et al., 2021; Ibrahim, 2020). Thus, understanding attitudes towards the police can indicate whether the system is functioning properly. If there are trends within certain populations that feel and experience that a public service does not benefit them or their community, it is important to highlight these issues as a starting point to address systemic inequality and injustice.

As such, the research question for this project is as follows: does visible minority status impact confidence in the police in comparison to non-visible minorities? This paper will begin with a review of contemporary literature on the subject, followed by the methods used for the current study. Results will then be outlined, followed by a discussion of these results and concluding with a review of key information and a discussion of the limitations of the study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Bolger et al. (2021) conducted a study for which their driving question was: what affects satisfaction with the police? In this multi-database search (including "Academic Search Ultimate, CINAHL Complete Complementary Index, Criminal Justice Abstracts, Emerald Insight, JSTOR Journals, Legal Collection, PsycArticles, Psychology and Behavior Sciences Collection, PsycINFO, ScienceDirect, SocINDEX with Full Text, Sociological Collection, and Supplemental Index" (Bolger et al., 2021, p.4)), the researchers utilized 66 independent studies on the topic with focal independent variables being citizen demographic variables, perceptions of their neighborhood, and prior experiences, and the dependent variable being satisfaction with the police. In the study, victimization was defined as the experience of being a victim of a crime. Education was defined by the highest level of education the resplendent has received. Socioeconomic status was measured by the individual's income. The main results from the study found that those who had more favourable attitudes towards the police were women, white people, and those older in age. People who had previously been victims of crime and those who have a more significant fear of crime were found to have lower satisfaction with the police. According to the authors, this may be due to the fact that the police are doing an insufficient job meeting the needs of those who have been victims of crime. It was additionally pointed out that due to the fact that racial minority status is a significant predictor of dissatisfaction with the police, the police may be doing a subpar job supporting those populations specifically (Bolger et al., 2021).

Panditharatne et al.'s (2018) study on marginal identity and the police was directed by the research question: what effect does belonging to a racial/ethnic group, as well as socioeconomic

status, have on people's trust in the police and their subsequent willingness to cooperate with law enforcement officials? The researchers gathered data from Time 7 (2015) of the New Zealand Attitudes and Values Study (NZACS), with a sample size of 13,942. The study's focal independent variables were racial/ethnic identity and socioeconomic status, and the dependent variable was trust in the police. Ultimately, the results of the study were that ethnic minorities were found to express less trust in the police in comparison to their ethnic majority counterparts. This distrust was particularly pronounced when ethnic minorities were of a lower socioeconomic status. This study cited that this intersectional approach was particularly useful in understanding and explaining how interacting planes of oppression converge to inform attitudes towards the police. Interestingly, the authors point out that cooperation with the police requires a level of trust in the institution. Those who are of a lower socioeconomic status are more likely to be victims of crime, but are the least likely to report a crime due to their lower trust in the police . The researchers suggest that these conclusions should be carried forward in future studies of perceptions of the police as a more holistic avenue through which to understand attitudes towards the insitution(Panditharatne et al., 2018).

Wu and Cao (2018) studied the impact that race-based discrimination had on confidence in order institutions, leading with the question: what is the process by which race and ethnicity affect the perception of discrimination which, in turn, affects confidence in order institutions, specifically focusing on the perceptions of African and Hispanic/Latino Americans? In this case, order institutions are those structural institutions such as the police, courts, and the legal system. The researchers drew from a sample of 1,001 American citizens with a response rate of around 40%. The data used was collected for the United States Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy (CID) Survey (2006). In this paper, the dependent variable is confidence in order insitutions. The key independent variable in the study was whether an individual had the sense of being discriminated against (defined by the question: would you describe yourself as being a member of a group that is discriminated against in this country). The remaining independent variables included out-group trust (whether an individual trusted people of a different race or religious faith from their own); satisfaction with democracy (satisfaction with the way democracy works in the US); and perceived citizen duty (level of importance an individual places on certain actions that are considered 'good' citizen behavior i.e. reporting a crime they witnessed). The results showed that confidence in order institutions from the perspective of African and Latino Americans were significantly lower than that of White Americans. It was found also that an individual's perception of discrimination plays a significant role in linking race and ethnicity with confidence in order institutions. The paper explains that this is likely due to two perspectives, being that minority groups perceive that order institutions primarily serve white interests as well as the fact that minority groups feel they are more likely to be unfairly treated by order institutions, leading to a more critical perception (Wu & Cao, 2018).

In their article titled *Perceptions of Police Conduct When Race and Gender Are Considered* (2019), Pica et al. ask the question: what are the effects of gender and race on the perceptions of two different non-violent encounters with the police? The research contains two different studies, with the sampling size for study 1 being 137, and for study 2 being 316. Participants were undergraduate students attending a university in Eastern Ontario, Canada. The main independent variables were race and gender. The dependent variable was perceived police legitimacy, which was based on perceived lawfulness, perceived procedural fairness, perceived distributive fairness, and perceived police effectiveness. The main results of the survey included that the decisions of both people in authority positions as well as police officers are informed and

influenced by race. Because the researchers did not ask respondents to explain their answers, they "can only speculate as to why this pattern emerged"(142), however they postulate that those who feel more favourably towards the police are less concerned with arrests that are racially driven, thus may not consider race when thinking about the lawfulness or fairness of the police. However, a reason for having a more negative perception of the police could be due to the belief that police are racially driven when making arrests (Pica et al., 2019).

In their article, Senreich and Williams-Gray (2021) pose the question: how do certain identity factors and interaction with the police impact students' confidence and attitudes towards police? Conducting a univariate, bivariate, and then multivariate analysis, the authors used a sample of 1,103 college students from two colleges in a large northeastern American city. The main independent variables used were encounters with the police (whether an individual has had positive or negative interactions with the police); neighborhood characteristics (whether an individual was fearful of crime in their neighborhood); socioeconomic status (from upper class to below the poverty line); age; gender; race/ethnicity; and commitment to education (evaluated on a Likert scale based on four questions about the extent to which a student is committed to their education). The dependent variables were confidence in the police (how well individuals perceive the police to be doing at undertaking the issues of crime in the community); and attitudes towards the police (broad attitudes directed towards personal qualities of police officers themselves). As found in previous studies, white participants generally responded with higher ratings in both confidence and attitudes towards the police, while black participants gave the lowest ratings. The variables that had the most substantial impact on both confidence and attitudes towards the police was that of neighborhood safety and race. The authors explain that these results align with critical race theory, in that the perceptions that black individuals hold of the police are drastically polar to those that white individuals hold. Interestingly, those who reported that they were more committed to their education were more likely to report higher confidence in and attitudes towards the police (Senreich & Williams-Gray, 2021).

Cheng (2015) conducted a study for which the research question was: what are the determining factors that account for variation in public satisfaction with the local police in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada? The data used for the present study was gathered from an official survey conducted by Insightrix, as well as from interviews with citizens of Saskatoon. This study utilized an integrated method, combining both quantitative and qualitative data. The dependent variable was satisfaction with the police (the question being "overall, how satisfied are you with the service provided by the Sask Police Service?"(p. 694)). The independent variables included perception of neighborhood safety; involuntary contact with police ("have you personally had contact either on the phone or in person with a police officer or other on duty employee of the Sask Police Service within the past 12 months"(p. 695)); learning about crime from media ("from what sources do you get the majority of your info about crime and crime issues in Saskatchewan"(p. 696)); age; Aboriginal status; gender; marital status; education level; and annual household income. Those who were most likely to be more satisfied with the police according to the study were non-Aboriginal, female, married, older, more highly educated, and more wealthy people. In addition, regardless of age or race, individuals who rate their neighborhoods more highly and experience a greater sense of safety demonstrate higher opinions of police (Cheng, 2015).

Finally, Peck (2015) conducted a state-of-the-art review, compiling data from a total of 92 academic studies, pulled from academic databases such as Criminal Justice Abstracts, EBSCO Host, and Web of Science. The research question for this review was: do minorities perceive the

police differently compared to their white counterparts? The majority of the studies used focused on black/white, non-white/white, and black/hispanic/white comparisons. The key independent variable in this review was minority status, while the dependent variable was perception of the police. There were two main findings from this review, the first being that those who identify as non-white are more likely to have negative attitudes towards and perceptions of the police than white individuals. Secondly, the results showed that Hispanic people were more likely to see the police in a negative light in comparison to white people, but more positively than black people (Peck, 2015). The study suggests further research into the perceptions of minority groups that do not fall under the category of Black, Hispanic, or White, as there is plentiful research done on these groups. However, there is not as much to be found on individuals who identify with different minority groups. In order to more completely understand the relationship between minority status and perceptions of the police, a more diverse array of racial groups must be considered.

CURRENT STUDY

This study aims to answer the question: does visible minority status impact confidence in the police? Thus, this project will explore the impact that race has on people's attitudes towards the police, data from the 2020 General Social Survey (GSS) on Social Idenitity. As such, confidence in institutions - police, has been selected as the dependent variable for this project. The focal independent variables for this project are visible minority and discrimination based on colour/race in the 5 years before the COVID-19 pandemic. The project will additionally take into account income; highest degree; and gender. Based on the information gathered from the literature, the following hypotheses have been developed:

- An increase in income will lead to an increased confidence in the police.
- As the level of education increases, respondents will report a higher level of confidence in the police than repsondents reporting lower levels of education.
- If a respondent identifies as a woman, then they will have a higher level of confidence in the police than respondents identifying as men.
- If a respondent reports experiencing race-based discrimination, then they will have a lower feeling of confidence in the police than those who have reported not experiencing race-based discrimination.
- If a respondent identifies as a visible minority, then they will have a lower level of confidence in the police than non-visible minorities.To be more specific:
    - South Asian respondents will have a lower confidence in the police than non-visible minorities;
    - South East Asian respondents will have a lower confidence in the police than non-visible minorities;
    - West Asian respondents will have a lower confidence in the police than non-visible minorities;
    - Latin American respondents will have a lower confidence in the police than non-visible minorities;
    - Black respondents will have a lower confidence in the police than non-visible minorities;
    - And other visible minority respondents will have a lower confidence in the police than non-visible minorities.

These hypotheses will be addressed using the 2020 General Social Survey (GSS) data, a survey conducted by Statistics Canada as a means of understanding and gathering data on social trends of Canadians. The survey has been conducted since 1985 and aims to provide a representative indication of the well-being and social contexts of Canadians (Statistics Canada, 2020a).

METHODS

DATA AND SAMPLE

Data was collected for the 2020 GSS survey from Canadian citizens through electronic questionnaires (rEQ) and through interviews over the telephone (iEQ) between the times of August 2020 and Feb 2021 (Statistics Canada, 2020a). A self-completed questionnaire was filled out electronically by each of the research participants. Additionally, interviews were completed by telephone with the help of computer assistance. The data collection spanned over the course of three months per wave, and two waves of data were collected. The sampling design used for the survey was stratified sampling, specifically a stratified two-stage random sample, and it is a cross-sectional design. The unit of analysis was individuals, and the target population was persons in Canada, not including those under the age of 15, residents of the Northern territories (Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut), those who reside in institutions full-time, and those who reside on Indigenous reserves. The sampling frame of the regular sample used the Statistics Canada Dwelling Universe File (DUG) to find household addresses to contact by mail and access telephone numbers (Statistics Canada, 2020a). This was used to produce reliable estimates at the provincial level and initiate contact with the research participants. After defining the target population, as described above, stratification variables were chosen for the sample. The provinces formed the strata for the regular sample. The sampling frame for the oversample used the 2016 long-form Census of Population. Households included in the oversample required all members of the household to be part of the same visible minority. The groups were stratified in a two-stage random sample and separated into the six minority groups of interest, income, and two forms of education, and were then selected based on a computer algorithm. Households were randomly selected and then every member in the household over the age of 15 was numbered and ordered. The steps for collecting the data then went as follows: a member was selected from each participating household to participate in the survey either through an electronic questionnaire or through an interview over the telephone. Letters were sent to the selected households which contained instructions for a member of the household to participate in the electronic questionnaire. In order to ensure variability within each stratum, minimum sample sizes were determined for each province. Once these minimums were met the remaining number of participants were distributed throughout the strata so as to meet the needs for precision at the national and stratum levels. The final sample included 34,044 participants; 19,473 in the regular sample and 14,571 in the oversample, with the average response rate being 40.3%. For the regular sample, 43.5% was the response rate, and the oversample's response rate was 36.7%. However, while the total sample size of the GSS 2020 is 34,044, the sample size for multivariate analysis in this project is 29,986 due to listwise deletion.

MEASURES

The dependent variable for this study is confidence in the police. Cao (2015) defines confidence in the police as the externally oriented degree to which trust in the police is shown time and time again to be justified, going on to say that confidence "connotes a conscious assessment of trust duly earned because of a belief that a reliable and consistent record of conduct has taken place"(p. 242). Cao (2015) further points out that confidence in the police demonstrates a support for the police as an institution. The question that was used to ask about confidence in the police was: using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 means No confidence at all and 5 means A great deal of confidence, please answer the following questions. How much confidence do you have in the following institutions? The police. The variable was coded with numbers 1-5 indicating an increasing level of confidence in the police; 1 = no confidence at all, and 5 = a great deal of confidence. In addition, valid skip = 6; don't know = 7; refusal = 8; and not stated = 9. The level of measurement for this variable is categorical with five or more categories, meaning that for the purposes of this project it was treated as continuous and was not recoded.

The first focal independent variable is visible minority status. In the GSS, visible minority status is divided into the categories of South Asian; Chinese; Black; Filipino; Arab; Latin American; Southeast Asian; West Asian; other visible minorities; and not a visible minority. Visible minority status is broadly understood as an identification with a non-white racial/ethnic identity, made visible by the visible defining traits such as different skin tone or phenotypically visibly different traits than white people (Song, 2020). Visible minority is a key independent variable in this project. The survey listed out a number of racial categories and asked participants to identify which category they belong to. The categories were coded as 1 = South Asian; 2 = Chinese; 3 = Black; 4 = Filipino; 5 = Arab; 6 = Latin American; 7 = Southeast Asian; 8 = West Asian; 9 = other visible minorities; 10 = not a visible minority; 96 = valid skip; 97 = don't know; 98 = refusal; and 99 = not stated (Statistics Canada, 2020b). The level of measurement for this variable is nominal categorical. For the purposes of this project, the variable *visible minority* was recoded in the following way: 1 = South Asian; 2 = South East Asian; 3 = West Asian; 4 = Latin American; 5 = Black; 6 = other visible minorities; 7 = not a visible minority. This was done so as to decrease the number of unnecessary categories.

The second focal independent variable is discrimination based on race/colour in the five years before the COVID-19 pandemic. The variable for discrimination - race/colour can be understood as an individual's experience of discrimination ie. being treated unfairly or being subject to various abuses due to their visible minority status (Bolger et al., 2021; Pica et al., 2019; Wu & Cao, 2018; Senreich & Williams-Gray, 2021). The question used to determine whether a participant experienced discrimination based on their race or colour was: in the 5 years before the Covid-19 pandemic, have you experienced discrimination or been treated unfairly by others in Canada because of any of the following? Was it because of: Your race or colour. The variable was coded as 1 = yes; 2 = no; 6 = valid skip; 7 = don't know; 8 = refusal; and 9 = not stated (Statistics Canada, 2020b). The level of measurement for this variable is nominal categorical (dichotomous), and was not recoded.

The GSS 2020 dataset sorts income (before tax) into five categories, being less than $24,999; $25,000 to $49,999; $50,000 to $74,999; $75,000 to $99,999; and $100,000 and over. Participants were asked to share their annual income before tax. This variable was coded as 01 = less than $24,999; 02 = $25,000 to $49,999; 03 = $50,000 to $74,999; 04 = $75,000 to $99,999; 05 = $100,000 and over; 96 = valid skip; 97 = don't know; 98 = refusal; 99 = not stated

(Statistics Canada, 2020b). The level of measurement for this variable for the purposes of this project is continuous (ordinal variable with five categories), and was not recoded.

Participants were asked to note the highest certificate, diploma, or degree that they have completed in order to gather information for the highest degree variable. The question used to determine a participant's highest degree was: what is the highest certificate, diploma, or degree you have received? The variable was coded with 1 = less than high school diploma or its equivalent; 2 = high school diploma or a high school equivalency certificate; 3 = trade certificate or diploma; 4 = college, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or diploma; 5 = university certificate or diploma below the bachelor's level; 6 = bachelor's degree (e.g. B.A., B.Sc,. LL.B.); 7 = university certificate, diploma, or degree above the bachelor's level; 96 = valid skip; 97 = don't know; 98 = refusal; and 99 = not stated (Statistics Canada, 2020b). The level of measurement for this variable is ordinal categorical. This variable was not recoded.

Gender was divided into men and women for the purposes of the survey, in which responses under the non-binary category were distributed into the other two gender categories so as not to reveal the identities of the few non-binary people who responded to the survey. Participants were asked to identify their gender, with options for male, female, and non-binary, though the non-binary respondents were distributed into the two categories of male and female to ensure confidentiality for those participants. The variable was coded as men+ = 1; women+ = 2; valid skip = 6; don't know = 7; refusal = 8; and not stated = 9 (Statistics Canada, 2020b). The level of measurement for this variable is nominal categorical (dichotomous), and it was not recoded.

These measures are consistent with what has been used by Statistics Canada for the duration of the GSS since 1985, demonstrating their reliability and validity (Statistics Canada, 2021b). .

ANALYSIS PLAN

Univariate

As seen in Table 1, because the variable visible minority is nominal, the descriptive statistics that will be included will be the percentages of each category within the variable (Dim, 2025c). For the variable discrimination based on colour/race, the mode is reported because the variable is nominal with only two categories (Dim, 2025c). The income variable is ordinal with 5 or more categories, and is therefore being treated as continuous for the purposes of this project. Thus, the univariate statistics reported for this variable are mean, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum (Dim, 2025c). This is the case for the variable of highest degree as well, with the univariate statistics reported being mean, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum (Dim, 2025c). The univariate statistic reported for the variable of gender is the percentage for the modal category (in this case, women+), because the variable is nominal (Dim, 2025c). Finally, the univariate statistics included for the dependent variable of confidence in the police, an ordinal variable with 5 categories and thus a continuous variable for the purposes of this project, include the mean, standard deviation, and the minimum and maximum (Dim, 2025c).

Bivariate

As seen in Table 2, one of the key independent variables, visible minority, is a categorical variable with more than two categories. Therefore, the bivariate test that will be used to examine

the relationship between visible minorities and confidence in the police is a comparison of means using an ANOVA (Dim, 2025d). The other key independent variables, discrimination based on colour/race, is a categorical variable with two categories. So, the bivariate test that will be used to examine its relationship to the dependent variable will also be a t-test (Dim, 2025d). The covariate, income, will be treated as a continuous variable for the purposes of this project. Therefore the statistical test that will be used to assess the relationship between income and confidence in the police will be a Pearson's *r* (correlation) test (Dim, 2025d). For the covariate of highest degree, the test used to examine its relationship to the dependent variable will be ANOVA due to the fact that the variable is ordinal (Dim, 2025d). Gender, the last covariate, is categorical with only two categories. Therefore, the statistical test that will be used to examine its relationship to confidence in the police, the dependent continuous variable, will be that of a comparison of means using a t-test (Dim, 2025d).

Multivariate

In order to analyze the relationships between each variable at once and reduce spuriousness, multivariate regression analysis was run. This form of analysis was employed to "find the independent effect of each independent variable on [the] dependent variable" (Dim, 2025e, slide 13). The multiple regression equation: $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + ... + e$ will be used to determine the line of best fit based on the given data in Table 3. In order to properly run regression analysis, the categorical variables gender, race-based discrimination, and visible minority status were dummy coded, with the reference variables being men+, yes (to experiences of race-based discrimination), and not a visible minority.

RESULTS

DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables

Variable	Mean or %	Std. Dev	Min	Max
Income	2.48	1.319	1	5
Highest Degree	4.03	2.049	1	7
Gender (Woman)	51.0			
Discrimination: race/colour (No)	85.5			
Visible Minority				
South Asian	10.8			
South East Asian	7.7			
West Asian	11.9			
Latin American	5.7			
Black	2.6			
Other Visible Minority	2.0			
Not a Visible Minority	59.4			
Confidence in the Police	3.93	1.066	1	5

As illustrated in Table 1, 10.8% of respondents indicated that they were South Asian, 7.7% were South East Asian, 11.9% were West Asian, 5.7% were Latin American, 2.6% were

Black, 2.0% were other visible minorities, and over half (59.4%) of respondents identified as not a visible minority. The majority (85.5%) of respondents indicated that they had not experienced discrimination based on their race/colour 5 years before COVID. The average respondent fell between the categories of $25,000-$49,000 and $50,000-$74,999 for their income (SD = 1.319). Respondents were, on average, educated at a level between college, CEGEP, or other non-university certificate or diploma and a university certificate or diploma below the bachelor's level (SD = 2.049). The mode for gender was women, being 51% of respondents. Finally, responses were more favourable than not for confidence in the police, with the average response being 3.93 (SD = 1.066) out of a 5-point scale of confidence, with 5 being a great deal of confidence.

BIVARIATE RESULTS

Table 2: Bivariate Relationship between independent variables and Confidence in the Police

Variable	Mean or Pearson's *r*	Std. Dev	Test	Value	Significance
Income	.016		Pearson's *r*		.003**
Highest degree	-.003		Pearson's *r*		.549
Gender					
Women+	3.94	1.049	T-Test	-2.593	<0.001***
Men+	3.91	1.083			
Discrimination based on race/colour					
Yes	3.50	1.174	T-Test	-29.728	<.001***
No	4.00	1.029			
Visible Minority					
South Asian	3.90	1.057	ANOVA	33.015	<.001***
South East Asian	3.84	1.050			
West Asian	4.07	1.079			
Latin American	4.00	1.072			
Black	3.58	1.191			
Other Visible Minority	3.71	1.185			
Not a Visible Minority	3.94	1.042			

Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

The F-value indicates that at least one of the group means significantly differs. As shown in Table 2, the probability of finding an empirical F-value of 33.015 for visible minority and confidence in the police is significant at p<.001. Thus the conclusion can be made that confidence in the police is impacted by visible minority status in some capacity. The post-hoc Tukey HSD test allows for the examination of the significant differences between each category reported for the visible minority variable (Dim, 2025d). Tukey test results show that Black respondents' confidence in the police is significantly lower than every other category. Additionally, West Asian respondents' confidence in the police was significantly higher than every category but Latin Americans, which made up the second highest group in terms of

confidence in the police. Latin American respondents' confidence in the police was significantly higher than that of South East Asian, Black, and other visible minorities. South Asian respondents' confidence in the police was significantly higher than that of other minorities. South East Asian respondents' confidence in the police was significantly lower than non-visible minorities, as well as West Asian and Latin American respondents. Finally, other visible minorities reported significantly lower confidence in the police than those who are not a visible minority. The difference between those who reported experiencing discrimination based on their race/colour is significant, with those having experienced discrimination having significantly less confidence in the police than those who reported not. The relationship between income and confidence in the police is weak, positive, and significant at p<.01. This implies that as an individual's income increases, their confidence in the police increases. The relationship between highest degree achieved and confidence in the police is negative, meaning that the more education an individual has, the less likely they are to be confident in the police. However, the relationship is not significant (p=0.549). Finally, the results of the t-test for gender differences indicate that women reported significantly higher confidence in the police than did men.

MULTIVARIATE RESULTS

Table 3: Regression Summary of All Independent Variables Regressed on Confidence in Police (n=29,986)

	b	**Std. Error**	**t**
Income	.022	.005	4.411
Highest degree	-.009**	.003	-2.923
Gender (Women+ = 1)	.046***	.012	3.708
Discrimination (No = 1)	.444***	.018	25.070
South Asian	.102***	.021	4.929
South East Asian	.026	.024	1.114
West Asian	.209***	.020	10.707
Latin American	.137***	.026	5.167
Black	-.163***	.040	-1.995
Other Visible Minority	-.088*	.044	-1.995
Constant	3.479***		
R^2	.028		

Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

$$Y = 3.479 + .022X_{income} - .009X_{degree} + .046X_{women} + .444X_{discrimination} + .102X_{s.asian} + .026X_{s.e.\ asian} + .209X_{w.\ asian} + .137X_{l.american} - .163X_{black} - .088X_{other\ vm} + e$$

The F-test results for this regression analysis is 86.445 with a significance of p<.001, indicating that there is a significance between group means. According to the regression analysis and equation for the line of best fit, Y=3.479 when all other categories (income, highest degree, gender, experience of racial discrimination, and visible minority status) are equal to zero. In other words, the Y-intercept for the line of best fit is at 3.479. A one-unit increase in income is related to a .022 unit increase in confidence in the police independent of degree level, gender,

visible minority status, and experience of racial discrimination. However, this is not signficiant. A one-unit increase in level of degree is related to a .009 unit decrease in confidence in the police, independent of income, gender, visible minority status, and experience of racial discrimination. This is significant at **, $p<.01$. Women have .046 units higher confidence in the police than men, independent of income, degree level, visible minority status, and experience of racial discrimination. This is significant at ***, $p<.001$. Those who have not experienced racial discrimination in the 5 years before the COVID-19 pandemic have .444 units higher confidence in the police than people who report experiencing racial discrimination. This is significant at ***, $p<.001$. South Asian respondents report .102 units **higher** confidence in the police compared to non-visible minorities, independent of degree level, gender, other visible minority categories, and experience of racial discrimination. This is significant at ***, $p<.001$. South East Asian respondents report .026 units **higher** confidence in the police compared to non-visible minorities, independent of degree level, gender, other visible minority categories, and experience of racial discrimination. However, this is not significant. West Asian respondents report .209 units higher confidence in the police compared to non-visible minorities, independent of degree level, gender, other visible minority categories, and experience of racial discrimination. This is significant at ***, $p<.001$. Latin American respondents report .137 units higher confidence in the police compared to non-visible minorities, independent of degree level, gender, other visible minority categories, and experience of racial discrimination. This is significant at ***, $p<.001$. Black respondents report .163 units lower confidence in the police compared to non-visible minorities, independent of degree level, gender, other visible minority categories, and experience of racial discrimination. This is significant at ***, $p<.001$. Other visible minority respondents report .088 units lower confidence in the police compared to non-visible minorities, independent of degree level, gender, other visible minority categories, and experience of racial discrimination. This is significant at ***, $p<.001$. The R-squared value is .028 which means that the model accounts for 2.8% of the variation in Y with income, level of educational degree, gender, experience of racial discrimination, and visible minority status. This suggests that there are a number of other factors that impact confidence in the police that have not been considered in the current study.

CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

In this study, I examined whether visible minority status impacts confidence in the police in comparison to those who are not a visible minority. Based on the bivariate results of the current study the hypotheses posed were largely supported, with some exceptions. An increase in income does lead to an increased confidence in the police, though not significantly. The higher degree of education an individual has, they are significalntly less likely to have confidence in the police, a result that does not support the initial hypothesis. Women do have a significantly higher degree of confidence in the police than do men, supporting the initial hypothesis. Those who report experiencing race-based discrimination do have a significantly lower level of confidence in the police than those who do not report experiencing race-based discrimination, supporting the initial hypothesis. Generally, visible minority respondents had lower levels of confidence in the police than did non-visible minority respondents with two exceptions: West Asian and Latin American respondents had a higher level of confidence in the police than did non-visible minority respondents. When controlling for other independent variables however, the significance level of the relationship between income and confidence in the police changed, losing its significance. When controlling for other independent variables, the significance level of the relationship between highest degree and confidence in the police changed, gaining

signficiane in multivariate analysis at $p<.01$. When controlling for other independent variables, the significance level of the relationship between gender and confidence in the police remained consistent at $p < .001$. When controlling for other independent variables, the significance level of the relationship between experiences of racial discrimination and confidence in the police remained consistent at $p < .001$. When controlling for other independent variables, the significance level of the relationship between visible minority status and confidence in the police fluctuated. In running bivariate analysis, this relationship was significant at $p<.001$. However, this did not remain consistent for each category which indicates that visible minority status is not a universal influencing factor on confidence in the police. Considering this, the present study demonstrated that visible minority status does, in some cases, have an impact on confidence in the police. However, as opposed to what was expected in the hypotheses, there are a number of visible minority groups which have a higher level of confidence in the police than non-visible minorities; specifically, West Asian and Latin American respondents reported higher confidence in the police than non-visible minorities.

Like all quantitative research, this project has limitations. In order to assume a causal relationship between variables, correlation, time order, and non-spuriousness must be met (Dim, 2025a). As far as correlation, a statistical relationship must be found. Though the data in this present study were correlated, this does not necessarily mean there is causation. Time order refers to whether "the cause precedes the effect" (Dim, 2025a, slide 63) and one must rely on theory and existing literature to assume a certain variable comes before the dependent. While an extensive review of current literature was conducted on the topic, this cannot guarantee time order for each variable included in the present study. Finally, non supriousness ensures that the perceived relationship between two variables is not simply being caused by a third variable. This issue is addressed through multiple regression, however it is not possible to eliminate all possible external factors impacting the relationship between each independent variable and the dependent variable. This study can be generalized to any members included in the target population of the GSS 2020; namely, all Canadians over the age of 15, excluding residents of the Northern territories (Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut), those who reside in institutions full-time, and those who reside on Indigenous reserves. However, it should be noted that individuals living on Indigenous reserves and residents of the Northern territories (Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut) were not included. As a result, much of Canada's Indigenous population was excluded from the data collection and is therefore not representative of Canada's entire population. Additionally, *Indigenous* was not a category for visible minority in the GSS, further reducing the ability for the study to be representative of Indigenous confidence in the police. Further studies in the area would benefit from utilizing a dataset that includes distinct Indigenous responses.

REFERENCES

Bolger, M. A., Lytle, D. J., & Bolger, P. C. (2021). What matters in citizen satisfaction with police: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *72*, 101760. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2020.101760

Cao, L. (2015). Differentiating confidence in the police, trust in the police, and satisfaction with the police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *38*(2), 239–249. https://doi.org/10.1108/pijpsm-12-2014-0127

Cheng, H. (2015). Factors influencing public satisfaction with the local police: a study in Saskatoon, Canada. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *38*(4), 690–704. https://doi.org/10.1108/pijpsm-11-2014-0125

DeAngelis, R. T. (2021). Systemic racism in police killings: new evidence from the Mapping Police Violence Database, 2013–2021. *Race and Justice*, *14*(3), 215336872110479. https://doi.org/10.1177/21533687211047943

Dim, E. (2025a). *SOC 376 TOPIC 2: Research Design and the Logic of Causation.* University of Victoria

Dim, E. (2025b). *SOC TOPIC 4: Sampling*. University of Victoria.

Dim, E. (2025c). *SOC 376 TOPIC 5: Intro to Quantitative Data Analysis and Univariate Statistics*. University of Victoria.

Dim, E. (2025d). *SOC 376 TOPIC 6: Hypothesis Testing and Bivariate Analysis*. University of Victoria.

Dim, E. (2025e). *SOC 376 TOPIC 7: Multiple Regression.* University of Victoria.

Dukes, K. N., & Kahn, K. B. (2017). What Social Science Research Says about Police Violence against Racial and Ethnic Minorities: Understanding the Antecedents and Consequences-An Introduction. *Journal of Social Issues*, *73*(4), 690–700. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12242

Government of Canada. (2021). *Indigenous policing | Royal Canadian Mounted Police*. Www.rcmp-Grc.gc.ca. https://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/en/indigenous-policing

Hayle, S., Wortley, S., & Tanner, J. (2016). Race, Street Life, and Policing: Implications for Racial Profiling. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *58*(3), 322–353. https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2014.e32

Holmes, O. (2020). Police brutality and four other ways racism kills Black people. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/edi-06-2020-0151

Ibrahim, D. (2020). Public Perceptions of the Police in Canada's Provinces, 2019. *Juristat: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*, *4*(30).

Malakieh, J. (2020). Adult and Youth Correctional Statistics in Canada, 2018/2019. *Juristat: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*, *3*(23). http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/scholarly-journals/adult-youth-correctional-statistics-canada-2018/docview/2490276355/se-2

Panditharatne, S., Chant, L., Sibley, C. G., & Osborne, D. (2018). At the Intersection of Disadvantage: Socioeconomic Status Heightens Ethnic Group Differences in Trust in the Police. *Race and Justice*, *11*(2), 215336871879611. https://doi.org/10.1177/2153368718796119

Peck, J. H. (2015). Minority perceptions of the police: a state-of-the-art review. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *38*(1), 173–203. https://doi.org/10.1108/pijpsm-01-2015-0001

Pica, E., Thompson, L. E., Pozzulo, J., & Sheahan, C. L. (2019). Perceptions of Police Conduct When Race and Gender Are Considered. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, *35*(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-019-09346-1

Province of British Columbia. (2024). *Local government bylaw enforcement - Province of British Columbia*. Www2.Gov.bc.ca. https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/governments/local-governments/governance-powers/bylaws/bylaw-enforcement

Rodriguez, N., & Turanovic, J. (2018). Impact of Incarceration on Families and Communities. In J. Wooldredge & P. Smith (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Prisons and Imprisonment* (pp. 189–207). Oxford University Press.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police. (2022). *2022 Police Intervention Options Report*. Royal Canadian Mounted Police. https://rcmp.ca/en/corporate-information/publications-and-manuals/2022-police-intervention-options-report#s4

Senreich, E., & Williams-Gray, B. (2021). Factors Impacting Diverse Students' Perceptions of the Police at Two Urban Colleges. Journal of College Student Development, 62(1), 72–89. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2021.0005

Song, M. (2020). Rethinking minority status and "visibility." *Comparative Migration Studies*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-019-0162-2

Statistics Canada. (2020a). *2020 General Social Survey: Public Use Microdata File User Guide*.

Statistics Canada. (2020b). *General Social Survey (Social Identity) 2020 - Public Use Microdata File (PUMF)*.

Statistics Canada. (2021a). *Census Profile, 2021 Census of Population*. Statcan.ca. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&GENDERlist=1%2C2%2C3&STATISTIClist=1&HEADERlist=0&DGUIDlist=2021A00055917034&SearchText=victoria&utm_source=CapitalDaily&utm_medium=newsletter&utm_campaign=jan-17-vicpd-use-of-force-numbers-released&_bhlid=6c436e089cbbf3b2db75b502ca4caff05a280250

Statistics Canada. (2021b). *Surveys and statistical programs - General Social Survey - Social Engagement (GSS)*. Statcan.gc.ca. https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&Id=5509

Statistics Canada. (2023, August 23). *Poverty among racialized groups across generations*. Www150.Statcan.gc.ca. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/36-28-0001/2023008/article/00002-eng.htm

Verdun-Jones, S., & Mitchell-Banks, T. (1988). The Fine as a Sentencing Option in Canada. In *Research Reports of the Canadian Sentencing Commission*. Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada.

Victoria Police Department. (2025). *VicPD Use Of Force Data 2018-2023 - VicPD.ca*. VicPD.ca. https://vicpd.ca/2025/01/15/vicpd-use-of-force-data-2018-2023/

Wu, Y., & Cao, L. (2018). Race/ethnicity, discrimination, and confidence in order institutions. *Policing: An International Journal*, *41*(6), 704–720. https://doi.org/10.1108/pijpsm-03-2017-0031

OUTPUTS

Univariate descriptives:

visible minority recoded

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	South Asian	3393	10.0	10.8	10.8
	South East Asian	2416	7.1	7.7	18.4
	West Asian	3750	11.0	11.9	30.3
	Latin American	1804	5.3	5.7	36.0
	Black	807	2.4	2.6	38.6
	Other visible minority	620	1.8	2.0	40.6
	Not a visible minority	18736	55.0	59.4	100.0
	Total	31526	92.6	100.0	
Missing	99.00	2518	7.4		
Total		34044	100.0		

5 yrs before Covid-19 - Reasons discrim. - Race/color

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	4578	13.4	14.5	14.5
	No	26985	79.3	85.5	100.0
	Total	31563	92.7	100.0	
Missing	999	2481	7.3		
Total		34044	100.0		

Income - Total (before tax)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than $24,999	9826	28.9	28.9	28.9
	$25,000 to $49,999	9465	27.8	27.8	56.7
	$50,000 to $74,999	7114	20.9	20.9	77.6
	$75,000 to $99,999	3698	10.9	10.9	88.4
	$100,000 and over	3941	11.6	11.6	100.0
	Total	34044	100.0	100.0	

Descriptives

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Income - Total (before tax)	34044	4	1	5	2.48	1.319
Valid N (listwise)	34044					

Highest degree – Respondent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than high school diploma or its equivalent	3768	11.1	11.4	11.4
	High school diploma or a high school equivalency certifi...	7431	21.8	22.6	34.0
	Trade certificate or diploma	2667	7.8	8.1	42.1
	College, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or dip...	5631	16.5	17.1	59.2
	University certificate or diploma below the bachelor's level	1717	5.0	5.2	64.4
	Bachelor's degree (e.g. B. A., B.Sc., LL.B.)	7038	20.7	21.4	85.8
	University certificate, diploma or degree above the bach...	4686	13.8	14.2	100.0
	Total	32938	96.8	100.0	
Missing	999	1106	3.2		
Total		34044	100.0		

Descriptives

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Highest degree – Respondent	32938	6	1	7	4.03	2.049
Valid N (listwise)	32938					

Gender (2) after distribution of the non-binary person

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Men+	16690	49.0	49.0	49.0
	Women+	17354	51.0	51.0	100.0
	Total	34044	100.0	100.0	

Confidence in institutions – Police

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No confidence at all	1222	3.6	3.8	3.8
	...	2065	6.1	6.4	10.2
	...	5978	17.6	18.6	28.9
	...	11428	33.6	35.6	64.5
	A great deal of confidence	11386	33.4	35.5	100.0
	Total	32079	94.2	100.0	
Missing	999	1965	5.8		
Total		34044	100.0		

Descriptives

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Confidence in institutions – Police	32079	4	1	5	3.93	1.066
Valid N (listwise)	32079					

Anova for visible minority & confidence in institutions:

Descriptives

Confidence in institutions – Police

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
South Asian	3271	3.90	1.057	.018	3.87	3.94	1	5
South East Asian	2341	3.84	1.050	.022	3.80	3.88	1	5
West Asian	3601	4.07	1.079	.018	4.03	4.10	1	5
Latin American	1754	4.00	1.072	.026	3.95	4.05	1	5
Black	769	3.58	1.191	.043	3.50	3.66	1	5
Other visible minority	590	3.71	1.185	.049	3.62	3.81	1	5
Not a visible minority	18289	3.94	1.042	.008	3.92	3.95	1	5
Total	30615	3.93	1.060	.006	3.92	3.94	1	5

ANOVA

Confidence in institutions – Police

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	221.388	6	36.898	33.015	<.001
Within Groups	34207.702	30608	1.118		
Total	34429.090	30614			

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Confidence in institutions - Police

Tukey HSD

(I) visible minority recoded	(J) visible minority recoded	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
South Asian	South East Asian	.064	.029	.329	-.02	.15
	West Asian	-.163*	.026	<.001	-.24	-.09
	Latin American	-.097*	.031	.045	-.19	.00
	Black	.325*	.043	<.001	.20	.45
	Other visible minority	.193*	.048	.001	.05	.34
	Not a visible minority	-.032	.020	.771	-.09	.03
	99.00	.102*	.033	.047	.00	.20
South East Asian	South Asian	-.064	.029	.329	-.15	.02
	West Asian	-.228*	.028	<.001	-.31	-.14
	Latin American	-.161*	.034	<.001	-.26	-.06
	Black	.260*	.044	<.001	.13	.39
	Other visible minority	.128	.049	.148	-.02	.28
	Not a visible minority	-.096*	.023	.001	-.17	-.03
	99.00	.038	.035	.964	-.07	.14
West Asian	South Asian	.163*	.026	<.001	.09	.24
	South East Asian	.228*	.028	<.001	.14	.31
	Latin American	.067	.031	.375	-.03	.16
	Black	.488*	.042	<.001	.36	.62
	Other visible minority	.356*	.047	<.001	.21	.50
	Not a visible minority	.132*	.019	<.001	.07	.19
	99.00	.265*	.033	<.001	.17	.37
Latin American	South Asian	.097*	.031	.045	.00	.19
	South East Asian	.161*	.034	<.001	.06	.26
	West Asian	-.067	.031	.375	-.16	.03
	Black	.421*	.046	<.001	.28	.56
	Other visible minority	.289*	.051	<.001	.14	.44
	Not a visible minority	.065	.027	.219	-.02	.15
	99.00	.199*	.038	<.001	.08	.31
Black	South Asian	-.325*	.043	<.001	-.45	-.20
	South East Asian	-.260*	.044	<.001	-.39	-.13

	West Asian	-.488*	.042	<.001	-.62	-.36
	Latin American	-.421*	.046	<.001	-.56	-.28
	Other visible minority	-.132	.058	.311	-.31	.04
	Not a visible minority	-.356*	.039	<.001	-.47	-.24
	99.00	-.223*	.047	<.001	-.37	-.08
Other visible minority	South Asian	-.193*	.048	.001	-.34	-.05
	South East Asian	-.128	.049	.148	-.28	.02
	West Asian	-.356*	.047	<.001	-.50	-.21
	Latin American	-.289*	.051	<.001	-.44	-.14
	Black	.132	.058	.311	-.04	.31
	Not a visible minority	-.224*	.044	<.001	-.36	-.09
	99.00	-.091	.052	.653	-.25	.07
Not a visible minority	South Asian	.032	.020	.771	-.03	.09
	South East Asian	.096*	.023	.001	.03	.17
	West Asian	-.132*	.019	<.001	-.19	-.07
	Latin American	-.065	.027	.219	-.15	.02
	Black	.356*	.039	<.001	.24	.47
	Other visible minority	.224*	.044	<.001	.09	.36
	99.00	.134*	.029	<.001	.05	.22
99.00	South Asian	-.102*	.033	.047	-.20	.00
	South East Asian	-.038	.035	.964	-.14	.07
	West Asian	-.265*	.033	<.001	-.37	-.17
	Latin American	-.199*	.038	<.001	-.31	-.08
	Black	.223*	.047	<.001	.08	.37
	Other visible minority	.091	.052	.653	-.07	.25
	Not a visible minority	-.134*	.029	<.001	-.22	-.05

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

T-test for discrimination (race/colour):

Group Statistics

	5 yrs before Covid-19 - Reasons discrim. - Race/color	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Confidence in institutions - Police	Yes	4556	3.50	1.174	.017
	No	26843	4.00	1.029	.006

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
						Significance		Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	One-Sided p	Two-Sided p	Difference	Difference	Lower	Upper
Confidence in institutions - Police	Equal variances assumed	449.033	<.001	-29.728	31397	<.001	<.001	-.501	.017	-.534	-.468
	Equal variances not assumed			-27.075	5802.975	<.001	<.001	-.501	.018	-.537	-.465

Pearson's *r* for income and highest degree:

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Income - Total (before tax)	2.48	1.319	34044
Highest degree - Respondent	4.03	2.049	32938
Confidence in institutions - Police	3.93	1.066	32079

Correlations

		Income - Total (before tax)	Highest degree - Respondent	Confidence in institutions - Police
Income - Total (before tax)	Pearson Correlation	1	.383**	.016**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<.001	.003
	N	34044	32938	32079
Highest degree - Respondent	Pearson Correlation	.383**	1	-.003
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001		.549
	N	32938	32938	31429
Confidence in institutions - Police	Pearson Correlation	.016**	-.003	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.549	
	N	32079	31429	32079

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

T-test for gender:

Group Statistics

	Gender (2) after distribution of the non-binary person	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Confidence in institutions – Police	Men+	15711	3.91	1.083	.009
	Women+	16368	3.94	1.049	.008

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
						Significance				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	One-Sided p	Two-Sided p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Confidence in institutions – Police	Equal variances assumed	19.301	<.001	-2.593	32077	.005	.010	-.031	.012	-.054	-.008
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.591	31906.487	.005	.010	-.031	.012	-.054	-.008

Dummy variable creation for all categorical independent variables

Create dummy variables

Variable Creation

	Label
discrimination_1	DIS_20=Yes
discrimination_2	DIS_20=No
discrimination_3	DIS_20=999.0

Create dummy variables

Variable Creation

	Label
gender_1	GENDER2P=Men+
gender_2	GENDER2P=Women+

Create dummy variables

Variable Creation

	Label
minority_1	vismin=South Asian
minority_2	vismin=South East Asian
minority_3	vismin=West Asian
minority_4	vismin=Latin American
minority_5	vismin=Black
minority_6	vismin=Other visible minority
minority_7	vismin=Not a visible minority
minority_8	vismin=99.0

Correlation between continuous variables and dependent variable:

Correlations

Correlations

		Highest degree - Respondent	Income - Total (before tax)	Confidence in institutions - Police
Highest degree - Respondent	Pearson Correlation	1	.383**	-.003
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<.001	.549
	N	32938	32938	31429
Income - Total (before tax)	Pearson Correlation	.383**	1	.016**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001		.003
	N	32938	34044	32079
Confidence in institutions - Police	Pearson Correlation	-.003	.016**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.549	.003	
	N	31429	32079	32079

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Multivariate regression between all independent variables and dependent variable

Regression

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Confidence in institutions - Police	3.93	1.058	29986
Highest degree - Respondent	4.04	2.043	29986
Income - Total (before tax)	2.51	1.324	29986
DIS_20=No	.8446	.36227	29986
GENDER2P=Women+	.5101	.49991	29986
vismin=South Asian	.1079	.31028	29986
vismin=South East Asian	.0768	.26623	29986
vismin=West Asian	.1187	.32347	29986
vismin=Latin American	.0573	.23247	29986
vismin=Black	.0250	.15606	29986
vismin=Other visible minority	.0194	.13796	29986

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.167[a]	.028	.028	1.043

a. Predictors: (Constant), vismin=Black, GENDER2P=Women+, vismin=Other visible minority, Highest degree - Respondent, vismin=Latin American, vismin=South East Asian, vismin=South Asian, vismin=West Asian, DIS_20=No, Income - Total (before tax)

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	940.581	10	94.058	86.445	<.001[b]
	Residual	32614.864	29975	1.088		
	Total	33555.445	29985			

a. Dependent Variable: Confidence in institutions - Police

b. Predictors: (Constant), vismin=Black, GENDER2P=Women+, vismin=Other visible minority, Highest degree - Respondent, vismin=Latin American, vismin=South East Asian, vismin=South Asian, vismin=West Asian, DIS_20=No, Income - Total (before tax)

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.479	.025		140.978	<.001
	Income - Total (before tax)	.022	.005	.028	4.411	<.001
	Highest degree - Respondent	-.009	.003	-.018	-2.923	.003
	GENDER2P=Women+	.046	.012	.022	3.708	<.001
	DIS_20=No	.444	.018	.152	25.070	<.001
	vismin=South Asian	.102	.021	.030	4.929	<.001
	vismin=South East Asian	.026	.024	.007	1.114	.265
	vismin=West Asian	.209	.020	.064	10.707	<.001
	vismin=Latin American	.137	.026	.030	5.167	<.001
	vismin=Other visible minority	-.088	.044	-.012	-1.995	.046
	vismin=Black	-.163	.040	-.024	-4.093	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: Confidence in institutions - Police