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THE MAKING OF A COMMUNITY POLICING OFFICER: THE IMPACT OF BASIC TRAINING AND OCCUPATIONAL SOCIALIZATION ON POLICE RECRUITS

ROBIN N. HAARR
Arizona State University West

This study examines the impact of basic training, field training, and work environment on shaping police recruits' attitudes and beliefs related to community policing, problem-solving policing, and police public relations. A multiple-treatment, single-case pretest-posttest design was used to survey 446 police recruits from 14 successive basic-training academy classes at the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy. The sample of police recruits was followed through the 606.5-hour, 16-week basic-training program and then through field training and the completion of a 1-year probationary period. Over 16 months, they were surveyed at four points and times. Findings reveal that although the training academy has a positive impact on police recruits' attitudes related to community policing and problem solving, over time, those positive attitudinal changes dissipate as police recruits proceed to their respective police agencies where they are assigned a field training officer and are exposed to the work environment and organizational culture.

During the last decade of the 20th century, there was a widespread movement initiated by a growing number of police administrators across the nation, as well as the Department of Justice, the Community Oriented Policing Services Office (COPS), and the Crime Act of 1994 to replace the...
traditional law enforcement model of policing with models of policing that encompass a combination of incident-driven policing, traditional policing tactics, and community policing and problem-solving philosophies and strategies (Couper & Lobitz, 1991; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1989; Wilkinson & Rosenbaum, 1994; Wycoff & Skogan, 1993). In both theory and practice, these newer models of policing (i.e., community policing and problem-oriented policing) call for a fundamental change in the basic role of police officers, including changes in the day-to-day activities, interactions, and skills of officers, well beyond the traditional roles for which police are commonly hired, trained, and evaluated (Buerger, Petrosino, & Petrosino, 1999; Lurigio & Rosenbaum, 1994). According to Buerger et al. (1999, p. 127), community policing and problem-oriented policing models do not eliminate or downplay the importance of the traditional model of control (i.e., confront, command, and coerce to establish and maintain authority and presence) but rather places officers in situations and partnership with the community in which the traditional model of control is irrelevant and counterproductive. Instead, community policing and problem-oriented policing models require officers to participate, promote, and persuade interested community stakeholders to come together and take action, and requires officers to mediate between conflicting parties and interests.

REFORM TRAINING: TRAINING THE POLICE IN ALTERNATIVE POLICING STRATEGIES

To effectively implement community policing, police departments must make it a priority to educate police officers in the theories and practices of community policing and problem-oriented policing, as well as train and encourage officers to translate program elements into actual field activities (Bradford & Pynes, 1999; Dantzker, Lurigio, Hartnett, Houmes, & Davidsdottir, 1995; Lurigio & Rosenbaum, 1994; Lurigio & Skogan, 1994; Rosenbaum, Yeh, & Wilkinson, 1994; Sadd & Grinc, 1993; Wilkinson & Rosenbaum, 1994; Wycoff & Skogan, 1993, 1994). Concomitantly, over the past several years, extensive efforts have been made by police administrators, police training specialists, and criminal justice scholars to redefine and redevelop police training programs and curricula around community policing and problem-oriented policing philosophies (see Dantzker et al.,

emy, the 446 police recruits, and the 25 Arizona police agencies that participated in this study. Thanks are also extended to Vincent Webb and David Schaefer for help and advice related to data analysis and earlier drafts of this final report.
In fact, the COPS has expended substantial financial resources to developing and delivering training to law enforcement personnel in support of community policing through the development of an extensive network of Regional Community Policing Institutes.

According to Buerger (1998), in much of the community policing training that is being delivered across the United States, the balance between training to change attitudes and beliefs and skills training to do community policing is uneven. Most of the emphasis has been placed on changing officers’ attitudes, and there are few skills training components that would mark or facilitate the necessary change in police officers’ behavior. This imbalance in training may, in part, exist because community policing training has been marketed as a philosophy and a fight for the hearts and minds of the ordinary patrol officer rather than a process of providing police with a set of skills and techniques. To achieve the level of support from police personnel that is necessary to move community policing beyond rhetoric to actual practice and effecting meaningful change, both Buerger (1998) and Wilkinson and Rosenbaum (1994) argue that fundamental changes need to be made to existing training programs, at all levels of the police organization.

Police training academies, responsible for delivering basic police officer training, have responded to the call to deliver community policing training by incorporating modules and materials designed to instill attitudes and beliefs in police personnel that are consistent with community policing philosophies. In a study of community policing training efforts across the United States, the Institute for Law and Justice (McEwen, Webster, & Pandey, 1997) found that training academies have incorporated community policing training into their recruit training in several ways, including adding new recruit courses related to community policing and/or incorporating community policing philosophies and practices into some or all recruit courses. Although the list of community policing courses varied, the most common courses were designed to inform recruits about community policing philosophies and concepts, problem-solving techniques, dealing with special populations, how to build police-community relations, team building and leadership, communication skills and tactics, and patrol techniques and beat profiling.

In 1995, mandated by the Arizona’s Police Officers Standard Training (POST) Board and the Arizona Law Enforcement Academies (ALEA) users group, the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy revised its basic-training curriculum and implemented a 606.5-hour, 16-week basic-
training program that integrates community policing and problem-oriented policing across the curriculum. The integrated curriculum was designed to provide a range of supportive concepts and skills that police officers can use to do police work, including teaching officers the benefits and methods of developing positive police-community relations and that community policing techniques are beneficial in dealing with crime problems. The goals of the redesigned basic-training program, in addition to developing basic proficiency in police tactical skills and knowledge of departmental procedures and laws, are to: increase support for the use of traditional policing tactics and processes; increase support for community policing philosophies and practices; develop more favorable attitudes toward problem-oriented policing; improve problem-solving capabilities; and develop more favorable attitudes toward building positive police-public relationships. This revised basic-training program is fairly typical and is a form of “reform training” being used by numerous agencies throughout the United States (see Buerger, 1998; McEwen, 1997).

Bradford and Pynes (1999) contended that despite police academy attempts to incorporate community policing and problem-solving policing training into basic-training curricula, police academy training has changed very little since 1986. In fact, after an examination of syllabi and curricula from 22 police academies across the United States, Bradford and Pynes concluded that less than 3% of basic-training academy time is spent on cognitive and decision-making domains (e.g., simulated scenarios, effective communication, and decision making based on reasoning and application of knowledge and skills). More than 90% of basic academy training time is spent on task-oriented training that instructs police recruits in the basic repetitive skills and conditioned responses associated with the reactive nature of the traditional model of policing. Likewise, Buerger (1998) maintains that recruit training still tends to focus on the basic everyday skills and legal training—use of criminal and motor vehicle codes, defensive tactics, firearms, defensive and pursuit driving, report writing—needed to perform police work, despite attempts to integrate reform training into basic police training and field training.

In light of the extensive efforts and resources devoted to redefining and redeveloping police training programs and curricula around community policing and problem-solving policing philosophies, it is surprising that few empirical studies have examined the direct effects of community-policing training on individual police personnel (Boydston & Sherry, 1975; Greene & Decker, 1989; Hayeslip & Cordner, 1987; Lurigio & Rosenbaum,
1994; Lurigio & Skogan, 1994; Rosenbaum et al., 1994; Schwartz & Clarren, 1977; Skogan, 1990; Trojanowicz, 1982, 1983; Weisburd, McElroy, & Hardyman, 1988; Wilson & Bennett, 1994; Wycoff & Skogan, 1993, 1994). Even fewer studies have examined the direct effects of basic-training programs that have integrated community policing and problem-oriented policing philosophies and strategies into its curriculum on police recruits (Bradford & Pynes, 1999). Thus, the level of training, type of training, and information exchange that is needed to achieve support for community policing and problem-oriented policing among police officers is still being explored (see Buerger, 1998; Dantzker et al., 1995; Rosenbaum et al., 1994; Wilson & Bennett, 1994; Wycoff & Skogan, 1994).

**SUSTAINING ATTITUDE CHANGE OVER TIME**

If basic training is successful in instilling cognitive changes that are supportive of community policing and problem-solving policing, what is required to sustain such cognitive changes? According to Mastrofski and Ritti (1996), an organization that wishes to benefit from the institutional function of training will tightly couple the training with other organizational structures and day-to-day work activities. Moreover, Mastrofski and Ritti theorize that intense and high-quality training may quickly dissipate once officers are exposed to the powerful effects of everyday work, the organization, and the occupational culture of more experienced and veteran coworkers. Thus, police recruits exposed to community policing and problem-solving policing training in the basic-training academy may find little value in those activities if, on graduation from the training academy and entrance into the police agency, field-training officers (FTOs) and the department afford them few opportunities to apply it, supervisors discourage it, and it is irrelevant for career advancement. For instance, McEwen (1997) found that among 532 law enforcement agencies that use FTOs, only 23% of these agencies require FTOs to have at least a knowledge of community policing and/or have demonstrated community policing skills. In addition, only 25% of the police agencies provide FTOs with specialized community policing training designed to help them train police recruits in community policing and problem-solving policing.

Community policing models further theorize that police departments with organizational structures and programs in place to support community policing and job designs that engage line officers in community policing and problem-solving practices should have greater success in sustaining
officer attitudes that are supportive of community policing and problem-solving policing. In addition, these organizational and job responsibility changes are expected to change the daily activities of police officers and consequently lead to community policing and problem-solving initiatives that are expected to improve officers’ attitudes, knowledge, and skills related to community policing and problem-solving policing, as well as change the nature of their relationship with the public (Lurigio & Skogan, 1998; Rosenbaum & Wilkinson, 1994; Wilson & Bennett, 1994; Wycoff & Skogan, 1993; see also, Rosenbaum, 1994).

A review of the community policing literature reveals that despite the importance of community policing training, the effects of such training on officers has not been fully explored. In fact, the following three general questions remain unanswered: Does a police training academy that integrates community policing and problem-solving principals throughout the basic-training curriculum have success in increasing police recruits’ support for and orientation to community policing and problem-solving policing? Do police departments with organizational structures and field-training processes in place to engage new officers in community policing and problem-solving practices have greater success in sustaining officer attitudes that are supportive of community policing and problem-solving policing? Do individual characteristics and other potential influences (e.g., preexisting attitudes) help explain changes in police recruits’ attitudes toward community policing and problem-solving policing in the earliest stages of their police career? In an effort to answer these questions and address a gap in the literature, this study was designed to assess the impact of basic training, field training, and work environment on police recruits’ attitudes related to community policing, problem-solving policing, and police-public relations.

METHOD AND DATA

To accomplish the objectives of the study, a panel sample of 446 police recruits were followed through the 606.5-hour, 16-week Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy basic-training program, and then to their respective police agencies where they proceeded through field training and the completion of a 1-year probationary period. More specifically, the panel sample of 446 police recruits was selected from 14 successive basic-training academy classes that began between December 1995 and October 1996. On entering the training academy (i.e., on the first day at the academy), each
police recruit was pretested (Time 1). Training academy administrators provided researchers with 1 hour of class time during which the survey was administered and collected immediately on completion. The pretest measured police recruits' baseline attitudes toward traditional policing, community policing philosophies and strategies, problem-solving techniques, and the importance of building positive police-public relations.

A 16-week lag existed between the pretest and the first posttest (Time 2), which was conducted during the final 3 days of the basic-training academy. From the original sample, 389 recruits of 446 completed the posttest at Time 2. Because the purpose of the training academy was to instill and shape police recruits’ attitudes to be supportive of community policing, problem-solving policing, police-public relations, and traditional policing, measures of attitudes were compared from Time 1 to Time 2.

Because continued assessment throughout the field-training and occupational socialization processes were an essential part of the research design, a second posttest (Time 3) was conducted at or near the end of the recruits’ field-training process, 12 weeks after the first posttest. At this stage of the research, recruits were tracked to their respective police agency. Exactly 356 police recruits completed the Time 3 survey, which was administered in a face-to-face setting between June 1996 and March 1997. The second posttest was an important part of the research inasmuch as it revealed the impact of field training, work environment, and disparate community policing approaches on officers’ attitudes. To reveal such impacts, officers’ attitudes were compared from Time 2 to Time 3.

Finally, a third posttest (Time 4) occurred after police recruits completed 1 year of employment in their respective police agency. Exactly 292 police recruits completed the Time 4 survey, which was administered in a face-to-face setting between March 1997 and February 1998. Police recruits’ attitudes after completing 1 year of employment in their respective police agency were compared to those at Time 1 and Time 2 to determine the magnitude and direction of change over time.

POLICE PERSONNEL SURVEY:
MEASUREMENT AND SCALE CONSTRUCTION

questions that formed scales that measured factors such as officers’ support for community policing and traditional policing, orientation to community policing and problem-solving policing, problem-solving capabilities, and attitudes toward police-public relations. Each of these multi-item scales reflect the influence of extensive research into community policing and problem-solving policing (Lurigio, 1995; Lurigio & Skogan, 1998; Rosenbaum, 1994; Wycoff & Skogan, 1993). Moreover, the construct validity of these multi-item scales have been confirmed in the work of Lurigio and Skogan (1994, 1998) and Rosenbaum et al. (1994) through a variety of evaluation studies designed to evaluate the impact of community policing on police personnel. In this study, the Police Personnel Survey was administered at the pretest and each of the posttests to assess the extent of stability and/or change in recruits’ attitudes as they advanced through basic training and the first year of their police careers.

Table 1 identifies the multi-item scales used in this study and the constructs that they measure, and provides the alpha statistics, the number of items included in each scale, and the Likert-type scale used to measure the scale items. Scale items are positively keyed so that larger summated scores reflect a stronger position on the scale dimension than do smaller scores. The alpha statistics, reflecting the reliability of the various scales, ranged from .572 to .888; all but three were above .70.5

To sort out how the effects of training and socialization are impacted by the individual characteristics of police recruits, the Police Personnel Survey was also designed to collect data on the individual characteristics of police recruits. These characteristics include the following: gender, race/ethnicity, age, prior military experience, prior law enforcement experience, marital status, and highest level of formal education completed.

Descriptive statistics for the panel sample of police recruits used in this analysis are presented in Table 2. As can be seen, the size and characteristics of the sample changed over time as police recruits dropped out of police work and/or the study.6 Males are overrepresented in the sample, composing at least 88% of the sample at any point in time. In addition, Whites compose at least 76% of the sample, Hispanics make up on average 11.5% of the sample, and Blacks make up 3%. The majority of the sample is between 20 and 30 years of age and had completed some college or a 4-year bachelor’s degree. Finally, the majority of recruits included in the sample were hired by Phoenix metropolitan area police agencies; more specifically, police recruits hired by the Phoenix Police Department made up 54.5% \( (n = 243) \) of the sample at Time 1 and 58.5% \( (n = 169) \) of the sample at Time 4.7
SURVEY OF POLICE AGENCIES

Another component of this longitudinal study involved a survey of police agencies across the State of Arizona that had police recruits in the final sample. Police agencies included metropolitan police agencies, small town/rural police agencies, sheriff offices, Indian tribal police agencies, and university police agencies. The Community Policing Survey developed by Mary Ann Wycoff (1993) was used to measure work environment and how police agencies conceptualized and implemented community policing. Between June 1996 and March 1997, the Community Policing Survey was administered to 21 of the 25 police agencies. More specifically, the survey was administered to police chiefs from 19 of the police agencies and 10 precinct/district commanders from 2 of the 25 police agencies. A total of 15 police chiefs and 6 precinct commanders completed and returned the Community Policing Survey, establishing an overall response rate of 72.4%.

TABLE 1. Scale Descriptions and Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Description</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community policing related scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for COP: Officers’ attitudes regarding the allocation of agency resources</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4-point Likert-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services in keeping with the philosophies and strategies of community policing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to COP: Officers’ opinions about community policing activities and</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5-point Likert-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police-community relations scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police-public relations: Officers’ perceptions about police-citizen relations and</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5-point Likert-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizens’ views and opinions of the police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving policing scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to PSP: Officers’ opinions about problem-solving activities and their</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5-point Likert-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving capability: Officers’ perceptions concerning their ability to</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-point Likert-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform problem-solving-related activities (i.e., engaging in each step of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A.R.A. model)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional policing related scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for TP: Officers’ attitudes regarding the allocation of agency resources</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-point Likert-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to activities and services in keeping with traditional policing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker attitudes scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers support for COP: Degree to which officers feel their coworkers support</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4-point Likert-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community policing activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers support for TP: Degree to which officers feel their coworkers support</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-point Likert-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional policing activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: COP = Community Oriented Policing Services Office; TP = traditional policing; S.A.R.A = scanning, analysis, response, and assessment; PSP = problem-solving policing.
Among the 15 police chiefs and 6 precinct commanders who responded to the survey, 71.4% (n = 15) reported their agency had already implemented community policing, and 23.8% (n = 5) reported their agency was in the process implementing a community policing approach. Although the majority of police agencies had implemented community policing, only 19% (n = 4) of the respondents reported having departmental policies to support community policing. On the other hand, 57% (n = 12) of the respondents reported their agency had or were in the process of developing written policies concerning police interactions with citizens, 52% (n = 11) had or
were in the process of developing written policies concerning procedures to
deal with neighborhood problems, and 42.9\% (n = 9) had or were in the pro-
cess of developing written policies concerning police interactions with
other government agencies. Furthermore, 52.4\% (n = 11) of the respondents
reported their agency measures its progress or success at community polic-
ing on the basis of published departmental goals or objectives.

**EXPECTATIONS**

As previously stated, the goal of the Phoenix Regional Police Training
Academy’s basic-training program is to bring about initial positive changes
in police recruits’ attitudes toward community policing, problem-solving
policing, police-public relations, and traditional policing. So, if the acad-
emy’s basic-training program was effective, one would expect police
recruits to have more positive attitudes toward community policing, problem-
solving policing, police-public relations, and traditional policing when they
exit the training academy compared to when they entered the training acad-
emy. One would also expect to see police recruits’ attitudes toward commu-
nity policing, problem-solving policing, police-public relations, and tradi-
tional policing increase or at least remain the same as they proceed through
the field-training phase and complete their 1-year probationary period.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

The first step in the analysis was to assess the impact of basic training,
field training, and work environment on police recruits’ attitudes related to
community policing, problem-solving policing, police-public relations,
and traditional policing. One-way analysis of variance and multiple regres-
sion were used. In the one-way analysis of variance, the dependent variables
are difference scores (i.e., Time 2 minus Time 1, Time 3 minus 2, Time 4
minus Time 2, and Time 4 minus Time 1 scores for individual respondents)
for each of the scales. This analysis allows us to determine if any changes in
police recruits’ attitudes were significant, as well as determine the direction
of change in recruits’ attitudes over time. Finally, multiple regression mod-
el models are used to investigate the effects of basic training, field training, and
occupational socialization while controlling for individual characteristics,
organizational environment factors, and other potential influences such as
academy class and preexisting attitudes.
RESULTS

CHANGE OVER TIME IN POLICE RECRUITS’ ATTITUDES

Table 3 reveals significant changes in mean scores on many of the scales. To begin, we note some significant differences in police recruits’ attitudes between Time 1 (preacademy) and Time 2 (exit academy). According to expectations, on completing basic training, police recruits expressed more positive attitudes toward both community policing and problem-solving policing, they felt more qualified to engage in problem-solving tasks related to the 4-stage problem-solving S.A.R.A. model (i.e., scanning, analysis, response, and assessment), and they were more supportive of allocating agency resources to traditional policing strategies. As expected, the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy had a positive impact on police recruits’ attitudes related to community policing, public-public relations, problem-solving policing, as well as traditional policing. Bear in mind that although the impact is significant, the change is small.

Police recruits’ attitudes continued to change after they left the training academy and returned to their respective police agencies where they completed field training. Unfortunately, the positive gains that the training academy had made in shaping police recruits’ attitudes toward community policing and problem-solving policing were lost by the end of the field-training process. In particular, at the end of field training (Time 3), police recruits believed that fewer resources should be devoted to community policing, expressed less favorable views toward community policing and its effectiveness, and felt less qualified to engage in problem-solving tasks related to the S.A.R.A. model. Between Time 2 and Time 3, the only positive attitude change that occurred was that police recruits developed more positive views of police-public relations.

After completing field training, police recruits then proceeded to complete a 1-year probationary period during which their attitudes continued to change. By the end of their first year on the job (Time 4), police recruits held more negative attitudes toward community policing and problem-solving policing and felt that fewer resources should be devoted to community policing, than they did at the end of academy training (Time 2). The positive gains the training academy made in increasing police recruit support for community policing and problem-solving policing was not sustained once police recruits returned to their respective police agencies. Police recruits did, however, express more favorable views of police-public relations after
1 year on the job than they did at the end of academy training. This finding suggests that as police recruits develop a streetwise competence and recognize that to “get the job done” or “do the job better,” they must interact with the community and work on developing positive police-public relations.

An overall assessment of changes in police recruits attitudes from Time 1 (preacademy) to Time 4 (end of first year) reveals that police recruits entered the training academy with more supportive views of community policing than they possessed after 1 year on the job. This means that police recruits’ support of community policing can quickly dissipate if training and programs are not in place to reinforce such attitudes. The only positive attitudinal changes that occurred between Time 1 and Time 4 were those related to police-public relations and problem-solving capabilities. Although the change on these scales was significant, the magnitude of change was small.

**PREDICTORS OF CHANGE IN POLICE RECRUITS’ ATTITUDES**

Next, multiple regression analysis was used to assess the strength of basic academy training, field training, and occupational socialization in ex-

---

**TABLE 3. Scale Means Over Time With Comparisons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Time 1: Enter Academy</th>
<th>Time 2: Exit Academy</th>
<th>Time 3: End Field Training</th>
<th>Time 4: End 1 Year</th>
<th>Overall F Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community policing related scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for COP</td>
<td>30.88</td>
<td>31.29</td>
<td>29.73^b</td>
<td>29.25^c,d</td>
<td>17.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to COP</td>
<td>35.51</td>
<td>36.53^a</td>
<td>34.99^b</td>
<td>34.82^c,d</td>
<td>19.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police-community relations scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police-public relations</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>22.15^h</td>
<td>22.31^f,d</td>
<td>6.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving policing scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to PSP</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>35.78^a</td>
<td>35.49</td>
<td>35.03^y</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving capability</td>
<td>13.96</td>
<td>14.98^a</td>
<td>14.31^b</td>
<td>14.82^d</td>
<td>19.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional policing related scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: T tests were used to compare across the different times. COP = Community Oriented Policing Services Office; TP = traditional policing; PSP = problem-solving policing.

a. Change from Time 1 to 2, p ≤ .05.
b. Change from Time 2 to 3, p ≤ .05.
c. Change from Time 2 to 4, p ≤ .05.
d. Change from Time 1 to 4, p ≤ .05.
plaining changes in police recruits’ attitudes while controlling for individual characteristics, organizational environment factors, and other potential influences (e.g., academy class and preexisting attitudes). The metrics for the independent variables or predictors included in the analyses are described below.

- **Age.** Actual self-reported age of recruits at Time 1.
- **Education.** Coded 1 if recruit had a bachelor’s degree or higher; 0 if recruit had less than a bachelor’s degree.
- **White/Caucasian.** Coded 1 if recruit was White/Caucasian; 0 if recruit was non-White/racial minority.
- **Sex.** Coded 1 if the recruit was male; 0 if the recruit was female.
- **Prior law enforcement experience.** Coded 1 if the recruit had prior law enforcement experience; 0 if recruit had no prior law enforcement experience. This variable was included to account for the possibility that prior law enforcement experience would be especially important in shaping recruits’ attitudes.
- **Prior military experience.** Coded 1 if recruit had prior military experience; 0 if recruit had no prior military experience. This variable was included to account for the possibility that prior experience in a military organization might be similar enough to that in a quasi-military police organization and produce an effect similar to that of prior law enforcement experience.
- **Baseline level.** The baseline level or mean score at Time 1 (preacademy). This variable provides a basis for assessing the relative impact of preacademy attitudes on change in those attitudes. This helps to get at the question of whether academy training, field training, and/or occupational socialization can significantly overcome the attitudes that police recruits bring with them to the academy, and change them in a direction that is more consistent with community policing philosophies and values.
- **Agency.** The police agencies from which recruits originated were grouped into one of three categories and treated as an indicator variable. “Phoenix PD” includes all recruits from the Phoenix Police Department; “Suburban Phoenix” includes recruits from the other police agencies in the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Recruits from police agencies other than the Phoenix PD or Suburban Phoenix were placed in a third category that served as the reference or excluded category for the other two categories. These categories serve as referents for several police organizational characteristics such as size, complexity of the police organization, workload, calls for service, and crime levels. The reference/excluded category was coded 0, and the included category was coded 1.
- **COP rank: Patrol officer responsibility.** The Community Policing Survey was used to rank police agencies as high or low on requiring the patrol officer to be involved in community policing activities. Police agencies were coded 1 if they ranked high; 0 if they ranked low. This category serves as a referent for work environment and implementation of community policing.
- **COP rank: Organizational arrangements.** The Community Policing Survey was also used to rank police agencies as high or low on having organizational arrangements/structures in place that support community policing philosophies. Police agencies
were coded 1 if they ranked high on the organizational arrangements/structures scale; 0 if they ranked low. This category also serves as a referent for work environment and implementation of community policing.

- COP rank: Citizen participation. The Community Policing Survey was also used to rank police agencies as high or low on the level of citizen participation in the police department. Police agencies were coded 1 if they ranked high on the citizen participation scale; 0 if they ranked low. This category serves as a referent for implementation of community policing.

- Coworker support for community policing. This is the mean score at Time 4 (end of 1 year) of police recruits’ views of their coworkers’ support for community policing. This variable provides a basis for assessing the impact of coworker attitudes on change in police recruits attitudes. This helps to get at the question of whether coworkers’ attitudes and beliefs, to which police recruits are exposed during the fieldtraining and occupational socialization processes, can significantly impact the attitudes of police recruits.

- Coworker support for traditional policing. This is the mean score at Time 4 (end of one year) of police recruits’ views of their coworkers’ support for traditional policing. This variable provides a basis for assessing the impact of coworker attitudes on change in police recruits attitudes.

- Shift. The shift to which recruits were assigned at Time 3 (end of field training) and Time 4 (end of 1 year) were grouped into one of four categories (1st shift, 2nd shift, 3rd shift, and other shifts). The 1st shift (6 a.m.-4 p.m.) was coded 0 and served as the reference or excluded category for the other three categories, which were coded 1. These categories serve as referents for several police organizational characteristics such as workload, calls for service, and opportunities to engage in community policing.

- Academy class. The academy class for each recruit was treated as an indicator variable and coded 1 if the recruit was in the class; 0 if not. Recruits from 14 different academy classes participated in the study, and the first class of recruits was treated as the excluded category in the regression models. Recruit class was included to capture the possibility that recruits who trained together for 16 weeks could possibly develop a unique training class culture that could influence recruit attitudes. For example, it would be reasonable to expect that a recruit sergeant and the makeup of the recruit class (i.e., a recruit class with a number of police recruits with prior law enforcement or military experience, or a recruit class with recruits from only the Phoenix PD or from numerous police agencies) might have an impact on individual recruits.

REGRESSION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDE CHANGE DURING ACADEMY TRAINING

Table 4 reveals the results of the multiple regression analysis that was used to assess the strength of academy training in explaining changes in police recruits’ attitudes, while controlling for individual characteristics, organizational environment factors, and other potential influences (e.g., academy class and preexisting attitudes). Each of the models in Table 4
TABLE 4. Regression Analysis of Attitude Change During Academy Training (From Time 1 to Time 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Change in Orientation Police-Public Relations</th>
<th>Change in PSP Capability</th>
<th>Change in Support for TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in Support for COP</td>
<td>Change in Orientation for COP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior law enforcement experience</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior military experience</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline level</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency—Phoenix Police Department</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency—Suburban Phoenix</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP rank: Patrol responsibility</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP rank: Organizational arrangements</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP rank: Citizen participation</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 2</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 3</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 4</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 5</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 6</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 7</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 8</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Change in Support for COP</th>
<th>Change in Orientation to COP</th>
<th>Change in Police-Public Relations</th>
<th>Change in Orientation to PSP</th>
<th>Change in PSP Capability</th>
<th>Change in Support for TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 9</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 13</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 \) adjusted | .174** | .189** | .246** | .202** | .570** | .294** |
\( F \)            | 3.60   | 3.88   | 5.05   | 4.14   | 17.41  | 6.14   |

Note: COP = Community Oriented Policing Services Office; TP = traditional policing; PSP = problem-solving policing.
*p ≤ .05. **p ≤ .01.
explains a large proportion of the variance in the change in police recruits’ attitudes during academy training. One of the most interesting findings is that, in each of the models, baseline level measures or preacademy attitudes emerge as the strongest predictor of the increase in police recruits’ attitudes related to community policing, problem-solving policing, police-public relations, and traditional policing during academy. In other words, police recruits who entered the training academy with the view that fewer resources should be devoted to community policing and/or traditional policing were more likely to support funding community policing and/or traditional policing activities on exiting the training academy. Similarly, recruits who entered the training academy with less favorable attitudes toward community policing, problem-solving policing, and/or police-public relations were more likely to exit the training academy with more positive attitudes toward community policing, problem-solving policing, and police-public relations. In addition, police recruits who did not feel qualified to engage in problem-solving activities when they entered the training academy were more likely to exit the training academy with more confidence in their problem-solving capabilities. These findings provide support for the assumption that academy training had a positive impact on shaping police recruits’ attitudes related to community policing, problem-solving policing, police-public relations, as well as traditional policing.10

In the change in support for community policing model, education also had a significant beta coefficient. Police recruits who held less than a bachelor’s degree were more likely to increase their support for community policing during academy training than recruits with a bachelor’s degree or higher. This, in part, may be because police recruits with less than a bachelor’s degree were not as likely to enter the training academy with the knowledge or awareness that many police agencies are moving toward a model of policing that encompasses a combination of incident-driven policing, traditional policing tactics, and community policing and problem-solving policing philosophies and strategies; thus, they may have been more likely to think that community policing activities were outside the realm of police work.

Another interesting finding is that an agency’s ranking on the patrol responsibility scale emerged as a weak predictor of the change in orientation to community policing and problem-solving policing. In other words, police recruits who were hired by police agencies that require patrol officers to engage in community policing were more likely to develop more
favorable attitudes toward community policing and problem-solving policing while at the training academy than recruits hired by agencies that do not require patrol officers to engage in community policing. This could mean that police agencies that require patrol officers to engage in community policing were more likely to hire individuals who were more receptive to community policing philosophies and practices, and/or that socialization of recruits into the organizational culture of a police agency begins early in a police officer’s career, as early as the hiring process and/or academy training (see Van Maanen, 1977).

Finally, academy classes emerged as statistically significant variables in four of the models (see Table 4). This finding suggests that police recruits who train together for 16 weeks possibly develop a unique training class culture that influences recruits’ attitudes. Class culture could be shaped by class sergeant and/or instructor differences from one class to the next; however, this study did not examine actual training practices per se. Differences in student composition from one class to another could also produce a dynamic or class effect that promotes or impedes the development of attitudinal and belief systems supportive of community policing, problem-solving policing, and police-public relations. For example, a class may have a number of police recruits with prior law enforcement and/or military experience, a bachelor’s degree, older or younger recruits, and recruits from police agencies that ranked high or low on the community policing scales.

These findings provide support for the assumption that a combination of preacademy attitudes, individual characteristics, organizational environment factors, and other mediating factors (such as academy class) had a significant impact on shaping police recruits’ attitudes related to community policing, problem-solving policing, police-public relations, and traditional policing during the earliest stages of their police careers.

**REGRESSION ANALYSIS: ATTITUDE CHANGE DURING FIELD TRAINING**

Next, multiple regression was used to assess the strength of field training in explaining changes in police recruits’ attitudes, while controlling for individual characteristics, organizational environment factors, and other potential influences (see Table 5). One of the most interesting findings is that both preacademy attitudes and academy class had less of an impact in explaining the variance in changes in police recruits’ attitudes during field
training, and organizational environment factors become more powerful forces in shaping police recruits’ attitudes during this time. For instance, in the orientation to community policing model, the strongest predictors of the decrease in attitudes toward community policing during field training were organizational environment factors, such as 3rd shift (9 p.m.-7 a.m.), other shifts (e.g., 9 a.m.-5 p.m. and relief shifts), and agency ranking on the patrol responsibility scale. In other words, police recruits assigned to 3rd shift or other shifts at the end of their field-training process were more likely to express less favorable attitudes toward community policing than recruits assigned to 1st shift (6 a.m.-4 p.m.). Police recruits assigned to 3rd shift were more likely to maintain their support for traditional policing (see change in support for traditional policing model). In addition, recruits working in police agencies that do not require patrol officers to engage in community policing activities were more likely to hold less favorable attitudes toward both community policing and problem-solving policing at the end of field training. These variables explained only 5% of the variance in the change in orientation to community policing during field training.

The police-public relations model explained 8% of the variance in the change in recruits’ attitudes toward police-public relations during field training. In this model, prior law enforcement experience, preacademy attitudes, and an agency’s ranking on the patrol responsibility scale had significant beta coefficients. Accordingly, police recruits who held more negative views of police-public relations at the end of academy training were more likely to hold more positive views of police-public relations after field training. In addition, police recruits who had prior law enforcement experience, as well as those working in police agencies that require patrol officers to engage in community policing, were more likely to develop more favorable views of police-public relations during field training.

It is important to point out that the models in Table 5 explain a small proportion of the variance in the change in police recruits’ attitudes during field training. The low adjusted $R^2$-squares in each of these models is largely based on the fact that the informal culture of police organizations and work groups seems to be a stronger predictor of the change in police recruits’ attitudes during field training than more easily measured individual characteristics. Because it is difficult to develop survey items and scales that adequately quantitatively measure the various dimensions of the informal culture of a police organization and/or work group, it is impossible to estimate the full effect of the informal culture over the formal training.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Change in Support for COP</th>
<th>Change in Support for COP</th>
<th>Change in Police-Public Relations</th>
<th>Change in Orientation to PSP</th>
<th>Change in PSP Capability</th>
<th>Change in Support for TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual characteristic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior law enforcement experience</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior military experience</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline level</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency—Phoenix Police Department</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency—Suburban Phoenix</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP rank: Patrol responsibility</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP rank: Organizational arrangements</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP rank: Citizen participation</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd shift</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd shift</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other shifts</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 2</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 3</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 4</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 5</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 6</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 7</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 8</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 9</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ adjusted</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.057*</td>
<td>.081**</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: COP = Community Oriented Policing Services Office; TP = traditional policing; PSP = problem-solving policing.*

*p ≤ .05. **p ≤ .01.
REGRESSION ANALYSIS: OVERALL ATTITUDE CHANGE DURING THE COURSE OF THE STUDY

Table 6 reveals the results of the multiple regression that was used to assess the strength of the formal and informal socialization experiences during the earliest stages of a police recruits’ careers in explaining changes in police recruits’ attitudes. The six models explained from 26% to 54% of the variance in changes in police recruits’ attitudes between Time 1 and Time 4. In each of the models, preadacemy attitudes was the strongest predictor of the overall changes that occurred in police recruits attitudes during the first 16-months of their police careers. Coworker attitudes and shift to which a recruit was assigned were also strong predictors of change in police recruits’ attitudes. In particular, police recruits working in police agencies in which coworkers were supportive of community policing were more likely to sustain their support for community policing and their orientation to problem-solving policing during the earliest stages of their police careers. At the same time, police recruits assigned to 2nd and 3rd shifts, in which patrol officers tend to have fewer opportunities and less time to engage in community policing due to workload, were more likely to develop more negative attitudes toward community policing during the earliest stage of their careers. In other words, work groups, based on shift, has a significant impact on shaping police recruits’ attitudes. These findings provide support for the hypothesis that organizational environment and culture has a significant impact on shaping police recruits’ attitudes during the earliest stages of their police careers.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In general, the findings presented reveal that the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy had a positive impact on shaping police recruits’ attitudes related to community policing, problem-solving policing, as well as traditional policing. In addition, the training academy was able to help police recruits improve their problem-solving capabilities. It is important to realize that although the impact of academy training on police recruits’ attitudes and skills is significant, the change is small.

On graduation from the Phoenix Police Training Academy, police recruits proceed to their respective police agencies where they are assigned to a FTO and required to successfully complete the field-training process and then a 1-year probationary period. The field-training phase of the police
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Change in Support for COP</th>
<th>Change in Orientation to COP</th>
<th>Change in Police–Public Relations to PSP</th>
<th>Change in Orientation to PSP</th>
<th>Change in PSP Capability</th>
<th>Change in Support for TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual characteristic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior law enforcement experience</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior military experience</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline level</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>-.62**</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.59**</td>
<td>-.75**</td>
<td>-.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency—Phoenix Police Department</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency—Suburban Phoenix</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP rank: Patrol responsibility</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP rank: Organizational arrangements</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP rank: Citizen participation</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker support for COP</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker support for TP</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd shift</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd shift</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other shifts</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 3</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Change in Support for COP</th>
<th>Change in Orientation to COP</th>
<th>Change in Police-Public Relations to PSP</th>
<th>Change in Orientation to PSP</th>
<th>Change in PSP Capability</th>
<th>Change in Support for TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 4</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 5</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 6</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 7</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 8</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 9</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 10</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 12</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 13</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy—class 14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


$F$: 4.06, 5.74, 3.79, 4.63, 10.18, 5.83

**Note:** COP = Community Oriented Policing Services Office; TP = traditional policing; PSP = problem-solving policing.

*p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01.
recruit’s career presents the first real opportunity for the recruit to experience the police officer role, engage in actual police work, and experience the environment and culture of the police organization. It also represents an important training opportunity for reinforcing and further developing the gains the training academy had made in shaping recruits’ attitudes toward community policing and problem-solving policing. At the same time, however, field training represents an opportunity to negate the gains achieved during academy training. The findings presented here show that the field-training processes and organizational environments of the various police agencies that participated in this study, in general, failed to reinforce the positive impact that the training academy had on police recruits’ attitudes toward community policing and problem-solving policing. Instead, the field-training processes and organizational environments had a negative impact on police recruits’ attitudes related to community policing and problem-solving policing, as well as on developing police recruits’ problem-solving capabilities. The only positive impact that the field-training processes had on police recruits was related to reinforcing their support for traditional policing and perceptions of police-public relations.

The present study not only reveals the direction of change in police recruits’ attitudes and beliefs over time but also confirms that preacademy attitudes and skills, organizational environment factors, individual characteristics, and academy class factors help to predict attitude and skill changes. Although there is variation over time as to which independent variables predict the change in police recruits’ attitudes, what is most interesting are some of the consistent patterns that emerge in each of the models. For one, the strongest predictor of the changes that occur during academy training is the preacademy attitudes that police recruits possess. This finding confirms Buerger’s (1998) assertion that no police recruit comes to basic training without well-developed attitudes and beliefs about the nature of police work. In other words, police recruits are not empty vessels to be filled with new attitudes and beliefs related to policing. Thus, training to change basic attitudes and beliefs, also referred to as “reform” training, faces a very different challenge than does basic skills training because attitudes and beliefs about the nature of policing are relatively stable cognitive states, that although not completely impervious to change, are very difficult to change.

The findings also suggest that police recruits who train together for 16 weeks possibly develop a unique training class culture that influences recruit attitudes. Class culture could be shaped by class sergeant and/or instructor differences from one class to the next; however, this study did not
examine actual training practices per se, and it may be that some instructors give recruits mixed messages that mediated desired training effects. Differences in student composition from one class to another could also produce a dynamic or class effect that promotes or impedes the development of attitudinal and belief systems supportive of community policing, traditional policing, problem-solving policing, and police-public relations. For example, a class may have a number of police recruits with prior law enforcement and/or military experience, a bachelor’s degree, older or younger recruits, and recruits from police agencies that ranked high or low on the community policing and problem-solving policing scales. These findings may have important policy implications for the organization and delivery of academy training. In particular, attention needs to be given to understanding and mediating those influences responsible for producing differential outcomes.

Perhaps an even more difficult problem is sustaining whatever academy training gains are made once the police recruit leaves the training academy and begins the process of socialization into the organization and immersion into the real world of police work. Although, there is variation across the models as to which independent variables are predictors of change during field training, there are some consistent patterns. In particular, organizational environment factors, such as shift, coworker attitudes, and whether a police agency requires patrol officers to engage in community policing were significant predictors of the change in police recruits’ attitudes. The emergence of shift and coworker attitudes as significant predictor variables provide support for the assumption that there are multiple informal cultures within police organizations, such as those based on shift and/or squad, with differing attitudes and beliefs about police work and police-public interactions. These findings also suggest that once the police recruit leaves the training academy and enters into the field-training process in their respective police agency, organizational environment factors, including the informal culture of a police agency, become more powerful forces in shaping police recruits’ attitudes and skills related to community policing, traditional policing, problem-solving policing, and police-public relations, than individual characteristics or preacademy attitudes. In fact, preacademy attitudes disappeared as a significant predictor of attitude change during the field-training process.

Finally, an examination of the strength of the overall socialization experience of police recruits reveals that preacademy attitudes and the informal culture of a police agency can be a more powerful force in shaping the attitudes and beliefs of new officers than formal academy and/or field training.
Academy classes virtually disappeared as predictors of attitude change between Time 1 (preacademy) and Time 4 (end of 1 year), supporting the assumption that the impact of academy training on police recruits diminishes as recruits go to work in their respective police agencies and are exposed to the more powerful influences of the organizational environment and informal occupational culture (Mastrofski & Ritti, 1996).

Based on the findings, it appears that one of the single best opportunities to advance models of policing that encompass community policing and problem-solving policing philosophies and strategies is to expose police recruits to community policing and problem-solving policing concepts, principles, and practices during basic academy training. These findings reveal, however, that a basic-training academy experience, like the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy, that combines skills and legal training with reform training, is not likely to be sufficient to alter police recruits’ basic attitudes and beliefs toward police work. The gains the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy made in changing the attitudes and beliefs of police recruits, as slight as they might be, require reinforcement as police recruits move to doing police work in their respective police agencies. For instance, it seems unreasonable to expect police recruits to continue their commitment to community policing and problem-solving policing principals and practices if they leave the training academy and return to a police agency that does not require its officers to engage in community policing or problem-solving activities and has few organizational arrangements, programs, or practices in place to support community. In other words, the police agency, through its leadership, organizational arrangements and programs, and informal work groups sets the tone for community policing and problem-solving policing. When leaders are on board and the organization is configured to practice community policing and problem-solving policing, and in fact does, one would expect a greater likelihood that the police recruits they employ would continue to have attitudes and beliefs supportive of community policing and problem-solving policing (Mastrofski & Ritti, 1996).

Because the field-training process takes place immediately after recruits leave the academy, it is the single best place to expose the police recruit to community policing and problem-solving policing practices and strategies; this, in turn, would couple or link police practice with academy reform training. Certainly, the police recruit needs the field-training process to learn how to put the skills acquired in the academy to use on the street, and both FTOs and recruits indicated that field training was an extremely busy
skills-building period; however, it probably makes sense to expand or restructure the field-training process so that there is ample time to train recruits in traditional policing skills, as well as community policing and problem-solving skills. Formalizing community policing and problem-oriented policing training as part of the field-training process (i.e., requiring recruits to engage in problem-solving projects with their FTOs or assigning recruits to a community policing unit for 1 week during the field-training process), but most important, training FTOs to do community policing and problem-oriented policing training is also an important step that could be taken to sustain and expand community policing and problem-solving policing training gains made in the training academy.

Although the findings presented here are important, they are based on a sample of police recruits who attended one police training academy that adopted one model of integrating community policing and problem-solving policing into academy training. In light of the heavy reliance on both academy and in-service training to produce cognitive changes supportive of community policing and problem-solving policing, there needs to be further research conducted to assess the effectiveness of academy and in-service training on shaping police recruits’ and veteran officers’ attitudes and beliefs.

NOTES

1. McEwen (1997) surveyed 230 training academy directors and 532 law enforcement executives that implemented community policing and served jurisdictions with populations greater than 50,000 residents.

2. No specific courses were added to the academy curriculum to address community policing or problem-oriented policing; rather, community policing philosophies and practices were simply integrated into some of the recruit courses, often at the discretion of the class sergeant. And class sergeants came from the different law enforcement agencies that used the Phoenix Regional Training Academy. Any description of how community policing and problem-oriented policing were actually integrated into academy curriculum would require direct observation, which is beyond the scope of this research.

3. Buerger (1998, p. 34) defines “reform training” as training designed to alter an officer’s perception of the world and/or police work. One of the goals of reform training is essentially to mitigate the excesses of a particular attitude toward progressive police reform. In the case of community policing training, the goal is to replace outdated attitudes and beliefs about policing with new attitudes and beliefs about policing that are consistent with community policing and problem-oriented policing philosophies and strategies.

4. A panel design of 446 police recruits from 14 successive academy classes was employed—with repeated measurement on the same respondents—to provide more
statistical control over individual pretest differences and threats of internal validity due to testing effects.

5. Findings based on the scales with reliabilities below .70 should be considered tentative, and estimates based on them may be unstable and difficult to replicate.

6. The panel sample of 446 police recruits from 14 academy classes was selected with the anticipation that recruits would drop out of police work and/or the study. Prior to beginning the study, training academy administrators advised the researcher that approximately 15% of police recruits drop out of basic academy training, and it was anticipated that another 10% of recruits would drop out of police work within the first year on the job. To manage the threat of internal validity due to drop out, an initial sample of more than 400 police recruits were sought at Time 1 and police recruits were contacted via telephone at subsequent posttests (i.e., Time 3 and Time 4) and asked to participate in a follow-up survey and face-to-face interview. On completion of the study, it was found that 114, or 25.6%, of the 446 police recruits dropped out of police work and only 40, or 8.9%, of the recruits dropped out of the study.

7. The representation of Phoenix police recruits was not consistent across the 14 academy classes. Some academy classes were made up of only Phoenix police recruits, others were mixed, and some contained no Phoenix police recruits.

8. The Community Policing Survey measured the executive’s views/understanding of community policing and its potential impacts, the organization’s experience with community policing, community policing programs and practices the agency has implemented or plans to implement, organizational arrangements/structures that the agency has or plans to have for community policing to occur, patrol officer/deputy responsibilities, authority and responsibility of mid-level field operation managers, ways in which the agency works or plans to work with citizens in the community, and basic organizational information.

9. Police agencies (n = 4) that had only one police recruit in the final sample were not surveyed. In the Phoenix Police Department and the Maricopa County Sheriffs Department, physical territory is broken down into precincts or districts to form separate territorial units with separate administrative structures; therefore, precinct/district commanders from these two agencies were asked to complete the Community Policing Survey.

10. One should be cautious in making too much of these changes because they are small and because some of the scales are subject to measurement error (i.e., alpha < .70) because the measures were borrowed from other studies.

11. These findings may also be a reflection of the fact that the basic-training academy is a testing environment, and one of the things that recruits quickly learn in such an environment is “what the right answer is.” Given that recruits may have not made a sharp distinction between a test and the survey, the survey results might indicate only the “right answer” based on training academy lessons and rhetoric rather than an actual change in belief or attitude.
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During the past two decades, many American police departments have developed Citizen Police Academies. These programs are intended to improve police-community relations, to educate the public, and to further the implementation of community policing strategies. Despite their widespread use, few efforts have been made to empirically evaluate Citizen Police Academies. This study examines the impact of one Citizen Police Academy program by surveying past program participants. The results show that although the Citizen Police Academy satisfied the department’s objectives, the majority of participants entered the program with positive views of the agency. These findings are discussed in terms of the program’s overall impact within the community.

At the heart of the community policing philosophy is cooperation and communication between police organizations and the public they serve (Trojanowicz, Kappeler, Gaines, & Bucqueroux, 1998). Inherent in this philosophy is the belief that police efficacy is limited by the public; in the absence of a populace that is supportive and understanding, the police cannot achieve their goals and objectives. In an effort to build partnerships and facilitate communication, police agencies have used a wide array of programs and approaches to build connections with residents of the communities they serve (West, 1996). These efforts are aimed at “pulling back the
blue curtain” (Clark, 1993) and creating new alliances between the police and the public. One method used by a number of departments to achieve these goals has been the implementation of a Citizen Police Academy program.

Citizen Police Academies (CPAs) were first developed in the United Kingdom in 1977 for the purpose of acquainting citizens with the nature and structure of police organizations and operations (Ferguson, 1985). American police organizations had comparable objectives when they began using CPAs in 1985 (Cohn, 1996). CPAs are designed to provide the participant with a basic understanding of crime and the associated police response within a community. Using a variety of teaching mediums (lectures, discussions, role-playing, simulations, demonstrations, and field observations) agencies endeavor to provide participants with an inside perspective on the organization and people protecting their community. Ideally, graduates will share their experiences and beliefs with friends and neighbors, allowing the sponsoring department to foster stronger citizen commitment and to exponentially build community support (West, 1996).

Police agencies typically attempt to foster the following two traits in academy participants: understanding and goodwill. First, academy classes are designed to provide students with a basic understanding of the structure and operations of the sponsoring agency and to demonstrate the complex nature of policing and law in contemporary society. Curricula are intended to help participants understand the logic and rationale that motivate police behavior in common situations (e.g., an officer’s concern for personal safety during a traffic stop). This insight is supposed to make citizens view officers’ conduct as being driven by acceptable motives (e.g., officer safety considerations) rather than inappropriate biases (e.g., a citizen’s race/ethnicity, gender, or age). By providing students with an overview of how the sponsoring agency is organized and the primary crime problems within its jurisdiction (Greenberg, 1991), it is believed that citizens will develop an appreciation for the challenges associated with policing the community. Participation in the CPA program provides students with the opportunity to develop new insights about police work, both generally (as an occupation) and specifically (within the sponsoring agency).

In addition to building understanding, CPA programs are intended to foster a sense of goodwill between the community and the sponsoring police department. Agencies anticipate that interacting with various academy instructors (primarily police officers) will allow students to develop positive views of the agency and its employees. Ideally, students will come to
see the police department as a professional organization. By going beyond stereotypes and assumptions, students will begin seeing officers as individuals rather than as members of an anonymous entity. On completion of the academy experience, graduates may also volunteer their time to support other department-initiated crime and community safety programs (Greenberg, 1991). By instilling graduates with a sense of understanding and goodwill, CPA programs are supposed to create a community member who has a better appreciation for the difficult nature of policing as an occupation. It is expected that this graduate will be more empathetic, will develop a sense of goodwill toward the agency, and will volunteer her or his time to support the organization.

Beyond the positive traits CPAs may instill within graduates, these programs may also be beneficial for police participants. Officers teaching in the academy have the opportunity to develop new perspectives by learning how citizens view police tactics and operations. This process benefits both the police and the public as the “exchange of ideas and different views helps to dispel suspicions and misconceptions” (Maffe & Burke, 1999, p. 79). Such exchanges are a key to improving both citizen perceptions of the police and police perceptions of citizens. It has been noted that the police tend to be socially isolated (Skolnick, 1994; Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993) and may even view “average” citizens as potential enemies (Sherman, 1982); an unintended consequence of CPAs may be the amelioration of this isolation and distrust.

EVALUATING CITIZEN POLICE ACADEMIES

Since their first appearance in the United States, CPAs have become common public relation and community policing tools for police departments. Despite the prevalence of these programs, there have been few empirical studies examining their structure, content, goals, and outcomes. The limited body of literature on the topic is primarily composed of descriptive accounts of specific programs that have appeared in trade publications. There are, however, several useful studies that have attempted to examine the organization and objectives of CPAs across multiple agencies. Hilson (1994) surveyed a nonrepresentative sample of police agencies in Texas. Citizen academies were identified in police departments ranging in size from 19 to more than 4,200 sworn employees. On average, these programs consisted of 33 hours of instruction; common academy topics included patrol operations, investigations, communications, drug and traffic enforce-
ment, and firearms safety. The responding agencies typically operated two sessions of the academy per year, serving an average of 27 students in each session, with a mean cost of $3,500 (including personnel expenses).

From a stratified sample of municipal police agencies and county sheriff’s departments across the United States, Bumphus, Gaines, and Blakely (1999) found 45% of the respondents operated some form of a CPA. Larger agencies were more likely to operate a citizen academy. Although the majority of the agencies (90%) operated a general academy, a small proportion offered special academies aimed at youth or seniors (found in 19% and 8%, respectively, of agencies with CPAs). On average, general academies lasted 33 hours and had been in place since the mid-1990s. The typical academy participant was “42-years-old and slightly more likely to be male (54%)” (Bumphus et al., 1999, p. 73).

These findings offer important insights into CPAs, but they fail to demonstrate the outcomes of such programs. Prior to devoting financial and personnel resources toward the operation of a CPA, police departments ought to know what types of outcomes and benefits (if any) they can expect. The specific outcome of each program will depend on the agency’s goals, the program’s structure, and the characteristics of participants, among other factors. Is the CPA merely intended as a tool for improving community relations? Does the agency hope to educate participants about specific aspects of their organization? Is it expected that graduates will become more active in supporting the agency’s mission and operations? Are participants expected to become goodwill ambassadors who might endeavor to bolster support within the community? Existing research relating to CPAs, although insightful in many ways, fails to address these types of questions.

There are several possible ways to measure the effect of CPAs. An agency’s unique goals and objectives ultimately mediate the desired outcome for their academy; such goals and objectives will influence the evaluation techniques that would be most appropriate. Based on the commonly expressed goals of CPAs (see generally, Cohn, 1996), it is possible to identify several methods that assess the success of a program. Changes in the amount of time graduates spend volunteering in police-sponsored programs may indicate that the academy experience instilled a sense of obligation and/or commitment within participants. Changes in citizen attitudes and judgments can also be determined with pretests and posttests that assess the impact of the academy experience. Pre- and posttest assessments may determine if academy instructors experienced a change in their beliefs about, or attitudes toward, citizens as a result of their interactions. Asking graduates
to reflect and comment on whether, and how, their academy experience changed their perceptions and judgments of the sponsoring agency could also reflect the impact of program participation.

The latter approach is utilized in this study to retrospectively assess the impact of a CPA on its participants. The study determines if a CPA operated by the Lansing (MI) Police Department is meeting its stated goals and objectives. Existing CPA research is limited to descriptive accounts of individual programs (Cohn, 1996; Ferguson, 1985; Greenberg, 1991; Maffe & Burke, 1999; Seelmeyer, 1987; West, 1996) or general surveys of the structure and content of programs across multiple agencies (Bumphus et al., 1999; Hilson, 1994). This study builds on the limited knowledge relating to CPA programs by assessing the outcomes of one such program. The specific research questions the authors seek to answer are if and (where applicable) how completing a CPA changed the attitudes and/or behaviors of program graduates. The authors also consider the potential of citizen academies to advance the objectives of community policing and present a key implication of the research that may alter academy efficacy.

THE LANSING POLICE DEPARTMENT
CITIZEN POLICE ACADEMY

In the early 1990s, the Lansing Police Department (LPD) was struggling to shift from a traditional to a community policing philosophy. As in many cities in which departments have tried to engage in cooperative problem solving (Grinc, 1994; Sadd & Grinc, 1994; Skogan & Hartnett, 1997), the department found Lansing’s residents were reluctant to engage in cooperative partnerships to improve community conditions. As the department experienced increasing interactions with citizens, it became apparent that the public lacked a basic understanding of the motivation behind many police actions, procedures, and decisions. During the same time period, LPD officers were involved in two shootings that heightened public scrutiny of the police and raised levels of distrust within some segments of the community. Police-community relations were strained and the department was searching for ways to improve the situation.

It was against this backdrop that the LPD began its CPA. The department felt it could achieve three explicit goals through the use of the CPA program. Specifically, the agency hoped to:

1. Create a network of citizens who had a basic understanding about the workings of the department and the complexity of police;
2. Give students the information they needed to make better evaluations of media reports about police performance;
3. Increase the likelihood that the graduates would work with officers to identify and solve neighborhood problems.

More specifically, the agency believed that citizens who were better informed about the department and the complex nature of policing in Lansing would be more sympathetic toward, and supportive of, the department. In addition, it was anticipated that graduates of the CPA would be vocal about their experience and would share their newly acquired knowledge with others in the community. The agency also thought graduates might be more likely to participate in department sponsored programs related to community policing and crime prevention.

The Lansing CPA had a structure similar to other comparable agencies (Cohn, 1996; Hilson, 1994). The academy lasted 10 weeks, with classes held one night a week for 3 hours (for a total curriculum of 30 hours). A designated officer coordinated the program; this coordinator served as the contact person both within the department and between the agency and the community. Officers from throughout the organization assisted in teaching different segments of the curriculum. The first academy class was held in the spring of 1996; since then, the agency has operated two classes each year. At the time this study was conducted, eight classes had graduated from the academy. The initial academy class was recruited from Neighborhood Watch participants; applicants for subsequent classes responded to advertisements in the local newspaper or via word of mouth referrals.

METHOD

A survey instrument containing both closed and open-ended questions was developed to retrospectively measure changes in attitudes and behavior among graduates of the LPD CPA program. Survey packets consisted of the survey instrument, a prestamped return envelope, and a cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey, which had been signed by a well-regarded officer. The cover letter ensured the respondents’ confidentiality and was written to encourage participation. These packets were mailed to all 134 graduates of the LPD CPA. Five of those could not be delivered as the graduates’ correct addresses could not be located. Of the 129 questionnaires sent to valid addresses, 92 were completed and returned in a usable format. This yielded a response rate of 71%. Sixty-eight women and 24 men
participated in the study; this distribution closely reflects the gender-distribution of CPA graduates.

RESULTS

The findings of this study must be interpreted within the context of the methodological design. The authors assess a single CPA program, thus study results should not automatically be generalized to represent the outcome of other CPA programs. Study results contribute to the body of knowledge relating to CPAs despite the use of data assessing a single program and the study’s retrospective nature (for limitations of retrospective studies, see generally Maxfield & Babbie, 1998, pp. 80-83). Unlike prior studies and accounts of CPA programs (Bumphus et al., 1999; Cohn, 1996; Ferguson, 1985; Greenberg, 1991; Hilson, 1994; Maffe & Burke, 1999; Seelmeyer, 1987; West, 1996), the unit of analysis is the citizen participant rather than the program itself. This allows for observations to be made about the effect of CPA programs on participants. Such observations indicate the degree to which the Lansing CPA program was meeting its goals.

CPAs are popular police programs, yet there is a conspicuous absence of empirically based evaluative research assessing their outcomes. It is important to critically assess these programs to determine what, if anything, they achieve. Such knowledge is important on several levels. First, scholars and police leaders should be aware of whether CPA programs may contribute to an agency’s overall public relations and/or community policing goals. Second, agencies can employ CPA programs in an appropriate fashion and may rethink the utility of CPAs in light of research findings. Finally, it is of pragmatic importance for police leaders to understand the outcomes of CPA programs to determine if they are a worthwhile investment of time and resources.

The results of the questionnaires completed by the CPA graduates indicated that the overwhelming majority of the participants found the experience to be positive and very informative. Overall, it appears that LPD is reaching its goals in operating a CPA program. Responses to individual items are discussed here in terms of respondents’ general views of the department and their overall impressions of Lansing’s CPA. Consideration is then given to the survey results as they relate to each of the department’s three primary goals.
GENERAL FINDINGS

The general views of Lansing’s CPA graduates toward the department suggest that the program has improved citizen perceptions of the organization among this population. The overwhelming majority of the respondents reported that prior to attending the academy, they held “positive” (73%) or “very positive” (22%) views of LPD. Respondents reported that after completing the academy, they still viewed the agency in a positive vein; however, there were shifts within these response ranges. More than four fifths (81%) rated their postacademy view of LPD as “very positive”; “positive” ratings were reported by 18% of the respondents. Only a small proportion of the respondents rated their pre- or postacademy views as “negative” (6% and 1%, respectively); there were no reports of “very negative” views.

Approximately half of the respondents reported that as a result of completing the CPA, their views on police use of force (52%) and policing as an occupation (51%) had changed. Sixty-seven percent stated that they viewed the police department differently as a result of their CPA experience. Each of these items was followed up with an open-ended question asking specifically how the respondent’s views had changed. Many of those who did not report that the CPA had changed their views on these topics indicated that this was due to already having a preexisting understanding of these matters. As shown in Table 1, CPA participants indicated their involvement had provided them with insights into the complex nature of police work and the occupational challenges faced by police officers. Although questions were structured to allow respondents to report negative changes in their views, all of the open-ended responses were positive in nature from the agency’s perspective.

Although the majority of the respondents entered the academy with a positive view of the department, on the whole these views became “more” positive. The participants also indicated that their views on select issues had changed in a manner that could be categorized as “pro-police.” Of the five respondents who stated that they began the academy with a negative view of the department, four reported having a “positive” or “very positive” view of the agency after their graduation from the program. The overwhelmingly positive initial views of the department suggest that the organization is only recruiting or selecting program participants from a limited segment of the community. Very few citizens with negative views of the department participated in Lansing’s CPA.
The survey asked the respondents to rate their overall impression of Lansing’s CPA program. All of the respondents reported having a “positive” or “very positive” impression of the CPA, even the respondent who still held a “negative” view of the organization. In an open-ended question, respondents were asked to identify the aspects of the academy that were most memorable (more than one aspect could be identified). The second most commonly identified aspect was the opportunity to develop relationships with the officers who taught the various courses (mentioned by 36%). This finding might be viewed as supporting the idea that a CPA can further an organization’s community policing objectives by developing relationships between the police and the public. Other memorable experiences identified by the respondents included using the Firearms Training Simulator (mentioned by 39%), the class featuring the Special Tactics and Rescue Team (mentioned by 13%), and a demonstration on the use of police canines (mentioned by 13%).

**GOAL ONE: UNDERSTANDING OF THE DEPARTMENT AND POLICE WORK**

The LPD initiated its academy to accomplish three primary goals. The first goal was to create a network of citizens who understood the department and the complex nature of policing. Respondents were asked to consider whether their awareness of various issues had changed as a result of participating in the CPA program. The majority of respondents indicated an increased awareness in several areas, including local crime and safety issues (87%), local police activities (92%), and department-initiated problem-
solving efforts (87%). These results were of profound importance to the agency. A community survey conducted in the mid-1990s had indicated that many residents were not aware of police initiatives to solve community problems. Although the department had been actively pursuing community policing for more than 5 years, police efforts were largely unrecognized within the community. The CPA may represent one mechanism by which public awareness of such initiatives can be increased. The efficacy of this mechanism is limited because the academy can only reach a limited number of citizens; if the academy is to inform the public, it must educate and influence citizens beyond its participants.

If an academy program is going to be a worthwhile investment of resources and personnel, it should impact those who participate as well as the broader community. The primary way in which organizations achieve this latter outcome is when graduates share their experiences with other members of the community. Nearly all of the respondents (98%) reported that they had told others about their experiences with the CPA. Information was most commonly shared with family members, friends, neighbors, and coworkers. Common answers when respondents were asked who they have told about the CPA included, “anybody who would listen,” “everyone I know,” and “people who complain or say bad things about the police.” It is unclear if this action had an impact on the attitudes and behaviors of other residents, but it would seem that graduates did share their views, knowledge, and experiences with other community members.

GOAL TWO: EVALUATING MEDIA REPORTS

Immediately prior to establishing its CPA, the department had been involved in several critical incidents that had generated a great deal of controversy within the community. Many within the agency felt that the local media was only portraying one side of these incidents. The department believed it was important that the academy create graduates who understood these critical incidents from the department’s perspective. The intent was not to brainwash citizens but rather to create advocates within the community who could see past media accounts that the department believed were biased and sensationalistic. Ideally, graduates would be able to understand police operations and appreciate the rationales that motivated officer conduct. Armed with this knowledge, these graduates might be able to advocate for the agency by helping their peers to understand why officers had behaved in certain ways during these incidents.
Seventy-four percent of the respondents said that since completing the CPA, they viewed media reports about the police department differently than they had before attending the academy. Responses to an open-ended follow-up question illuminate the direction in which their views had changed. Those who reported a change in how they viewed media accounts about the department suggested that they now believed the media tended to engage in sensational reporting and that the media was too quick to second-guess the actions of officers before all of the facts about situations had been released. One response captured the essence of this stating, “I better understand the complex nature of policing—I now have more of a sense of what is NOT being reported by the media.”

GOAL THREE: WILLINGNESS TO WORK WITH THE DEPARTMENT

The final goal of Lansing’s CPA was to develop a network of citizens who were willing to collaborate with the police. One element of such collaboration was citizens who would volunteer to work on various crime prevention and community safety programs operated by the department. Similar proportions of the respondents reported that they had engaged in volunteer activities before and after their involvement with the CPA program (56% and 63%, respectively). Although this only represents a modest increase, it does not reflect the amount of time volunteered by these individuals; it is unclear if the amount of volunteer time increased, decreased, or remained stable. Common programs in which respondents were involved included working with their Neighborhood Watch, serving as a victim’s rights advocate, being a member of a police advisory board, and helping with the department’s truancy reduction program. The type of program that graduates volunteered for did not change appreciably after they had completed the CPA program.

Despite only a modest increase in actual involvement in police programs, one third (34.8%) of the respondents reported that they were more willing to volunteer their time after completing the academy. In addition, the vast majority of respondents (94%) stated that as a result of participating in the CPA, they were more likely to work with the police to solve a neighborhood problem than they were prior to attending the academy. These findings would tend to suggest that the department was generally meeting its goal of creating a network of citizens willing to collaborate with the agency. It is
possible that the department needed to be more diligent in attempting to capitalize on this willingness to volunteer among CPA graduates.

DISCUSSION

The retrospective nature of the survey process mediates the interpretation of the research findings; it is difficult to determine whether pre- and postacademy changes were the result of completing the program or some other unknown variable(s). Findings do allow for certain general observations to be made about Lansing’s CPA program. The department was generally achieving the three goals associated with the academy; those who attended the program gained an understanding of the workings of the department and the complexities of police work. A majority of the respondents indicated that they were more critical in viewing media reports about the police and that they were more willing to collaborate in problem-solving efforts with the department as a result of their CPA experience. Likewise, the respondents indicated that they had told others about the academy and the knowledge they gained by attending the CPA.

The results also suggest that the success of the CPA may be a product of its participants. The majority of citizens who participated in the CPA entered with a positive view of the police department. Although the program strengthened their positive views, very few citizens entered the program with a negative view of the department. In addition, many of the respondents were already volunteering their time to help support department-initiated crime prevention and community safety initiatives prior to attending the academy. Even if these citizens had not participated in the CPA, it is probable that they would continue to hold a positive view of the agency, would volunteer their time, and would stand up for the department within the community. A similar observation was made by Bumphus et al. (1999), who remarked that citizens “who are already police supporters appear to be the audience most attracted to these programs” (p. 76).

The majority of the agencies (56%) responding to Hilson’s (1994) survey indicated that citizens were required to have a clean criminal history to participate in the program. Although it is advisable for departments to run criminal history checks on prospective academy participants, agencies should reconsider the absolute exclusion of citizens with a criminal history. Academy applicants who have only committed minor offenses or have committed no offenses for some period of time could bring important perspec-
tives to the program. Although a screening process is certainly necessary, it should not limit an agency’s ability to reach diverse segments of its community. As noted by Bumphus et al. (1999),

The screening processes exclude, whether inadvertently or not, younger citizens and individuals with minor criminal histories. These individuals, due to higher levels of ambivalence towards the police, may be the most appropriate participants if the agency’s goal is to foster more positive citizen-police relations. (p. 77)

For the LPD and other agencies seeking to use citizen academies to strengthen community alliances, the primary challenge for the future is drawing a more heterogeneous sample of the community into such programs. Every department can identify certain segments of their community with whom they have historically had strained relations; it is this portion of the community to whom agencies should market their CPA. If community policing efforts are going to be successful, agencies must improve understanding and communication with those segments of the population who mistrust, fear, or feel disenchanted from the police. A CPA can contribute to this effort; but, for a program to have a meaningful impact, agencies should actively recruit participants who are not already supporters of the police.

This study’s findings lend support to the use of CPA programs. The apparent “pro-police” attitudes held by the study respondents limit our ability to conclude that similar findings would occur if broader cross-sections of a community participated in such programs. This study does, however, make tentative steps toward evaluating the impact of CPA programs on their participants. It expands on existing knowledge of the subject by considering CPAs from a new perspective by focusing on participants. Further exploration of this issue would still be beneficial. The authors have used one possible approach to assess changes in citizen attitudes and perceptions. Future studies might consider using pre- and posttests to measure specific ways in which an individual’s perceptions and attitudes might change through their participation in a CPA. Subsequent evaluations might also consider what other outcome measures indicate whether a specific CPA program is achieving the desired effect within a community. In addition, it might be of interest to examine whether CPA benefits are asymmetrical (only influencing the attitudes and beliefs of citizens) or symmetrical (influencing the attitudes and beliefs of both citizens and those police personnel who are involved in such programs).
CONCLUSION

The results of this study suggest that the CPA program in question was meeting the goals and objectives established by the sponsoring police agency. Citizens indicated a positive shift in their views of the department and reported that participating in the CPA was a positive experience. Although the study only assesses the outcome of a single program and its particular goals, the structure and objectives of the LPD program are comparable to those in many other agency. This would suggest that CPA programs offer some benefits for sponsoring organizations. More research is needed to determine to what extent other CPA programs achieve their objectives. Such an understanding would allow scholars and police leaders to determine whether, and under what circumstances, these programs are a worthwhile investment of financial and personnel resources. More definitive conclusions might be drawn through a research design that employs pre- and posttests to more accurately measure attitudes and opinions.

CPAs have a high entertainment value for their participants. If, however, there are additional outcomes that support an agency’s objectives, CPAs may still be a worthwhile endeavor. This study found that a CPA can generate positive changes in citizens’ attitudes. Even participants who had positive views about the department prior to attending the academy reported learning more about policing and police operations within their community. Reaching out to those who are distrustful or skeptical of law enforcement and inviting them to take a closer look at police operations can be intimidating and uncomfortable for the police. If agencies hope to capitalize on the potential benefits of CPA programs, the results of this survey suggest that the rewards for doing so may well be worth the effort.
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This study examined the attitudes of 581 residents of Midland and Odessa, Texas regarding their satisfaction with 14 police attributes and the importance of these attributes. Descriptive findings showed the citizens are generally satisfied with police performance but still rated the importance of attributes higher than the satisfaction. The satisfaction-importance graph revealed that the professional conduct factor (professional knowledge, professional conduct, honesty, quality of service, and fairness) received relatively higher satisfaction and importance scores compared to the friendliness factor (friendliness, putting one at ease, concern, politeness, and helpfulness) and the crime control/prevention factor (level of police protection, investigative skill, ability to fight crime, and ability to prevent crime). The friendliness factor received relatively moderate satisfaction scores as did the crime control/prevention factor but was considered the least important among the three factors. Finally, the findings showed the attribute that needs the most improvement is the ability to prevent crime.

In the 1990s, American police managers started to apply to policing the concept of service quality that has been successfully implemented by innumerable...
for-profit companies. Service quality is defined as conformance to customer specification (Berry, Parasuraman, & Zeithaml, 1988). Studies indicate a trend that people sometimes perceive a need for improvement. Even though evaluating the quality of professional services is difficult and complex, customers do evaluate it. Numerous studies of for-profit organizations (Berry et al., 1988; Brown & Swartz, 1989; Cronin & Taylor, 1992) and police departments (Butler, 1992; Couper, 1991; Couper & Lobitz, 1991; Glauser & Tullar, 1985; Stephens, 1996; Tyler & Folger, 1980) have documented the importance of customers’ perceptions toward improvement of their service quality.

As the significance of the police role shifts from crime-fighting to order maintenance and enhancement of the quality of life in our communities, evaluating the quality of police service becomes critical because police supply services that most citizens cannot obtain elsewhere (Lipsky, 1980). Although an individual can seek service satisfaction from other private companies, he or she cannot do so in policing. The individual who seeks certain services from the police must accept the outcome, either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Moreover, the reasons individuals contact the police can be either voluntary (e.g., service calls) or nonvoluntary (e.g., traffic stop) (Bercal, 1970). For the latter case, such as an arrest, the environment of the contact is inclined to yield a more negative image of police. However, researchers demonstrate that citizens’ perception of fairness of the treatment by the police is independent of whether the police cite the citizen they have stopped for a law violation (Tyler & Folger, 1980).

If the goal of the community policing programs is to enhance the relationship between the police and the public, how satisfied citizens feel about police performance can have a significant impact on the citizens’ feelings of involvement in and cooperation with community policing activities. However, dissatisfaction with police performance would suggest the need for improvement in police service only if citizens consider such attributes important to the police force. Unfortunately, most police research on citizens’ attitudes of police performance tends to focus either on the satisfaction or the importance aspect, thus making it difficult to prioritize police activities and resources. Therefore, it is vital to examine both satisfaction and importance of certain attributes perceived by the citizens and the gap between the two. The data can provide police administrators with information on how citizens feel about police performance and the priorities for delivery of services to the community. In other words, the current study asks (a) Is there a difference between citizens’ satisfaction with police attributes
and the importance of these attributes? and (b) What should be the priorities of police under community policing?

LITERATURE REVIEW

CITIZEN SATISFACTION WITH POLICE PERFORMANCE

Citizen satisfaction with police performance can be measured in several ways. One of the traditional measures is citizen complaints against police officers. Usually, police departments report the number of complaints, their nature, and their dispositions (which generally are reported as sustained, not sustained, exonerated, or unfounded). Although citizen complaint is an important indicator of how well police do their job, it is very difficult to interpret what the number and disposition of citizen complaints mean for the police and the community (Stephens, 1996). For example, do a high number of complaints reflect a low priority of a police department on how citizens are treated? Or does it indicate that citizens are confident their complaints will be taken seriously? What does a sustained rate of 15% or 20% mean (Stephens, 1996, p. 107)?

Other useful indicators about how well police perform their job are the letters and telephone calls police departments receive from citizens regarding their experience with the police. Even though these indicators directly convey how citizens feel toward the police, they still pose some restrictions. It takes an extra effort on the part of citizens to write or call with their comments about their encounters with the police, which in turn results in a disproportionate number of letters and phone calls to the police compared to the large number of police-citizen contacts that occur every day. Relying on the letters and phone calls to the police also means the exclusion of the attitudes of those citizens who never have direct contact with the police. Therefore, the indicators mentioned above (i.e., citizen complaints, letters, and phone calls) may be skewed in favor of or against the police and cannot scientifically represent the whole population. This does not suggest that police departments should ignore these measures. Instead, to effectively judge police performance, a combination of several measures must be used.

A better and more popular mechanism used to measure citizen satisfaction with police performance is citizen surveys. Generally, the usual findings of citizen surveys are that most people are satisfied with the job done by the police. These positive findings have been found in studies that targeted the general public (Flanagan & Longmire, 1995; Longmire & Hignite,
1998) and people who have been affected by community policing programs (Campbell Delong Resources, Inc., 1999; Madison Police Department, 1999; Skogan et al., 1997; Stephens, 1996). For example, Longmire and Hignite (1998) found that the vast majority of Texans have a “great deal” or “some confidence” in both their local police department (83%) and the Texas Department of Public Safety (86%). Regarding some of the cities that have implemented the community policing programs, research revealed that about three fourths of the Madison, Wisconsin residents were found to be either “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with how the police handle their calls (Madison Police Department, 1999). In Chicago, citizens considered police as performing a “good job” (as supposed to a “fair job” or a “very good job”) and recognized police effectiveness and police professionalism (Skogan et al., 1997).

Although race is one of the strongest predictors of attitudes toward the police (Peek, Lowe, & Alston, 1981), contact and experience with the police appear to have a greater impact on attitudes toward them (Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Jacob, 1971; Scaglion & Condon, 1980; Smith & Hawkins, 1973; Zevitz & Rettammel, 1990). As a matter of fact, Scaglion and Condon (1980, p. 490) argued that “personal contact with the police is the most significant determinant of general satisfaction with police services than all other variables combined.” Several studies demonstrated that if people characterized their contact with the police as positive, the police performance tended to be rated as favorable (Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Reno Police Department, 1992). In contrast, people with negative experiences with the police tended to feel less satisfied with police performance, regardless of race and other demographic variables (Cheurprakobkit, 2000).

In addition to creating favorable attitudes toward the police, positive experience with the police can also neutralize or ameliorate negative police contacts (Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Rusinko, Johnson, & Hornung, 1978). Cheurprakobkit (2000) found that citizens who had both positive and negative police experiences felt slightly more satisfied with police performance than those who had only negative experiences. Although there is no readily apparent explanation why those who had both positive and negative experiences with the police still rated police performance as slightly favorable, it does suggest that police behaviors during the course of contact seem to have a significant impact on attitudes. In a related point, Cox and White (1988) revealed that receiving a traffic citation, which was associated with negative attitudes because of increased insurance costs and a belief that police should be dealing with serious crime instead (Radelet & Carter, 1994, p. 207), was
not the determining factor that caused unfavorable police ratings. Instead, what determines attitudes are the perceptions and evaluations of the interactions that occurred between the citizens and the police during the course of contact (Cox & White, 1988). Similarly, it was found that the fair, just procedures police officers used to enforce the laws would make people feel they were treated fairly and feel satisfied with officers’ performances even though they received undesirable outcomes from the interaction (Tyler & Folger, 1980). The findings of these studies suggest that the general perception developed during the police-citizen encounter is far more significant than race or the nature of police contact in determining how citizens evaluate the police.

To improve the quality of police performance evaluation, the importance of attributes perceived by citizens should also be measured. Some argued that citizen attitudes about police services can be further shaped according to each individual’s value system and understanding of what should or should not be police priorities.

CITIZEN RATING OF THE IMPORTANCE OF POLICE ACTIVITIES

For this study’s purposes, importance is defined as the “condition of being characterized by great value” (Webster’s II, 1984, p. 614). Importance encompasses a citizen’s feeling about the “significance of quality” (Webster’s II, 1984). Importance differs from expectation. Although expectation involves the act of looking forward to a probable occurrence, importance is something regarded as an inner significance (Webster’s II, 1984, pp. 454, 736).

Given the difficult task of allocating scarce resources in policing, citizen assessment of the importance of specific police duties is often used by police administrators to determine priorities. Such priorities may warrant the use of either single or mixed strategies of policing for different racial and ethnic neighborhoods (Dunham & Alpert, 1988). Different groups in the communities have different priorities for police services; however, the question remains: What police services do citizens consider top priorities?

It is assumed that a consensus exists within a neighborhood regarding crime control, prevention, and suppression and that citizens within the neighborhood have similar attitudes regarding what kinds of police activities they prefer (Green & Decker, 1989, p. 107). Several studies have been conducted to reveal community preferences for police roles and community
activities. For example, Murphy (1988) randomly surveyed residents in Toronto to identify important community problems but could not find any evidence of consensus regarding the residents’ opinions. Webb and Katz (1997) argued that failure to identify the neighborhood problems in Murphy’s study might be due to the exclusion of contextual (i.e., geographic location) and individual variables (i.e., race, gender, age) from the study that might be associated with citizens’ attitudes toward community problems. In a related point, Alpert and Dunham (1988) studied how citizens ranked particular police tasks by examining the association between the respondents and their ethnicity, gender, and neighborhood affiliation. They found that those residents who lived in the same neighborhood prioritized similar patterns of police duties.

More recently, Webb and Graham (1994) studied citizen attitudes toward the importance of various crime control and order-maintenance police activities. The findings show that among all the police activities, ranging from enforcing the traffic laws to investigating family disputes, the respondents regarded drug enforcement and gang-related monitoring activities as most highly important. A similar study conducted by Webb and Katz (1997) asked respondents to rate the importance of various police activities. Their findings are consistent with Webb and Graham’s (1994) research: They found that regardless of personal characteristics, as well as awareness and knowledge of community policing, the respondents rated gang investigation and drug enforcement as the most important law enforcement activities.

Findings such as these suggest that even though public agreement on the role of the police may vary according to the community’s social structure, there is still some agreement on certain types of police activities. However, it should be noted that the above research did not examine how satisfied the citizens felt toward police performance of those activities; only the rating of importance was measured. With this in mind, police administrators should cautiously view the findings of these studies; being rated as an important activity may not always make that activity a top priority unless citizens feel very unsatisfied with police performance in the area. Also, police may not have to invest more time, effort, and resources on an “important activity” if citizens are already very satisfied with police performance in that area. The importance of certain activities may suggest the following: (a) an evaluation to determine whether resources can be reduced without affecting satisfaction if citizens perceived those activities as being met very satisfactory and that the activities are very important (Walker, 1994); (b) a significant
increase of attention and resources if citizens are unsatisfied with an activity but perceive them as very important; (c) a reduction of resources if citizens feel the activity is unimportant but they are very satisfied with performance; and (d) a lower priority if citizens feel the activities are neither important nor are they satisfied with the performance. Therefore, the comparison between the level of satisfaction of police performance and importance of the activity is crucial for making priorities and allocating resources.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK BETWEEN SATISFACTION WITH AND IMPORTANCE OF POLICE ATTRIBUTES

For any attribute of police work (e.g., ability to fight crime, professional knowledge, etc.), one can find how important the attribute is and how satisfied people are with the police on that attribute. In an ideal situation, satisfaction would be high for all attributes. Given that police officers have limited resources of time and money, having high satisfaction for all attributes may not be feasible. In this case, it would be better for those attributes that are considered highly important to have higher satisfaction ratings than attributes that are considered less important. By investigating importance and satisfaction ratings together, one can prioritize which attributes should be focused on to increase overall satisfaction (Graf, Hemmasi, & Nielsen, 1992). To accomplish this, one can create a scatterplot of all the attributes with the importance ratings on the x-axis and the satisfaction ratings on the y-axis. By examining a group of attributes, one can prioritize which attributes need improvement and which attributes could suffer a reduction in satisfaction without a reduction in overall community satisfaction (Graf et al., 1992). Figure 1 presents a format for interpreting a satisfaction/importance scatterplot.

The upper right corner of Figure 1 indicates an attribute that has high satisfaction and high importance. Citizens are satisfied with these attributes, and it is likely that a reduction in resources toward this attribute would reduce the general satisfaction level of the public for the police. Therefore, resources supporting these activities should not be reduced. The lower right corner of Figure 1 indicates low satisfaction and high importance. Of all the attributes in the graph, the ones in this corner need more resources. The upper left corner of Figure 1 indicates high satisfaction and low importance. Attributes that are found in this area of the graph can withstand a resource cut, presumably without a large decrease in the overall satisfaction. However, if there are no attributes in the need improvement section of the graph,
cutting resources to these areas for no reason would not be worthwhile. The lower left corner of Figure 1 are attributes that have low satisfaction and less importance. These attributes should be given lower priority compared to the ones in the lower right corner. If resources are abundant, and there are no attributes in the need improvement area, these attributes can be improved.

**METHOD**

**LOCATION OF STUDY**

Midland and Odessa are two neighboring cities (about 20 miles apart) located in west Texas that have similar characteristics both in terms of city demographics and police department structure. Midland covers 65 square miles (the city plus the international airport) with an approximate population of 99,789 (70% White; 21% Hispanic; 8% Black; and 1% other). The Midland Police Department (MPD) employed 155 sworn personnel and 51 civilian employees in 1996 (Midland Police Department, 1996). Similarly, encompassing 35 square miles, Odessa had approximately 95,000 people and employed 229 personnel (182 sworn officers and 47 civilians) in 1998 (Odessa Police Department [OPD], 1998). Demographics for the City of Odessa are 62% White, 31% Hispanic, 6% Black, and 1% other.
The Midland and Odessa police departments moved toward the practice of community policing in the early 1990s (1993 for Midland, 1991 for Odessa). Since then, more and more community policing programs have been developed and implemented throughout the two cities. Some of these programs include the Police Athletic League (PAL), Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E), Neighborhood Watch Program, Storefront Operations, and Citizen Police Academy with the MPD offering both English and Spanish versions. Although neither police department implements community policing programs to a fuller scale like other big departments (e.g., the Chicago, Portland, San Diego, or Aurora police departments), their current practices evidence their commitment to the community policing philosophy. The present study combined citizens from Midland and Odessa into one analysis. We believe, given the high level of interaction between the two cities, that many citizens would not have a separate stereotype of Midland police and Odessa police. Furthermore, by combining the two cities, we can increase the power and reliability of the study.

PARTICIPANTS

A random digit dialing technique was used to reach participants for a telephone interview. The interviews were conducted from 9 a.m. to 7 p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays and from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. on Saturdays from May 19, 1997, to June 30, 1997. For the two cities, 2,066 calls went to connected residential numbers. Of these calls, 49.2% were not answered or answered by an answering machine. Of the remaining 1,049 calls that were answered, there was no appropriate person or the appropriate person was unable to communicate with the interviewer for 7.5% (79) of the calls; 37.1% (389) of the calls were refused; and in the remaining 55.4% (581) of the calls, an interview was completed. To ensure greater randomness in the sample, the interviewer asked for the youngest/oldest male/female in the household over the age of 18. The categories were then switched after every respondent.

SURVEY AND MEASURES

The questions analyzed in this study were part of the 1997 Citizen Expectations and Attitudes about Police Performance survey performed under the guidance of the first author. Of importance to this study were the questions that asked about the satisfaction and relative importance of particular...
attributes. Participants who had some contact with police in the last 2 years (258 individuals) were first asked “on a scale from 1 to 7, with 7 meaning that you are very satisfied and 1 meaning that you are very unsatisfied, please rate the following characteristics as you feel they relate to your experience with your local police department.” The attributes were: fairness, politeness, concern, quality of service, honesty, putting one at ease, helpfulness, friendliness, level of police protection, professional knowledge, professional conduct, investigative skill, ability to fight crime, and ability to prevent crime.

All participants were then asked, “Now, I would like you to rate the importance of each of the following attributes in police work. Use a scale of 1 to 7, with 7 meaning that it is very important, and 1 meaning that it is not important at all.” All of the characteristics that were used in the satisfaction ratings were used with these importance ratings. For both the satisfaction and importance ratings, a technique of rotating questions was used to prevent a sequential bias.

It is important to reemphasize that this study focused on the relationship between perceived importance and perceived satisfaction rather than the impact of police contact on citizens’ attitudes. That is why this study (a) did not detail either the nature (citizen-initiated or police-initiated) or the type (positive or negative) of police contacts, which might have affected citizens’ attitudes toward the police; and (b) excluded the analysis of specific assessments of the police (e.g., satisfaction with the police in particular incidents) as structured and analyzed by previous researchers (Brandl, Frank, Worden, & Bynum, 1994; Frank, Brandl, & Cullen, 1996). Although the absence of detailed police contact variables and the exclusion of citizens’ specific assessments may have produced different results, it is beyond the scope of the data in this study because the main focus of this study is to offer an evaluation tool for the police to assess resource priorities.

RESULTS

Satisfaction and importance scores are listed in Table 1. All items were above the midpoint (i.e., 4) in terms of satisfaction. The lowest satisfaction attribute score was the ability to prevent crime. The next lowest were investigative skill and putting one at ease. The attribute with the highest satisfaction score was honesty followed by professional knowledge and professional conduct.
Regarding the importance scores, there were no significant differences in importance ratings between the contact and no contact groups (all $p$s > .10). Therefore, only the overall importance ratings are given. All of the attributes were rated as important. The lowest importance rating on the 7-point Likert-type scale was friendliness ($M = 6.29$). Putting one at ease and politeness were also rated relatively low. Honesty was rated as the most important attribute followed by professional conduct and professional knowledge.

Although all of the attributes were fairly similar in both satisfaction and importance ratings, distinction among these attributes was examined. After using a factor analysis on the importance ratings of the 14 variables, three factors emerged: (a) the friendliness factor, which emphasizes whether a police officer is friendly, consisted of politeness, concern, putting one at ease, helpfulness, and friendliness; (b) the professional conduct factor, which emphasizes the professional conduct of an officer, including fairness, quality of service, honesty, professional knowledge, and professional conduct; and (c) the crime control/prevention factor emphasizes the officer’s proficiency at crime control/prevention, including level of police protection, investigative skill, ability to fight crime, and ability to prevent crime. Figure 2 presents the scatterplot of the importance and satisfaction for the 14 attributes, which are divided into three different factors.

### TABLE 1. Satisfaction and Importance Scores Arranged from Lowest to Highest Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfaction (n = 258)</th>
<th>Importance (N = 581)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to prevent crime</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative skill</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting one at ease</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to fight crime</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of police protection</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of service</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional conduct</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional knowledge</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From this figure, two avenues of analysis are possible. The first method is to examine the differences in all 14 attributes on the importance and satisfaction dimensions. Even though this scatterplot only examines part of the graph presented in the introduction, the strategy for determining which attributes need more or less attention is still the same. The attributes closest to the lower right hand corner of Figure 2 need the most improvement, and the attributes closest to the upper left hand corner of Figure 2 are ones that can stand a cut in resources (if no other options are available). Most of the attributes are gathered in a relatively narrow space. There appears to be an overall trend such that attributes with higher importance ratings also have higher satisfaction ratings. This trend is consistent with what should occur if
an organization wanted to have higher satisfaction ratings on the items that were more important. The only point that deviates from this trend is the point at the very bottom of the distribution. This point represents the ability to prevent crime and has a lower satisfaction rating, suggesting that the police should allocate more resources into that area. Unfortunately, there are no attributes that deviate from the others toward the upper left corner of Figure 2. Consequently, this analysis cannot suggest a place to de-emphasize while emphasizing the ability to prevent crime.

The second method to analyze the satisfaction-importance graph is to examine the three groups of attributes that were found in the factor analysis. Each subgroup of attributes appears in a different location on the scatterplot. Attributes in the friendliness factor have relatively moderate satisfaction scores and relatively low importance scores. Attributes in the professional conduct factor have both relatively high satisfaction scores and relatively high importance scores. Attributes in the crime control/prevention factor have relatively high importance scores and relatively low satisfaction scores.

DISCUSSION

SATISFACTION OF ATTRIBUTES

In general, the citizens of Midland and Odessa were satisfied with police performance but still rated the importance of the attributes higher than the satisfaction. In particular, these findings show that citizens were more satisfied with attributes regarding police conduct than the law enforcement attributes. There seems to be a consensus that citizens are least satisfied with police ability to prevent crime. Given that only those who had contacts with the police responded to the satisfaction rating, these findings may be biased if the nature of the contacts resulted from victimization. Moreover, there has been a 47% reduction of Part I crime in the Odessa area since 1991 (Odessa Police Department, 1996). This may suggest that, at least in the City of Odessa, citizens have yet to perceive accurate information on crime reduction in their neighborhood.

IMPORTANCE OF ATTRIBUTES

The citizens of both Midland and Odessa considered all of the attributes important. However, there were some differences between the attributes as
well. Citizens believed that honesty was the most important. This attribute may be considered the most important because (a) trust is essential between police and citizens, especially considering that police services cannot be obtained elsewhere, (b) honesty is perceived as more controllable than other attributes such as ability to prevent crime, and (c) an increasing number and magnitude of policing programs involved both police and citizens under the community policing philosophy. Citizens also considered attributes related to professional conduct and ability to control/prevent crime as important. Other attributes that were rated as less important (but still important) were attributes in the friendliness factor. These findings suggest that citizens are first interested in the police conducting themselves in a professional manner, followed by being good at their primary duty of fighting crime, and then interested in the police having interpersonal skills (e.g., being friendly, being helpful, and being concerned).

THE SCATTERPLOT AND ITS ASSUMPTIONS

Although the scatterplot is useful to various groups wanting to know what attributes should receive priorities, there are certain assumptions that may not make this model good for all areas. The first assumption is that resources used to support a characteristic will improve the performance on that attribute and consequently the satisfaction rating in the area. If additional resources will not help, then, of course, placing additional resources toward the attribute is not recommended. For instance, as shown in the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment, the number of patrol officers is not positively related to police ability to prevent crime (Kelling, Pate, Dieckman, & Brown, 1974). Using more patrol vehicles or more technology in policing may not result in a better public image if officers lack rectitude.

A second assumption of the model is that the importance of an attribute will remain constant. It is conceivable that as a person becomes satisfied with the performance on a particular dimension, that attribute becomes less important because it is not a problem. Although one can graph the change in both the satisfaction and the importance, the strategy to improve overall satisfaction becomes more complicated.

The next assumption is that the citizens making the importance and satisfaction ratings are accurate in their assessments. One problem with this is that people may not realize what is necessary to do a job. For example,
people may not feel that much of the paperwork that police officers do is important; however, the paperwork is a necessary part of the job.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the same amount of resources might have a different effect on two different attributes. For example, one unit of resources may greatly improve the satisfaction of something that is not very important, but that same unit of resources may only slightly improve (or not improve at all) the satisfaction of something that is very important. This difference in the effectiveness of resources will need to be assessed before any changes suggested by this model are implemented.

Given these assumptions, police departments can use this scatterplot as a useful tool in assessing police work; however, this tool, like any other tool, can be misused. Therefore, we strongly recommend that the scatterplot be used only in the context of the situation.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study reflect several important trends of today’s American policing. First, the citizens’ least satisfaction of police ability to prevent crime has called for new and more proactive policing strategies in responding to crime problems. Such strategies have been adopted by many law enforcement agencies, especially those agencies that practice community policing. Second, the overall high importance scores of all attributes have reinforced the public expectations that police work is a profession (Cheurprakobkit & Bartsch, 1999) and that the role of the police includes both law enforcement and service functions. Finally, the importance of police professional conduct—viewed by citizens as most important—is parallel to the goals many law enforcement agencies strive for to improve police accountability and quality of service. One caveat is that police efforts to become more professional (e.g., changes in organizational structures and operational strategies, military posturing, and technological improvement) may differ from the criteria used by the citizens (e.g., quality of service and rectitude) (Cheurprakobkit & Bartsch, 1999). However, Radelet and Carter (1994) argued that police work involves police-community transactions, and community attitudes should prevail.

Studying satisfaction and importance ratings of police attributes not only reveals how police perform but identifies police priorities. Although indicating citizens’ rating of satisfaction and importance of police attributes are positive, the overall findings do suggest crime prevention is the priority.
Moreover, the findings also urge police executives to be more concerned with the professional conduct factor (i.e., professional knowledge, professional conduct, quality of service, honesty, and fairness) over the friendliness and the crime control/prevention factors. Due to the nature of police-citizen encounters in police work, how officers do their job (not what they do) will have a significant impact on police image.

In sum, evaluation of police performance continues to be a critical part of measuring police effectiveness. Such evaluation has become more complicated because the role of the police, especially under the community policing umbrella, appears to expand beyond crime fighting. As Bayley (1994, p. 79) stated, police performance should be measured based on the following three criteria: effectiveness, efficiency, and rectitude (whether the police treat people properly, legally, and morally). Given the scarce amount of resources the police have, comparison between the satisfaction and importance of police attributes can yield useful information that in turn leads to an increase of efficiency and effectiveness. If the police are to be more responsive to the public needs, carefully developed policies must involve citizen input.

This study is limited by three factors. First, there are no standard definitions of the attributes used in the study. Each attribute may have slightly different meanings to different respondents; therefore, this may lead to different attitude scores. Second, this cross-sectional study offers only a snapshot of police performance evaluation at a certain period of time. Constant demographic and social changes require periodic evaluation of police performance. Third, this study assesses citizens’ overall beliefs about the police and excludes other factors (e.g., demographic variables and experience with police) that may have some influence on respondents’ attitudes. Fourth, this study did not measure specific attitudes about the police, which might have generated more useful information for policy implications.

Future research still needs to involve the public’s opinions to more fully understand what they view as areas in need of improvement as well as the perceived needs. Their evaluation can then be better determined for validity. Police should not expect the public to be passive recipients of police services. With the model used in this study, future research that includes educational level, race/ethnicity, experience with police, and other important factors would significantly help police executives identify more clearly the specific nature, urgency, and location of problem areas in which priority-based resource allocation can be done with modest cost. Using the model presented in this study, future research that includes the data on citizens’
specific assessments (e.g., satisfaction with the police in particular incidents) will yield even more beneficial information for police implications regarding how specific areas of police work can be improved.

NOTES

1. A number of studies revealed that minorities (i.e., Blacks and Hispanics) were more likely to rate the police less favorably compared to Whites (Carter, 1983, 1985; Garofalo, 1977; Jacob, 1971; Lasley, 1994; Mirande, 1981; Waddington & Braddock, 1991). However, the race variable is not the focus of this study; therefore, it is not discussed in greater detail.

2. The first author interviewed Sergeant David Tavarez of the Odessa Police Department and Deputy Chief John Urby, who currently is the Police Chief of the Midland Police Department, in October 1999 about their departments transitioning toward community policing. He was informed that since Chief James Jenkins of the Odessa Police Department took office in 1991, more community-based policing programs have been developed and implemented. The Community Relations Division was created in December 1991 as part of Chief Jenkins’s commitment to community policing. In 1993, the Midland Police Department started its movement toward community policing by developing and implementing several programs with the patrol division. One of the most interesting projects is the use of a mobile substation to make police services more available to the people in various neighborhoods. At present, both police departments are still actively involved in practicing community policing.

3. Both Midland and Odessa share similar demographic characteristics, and individual analyses of the cities demonstrated very similar results.

4. Contact included any contact with police such as reporting a crime, calling for information, or receiving a traffic ticket.

5. The importance scores were calculated in the factor analysis because they included all the respondents. The satisfaction scores excluded those respondents who had no contact with the police.
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The goal of this study was to identify desirable and undesirable performance indicators and leadership styles of police chiefs. Two hundred five municipal managers in Pennsylvania responded to a survey designed to capture the municipal managers’ assessment of the performance and leadership attributes of the police chief working under their direct supervision. The performance traits and leadership qualities were organized into six subsets, including sad, upset, calm, sharing, Boy Scout, and James Bond. Significant differences were found between chiefs’ education level, whether they were promoted from within or hired from the outside, if they had graduated from the FBI National Academy, and if the police officers were organized as a union.

This research set out to examine municipal managers’ attitudes regarding police chiefs’ performances and leadership styles. Two hundred five municipal managers in Pennsylvania responded to self-reported surveys designed to elicit specific performance indicators and leadership styles from police chiefs under their supervision. Thus, the survey’s goal was to identify desirable and undesirable performance indicators and leadership styles of police chiefs. An ancillary goal was to be able to predict both desirable and undesirable performance based on a number of independent variables. Brown, Cooper, and Kirkcaldy (1996, p. 32) make a point that it “seems especially appropriate at this time to invest more research effort into those who are responsible for managing police services.” They base this statement on the premise that policing is still at the beginning stages of change and that
baseline information on critical management issues will eventually help to facilitate this change.

Fyfe, Greene, Walsh, Wilson, and McLaren (1997) make a similar point in the preface of their fifth edition of O. W. Wilson’s *Police Administration* textbook. The authors claim that when the first edition was published in 1950, the ideal police response to political interference and subsequent corruption was to organize police departments in a highly bureaucratic fashion. Indeed, the authors continue, police did organize as structured bureaucracies until pressures from society forced them to change, including rising rates of violence, the civil rights movement, urban disorder, and an overhaul of the American court system by an activist Supreme Court. Police administrators have become better informed, better trained, and better educated, and, it is hoped, they recognize the need to change management philosophies and adopt a community-oriented strategy. The need to eliminate artificial walls between police and the community requires solving community problems and improving neighborhoods.

The point is that the public has increasingly placed demands on police commanders to become innovative in their approach to managing their departments. This research seeks to assess the level to which police chiefs have altered their command strategies and adopted a modern approach to policing in Pennsylvania. To that end, the municipal managers in Pennsylvania were asked to rate the police chief under his/her supervision on a series of performance indicators and leadership attributes.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

To date, the research on police administrator performance has been inquiries directed at current police supervisors in which the subjects rated themselves. For example, Brown et al. (1996) surveyed police administrators throughout the United Kingdom. The research found that police administrators felt a loss of control over their work environment. This was because managerial innovations created unsuspected demands on supervisors who had been selected for that supervisory role based largely on their technical skill. Feeling overwhelmed by innovations, the police supervisor can fall into a pattern of willful ignorance. Police supervisors also reported feeling resistance toward admitting their crisis. “To do so would be perceived as a weakness,” Brown et al. (1996, p. 38).

This loss of control over one’s work environment results in lower levels of job satisfaction and in numerous performance problems, as well as a
domino effect of failing emotional and physical health. In the present study, a number of township managers believed that the police chief under their supervision displayed elements of the aforementioned loss of power.

Girodo (1998) also surveyed police supervisors. He surveyed chief executive officers of police departments from around the world. His goal was to assess variants in leadership influence over subordinates in policed departments. Girodo found respondents fell into distinct management style groups. They characterized their manager behavior as either transformational, bureaucratic, Machiavellian, or social contract. The transformational leaders see themselves as being considerate, charismatic, and personable. The bureaucratic leaders see themselves as being structured by rules. The Machiavellian leaders reported themselves to possess manipulative personality traits with a means-end management philosophy. Finally, the social contract managers felt themselves to be professional. Most of the police supervisors responding to the study fell into the Machiavellian framework. This is noteworthy as a substantial percentage of township managers responding to the present study rated their police chiefs in the Machiavellian category. Also, Girodo’s work provided a mindset for the present research in terms of leadership categories, thus supporting Brown’s thesis.

Kuykendall and Unsinger (1982) provided further conceptualization categories as they argued that leadership theory could be classified into one of six frameworks: great man, environmental, exchange, humanistic, interaction-expectation, and personal-situational. The great man theories posit that leaders have the natural ability to lead as they have certain identifiable traits. The environmental theories maintain that leadership is a function of time, place, and circumstance. The exchange theories describe the process of leadership as the exchange of mutual rewards. The humanistic theories consider the individual and organizational interests together. The interaction-expectation theories regard the leader’s ability to interact with subordinates in a manner designed to facilitate an expected response. Finally, the personal-situational theories recognize the importance of the individual and the organization. These categories were also beneficial in this analysis as the respondents reported considerable similarities and dissimilarities among leadership indicators. Kuykendall and Unsinger (1982) employed a survey directed at the police supervisors similar to the previously mentioned research. They found that the most common police management style was like that of a salesman. The “selling” style suggests high-level task and much emphasis on the relationship. This means the police managers reported working in a team environment. This is somewhat contradictory to
recent findings (including our own), but the inclusion of categories for analysis was critical at this juncture. Perhaps when this study was conducted, there was less pressure on police supervisors to be forced into innovations.

Burns and Shuman (1988) employed a Likert-type model in their attempt to assess police supervisors’ perceptions of how their particular organization is structured. The Likert-type model uses four categories to distinguish between leadership styles. They are exploitative-authoritative, benevolent-authoritative, consultative, and participative-group. The mid-level supervisors involved in the Burns and Shuman study indicated their desire to work in a participative environment, but police organizations reportedly rejected this type of leadership. Clearly, the literature on police self-assessments of leadership style is inconclusive and sparse. However, the literature does provide a number of assessment possibilities when considering such work. Although limited, the research on police management styles nevertheless has provided an apt starting point when developing categories of leadership styles. Thus, 14 police leadership styles have been identified. These categories all offer the same general theme, the attempt to describe police chiefs. They seem to range from bad (Machiavellian) to good (participatory-good), with a few categorical options in between.

The ability to pigeon-hole police leadership styles offers little utility without considering the social structure in which police administrators function. If police chiefs consistently rate themselves with less than effective leadership styles, why does this practice continue? Perhaps the answer lies within the fabric of the bureaucratic policing model.

Where organizing a police department with the intent of keeping politics out of the daily milieu of police officers’ lives made sense initially, the practice came under fire in the early 1980s. Archambeault and Weirman (1983) aptly summarize the obstacles to change that faced American police departments at that time. These obstacles remain nearly 20 years later and may provide insight to the findings made at the conclusion of this article. Archambeault and Weirman claim that because of the bureaucratic model, police departments have developed a work climate that discourages productivity, initiative, and personal commitment while it encourages the pursuit of individual self-interests at the expense of the police organization. Furthermore, police bureaucratic models create adversarial relationships between management and employees. It fosters game playing and creates an impersonal work climate. Police officers working under these conditions seek refuge in special interest groups and collective bargaining units. The
impersonal nature of bureaucracies annoys people and may keep highly qualified applicants from applying to police departments.

The inability of police departments to deal with these changes has caused four major negative consequences. First, it has caused an adversarial relationship between the officers and supervision. Second, unionism has caused conflicting loyalties to emerge. Third, this has encouraged officers to pursue individualized (highly specialized) career goals. Last, bureaucratic models cause high turnover rates. Arguably, these negative consequences of the bureaucratic model may be at the root of the problem and keep the police departments from initiating change. Thus, Archambeault and Weirman (1983) introduce the concept that police chiefs struggling with leadership may look to the bureaucratic structure for the answer.

Hunt and Magenau (1993) continued the discussion of the negative consequences of the bureaucratic model by pointing out that in the political arena, a number of power scenarios exist, the worst being “the complete political arena” in which conflict is out of control, intense, pervasive, and brief. The typical political response is to fire the police chief. Accordingly, bureaucratic police chiefs are intolerant of dissent due to an over-exaggerated sense of personal power. The real power struggle exists between the chief and the rank and file. The chief resists any threat to his command position by restricting command positions and keeping the command at the working-class culture. This friction exists when a police chief is working toward total domination of the police department.

Moreover, Brown (1996) wrote that police departments have increasingly faced with dealing with scarce resources, and this is coupled with a new demand for organizational efficiency. The balance between the need for efficiency and the resources available is at the crux of the power balance problem. Potts (1982) clarifies Brown’s position by claiming role ambiguity as a basic problem, caused by changing demands and lack of resources. Potts claims that to be an effective police chief, one must be able to instill a commitment to the goals throughout the agency. This requires a commitment from the institution itself. Therefore, demanding effective policing without supplying the necessary resources will create role ambiguity for the police manager. This, in turn, places the police chief at odds with the line and staff as neither can sustain the other’s expectations.

Categorizing police chiefs into specific leadership styles has been an evolving process. The literature is consistent that different styles do indeed exist and some leadership styles are better suited for some police departments than others. Investigating the origins of the different leadership styles
of police chiefs is clearly a more elusive matter. Police chief leadership styles can be grossly affected by the situation in which the chief is forced to operate. The chief may be working in a hostile political environment with inappropriate resources. Or, the chief may be the product of learning how to survive in a bureaucratic environment.

THE CURRENT STUDY

This study set out to examine Pennsylvania municipal managers’ perceptions of police chief performance. The managers were mailed a questionnaire in a self-addressed return envelope advising them to complete the survey only if they directly supervised a police chief. The managers’ names and addresses were obtained from Pennsylvania’s Office of Community Affairs. Each manager on the list was included in the study. Four hundred questionnaires were mailed. Two hundred five were completed and returned. Thus, a return rate of 51% was realized. The municipal managers were instructed to rate the police chief under his or her tutelage on 45 different leadership attributes and performance indicators. The leadership attributes were a mix of positive leadership indicators and negative indicators. The respondents rated the attributes on a Likert-type scoring system in which 1 represented the least and 5 the most.

FINDINGS

Additional descriptive data on the chiefs were also collected on the survey. The municipal managers were asked how many years the chief has been in his current position. The respondents indicated that the police chiefs under their command had between 1 and 30 years of experience as a police chief and between 10 and 45 years on the job. When asked whether he was hired from outside the department or promoted from within, the managers reported that 70% were promoted from within. Thirty-five percent of the police chiefs were graduates of the FBI National Academy (FBINA), and 30% had a bachelor’s degree. Table 1 offers a summary of the demographic data collected from the survey respondents.

The leadership indicators were first analyzed as the mean scores were calculated and compared as t tests. Those police chiefs who had graduated from the FBINA were compared to those police chiefs who had not. Of the police chiefs in this study, 35% have graduated from the FBINA. Police chiefs who had graduated from the national academy scored significantly
higher on 22 positive leadership indictors. A review of Table 2 will reveal both the positive and negative leadership indicators that scored significant differences. The police chiefs who did not have the FBINA experience received significantly lower scores on the negative leadership indicators than their FBINA graduate counterparts. These negative indicators include: vulnerability, betrayal of personal trust, has specific performance problems, can’t delegate responsibility to others, and denies doing anything wrong. Furthermore, the chiefs with the FBINA experience scored significantly higher on the overall score given by the municipal managers.

The second independent variable analyzed was whether the police chief was hired from outside the department or promoted from within. Of the police chiefs in this study, 30% were hired from outside the department. The mean scores were calculated followed by a comparison with t tests. Table 3 (see below) lists those dependent variables where significant differences are found. This research found that police chiefs hired from within had significantly lower scores on being arrogant, betraying trust, denying wrong doing, and ruling with an iron fist. In other words, police chiefs hired from outside the department had identifiable performance or leadership deficiencies according to the scores given by the municipal managers.

The third variable analyzed by comparison of means and a t test was education level. The education level was operationalized as having some college credits versus not possessing any credits. Of the police chiefs being
analyzed in this study, 30% possessed a bachelor’s degree or higher, and 72% reportedly had some college. Conversely, 28% had not progressed beyond a high school education. Table 4 lists those significant differences.

### TABLE 2.  *t* Scores by the National Academy Graduate Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M (for No)</th>
<th>M (for Yes)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible/future</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>3.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares information</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear vision</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New patterns</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capable</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair minded</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>4.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautious</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>−1.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betrays trust</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>−2.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance problems</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>−1.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>−1.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denies wrongs</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>−3.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setter</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivator</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors activities</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rate</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>−3.38*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = .05.

### TABLE 3.  *t* Scores by Promoted From Within Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M (for No)</th>
<th>M (for Yes)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>−2.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betrays trust</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>−2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denies wrongs</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>−2.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules with iron fist</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>−1.94*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = .05.
between police chiefs possessing some college credits versus those who possess a high school diploma. There were significant differences between these two groups on 35 performance and leadership indicators. It might be more precise to elaborate on those variables in which no significance was found. The reader can see the significant differences in Table 4. Those performance and leadership indicators in which no difference was found include: being competitive, feeling contented, feeling secure, feeling cautious, depressed, dissatisfied, frustrated, lonely, reserved, vulnerable, or having problems selecting subordinates. Again, on all others, there were significant differences seen. Thus, not possessing college experience, for the police chiefs in this study, was a substantial predictor of performance and leadership difficulty. At the very least, this is indicated in the answers from the township managers responding to the questionnaire.

The final step in the analysis of this data was to employ linear regression on the dependent variables (the 45 performance and leadership indicators) against the independent variables. The independent variables were as follows: years as the police chief (tenure); years as a police officer (experience); hired from outside or promoted from within (hired from); graduate of the FBINA (academy); education level (education); urban, suburban, or rural community (community); number of personnel (person); and if the police department is unionized (union).

The dependent variables (the 45 performance and leadership indicators) were presented to the township managers in the form of a Likert-type scale with integers ranging from 1 to 5. Depending on the variable, the respondents were asked to respond to the degree to which the police chief under their management tutelage met the stated criteria. They rated their police chief on a scale between strongly agreed to strongly disagreed or they rated the performance indicators on a scale between never and always.

Initially, the dependent variables were an unwieldy list. The task then became to logically organize the variables into manageable groups. Six subsets were created from the original list of variables. The first was sad, and was composed of the following: having specific leadership problems, is unable to delegate authority, is defensive, is dissatisfied, is lonely, and is vulnerable. The Cronbach’s alpha for sad = .87, indicating consistency of these variables. The second subset was upset, and was composed of the following variables: insensitive, arrogant, betrays trust, is inappropriately ambitious, rules with an iron fist, has boot camp values, and denies responsibility. The Cronbach’s alpha for upset = .84, indicating consistency of these variables. The third subset was calm, and was composed of the
TABLE 4. *t* Scores by Education Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Some College (all)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People person</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible/future</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborates</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares information</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3.82*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear vision</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New patterns</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disequilibrium</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capable</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contented</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair minded</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>3.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-controlled</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>4.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautious</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>−1.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>−0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>−1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrated</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>−1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonely</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>−1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>−0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>−1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insensitive</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>−1.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>−2.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betrays trust</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>−2.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriately ambitious</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>−2.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance problems</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>−5.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>−2.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selects subordinates</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron fist</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>−2.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot camp values</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>−1.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denies wrongs</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>−2.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setter</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivator</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors activities</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rate</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>−3.17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = .05.*
following variables: fair minded, sincere, reasonable, recognizes the value of disequilibrium, is comfortable with uncertainty, is competitive, conscientious, and able to focus on the whole problem. The Cronbach’s alpha for calm = .59, indicating internal consistency of these variables. The fourth subset was sharing, and was composed of the following variables: is a person, a collaborator, shares information, provides a clear vision, develops new patterns of relationships, motivates employees, and is outgoing. The Cronbach’ alpha = .91 for sharing, indicating internal consistency of these variables. The fifth subset was scout (short for Boy Scout) and was composed of the following variables: takes responsibility, is responsible, selects good subordinates, is appropriately ambitious, is well organized, selects and maintains goals, and properly maintains activities. The Cronbach’s alpha for scout = .87, indicating internal consistency of these variables. The sixth and final subset developed was Bond (short for James Bond) and was composed of the following variables: self-controlled, cautious, reserved, controlled, capable, secure, and intelligent. The Cronbach’s alpha for Bond was .52, indicating internal consistency of these variables. Thus, we have a manageable array of variables (eight independent and six subsets of dependent). Fundamentally, the assignment of the variables into subsets was a bit arbitrary, but the literature on police chief performance and leadership scales is scant if it exists at all.

The labels for the subsets were simply the authors’ nomenclature to fit the requirements of the computer software package. The performance indicator sad can also be considered poor leader or less than desirable. The upset police chief can also be classified as means-end or Machiavellian. The calm leader might be a social contract or professional police chief. The sharing police chief might be classified as a transformation or charismatic leader. The scout chief could also be a bureaucratic leader, and the James Bond chief is probably infallible. In short, the names of the leadership styles or performance categories were linked in a commonsense way to the internal descriptors within.

A review of Table 5 indicates that the tenure of the police chief or his years on the job had no significance when regressed with the subsets of the dependent variables. However, the variable hired from saw significance on the subsets upset, calm, sharing, and scout. Notice the negative direction of the beta weight scores on calm, sharing, and scout and the positive direction on upset. This is interpreted to mean that police chiefs promoted from within the department tend to fit into the calm (−.220), sharing (−.194), and scout (−.207) subsets and the chiefs hired from the outside were significantly
more likely to be in the upset (.176) subset. The independent variable academy also was significant in a number of subsets. The police chiefs graduating from the FBINA were significantly more likely to be rated in the calm (–.222), sharing (–.224), scout (–.232), and Bond (–.233) subsets. The independent variable education was a predictor of poor performance in this study. The negative beta weight (–.573) indicated that police chiefs possessing (at best) a high school degree were significantly more likely to have performance and leadership problems. On the other hand, police chiefs with education were significantly more likely to be rated in the sharing (.210) or scout (.159) subsets. The type of community or the number of sworn personnel had no significant predictive benefit for this study. But, the police departments that were union organized were significantly more likely to have the police chiefs rated in the calm (.167), sharing (.165), or scout (.184) subsets.

In sum, this analysis indicates that police chiefs managing police departments, organized as a union shop, and possessing some college credits, graduating from the FBINA, and being promoted from within the police department had a significantly higher rating from the township managers as those chiefs who were rated as being less sad, upset, or having specific performance problems. Moreover, police chiefs possessing no college credits were significantly more likely to be rated as a sad or a poor leader.

DISCUSSION

Perhaps it would be best to discuss the police chiefs with the high performance and leadership ratings first. In a nutshell, it seems the police chiefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Sad</th>
<th>Upset</th>
<th>Calm</th>
<th>Sharing</th>
<th>Scout</th>
<th>Bond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>−.185</td>
<td>−.138</td>
<td>−.070</td>
<td>−.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>−.054</td>
<td>−.119</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired from</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.176*</td>
<td>−.220*</td>
<td>−.194*</td>
<td>−.207*</td>
<td>−.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>−.222*</td>
<td>−.224*</td>
<td>−.232*</td>
<td>−.233*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>−.573*</td>
<td>−.138</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.210*</td>
<td>.159*</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>−.029</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>−.048</td>
<td>−.048</td>
<td>−.055</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>−.142</td>
<td>−.058</td>
<td>−.016</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>−.123</td>
<td>−.096</td>
<td>.167*</td>
<td>.165*</td>
<td>.184*</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R square</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = .05.
receiving the better performance and leadership ratings tend to be educated, groomed for leadership (hence the participation in the FBINA), promoted from within, and work in a union environment. Delattre (1996, p. 224) summarized the promotion from within leadership phenomenon rather well when he wrote, “Those who aspire to strength of character hold themselves answerable for their faults. Though accountable to others, perhaps through a chain of command, they become worthy of trust by being genuinely accountable to themselves.” So, the police chief must draw a fair portion of vigilance and honor from within. Furthermore, the benefits of a college education have long been touted and recognized as an indicator of successful leadership in most professions, policing notwithstanding. The fact that nearly one third of the police chiefs in this study did not possess any college credit may give rise to concern to somebody. The participation and completion of the FBINA should stand on its own merit as an indicator of successful leadership and performance. However, little research, if any, has been published on the long-term benefits of FBINA graduation. Finally, the relationship between unionization of police departments and superior police chief performance is an enigma and certainly worthy of further study.

Those police chiefs with poor ratings were identified as those without college credit. Education was the only significant predictor of police chiefs being rated as sad or poor. The remaining poor performance variable to consider is being hired from the outside. Being hired from the outside was a significant predictor of police chiefs rating as upset. So, the police chiefs at the reverse end (sad or upset) tend to lack formal education and/or be hired from outside the police department. Fielding (1995) found in his work with community policing programs that if immediate supervisors discourage planning and proactive operations, then the chances for cooperation with police units seem even worse. “Once again, there’s a lack of communication. Nobody took the other into their confidence” (p. 119). Perhaps a police chief hired from the outside is ostracized by the police officers and, thus, tends to not take others into their confidence.

One last comment of performance deals with Machiavellian personalities. The Machiavellian variable (also known as upset in this study) was positively associated with those chiefs hired from the outside. Byrne and Whiten (1988, p. 19) wrote, “Social interaction is like a game of chess. The players must be capable of forward planning so that they can remain in a position of power regardless of the moves of the other player.” In a police chief’s world (as in a complex society of animals), his adversaries are members of his own breeding community. He must at all times be able to outwit
the individuals who seek his position. Furthermore, Gutterman (1970, p. 3) posited that “Machiavellianism refers to an amoral, manipulative attitude toward other individuals, combined with a cynical view of men’s motives and their character.” Perhaps being hired from the outside places the chief at the disadvantage of not proving himself as a successful animal deserving of the title.

IN THE FUTURE

This research would be greatly enhanced by repeating the use of performance indicators such as used in this study in a number of states. This expansion will add to the reliability of the instrument developed in the Pennsylvania research. Furthermore, more research on the characteristics of the municipal manager, such as education level, years in their position, and qualifications necessary to adequately rate the police chief, would be helpful as well.
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**BOOK REVIEWS**


In the context of the evolving body of knowledge on policing as a social control mechanism globally, two contemporary themes have assumed tremendous significance as appropriate areas for scholarly investigation. These are comparative policing and democratic policing. Conceptually esoteric though they do sometimes appear to criminal justice practitioners, yet there has been no lack of scholarly audaciousness, as it were, in traversing a not-too-often traveled and bewildering territory of academic investigation. It is against this background that the editors of this book have put together meticulously and with much scholarly perspicacity various excellent contributions from academic stalwarts in the field of comparative and international policing that originally formed the topics of presentation papers at a symposium held in May 1995 at the Onati Sociology of Law Institute in Spain. The work is most timely as increasing international attention continues to be focused on the “global challenges of policing democratic societies during a decade of democratic geo-political change” (p. xi). The book is divided into four sections. Section 1 deals with challenges of policing democracies. Section 2 covers country perspectives. Section 3 is about reflections on challenges of policing democracies. Section 4 deals with country studies.

Dilip Das, in a comprehensive and well-documented introductory chapter, puts the entire theme of the book in its correct conceptual and theoretical context. The chapter highlights some key perspectives on the concept of democratic policing (pp. 4-5); identifying organizational issues, young personnel and old culture, centralizing trends; operational issues (e.g., crime, migration); professional issues (e.g., police subculture and violence, corruption, politicization, stereotyping) as major challenges to democratic policing in the countries studied (pp. 5-11). Das then articulates with clarity and precision major responses and remedies in the form of international cooperation, legal resources, media and the police, and administrative measures (pp. 12-16). The introduction concludes instructively, with a threefold acknowledgment:

1. The multidimensionality in the concept of democratic policing;
2. Differences and similarities of the challenges;
3. Differences in responses. (pp. 16-19)
Chapter 2 presents a historical overview of policing in democratic societies. Beginning with an analysis of some key perspectives on the concepts of democratic policing and democracy and definition of “democracy,” which “implies that the citizens themselves are the ultimate source of power” (p. 24), Peter Kratcoski skeptically observes that the concept of “democratic policing” “may be misnomer when applied to the internal functioning of a police department” for the reason that “police departments traditionally have been structured along a military model” (p. 24). He then explores and discusses some main features of the development of modern policing, ranging from three models of police organizational structures (centralized, coordinated, and fragmented) (pp. 27-28) to policing in an era of change (p. 40).

From a comparative perspective, one illuminating feature of the book is the detailed treatment of challenges to democratic policing cross-culturally. To this end, chapter 3, by Sanja Kutnjak Ivkovich, covers the Croatian experience. It sets the tone with a background analysis of the social, political, and economic conditions of that country, followed by an articulation of its own brand of democratic policing (pp. 48-49), organizational (pp. 49-66), operational (pp. 66-76), and professional challenges (pp. 77-81).

Chapter 4 examines democratic perspectives on policing in Estonia from the same set of perspectives, the Estonian concept of democratic policing (pp. 90-91), organizational (pp. 92-95), operational (pp. 95-101), and professional challenges (pp. 101-104), and responses to challenges (pp. 104-110). Instructively, as regards responses to challenges, the author, Ando Leps, discusses extensively the importance of international cooperation on the part of the Estonian police, attributing it largely to the emergence of “new forms of transnational crime” (p. 106). Reference is also made to the attempt to bring about democratic behavior by a police force through legislative means (p. 107) by the enactment of a new Estonian Public Law in 1990, and of the antagonistic relationship between the media and the Estonian police (p. 107).

Chapter 5 deals with challenges of policing democracy in Hungary. It is a detailed examination of the Hungarian experience. The author, Istvan Szikinger, begins with the familiar observation of the lack of consensus on the concept of democratic policing (p. 115), as it were, cautioning the reader that, as a novel area of intellectual investigation in the social sciences, democratic policing bristles with complex definitional problems. The entire chapter is devoted to exploring fully the operational and professional challenges and articulating possible responses (pp. 116-136). Of significance is the reference to politicization and abuse of power as the two major challenges to democratic policing, from the professional perspective. The chapter’s theoretical value is enhanced or enriched by the detailed narration of the facts and circumstances of two leading cases of alleged police brutality as reported by Amnesty International (pp. 138-139). They effectively illustrate the real-life deleterious impact of nondemocratic policing. Perhaps, other chapters could have been enriched by similar narrations.
Chapter 6 is an especially enlightening exposition on challenges of policing democracy in Poland. The Polish experience is discussed extensively, the emphasis being on the difficulties encountered in getting police behavior to conform to democratic standards (pp. 143-170).

Chapters 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 likewise examine exhaustively challenges to democratic policing in Russia, South Africa, Austria, Britain, and the Netherlands respectively (pp. 173-305).

From a philosophical standpoint, chapter 12 is preeminent. It is an excellent articulation of the nature of democracy, democratic policing, and of democratization as a necessary prelude for any constructive and objective analysis of the challenges of democratic policing outlined in the earlier chapters and how to tackle them. The author, Otwin Marenin, begins with a very insightful conceptualization of democracy somehow remote from the orthodox usage of the term. He portrays democracy as “a dynamic set of balances between conflicting yet equally legitimate interests, demands and values” (p. 311) and observes that “a fundamental tension and need for balance between populist demands and personal integrity are often described as the most profound personal choice facing elected delegates in any democratic system” (p. 311). He then proceeds to analogize that this dilemma is faced by the police also in the sense of having to make a “choice between obedience to conscience and law (doing what is right) versus responsiveness to community demands (doing what is expected)—all legitimate aspirations and values” (p. 311).

Marenin points out that policing is “a universal social function, a form of social control and order maintenance,” arguing that “democratic policing is a particular version of how to conduct that function” (p. 312). Continuing, he contends that “efforts to democratize policing” do “require the development of rules for working (their specific substantive and procedural contents) which are effective responses to functional needs and also incorporate accepted and universal behavior” (p. 313). Evidently, the most convincing analysis in this chapter relates to the real challenge for democratic policing, which, quite rightly, in the author’s view, is twofold: (a) “to translate principles into rules of work which can be taught, enforced, rewarded if properly done and sanctioned if abused,” and (b) “rules for work will only become operational and guide day-to-day decisions if they can be made to sink down and become part of the operative, formal and informal, police culture” (p. 313).

Evidently, the book’s main strength is the drawing together of the common conceptual themes and methodological approaches as regards challenges to democratic policing, from both the comparative and international perspectives, with a keen focus on similarities and dissimilarities and what norms and values in policing are desirable globally. This is indeed commendable. By the same token, concluding the study with country studies on policing (chapters 13, 14, and 15) is, unhappily, a logical mistake. These chapters, singly or together, detract unnecessarily from the analytical value of the contentions and submissions so carefully set out in chapter 12 that, by any objective reasoning, can be perceived as the climax of the study.
As indicated already, chapter 12 adequately summarizes the findings in the earlier chapters and draws relevant and valid inferences from them. An unbiased scholar reading the book would be inclined to agree that the work should have ended appropriately on this note:

Lastly, mechanisms for accountability in practical democratic policing must be in place. Democratic policing is not self-enforcing. It can be implemented by standards, training and expectations of work, but it must also be supervised and disciplined to ensure that officers carry teaching into practice. (p. 326)

On the whole, however, Challenges of Policing Democracies: A World Perspective is scholarly, thoroughly researched, and well-documented. It is certainly a major contribution to the sparse literature on democratic policing.

—Bankole Thompson
Eastern Kentucky University


Over the past decade or so, discourse in policing has been become concerned with the notions of increased decentralization of decision making and the increased discretion that comes with that organizational choice. Some critiques of particular implementations of decentralization, principally community-oriented policing and problem-oriented policing (POP), have escalated their claims that each will lead to likely increases in abuse, corruption, shirking, or all three. Though rejecting those claims, proponents of increased decentralization and community involvement do not respond to the core observations about current abuses in policing. For their part, critics point to no theory that might help us understand discretion, give it more legitimacy, and thereby satisfy both camps.

Street-Level Leadership: Discretion and Legitimacy in Front-Line Public Service by Janet Coble Vinzant and Lane Crothers, attempts to offer a theory of street-level work that explains discretion and delivers legitimacy to justify increased discretion. Historically, the two primary problems of organizational arrangements have been coordination and control. The latter is essential to ensure that members of the organization direct their efforts toward organizational goals. The former is essential, for as organizations grow, either by increased specialization or by increased complexity of generalists’ tasks, the costs of control increase and some coordination of efforts is essential. Prior efforts to achieve both, in policing as in all public organizations, have been focused on hierarchical management, training,
organizational culture, and the like. For the proponents of decentralized decision making in police, these approaches are the cause of the problems we see as police abuses. Driven by organizational isolation, a culture disconnected from the community, and training that focuses on a narrow range of police roles (order maintenance and law enforcement), these outcomes are predictable in policing. For the critics of decentralization, it is unbridled discretion that is the problem, given that historically useful means to control organizations fail in police organizations. Yet, neither position addresses the nature of discretion nor how it can achieve legitimacy. The essential contribution of this work is that it makes a serious effort at both.

For several years, the authors observed social workers and police officers working cases on the streets in several cities. Their decidedly qualitative approach notwithstanding, they produce a rich and contextual understanding of the nature of discretion in a manner that permits them to generate a theory of discretion and legitimacy grounded in theories of leadership. Because their study population engages in various forms of problem solving and direct community involvement, it is significant in the current debate about community models of policing.

Vinzant and Crothers begin their assessment with some core assumptions. The work of street-level workers is inherently important, involves significant discretion, holds potential for benefit as well as abuse, and the dynamic nature of discretion leads to multiple choices in many, if not most, cases. Moreover, they carry out their functions in a matrix of influences that often provide conflicting criteria for their performance. These include courts, bureaucracy, citizen expectations, clients, supervisors, and media to name but a few. Although Lipsky suggested some sources of discretion, they argue that since his work in 1980, the nature and scope of discretion has changed for several reasons. First, new management practices such as Total Quality Management and community-based programming have driven decision making further down. Second, the antigovernment mood in the body politic places enormous pressure on the use of discretion. Third, increased demands and expectations at the neighborhood level impact decision making. Finally, street-level workers are asked to address increasingly “wicked” problems that may not be subject to correction and offer few means to test or evaluate their efforts. Hence, legitimacy is a problem, the core problem being criteria on which to judge discretionary acts. They note that there have been many attempts to provide those criteria, including constitutional principle, conservatorship, personal responsibility, stewardship, and citizenship among others.

Still, current theories or models of public service have failed to account for discretion and legitimacy. Vinzant and Crothers argue that theories that paint street-level public servants as bureaucrats, implementors, policy makers, power wielders, professionals, problem solvers (e.g., POP), or political actors all fail to account for the twin problems of discretion and legitimacy. The authors offer leadership as the model that can best account for both. Why? Leadership encompasses a variety of behaviors, demands the consideration of values (the missing link in existing
models), and provides concepts and standards by which actions can be deemed appropriate and legitimate. Moreover, the language of leadership provides a positive means with which to address the work of street-level workers. Finally, it speaks to both forms of discretion (process and outcome).

Their model is most easily represented by the $2 \times 2$ table on page 91 of the text. One side (x-axis) of the table is the outcome dimension, whereas the other (y-axis) is the process dimension. Those situations with limited outcome discretion and limited process discretion are resolved by administrative procedure. Those that have low outcome discretion but high process discretion are best described by situational leadership theory, whereas the reverse (high output but low process discretion) are best described by transformational leadership theory. Finally, those situations that call for high discretion on both metrics call for both transformational and situational theories of leadership. It is these latter sorts of situations that speak to community policing and problem-oriented policing. The behavior of leaders that most conforms to the expectations of these models can be identified as legitimate.

Having said that, the criteria in each of the leadership models is quite well-developed and offers a genuinely understandable benchmark for legitimacy criteria.

The authors do make a case that discretion and legitimacy are poorly handled in current literature, and it is unlikely a strong case can be made that the policing literature has much addressed the latter question at all. Indeed, the notions of legitimacy in policing literature focus on the absence of wrongdoing and the involvement of community as the two principal measures of legitimate actions (and, conversely, the absence thereof). Carefully examined, these cannot serve as criteria for legitimate actions. Whether the reader will agree or not that Vinzant and Crothers have solved the puzzle, this is an admirable, readable, and suitable book for those who are interested in policing, either academically or in practical terms. This book is highly recommended. Yes, it is a book by two public administrationists about police and social workers. Yet, the topic is timely and fills a void in the current discourse.

—GREGORY D. RUSSELL
Washington State University


This text represents a commendable effort to provide insights into diversity and diversity issues that impact the criminal justice system in the United States. The authors describe not only racial and/or ethnic differences but attempt insights into all the ways in which people are different. To that end, class, gender, sexual identity,
age, disabled, and religious differences are presented within a criminal justice context. The groups are described in terms of their own social historical experiences and ability to impact sociopolitical agendas. In addition, the authors describe the aforementioned groupings within the context of victimization, patterns of offending, and employment within the criminal justice system.

The text is subdivided into four distinct components: an introduction, categorizations of difference, reconstructing difference, and concluding remarks. The authors begin with a description of the conceptualization and categorization of difference as social constructs. Moreover, the authors do a rather impressive job of presenting these socially constructed differences as outcomes of social interactions impacted by power relationships. This conflict-oriented theoretical perspective is further elaborated on in the third chapter, in which crime and privilege are also identified and presented as social constructs.

The second segment of the text describes the sociohistorical and political experiences of 12 diverse groups. These 12 chapters focus on: Native Americans, African Americans, immigrants, Latino/as, Asian Americans, social class, women, gays and lesbians, the elderly, adolescents, disabled or special needs populations, and religious groups. In addition to the aforementioned brief descriptions, criminal justice–related experiences of the groups as victims, perpetrators, and service providers are also discussed.

The third section of the text consists of four chapters that describe current trends and criminal agencies’ varied responses to the issue of diversity. This segment begins with analogies depicting challenges encountered by minority citizens and applicants who seek careers within the criminal justice system. Brief discussions of governmental responses such as the Civil Rights Act, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and Affirmative Action prepare the reader for an opportunity to better understand challenges that minorities and women confront in the arenas of policing, corrections, and the courts. The remaining chapters elaborate upon the benefits of having diverse personnel within the criminal justice system and present strategies that break down barriers that inhibit diversity, communication, and sensitivity to victims of crime and overall productivity.

The concluding chapter integrates previously described socioeconomic and political strategies adopted by various groups in efforts to have their needs met by the criminal justice system. It appropriately concludes by contrasting criminal justice to social justice, denoting growth of the former in absence of the latter.

This particular text can be a welcomed addition to many criminal justice courses in which the objective is to consider the impact and challenges of diversity. The constantly changing demographics of the country suggest that all criminal justice agencies are or will be affected by changes in the population. Though readers may sense the text attempts to achieve too much with the inclusion of racial/ethnic, gender, class, disability, and religious differences presented in one book, this text
prompts readers to consider many aspects of the changing world in which our criminal justice system operates and the challenges it faces in securing justice that is not premised on preconceived notions that produce discriminatory results.

—CHARLES J. CORLEY
Michigan State University
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