19068

THE IMPACT OF COMMUNITY POLICING TRAINING AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION ON POLICE PERSONNEL

Prepared for the
National Institute of Justice, Washington D.C.

by

Robin N. Haarr, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator

FINAL REPORT *Archive*

Approved By: _____

Date: _8/27/01_

November 2000

Grant No. 96-IJ-CX-0060
Grant Period: January 1, 1997 – June 30, 1999

1

THE IMPACT OF COMMUNITY POLICING TRAINING AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION ON POLICE PERSONNEL

by

Robin N. Haarr, Ph.D.[1]

Arizona State University West
Administration of Justice
4701 W. Thunderbird Rd.
Phoenix, AZ 85069-7100
(602) 543-6671
rhaarr@asu.edu

[1] Robin N. Haarr is an Associate Professor in the Administration of Justice Department at Arizona State University West. Her research interests include community policing, police behavior and culture, women and minorities in criminal justice occupations, and female victimization and crime.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

This report is based upon a three and a half year study of the impact of basic training, field training, and work environment on police recruits attitudes toward policing in general, but in particular, community policing, problem-solving policing, and cultural sensitivity. This study was conducted in cooperation with the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy and 25 police agencies across the State of Arizona. In particular, in 1995, mandated by the Arizona's Police Officers Standards Training (P.O.S.T.) Board and the Arizona Law Enforcement Academies users groups, 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 Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy was interested in understanding the impact of basic training on police recruits' attitudes and beliefs related to community policing, problem-solving policing and cultural diversity. In addition, Arizona's P.O.S.T. Board and participating police agencies were interested in understanding the impact of field training and work environment on police recruits' attitudes and beliefs related to community policing, problem-solving policing and cultural diversity. A third and final objective of the study was to track dropouts and determine if and how their attitudes and values differ systematically from non-dropouts.

Methodology

I examined the impact of basic training on police recruits by using a single case study pretest-posttest design of a panel sample of 446 police recruits, from 14 successive training academy classes that began between December 1995 and October 1996. A panel design was employed—with repeated measurement on the same respondents—to provide more statistical control over individual pretest differences. Police recruits were pre-tested (Time 1) upon entering the training academy (i.e., on the first day at the academy). The pretest measure determined police recruits baseline measures of job involvement and job satisfaction and attitudes and beliefs about traditional policing strategies, community policing methods and philosophies, problem-solving techniques, the importance of building positive police-public relations, and multicultural awareness and skills. A 16-week lag existed between the pretest and the first posttest (Time 2), which was conducted during the final three days of the basic training academy. Four hundred and forty-six (446) recruits from the original panel completed the Time 2 posttest survey. Since the purpose of the training academy was to instill and shape desired attitudes and beliefs, measures of attitudes and beliefs were compared from the pretest to the first posttest.

Since 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 12 weeks after the first posttest, at or near the end of the recruits' field training process. The second posttest occurred between June 1996 and March 1997. At this stage of the research, each

recruit was tracked to his or her respective police agency. Three hundred and ninety-four (394) police recruits from the original panel completed the Time 3 survey. The second posttest was an important part of the evaluation research; in as much as it revealed the impact of field training, non-field training effects, the work environment, and disparate community policing programs on officers' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. Finally, a third posttest (Time 4) occurred at the completion of the one-year probationary period. Three hundred and twenty-eight (328) officers from the original panel completed the Time 4 survey. Police officers' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors after completing one-year of employment in their respective police agency were compared to Time 1, Time 2, and Time 3. The third posttest and final assessment occurred between March 1997 and February 1998.

Another component of this longitudinal study was a survey of police agencies that had recruits in the final sample. The Community Policing Survey developed by Mary Ann Wycoff (1993) was used to generate the data used to measure work environment and how police agencies that had officers in the final sample conceptualized and implemented community policing and problem-oriented. In an added effort to understand the socialization process of new police officers into police work, face-to-face interviews were conducted with 81 field training officers from four of the participating metropolitan police agencies. Field training officers were selected because they have the most immediate and potentially the most intense impact on shaping new police officers attitudes and behaviors.

Finally, in order to identify systematic differences in attitudinal and value patterns between dropouts and "quitters" and non-dropouts from police work, efforts were made to survey and interview the 118 police recruits that dropped out of police work during the period of the research, which included the 16-month period starting with each recruits entry into the basic training academy.

Summary of Major Findings

In general, the findings presented in this report reveal that the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy has a positive impact on police recruits' attitudes related to community policing and problem-solving policing, as well as developing police recruits' sense of capability at engaging in problem-solving activities and assessing the needs of diverse groups of citizens. At the same time, the training academy has a positive impact on shaping police recruits' support for traditional policing. It is important to realize that while the impact is significant, the change is small. In regards to shaping police recruits' attitudes related to various dimensions of the job and job satisfaction, academy training appears to have mixed results (i.e., some positive and some negative).

Upon graduation from the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy, police recruits proceed to their respective police agencies where they are assigned to a field training officer and required to successfully complete the field training process. Interviews with field training officers and recruits revealed that there was some emphasis placed on community policing and problem-solving during the field training, although the vast majority of time is allocated to skills development such as learning to use the radio, making traffic stops, officer safety, and filling out reports. There is little evidence of a formal and systematic approach to incorporate community policing and problem-solving policing into the field training process.

Thus, it was not surprising that findings show that the field training process, in general, fails to reinforce the positive impact that the training academy had on police recruits' attitudes toward community policing, problem-solving policing, and cultural sensitivity. Instead, the field training process was found to have a negative impact on police recruits' attitudes related to community policing and problem-solving policing, as well as on police recruits' sense of capability at engaging in problem-solving activities and assessing the needs of diverse groups of citizens. The only positive impact that the field training process had on police recruits' attitudes was related reinforcing recruits' support for traditional policing and support for police-public relations. Field training was also found to have a negative impact on police recruits' attitudes related to the various dimensions of the job and job satisfaction.

As police recruits proceed through the field training process and the first year of their police careers they experience the police officer role, engage in actual police work, and experience the environment and culture of the police organization. Findings from the Community Policing Survey indicate that across the board, agencies whose recruits participated in the study were squarely committed to community policing philosophy. In fact, the leaders of these agencies had made several structural adjustments to put community policing into practice and recognized the benefits of community policing. At least as indicated by survey findings, the possibility that recruits would leave the academy and return to agencies non-supportive of community policing was slim. The findings presented throughout this report, however, show that, in most cases, the field training process and the organizational environment fail to reinforce the small, but positive impact the training academy had on police recruits' attitudes and skills related to community policing, problem-solving policing, and cultural sensitivity. The only positive impact that the field training process and work environment has on police recruits' is in reinforcing support for traditional policing and support for police-public relations. In regards to shaping police recruits' attitudes related to various dimensions of the job and job satisfaction, the first year on the job reveals to have mixed results (i.e., some positive and some negative).

These findings not only reveal the direction of change in police recruits attitudes and beliefs, but they confirm that individual characteristics, organizational environment factors, baseline level attitudes and skills, and academy class factors predict attitude and skill changes. Although, there is variation across the scales as to which independent variables predict the change. What is most interesting are some of the consistent patterns that emerge. In particular, the strongest predictor of change from Time 1 to Time 2 is the baseline level scores. In fact, baseline level scores explained most of the variance in police recruits attitudinal change from Time 1 to Time 2. Another weaker predictor of change from Time 1 to Time 2 was a police agencies ranking on the patrol officers are required to engage in community policing activities scale. For instance, this variable was a significant predictor of the increase in orientation to community policing and orientation to problem-solving policing. This finding suggests that police agencies that ranked high on patrol officers/deputies are required to engage in activities/responsibilities related to community policing may tend to hire individuals that are oriented to or supportive of community policing philosophies and strategies and problem-solving techniques. This finding may also be evidence that socialization of police recruits into the culture of a police agency begins early in a police officers' career, as early as the hiring process and/or during the basic training academy. Other weak predictors of change from Time 1 to Time 2 that emerged were individual characteristics such as education, age and prior military experience. Academy classes also emerged as weak

predictors of change. This finding suggests 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 the class sergeant and/or the makeup of the class (e.g., a class may have a number of police recruits with prior law enforcement and/or military experience, a bachelors degree, older or younger recruits, and recruits from police agencies that ranked high or low on the community policing scales). There was not consistent pattern across the scales or models for these weaker predictors to draw any conclusions.

Another interesting and consistent pattern that emerged is that baseline level scores were no longer the strongest predictor of change from Time 2 to Time 3, and in some cases it actually disappeared as a significant predictor of change. Instead, organizational environment factors such as shift, police agencies ranking on the patrol officers are required to engage in community policing activities scale, and agency location (e.g., suburban Phoenix police agencies) emerged as predictors of the change in police recruits' attitudes. This finding suggests that once the police recruit leaves the training academy and enters into the field training process in their respective police agencies, organizational environment factors become more powerful forces in shaping police recruits' attitudes, beliefs, and skills related to community policing, problem-solving policing and cultural sensitivity, than do individual characteristics or baseline level attitudes. Still, however, individual characteristics such as prior military experience, prior law enforcement experience, and gender occasionally emerged as predictors of change, as did academy classes. This finding reveals that not only the organizational environment predicts change in attitudes, but also individual characteristics continue to have a significant impact on attitude change over time.

Baseline level scores consistently emerged as the strongest predictor of change from Time 1 to Time 4. Another strong predictor of change from Time 1 to Time 4 is coworker support for community policing and traditional policing. Coworker attitudes emerge as a more consistent and stronger predictor of change in police recruits attitudes and beliefs than does an organizations ranking on the various community policing scales or individual characteristics. This finding suggests that the informal culture of a police department can be a more powerful force in shaping the attitudes and beliefs of new officers, than the formal organization. In many of the models, shift also emerged as a significant predictor variable along with coworkers' attitudes; thus, supporting the assumption that there are multiple informal cultures in an organization, such as those based on shift and squad, with differing attitudes and beliefs about police work and police-public interactions. Individual characteristics including race/ethnicity, education, and prior law enforcement experience emerged as weak predictors of change from Time 1 to Time 4 in several of the tables. Academy classes virtually disappeared as predictors of change from Time 1 to Time 4; thus 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.

Finally, interviews with dropouts revealed that police recruits who self-initiated resignation from police work within the first 16-months of their policing careers experienced a high level of pre-termination conflict and dissonance when the realities of police work differed from their ideals or expectations of police work. The various dimensions of the job and work environment that conflicted with their ideals of police work included the stress and risk of the job, problems with field training officers, running call-to-call, the immense amount of paperwork that is required,

the politics that guides assignments and promotions, the possibility of being sued for doing one's job, heavy-handed policing, fellow officers who provoked subjects into fights, and lack of community policing. For many recruits, the conflict they experienced culminated from the cumulative effects of several of realities that are characteristics of the occupational culture of policing. This conflict provoked a state of dissonance for the police recruit and ultimately the decision to quit, rather than change their beliefs and attitudes to a more realistic perspective of police work.

Police recruits whom academy administrators terminated or the police agency that hired them did not report experiencing the same pre-termination conflicts related to police work and the work environment that self-initiated dropouts disclosed. Rather, for the majority of these academy-initiated and department-initiated dropouts the termination was unexpected or not planned; thus they expressed a higher level of post-termination conflict surrounding their injury, the inability to complete the training academy, and being forced to leave police work. Thus, it was not surprising that several of these dropouts expressed the desire or identified the efforts in which they were engaged to enter back into police work.

Recommendations

Perhaps the most important point that can be made about the impact of academy training on recruit attitudes and beliefs related to community policing is that the basic belief system of police recruits about the nature of policing is firmly established by the time they arrive at the academy. During the timeframe of this study, the best predictors of attitude change were by far the attitudes that recruits brought with them to the academy. In other words, police recruits are not empty vessels to be filled with new attitudes and values related to policing. Thus, training to change basic attitudes and beliefs, also referred to as reform training, faces a much different challenge than does basic skills training because attitudes and beliefs about the nature of policing are relatively stable cognitive states that while not completely impervious to change, are very difficult to change. Perhaps an even more difficult problem is sustaining whatever academy training gains are made once the recruit leaves the academy and begins the process of immersion into the "real world" of police work.

Academy training gains, as slight as they might be, require reinforcement as recruits move from the academy to doing police work in the agency of their employment. One source of reinforcement is the police agency itself. It seems unreasonable to expect recruits to continue their commitment to community policing principals and practices if they return from the academy to a police agency that is not committed to and engaging in community policing. The police agency through its leadership and organizational structure and programs sets the tone for community policing. When leaders are on board and when the organization is configured to practice community policing, and in fact does, one would expect a greater likelihood that the recruits that they employ will continue to have attitudes and beliefs supportive of community policing.

Since the field training phase of the police neophyte's career presents the first real opportunity for the recruit to do real police work, and it also represents an important training opportunity for reinforcing and further developing community policing–related academy training gains. Since

the field training process takes place immediately after recruits leave the academy, it might be the single best place to expose the recruit to community policing in practice and that in turn could couple or link police practice with academy reform training. Formalizing community policing training as part of the field training process, and most importantly, training field training officers to do community policing training are other steps that could be taken to sustain and expand community policing training gains made in the academy.

In sum, the evidence generated by this study calls into question the utility of basic police academy training for affecting recruit attitudes and beliefs related to community policing. This study did not examine the training curriculum in detail, and no assessment of actual dosage or exposure to community policing related training content was made.

Training in support of community policing must start with the development of awareness of its principals and practices, and this is where the academy should continue to focus, making recruits aware. However academy taught principals and need to be coupled more closely to police practice, and community policing training needs to place much greater emphasis on the development of community policing skills and the use of these skills in police work. Officers who possess community-policing skills, who know how to apply their skills to daily police work, and who see tangible outcomes from their application are likely to develop the cognitive systems that result in attitudes, values, and beliefs consistent with and support of community policing.

CHAPTER 1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Across the United States, police organizations are giving increased attention to improving the ability of police personnel to respond to community needs through adoption and application of community policing philosophies and strategies and problem-solving techniques. In both theory and practice, community policing represents a fundamental change in the basic role of police officers, including changes in their skills, motivations, and opportunities to engage in problem-solving activities and develop relations with key stakeholders in the community. Scholars (Wilkinson and Rosenbaum, 1994; Lurigio and Skogan, 1994; Dantzker et al, 1995) have maintained that responsibility for achieving these changes in police officers' attitudes and behaviors rests with the officer's employer. 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., 1995). In fact, the Office of Community Policing Services (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.

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. For example, in 1995, mandated by the Arizona's Police Officers Standard Training (P.O.S.T.) Board and the Arizona Law Enforcement Academies

(A.L.E.A.) 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 crimes 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: 1) to increase support for the use traditional policing tactics and processes; 2) to increase support for professional policing; 3) to develop more favorable attitudes about community policing; 4) to develop more favorable attitudes about problem-oriented policing; and 5) to develop more favorable attitudes toward building positive police-public relationships. [2]The revised curriculum also placed substantial emphasis on training related to enhancing individuals' sensitivity and awareness to cultural and ethnic differences. This training approach is fairly typical and is being used by numerous agencies throughout the United States (see McEwen et al., 1997).

The revised basic training program developed by the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy is clearly a version of what Buerger (1998, p. 34) refers to as "reform training," that is training designed to alter an officers' 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

---

[2] A professional model of policing can be defined as that encompassing a combination of incident-driven policing, traditional policing tactics, and community policing and problem-solving philosophies and strategies.

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.

In light of the extensive efforts and resources devoted to redefine and redevelop 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 in-service community policing training on individual police personnel (Boydstun and Sherry, 1975; Greene and Decker, 1989; Hayeslip and Cordner, 1987; Lurigio and Rosenbaum, 1994; Lurigio and Skogan, 1994; Rosenbaum et al., 1994; Schwartz and Clarren, 1977; Skogan, 1990; Trojanowicz, 1982, 1983, 1986; Weisburd, McElroy, and Hardyman, 1988; Wilson and Bennett, 1994; Wycoff and Skogan, 1993, 1994). Moreover, 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. 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 Dantzker et al., 1995; Rosenbaum et al., 1994; Wycoff and Skogan, 1994).

To learn more about the impact of a basic training program that integrates community policing and problem-oriented policing across the curriculum, in 1995, the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy, with the endorsement of the Arizona P.O.S.T. Board and ALEA, collaborated with Arizona State University West to design a study that would estimate the short- and long-term effects of the 606.5 hour, 16 week basic training program on police recruits. In doing so, this research project was designed to accomplish three main objectives. One, to

evaluate the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy's basic training program that was redesigned with the intention to support community policing and problem-oriented policing. Two, to track a panel sample of training academy graduates through the first year of their police careers, in their respective police agencies, to evaluate the effects of field training, occupational socialization, and different work environments and community policing practices on their beliefs and behaviors related to community policing and problem-oriented policing. Finally, three, to track dropouts and determine if and how their individual characteristics and attitudes and values differ systematically from non-dropouts.

Findings generated from this study should provide police administrators and training specialists with insight into the impact of basic training and field training on reshaping or reinforcing existing attitudes and beliefs about police work. Furthermore, findings generated in this study can be used to identify the types of training and information exchange that is needed to achieve officer support for community policing and problem-oriented policing.

COMMUNITY POLICING: THEORY AND PRACTICE

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 and Lobitz, 1991; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1989; Wilkinson and Rosenbaum, 1994; Wycoff and Skogan, 1993). The forces behind this movement have been numerous; the most obvious has been the failure of traditional policing methods to make a permanent and significant impact on

community problems such as violent crime, drug trafficking, and gang activity (Rosenbaum, 1994).

The movement to integrate community policing and problem-oriented policing into police work and police organizations has generated considerable debate over what community policing is and what kinds of strategies and tactics constitute community policing (see Greene and Mastrofski for a debate about the rhetoric and realities of community policing; see also Couper and Lobitz, 1991; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1989; Wilkinson and Rosenbaum, 1994; Wycoff and Skogan, 1993). Rosenbaum (1994, p. xi) maintained that "while there is no simple or commonly shared definition of community policing, there is a shared set of theory-based ideas and philosophical principles that serve as catalysts for a wide array of changes in police organizations and operations." In fact, a review of the literature reveals that community policing is based upon the concept that police officers, private citizens, and local and state agencies can form relations and work together in creative ways to help identify and solve contemporary community problems related to crime, social and physical disorder, neighborhood decay, and fear of crime. Buerger, Cohen and Petrosino (1995) identify numerous advantages of community policing for both communities and the police.

> The advantages to the community of the community policing partnership are thought to be greater responsiveness of police agencies to citizen-defined problems, increased police attention to order maintenance, and the resulting reduced public perception of and fear of crime. The advantages to the police are promoted decentralized decision making that improves agency performance, greater job satisfaction for officers, and improved citizen satisfaction with the police, and a reduction in the police workload. (Buerger et al., 1995: 126).

Concomitantly, community policing is seen as not only a means to reduce and prevent crime, as well as protect and enhance the quality of life in an urban environment, but also to encourage positive interactions between the police and citizens in the hopes of dispelling the damaging stereotypes that each group has held against each other (Buerger et al., 1995; Goldstein, 1990; Rosenbaum, 1994; Skolnick and Bayley, 1989; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1989; Wilkinson and Rosenbaum, 1994; Wycoff and 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, expectations, and skills of officers, well beyond the traditional roles for which police are commonly hired, trained and evaluated (Buerger et al, 1995; Lurigio and Rosenbaum, 1994). According to Buerger et al. (1995: 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 in which the traditional model of control is irrelevant and counterproductive. Instead, officers are required to participate, promote, and persuade interested stakeholders to come together and take action, as well as mediate between conflicting parties and interests.

For many police organizations, a major obstacle to reforming the traditional policing model is the attitudinal resistance among police officers regarding community policing philosophies and practices. More often than not, the lack of knowledge and skills that are needed to engage in community policing and problem-solving activities explain officers' resistance to these newer models of policing (Greene et al., 1994; Lurigio and Rosenbaum, 1994; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1994; Weisel and Eck, 1994).

Reform Training: Training the Police in Alternative Policing Strategies

In order 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 (Lurigio and Rosenbaum, 1994; Lurigio and Skogan, 1994; Rosenbaum et al., 1994; Sadd and Grinc, 1993; Wycoff and Skogan, 1993, 1994). 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. In order 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.

In 1996, the Institute for Law and Justice (McEwen, Webster, and Pandey, 1997) conducted an empirical study of community policing training efforts across the United States. McEwen et al. surveyed 230 training academy directors and 532 law enforcement executives that implemented community policing and served jurisdictions with populations greater than 50,000 residents. What they found is that training academies across the United States 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, how to build police-community relations, communication skills and tactics, dealing with special populations, team building and leadership, and patrol techniques and beat profiling (McEwen, 1997, p. 18). Another approach, adopted by approximately 18 percent of the four types of academies surveyed, was to incorporate community policing philosophies into all recruits courses.

In addition, to adding community policing training to basic training curriculums, McEwen et al. also found that at least 59% of the training academies provide training to field training officers. Yet only one-quarter of the law enforcement agencies that use field training officers report providing field training officers with specialized community policing training designed to help FTOs training police recruits in community policing and problem-solving policing. Moreover, only 23% of law enforcement agencies that use field training officers have made changes to the field training selection process, such as requiring field training officers to have at least a knowledge of and commitment to community policing and/or have demonstrated community policing skills.

Sustaining Attitude Change over Time

If training is successful in instilling cognitive changes supportive of community policing, what is required to sustain such cognitive changes? According to Mastrofski and Ritti (1996:295) "an organization that wishes to benefit from the institutional function of training, but is unwilling or unable to heighten its enforcement, will decouple the training structure from work activities." In such an environment, even intense and high-quality training may quickly dissipate once officers are exposed to the powerful effects of every day work, the organization, and the occupational culture of

their more experienced coworkers. In particular, officers exposed to community policing and problem-solving training may find little value in those activities if, upon graduation from the training academy and entrance into the police agency, the department affords them few opportunities to apply it, supervisors discourage it, and it is irrelevant for career advancement. In contrast, an organization that wishes to enhance community policing implementation will tightly couple training with work activities. For instance, police departments with organizational structures and job designs that engage officers in community policing and problem-solving practices should have greater success in sustaining officer attitudes that are supportive of community and problem-solving policing.

In addition, community policing models theorize that changes in organizational structure, management style, and training programs should expand the line officers' job and create a supportive work environment, which in turn should produce positive changes in officers' attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors toward community policing and problem-solving policing. Collateral outcomes should be increased commitment to the police organization and decreased officer cynicism about police work. Finally, these organizational changes are also expected to change the daily activities of police officers, and consequently change the nature of their relationship with the public (see Rosenbaum, 1994).

A review of the literature on the effects of community policing training and program implementation on officers' attitudes reveals mixed findings. Wilson and Bennett (1994) contend the findings have been mixed largely because community policing programs and training has differed across police agencies and these differences have dictated different outcome variables and methods of evaluation. For instance, in an evaluation of eight Bureau of Justice funded Innovative Neighborhood Oriented Policing (INOP) programs (i.e., Hayward, California; Houston, Texas;

Louisville, Kentucky; New York, New York; Norfolk, Virginia; Portland, Oregon; Prince George's County, Maryland; and Tempe, Arizona), the Vera Institute of Justice found, in general, police officers had little understanding of the goals of the INOP program or community policing in general. In fact, officers often resisted the transition to community policing for reasons including: community policing redefined the line officers role from crime-fighter to problem-solver and the way they performed their duties (e.g., an emphasis was placed on community outreach); community policing was implemented without line officers input into the process; and line officers doubted its potential for success at controlling and preventing crime (see also Sadd and Grinc, 1994). One of the major findings to come out of the INOP research was that police administrators and program designers had greatly underestimated the difficulties of educating both rank and line officers on the philosophies, goals, and tactics of community policing in order to gain their support.

In contrast, Wycoff and Skogan (1993) revealed that police officers that worked in the Experimental Police District of the Madison, WI Police Department—a geographic area in which officers actively communicated with citizens, learned citizens' perceptions of community problems, and worked with citizens to solve problems—reported greater organizational support for problem solving policing and closer working relationships with other officers, supervisors, and detectives. In addition, officers in the experimental district reported the community-oriented policing activities they engaged in fostered community support for the police. These officers also reported an increased job satisfaction and satisfaction with the organization as a place to work. Officers in the experimental district, however, were no more likely than officers outside of the experimental district to perceive greater success at problem-solving, to believe that citizens should be involved in problems, or to report more time available for proactive police work.

In an evaluation of the community policing programs in Aurora and Joliet, Illinois, Rosenbaum and Wilkenson (1994) reported that program officers in both cities reported more opportunities to work closely with other employees, more familiarity with problem-solving policing, more frequent interactions with citizens, and more hours spent on foot patrol. At the same time, however, Rosenbaum and Wilkenson found that program officers reported fewer problems were being addressed by problem-solving techniques and fewer meetings were being held with community groups and citizens. In addition, program officers in both cities reported less satisfaction with the feedback they received from supervisors and peers. Nearby in the Chicago Police Department, Lurigio and Skogan (1994) found that police officers were supportive of some of Chicago's Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) Program activities, but not of others. Moreover, Lurigio and Skogan found that Chicago officers were skeptical about the CAPS Program's effects on reducing crime and improving police-community relations. Likewise, in an evaluation of New York's Community Patrol officers Program (CPOP), McElroy, Cosgrove, and Sadd (1993) found few, if any, significant attitudinal changes among program officer toward their role as a police officer, the CPOP Program, the community, or the New York City Police Department.

COPS WHO QUIT: VALUE CONFLICTS AND MISTAKEN BELIEFS
ABOUT THE NATURE OF POLICE WORK

Despite the high direct costs of recruiting, selecting, and training police personnel and the indirect costs of waiting for recruits to achieve a "street wise" competence, the resignation of police officers remains a neglected topic in the police literature (Fielding and Fielding, 1987; Sparger and Giacopassi, 1978). Findings from the few studies that do exist provide limited opportunity for understanding why police recruits drop out of basic training and quit police

work. This study afforded the opportunity to examine the characteristics, beliefs, and motivations of police "dropouts."

Three lines of inquiry that have previously been pursued in the limited literature on police resignation or dropout are cognitive dissonance (Fielding and Fielding, 1987), occupational socialization (Fielding and Fielding, 1987; Van Maanen, 1975), and burnout (Sparger and Giacopassi, 1978). Adherents of cognitive dissonance theory hold that police resignation is a product of the problem of adjustment suffered by police recruits who experience conflict between the version of policing embodied in their ideals of police work and the realities of police practices (Fielding and Fielding 1987; see also Festinger 1957). For instance, in a longitudinal study of 125 police recruits who entered the Derbyshire Training Establishment, of which 28 (22 percent) resigned during the period of the research (up to 42 months from joining), Fielding and Fielding (1987) compared resigners and nonresigners by attitudes toward crime, the police, and social and political issues. They found no apparent attitudinal differences between resigners and nonresigners at induction into the training academy, however, by the end of the first year, the rate of development of instrumentalism was greater among resigners. In particular, resigners were more likely than nonresigners to advocate recriminatory action against offenders (including capital punishment) and were more concerned with firmly punishing the offender as an individual than with assessing the harm caused by the offense in relation to principles of equity. In addition, resigners expressed greater dissatisfaction with the paperwork involved in the job and were more dissatisfied with the social isolation of the job and the public image of the police. Fielding and Fielding found utility in the theory of cognitive dissonance for explaining resignation within the early period of police training and service, they concluded that police recruits respond to dissonance either by revising their belief system or by resignation.

A second explanation for resignation and dropout, especially in the early stages of the police career, is rooted in the concept of occupational socialization. Occupational socialization is a concept that represents the processes whereby recruits learn the required behaviors, supportive attitudes, and norms and values for organizational and occupational membership. This process of occupational socialization occurs through both formal and informal training and exposure to the unique demands of police work (Manning 1977; Skolnick 1966; Van Maanen 1973). Included in the process of occupational socialization are stages of career contingency and development, which also represents thresholds at which police recruits and officers may elect to withdraw from further commitment or continuation in the process. Van Maanen (1975) insisted police experience temporary states of anomie or alienation during the course of their career, which forces individuals to reconsider their situated identity and place in the organization. Accordingly, the decision to quit or continue is typically contingent upon on the police recruits or officers stake in conformity to occupational, organizational, and work group norms and values or commitment to the organization and occupation.

Conversely, adherents of "burnout" theory argue that police officers who voluntarily resign after relatively long periods of police service do so because they experience a state of "burnout" that occurs as a result of the inherently cumulative occupational and organizational stresses. Sparger and Giacopassi (1978), in a study of Memphis police officers who voluntarily resigned from police work between 1975 and 1980, concluded that veteran officers voluntarily resigned because of occupational dissatisfactions, frustrations and stressors that culminate and result in burnout. The most common reason given for resignation was the feeling of stagnation in one's job, and the primary sources of dissatisfaction were perceived lack of opportunity for promotion within the department and departmental politics. Other stressors that have been found

to culminate and result in burnout include the traditional authoritarian management style of police departments, relations with civic officials, organizational policies, the system of internal discipline, court policies, and community expectations (Singleton and Teahan 1978). The theory of burnout advanced by Sparger and Giacopassi (1978) does not apply to the sample of police recruits involved in this study because the length of service over which police recruits were tracked was a 16-month period starting with recruits' entry into the basic training academy. Sparger and Giacopassi's resigners had an average length of service of 6.9 years. I assume that police recruits would not experience a state of "burnout" within the first 16 months of police work (see also Fielding and Fielding 1987).

The present study draws on the perspectives of cognitive dissonance and occupational socialization to help identify the factors involved in the voluntary and involuntary employment separation of police officers in the earliest stages of the police career.

OVERVIEW OF THE FINAL REPORT CONTENTS

The contents of this final report are organized in a manner that attempts to lay out the major findings from this research project and allow the various data sets to build upon each other and produce an in-depth analysis of how basic training, field training, and work environment and community policing conceptualization impact police recruits' attitudes and behaviors related mainly to various job dimensions and satisfaction, community policing, problem-solving policing, and cultural sensitivity.

To begin, Chapter 2 describes the basic research design and methods of data collection used to complete this research project. Next, Chapter 3 presents the major findings generated from an analysis of the longitudinal survey data collected on police recruits at four different points in time during the early stages of their police careers. The data and analysis presented in this chapter reveal

the direction and magnitude of change that occurs in police recruits' attitudes and beliefs about various job dimensions and satisfaction, community policing, problem-oriented policing, and cultural sensitivity as recruits are impacted by the basic training program, and than continue on in their careers through the field training process and the one-year probationary period. In addition, this chapter identifies the various individual characteristics, work environment characteristics, and academy class impacts that predict attitudinal change among police recruits.

Chapter 4 is supplemental to Chapter 3, it provides the reader with a more thorough analysis of the impact of field training, work environment, and community policing approach on police recruits' attitudes related to community policing, traditional policing, problem-solving policing, and cultural sensitivity. The analysis focuses on police recruits' working within seven Phoenix metropolitan area police agencies. Findings generated from an analysis of the longitudinal survey data collected on police recruits from the seven Phoenix metropolitan area police agencies are presented to identify the various individual and work environment characteristics that predict attitudinal change among police recruits from the seven police agencies. This chapter also includes an analysis of data collected during interviews with field training to reveal the attitudes and training practices of field training officers from four of the seven police agencies. Chapter 5 further attempts to document how and why patrol officers' community policing practices vary within and across the seven Phoenix metropolitan area police agencies that were focused on in Chapter 4.

Chapter 6 takes a close look at why individuals "quit" police work. Information presented in this chapter should provide police administrators with insight into some systematic differences in individual characteristics and attitudinal and value patterns between dropouts and non-dropouts. Finally, Chapter 7 provides the reader with a conclusion and some possible policy implications.

Findings presented in this report can be used to identify the types of training, information exchange, and work environment that is needed to achieve and sustain officer support for community policing and problem-oriented policing.

CHAPTER 2

STUDY DESIGN

This research project was designed to accomplish three primary objectives. One objective was to evaluate the extent to which the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy's basic training program produced desired changes in officers' attitudes and beliefs related to community policing, problem-oriented policing, and police-citizen interactions. Although the objective was to estimate the effects of the basic training curriculum on a panel of police recruits, in doing so I was also interested in identifying the potential mediating effects of individual characteristics and pre-existing attitudes about policing that police recruits bring to the training academy. A second objective of the study was to track a panel of training academy graduates through the first year of their police careers, in their respective police agencies, to evaluate the effects of field training, occupational socialization, and different work environments (department size, serving constituencies with different needs and demands) and implements of community policing on officers' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors related to traditional policing, community policing, problem-oriented policing, and police-citizen interactions. A third and final objective was to track dropouts and determine if and how their attitudes and values differ systematically from non-dropouts.

To accomplish these three study objectives, a multiple-treatment single-case design (Cook and Campbell, 1979; Kazdin, 1982) was used to survey 446 police recruits, from 14 successive basic training academy classes that began between December 1995 and October 1996. The panel sample of 446 police recruits was followed through the 606.5 hour, 16-week basic training program and then through field training and the completion of a one-year probationary period. Four assessments of officers' attitudes and behaviors were made during this time: upon

entering the basic training academy (Time 1); 16 weeks later, just prior to exiting the training academy (Time 2); 12 weeks later, upon completing field training (Time 3); and at the end of their one-year probation (Time 4). Administration of the pretest (Time 1) began in December 1995, and the last posttest (Time 4) was completed in February 1998. Twenty-five (25) police agencies across the state of Arizona had recruits in the final sample, and each academy class had representatives from several different police agencies. Police agencies included metropolitan police agencies, small town/rural police agencies, sheriff offices, Indian tribal police agencies, and university police agencies.

The second part of this longitudinal study involved a survey of the police agencies that had recruits in the final sample and face-to-face interviews with field training officers from four of the agencies. The Community Policing Survey developed by Mary Ann Wycoff (1993) was used to generate data to measure work environment and how police agencies that had officers in the final sample conceptualized and implemented community policing. Face-to-face interviews with 81 field training officers from four participating metropolitan police agencies were also used to explore field training officers attitudes and training practices related to police work in general, as well as community policing and problem-oriented policing.

The third and final part of this research project involved an attempt to track down the 118 sample officers who resigned from police work or were terminated from the training academy or police department during the period of the research. Questionnaires were mailed to the 118 police recruits that dropped out of police work during the course of the study and 32 dropouts (28.1%) returned the questionnaire and agreed to participate in a telephone interview.

Survey and Sample of Police Recruits

As noted above, the impact of the basic training program on police recruits was evaluated using a single case study pretest-posttest design (Cook and Campbell, 1979; Kazdin, 1982) of a panel sample of 446 police recruits, from 14 successive training academy classes that began between December 1995 and October 1996. A panel design was employed—with repeated measurement on the same respondents—to provide more statistical control over individual pretest differences. Police recruits were pre-tested (Time 1) upon entering the training academy (i.e., on the first day at the academy). Training academy administrators provided researchers with one hour of class time during which the survey was administered and collected immediately upon completion. The pretest measure determined police recruits baseline measures of job involvement and job satisfaction and attitudes and beliefs about traditional policing strategies, community policing methods and philosophies, problem-solving techniques, the importance of building positive police-public relations, and multicultural awareness and skills. A 16-week lag existed between the pretest and the first posttest (Time 2), which was conducted during the final three days of the basic training academy. Four hundred and forty-six (446) recruits from the original panel completed the Time 2 posttest survey. Since the purpose of the training academy was to instill and shape desired attitudes and beliefs, measures of attitudes and beliefs were compared from the pretest to the first posttest.

Since 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 12 weeks after the first posttest, at or near the end of the recruits' field training process. The second posttest occurred between June 1996 and March 1997. At this stage of the research, each recruit was tracked to his or her respective police agency. Three hundred and ninety-four (394) police recruits from the original panel completed the Time 3 survey. The second posttest was an important part of

the evaluation research; in as much as it revealed the impact of field training, non-field training effects, the work environment, and disparate community policing programs on officers' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. Officers' attitudes and beliefs were compared from Time 2 to Time 3.

Finally, a third posttest (Time 4) occurred at the completion of the one-year probationary period. Three hundred and twenty-eight (328) officers from the original panel completed the Time 4 survey. Police officers' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors after completing one-year of employment in their respective police agency were compared to Time 1, Time 2, and Time 3. The third posttest and final assessment occurred between March 1997 and February 1998.

It is important to note that the second (Time 3) and third posttests (Time 4) were administered in a face-to-face setting with the police officer. In addition, during the third and fourth assessments, a 10- to 20-minute face-to-face interview was conducted with each officer. The interview included a series of open-ended questions about their field training experiences, experiences in the police department and in police/patrol work, experiences with the community, perceptions of community policing, participation in community policing and problem-solving policing activities, training received in community policing, organizational support for community policing, view of the communities role of working with the police, and benefits and drawbacks of community policing. During these developmental stages of the officers' career, it was important to probe respondents to gain a more comprehensive understanding of their workplace and job experiences. The qualitative data, thus obtained, was used to augment and contextualize the quantitative data.

Table 2.1 provides some basic demographic characteristics of the police recruits that made up the panel sample of 446 police recruits. Sample characteristics were included for the pretest (Time 1) and each of the posttests in order to reveal the degree to which the

characteristics of the sample changed over time. One of the most striking findings is that police recruits with a high school diploma/G.E.D. (65%), technical school experience (72.2%), and some graduate school education (66.7%) were much more likely to drop out of the study and /or police work between Time 1 and Time 4, then police recruits with some college (30.7%) or a bachelors degree (24.4%). Another interesting finding is that Native Americans (100%) and Hispanics/Mexican-Americans (47.4%) were more likely to drop out of the study and/or police work between Time 1 and Time 4, then Whites/Anglos (30.8%), Blacks/African-Americans (28.6%), and Asian-Americans (27.3%). Finally, slightly more females (37%) then males (34%) dropped out of the study and/or police work between Time 1 and Time 4.

Table 2.1. Characteristics of the Sample Over Time

Characteristics	Time 1 % (n)	Time 2 % (n)	Time 3 % (n)	Time 4 % (n)
Sample Size	446	389	356	292
Gender				
Male	89.7 (399)	88.4 (344)	88.5 (315)	90.1 (263)
Female	10.3 (46)	11.6 (45)	11.5 (41)	9.9 (29)
Race/Ethnicity				
White/Anglo	76.8 (341)	79.4 (304)	79.5 (283)	81.4 (236)
Black/African-American	3.2 (14)	3.7 (14)	3.9 (14)	3.4 (10)
Hispanic/Mexican-Am.	12.8 (57)	12.0 (46)	11.0 (39)	10.3 (30)
Asian-American	2.5 (11)	2.9 (11)	3.4 (12)	2.8 (8)
Native American	3.2 (14)	0.8 (3)	0.6 (2)	0.0 (0)
Other	1.6 (7)	1.3 (5)	1.7 (6)	1.7 (5)
Age				
20-25 years old	47.7 (212)	45.2 (175)	42.9 (152)	31.3 (90)
26-30 years old	32.3 (143)	34.1 (132)	36.2 (128)	44.1 (128)
31-35 years old	12.3 (55)	13.7 (53)	13.0 (46)	14.8 (43)
36-40 years old	4.1 (18)	3.4 (13)	4.2 (19)	5.2 (15)
41-45 years old	2.7 (9)	2.8 (11)	3.1 (11)	3.1 (9)
46-50 years old	0.9 (4)	0.8 (3)	0.6 (2)	1.4 (4)
Level of Education				
High School/G.E.D.	9.0 (40)	5.9 (23)	5.4 (19)	4.8 (14)
Technical School	4.1 (18)	2.3 (9)	1.1 (4)	1.7 (5)
Some College	48.4 (215)	52.1 (203)	51.9 (183)	51.2 (149)
Bachelors Degree	35.1 (156)	37.4 (146)	37.6 (133)	40.6 (118)
Graduate Degree	3.4 (15)	2.3 (9)	4.0 (14)	1.7 (5)

Table 2.1, cont.

Police Agency				
Phoenix Metropolitan Area				
Phoenix PD	54.5 (243)	56.9 (222)	57.2 (203)	58.5 (169)
Scottsdale PD	5.4 (24)	5.4 (21)	5.1 (18)	5.9 (17)
Tempe PD	2.5 (11)	2.6 (10)	3.1 (11)	3.8 (11)
Glendale PD	3.4 (15)	3.3 (13)	3.4 (12)	3.1 (9)
Gilbert PD	1.8 (8)	1.8 (7)	2.0 (7)	2.4 (7)
Peoria PD	1.3 (6)	1.5 (6)	1.7 (6)	2.1 (6)
Chandler PD	3.1 (14)	3.3 (13)	3.7 (13)	4.2 (12)
Maricopa County Sheriffs	6.1 (27)	6.2 (24)	6.5 (23)	6.6 (19)
Rural Arizona				
Flagstaff PD	1.1 (5)	1.3 (5)	1.4 (5)	1.4 (4)
Bullhead City PD	0.9 (4)	0.8 (3)	0.8 (3)	0.7 (2)
Yuma PD	2.2 (1)	2.3 (9)	2.3 (8)	1.0 (3)
Kingman PD	0.7 (3)	0.8 (3)	0.8 (3)	0.7 (2)
Mohave County Sheriffs Office	1.3 (6)	1.3 (5)	1.1 (4)	0.3 (1)
Coconino County Sheriffs Office	0.9 (4)	1.0 (4)	1.1 (4)	1.4 (4)
La Paz County Sheriffs Office	0.7 (3)	0.8 (3)	0.8 (3)	0.7 (2)
Santa Cruz County Sheriffs Office	0.2 (1)	----	----	----
Greenlee County Sheriffs Office	0.2 (1)	----	----	----
Colorado River Indian Tribal Police	2.5 (11)	1.8 (7)	1.7 (6)	2.1 (6)
Navajo Dept. of Law Enf.	1.1 (5)	0.4 (2)	----	----
Ak-Chin Indian Tribal Police	0.4 (2)	----	----	----
Cocopah Tribal Police	0.2 (1)	----	----	----
Whiteriver Indian Tribal Police	0.4 (2)	----	----	----
Gila River Tribal Police	0.4 (2)	0.5 (2)	0.6 (2)	----
Camp Verde Marshalls Office	0.2 (1)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)
Patagonia Marshalls Office	0.2 (1)	----	----	----
Quartzsite Marshalls Office	0.4 (2)	0.3 (1)	----	----
Pinetop/Lakeside PD	0.2 (1)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)
Show Low PD	0.4 (2)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)	----
Winslow PD	0.2 (1)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)
Holbrook PD	0.4 (2)	0.5 (2)	0.6 (2)	0.3 (1)
Sierra Vista PD	0.4 (2)	0.5 (2)	0.6 (2)	0.7 (2)
Kearny PD	0.4 (2)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)	----
Willcox PD	0.2 (1)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)
University Police Agencies				
University of Arizona PD	1.1 (5)	1.0 (4)	1.4 (5)	1.4 (4)
Northern AZ University PD	0.9 (4)	1.0 (4)	1.1 (4)	1.0 (3)
ASU Public Safety	0.2 (1)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)
Other Police Agencies				
AZ Dept. of Public Safety	0.2 (1)	0.3 (1)	----	----
AZ State Capitol Police	0.2 (4)	0.3 (1)	----	----
AZ Game and Fish	1.3 (6)	1.3 (5)	----	----
Maricopa County Rec. Services	0.9 (4)	1.0 (4)	1.1 (4)	----

Police Personnel Survey: Quantitative Measurement/Scale Construction. The main component of the proposed research was an extensive survey instrument, adopted from Rosenbaum, Yeh and Wilkinson's (1994) evaluation of community policing in Joliet, Illinois, Lurigio and Skogan's evaluation of community policing in Chicago, Illinois (1994, 1995), and Wycoff and Skogan's (1993) evaluations of community policing in Houston, Texas and Madison, Wisconsin. In this study, the Police Personnel Survey was designed to take repeated measures of a variety of police officer attitudes and beliefs related to various dimensions of the job and satisfaction with the job, community policing, problem-solving policing, traditional policing, the role of police, relations with the community, and multicultural sensitivity.

The Police Personnel Survey included questions that formed 21 scales measuring factors such as job dimensions and satisfaction, officers' attitudes toward community policing and problem-solving policing, coworker support for community policing, and cultural sensitivity. The multi-item scales used in this survey reflect the influence of extensive research into community policing and problem-solving policing (Lurigio, 1994, 1995; Lurigio and Skogan, 1998; Rosenbaum, 1993; Wycoff and Skogan, 1993), organizational behavior (Dunham et al., 1977; Dunham and Herman, 1975; Hackman and Oldham, 1975, 1976), and cultural sensitivity (D'Andrea et al., 1990). The construct validity of the multi-item scales have been confirmed in the work of Lurigio, Rosenbaum, Skogan, and their co-authors through a variety of evaluation studies designed to evaluate the impact of community policing on police personnel. It is important to point out that the focus of this study was to explore whether or not attitudinal changes occur as officers

advance through the basic training academy and the first year of their careers, rather than to test specific theoretical hypotheses about each scale.[3]

Table 2.2 identifies the scales that were used in this study and the constructs that they measure, as well as provides the alpha statistics, the number of items included in each scale, and the Likert scale used to measure the scale items. A list of survey items that were included in each of the scales can be found in Appendix A.

Table 2.2. Scale Descriptions and Reliabilities

Job Dimensions and Satisfaction

Skill Variety: Amount of variation in the skills and responsibilities that officers experienced in their job. (alpha=.548, 3 items; 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree')

Task Identity: Extent to which the job involves complex tasks and the opportunity to do an entire job from beginning to end. (alpha=.636, 3 items; 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree')

Job Autonomy: Degree to which officers believe their job affords them discretion and independence. (alpha=.745, 4 items; 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree')

Working with Others: Degree to which officer's feel their job requires them to work and cooperate with others. (alpha=.675, 2 items; 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree')

Job Feedback: Extent to which officers perceive the job provides them with information and feedback about their performance. (alpha=.711, 2 items; 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree')

Peer and Supervisory Feedback: Degree to which officers feel their coworkers and supervisors provide them with information and feedback related to their job performance. (alpha=.831, 2 items; 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree')

Job Involvement: Extent to which officers' like/enjoy police work. (alpha=.744, 3 items; 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree')

Job Creates Challenge and Personal Growth: Extent to which the job is challenging and provides the opportunity for personal growth and development. (alpha=.897, 6 items; 1 'very undesirable' to 5 'very desirable')

Receptivity to Change: Degree to which officers look forward to changes at work and trying out new ideas/ approaches. (alpha=.681, 6 items; 1 'strongly disagree to 5 'strongly agree')

Satisfaction with the Organization: Officers' views about their agency/department and what it is like working there. (alpha=.782, 4 items; 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree')

Community Policing Related Scales

Support for Community Policing: Officers' attitudes regarding the allocation of agency resources to activities and services in keeping with the philosophies and strategies of community policing. (alpha=.820, 10 items; 1 'none' to 4 'large amount')

---

[3] The survey was administered at pretest and each of the posttests in order to assess the extent of stability and/or changes in those states that occurred over time.

Table 2.2, cont.

Support for Traditional Policing: Officers' attitudes regarding the allocation of agency resources to activities and services in keeping with traditional policing. (alpha=.572, 4 items; 1 'none' to 4 'large amount')

Orientation to Community Policing: Officers' opinions about community policing activities and their effectiveness. (alpha=.685, 9 items; 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree')

Patrol Responsiveness to the Community: Degree to which officers' feel patrol engage in activities and provide services that are in keeping with the philosophies and strategies of community policing. (alpha=.845, 9 items; 1 ' very negative' to 5 'very positive')

Police-Public Relations: Officers' perceptions about police-citizen relations and citizens' views and opinions of the police. (alpha=.771, 7 items; 1 ' strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree')

Problem-Solving Knowledge and Skills

Orientation to Problem-Solving Policing: Officers' opinions about problem-solving activities and their effectiveness. (alpha=.718, 10 items; 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree')

Problem-Solving Capability: Officers' perceptions concerning their ability to perform problem-solving related activities (i.e., engaging in each step of the S.A.R.A. Model). (alpha=.857, 5 items; 1 'very unqualified' to 5 'very qualified')

Coworker Support for Community Policing

Coworker Support for Community Policing: Degree to which officers' feel their coworkers support community policing activities. (alpha=.888, 12 items; 1 'very important' to 4 'unimportant')

Coworker Support for Traditional Policing: Degree to which officers' feel their coworkers support traditional policing activities. (alpha=.587, 4 items; 1 'very important' to 4 'unimportant')

Cultural Sensitivity

Ability to Assess Needs of Diverse Groups: Officers' perceptions concerning their ability to assess the needs of citizens from different groups (e.g., gender, age, sexual orientation, socio-economic). (alpha=.858, 7 items; 1 'very limited' to 4 'very good')

Ability to Assess Needs of Culturally Diverse Groups: Officers' perceptions concerning their ability to assess the needs of citizens from different race and ethnic groups. (alpha=.809, 6 items; 1 'very limited' to 4 'very good')

In order to sort out how the effects of training are impacted by the characteristics of recruits, extensive data was also collected on the recruits' themselves. The Police Personnel Survey was designed to measure background characteristics of police recruits including: gender, race/ethnicity, age, prior military experience, number of years of prior military experience, prior law enforcement experience, number of years of prior law enforcement experience, marital and family status, highest level of formal education completed, undergraduate and/or graduate college major, previous work experiences, hobbies/non-work activities, and occupational history of parents.

Police Officer Interviews: Qualitative Measures. During the second and third posttests, a 10- to 20-minute face-to-face interview was conducted with each officer. Interviews were tape

recorded and later transcribed. The interviews were conducted during these developmental stages (i.e., field training and occupational socialization) of the officers' career in an effort to gain a more comprehensive and descriptive understanding of their workplace and job experiences. The qualitative data, thus obtained, has been used to augment and contextualize the quantitative data.

The interview conducted at Time 3 included a series of open-ended questions designed to tap fourteen component areas:

- reason for entering police work;

- likes and dislikes about the job;

- field training experiences (e.g., number of weeks, number of FTOs, degree to which lessons learned in the academy were reinforced or contradicted by FTOs);

- experiences in the police department;

- experiences in police/patrol work;

- experiences with the community;

- citizen complaints;

- definition of community policing;

- community policing activities one has engaged in;

- benefits of community policing;

- organizational support for community policing;

- communities role of working with the police;

- drawbacks of community policing; and

- lessons/training the training academy failed to provide.

The interview conducted at Time 4 included some of the same questions asked at Time 3, as well as others. This interview instrument was designed to tap fourteen component areas:

- description of the first year in law enforcement;

- experiences in the police department;

- experiences in police/patrol work;

- experiences with the community;

- citizen complaints;

- community policing training (e.g., type of training, impact on view of community policing and the way police work is done);

- percentage of time spent engaged in community policing;

- examples of community policing activities;

- benefits of community policing;

- organizational support for community policing;

- definition of problem-solving policing;

- problem-solving policing activities one has engaged in;

- communities role of working with the police; and

- drawbacks of community policing.

Survey and Sample of Police Agencies

Another component of this longitudinal study was a survey of police agencies that had recruits in the final sample. The Community Policing Survey developed by Mary Ann Wycoff (1993) was used to generate the data used to measure work environment and how police agencies that had officers in the final sample conceptualized and implemented community policing and

problem-oriented (see Appendix E). The Community Policing Survey is divided into nine sections. The first section, to be answered by the head of the agency, measures the executive's views/understanding of community policing and its potential impacts. The information gathered in sections two through nine measure: 2) the organization's experience with community policing (i.e., adoption, importance of reform training, effects of community policing, and creation of new written policies, ordinances, and published goals/objectives to support community policing); 3) community policing programs and practices the agency has implemented or plans to implement; 4) organizational arrangements/structures that the agency has or plans to have for community policing to occur; 5) patrol officer/deputy responsibilities; 6) authority and responsibility of mid-level field operation managers (e.g., captains and lieutenants); 7) ways in which the agency works or plans to work with citizens in the community; 8) basic organizational information (e.g., number of sworn personnel); and 9) other community policing information.

The Community Policing Survey was administered to 21 of the 25 police agencies that had police recruits in the final sample. In particular, police chiefs from 19 of the 25 police agencies and 10 precinct/district commanders from two of the 25 police agencies.[4] The research director met with each of the police chiefs and precinct/district commanders to explain the nature

---

[2] In the larger police agencies, such as the Phoenix Police Department (PD) and the Maricopa County Sheriffs Department, physical territory is broken down into precincts or districts to form separate territorial units with separate administrative structures. Thus, each of the precinct/district commanders from the Phoenix PD and the Maricopa County Sheriffs Office were asked to complete the Community Policing Survey.

and scope of the overall study and encourage their participation in the study, as well as explain the purpose of the Community Policing Survey and encourage them to complete and return it to ASU West. The initial meetings and administration of the Community Policing Surveys occurred between June 1996 and March 1997. Several months after each of the initial meetings, a second survey was mailed to non-respondents in order to increase the response rate. A total of 15 police chiefs and six precinct commanders returned completed surveys, establishing an overall response rate of 72.4 percent.

Among the 15 police chiefs and six precinct commanders that responded to the survey, 71.4% (n = 15) reported their departments had already implemented community policing and 23.8% (n = 5) reported their agency was in the process of planning to or implementing a community policing approach. Those agencies in the process of implementing community policing included the Colorado River Indian Tribal Police Department, Bullhead City Police Department, Gilbert Police Department, and the South Mountain Precinct of the Phoenix Police Department. While the majority of police agencies had implemented community policing, only 19 percent (n = 4) of the respondents reported their agency had gone so far as to develop departmental policies to support community policing. Concomitantly, 57 percent (n = 12) of the respondents reported their agency had or was in the process of developing written policies concerning police interactions with citizens or citizen groups, 52 percent (n = 11) had or was in the process of developing written policies concerning procedures to deal with neighborhood problems, and 42.9 percent (n = 9) had or were in the process of developing new written policies concerning police interactions with other government agencies. Furthermore, 52.4 percent (n =

11) of the respondents reported their agency measures its progress or success at community policing on the basis of published departmental goals or objectives.

Data on the characteristics of the communities in which study recruits worked was also collected. These community characteristics included population, percentage of population that is minority and minority, percentage of population that is below the poverty level, and number of reported violent and property crimes.

Survey and Sample of Field Training Officers

In an added effort to understand the socialization process of new police officers into police work, interviews were conducted with 81 field training officers from four of the participating metropolitan police agencies. Field training officers were selected because they have the most immediate and potentially the most intense impact on shaping new police officers attitudes and behaviors. According to Manning (1989; see also Rubinstein, 1973; Skolnick, 1973; Van Maanen, 1975), police officers' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors are shaped as they begin to internalize the norms and values of the organization and as they are exposed to training, field experiences, and more experienced and veteran officers. Thus, in policing, we can assume that intense, high-quality basic training may quickly dissipate once officers are exposed to the powerful effects of everyday work, the organization and its employees, and the occupational culture (Mastrofski and Ritti, 1996).

Face-to-face interviews were conducted with 81 FTOs from four of the participating metropolitan police agencies, including five Phoenix precincts (see Table 2.3). The ability to interview field training officers depended solely on their willingness to be sampled.

Table 2.3. Number of Field Training Officers Sampled by Agency/Precinct

Police Agencies and Precincts	Number of Field Training Officers Interviewed
Phoenix PD	
Central City Precinct	10
Desert Horizon Precinct	14
Maryvale Precinct	6
South Mountain Precinct	14
Squaw Peak Precinct	9
Scottsdale PD	8
Glendale PD	15
Gilbert PD	5
Total	81

Field Training Officer Interviews: Qualitative Measures. Interviews with field training officers were designed to measure their attitudes and training practices related to police work in general, but in particular to community policing and problem-oriented policing. The interview instrument consisted of a series of open-ended questions developed to tap six information domains: number of years on the force; number of years as a field training officer; training for field training officers; skills an officer in training needs to learn as part of the field training process; inclusion of community policing and problem-oriented policing into the field training process; and skills new officers are lacking or missing when they come out of the academy (see Appendix F).

Survey and Sample of Dropouts

It is important to know why individuals "quit" police work. This study sought to identify systematic differences in attitudinal and value patterns between dropouts and "quitters" and non-dropouts from police work. Of the 446 police recruits that were included in the initial survey assessment, 118 or 26.4 percent resigned from police work during the period of the research, which included the 16-month period starting with each recruits entry into the basic training academy. Fifty-two or 11.7 percent of the recruits dropped out of the basic training academy, 25

or 5.6 percent dropped out during the field training process, and 41 or 9.2 percent dropped out within the first year of probation. Eighteen or 4 percent of the recruits removed themselves from the study. This study compares the 118 dropouts with the 310 police recruits that completed the training academy and made it through the first year of their careers, and completed the study.

Questionnaires were mailed to the 118 police recruits that dropped out of police work during the course of the study. Thirty-two dropouts (28.1%) returned the questionnaire and agreed to participate in a telephone interview. Fifteen of those who participated in a telephone interview dropped out of the training academy, 7 dropped out during the field training process, and 12 dropped out after completing field training but within the first year of probation.

Dropout Interviews: Qualitative Measures. The telephone interviews were conducted in an effort to gain a more comprehensive and descriptive understanding of the dropouts' experiences in the training academy and the police department, as well as their reasons for leaving police work. The qualitative data, thus obtained, is used to augment and contextualize the quantitative data. The telephone interview included a series of open-ended questions developed to tap seven information domains: reasons for entering police work; reasons for leaving police work; training academy experiences; department experiences; expectations about police work; conflicting realities of police work; and recommendations for academy and department changes.

CHAPTER 3

ASSESSING CHANGE OVER TIME IN POLICE RECRUITS'
ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS

As previously noted, this study was designed to assess how a basic training program that integrates community policing and problem-oriented policing "across the curriculum" impacts such things officer support for traditional policing tactics, community policing philosophies and strategies, problem-solving techniques, belief about the importance of police-public relations, and cultural awareness. Although the objective was to estimate the effects of the basic training curriculum on a panel of police recruits, in doing so I was also interested in identifying the potential mediating effects of individual characteristics and pre-existing attitudes about policing that police recruits bring to the training academy. Another objective of the study was to track a panel of training academy graduates through the first year of their police careers, in their respective police agencies, to evaluate the effects of field training, occupational socialization, and different work environments (department size, serving constituencies with different needs and demands) and implements of community policing on officers' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors related to traditional policing, community policing, problem-oriented policing, and police-citizen interactions.

In keeping with the objectives of the study, the findings presented in this chapter reveal the direction and magnitude of change in police recruits' attitudes and beliefs about police work and community policing and problem-oriented policing as they proceed through basic training, the field training process and the one-year probationary period of their career. The data are also used to test the assumption that police recruits who are exposed to community policing and problem-solving training in the basic training program, will find little value in those activities, if upon graduation

from the training academy and entrance into the police agency, field training officers do not reinforce such activities and the department affords them few opportunities to apply it. This assumption is based, in part, upon Mastrofski and Ritti's (1996) contention that intense and high-quality training may quickly dissipate once officers are exposed to the powerful effect of everyday work, the organization and its bureaucratic structure, and the occupational culture of more experienced and veteran coworkers.

Although community policing models theorize that changes in organizational structure, management style, and training programs should expand the line officers' job and create a supportive work environment, which in turn should produce positive changes in officers' attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors related to community policing and problem-oriented policing. These organizational changes are also 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' knowledge, attitudes, and skills related to community policing and problem-oriented policing, as well as change the nature of their relationship with the public. Collateral outcomes should be increased job satisfaction and commitment to the police organization and decreased officer cynicism about police work (see Rosenbaum, 1994; Wesley and Skogan, 1994). A review of the community policing literature, however, reveals that this model has not been examined and the following question has not been fully explored: 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 supportive of community policing?

Scales Measuring Police Recruits' Attitudes and Beliefs

As previously stated, many of the scales used in this study were taken from Lurigio (1994, 1995) and Rosenbaum (1993). The construct validity of these scales had been confirmed in the work of Lurigio and Rosenbaum and their coauthors through using these measures to evaluate changes in police personnel attitudes due to the implementation of community policing. Table 3.1 includes the

Table 3.1. Descriptive Statistics for Each of the Scales

Scales	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Reliability
Job Dimensions				
Skill Variety	10.62	1.19	3-15	.548
Task Identity	10.14	2.08	3-15	.636
Autonomy	15.26	2.40	4-20	.745
Work with Others	8.73	1.08	2-10	.675
Job Feedback	7.85	1.06	2-10	.711
Peer/Supervisor Feedback	7.92	1.35	2-10	.831
Job Satisfaction				
Job Involvement	12.67	1.63	3-15	.744
Job Challenges/Personal Growth	27.21	2.96	6-30	.897
Receptivity to Change	22.03	2.62	6-30	.681
Organizational Commitment	15.63	2.51	4-20	.782
Attitudes toward Community Policing				
Support for Community Policing	30.39	4.30	10-40	.820
Support for Traditional Policing	13.87	1.50	4-16	.572
Orientation to Community Policing	35.52	3.33	9-45	.685
Patrol Responsiveness to Community	34.77	4.15	9-45	.845
Police-Public Relations	21.77	3.51	7-35	.771
Problem-Solving Knowledge and Skills				
Orientation to Problem-Solving Policing	35.40	3.85	10-50	.718
Problem-Solving Capability	14.48	2.18	5-20	.857
Coworker Attitudes				
Coworker Support for Community Policing	26.98	5.16	10-40	.888
Coworker Support for Traditional Policing	29.98	5.16	4-16	.587
Cultural Sensitivity				
Ability to Assess Needs of Diverse Groups	20.51	3.66	7-28	.908
Ability to Assess Needs of Culturally Diverse Groups	14.78	2.12	6-24	.809

NOTE: The mean reported in this table is the mean across all time periods.

scale means, standard deviations, range, and reliabilities coefficients (Cronbach's Alpha) for each of the scales used in this study. Scale items are positively keyed so that larger summated scale 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 .548 to .908; all but seven were above .70.[5]

A general description of the various scales can be found in Table 2.1 in Chapter 2, and a list of survey items that were included in each of the scales can be found in Appendix A.

Analysis of Mean Changes Over Time in Police Recruits' Attitudes and Beliefs

The basic strategy used to assess changes in police recruits' attitudes and beliefs during the initial phases of their police careers (i.e., basic training, field training, one-year probationary period) was to examine changes in average summated scores for each of the scales from Time 1, Time 2, Time 3 and Time 4. In particular, I was interested in first determining if there were any overall changes in police recruits' attitudes and beliefs between the time recruits entered the basic training academy (Time 1, baseline) and when they exited the academy (Time 2). Next, I was interested in determining whether there were additional changes in recruits' attitudes and beliefs after they left basic training and completed the field training process (Time 3), and then later completed their one-year probationary period (Time 4).

As noted in Chapter 1, the goals of the basic training program, in addition to developing basic proficiency in police tactical skills and knowledge of departmental procedures and laws, were: 1) to increase support for the use of traditional policing tactics and processes; 2) to increase support for professional policing; 3) to develop more favorable attitudes about community policing; 4) to develop more favorable attitudes about problem-solving policing; 5) to develop more favorable attitudes toward building positive police-public relationships; and 6) to develop more favorable attitudes toward multiculturalism.

---

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

Time 2 *versus* Time1. Table 3.2 reveals significant changes in mean values on many of the scales between Time 1 and Time 2, or from when police recruits began the basic training academy (baseline) to when they completed the training academy. With respect to the job dimensions and satisfaction scales, police recruits scored significantly higher on skill variety (i.e., the job requires the use of a variety of skills and talents), job autonomy (i.e., the job affords them discretion and independence), job feedback (i.e., the job provides information and feedback about performance), peer and supervisory feedback (i.e., coworkers and supervisors provide information and feedback related to job performance), and job involvement (i.e., extent to which officers like/enjoy police work).

In regard the community policing related scales, at Time 2, police recruits scored significantly higher on orientation to community policing (i.e., opinions about community policing activities and their effectiveness) and patrol responsiveness to the community (i.e., patrol engages in activities and provide services that are in keeping with the philosophies and strategies of community policing). In contrast, however, police recruits also scored significantly higher on support for traditional policing (i.e., the allocation of agency resources to activities and services in keeping with traditional policing). With respect to the problem-solving knowledge and skills scales, police recruits scored significantly higher on orientation to problem-solving policing, as well as felt more qualified to engage in problem-solving tasks, in particular those related to the S.A.R.A. Model.

Finally, in regards to the cultural sensitivity scales, at Time 2, police recruits felt more qualified to assess the needs of citizens from diverse groups (i.e., age, gender, socio-economic status, sexual orientation) and the needs of citizens from race/ethnicity groups that are different than their own.

Table 3.2. Scale Means over Time with Comparisons

Scales	Time 1 Baseline	Time 2 Academy	Time 3 Field Training	Time4 1-Year	Overall F-test
Job Dimensions and Satisfaction					
Skill Variety	10.59	10.85[a]	10.49[b]	10.51[c]	7.13*
Task Identity	10.27	10.17	10.12	9.91[d]	1.77
Job Autonomy	14.12	15.77[a]	15.69	15.82[d]	53.88*
Work with Others	8.91	8.87	8.56[b]	8.46[c,d]	15.83*
Job Feedback	7.75	8.01[a]	7.86[b]	7.77[c]	4.98*
Peer/Supervisor Feedback	7.76	7.97[a]	8.08	7.90	4.12*
Job Involvement	12.56	12.82[a]	12.57[b]	12.74	2.50
Job Challenges/Personal Growth	27.33	27.65	26.79[b]	26.97[c]	6.12*
Receptivity to Change	22.34	22.20	21.66[b]	21.80[c,d]	5.83*
Organizational Satisfaction	16.17	15.92	15.50[b]	14.60[c,d]	26.65*
Community Policing Related Scales					
Support for Community Policing	30.88	31.29	29.73[b]	29.25[c,d]	17.75*
Support for Traditional Policing	13.66	13.98[a]	13.99	13.88	4.26*
Orientation to Community Policing	35.51	36.53[a]	34.99[b]	34.82[c,d]	19.93*
Patrol Responsiveness to Community	34.49	35.18[a]	35.03	34.30[c]	3.60*
Police-Public Relations	21.31	21.54	22.15[b]	22.31[c,d]	6.87*
Problem-Solving Knowledge/Skills					
Orientation to Problem-Solving Policing	35.25	35.78[a]	35.49	35.03[c]	2.47
Problem-Solving Capability	13.96	14.98[a]	14.31[b]	14.82[d]	19.29*
Coworker Support for Community Policing					
Coworker Support for COP	----	----	----	15.00	---
Coworker Support for Traditional Policing	----	----	----	26.98	---
Cultural Sensitivity					
Ability to Assess Needs of Diverse Groups	19.65	21.18[a]	20.64[b]	20.77[d]	13.56*
Ability to Assess Needs of Culturally Diverse Groups	14.26	15.26[a]	14.71[b]	15.00[d]	17.47*

NOTE: T-tests were used to compare across the different time periods.
a Change from Time 1 to 2, $p \le .05$
b Change from Time 2 to 3, $p \le .05$
c Change from Time 2 to 4, $p \le .05$
d Change from Time 1 to 4, $p \le .05$

Time 3 *versus.* Time 2. There were additional changes in police recruits attitudes and beliefs after they left the training academy and completed the field training process; in other words, significant changes in mean values on many of the scales occurred between Time 2 and Time 3. In regards to the job dimensions and satisfaction scales, at Time 3, police recruits became more pessimistic about the job and scored significantly lower on skill variety, working with others, job feedback, job involvement, job creates challenge and personal growth, and satisfaction with the

organization. In addition, officers scored significantly lower on receptivity to change or looking forward to changes at work and trying new ideas or approaches.

On the community policing related scales, at the end of the field training process (Time 3), police recruits expressed more favorable view of police-public relations. On the other hand, police recruits support for community policing significantly decreased and police recruits scored significantly lower on orientation to community policing and expressed lesser favorable views of police-public partnerships. On the problem-solving knowledge and skills scales, police recruits felt significantly less qualified to engage in problem-solving tasks, in particular those related to the S.A.R.A. Model.

Finally, in regards to the cultural sensitivity scales, at Time 3, police recruits felt they were less qualified to assess the needs of citizens from diverse groups, as well as the needs of citizens from race/ethnicity groups that are different than their own.

Time 4 *versus* Time 2. Next, a comparison of mean scale scores from Time 2 to Time 4, or when police recruits completed the basic training academy to when they completed their first year as a police officer in their respective police agency, revealed significant changes in mean values on many of the scales. For instance, on the job dimensions and satisfaction scales, police recruits became more pessimistic about the job and scored significantly lower on skill variety, working with others, job feedback, job creates challenge and personal growth, receptivity to change, and satisfaction with the organization.

With respect to the community policing related scales, at Time 4 *versus* Time 2, police recruits scored significantly lower on support for community policing and orientation to community policing. In addition, they were more pessimistic about patrol responsiveness to the community (i.e., patrol engages in activities and provide services that are in keeping with the philosophies and

strategies of community policing). In contrast, however, officers expressed more favorable views of police-public relations. On the problem-solving knowledge and skills scales, police recruits scored significantly lower at Time 4 *versus* Time 2 on orientation to problem-solving policing. In addition, police recruits felt significantly less qualified to engage in problem-solving tasks.

Time 4 *versus* Time 1. A final comparison of mean scale scores from Time 1 to Time 4, or when police recruits entered the basic training academy to when they completed their first year as a police officer in their respective police agency, also revealed significant changes in mean values on many of the scales. With respect to job dimensions and satisfaction scales, police recruits scored significantly lower on task identity, working with others, receptivity to change, and satisfaction with the organization. Job autonomy was the only job dimension and satisfaction scale on which police recruits scored significantly higher at Time 4 *versus* Time 1.

On the community policing related scales, police recruits scored significantly lower on support for community policing and orientation to community policing (i.e., opinions about community policing activities and their effectiveness). They did, however, express more favorable views of police-public relations. On the problem-solving knowledge and skills scales, police recruits felt significantly more qualified to engage in problem-solving tasks at Time 4 *versus* Time 1.

Finally, in regards to the cultural sensitivity scales, at Time 4, in comparison to Time 1, police recruits felt significantly more qualified to assess the needs of citizens from diverse groups, as well as the needs of citizens from race/ethnicity groups that are different than their own.

Direction of Change Over Time in Police Recruits' Attitudes and Beliefs

Producing change in police recruits' attitudes and beliefs without regard for the direction of change is not the goal of the basic training academy. Rather, the goal of the basic training academy is to bring about initial positive changes in police recruits' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. For

instance, increased support for community policing and problem-solving policing, more favorable attitudes toward the need to work with the public, and increased competency to engage in problem-solving and assess the needs of minority groups that exist within the community. So, if the community policing training that police recruits' receive in the training academy is effective, one would expect police recruits to have more positive attitudes toward community policing when they exit the academy, compared to when they started the basic training academy. One would also expect to see police recruits' attitudes toward community policing increase or at least remain the same as they proceed through the field training phase and complete their one-year probationary period.

Table 3.3 summarizes the direction of change in mean summated scores for each of the scales that were reported in Table 3.2. For each of the scales, a plus sign indicates that the change in attitudes and beliefs measured by the scale was in the intended or right direction; in other words, officers' attitudes and beliefs increased or became more positive. A negative sign indicates that the change in attitudes and beliefs was in the wrong direction; officers' attitudes and beliefs decreased or became more negative. The absence of a sign indicates that the change was not significant, too small to be labeled as positive or negative, or in the right or wrong direction.

Direction of Change: Job Dimensions and Satisfaction. As Table 3.3 reveals, significant positive changes occurred on only five of the ten job dimension and satisfaction scales from basic training academy entry to academy exit. These scales include skill variety, job autonomy, job feedback, peer and supervisory feedback, and job involvement. By the end of the field training process, however, the mean values for skill variety, job feedback, and job involvement decreased significantly; in other words, they changed in the wrong direction. During this same time period, significant negative changes also occurred on working with others, perceptions that the job creates challenge and personal growth, receptivity to change, and satisfaction with the organization.

Table 3.3. Direction of Change in Sequential Time Periods

Scales	Time 1 to Time 2	Time 2 to Time 3	Time 2 to Time 4	Overall Time 1 to Time 4
Job Dimensions and Satisfaction				
Skill Variety	+	-	-	
Task Identity				-
Job Autonomy	+			+
Work with Others		-	-	-
Job Feedback	+	-	-	
Peer/Supervisor Feedback	+			
Job Involvement	+	-		
Job Challenges/Personal Growth		-	-	
Receptivity to Change		-	-	-
Organizational Satisfaction		-	-	-
Community Policing Related Scales				
Support for Community Policing		-	-	-
Support for Traditional Policing	+			
Orientation to Community Policing	+	-	-	-
Patrol Responsiveness to Community	+		-	
Police-Public Relations		+	+	+
Problem-Solving Knowledge/Skills				
Orientation to Problem-Solving Policing	+		-	
Problem Solving Capability	+	-		+
Multicultural Sensitivity				
Ability to Assess Needs of Diverse Groups	+	-		+
Ability to Assess Needs of Culturally Diverse Groups	+	-		+

NOTE: Positive and negative symbols indicate the t-test probability was [.05.

By the end of the one-year probationary period or the first year on the job, significant negative changes occurred on seven of the ten job dimensions and satisfaction scales. These seven scales include skill variety, task identity, working with others, job feedback, job creates challenge and personal growth, receptivity to change, and satisfaction with the organization. Only the job autonomy scale changed significantly in the positive direction from Time 1 to Time 4.

Direction of Change: Community Policing Related Scales. In regards to community policing related scales, significant positive changes occurred on only two of the four scales from basic training academy entry to academy exit. These scales were orientation to community policing and patrol responsiveness to the community. During the same time period, however, support for traditional policing increased or became more positive and than remained unchanged throughout the

rest of the study period. Support for community policing and police-public relations did not change significantly between Time 1 and Time 2.

Between the time police recruits exited the training academy and completed the field training process, the only community policing related scale that showed positive significant increase was police-public relations. Significant negative decreases occurred in officers' support for community policing and orientation to community policing. Moreover, at the end of one-year on the job, significant negative changes occurred on support for community policing, orientation to community policing, and recognition of patrol responsiveness to the community. Only one of the community policing related scales, perception of police-public relations, showed significant positive increase when Time 4 was compared to Time 2, and when Time 4 was compared to Time 1.

Direction of Change: Problem-Solving Knowledge/Skills. On the problem-solving knowledge and skills scales, significant positive changes occurred on orientation to problem-solving policing and problem-solving capability from basic training academy entry to academy exit. By the end of the field training process, a significant negative decrease in problem-solving capabilities occurred; this change was clearly in the wrong direction. By the end of the first year on the job, significant negative changes occurred on orientation to problem-solving policing. Overall, from Time 1 to Time 4, problem-solving capability changed significantly in the positive direction, despite a decrease from Time 2 to Time 3.

Direction of Change: Cultural Sensitivity. Finally, significant positive changes occurred on both of the cultural sensitivity scales from basic training academy entry to academy exit. By the end of the field training process, however, the mean values for ability to assess the needs of citizens from diverse groups, as well as the ability to assess the needs of citizens from race/ethnicity groups that are different than one's own decreased significantly and than remained unchanged over time.

Overall, from Time 1 to Time 4, both of the cultural sensitivity scales did change significantly in the positive direction.

Predictors of Change in Police Recruits' Attitudes and Beliefs

To single out the individual characteristics and organizational environment factors that had a nonspurious relationship with change over time in police recruits' attitudes and beliefs, the next step in the analysis was to determine the predictors of attitude change after controlling for individual characteristics, organizational environment factors, and other potential influences (e.g., academy class and baseline attitudes). These analyses are limited to the community policing related scales, problem-solving knowledge and skill scales and cultural sensitivity scales. I conducted regression analysis for the full group of subjects, yet separately for change from Time 1 to Time 2 (Model 1), change from Time 2 to Time 3 (Model 2), change from Time 2 to Time 4 (Model 3), and change from Time 1 to Time 4 (Model 4).

Each of the models

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 bachelors degree or higher; 0 if recruit had less than a bachelors degree.

Anglo. Coded 1 if recruit was Anglo; 0 if NonAnglo.

Sex. Coded 1 if recruit was a male; 0 if female.

Prior Law Enforcement Experience. Coded 1 if the recruit had prior law enforcement experience; 0 if 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 recruit 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 summated scale scores at Time 1. This variable provides a basis for assessing the relative impact of pre-academy attitudes on change in those attitudes. This helps to get at the question of whether or not academy training, field training, 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 county police agencies in the great Phoenix metropolitan area (i.e., Scottsdale PD, Tempe PD, Glendale PD, Gilbert PD, Peoria PD, Chandler PD, and Maricopa County Sheriffs Office). 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 implementation of community policing, such as patrol officer involvement in community policing activities. Police agencies were coded 1 if they ranked high on the patrol officers/deputies required to engage in activities related to community policing scale, and 0 if they ranked low. This category serves as a referent for work environment, as well as how police agencies conceptualize and implement community policing.

COP Rank: Organizational Arrangements. The Community Policing Survey was used to rank police agencies as high or low on having organizational arrangements/structures in place that support community policing and are in keeping with community policing philosophies. Police agencies were coded 1 if they ranked high on the organizational arrangements/structures scale, and 0 if they ranked low. This category services as a referent for work environment, as well as how police agencies conceptualize and implement community policing.

COP Rank: Citizen Participation. The Community Policing Survey was used to rank police agencies as high or low on working with the citizens in the community and having citizen participation in the police department. Police agencies were coded 1 if they ranked high on the citizen participation scale, and 0 if they ranked low. This category services as a referent for how police agencies conceptualize and implement community policing.

Coworker Support for Community Policing (COP). This is the summated scale scores at Time 4 for police recruits' perception of coworker support for community policing. This variable provides a basis for assessing the relative impact of coworkers' attitudes and beliefs 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 to during the field training and occupational socialization processes, can significantly impact the attitudes of police recruits.

Coworker Support for Traditional Policing (TP). This is the summated scale scores at Time 4 for police recruits' perception of coworker support for traditional policing. This variable provides a basis for assessing the relative impact of coworkers' attitudes and beliefs 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 to during the field training and occupational socialization processes, can significantly impact the attitudes that police recruits.

Shift. The shift to which recruits were assigned at Time 3 and Time 4 were grouped into one of four categories (*1st shift, 2nd shift, 3rd shift,* and *other shifts)* and treated as an indicator variable. *1st shift* served as the reference or excluded category for the other three categories. These categories serve as referents for several police organizational characteristics such as workload, calls for service, and opportunities to engage in community policing. The reference/excluded category was coded 0, and the included category was coded 1.

Recruit Class. The academy class for each recruit was treated as an indicator variable and coded 1 if the recruit was in the class and 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 a recruits from numerous police agencies) might have an impact on individual recruits.

Regression Analysis: Change in Support for Community Policing. Table 3.4 provides the results of the regression analysis for the change over time in support for community policing

scale. As previously revealed in Table 3.2, the mean value score for support for community policing increased from Time 1 (enter the training academy) to Time 2 (exit the training academy); however, the change was not significant.[6] According to Model 1, the strongest predictor of increase change in support for community policing from Time 1 to Time 2 is the baseline level of support for community policing at Time 1. In other words, police recruits who did not support allocating agency resources to activities and services in keeping with the philosophies and strategies of community policing at Time 1, were more likely to support allocating agency resources for community policing at Time 2. Thus, one can assume that academy training had a positive impact on shaping police recruits' support for community policing. Another predictor of change from Time 1 to Time 2 is education; although education is not as strong a predictor as the baseline level. But, police recruits with a high school diploma and some college education were more likely increase their support for community policing from Time 1 to Time 2. Model 1 also reveals that police recruits from three of the academy classes (i.e., class 2, class 8, and class 13) were more likely to support allocating agency resource for community policing at Time 2 *versus* Time 1. I am unable to explain what is so unique about these three classes in comparison to the others; however, one can hypothesize that recruit classes that trained together for 14 weeks possibly developed a unique training class culture that influenced recruits' attitudes. For instance, it would be reasonable to assume that a recruit sergeant and/or the makeup of the recruit class might have an impact on the class culture and individual recruits.

---

[6] In order to interpret the results of the regression analysis it is important to take into consideration the direction of change (i.e., positive or negative) between each of the points in time (e.g., Time 1 to Time 2, Time 2 to Time 3, Time 2 to Time 4, and Time 1 to Time 4); thus, I will frequently refer back to Table 3.2.

From Time 2 (end of academy training) to Time 3 (end of field training), there was a significant decrease in the mean value score on the support for community policing scale (Table 3.2). According to Model 2, none of the individual characteristics, organizational environment factors, or other potential influences included in the regression were predictors of the change from Time 2 to Time 3. Furthermore, from Time 2 to Time 4 (end of one-year on the job), there was a significant decrease in the mean value score on this scale. Model 3, however, reveals that none of the individual characteristics or organizational environment factors was predictors of the change from Time 2 to Time 4. Only academy class 13 emerged as a significant predictor; police recruits from academy class 13 were more likely to maintain their support for community policing from Time 2 to Time 4.

Finally, from Time 1 to Time 4, there was again a significant decrease in the mean value score on the support for community policing scale (Table 3.2). According to Model 4, the strongest predictors of change in support for community policing from Time 1 to Time 4 are the baseline level attitudes on this scale, coworker support for community policing, and race. In other words, police recruits who tended not to support the allocation of agency resources to activities and services related to community policing at Time 1 were more likely to lessen their support for community policing at Time 4. This means that the support for community policing that was generated in the training academy, was not sustained once police recruits went to work in their respective police agencies. In regards to coworker support for community policing, police recruits working in an organization/environment where coworkers are not supportive of allocating agency resources to activities and services in keeping with community policing are more likely to decrease their support for community policing between Time 1 and Time 4. This

Table 3.4. Regression of Change in Support for Community Policing (From Baseline to One-Year)

	Model 1 (Change Time 1 to Time 2)		Model 2 (Change Time 2 to Time 3)		Model 3 (Change Time 2 to Time 4)		Model 4 (Change Time 1 to Time 4)	
	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta
Constant	11.85*		1.43		2.37		24.36*	
Age	.05	.068	.01	.01	-.02	-.02	-.04	.05
Education (1=Bachelors Degree)	-.97	-.14**	.05	.01	-.54	-.06	-.75	-.08
Anglo (1=yes)	-.81	-.09	-.00	.00	-1.42	-.13	-2.16	-.20**
Sex (1=male)	-.16	-.01	.82	.07	1.52	.10	.68	.04
Prior Law Enf. Experience (1=yes)	.22	.03	.10	.01	.11	.01	.24	.02
Prior Military Experience (1=yes)	-.63	-.08	-.08	-.01	-.19	-.02	-.11	-.01
Baseline Level	-.38	-.41*	-.06	-.06	-.14	-.12	-.63	-.55*
Agency – Phoenix PD	-1.19	-.15	-.19	-.02	.15	.02	-1.01	-.11
Agency – Suburban Phoenix	-.77	-.08	-.68	-.07	2.6	.24	.95	.09
COP Rank: Patrol Responsibility	-.50	-.02	-1.46	-.06	.51	.02	.65	.02
COP Rank: Org. Arrangements	-.07	-.00	1.11	.06	-.92	-.04	-.61	-.03
COP Rank: Citizen Participation	.50	.05	-.10	-.01	1.21	.11	.94	.08
Coworker Support for COP	---	---	---	---	-.12	-.15	-.25	-.31*
Coworker Support for TP	---	---	---	---	.38	.14	-.05	-.02
2nd Shift	---	---	-.59	-.07	-.99	-.11	-.69	-.08
3rd Shift	---	---	-.04	-.00	-.29	-.03	.49	.05
Other Shifts	---	---	.55	.04	.95	.04	-.32	-.01
Dummy – Class 2	1.93	.14**	-.61	-.05	-1.19	-.08	.51	.03
Dummy – Class 3	1.59	.12	.48	.04	-1.60	-.11	-.41	-.03
Dummy – Class 4	.85	.07	-.80	-.07	-1.09	-.08	-.55	-.04
Dummy – Class 5	-3.35	-.12	.93	.03	1.78	.05	-1.17	-.04
Dummy – Class 6	1.04	.08	-1.13	-.09	-.26	-.02	.45	.03
Dummy – Class 7	2.51	.12	-1.77	-.08	-2.56	-.08	-1.82	-.05
Dummy – Class 8	2.10	.17**	-1.17	-.09	-2.58	-.17	.01	.00
Dummy – Class 9	1.59	.12	1.27	.09	-.66	-.04	.64	.04
Dummy – Class 10	-.56	-.02	2.45	.10	3.18	.12	3.59	.13*
Dummy – Class 11	.91	.08	1.20	.11	-.20	-.02	.48	.03
Dummy – Class 12	1.24	.06	-.01	.00	-1.41	-.06	-.01	-.00
Dummy – Class 13	1.85	.14**	-.52	-.04	-3.74	-.21**	-1.96	-.11
Dummy – Class 14	1.29	.10	.21	.02	-2.34	-.13	-.21	-.01
R² Adjusted	.174*		-.002		.044		.284*	

*$p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

finding reinforces the hypothesis that organizational environment or organizational culture has a significant impact on shaping or reshaping police recruits attitudes and beliefs once they leave the training academy. And finally, in regards to race, NonAnglo or racial/ethnic minority police recruits are more likely to decrease their support for community policing from Time 1 to Time4. Academy class 10 emerged as a weak predictor of change from Time 1 to Time 4; that is, police recruits from academy class 10 were more likely to decrease or lessen their support for community policing from Time 1 to Time 4.

Regression Analysis: Change in Support for Traditional Policing. Table 3.5 provides the results of the regression analysis for change over time in support for traditional policing. Table 3.2 revealed that the summated mean value score for support for community policing increased significantly from Time 1 (enter the training academy) to Time 2 (exit the training academy). According to Model 1, the strongest predictor of this increase in support for traditional policing from Time 1 to Time 2 is the baseline level of support for traditional policing (Table 3.5). In other words, police recruits who tended not to support the allocation of agency resources for activities and services in keeping with traditional policing at Time 1, were more likely to increase their support for traditional policing at Time 2. Thus, the training academy clearly has a positive impact on encouraging police recruits' support for traditional policing.

From Time 2 (end of academy training) to Time 3 (end of field training), the mean value score on the support for traditional policing scale did not change. Model 2 reveals, however, that police recruits assigned to 3rd shift at Time 3 were more likely to maintain their support for traditional policing, than officers working 1st shift. From Time 2 to Time 4 (end of one-year on the job), the mean value score on the support for traditional policing scale slightly decreased; however, the change was not significant. According to Model 3, coworker support for

Table 3.5. Regression of Change in Support for Traditional Policing (from Baseline to One-Year)

	Model 1 (Change Time 1 to Time 2)		Model 2 (Change Time 2 to Time 3)		Model 3 (Change Time 2 to Time 4)		Model 4 (Change Time 1 to Time 4)	
	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta
Constant	8.07*		.25		1.68		12.65*	
Age	.01	.05	-.01	-.05	-.03	-.13	-.02	-.07
Education (1=Bachelors Degree)	-.34	-.10	-.08	-.03	-.04	-.01	-.24	-.07
Anglo (1=yes)	.16	.04	-.31	-.09	-.25	-.07	.06	.02
Sex (1=male)	.08	.02	.00	.00	.06	.01	-.19	-.03
Prior Law Enf. Experience (1=yes)	.03	.01	-.18	-.05	-.10	-.03	-.07	-.02
Prior Military Experience (1=yes)	.01	.00	.01	.00	-.20	-.06	-.10	-.03
Baseline Level	-.57	-.53*	-.03	-.03	-.07	-.07	-.74	-.66*
Agency – Phoenix PD	-.54	-.15	.25	.08	-.21	-.06	-.88	-.24
Agency – Suburban Phoenix	-.72	-.17	.37	.10	.33	.09	-.39	-.09
COP Rank: Patrol Responsibility	.31	.03	.66	.07	.59	.06	1.25	.12
COP Rank: Org. Arrangements	.73	.09	.51	.07	-.31	-.04	.19	.02
COP Rank: Citizen Participation	-.49	-.12	.17	.05	.59	.15	.26	.06
Coworker Support for COP	---	---	---	---	-.03	.12	.03	.10
Coworker Support for TP	---	---	---	---	-.19	-.21**	-.42	-.40*
2nd Shift	---	---	-.61	-.19	.21	.07	.33	.09
3rd Shift	---	---	-.91	-.19**	.19	.06	.36	.10
Other Shifts	---	---	-.34	-.07	1.43	.17*	1.23	.13**
Dummy – Class 2	.92	.15	.38	.07	-.48	-.09	.19	.03
Dummy – Class 3	.16	.03	.21	.04	-.15	-.03	-.42	-.07
Dummy – Class 4	.11	.02	.40	.08	-.58	-.12	-.48	-.09
Dummy – Class 5	-1.18	-.09	.44	.04	.72	.06	-.64	-.05
Dummy – Class 6	.13	.02	.31	.06	-.36	-.07	-.39	-.07
Dummy – Class 7	-.16	-.02	.83	.10	.63	.05	.05	.00
Dummy – Class 8	.53	.10	.43	.09	-.16	-.03	.14	.02
Dummy – Class 9	.08	.01	.51	.10	-.39	-.07	-.19	-.03
Dummy – Class 10	-.07	-.01	.41	.04	.15	.02	.17	.02
Dummy – Class 11	.45	.09	.29	.06	-.45	-.09	-.13	-.02
Dummy – Class 12	.02	.00	.20	.03	-.13	-.02	-.26	-.03
Dummy – Class 13	-.01	-.00	.59	.11	-.02	-.00	-.32	-.05
Dummy – Class 14	.38	.06	-.65	-.12	-.46	-.07	.13	.02
R² Adjusted	.294*		-.003		-.030		.386*	

* $p \le .01$; ** $p \le .05$

traditional policing and other shifts were found to be significant predictors of the change in support

for traditional policing from Time 2 to Time 4. In other words, police recruits working in an

organization/environment where coworkers support the allocation of agency resources to activities

and services in keeping with traditional policing were less likely to decrease their support for

traditional policing from Time 2 to Time 4. In addition, police recruits working other shifts were

more likely to report a decrease in support for traditional policing from Time 2 to Time 4. Again, it

becomes apparent that the organizational environment or organizational culture has a significant

impact on shaping or reshaping police recruits attitudes and beliefs once they leave the training

academy.

Finally, as revealed in Table 3.2, the mean value score on the support for traditional policing

scale slightly increased from Time 1 to Time 4; however, the change was not significant. Model 4

reveals that baseline level attitudes and coworker support for traditional policing were the strongest

predictors of change from Time 1 to Time 4. Similar to Model 1, police recruits who did not support

the allocation of agency resources to activities and services in keeping with traditional policing at

Time 1, were more likely to support traditional policing at Time 4. In addition, police recruits

working in an organization/environment where coworkers support traditional policing were less

likely to change their support for traditional policing from Time 1 to Time 4. Finally, other shifts

also emerged as a weak predictor of change in support for traditional policing.

Regression Analysis: Change in Orientation to Community Policing. Table 3.6 provides the

results of the regression analysis for the change over time in orientation to community policing

scale. According to Table 3.2, the mean value score for orientation to community policing

significantly increased from Time 1 to Time 2. The strongest predictor of this positive change in

orientation to community policing from Time 1 to Time 2 is the baseline level of orientation to

community policing (Model 1). Police recruits that were not oriented to community policing at Time 1 were more likely to express an orientation to community policing at Time 2. This finding is similar to that revealed in Table 3.4, the training academy clearly has a positive impact on shaping an orientation to community policing among police recruits. A weaker predictor of change in orientation to community policing is whether or not a recruit is hired by an organization that ranks high on patrol officers/deputies are required to engage in activities/responsibilities related to community policing. In other words, police recruits hired by a policy agency that requires its patrol officers/deputies to engage in activities/responsibilities related to community policing are more likely to maintain a positive orientation to community policing from Time 1 to Time 2. This finding may be based upon the fact that police agencies that ranked high on patrol officers/deputies are required to engage in activities/responsibilities related to community policing were more likely to hire individuals that are oriented or supportive of community policing philosophies and strategies. On the other hand, this finding may be evidence that socialization of new recruits into the organizational culture of a police agency begins early on, either during the hiring process or during academy training. Academy class 9 also emerged as a predictor of change; police recruits from academy class 9 were more likely to increase their orientation to community policing from Time 1 to Time 2.

From Time 2 to Time 3, the mean value score for orientation to community policing significantly decreased (Table 3.2). Model 2 reveals three predictors of this negative decrease in orientation to community policing. These predictors include 3rd shift, other shifts, and whether or not a recruit is hired by an organization that ranks high on the patrol officers/deputies are required to engage in activities/responsibilities related to community policing scale. In regards to shift, police recruits assigned to 3rd shift or other shifts at Time 3, were more likely to report a decrease in

Table 3.6. Regression of Change in Orientation to Community Policing (from Baseline to One-Year)

	Model 1 (Change Time 1 to Time 2)		Model 2 (Change Time 2 to Time 3)		Model 3 (Change Time 2 to Time 4)		Model 4 (Change Time 1 to Time 4)	
	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta
Constant	14.94*		4.91		12.63*		29.89*	
Age	-.00	-.00	.05	.07	.06	.09	.06	.09
Education (1=Bachelors Degree)	-.04	-.01	-.16	-.02	-.33	-.05	.11	.02
Anglo (1=yes)	-.12	-.02	-.83	-.10	-.30	-.03	-.72	-.08
Sex (1=male)	-1.09	-.10	.59	.05	.94	.08	.16	.01
Prior Law Enf. Experience (1=yes)	.42	.06	-.02	-.00	.02	.00	.44	.06
Prior Military Experience (1=yes)	.06	.01	.14	.02	.44	.06	.76	.10
Baseline Level	-.47	-.45*	-.11	-.10	-.22	-.19	-.71	-.62*
Agency – Phoenix PD	.21	.03	-.39	-.05	-.61	-.08	-.48	-.06
Agency – Suburban Phoenix	.15	.02	-.23	-.03	-.22	-.02	.19	.02
COP Rank: Patrol Responsibility	2.86	.13**	-4.03	-.17**	-3.41	.15	-.98	-.04
COP Rank: Org. Arrangements	-.11	-.01	1.54	.09	.96	.06	.57	.03
COP Rank: Citizen Participation	.16	.02	.33	.04	-.93	-.10	-.30	-.03
Coworker Support for COP	---	---	---	---	-.06	-.09	-.10	.05**
Coworker Support for TP	---	---	---	---	-.40	-.18**	-.47	.15*
2nd Shift	---	---	1.49	.20	1.56	.21**	1.56	.22*
3rd Shift	---	---	1.93	.17**	1.12	.15	1.53	.21*
Other Shifts	---	---	2.45	.20**	-1.36	-.07	.18	.01
Dummy – Class 2	.06	.01	-.75	-.06	-.59	-.05	-1.03	-.08
Dummy – Class 3	.79	.07	-1.20	-.10	-.30	-.02	-.04	-.00
Dummy – Class 4	.85	.08	-1.49	-.13	-1.10	-.10	-1.03	-.09
Dummy – Class 5	.96	.04	-5.11	-.19*	-2.73	-.10	-2.54	-.09
Dummy – Class 6	.08	.01	-1.24	-.10	-.25	-.02	-1.01	-.09
Dummy – Class 7	.93	.05	-.37	-.02	1.30	.05	.85	.03
Dummy – Class 8	1.37	.12	-1.81	-.15	-.13	-.01	.90	.07
Dummy – Class 9	2.40	.20*	-3.16	-.25*	-2.57	-.20*	-.09	-.01
Dummy – Class 10	1.32	.06	-.99	-.04	-.24	-.01	.52	.02
Dummy – Class 11	-.00	.00	-.23	-.02	.73	.07	.04	.00
Dummy – Class 12	1.13	.06	-1.40	-.07	-2.78	-.15	-1.28	-.07
Dummy – Class 13	1.06	.09	-.72	-.05	-1.43	-.10	-.89	-.06
Dummy – Class 14	.00	.00	-.69	-.05	-.80	-.06	-.63	-.044
R^2	.189*		.057**		.105*		.380*	

$* p \leq .01; ** p \leq .05$

orientation to community policing from Time 1 to 3. Similar to Model 1, police recruits hired by a policy agency that requires its patrol officers/deputies to engage in activities/responsibilities related to community policing were more likely to maintain their orientation to community policing from Time 2 to Time 3, than police recruits hired by a policy agency that does not require its patrol officers to engage in activities related to community policing. Academy class 5 and class 9 also emerged as significantly related to the change in orientation to community policing; both academy classes were more likely to maintain an orientation to community policing.

From Time 2 to Time 4, the mean value score for the orientation to community policing scale significantly decreased (Table 3.2). Model 3 in Table 3.6, reveals that coworker support for traditional policing and 2nd shift were significant predictors of negative change or decrease in mean value score. In other words, police recruits working in an organization/environment where coworkers were more supportive of traditional policing were less likely to change their orientation to community policing from Time 2 to Time 4. In regards to shift, police recruits assigned to 2nd shift at Time 4 were more likely to report a decrease in orientation to community policing from Time 2 to Time 4, than recruits assigned to 1st shift. The interactive effects of shift and organizational environment become important. Similar to Models 1 and 2, academy class 9 emerged as a predictor of change; police recruits from academy class 9 were less likely to decrease their orientation to community policing over time.

Finally, from Time 1 to Time 4, the mean value score for the orientation to community policing scale significantly decreased. As Model 4 reveals, baseline level is the strongest predictor of the change on this scale. Police recruits who did not express a strong orientation to community policing upon entering the training academy were more likely to report a decrease in

orientation to community policing from Time 1 to Time 4. Coworker support for traditional policing and 2nd and 3rd shifts also emerged as predictors of the change on this scale. For instance, police recruits working in an organization where coworkers support the allocation of agency resources to activities and services in keeping with traditional policing were more likely to report a decrease in orientation to community policing from Time 1 to Time 4. And police recruits assigned to 2nd and 3rd shifts at Time 4 were more likely to report a decrease in orientation to community policing, then recruits assigned to 1st shift.

Regression Analysis: Change in Police-Public Relations. Table 3.7 provides the results of the regression analysis for the change over time in police recruits' attitudes toward police-public relations. As revealed in Table 3.2, from Time 1 to Time 2 there was a slight increase in mean value scores on the police-public relations scale; however, it was not significant. According to Model 1, the strongest predictor of change in attitudes toward police-public relations from Time 1 to Time 2 is the baseline level of police recruits' attitudes toward police-public relations upon entering the training academy. In other words, police recruits who expressed negative perceptions of police-public relations upon entering the training academy were more likely to express more positive attitudes toward police-public relations after completing the 16-week basic training academy. The training academy clearly had a positive impact on shaping police recruits attitudes toward the police-public relations. On the other hand, Model 1 reveals that academy classes 3, 8, 11, and 14 were less likely to report an increase in positive attitudes toward police-public relations at from Time 1 to Time 2.

From Time 2 to Time 3, there was again a significant increase in the mean value scores on the police-public relations scale. According to Model 2, predictors of this change are prior law enforcement experience, baseline level attitudes, and whether or not a recruit is hired by an

Table 3.7. Regression of Change in Police-Public Relations (from Baseline to One-Year)

	Model 1 (Change Time 1 to Time 2)		Model 2 (Change Time 2 to Time 3)		Model 3 (Change Time 2 to Time 4)		Model 4 (Change Time 1 to Time 4)	
	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta
Constant	10.73*		-1.65		-1.46		11.61*	
Age	-.00	-.01	.06	.10	.05	.07	.01	.02
Education (1=Bachelors Degree)	-.06	-.01	.48	.07	.94	.13	1.24	.17**
Anglo (1=yes)	.56	.07	-.39	-.05	-.30	-.03	.01	.00
Sex (1=Male)	-.28	-.03	.23	.02	.90	.07	.10	.01
Prior Law Enf. Experience (1=yes)	-.55	-.07	1.06	.14*	.39	.05	.26	.03
Prior Military Experience (1=yes)	.50	.07	-.66	-.10	-.10	-.01	.61	.08
Baseline Level	-.40	-.40*	-.13	-.13**	-.17	-.16**	-.57	-.52*
Agency – Phoenix PD	-.15	-.02	-1.95	-.27	.43	.05	.32	.04
Agency – Suburban Phoenix	1.43	.17	-1.08	-.13	.12	.01	.79	.09
COP Rank: Patrol Responsibility	-2.05	-.09	3.67	.16**	3.60	.16	1.84	.08
COP Rank: Org. Arrangements	-.26	-.02	-.77	-.05	.75	.04	.78	.04
COP Rank: Citizen Participation	1.06	.12	1.43	.17	-.10	-.01	.69	.07
Coworker Support for COP	---	---	---	---	-.08	-.12	-.08	-.11
Coworker Support for TP	---	---	---	---	-.08	.03	-.10	-.04
2nd Shift	---	---	-.04	-.01	.09	.01	.36	.05
3rd Shift	---	---	-.52	-.05	4.32	.01	.66	.09
Other Shifts	---	---	-.22	-.02	2.31	.11	1.82	.09
Dummy – Class 2	-1.13	-.09	-.81	-.07	1.08	.08	-.39	-.03
Dummy – Class 3	-1.82	-.15**	.57	.05	.77	.06	-1.71	-.13
Dummy – Class 4	-.22	-.02	-.59	-.06	-.65	-.06	-.85	-.07
Dummy – Class 5	1.19	.05	-2.71	-.11	-.94	-.03	-.82	-.03
Dummy – Class 6	-.86	-.08	.24	.02	1.43	.12	.45	.04
Dummy – Class 7	1.83	.09	-.52	-.03	-3.00	-.11	-1.44	-.05
Dummy – Class 8	-1.80	-.16**	-.91	-.08	2.08	.16	.34	.03
Dummy – Class 9	-.60	-.05	.50	.04	.72	.05	.97	.07
Dummy – Class 10	-1.58	-.07	1.96	.09	.34	.12	-.44	-.02
Dummy – Class 11	-2.72	-.28*	2.14	.20**	2.97	.25*	.04	.00
Dummy – Class 12	-.98	-.06	-.93	-.05	-.31	-.02	-.70	-.04
Dummy – Class 13	-1.57	-.13	-.45	-.04	.72	.05	-.54	-.04
Dummy – Class 14	-3.14	-.27*	1.26	.10	2.71	.18**	-.84	-.06
R^2 Adjusted	.246*		.081*		.098*		.265*	

$* p \leq .01; ** p \leq .05$

organization that ranks high on the patrol officer/deputy are required to engage in activities/responsibilities related to community policing scale. In other words, police recruits with prior law enforcement experience were more likely to report an increase in attitudes toward police-public relations at Time 3 *versus* Time 2. In addition, police recruits who had more negative perceptions of police-public relations at Time 2 were more likely to report an increase in perceptions of police-public relations at Time 3. And, police recruits hired by a policy agency that requires its patrol officers/deputies to engage in activities/responsibilities related to community policing were more likely to report an increase in attitudes toward police public relations at Time 3. Academy class 11 also emerged as a predictor of change; police recruits from academy class 11 were more likely to report an increase in perceptions of police-public relations. From Time 2 to Time 4, there was again a significant increase in the mean value score on the police-public relations scale. Model 3 reveals that baseline level attitudes remain a predictor of this change, and that academy classes 11 and 14 are also predictors of this change.

Finally, from Time 1 to Time 4 there was also a significant increase in the mean value score on the police-public relations scale. According to Model 4, baseline level remains the strongest predictor of this change. Police recruits that expressed more negative perceptions of police-public relations at Time 1 were more likely to express more positive attitudes toward police-public relations at Time 4. Age also emerged as a weak predictor in this model. In other words, as the age of police recruits increases they are more likely to express more positive perceptions of police-public relations.

Regression Analysis: Change in Orientation to Problem-Solving Policing. Table 3.8 provides the results of the regression analysis for the change over time in orientation to problem-solving policing. As previously stated, there was a significant increase in the mean value scores

from Time 1 to Time 2 on the orientation to problem-solving policing scale. According to Model 1, the strongest predictor of change on this scale is the baseline level of orientation to problem-solving policing. Police recruits who were not oriented to problem-solving policing upon entering the training academy (Time 1) were more likely to report an increase in orientation to problem-solving policing at the end of academy training (Time 2). A weaker predictor of change is whether or not a recruit was hired by an organization that ranks high on the patrol officer/deputy required to engage in activities/responsibilities related to community policing scale. In other words, police recruits that were hired by a policy agency that does not require its patrol officers/deputies to engage in activities/responsibilities related to community policing were actually more likely to report an increase in orientation to problem-solving policing from Time 1 to Time 2. According to Model 1, it is apparent that academy training has had a positive impact on shaping police recruits attitudes toward problem-solving policing.

From Time 2 to Time 3 there was a slight, yet insignificant decrease in the mean value scores on the orientation to problem-solving policing scale, and from Time 2 to Time 4 there was a significant decrease in the mean value scores on this scale. According to Models 2 and 3, baseline level attitudes and whether or not a police recruit is working for an organization that ranks high on the patrol officer/deputy required to engage in activities/responsibilities related to community policing scale is predictors of this change. In other words, police recruits who were not oriented to problem-solving policing at Time 2 were more likely to report a decrease in orientation to problem-solving policing at Time 3 and Time 4. Moreover, police recruits working or a police agency that requires its patrol officers/deputies to engage in activities/responsibilities related to community policing were more likely to report a decrease in orientation to problem-solving policing at Time 3 and Time 4.

Table 3.8. Regression of Change in Orientation to Problem-Solving Policing (from Baseline to One-Year)

	Model 1 (Change Time 1 to Time 2)		Model 2 (Change Time 2 to Time 3)		Model 3 (Change Time 2 to Time 4)		Model 4 (Change Time 1 to Time 4)	
	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta
Constant	21.27*		-.92		5.14		31.74*	
Age	-.04	-.05	.05	.08	.02	.02	-.05	-.07
Education (1=Bachelors Degree)	-.11	-.01	-.18	-.02	-.07	-.01	.20	.02
Anglo (1=yes)	.47	.05	-.18	-.02	-.40	-.04	-.51	-.05
Sex (1=Male)	-.41	-.03	-.43	-.03	-.47	-.03	-.97	-.07
Prior Law Enf. Experience (1=yes)	-.35	-.04	.59	.07	1.19	.12	.75	.08
Prior Military Experience (1=yes)	-.53	-.07	.14	.02	.92	.11	.33	.04
Baseline Level	-.43	-.44*	-.16	-.16*	-.24	-.20*	-.70	-.59*
Agency – Phoenix PD	-.52	-.06	-1.76	-.22	-1.18	-.13	-.77	-.08
Agency – Suburban Phoenix	1.08	.11	-1.46	-.15	-1.13	-.11	1.45	.14
COP Rank: Patrol Responsibility	-4.36	-.17*	5.38	.20*	5.37	.20**	-.16	-.01
COP Rank: Org. Arrangements	.00	.00	.87	.05	1.29	.06	.31	.02
COP Rank: Citizen Participation	1.12	.11	.77	.08	-.35	-.03	1.71	.16
Coworker Support for COP	---	---	---	---	-.10	-.11	-.19	-.23*
Coworker Support for TP	---	---	---	---	-.21	-.08	-.22	.08
2nd Shift	---	---	-.07	-.04	.86	.10	.64	.07
3rd Shift	---	---	-.31	-.12	1.12	.13	1.22	.14
Other Shifts	---	---	-1.41	-.01	-.65	-.03	1.00	.04
Dummy – Class 2	-1.06	-.08	.76	.06	1.02	.07	-1.24	-.08
Dummy – Class 3	-.80	-.06	1.49	.11	1.96	.13	.10	.01
Dummy – Class 4	-.88	-.07	1.03	.09	1.28	.10	.07	.01
Dummy – Class 5	-2.88	-.10	.95	.03	2.01	.06	-.26	-.01
Dummy – Class 6	-.99	-.08	1.28	.10	1.36	.10	.05	.00
Dummy – Class 7	2.03	.09	.70	.03	-.51	-.02	-.31	-.01
Dummy – Class 8	-.80	-.06	.76	.06	1.26	.09	-.16	-.01
Dummy – Class 9	-.53	-.04	1.71	.12	.49	.03	.10	.01
Dummy – Class 10	-1.92	-.08	3.26	.13	1.86	.07	-.07	-.00
Dummy – Class 11	-1.62	-.14	1.62	.14	2.09	.16	.06	.01
Dummy – Class 12	-1.73	-.09	.98	.05	1.44	.07	-.08	-.00
Dummy – Class 13	-1.71	-.12	1.81	.13	1.68	.10	-.72	-.04
Dummy – Class 14	-1.03	-.08	.87	.06	.73	.04	-.58	-.03
R^2	.202*		.017		.030		.320*	

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

Finally, there was a decrease in the mean value score on the orientation to problem-solving policing scale from Time 1 to Time 4; however, it was not significant. According to Model 4, the strongest predictor of this change was the baseline level orientation to problem-solving policing at Time 1. Police recruits that entered the basic training academy with a negative orientation to problem-solving policing were more likely to report a decrease in orientation to problem-solving policing at Time 4. In addition, coworker support for community policing also emerged as a predictor of change from Time 1 to 4. In other words, police recruits working in an organization/environment in which police recruits doe not support community policing were more likely to report a decrease in orientation to problem-solving policing from Time 1 to Time 4. These findings support the hypothesis that organizational environment or culture has a significant impact on shaping police recruits attitudes and beliefs within the first year on the job.

Regression Analysis: Change in Problem-Solving Capability. Table 3.9 provides the results of the regression analysis for the change over time in the problem-solving capability scale. As Table 3.2 revealed, there was a significant increase in the mean value scores on the problem-solving capability scale from Time 1 to Time 2. According to Model 1, the strongest predictor of this change is the baseline level of problem-solving capability. Police recruits who did not feel as qualified to engage in problem-solving activities, particularly those related to the S.A.R.A. Model, at Time 1 were more likely to report an increase in their problem-solving capabilities at Time 2. A weak predictor of the change from Time 1 to Time 2 is whether a police recruit is hired by a suburban Phoenix police agency. In other words, police recruits hired by a suburban Phoenix police agency was less likely to report an increase in their problem-solving capabilities.

From Time 2 to Time 3, there was a significant decrease in the mean value score on the problem-solving capability scale. Model 2 reveals that gender and whether a police recruit is working in a suburban Phoenix police agency are predictors of the mean value change from Time 2 to 3. In fact, in Model 2, whether a police recruit is working in a suburban Phoenix police agency emerged as a stronger predictor of the change than it did in Model 1. In particular, police recruits working in suburban Phoenix police agencies were more likely to report a decrease in their ability to perform problem-solving activities related to the S.A.R.A. Model from Time 2 to Time 3. In addition, male police recruits were more likely to report a decrease in their ability to perform problem-solving activities related to the S.A.R.A. Model, than were female police recruits.

From Time 2 to Time 4, the mean value scores on the problem-solving capability scale decreased; however, it the decrease was not significant. Furthermore, Model 3 reveals that none of the independent variables included in the regression were significant predictors of the change in the summated scale mean from Time 2 to Time 4.

Finally, there was a significant increase in the mean value score on the problem-solving capability scale from Time 1 to Time 4. According to Model 4, only the baseline level emerged as a strong predictor of the change in the mean value score from Time 1 to Time 4. In other words, police recruits who did not feel as qualified to engage in problem-solving activities related to the S.A.R.A. Model at Time 1 were more likely to report an increase in their problem-solving capabilities at Time 4.

Table 3.9. Regression of Change in Problem-Solving Capability (from Baseline to One-Year)

	Model 1 (Change Time 1 to Time 2)		Model 2 (Change Time 2 to Time 3)		Model 3 (Change Time 2 to Time 4)		Model 4 (Change Time 1 to Time 4)	
	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta
Constant	11.39*		1.18		.49		14.75*	
Age	.02	.04	-.04	-.12	.00	.00	-.00	-.00
Education (1=Bachelors Degree)	-.10	-.02	.01	.00	.17	.04	.34	.06
Anglo (1=yes)	-.20	-.03	.05	.01	-.38	-.07	-.48	-.07
Sex (1=Male)	-.37	-.04	.81	.13**	.28	.04	-.47	-.05
Prior Law Enf. Experience (1=yes)	.08	.01	-.07	-.02	-.16	-.03	-.10	-.02
Prior Military Experience (1=yes)	-.06	-.01	.12	.03	.12	.03	.41	.07
Baseline Level	-.71	-.73*	-.07	-.10	-.03	-.03	-.77	-.75*
Agency – Phoenix PD	-.95	-.17	.55	.13	1.50	.30	.65	.11
Agency – Suburban Phoenix	-.97	-.15**	1.20	.25**	1.43	.25	.45	.07
COP Rank: Patrol Responsibility	.36	.02	-.23	-.02	-1.26	-.09	-.54	-.03
COP Rank: Org. Arrangements	-.90	-.07	.77	.09	1.42	.12	.28	.02
COP Rank: Citizen Participation	.27	.04	-.62	-.13	-1.10	-.19	-.85	-.13
Coworker Support for COP	---	---	---	---	-.02	-.05	-.03	-.07
Coworker Support for TP	---	---	---	---	.14	.10	-.09	-.06
2nd Shift	---	---	.09	.02	.27	.06	.39	.07
3rd Shift	---	---	-.66	-.11	-.13	-.03	-.19	-.04
Other Shifts	---	---	.17	.03	.03	.00	.47	.03
Dummy – Class 2	-.31	-.03	-.11	-.02	-.25	-.03	-.65	-.07
Dummy – Class 3	.49	.05	-.59	-.09	-.30	-.04	-.02	-.00
Dummy – Class 4	-.40	-.05	-.23	-.04	.19	.03	-.24	-.03
Dummy – Class 5	-1.73	-.09**	-.46	-.03	1.40	.08	-.07	-.00
Dummy – Class 6	.54	.06	-.95	-.15	-1.05	-.13	-.71	-.08
Dummy – Class 7	-.14	-.01	.51	.05	1.15	.06	.60	.03
Dummy – Class 8	-.54	-.06	.04	.01	.59	.07	.28	.03
Dummy – Class 9	-.06	-.01	-.99	-.14	-.10	-.01	-.17	-.02
Dummy – Class 10	-1.59	-.09**	-.32	-.03	.34	.02	-.90	-.05
Dummy – Class 11	-1.08	-.14**	.07	.01	.91	.12	-.51	-.06
Dummy – Class 12	.53	.04	-.75	-.07	-1.54	-.13	-.96	-.07
Dummy – Class 13	-.23	-.02	-.45	-.06	-.51	-.05	-.90	-.08
Dummy – Class 14	-.41	-.05	-.06	-.01	-.32	-.03	-1.07	-.10
R^2	.570*		.028		-.008		.544*	

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

Regression Analysis: Change in Ability to Assess Needs of Diverse Groups. Table 3.10 provides the results of the regression analysis for the change over time in the ability to assess the needs of diverse groups scale. As Table 3.2 revealed, there was a significant increase in the mean value score on this scale from Time 1 to Time 2. According to Model 1, the strongest predictor of this change is police recruits' baseline level assessment of their ability to assess the needs of diverse groups (i.e., men/women, elderly, gay/lesbian, handicapped, and poor). In other words, police recruits who maintained their ability to assess the needs of diverse groups was limited at Time 1, were more likely to report an increase in their ability to assess the needs of diverse groups at Time 2. This finding provides support for the assumption that the basic training academy has a positive impact on shaping police recruits cultural sensitivity. A weaker predictor of change is age. As the age of police recruits increased, they were more likely to report an increase in their ability to assess the needs of diverse groups from Time 1 to Time 2.

From Time 2 to Time 3, there was a significant decrease in the mean value scores on this scale. According to Model 2, baseline level emerged as a weak predictor of this change. Police recruits that maintained their ability to assess the needs of divers groups was limited upon exiting the training academy (Time 2), were more likely to report a decrease in the ability to assess the needs of diverse groups at the end of the field training process (Time 3). From Time 2 to Time 4, there was also a decrease in the mean value scores on this scale; however, the change was not significant. Model 3 reveals that police recruits working in an organization/environment which ranked high for citizen participation were more likely to report a decrease in the ability to assess the needs of diverse groups from Time 2 to Time 4.

Table 3.10. Regression of Change in Ability to Assess Needs of Diverse Groups (from Baseline to One-Year)

	Model 1 (Change Time 1 to Time 2)		Model 2 (Change Time 2 to Time 3)		Model 3 (Change Time 2 to Time 4)		Model 4 (Change Time 1 to Time 4)	
	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta
Constant	11.55*		.48		-1.23		12.32*	
Age	.08	.10**	-.03	-.04	.03	.04	.07	.08
Education (1=Bachelors Degree)	-.46	-.06	-.18	-.03	-.11	-.01	-.36	-.04
Anglo (1=yes)	.19	.02	-.38	-.05	.01	.00	-.34	-.03
Sex (1=Male)	-.69	-.05	.38	.04	-.71	-.05	-.89	-.06
Prior Law Enf. Experience (1=yes)	.09	.01	-.53	-.07	-.51	-.05	-.61	-.06
Prior Military Experience (1=yes)	-.68	-.08	.68	.10	-.20	-.02	-.54	-.06
Baseline Level	-.59	-.56*	-.14	-.15**	-.08	-.07	-.66	-.57*
Agency – Phoenix PD	-.03	-.00	1.81	.25	-2.13	-.23	-2.04	-.21
Agency – Suburban Phoenix	-.12	-.01	1.06	.12	.04	.00	.20	.02
COP Rank: Patrol Responsibility	-.67	-.03	2.33	.10	1.34	.05	1.19	.04
COP Rank: Org. Arrangements	-.60	-.03	1.13	.07	-1.26	-.06	-1.68	-.08
COP Rank: Citizen Participation	.18	.02	-1.66	-.19	3.21	.30**	3.34	.29*
Coworker Support for COP	---	---	---	---	-.01	-.02	-.05	-.06
Coworker Support for TP	---	---	---	---	.17	.06	.04	.02
2nd Shift	---	---	.08	.01	.27	.03	.59	.06
3rd Shift	---	---	-.44	-.04	-.41	-.05	-.21	-.02
Other Shifts	---	---	.89	.08	.84	.04	.22	.01
Dummy – Class 2	.36	.03	-.36	-.03	-.85	-.06	-.60	-.04
Dummy – Class 3	1.31	.09	.20	.02	-1.95	-.13	-.58	-.04
Dummy – Class 4	.59	.05	-.13	-.01	-1.42	-.11	-.66	-.05
Dummy – Class 5	1.09	.04	-2.54	-.10	-.87	-.03	-.11	-.00
Dummy – Class 6	1.23	.09	-.81	-.07	-.91	-.06	-.14	-.01
Dummy – Class 7	1.11	.05	-.60	-.03	.85	.03	1.01	.03
Dummy – Class 8	.76	.06	.43	.04	-.54	-.04	-.26	-.02
Dummy – Class 9	.77	.05	.88	.07	.52	.03	1.80	.11
Dummy – Class 10	-.79	-.03	1.44	.07	.57	.02	.18	.01
Dummy – Class 11	.33	.03	.39	.04	-.09	-.01	-.10	-.01
Dummy – Class 12	1.64	.08	.54	.03	.48	.02	1.24	.05
Dummy – Class 13	1.34	.09	-.89	-.07	-.36	-.02	-.28	-.02
Dummy – Class 14	1.54	.11	-.39	-.03	-1.66	-.10	-.63	-.03
R^2	.283*		.007		-.057		.289*	

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

Table 3.11. Regression of Change in Ability to Assess Needs of Culturally Diverse Groups (from Baseline to One-Year)

	Model 1 (Change Time 1 to Time 2)		Model 2 (Change Time 2 to Time 3)		Model 3 (Change Time 2 to Time 4)		Model 4 (Change Time 1 to Time 4)	
	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta	b	Beta
Constant	9.06*		-2.60		-.73		11.76*	
Age	.05	.11**	-.01	-.04	-.01	-.03	.01	.03
Education (1=Bachelors Degree)	-.20	-.04	.02	.01	-.39	-.10	-.39	-.08
Anglo (1=yes)	-.26	-.05	-.07	-.02	.25	.05	-.37	-.06
Sex (1=Male)	.13	-.05	.20	.03	.60	.09	.60	.07
Prior Law Enf. Experience (1=yes)	.13	.02	-.29	-.07	-.53	-.11	-.67	-.12**
Prior Military Experience (1=yes)	-.73	.03*	.66	.17*	.06	.02	-.39	-.08
Baseline Level	-.57	-.59*	-.01	-.02	-.04	-.05	-.69	-.66*
Agency – Phoenix PD	-.40	-.08	1.13	.28	.48	.11	.34	.07
Agency – Suburban Phoenix	-.15	-.03	.79	.17	.08	.02	.24	.04
COP Rank: Patrol Responsibility	-1.02	-.07	1.89	.15**	.58	.05	-.15	-.01
COP Rank: Org. Arrangements	-.82	-.07	.94	.11	1.05	.11	.38	.03
COP Rank: Citizen Participation	.26	.04	-1.02	-.21	-.27	-.05	.06	.01
Coworker Support for COP	---	---	---	---	.01	.03	-.01	-.01
Coworker Support for TP	---	---	---	---	-.01	-.01	-.20	-.14**
2nd Shift	---	---	.26	.06	.24	.06	.27	.06
3rd Shift	---	---	.24	.04	.17	.04	-.03	-.01
Other Shifts	---	---	.32	.05	-.34	-.03	.19	.02
Dummy – Class 2	3.35	.00	.07	.01	-.15	-.02	-.20	-.03
Dummy – Class 3	1.07	.13**	-.69	-.10	-.65	-.09	.56	.07
Dummy – Class 4	.11	.02	.15	.03	-.02	-.00	-.02	-.00
Dummy – Class 5	-.31	-.02	-.60	-.04	-1.13	-.07	-.92	-.05
Dummy – Class 6	.50	.07	-.23	-.04	-.52	-.08	-.11	-.01
Dummy – Class 7	.44	.03	.06	.01	-1.13	-.07	-.83	-.05
Dummy – Class 8	.53	.07	.26	.04	-.51	-.07	.47	.06
Dummy – Class 9	.82	.10	-.22	-.03	-.12	-.02	1.23	.15**
Dummy – Class 10	-.95	-.06	1.00	.08	.45	.04	-.29	-.02
Dummy – Class 11	.41	.06	-.26	-.04	-.39	-.06	.09	.01
Dummy – Class 12	.92	.08	.33	.03	-.83	-.08	.22	.02
Dummy – Class 13	.74	.10	.10	.01	-.30	-.04	.26	.03
Dummy – Class 14	.45	.06	-.08	-.01	-.33	-.04	.25	.03
R^2	.355*		.001		-.056		.411*	

$* p \leq .01; ** p \leq .05$

Finally, Table 3.2 revealed a significant increase in the mean value scores on this scale from Time 1 to Time 4. According to Model 4, the strongest predictor of this change was baseline level. In other words, police recruits who maintained their ability to assess the needs of diverse groups was limited at Time 1, were more likely to report an increase in their ability to assess the needs of diverse groups at Time 4. Furthermore, organizational ranking on citizen participation also emerged as a significant predictor of the change on this scale from Time 1 to Time 2. Police recruits working in an organization/environment which ranked high on citizen participation were more likely to report an increase in the ability to assess the needs of diverse groups from Time 1 to Time 4. This finding supports the assumption that organizational environment or culture has a significant impact on shaping or reshaping police recruits attitudes and beliefs.

Regression Analysis: Change in Ability to Assess the Needs of Culturally Diverse Groups. Finally, Table 3.11 provides the result of the regression analysis for the change over time in ability to assess the needs of culturally diverse groups. As previously stated, there was a significant increase in the mean value scores on this scale from Time 1 to Time 2 (Table 3.2). According to Model 1 in Table 3.11, the strongest predictor of this mean value score change from Time 1 to Time 2 is the baseline level of ability to assess needs of culturally diverse groups. In other words, police recruits who maintained their ability to assess needs of culturally diverse groups was limited at Time 1, were more likely to report an increase in the ability to assess the needs of culturally diverse groups at Time 2. This finding supports the assumption that the basic training academy has a positive impact on shaping police recruits attitudes and beliefs. A weaker predictor of this change is age. As the age of police recruits increase, the more likely a police recruit is to report an increase in the ability to assess the needs of culturally diverse groups from

Time 1 to Time 2. In addition, police recruits from academy class 3 were more likely to report an increase on this scale from Time 1 to Time 2.

From Time 2 to Time 3 there was a significant decrease in the mean value scores on the ability to assess the needs of diverse groups scale (Table 3.2). Model 2 in Table 3.11 reveals that prior military experience and an organizations ranking on patrol officers/deputies are required to engage in community policing activities scale were predictors of this change. In other words, police recruits with prior military experience were more likely to report a decrease in their ability to assess the needs of culturally diverse groups from Time 2 to the Time 3. Furthermore, police recruits working in an organization that ranked high on patrol officers/deputies are required to engage in community policing activities were more likely to report a decrease in the ability to assess the needs of culturally diverse groups. There was also a decrease in the means value scores on this scale from Time 2 to Time 4, however, it was not significant; moreover, none of the independent variables included in the regression for Model 3 were significant.

Finally, there was a significant increase in the mean value scores from Time 1 to Time 4 on the ability to assess the needs of culturally diverse groups scale. Model 4 reveals that police recruits' baseline level assessment of their ability to assess the needs of culturally diverse groups was the strongest predictor of the change from Time 1 to Time 4. Similar to Model 1, police recruits who maintained their ability to assess the needs of culturally diverse groups was limited at Time 1, were more likely to report an increase in their ability to assess the needs of culturally diverse groups at Time 4. Both prior law enforcement experience and coworker support for traditional policing also emerged as weak predictors of this change. Police recruits did not have prior law enforcement experience were more likely to report an increase in their ability to assess the needs of culturally diverse groups. In addition, police recruits working in an

organization/environment where coworkers' support allocating agency resources to activities and services related to traditional policing were less likely to report an increase their ability to assess the needs of culturally diverse groups at Time 4.

SUMMARY

In general, the findings presented in this chapter reveal that the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy has a positive impact on police recruits' attitudes related to community policing and problem-solving policing, as well as developing police recruits' sense of capability at engaging in problem-solving activities and assessing the needs of diverse groups of citizens. At the same time, the training academy has a positive impact on shaping police recruits' support for traditional policing. It is important to realize that while the impact is significant, the change is small.[7] In regards to shaping police recruits' attitudes related to various dimensions of the job and job satisfaction, academy training appears to have mixed results (i.e., some positive and some negative).

Upon graduation from the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy, police recruits proceed to their respective police agencies where they are assigned to a field training officer and required to successfully complete the field training process. The findings presented in this chapter show that the field training process, in general, fails to reinforce the positive impact that the training academy had on police recruits' attitudes toward community policing, problem-solving policing, and cultural sensitivity. Instead, the field training process was found to have a negative impact on police recruits' attitudes related to community policing and problem-solving

---

[7] 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 $< .70$) since the measures were borrowed from other studies.

policing, as well as on police recruits' sense of capability at engaging in problem-solving activities and assessing the needs of diverse groups of citizens. The only positive impact that the field training process had on police recruits' attitudes was related reinforcing recruits' support for traditional policing and support for police-public relations. Field training was also found to have a negative impact on police recruits' attitudes related to the various dimensions of the job and job satisfaction.

As police recruits proceed through the field training process and the first year of their police careers they experience the police officer role, engage in actual police work, and experience the environment and culture of the police organization. The findings presented throughout this chapter show that, in most cases, the field training process, the socialization process and the organizational environment fail to reinforce the small, but positive impact the training academy had on police recruits' attitudes and skills related to community policing, problem-solving policing, and cultural sensitivity. The only positive impact that the field training and occupational socialization processes has on police recruits' is in reinforcing support for traditional policing and support for police-public relations. In regards to shaping police recruits' attitudes related to various dimensions of the job and job satisfaction, the first year on the job reveals to have mixed results (i.e., some positive and some negative).

These findings not only reveal the direction of change in police recruits attitudes and beliefs, but they confirm that individual characteristics, organizational environment factors, baseline level attitudes and skills, and academy class factors predict attitude and skill changes. Although, there is variation across the scales as to which independent variables predict the change. What is most interesting are some of the consistent patterns that emerge across each of the tables and the models. In particular, for each of the scales, the strongest predictor of change

from Time 1 to Time 2 is the baseline level scores. In fact, baseline level scores explained most of the variance in police recruits attitudinal change from Time 1 to Time 2. Another weaker predictor of change from Time 1 to Time 2 that emerged in several of the tables was a police agencies ranking on the patrol officers are required to engage in community policing activities (COP Rank: Patrol Responsibility) scale. For instance, this variable was a significant predictor of the increase in orientation to community policing and orientation to problem-solving policing. This finding suggests that police agencies that ranked high on patrol officers/deputies are required to engage in activities/responsibilities related to community policing may tend to hire individuals that are oriented to or supportive of community policing philosophies and strategies and problem-solving techniques. This finding may also be evidence that socialization of police recruits into the culture of a police agency begins early in a police officers' career, as early as the hiring process and/or during the basic training academy. Other weak predictors of change from Time 1 to Time 2 that emerged in some of the tables were individual characteristics such as education, age and prior military experience. For some of the scales, academy classes also emerged as weak predictors of change. This finding suggests 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 the class sergeant and/or the makeup of the class (e.g., a class may have a number of police recruits with prior law enforcement and/or military experience, a bachelors degree, older or younger recruits, and recruits from police agencies that ranked high or low on the community policing scales). There was not consistent pattern across the scales or models for these weaker predictors to draw any conclusions.

Another interesting and consistent pattern that emerged across each of the tables is that baseline level scores was no longer the strongest predictor of change from Time 2 to Time 3 (see

Models 2), and in some of the tables it actually disappeared as a significant predictor of change. Instead, organizational environment factors such as shift, police agencies ranking on the patrol officers are required to engage in community policing activities (COP: Patrol Responsibility) scale, and agency location (e.g., suburban Phoenix police agencies) emerged as predictors of the change in police recruits' attitudes. This finding suggests that once the police recruit leaves the training academy and enters into the field training process in their respective police agencies, organizational environment factors become more powerful forces in shaping police recruits' attitudes, beliefs, and skills related to community policing, problem-solving policing and cultural sensitivity, than do individual characteristics or baseline level attitudes. In some of the tables, individual characteristics such as prior military experience, prior law enforcement experience, and gender emerged as predictors of change, as did academy classes. This finding reveals that not only the organizational environment predicts change in attitudes, but also individual characteristics continue to have a significant impact on attitude change over time.

In each of the tables, organizational environment factors such as coworker support for traditional policing, shift, police agencies ranking on the patrol officers are required to engage in community policing activities scale, and police agencies ranking on the citizen participation scale became significant predictors of change from Time 2 to Time 4 (see Models 3). In some of the tables, academy classes and baseline level scores emerged as predictors of change.

Finally, an examination of Model 4 in each of the tables reveals numerous consistent and interesting patterns. First, baseline level scores consistently emerged as the strongest predictor of change from Time 1 to Time 4. Another strong predictor of change from Time 1 to Time 4 is coworker support for community policing and traditional policing. Coworker attitudes emerge as a more consistent and stronger predictor of change in police recruits attitudes and beliefs than does an

organizations ranking on the various community policing scales or individual characteristics. This finding suggests that the informal culture of a police department can be a more powerful force in shaping the attitudes and beliefs of new officers, than the formal organization. In many of the models, shift also emerged as a significant predictor variable along with coworkers' attitudes; thus, supporting the assumption that there are multiple informal cultures in an organization, such as those based on shift and squad, with differing attitudes and beliefs about police work and police-public interactions. Individual characteristics including race/ethnicity, education, and prior law enforcement experience emerged as weak predictors of change from Time 1 to Time 4 in several of the tables. Academy classes virtually disappeared as predictors of change from Time 1 to Time 4; thus 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.

These findings are important as they reveal the mixed impacts of academy training, field training, occupational socialization, and organizational environment on shaping police recruits attitudes, beliefs, and skills related to the police role, community policing, problem-solving policing, and cultural sensitivity. Another important point that has been overlooked in much of the research and discussion of academy training is the impact of baseline scores in the regressions. Baseline level scores is the best predictor of attitude change from Time 1 to Time 2, and from Time 1 to Time 4 it is also the attitudes and beliefs that police recruits' bring with them to the academy in the first place (Time 1). 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. Thus, it should come as no surprise that academy training has very limited impact

on shaping or reshaping police recruits attitudes and beliefs about police work. After all, attitudes represent relatively stable cognitive states that are hard to change.

Training to change attitudes and beliefs, referred to as reform training (Buerger, 1998), is not like skills or legal training. In most cases, recruit training tends to focus on the basic every day 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 and police recruits will typically display noticeable or impressive learning gains in skills. 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 basic attitudes and beliefs. Attitudes are not skills, and training as a means for reform is usually not accomplished in classroom situations, particularly not those of only two, eight, or even forty hours (Buerger, 1998: 53).

CHAPTER 4

SOCIALIZATION OF NEW RECRUITS INTO THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE: CASE STUDIES OF PHOENIX METROPOLITAN AREA POLICE AGENCIES

A review of the literature reveals that community policing is implemented and practiced in various forms across police agencies, communities, and neighborhoods (see Alpert and Piquero, 1998; Cordner, 1997; Parks et al., 1999; Rosenbaum et al., 1994; Skolnick and Bayley, 1986; Weisel and Eck, 1994). In recent years, research has begun to reveal the various approaches or models to community policing that police agencies have implemented, as well as document some of the factors that have shaped cities community policing approaches (e.g., political structure and dynamics of the city, the context of the community, the police organization and management style, and the informal culture of police work; see Parks et al., 1999; Saad and Grinc, 1993; Skogan and Hartnett, 1997; Weisel and Eck, 1994; Wycoff and Skogan, 1993).

So far as police departments adopt different community policing approaches, they vary in the degree to which they allow or require patrol officers to engage in community policing activities. Parks et al. (1999) describes three popular community policing approaches: split-force approach, generalist approach, and mixed models (see also Maguire, 1997; Skogan and Hartnett, 1997). Police departments that adopt a split-force approach to community policing create special assignments that allow some patrol officers to specialize in community policing and requires other patrol officers to respond to calls for service. Departments that embrace a generalist approach to community policing do not create a division of labor among patrol officers; rather, all patrol officers are expected to respond to calls for service and engage in community policing activities. Finally, under the mixed model, generalist patrol officers are allowed to do some

community policing, but concentrate more heavily on calls for service, and specialist officers may answer some calls for service, but concentrate more heavily on community policing (see Parks 1999: 485). The community policing approach or model a police department emphasizes not only shapes how officers at the street level spend their time with the community and the community policing tasks they undertake, but may also play a role in shaping their attitudes toward community policing and problem-solving policing.

As part of a systematic attempt to understand the effects of field training and different work environments (including type of community policing approach) on police recruits' attitudes toward community policing, problem-solving policing, and police-public relations, I examine survey data for police recruits assigned to seven Phoenix metropolitan area police agencies. These seven police agencies include the Phoenix Police Department (PD), Scottsdale PD, Tempe PD, Glendale PD, Chandler PD, Peoria PD, and Gilbert PD.[8] I also examine the attitudes and training practices of field training officers (FTOs) from four of these police agencies in order to identify the role of FTOs in socializing police recruits into patrol work. Field training officers were selected because they have the most immediate and potentially the most intense impact on shaping new police officers attitudes and behaviors. I also use data from the Community Policing Survey to rank police agencies on several scales related to community policing implementation and conceptualization. All of these data sources are used to test the assumption that upon graduation from the training academy and entrance into the police agency, police recruits'

---

[8] The decision to focus on only seven police agencies in this chapter was to focus more specifically on police agencies that have are geographically located within the greater Phoenix metropolitan area and share jurisdictional boundaries, yet vary in organization and management style, approach to community policing, process of field training, and citizen participation in the police department.

working in police agencies that have changed their organizational structure, management style, and field training program to support community policing and problem-solving policing should sustain and/or produce positive changes in police recruits' attitudes related to community policing, problem-solving policing, and police-public relations (see Mastrofski and Ritti, 1996; Rosenbaum, 1994; Wesley and Skogan, 1994).

The contents of this chapter are organized in a manner that attempts to lay out the major findings and allow the various data sets to build upon each other and produce an in-depth analysis of how field training, work environment, and approach to community policing impact police recruits' attitudes related mainly to traditional policing, community policing, and problem-solving policing. To begin, a brief description of each of the seven study sites is presented to provide the reader with a context in which to understand the data. Next, an analysis of field training officer interview data is presented to reveal the attitudes and training practices of field training officers in four of the sample police agencies. Then, an analysis of mean differences across police agencies on each of the scales is presented and discussed in order to reveal variations among police recruits by agency. Finally, findings generated from an analysis of the longitudinal survey data collected on police recruits are presented to identify the various individual and work environment characteristics that predict attitudinal change among police recruits from the seven police agencies.

OVERVIEW OF CASE STUDY SITES

Phoenix, Arizona

The City of Phoenix, the capital of Arizona and the seat of government for Maricopa County, is the largest city in the State of Arizona with a 1997 population of 1,172,538 (see Table 4.1). Over the past decade and a half, Phoenix has developed a fast growing and diversified

economic base, including manufacturing, electronics, and tourism. As a result, the city has experienced significant population growth and a resurgence in the downtown area with the development of numerous cultural and entertainment projects.

As the city of Phoenix has grown, so has the Phoenix Police Department. In 1997, the Phoenix Police Department was comprised of more than 2,228 sworn police officers and 657 civil personnel who responded to more than 872,116 calls for service. While the Phoenix Police Department has a centralized primary administrative structure, it is divided into six separate territorial precincts with separate administrative structures. The six precincts include: Cactus Park Precinct, Central City Precinct, Desert Horizon Precinct, Maryvale Precinct, South Mountain Precinct, and Squaw Peak Precinct. Patrol and some special enforcement functions (e.g., neighborhood police officers, bike patrol squads, and juvenile enforcement teams) are decentralized into each of the precincts.[9] Across the precincts, variation exists in regards to geographic size of the precinct area, population demographics (e.g., economic status, race/ethnicity), composition of neighborhoods (e.g., residential stability, single- and multi-family dwellings), crime patterns and rates, and management style of precinct commanders.

The Central City Precinct provides service to the east-central portion of the city, including the downtown area. Central City is considered a high crime precinct, with a total of 2,281 violent crimes and 16,406 property crimes in 1997. In comparison to other precincts, in 1997, Central City led the way in robberies and sexual assaults, and ranked high in homicides, aggravated assaults, and drug crime. Maryvale Precinct is also considered a high crime precinct,

---

[9] This creates territorially based division of labor and distinct, stable work groups within each of the precincts.

with a total of 2,274 violent crimes in 1997; that same year, Maryvale reported 19,236 property crimes. Maryvale provides service to the west-central portion of the city. In 1997, Maryvale led the way in aggravated assaults and ranked high in robberies, sexual assaults, burglaries, drug crimes, gang-involved crimes, and property crimes. South Mountain Precinct is also considered a high crime precinct with 2,189 violent crimes in 1997. South Mountain Precinct provides service to the southern portion of the city. In 1997, South Mountain led the way in homicides, and ranked high in robberies, aggravated assaults, burglaries, drug crimes, and gang involved crimes. Conversely, South Mountain reported the lowest number of property crimes (16,039), in comparison to the other precincts.

Cactus Park Precinct provides service to the northwest portion of the city. In 1997, Cactus Park Precinct led the way in property crimes (i.e., burglaries, larceny thefts, and auto thefts), with 22,408 recorded. Cactus Park also reported 1,355 drug crimes and 164 gang-involved crimes in 1997. Desert Horizon Precinct provides service to the northeast section of the city, which is considered one of the more affluent sections of the city. In 1997, Desert Horizon Precinct reported the lowest violent crime rates and ranked fourth for property crimes. Finally, Squaw Peak Precinct provides service to the eastern portion of the city, including the Biltmore area. In 1997, Squaw Peak recorded only 1,587 violent crimes (one of the lowest in the city) and 18,322 property crimes.

Over the years, the Phoenix Police Department has been recognized as a progressive law enforcement agency. In 1986, the department was the first law enforcement agency in the state of Arizona to receive accreditation. As early as 1990, the department began implementing community policing and eventually adopted a mixed model, under which generalist patrol officers are encouraged to do some community policing, but concentrate more heavily on calls

Table 4.1. Characteristics of Research Sites

	Phoenix	Scottsdale	Tempe	Glendale	Chandler	Peoria	Gilbert
Population of Service area (1997 estimate)	1,172,538	174,490	172,056	188,278	133,269	78,399	72,626
% of Pop. Minority (1990)	18.3	4.0	13	15	14	13	12
% of Pop. Unemployed (1996)	3.8	2.5	2.9	3.4	3.0	2.6	2.4
% of Pop. Below Poverty Level (1990)	14.2	5.9	13.6	11.5	9.7	7.9	6.2
Violent Crime Rate per 100,000 (1997)	884.9	317.5	504.5	622.0	288.9	252.6	289.2
Property Crime Rate per 100,000 (1997)	8746.7	5546.4	8339.7	7475.1	6440.4	4815.1	4543.8
# Full-Time Sworn Officers	2,228	251	272	238	207	76	71
# Civilian Personnel	657	144	115	103	76	33	31
# Full-Time Sworn Patrol Officers (1997)	1,120	133	140	145	125	44	45
Year COP was Implemented	1990	1992	1988	1988	1991	1995	1996
Community Policing Approach	Mixed	Generalist	Generalist	Mixed	Generalist	Split-force	Split-force
Ranking: Org. Arrangements & Structures [a]	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low
Ranking: Patrol Officer Responsibilities	Low	High	High	High	High	Low	Low
Ranking: Dept. Programs and Practices	High	High	High	High	High	High	High
Ranking: Citizen Participation	High	High	Low	High	Low	Low	Low

[a] Each of the community policing rankings are based upon data collected from the Community Policing Survey.

for service. Specialist officers, referred to as Neighborhood Police Officers (NPOs) and Community Action Officers (CAOs), concentrate more specifically on community policing and problem-oriented policing. Since the department adopted a mixed approach to community policing, it was not surprising that the department ranked low on the patrol officers responsibilities scale (i.e., patrol officers are not required to engage in a wide range of community policing activities; see Table 4.1). Moreover, although the Phoenix Police Department has established a multitude of organizational arrangements and structures to support community policing, the department ranked low on this scale in comparison to the other study sites. The Phoenix Police Department did rank high, however, on the citizen participation scale. In other words, the department has established a variety of programs to encourage citizen participation in crime prevention and the police department. Citizen participation programs include: neighborhood watch programs, citizen volunteers working in the department, citizen police academies, and citizen advisory councils at the city level. Finally, the Phoenix Police Department also ranked high on the department programs and practices scale, which means the department has other community- and school-based programs and field operations practices (e.g., citizen surveys, victim assistance programs, foot patrol, and crime analysis) to support community policing.

Scottsdale, Arizona

Scottsdale, located on the northeast side of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area, is considered one of the areas most affluent communities and one of America's leading resort communities, known for attracting tourists to its many golf resorts/spas/hotels, shops, and businesses. The City of Scottsdale, like other communities in the greater Phoenix metropolitan area, is a rapidly growing community with an estimated population of 174,490 in 1997 (see

Table 4.1). The legal boundaries of the community encompass approximately 185 square miles, and with about half of Scottsdale's land mass filled-in, continued growth is anticipated. In spite of its reputation as an affluent community, Scottsdale is quite diverse and has the same crime and disorder problems experienced by other Phoenix communities. In fact, field operations units between July 1995 and June 1996 handled nearly 200,000 calls for service. More specifically, in 1998, the department reported 9,597 property crimes and 400 violent crimes, including an increase in forcible rape, robbery, burglary and auto theft.

The Scottsdale Police Department is a mid-sized organization of about 251 sworn personnel and 144 civilian personnel. The police department is currently divided into two districts, District I South and District II North, which are managed by district captains. Within the next year, a third district is expected to open, which will consume about half of District II North. In 1992, the Scottsdale Police Department implemented community policing and adopted a generalist approach. That is, every patrol officers is expected to be a community policing officer and is held responsible for addressing crime and disorder problems in their beat area of responsibility. Patrol officers are also expected to initiate positive community interactions and work with business groups, neighborhood associations, local housing agencies, and other city agencies. The goal of Scottsdale police administrators is to have patrol officers devote 40 percent of their time to answering radio calls, 40 percent to community policing, and 20 percent to administrative and paperwork.

Data obtained from the Community Policing Survey reveals that although the Scottsdale Police Department has established a multitude of organizational arrangements and structures to support community policing, the department ranks low on this scale in comparison to the other study sites (Table 4.1). The department did rank high, however, on the patrol officer

responsibilities scale. This is largely because the department has adopted a generalist approach to community policing and, as a result, requires patrol officers to engage in a wide range of community policing activities, including: making door-to-door contacts in neighborhoods, working with citizens to identify and resolve area problems, and working with other city agencies to solve neighborhood problems. The Scottsdale Police Department also as a variety of programs in place to encourage citizen participation in crime prevention and the police department. Citizen participation programs include: neighborhood watch programs, citizen volunteers working in the department, citizen police academies, and citizen advisory councils at the city level. Finally, the Scottsdale Police Department has also established other programs and practices such as citizen surveys, victim assistance programs, foot patrol, and crime analysis to support community policing.

Tempe, Arizona

The City of Tempe, located near the heart of the Phoenix metropolitan area, is the fifth largest city in Arizona with a population of 172,056 within 40 square miles. Tempe is home to Arizona State University, the nation's fifth largest university with an enrollment of 47,000 students and a staff of more than 10,000. For many years, Tempe was dependent on ASU for its prosperity, but over the past decade, Tempe has developed a multifaceted economic base including some 200 manufacturing firms that produce electronics, semiconductors, computers, and computer software. Research and development firms have also flourished in Tempe. In addition, downtown Tempe has become a regional entertainment center. In 1997, the department received approximately 119,000 calls for service and recorded 868 violent crimes and 14,349

property crimes.[10] Between 1997 and 1998, Tempe reported a 15.1 percent increase in violent crime totals; in particular, the number of robberies increased by 52.9 percent from 280 in 1997, to 428 in 1998, and the number of homicides and forcible rape decreased. In comparison to the other six Phoenix metropolitan area police agencies examined in this chapter, Tempe ranks second for violent crime totals and led the way with property crime totals.

The Tempe Police Department is a mid-sized police organization of 272 sworn personnel, 115 civilian personnel and 128 volunteers. The Tempe Police Department is divided into two districts, the North District and the South District. In 1988, the Tempe Police Department began to incorporate community policing and problem-solving principles into the organization. In 1989, the department hired its first crime analyst to upgrade their ability to gather and interpret crime and offense information. Between 1991 and 1993, the department received two Innovative Neighborhood Policing grants from the U.S. Department of Justice. In 1993, the department also adopted a generalist approach to community policing and the project was extended to the department's patrol operations through geographic deployment of patrol officers to one-year fixed beat assignments. Today, patrol officers are not only held responsible for responding to calls for service, but they are also responsible for engaging in a wide range of community policing and problem-solving activities, including working with community members and business owners within their beat area to solve crime and disorder problems. Thus, it was not surprising that the department ranked high on the patrol officer responsibilities scale (Table 4.1). On the other hand, although the Tempe Police Department has established a multitude of organizational arrangements and structures to support community policing and have programs in

---

[10] These were citizen generated calls for service and did not include the 48,067 officer-initiated calls.

place to encourage citizen participation in crime prevention and the department, the department ranked low on both of these scales. The department did rank high, however, on the department programs and practices scale, which means the department has a variety of community- and school-based programs and field operations practices established in to support community policing.

Glendale, Arizona

The City of Glendale, located on the northwest side of the greater Phoenix area, experienced a 52 percent growth rate between 1980 and 1990. By 1997, Glendale had become Arizona's fourth largest city with a population of 188,278. Today, Glendale is a diverse community in terms of socio-economics and ethnicity. It also has a diverse economic base that includes manufacturing, service, aerospace, precision metal working and casting, chemicals, and warehousing. In 1995, Luke Air Force Base, the largest jet fighter training center in the world, was annexed by Glendale and has become one of Glendale's largest employers.

The Glendale Police Department is a mid-sized organization of 238 sworn personnel and 103 civilian employees. In 1988, the Glendale Police Department implemented community policing and adopted a generalist approach to community policing. By 1989, the department's community policing efforts were structured around the decentralization of patrol activities to three patrol districts (i.e., Central, East, and West), and each is district is commanded by a district captain. By 1994, the department established Community Action Teams (CATs) to specialize in community policing and problem-solving policing; as a result, the department moved to a mixed model approach to community policing. Today, the department has five CATs, made up of a civilian crime prevention specialist and a patrol officer. CAT officers are responsible for working with neighborhood groups to set up neighborhood crime prevention

programs and engaging in problem-solving activities. Within each district, patrol officers are also encouraged to develop familiarity with community leaders, work with citizens to identify and solve crime problems, and work with detectives on crime cases. Each squad of patrol officers, under the supervision of a squad sergeant, is also expected to have at least one POP project ongoing at anytime during the year.

The Glendale Police Department ranked high on all of the community policing scales. In particular, the Glendale Police Department has established a multitude of organizational arrangements and structures to support community policing, it requires patrol officers to engage in a wide range of community policing activities, it has a variety of programs in place to encourage citizen participation in crime prevention and the police department, and it has established other community- and school-based programs and field operations practices to support community policing.

Chandler, Arizona

The City of Chandler, located in the southeast corner of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area, was a small farming town until the 1980s when it tripled in size. By 1997, Chandler was a community of approximately 133,269 residents.[11] In recent years, Chandler has experienced a successful diversification process; while its agricultural base is still important, the city is now one of the fastest growing high technology manufacturing cities.[12]

As the city of Chandler has grown, so has the Chandler Police Department; between 1996 and 1997, the Chandler Police Department nearly doubled in size from 116 to 207 full-time

---

[11] In 1999, it was estimated that the was growing at a rate of 800 to 1,000 residents a month.
[12] In 1998, more than 75 percent of Chandler's manufacturing employees were in high-tech fields, compared to the national average of 15 percent (Arizona Department of Economic Security, 1998).

sworn officers and 76 civilian personnel. In 1991, the department formally implemented community policing, did some internal restructuring, and began to tie hiring and promotions to community policing. Police administrators adopted the concept that it is necessary to use a wide range of city resources in order to strengthen neighborhoods and improve public safety and the quality of life; in an effort to do so, the department established a Community Services Division to coordinate many of the organized community policing activities. By 1996, the department had adopted a generalist approach to community policing and established 2 to 3 years fixed beat assignments for patrol officers in an effort to establish a sense of "beat integrity." Patrol activities are decentralized into 12 beats in one geographic area, which is commanded by a patrol captain. Within each beat, patrol sergeants are responsible for encouraging officers to participate in community policing and problem-solving activities, as well as attend bi-monthly beat meetings which are also attended by beat detectives and community members (Table 4.1).

On the other hand, although the Chandler Police Department has established a multitude of organizational arrangements and structures to support community policing and have programs in place to encourage citizen participation in crime prevention and the department, the department ranked low on both of these scales. The department did rank high, however, on the department programs and practices scale, which means the department has a variety of community and school-based programs and field operations practices in place to support community policing.

Peoria, Arizona

The City of Peoria, formerly an agricultural town, is also a rapidly growing suburban community in the northwest section of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. From 1980 to

1990, the city experienced a 300 percent increase in population growth. In 1997, Peoria was Arizona's ninth largest city with a population of 78,399. During the same time period, the Peoria Police Department has also experienced growth. In 1997, the department employed 76 sworn personnel and 33 civilian employees; by 1998, the department had grown to include 109 sworn officers, 49 non-sworn civilian positions, and 28 volunteers.

The Peoria Police Department has adopted a split-force approach to community policing. In 1996, the department's Neighborhood Response Unit (NRU), or Bicycle Patrol, was assigned the task of participating in community policing with the citizens and assisting with controlling crime in high crime areas. The Community Relations Unit has been tasked with many of the support functions for community policing, including conducting programs regarding crime prevention and community involvement. At the time of the study, patrol officers involvement in community policing and problem-solving activities was limited. Since the Peoria Police Department had recently implemented community policing, the department was in the early stages of implementing organizational arrangements and structures to support community policing and developing programs to encourage citizen participation in crime prevention and the department. As a result, the department ranked low on both of these scales in comparison to the other study sites. The department also ranked low on requiring patrol officers to engage in community policing; in part, this is because the department adopted a split-force approach to community policing. The department did rank high, however, on the department programs and practices scale.

Peoria has one of the lowest crime rates of the seven Phoenix metropolitan police agencies included in this chapter. In 1997, the Peoria Police Department reported a total of 198 violent crimes and 3,775 property crimes or 4,763 crimes per 100,000 population.

Gilbert, Arizona

Gilbert is a relatively new affluent community located in the southeast coroner of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Gilbert is also experiencing a rapid transition from a historically agriculture-based community to a suburb of Phoenix. During the past two decades, Gilbert has experienced a 410 percent population increase from 5,717 in 1980, to 72,626 in 1997. In 1997, Gilbert recorded 210 violent crimes and 3,300 property crimes, some of crime totals of any of the cities included in this chapter. Despite the city's growth, agriculture still plays an important role in the community.

The Gilbert Police Department is a mid-sized police agency with 71 sworn officers and 31 civilian personnel. In 1996, the department began implementing a split-force approach to community policing. The task of conducting community policing and being proactive in the business and residential communities has been assigned to the Bicycle Patrol Unit, which consists of two bicycle teams consisting of two officers each. The Gilbert Police Department is much like the Peoria Police Department, in that it recently implemented community policing and adopted a split-force approach. Thus, it was not surprising that the Gilbert Police Department ranked low on the organizational arrangements and structures scale, the citizen participation scale, and the patrol officer responsibilities scale. The department did rank high, however, on the department programs and practices scale.

FIELD TRAINING OFFICERS AS OCCUPATIONAL SOCIALIZERS

As previously stated, in an added effort to understand the socialization process of police recruits into police work, interviews were conducted with 81 field training officers from four of the participating metropolitan police agencies (i.e., Phoenix PD, Scottsdale PD, Glendale PD,

and Gilbert PD), including five Phoenix police precincts (see Table 2.3).[13] The Phoenix, Scottsdale, Glendale and Gilbert Police Departments were selected for two main reasons. For one, police administrators in each of these agencies were willing to provide me access to and time with field training officers to conduct the interviews. Two, each of these police agencies had adopted one of the three approaches to community policing. The Phoenix and Glendale Police Departments adopted a mixed approach to community policing, Scottsdale Police Department adopted a generalist approach, and the Gilbert Police Department adopted a split-force approach. This allowed me to compare the attitudes and practices of field training officers not only across sites, but also among approaches to community policing. For instance, one would assume that a police agency that has adopted a generalist approach to community policing would be more likely to integrate community policing and problem-solving policing in the field training process.

Field Training Officer Training and Experience

Across police agencies, there was variation in the number of years FTOs' reported being on the force and serving as a FTO. Table 4.2 reveals FTOs from the Scottsdale and Phoenix Police Departments tended to be less senior patrol officers (i.e., with only two to three years on the police force) and served as FTOs for two years or less. The Glendale Police Department, on the other hand, tended to use more senior officers as FTOs. These officers also tended to have more years experience as FTOs.

Across the four police agencies, training for field training officers (FTOs) varied. For instance, Scottsdale FTOs received a 40-hour block of training that included such topics as:

---

[13] The ability to interview field training officers depended solely on their willingness to be sampled.

overview of basic academy training, required areas of competency for new officers, how to document and rate a new officers progress, establishing rating consistency among FTOs on evaluation scales, policies and procedures, liability, providing feedback to officers in training, training techniques (e.g., navigator driving, role playing, and mirroring reports), and training in phases I, II, III, and IV. Gilbert FTOs also received a 40-hour block of training; however, topics were limited to how to train new officers in different techniques and philosophies, how to evaluate and rate officers in training, problem solving techniques for different scenarios, and liability.

Table 4.2. Number of Years on the Police Force and as Field Training Officer by Agency

	Phoenix PD % (n)	Scottsdale PD % (n)	Glendale PD % (n)	Gilbert PD % (n)
# years as a police officer				
2-3 years	47.2 (25)	50.0 (4)	6.7 (1)	40.0 (2)
4-5 years	13.2 (7)	37.5 (3)	----	----
6-7 years	17.0 (9)	12.5 (1)	6.7 (1)	----
8-9 years	9.4 (5)	----	----	----
10 or more years	7.5 (4)	----	46.7 (7)	40.0 (2)
Unknown	5.7 (3)	----	40.0 (6)	20.0 (1)
# years as a FTO				
Less than 1 year	43.4 (23)	87.5 (7)	----	----
1-2	35.8 (19)	12.5 (1)	33.3 (5)	----
3-4	9.4 (5)	----	6.7 (1)	40.0 (2)
5-6	1.9 (1)	----	40.0 (6)	----
7-8	3.8 (2)	----	13.3 (2)	----
9 or more years	----	----	6.7 (1)	40.0 (2)
Unknown	5.7 (3)	----	----	20.0 (1)

FTOs from the Phoenix Police Department reported receiving a 24-hour block of training that included such topics as: how to evaluate, rate, and document a new officers progress; recognizing and working with problems a new officers is having; teaching styles and techniques; personality types and dealing with personality conflicts; liability; experiences of other field training officers; department philosophy and community policing; cultural diversity; and sexual harassment. Phoenix FTOs are required to attend re-certification training every other year.

Finally, in the Glendale Police Department, some FTOs reported receiving as few as two hours of training, while others reported receiving a ten-hour block of training. FTOs who received training six years or more ago received only two-hours of training, while FTOs who received training within the past three years received a 10-hour block of training. Most all of the FTOs, however, reported there was no specific training curriculum, that the training entailed simply going over the field training manual that outlines the four phases of the field training program, how to rate and document officers' progress, and liability. Furthermore, the department has no mandatory recertification training for field training officers.

Skills Field Training Officers Emphasize During the Field Training Process

The majority of field training officers, from each of the police departments, identified officer safety and communication with the public as skills they emphasize during the field training process (see Table 4.3).[14] Other skills that FTOs from each of the police agencies commonly reported placing emphasis on, include: report writing skills, discretion and common sense, policies and procedures/rules and regulations, and flexibility and adaptability. What is interesting is that Scottsdale FTOs did not identify report writing skills as one of the skills a new officer needs to learn as part of the field training process. This, in part, may be because the

---

[14] Analysis of precinct level differences within the Phoenix Police Department revealed only 33.3% (3) of the FTOs from the Squaw Peak Precinct identified officer safety as one of the skills a new officer needs to learn during the field training process. Rather, the majority of Squaw Peak FTOs identified making sure a new officer can communicate with the public (66.7%) and has the necessary report writing skills (55.6%). Squaw Peak Precinct experiences less violent crime than some of the other precincts. South Mountain Precinct, in comparison, is considered one of the most violent Precincts and had only 16.7% (2) of the FTOs identify communication with the public as one of the skills an officer in training needs to learn; rather, officer safety, knowing policies and procedures, report writing skills and radio communication were identified more often.

Scottsdale Police Department is the only police agency in the sample that requires police recruits

to have a four-year college degree upon entering the training academy.

Table 4.3. Skills FTOs Place Emphasis on During the Field Training Process by Agency

Skills FTO Emphasize	Phoenix PD % n=53	Scottsdale PD % n=8	Glendale PD % n=15	Gilbert PD % n=5	Total %
Officer Safety	52.8	75.0	86.7	60.0	61.7
Communication with the Public	47.2	50.0	60.0	80.0	51.9
Report Writing Skills	43.4	---	20.0	20.0	33.3
Discretion/Common-Sense	20.8	12.5	20.0	60.0	22.2
Policies & Procedures/ Rules & Regulations	18.9	12.5	---	20.0	14.8
Command Presence/ Continuum of Force	17.0	---	6.7	---	12.3
Daily Patrol Routine	22.6	---	---	---	14.8
State Ordinances/Laws	3.8	37.5	13.3	---	8.6
Multi-Task Orientation	9.4	25.0	---	---	8.6
Flexibility/Adaptability	13.2	25.0	6.7	---	12.3
Community Policing	9.4	---	---	---	6.2
Radio/MDT Comm.	9.4	25.0	6.7	---	9.9
Observation Skills	5.7	---	20.0	---	7.4
Geography	---	12.5	13.3	20.0	4.9
Crime Scene/Invest. Skills	5.7	12.5	---	---	4.9
Driving Skills	9.4	---	13.3	---	8.6
Problem-Solving	5.7	---	---	40.0	6.2
Professionalism/Integrity	---	---	6.7	20.0	2.5

Interview data provides some insight into the attitudes and perceptions of field training

officers from each of the police agencies. These particular quotes were selected because the

represent some of the common responses to the question, "From your point of view, what skills

does an officer in training need to learn as part of the field training process?"

> Officer safety is the main concern. Another primary concern is the officer's attitude
> toward the public and fellow officers. We don't want someone who is belligerent or has a
> bad attitude because that type of person is just going to cause a lot of problems. So the
> main areas we look for are officer safety and officers' demeanor in dealing with people.
> (FTO, Gilbert PD)

They have to have excellent people skills . . . I think that's the primary thing because that's what you do most is deal with people. Sometimes you get people that are timid and aren't very wordy, and they have problems dealing with the public, being assertive, talking to people, and taking statements from people. They are afraid to approach people and stuff like that. (FTO, Glendale PD)

I think the major thing that officers need to be trained in is safety; whether it is [safety] for the citizen, himself, or other officers. We get allot of officers coming out of the academy that are afraid to touch anybody, afraid to put their hands on somebody and tell them they are in custody. (FTO, Phoenix PD, South Mountain Precinct)

Basically going from Joe Blow civilian and walking through life that way and molding him or her into a cop with a cop's perspective on life; because there's the civilian life and a cop's view of life, which are totally different. And if you do the cop job with a civilian point of view you're gonna either get hurt or you're going to get somebody else hurt, or you're going to get sued. The biggest part is teaching a person to be a cop. (FTO, Scottsdale PD)

Phoenix FTOs, in particular, reported placing emphasis on teaching police recruits a daily

patrol routine and how to establish and maintain a command presence by following the

continuum of force. As two South Mountain FTOs explained,

I think another part would be to just learn their area, learn what it's like to drive up and down streets and see between houses. Some officers will just drive down a street and say, "I patrolled that area;" when in reality they didn't look between houses to see if people were walking around. So safety, getting to know their area, and just be willing to give full force on assistance . . . Just keeping your distance from subjects when you are talking to them. Don't put yourself in a situation while off-duty that a normal person would not want to be put in, even if you are eating with your family and the restaurant gets held up. I emphasize to these guys, don't get involved unless somebody's life is in danger and you need to take part. (FTO, Phoenix PD, South Mountain Precinct)

People skills . . . I'm not talking about always being nice to people, but treating them as they treat you and keeping it on that respectful level. If they disrespect you, once they talk shit to you, then you got to deal with them in the same manner or one step above. Because that's how they respect you out there on the street. If you, yes sir, no sir them to death, they don't want to hear that, they want to deal with someone who knows what it's like on the street, not someone who comes from a college background, and in my opinion, doesn't have street smarts. (FTO, Phoenix PD, South Mountain Precinct)

Inclusion of COP and PSP into the Field Training Process

When FTOs were asked to identify the skills they place emphasis on during the field training process, only five Phoenix FTOs reported emphasizing community policing (Table 4.4); however, when FTOs were specifically asked if community policing is integrated into the field training process, the majority of FTOs from the Scottsdale, Glendale, and Phoenix Police Departments stated "yes" (see Table 4.4). On the other hand, when FTOs were asked if they emphasize problem-oriented policing during field training process, the majority of FTOs from the Scottsdale and the Glendale Police Departments stated "yes." This finding is largely based upon the fact that both the Scottsdale and Glendale Police Departments require patrol officers to engage in community policing and work on formal problem-solving projects.

Table 4.4. Inclusion of COP and PSP into the Field Training Process by Agency

	Phoenix PD % n=53	Scottsdale PD % n=8	Glendale PD % n=15	Gilbert PD % n=5
Include COP				
Yes	87.5	66.6	40.0	67.9
No	12.5	26.6	60.0	22.6
Include PSP				
Yes	87.5	80.0	20.0	26.4
No	12.5	37.5	80.0	60.4

Several FTOs explained how they attempt to integrate community policing and problem-oriented policing into the field training process.

> We explain to them how problem-oriented policing works and how we make contacts with the community. Now each beat will have three or four specific problems that patrol officers assigned to that beat area will work on, so it will be easy to train on because the problems are listed and every day you have that list when you're training . . . then if you get dispatched on calls concerning the beat goal, you document those and you log it on your daily. (FTO, Scottsdale PD)

> What I try and do is show him the things that I'm doing as part of my beat goals or community policing goals, and some of the projects that I'm working on. I don't try to have him or her do those things, but just start getting them thinking about things that they can do when they're on their own. (FTO, Scottsdale PD).

It's my specialty . . . I've been doing POP Projects since they began, and I get them [the new recruit] involved in what I'm doing. Every time I have a trainee I start a POP Project. That way they can get it from the beginning, and hopefully through to the end. I get them involved in it so they know the inner workings of how to do it when they get out on their own, and hopefully they will go out and find their own. (FTO, Glendale PD)

FTOs from the Gilbert and Phoenix Police Departments do not require patrol officers to work on formal problem-solving projects; thus it was not surprising that the majority of FTOs from these two agencies reported they do not integrate problem-solving policing into the field training process.

Interview data revealed that FTOs who did not integrate community policing or problem-solving policing into the field training process maintained there is no community policing or problem-solving section in the field training manual and new officers to learn tactical and technical skills during the 12 to 14 week field training process, such as officer safety, command presence, and how to communicate with the public. These FTOs asserted new officers could learn the specialized aspects of police work, such as community policing and problem-solving policing, after they learn the basics of police work.

Skills New Police Recruits Are Lacking

Finally, FTOs were asked to identify the skills new officers are lacking when they arrive in the police agency after completing the basic training academy. Table 4.5 reveals that the majority of FTOs from the Scottsdale PD and Gilbert PD identified streetwise/life experience as lacking in new officers. In comparison, the majority (43.4%) of Phoenix FTOs identified report writing skills as lacking in new officers. Glendale FTOs did not identify any one specific skill as lacking in new officers; rather they identified arrest tactics/firearms skills, communication skills, and maturity and subordination as lacking.

Table 4.5. Skills New Officers are Lacking by Agency

Skills Officers are Lacking	Phoenix PD % n=53	Scottsdale PD % n=8	Glendale PD % n=15	Gilbert PD % n=5
Streetwise/Life Experience	11.3	100.0	6.7	100.0 (5)
Report Writing Skills	43.4	---	13.3	---
Arrest Tactics/Firearms Skills	11.3	---	---	---
Communication Skills	7.5	---	13.3	---
Radio Codes/Radio Communication Skills	5.7	---	---	---
Self Confidence	1.9	---	6.7	---
DUI/Breath Tests	3.8	---	---	---
Knowledge of the City	3.8	---	---	---
Maturity/Subordination	3.8	---	13.3	---
Knowledge of Policies & Procedures	1.9	---	---	---
Investigation Skills	1.9	---	---	---
Ticket Writing Skills	1.9	---	---	---
Problem-Solving Abilities	1.9	---	---	---
Knowledge of COP	1.9	---	---	---
Observation Skills	1.9	---	---	---
Ability to Pace Self	---	12.5	---	---
Motivation	---	---	6.7	---
No One Area	---	50.0	---	---

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCES ACROSS POLICE AGENCIES

IN POLICE RECRUITS ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS

So far as the organizational work environment of police agencies differs and agencies adopt different approaches to community policing, the assumption is police agencies will recruit different types of individuals into their agency and once in the agency police recruits' experiences will differ from those in other police agencies. The basic strategy used to assess differences in police recruits' attitudes and beliefs across the seven police agencies was to examine differences in average summated scores for each of the scales across police agencies at Time 1, Time 2, Time 3, and Time 4. I was interested in first determining if there were significant differences across the seven police agencies in the attitudes and beliefs of police recruits' that were hired and entered the training academy (Time 1, baseline). Next, I was

interested in determining if police recruits were able to sustain those differences during the 16-week training academy (Time 2). Than, I was interested in determining if there were any significant differences across the seven police agencies in regards to changes in recruits' attitudes and beliefs after they completed their field training process (Time 3), and then completed their one-year probationary period (Time 4).

Table 4.6 reveals there were significant differences across police agencies in mean values at Time 1, Time 3, and Time 4.[15] At Time 1, significant differences emerged in only two of the scales: working with others and ability to assess the needs of diverse groups. In other words, upon entering the training academy (Time 1), police recruits from the seven police agencies held significantly different attitudes or beliefs related to the degree to which they perceive police work requires them to work and cooperate with others. In particular, police recruits hired by the Peoria, Scottsdale, Phoenix and Chandler Police Departments were significantly more likely, at Time 1, to feel that police work requires officers to work with and cooperate with each other, than recruits hired by the Tempe or Glendale Police Departments.[16] In addition, at Time 1, police recruits hired by the Peoria, Phoenix, and Scottsdale Police Departments maintained they were significantly more capable of assessing the needs of citizens from different groups (e.g., gender, age, sexual orientation, socio-economic status), than did officers from the Glendale and Chandler Police Departments.

At Time 2, no significant differences in mean values emerged across police agencies on any of the scales; thus, revealing that any significant differences that existed at Time 1 dissipated

---

[15] While all of the scales were compared by agency, only those scales that revealed significant differences across the seven police agencies are presented in the table due to lack of space.

[16] Once I determined that differences exist among the means, to determine which means differ a pairwise multiple comparison was made using the least significant difference (LSD).

during the course of the 16-week basic training academy. Once police recruits left the training academy, however, and entered into their respective police agencies where they were exposed to different field training experiences, different work environments, and different approaches to community policing numerous significant differences emerged across police agencies (Table 4.6). In fact, at Time 3, there were significant differences across police agencies on six of the scales. In regards to the job autonomy scale, at the end of the field training process, police recruits working in the Gilbert, Tempe and Scottsdale Police Departments were significantly more likely to believe their job affords them discretion and independence, than police recruits working in the Phoenix and Peoria Police Department.

Table 4.6. Scale Means by Agency With Comparisons

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Job Autonomy				
Phoenix PD	13.74	15.58	15.32	15.55
Scottsdale PD	13.96	15.81	16.61	17.00
Tempe PD	14.64	16.91	16.36	15.09
Glendale PD	13.40	14.54	15.92	16.50
Chandler PD	13.43	16.00	15.62	16.25
Gilbert PD	15.00	17.29	17.14	17.29
Peoria PD	13.50	15.67	14.33	14.83
Overall F-Test	.62	1.72	2.78**	2.53**
Work with Others				
Phoenix PD	8.99	8.84	8.56	8.46
Scottsdale PD	9.00	9.10	8.78	9.00
Tempe PD	7.82	8.36	9.09	8.45
Glendale PD	8.33	8.69	8.62	8.70
Chandler PD	8.93	9.15	9.23	8.58
Gilbert PD	8.75	9.00	8.71	8.14
Peoria PD	9.17	9.00	8.33	8.67
Overall F-test	3.11*	.85	1.56	.76

Table 4.6, cont.

Job Involvement				
Phoenix PD	12.42	12.90	12.53	12.73
Scottsdale PD	12.74	12.67	13.11	13.19
Tempe PD	12.45	12.55	12.55	12.18
Glendale PD	12.60	12.54	12.54	12.60
Chandler PD	12.50	12.46	11.62	12.64
Gilbert PD	12.75	13.71	14.29	13.71
Peoria PD	12.33	13.17	12.67	12.50
Overall F-test	.18	.84	2.33**	1.08
Receptivity to Change				
Phoenix PD	22.29	21.94	21.45	21.53
Scottsdale PD	22.70	23.19	23.17	23.19
Tempe PD	22.36	22.73	21.36	22.91
Glendale PD	21.47	21.92	21.92	20.80
Chandler PD	23.71	22.54	21.54	22.45
Gilbert PD	22.38	22.71	23.57	22.71
Peoria PD	23.00	23.33	22.50	22.83
Overall F-test	1.07	1.18	2.29**	2.21**
Organizational Satisfaction				
Phoenix PD	16.45	16.32	16.07	15.18
Scottsdale PD	17.39	17.05	17.44	15.25
Tempe PD	16.55	15.00	14.91	13.45
Glendale PD	16.20	15.85	15.23	15.40
Chandler PD	17.21	15.69	16.08	15.42
Gilbert PD	15.5	16.71	15.29	14.86
Peoria PD	17.50	16.00	15.67	13.33
Overall F-test	1.67	1.62	2.90*	1.37
Patrol Responsive to Comm.				
Phoenix PD	34.53	35.04	34.78	34.09
Scottsdale PD	34.13	35.88	36.61	36.00
Tempe PD	34.09	33.18	37.36	34.82
Glendale PD	33.67	34.31	34.85	34.50
Chandler PD	33.00	34.38	34.69	34.17
Gilbert PD	36.88	37.86	38.00	34.86
Peoria PD	35.00	34.83	32.83	33.67
Overall F-test	.68	1.30	3.08*	.82
Orientation to Problem-Solving				
Phoenix PD	35.69	35.66	35.32	34.71
Scottsdale PD	35.39	37.17	38.06	36.63
Tempe PD	34.82	34.36	35.39	34.64
Glendale PD	33.80	36.08	37.31	36.90
Chandler PD	36.54	35.27	34.46	36.58
Gilbert PD	34.25	35.86	35.43	35.71
Peoria PD	35.56	35.67	33.17	35.17
Overall F-test	.98	.72	2.67**	1.41

105

Table 4.6, cont.

Ability to Assess Needs of Diverse Groups				
Phoenix PD	20.17	21.34	20.81	20.96
Scottsdale PD	19.48	21.14	20.50	22.45
Tempe PD	18.70	19.73	20.18	18.55
Glendale PD	16.80	19.77	20.00	21.00
Chandler PD	17.64	21.31	18.69	20.17
Gilbert PD	19.75	22.71	23.57	21.43
Peoria PD	21.83	20.17	21.00	19.33
Overall F-test	3.19*	.94	2.10	1.33
Ability to Assess Needs of Culturally Diverse Groups				
Phoenix PD	14.57	15.47	14.85	15.23
Scottsdale PD	13.57	15.10	14.67	14.50
Tempe PD	14.09	14.00	14.00	13.27
Glendale PD	13.65	14.77	14.62	15.40
Chandler PD	13.16	14.77	14.67	14.92
Gilbert PD	13.63	16.29	16.43	16.00
Peoria PD	14.17	15.33	15.17	15.17
Overall F-test	1.94	1.57	1.41	2.26**

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

With respect to the job involvement scale, police recruits working in the Gilbert Police Department were significantly more likely to like/enjoy police work at Time 3, than police recruits working in the Phoenix, Tempe, Glendale or Chandler Police Departments. In addition, Scottsdale police recruits were more likely to like/enjoy police work, than Chandler police recruits. In regards to the receptivity to change scale, police recruits working in the Scottsdale and Gilbert Police Departments were significantly more likely to look forward to changes at work and trying out new ideas/approaches, than police recruits working in the Phoenix Police Department. In addition, at Time 3, Scottsdale police recruits were significantly more likely to express satisfaction with working in their police agency/department, than police recruits working in any of the other six police agencies. Tempe police recruits, on the other hand, expressed the lowest levels of satisfaction with the organization.

In regards to evaluating patrol responsiveness to the community, at Time 3, police recruits working in the Gilbert, Tempe and Scottsdale Police Department were significantly more

likely to maintain that patrol engages in activities and provides services that are in keeping with the philosophies and strategies of community policing, than police recruits working in the Phoenix, Glendale, Chandler or Peoria Police Departments.

Finally, with respect to orientation to problem-solving policing, at Time 3, police recruits working in the Scottsdale and Glendale Police Departments were significantly more likely to express an orientation to problem-solving policing, than police recruits working in the Phoenix, Chandler and Peoria Police Departments. This finding is probably largely based upon the earlier finding that field training officers from both the Scottsdale and Glendale Police Departments reported integrating problem-solving policing into the field training process; mainly through working on beat projects with officers in training.

At Time 4, there were significant differences across police agencies in mean values on only three of the scales: job autonomy, receptivity to change, and ability to assess the needs of cultural diverse groups. Many of the significant differences across police agencies that emerged at Time 3 appear to have dissipated between the time police recruits completed the field training process and the end of their one-year probationary period (Time 4). In particular, in regards to the job autonomy scale, police recruits working in the Gilbert and Scottsdale Police Departments were significantly more likely to believe their job affords them discretion and independence, than police recruits working in the other five police agencies. In fact, police recruits working in the Peoria and Phoenix Police Departments were least likely to main their job affords them discretion and independence. With respect to the receptivity to change scale, at Time 4, police recruits working in the Scottsdale Police Department were significantly more likely to look forward to changes at work and trying out new ideas/approaches, than police recruits working in the Glendale and Phoenix Police Departments.

Finally, at Time 4, police recruits working in the Phoenix, Gilbert, and Glendale Police Departments were more likely to maintain they feel capable of assessing the needs of citizens from different race and ethnic groups, than police recruits working in the Tempe Police Department.

PREDICTORS OF CHANGE IN POLICE RECRUITS' ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS DURING THEIR FIRST YEAR ON THE JOB

The next step in the analysis was to single out the individual characteristics and organizational environment facts that predict the change in police recruits' attitudes and beliefs during their first year on the job, specifically for officers working in the seven case study police organizations. These analyses are limited to only the community policing-related scales and problem-solving knowledge and skill scales, focusing only on change from Time 2 to Time 3 (Model 1) and change from Time 2 to Time 4 (Model 2).

The regression analysis in this chapter include many of the same independent variables or predictors that were included in regression analyses presented in Chapter 3; however, the analyses in this chapter includes some additional variables or predictors. The metrics for the additional independent variables or predictors are described below.

COP Approach. The community policing approach a police agency adopted were grouped into one of three categories (*generalist approach, mixed model, and split force approach)* and treated as an indicator variable. The *generalist approach* serves as the reference or excluded category for the other three categories.

Precinct. The precinct to which Phoenix police recruits were assigned at Time 3 and Time 4 were grouped into one of six different categories (*South Mountain Precinct, Central City Precinct, Desert Horizon Precinct, Squaw Peak Precinct, Maryvale Precinct, and Cactus Park*

Precinct) and treated as an indicator variable. These categories serve as referents for several police organizational characteristics such as workload, calls for service, and opportunities to engage in community policing. The reference/excluded category was coded 0, and the included category was coded 1

Regression Analysis: Change in Support for Community Policing. Table 4.7 provides the results of the regression analysis for the change in police recruits' support for community policing during their first year on the job. As revealed in Table 3.2, once police recruits left the training academy, there was a significant decrease in their support for community policing from Time 2 to Time 3, as well as from Time 2 to Time 4. According to Model 1, the strongest predictor of change for police recruits working in the Phoenix Police Department, is the precinct a recruit is assigned to upon graduation from the training academy. In particular, police recruits assigned to the South Mountain, Central City, Desert Horizon, Squaw Peak and Cactus Park Precincts are more likely to report a decrease in support for community policing from the end of academy training (Time 2) to end of field training (Time 3). On the other hand, police recruits assigned to the Maryvale Precinct were not as likely to report a decrease in support for community policing from Time 2 to Time 3; this, in part, may be due to the fact that, at the time of the study, police recruits who were assigned to the Maryvale Precinct for their field training were required to spend one week of their field training program with a community policing specialist or CAO. This finding may be evidence that formally and systematically integrating community policing training into the field training process is key to sustaining and possibly increasing the positive impact academy training has on police recruits' support for community policing.

Table 4.7. Regression of Change in Support for Community Policing

	Model 1 (Change Time 2 to Time 3)		Model 2 (Change Time 2 to Time 4)	
	b	Beta	b	Beta
Constant	-.54		3.74	
Age	-.02	-.03	-.01	-.02
Education (1=Bachelors Degree)	.13	.55	-.15	-.02
Anglo (1=yes)	-.37	-.04	-1.89	-.19**
Sex (1=male)	.52	.04	.91	.07
Prior Law Enf. Experience (1=yes)	-.12	-.01	.94	.09
Prior Military Experience (1=yes)	.13	.02	-.53	-.06
Baseline Level	-.04	-.04	-.05	-.05
COP Approach: Mixed Model	-1.24	-.09	-2.77	-.09
COP Approach: Split-Force	.87	.04	-11.30	-.21
COP Rank: Org. Arrangements	6.65	.34**	.49	.01
COP Rank: Citizen Participation	-3.80	-.21	-1.57	-.04
2nd Shift	-1.05	-.11	-.44	-.05
3rd Shift	-.48	-.04	.26	.03
Other Shifts	1.67	.07	-.43	-.01
Coworker Support for COP	---	---	-.15	-.19
Coworker Support for Trad. Policing	---	---	.78	.30*
South Mountain Precinct	6.36	.64**	1.42	.13
Central City Precinct	6.69	.64**	2.17	.17
Desert Horizon Precinct	5.36	.53**	.95	.09
Squaw Peak Precinct	5.90	.57**	---	---
Maryvale Precinct	5.25	.54	.14	.01
Cactus Park Precinct	6.84	.65**	.54	.05
R^2 Adjusted	-.02		-.02	

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

Another predictor of change in Model 1, which applies to each of the seven police agencies, is a police organizations ranking on the organizational arrangements and structures scale. Police recruits working in a police department that ranked high on the organizational arrangements and structures scale were more likely to report a decrease in support for community policing from Time 2 to Time 3. Table 4.1 reveals the Glendale Police Department was the only police agency that ranked high on the organizational arrangements and structures scale; thus, police recruits working in the Glendale Police Department are probably more likely to report a decrease in support for community policing from Time 2 to Time 3.

Model 2 reveals the strongest predictor of change or decrease in support for community policing from end of academy training (Time 2) to end of one-year probationary period (Time 4) is coworker support for traditional policing. Police recruits working in an organization or environment where coworkers support the allocation of agency resources to activities and services in keeping with traditional policing were more likely to report a decrease in support for community policing from Time 2 to Time 4. This finding supports the assumption that the attitudes and beliefs of more experienced and veteran officers is a powerful influence in the police organization, and plays a role in shaping the attitudes and beliefs of new officers.

An officers' race/ethnicity also emerged as a weak predictor of change in police recruits support for community policing. In particular, nonAnglo or racial/ethnic minority police recruits were more likely to report a decrease in support for community policing from Time 2 to Time 4. In other words, minority officers may express more support for community policing upon entering police work, however, are more likely to report a decrease their support for community policing within their first on the job as they are exposed to more experienced and veteran officers and as they attempt to integrate into a predominately Anglo dominated organization. This hypothesis is based upon prior research (Alex, 1969; Felkenes and Schroedel, 1993; Fielding, 1988; Haarr, 1997; Martin, 1980, 1990, 1994) that has found the police occupational culture is a resource more fully available to some groups in the organization than to others; diverse groups such as women, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians are typically not welcomed into the informal policing culture. In particular, minority officers are more likely to report feeling of isolation and social distancing, than white officers (Buzawa, 1981; Haarr, 1997; Martin, 1994).

Regression Analysis: Change in Support for Traditional Policing. Table 4.8 provides the results of the regression analysis for the change in police recruits' support for traditional policing

during their first year on the job. According to Table 3.2, the mean value score for support for traditional policing significantly increased from Time 1 to Time 2, and than remained stable or did not change Time 2 to Time 3. A closer look at the mean value score changes across police agencies revealed, however, that police recruits working in the Phoenix, Gilbert and Peoria Police Department reported a slight decrease in their support for traditional policing from Time 2 to Time 3, while police recruits working in the Scottsdale, Tempe, Chandler, and Glendale Police Departments reported a slight increase on this scale. According to Model 1, police recruits assigned to 2nd and 3rd shifts at Time 3 were more likely to maintain their support for traditional policing, than officers working 1st shift.

According to Table 3.2, from Time 2 to Time 4, the mean value score on the support for traditional policing scale slightly decreased. Again a closer look at the mean value scores across police agencies revealed that police recruits working in the Phoenix, Gilbert, Tempe and Peoria Police Department report a slight decrease in support for traditional policing from Time 2 to Time 4, while police recruits from the Scottsdale, Chandler and Glendale Police Departments reported a slight increase. Model 2 reveals that the strongest predictor of this change is coworker support for traditional policing. In other words, police recruits working in an organization or environment where coworkers support allocating agency resources to activities and services in keeping with traditional policing were less likely to decrease their support for traditional policing from Time 2 to Time 4. Thus, one can conclude that the Scottsdale, Chandler and Glendale Police Department must have a significant number of more experienced and veteran officers that support traditional policing, and possibly resist community policing practices and activities.

According to Model 2, another predictor of change for police recruits working in the Phoenix Police Department, is the precinct a recruit is assigned to during their first year on the

job. In particular, police recruits assigned to the Desert Horizon Precinct were less likely to report a decrease in support for traditional policing from Time 2 to Time 4.

Table 4.8. Regression of Change in Support for Traditional Policing

| | Model 1 (Change Time 2 to Time 3) | | Model 2 (Change Time 2 to Time 4) | |
	b	Beta	b	Beta
Constant	1.66		3.23	
Age	-.03	-.01	-.03	-.10
Education (1=Bachelors Degree)	-.12	-.04	-.07	-.00
Anglo (1=yes)	-.39	-.11	-.17	-.04
Sex (1=male)	.36	.08	.34	.06
Prior Law Enf. Experience (1=yes)	-.11	-.03	-.38	-.10
Prior Military Experience (1=yes)	-.13	-.04	-.33	-.10
Baseline Level	-.05	-.05	-.04	-.04
COP Approach: Mixed Model	.79	.14	1.23	.10
COP Approach: Split-Force	-.65	-.07	-2.75	-.13
COP Rank: Org. Arrangements	.06	.01	-1.11	-.05
COP Rank: Citizen Participation	-.50	-.07	-3.25	-.22
2nd Shift	-1.25	-.33*	.20	.06
3rd Shift	-1.27	-.25**	.27	.08
Other Shifts	-.10	-.01	-1.99	-.01
Coworker Support for COP	---	---	.04	.15
Coworker Support for Trad. Policing	---	---	-.29	-.28*
South Mountain Precinct	.08	.02	-.28	-.06
Central City Precinct	.51	.12	.26	.05
Desert Horizon Precinct	-.19	-.05	-1.03	-.24**
Squaw Peak Precinct	-.31	-.07	-.38	-.09
Maryvale Precinct	.11	.03	.17	.04
Cactus Park Precinct	-.04	-.01	---	---
R^2 Adjusted	.01		.05	

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

Regression Analysis: Change in Orientation to Community Policing. Table 4.9 provides the results of the regression analysis for the change in orientation to community policing scale. After a significant increase in police recruits orientation to community policing while at the training academy, the mean value score for orientation to community policing significantly decreased from Time 2 to Time 3 (Table 3.2). Model 1 reveals the strongest predictor of the decrease in orientation to community policing from Time 2 to Time 3 is "other" shifts. Police

recruits assigned to shifts other than 1st, 2nd or 3rd shifts were more likely to report a decrease in orientation to community policing. A weak predictor of change that emerged in this model is the baseline level of orientation to community policing at Time 1. Police recruits that reported an orientation to community policing at Time 1 were less likely to report a decrease in orientation to community policing from Time 2 to Time 3.

Table 4.9. Regression of Change in Orientation to Community Policing

	Model 1 (Change Time 2 to Time 3)		Model 2 (Change Time 2 to Time 4)	
	b	Beta	b	Beta
Constant	-.56		4.50	
Age	.07	.11	.12	.18**
Education (1=Bachelors Degree)	.28	.04	-.36	-.05
Anglo (1=yes)	-.57	.07	-.91	-.11
Sex (1=male)	.08	.01	.99	.09
Prior Law Enf. Experience (1=yes)	-.40	-.05	.11	.01
Prior Military Experience (1=yes)	.13	.02	.12	.02
Baseline Level	-.17	-.14**	-.22	-.18**
COP Approach: Mixed Model	2.03	.15	1.75	.07
COP Approach: Split-Force	-1.70	-.07	-5.60	-.12
COP Rank: Org. Arrangements	1.62	.09	5.02	.11
COP Rank: Citizen Participation	-1.29	-.07	-5.55	-.17
2nd Shift	1.58	.17	1.76	.24**
3rd Shift	1.91	.16	.99	.14
Other Shifts	5.78	.25*	-6.35	-.14
Coworker Support for COP	---	---	-.03	-.05
Coworker Support for Trad. Policing	---	---	-.49	-.23**
South Mountain Precinct	.44	.05	1.66	.18
Central City Precinct	.58	.06	.88	.08
Desert Horizon Precinct	1.54	.16	1.45	.16
Squaw Peak Precinct	1.94	.20	.88	.10
Maryvale Precinct	2.11	.23	.92	.09
Cactus Park Precinct	.50	.51	---	---
R² Adjusted	.04		.02	

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

From Time 2 to Time 4, the mean value score for the orientation to community policing scale significantly decreased (Table 3.2). Model 2 reveals that the strongest predictors of the decrease in mean value scores on the orientation to community policing scale are coworker

support for traditional policing and 2nd shift. Police recruits working in an organization or environment where coworkers were supportive of the allocation of resources to services and activities in keeping with traditional policing were less likely to report a decrease in orientation to community policing from Time 2 to Time 4. This could possibly mean that early on in a police recruits career they may attempt to resist some of the attitudes and perspectives of more senior officers when it comes to issues of police reform. In regards to shift, police recruits assigned to 2nd shift at Time 4 were more likely to report a decrease in orientation to community policing from Time 2 to Time 4, than recruits assigned to 1st shift.

Two other predictors of the decrease in orientation to community policing were age and baseline level orientation to community policing. As the age of a police recruit increases they are more likely to report a decrease in orientation to community policing from Time 2 to Time 4. Also, police recruits that expressed an orientation to community policing at Time 1, were less likely to report a decrease in orientation to community policing at Time 4.

Regression Analysis: Change in Attitudes Toward Police-Public Relations. Table 4.10 provides the results of the regression analysis for the change in attitudes toward police-public relations. Table 3.2 revealed a significant increase in mean value scores on the police-public relations scale that from Time 2 to Time 3. A closer look at the mean value score differences by agency, however, reveal that police recruits from only the Phoenix and Gilbert Police Department reported an increase on the police-public relations scale from Time 2 to Time 3, while police recruits from the Scottsdale, Tempe, Chandler, Glendale and Peoria Police Departments reported a decrease.

According to Model 1, baseline level attitudes toward police-public relations are a predictor of this change in mean value scores. In other words, police recruits who expressed

negative perceptions of police-public relations at Time 2 were more likely to report more positive perceptions of police-public relations at Time 3.

Table 4.10. Regression of Change in Attitudes Toward Police-Public Relations

	Model 1 (Change Time 2 to Time 3)		Model 2 (Change Time 2 to Time 4)	
	b	Beta	b	Beta
Constant	2.93		11.68**	
Age	.04	.06	.01	.02
Education (1=Bachelors Degree)	.35	.05	.30	.04
Anglo (1=yes)	-.30	-.04	-1.21	-.13
Sex (1=male)	-.15	-.01	1.20	.10
Prior Law Enf. Experience (1=yes)	1.06	.13	1.55	.17**
Prior Military Experience (1=yes)	-.77	-.11	-.34	-.04
Baseline Level	-.17	-.16**	-.26	-.21*
COP Approach: Mixed Model	-.92	-.07	-4.55	-.16
COP Approach: Split-Force	.30	.01	-6.81	-.14
COP Rank: Org. Arrangements	-.27	-.02	1.56	.03
COP Rank: Citizen Participation	1.63	.09	-.14	-.00
2nd Shift	-.16	-.02	-.39	-.05
3rd Shift	-.14	-.01	-1.30	-.17
Other Shifts	-2.49	-.11	-4.22	-.09
Coworker Support for COP	---	---	-.01	-.01
Coworker Support for Trad. Policing	---	---	-.07	-.03
South Mountain Precinct	-1.25	-.13	-2.75	-.28*
Central City Precinct	-.46	-.05	-.31	-.03
Desert Horizon Precinct	1.13	.12	.81	.08
Squaw Peak Precinct	.34	.04	-.76	-.08
Maryvale Precinct	-.55	-.06	-3.07	-.28*
Cactus Park Precinct	1.29	.13	---	---
R^2 Adjusted	.04		.15*	

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

According to Table 3.2, from Time 2 to Time 4, there was again a significant increase in the mean value score on the police-public relations scale. However, among the seven police agencies included in this analysis, only police recruits from the Glendale Police Department reported an increase in the mean value score on the police-public relations scale from Time 2 to Time 4. Police recruits from the other six police agencies reported a decrease. According to Model 2, for police recruits working in the Phoenix Police Department, the strongest predictor of

this change is precinct. In particular, police recruits assigned to the South Mountain and Maryvale Precincts were less likely to report an increase in police-public relations. I can assume that this finding has to do with the work cultures that exist within these two precincts and the attitudes and beliefs of more experienced and veteran officers toward police-public relations. Both of these precincts are high crime precincts, composed of predominantly minority and lower- and working-class neighborhoods. Two other predictors of change in Model 2, that apply to each of the seven police agencies, are baseline level attitudes toward police-public relations and prior law enforcement experience. Police recruits with prior law enforcement experience were more likely to report an increase in attitudes toward police-public relations from Time 2 to Time 4.

Regression Analysis: Change in Orientation to Problem-Solving Policing. Table 4.11 provides the results of the regression analysis for the change over time in the problem-solving capability scale. After a significant increase in orientation to problem-solving policing while at the training academy, according to Table 3.2 the mean value score on the orientation to problem-solving policing scale slightly decreased from Time 2 to Time 3, however, the decrease was not significant. A closer look at the data, however, reveals differences among the police agencies. Although police recruits working in the Phoenix, Gilbert, Chandler and Peoria Police Departments reported a decrease in orientation to problem-solving policing from Time 2 to Time 3, police recruits working in the Scottsdale, Tempe, and Glendale Police Departments report an increase in orientation to problem-solving policing. According to Model 1, 3rd shift is the strongest predictor of the change. Police recruits assigned to 3rd shift were less likely to report a decrease in orientation to problem-solving policing, than officers assigned to 1st shift.

Table 4.11. Regression of Change in Orientation to Problem-Solving Policing

	Model 1 (Change Time 2 to Time 3)		Model 2 (Change Time 2 to Time 4)	
	b	Beta	b	Beta
Constant	7.55**		13.40**	
Age	-.01	-.02	-.05	-.07
Education (1=Bachelors Degree)	-.52	-.07	-.61	-.07
Anglo (1=yes)	-.40	-.05	-1.70	-.17**
Sex (1=male)	-.26	-.02	-.77	-.06
Prior Law Enf. Experience (1=yes)	.62	.07	1.99	.20**
Prior Military Experience (1=yes)	.04	.01	1.09	.13
Baseline Level	-.12	-.13	-.30	-.26*
COP Approach: Mixed Model	.09	.01	-3.71	-.12
COP Approach: Split-Force	-3.62	-.15	3.52	.01
COP Rank: Org. Arrangements	.68	.04	2.95	.06
COP Rank: Citizen Participation	-1.12	-.06	.37	.01
2nd Shift	-1.60	-.17	2.25	.26**
3rd Shift	-2.73	-.22**	1.91	.23**
Other Shifts	.30	.01	-.32	-.01
Coworker Support for COP	---	---	.01	.01
Coworker Support for Trad. Policing	---	---	-.34	-.13
South Mountain Precinct	-.91	-.09	.66	.06
Central City Precinct	.69	.07	1.72	.13
Desert Horizon Precinct	-.28	-.03	.92	.09
Squaw Peak Precinct	.61	.06	1.04	.10
Maryvale Precinct	.46	.05	.63	.05
Cactus Park Precinct	-.51	-.05	---	---
R^2 Adjusted	-.00		.11*	

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

Again, according to Table 3.2, there was a significant decrease in the mean value score on the orientation to problem-solving policing scale from Time 2 to Time 4. This time a comparison across police agencies reveals that police recruits working in the Tempe, Chandler, and Glendale Police Department reported an increase in orientation to problem-solving policing from Time 2 to Time 4; while police recruits working in the Phoenix, Scottsdale, Gilbert and Peoria Police Departments reported a decrease. According to Model 2, there are numerous predictors of this change. For one, police recruits assigned to 2nd and 3rd shifts at Time 4 were more likely to report a decrease in orientation to problem-solving policing from Time 2 to Time

4. Two, nonAnglo or racial/ethnic minority police recruits were more likely than Anglo police recruits to report a decrease in orientation to problem-solving policing from Time 2 to Time 4. In addition, police recruits who did not report a strong orientation to problem-solving policing at Time 1 were more likely to report a decrease in orientation to problem-solving policing from Time 2 to Time 4. And finally, police recruits were prior law enforcement experience were less likely to report a decrease in orientation to problem-solving policing from Time 2 to Time 4.

Regression Analysis: Change in Problem-Solving Capability. Table 4.12 provides the results of the regression analysis for the change in the problem-solving capability scale during the first year on the job. Table 3.2 revealed that after a significant increase in the mean value score on the problem-solving capability scale from Time 1 to Time 2, there was a significant decrease in mean value scores on this scale from Time 2 to Time 3. Further analysis revealed, however, variation across the seven police agencies. In particular, police recruits working in the Gilbert, Tempe and Glendale Police Departments reported an increase in problem-solving capabilities from Time 2 to Time 3; while police recruits from the Phoenix, Scottsdale, Chandler and Peoria Police Departments reported a decrease in problem-solving capabilities. According to Model 1, the strongest predictor of this change is "other" shifts. In other words, police recruits assigned to other shifts (i.e., other than 1st, 2nd, or 3rd shifts) were more likely to report a decrease in their problem-solving capabilities at Time 3.

From Time 2 to Time 4, there was a slight, yet insignificant decrease in the mean value score on the problem-solving capability scale for the full sample. However, in the seven police agencies examined here, only police recruits from the Phoenix and Chandler Police Departments reported a decrease in problem-solving capabilities; while police recruits working in the Scottsdale, Gilbert, Tempe, Chandler, Glendale, and Peoria Police Departments reported an

increase in problem-solving capabilities. According to Model 2, the only predictor of this change was race/ethnicity. In other words, nonAnglo or racial/ethnic minority recruits were more likely than Anglo recruits to report that they did not feel as qualified to engage in problem-solving activities related to the S.A.R.A. Model at Time 4 versus Time 2.

Table 4.12. Regression of Change in Problem-Solving Capability

	Model 1 (Change Time 2 to Time 3)		Model 2 (Change Time 2 to Time 4)	
	b	Beta	b	Beta
Constant	-.12		-4.48	
Age	-.02	-.07	-.01	-.01
Education (1=Bachelors Degree)	-.01	-.00	.30	.06
Anglo (1=yes)	-.14	-.03	-.99	-.17**
Sex (1=male)	.50	.08	-.77	-.10
Prior Law Enf. Experience (1=yes)	.07	.02	-.01	-.00
Prior Military Experience (1=yes)	.20	.05	.28	.06
Baseline Level	.01	.01	-.10	.11
COP Approach: Mixed Model	-1.44	-.20	-.02	-.00
COP Approach: Split-Force	-1.95	-.15	-1.21	-.04
COP Rank: Org. Arrangements	2.53	.25	-4.50	-.15
COP Rank: Citizen Participation	-.60	-.06	4.15	.19
2nd Shift	.26	.05	.37	.08
3rd Shift	-.29	-.04	.06	.01
Other Shifts	2.90	.23**	.15	.01
Coworker Support for COP	---	---	.01	.02
Coworker Support for Trad. Policing	---	---	.05	.04
South Mountain Precinct	1.41	.27	.66	.11
Central City Precinct	1.29	.24	1.14	.15
Desert Horizon Precinct	1.27	.24	-.86	-.14
Squaw Peak Precinct	1.46	.27	.11	.02
Maryvale Precinct	1.03	.21	-.60	-.09
Cactus Park Precinct	1.34	.25	---	---
R^2 Adjusted	-.00		.06	

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

SUMMARY

The findings presented in this chapter reveal that upon graduation from the training academy, police recruits proceed to their respective police agencies where they are exposed to distinct work environments and organizational cultures, shaped by more experienced and veteran

officers, different approaches to community policing, and different organizational structures, arrangements, programs and practices. What is most interesting is to begin to see the degree to which different work environments impact police recruits attitudes and beliefs related to community policing, problem-solving policing, and police-public relations. For instance, organizational environment factors such as shift and police agencies ranking on the organizational arrangements and structures scale emerged as strong predictors of the change in police recruits' attitudes. Moreover, for police recruits working in the Phoenix Police Department, the strongest predictor of change on some of the scales was precinct. Baseline level attitudes also emerged as a predictor of change in police recruits' attitudes; however, it was not as strong a predictor as the organizational environment factors. This finding suggests that once the police recruit leaves the training academy and enters into the field training process in their respective police agencies, organizational environment factors become more powerful forces in shaping police recruits' attitudes and skills related to community policing and problem-solving policing, than do individual characteristics.

An examination of Model 2 in each of the tables also reveals several interesting patterns. First, organizational environment factors such as coworker support for traditional policing and shift emerged as strong predictors of change from Time 2 to Time 4. For police recruits working in the Phoenix Police Department, precinct also emerged as a strong predictor of change from Time 2 to Time 4. Baseline level scores and individual characteristics including race/ethnicity, age, and prior law enforcement experience emerged as weak predictors of change from Time 2 to Time 4 in several of the tables.

In general, coworker attitudes emerged as a more consistent and fairly strong predictor of change in police recruits attitudes and beliefs, than did an organizations ranking on the various

community policing scales. This finding suggests that the informal culture of a police department can be a more powerful force in shaping the attitudes and beliefs of new officers, than the formal organization. In many of the models, precinct and shift also emerged as a significant predictor variables, and in some cases right along with coworkers attitudes; thus, supporting the assumption that there are multiple informal cultures in an organization, such as those based on shift, squad, and precinct with differing attitudes and beliefs about police work and police-public interactions. These findings are important as they reveal the mixed impacts of field training, occupational socialization, and organizational environment on shaping police recruits attitudes, beliefs, and skills related to community policing and problem-solving policing.

CHAPTER 5

POLICE RECRUITS ON THE STREETS: COMMUNITY POLICING "IN ACTION"

Chapter 4 revealed that while all of the police recruits were exposed to training on community policing concepts and practices during basic training, cross-site comparisons revealed that police agencies varied in the degree to which they integrate community policing and problem-solving policing into the field training process and have developed programs and practices to support community policing. Moreover, the seven police agencies varied in the community policing approach they adopted and the degree to which they expect patrol officers to engage in community policing activities. As previously stated, police departments that adopt a split-force approach to community policing create special assignments that allow some patrol officers to specialize in community policing and requires other patrol officers to respond to calls for service. Departments that embrace a generalist approach to community policing do not create a division of labor among patrol officers; rather, all patrol officers are expected to respond to calls for service and engage in community policing activities. Finally, under the mixed model, generalist patrol officers are allowed to do some community policing, but concentrate more heavily on calls for service, and specialist officers may answer some calls for service but concentrate more heavily on community policing.

Some researchers contend the community policing approach a police department emphasizes shapes how patrol officers spend their time, interact with the community, and the community policing activities or tasks they undertake (Parks et al., 1999). As part of a systematic attempt to explore the similarities and differences across police agencies and precincts in patrol officers' involvement in community policing activities and understand how and why patrol

officers' community policing practices vary within and across agencies and precincts I examine the qualitative data obtained from interviews with police recruits at Time 3 and Time 4.

Sample of Police Recruits for the Case Study Analysis

As previously stated, face-to-face interviews were conducted with police recruits at Time 3 and Time 4. Table 5.1 reveals the number of police recruits from each of the six police agencies and six Phoenix Precincts for which interview data were available for analysis at Time 3 and Time 4. Phoenix police officers (n=203) make up the majority of the sample. It is important to point out, however, that although the Phoenix Police Department has a centralized primary administrative structure, it is divided into six separate territorial precincts with separate administrative structures. Patrol and some special enforcement functions (e.g., neighborhood policing officers, bike patrol squads, and juvenile enforcement teams) are decentralized into each of the precincts. Upon graduation from the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy, police recruits are assigned to one of the six precincts where they complete their field training and one year probationary period. For the purpose of the data analysis that is conducted in this chapter, each precinct is treated as a subdistrict or separate agency/unit.

Table 5.1. Sample Police Recruits Assigned to Police Agencies/Precincts

Police Agencies and Precincts	Number of Police Recruits
Phoenix PD	203
Cactus Park Precinct	32
Central City Precinct	31
Desert Horizon Precinct	35
Maryvale Precinct	38
South Mountain Precinct	38
Squaw Peak Precinct	32
Scottsdale PD	18
Tempe PD	11
Chandler PD	13
Glendale PD	12
Gilbert PD	7
Peoria PD	6
Total	278

Although the Scottsdale, Glendale, and Tempe Police Departments are also subdivided into subdistricts, police recruits working within each of these agencies are not typically assigned to complete their field training and one-year probationary period in only one of the subdistricts; rather, police recruits are rotated between the various district areas throughout their first year in their careers in order to ensure their exposure to various sections of the city. Because police recruits are rotated across subdistricts in each of these agencies, officers were not subdivided into patrol districts for the analysis.

Time Spent Engaging in Community Policing

During the interview at Time 4 (end of one year probationary period), police recruits were asked, "On a weekly basis, what percentage of your time do you spend engaged in community policing activities?" Table 5.2 reveals the number of hours per week that police recruits reported engaging in community policing activities. While no obvious differences based upon community policing approach emerged in Table 5.2, an interesting finding that emerge is that the majority of police recruits in the sample reported they do not spend any time during their 40-hour work week engaging in community policing activities. In fact, 40% (n=4) of the police recruits from the Tempe Police Department, an agency that has adopted a generalist approach to community policing and ranked high on the patrol officer responsibilities scale (Table 4.1), reported they do not any spend time during their work week engaging in community policing.

Among police recruits that did report spending time engaged in community policing, the majority of officers in the sample reported spending 1-4 hours of their 40-hour work week engaging in community policing. A closer look reveals agency differences; in particular, at least one-quarter of the police recruits from each of the police agencies, except the Glendale Police Department, reported spending 1-4 hours engaging in community policing. The majority (57.1%)

of police recruits from the Glendale Police Department reported spending 17-24 hours of their work week engaging in community policing. This may be due, in part, to the fact that field training officers from the Glendale Police Department tend to incorporate community policing and problem-solving policing principals and practices into the field training process. In addition, a fairly large percentage of police recruits from the Phoenix (18.3%) and Chandler (36.4%) Police Departments reported spending at least 17-24 hours of their 40-hour work week engaged in community policing. One possible explanation for this finding is that a number of police recruits tended to identify everything they do in the course of their work day as community policing, because in their mind everything they do in police work involves interacting with citizens in one way or another.

Table 5.2. Hours per Week Spent on Community Policing by Agency

	None % (n)	1-4 hrs % (n)	6-8 hrs % (n)	9-16 hrs (n)	17-24 hrs (n)	o 24 hrs % (n)	Total n
Mixed Model Approach							
Phoenix PD	34.9 (44)	31.0 (39)	7.9 (10)	4.0 (5)	18.3 (23)	4.0 (5)	126
Glendale PD	14.3 (1)	14.3 (1)	14.3 (1)	----	57.1 (4)	----	7
Total	33.8 (45)	30.1 (40)	8.3 (11)	3.8 (5)	20.3 (27)	3.8 (5)	
Generalist App							
Scottsdale PD	20.0 (3)	33.3 (5)	20.0 (3)	13.3 (2)	6.7 (1)	6.7 (1)	15
Tempe PD	40.0 (4)	20.0 (2)	20.0 (2)	----	10.0 (1)	10.0 (1)	10
Chandler PD	27.3 (3)	27.3 (3)	----	9.1 (1)	36.4 (4)	----	11
Total	27.8 (10)	27.8 (10)	13.9 (5)	8.3 (3)	16.7 (6)	5.6 (2)	
Split-force App							
Gilbert PD	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	----	33.3 (1)	----	3
Peoria PD	25.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	----	25.0 (1)	----	3
Total	28.6 (2)	14.3 (1)	28.6 (2)	----	28.6 (2)	----	

The next step in the analysis of the interview data was to examine the differences or similarities among Phoenix Precincts in the amount of time police recruits reported engaging in community policing at Time 4. Table 5.3 reveals that 50% of the police recruits working in the Cactus Park and Squaw Peak Precincts and 40% of the recruits working in the Central City

Precinct reported they spend no time during the week engaging in community policing activities. Police recruits from the Maryvale Precinct (17.4%) were least likely to report spending no time engaged in community policing.

Among Phoenix recruits that did spending time during their work week engaging in community policing, differences did emerge across precincts. The majority of police recruits from the Central City Precinct (53.3%) reported spending 1-4 hours of their 40-hour work week engaging in community policing activities. In the Cactus Park and Squaw Peak Precincts, 20.8% and 22.7 respectively, reported spending 1-4 hours engaging in community policing. Police recruits working in the Desert Horizon and Maryvale Precincts were divided, at least 37% of recruits in each of these agencies reported spending 1-4 hours per week engaging in community policing, and at least 26% reported spending 17-24 hours per week engaging in community policing activities. One possible reason for Maryvale officers increased involvement in community policing could be due to the fact that police recruits assigned to the Maryvale Precinct for their field training were required to spend one week of their field training process with a community policing specialist or CAO. Finally, 27.8% of the police recruits working in the South Mountain Precinct reported spending 6-8 hours of their work week engaging in community policing.

Interview data further revealed it was not unusual for patrol officers from the same agency or precinct and on the same squad or shift to report devoting slightly different percentages of time to community policing. These differences could be explained, in part, by how officers defined and conceptualized community policing, as is described in later sections of this chapter.

Table 5.3. Hours per Week Spent on Community Policing by Phoenix Precinct

Phoenix Precincts	None % (n)	1-4 hrs % (n)	6-8 hrs % (n)	9-16 hrs (n)	17-24 hrs (n)	o 24 hrs % (n)
Cactus Park	50.0 (12)	20.8 (5)	4.2 (1)	4.8 (2)	16.7 (4)	----
Central City	40.0 (6)	53.3 (8)	----	----	6.7 (1)	----
Desert Horizon	25.0 (6)	37.5 (9)	4.2 (1)	4.2 (1)	29.2 (7)	----
Maryvale	17.4 (4)	39.1 (9)	4.3 (1)	4.3 (1)	26.1 (6)	8.7 (2)
South Mt.	27.8 (5)	16.7 (3)	27.8 (5)	5.6 (1)	16.7 (3)	5.6 (1)
Squaw Peak	50.0 (11)	22.7 (5)	9.1 (2)	----	9.1 (2)	9.1 (2)

In order to better understand the amount of time police recruits spend engaged in community policing activities and the types of community policing activities they are engaging in, data obtained from the Police Personnel Survey was analyzed and is presented below. It is important to point out differences between interview data and survey data may emerge. Any differences that do emerge are probably due to the fact that the survey asked police recruits to report the amount of time spent engaging in specific community policing activities (e.g., foot patrol, attending meetings with the public, contacting other city/state agencies to get them involved with a problem, and talking with business owners/managers), while the interview was open-ended and allowed police recruits the opportunity to identify a wide range of community activities they engage in, many of these were not measured in the survey.

According to survey data, police recruits from all of the police agencies report spending the more than 21 hours of their 40-hour work week in a mark/unmarked squad car (see Table 5.4). There were not significant differences, however, among police agencies or based upon community policing approach in the number of hours per week a police recruits reported spending in a squad car.

Table 5.4. Hours per Week Spent in a Marked/Unmarked Squad Car by Agency

	None % (n)	1-5 hrs % (n)	6-10 hrs % (n)	11-20 hrs % (n)	μ 21 hrs % (n)	Total n
Mixed Approach						
Phoenix PD	3.6 (6)	1.8 (3)	9.0 (15)	3.6 (6)	81.9 (136)	166
Glendale PD	---	10.0 (1)	---	10.0 (1)	82.4 (14)	10
Total	3.6 (6)	2.3 (4)	8.5 (15)	4.0 (7)	85.2 (150)	176
Generalist App.						
Scottsdale PD	5.9 (1)	5.9 (1)	---	5.9 (1)	85.7 (6)	17
Tempe PD	---	---	---	27.3 (3)	72.7 (8)	11
Chandler PD	---	---	---	---	100.0 (12)	12
Total	2.5 (1)	2.5 (1)	---	10.0 (4)	65.0 (26)	40
Split-Force App.						
Gilbert PD	---	---	---	14.3 (1)	85.7 (6)	7
Peoria PD	---	---	---	---	100.0 (6)	6
Total	---	---	---	7.7 (1)	92.3 (12)	13
	$x^2 = 26.79$					

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

Table 5.5 reveals significant differences do emerge in the number of hours per week that police recruits report spending engaged in foot patrol. In particular, the majority of police recruits from the Phoenix Police Department (53.6%), Tempe Police Department (54.5%), and Gilbert Police Department (100.0%) reported spending no time on foot patrol. While only 11.8% of the police recruits from the Scottsdale Police Department and 16.7% of the recruits from the Chandler Police Department reported spending no time on foot patrol. Instead, the majority of police recruits from the Glendale (70.0%), Scottsdale (76.5%), Chandler (75.0%), and Peoria Police Departments (66.7%) reported spending 1-5 hours of their 40-hour work week on foot patrol. And 11.8% of Scottsdale officers reported spending 6-10 hours per week on foot patrol. Still, however, significant percentage of police recruits from the Phoenix Police Department (42.3%) and Tempe Police Department (45.5%) also reported spending 1-5 hours per week on foot patrol.

Table 5.5. Hours per Week Spent on Foot Patrol by Agency

	None % (n)	1-5 hrs % (n)	6-10 hrs % (n)	11-20 hrs % (n)	Total n
Mixed Approach					
Phoenix PD	53.6 (90)	42.3 (71)	3.0 (5)	1.2 (2)	168
Glendale PD	30.0 (3)	70.0 (7)	---	---	10
Total	52.2 (93)	43.8 (78)	2.8 (5)	1.1 (2)	178
Generalist Approach					
Scottsdale PD	11.8 (2)	76.5 (13)	11.8 (2)	---	17
Tempe PD	54.5 (6)	45.5 (5)	---	---	11
Chandler PD	16.7 (2)	75.0 (9)	8.3 (1)	---	12
Total	25.0 (10)	67.5 (27)	1.7 (3)	---	40
Split-Force Approach					
Gilbert PD	100.0 (7)	---	---	---	7
Peoria PD	33.3 (2)	66.7 (4)	---	---	6
Total	69.2 (9)	30.8 (4)	---	---	13
	$x^2 = 30.10$**				

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

Another interesting finding that emerges in Table 5.5, is that police recruits working in police agencies that have adopted a mixed approach or split-force approach to community policing were more likely to report spending no time on foot patrol, while officers working in police agencies that have adopted a split for approach were more likely to report spending at least 1-5 hours per week on foot patrol.

Table 5.6 also reveals significant differences in the number of hours per week spent attending meetings with the public present. In particular, more than 80% of the police recruits working in the Phoenix, Glendale, and Gilbert Police Departments reported they spend no time attending meetings, such as beat meetings or blockwatch meetings, with the public present. Even 62.5% of Scottsdale police recruits reported spending no time attending meetings with the public present. The majority of police recruits from the Tempe (54.5%) and Chandler (58.3%) Police Departments did, however, report spending at least 1-5 hours per week attending meetings with the public present. Police recruits working for the Peoria Police Department were divided,

50% reported spending no time attending meeting with the public present and 50% reported spending 1-5 hours per week in meetings with the public.

Another interesting finding that emerges in Table 5.6, is that police recruits working in police agencies that adopted a generalist approach to community policing were more likely to report spending time attending meetings, such as beat or blockwatch meetings, with the public present. While police recruits working in police agencies that adopted a mixed approach of split-force approach to community policing were more likely to spend no time in meeting with the public present.

Table 5.6. Hours per Week Spent Attending Meeting with the Public by Agency

	None % (n)	1-5 hrs % (n)	6-10 hrs % (n)	Total % (n)
Mixed Approach				
Phoenix PD	88.0 (146)	10.2 (17)	1.8 (3)	166
Glendale PD	80.0 (8)	20.0 (2)	---	10
Total	87.5 (154)	10.8 (19)	1.7 (3)	176
Generalist Approach				
Scottsdale PD	62.5 (10)	37.5 (6)	---	16
Tempe PD	36.4 (4)	54.5 (6)	9.1 (1)	11
Chandler PD	41.7 (5)	58.3 (7)	---	12
Total	48.7 (19)	48.7 (19)	2.6 (1)	39
Split-Force Approach				
Gilbert PD	85.7 (6)	14.3 (1)	---	7
Peoria PD	50.0 (3)	50.0 (3)	---	6
Total	69.2 (9)	30.8 (4)	---	13
	$x^2 =42.43*$			

$*p \le .01; **p \le .05$

According to survey data, the majority of police recruits from the Phoenix Police Department (62.9%) and the Glendale Police Department (70.0%) reported spending no time contacting other city or state agencies to get them involved with a problem (see Table 5.7). Both of these agencies have adopted a mixed approach to community policing, which means they have community policing specialists that probably oversee contacting and coordinating other agencies for purpose of solving community crime and disorder problems. In comparison, the majority of

police recruits from the Scottsdale (64.7%), Tempe (54.5%), Chandler (66.7%), Gilbert (57.1%), and Peoria (50.0%) Police Departments reported spending 1-5 hours per week contacting other city or state agencies to get them involved with a problem. It is not surprising that police recruits working in police agencies that have adopted a generalist approach to community policing are more likely to spend time contacting other agencies to get them involved with a problem, since that is most likely part of their job as a generalist community policing officer. While these findings are interesting and noteworthy, they are not significant.

Table 5.7. Hours per Week Spent Contacting Other City Agencies by Agency

	None % (n)	1-5 hrs % (n)	6-10 hrs % (n)	Total n
Mixed Approach				
Phoenix PD	62.9 (105)	35.9 (60)	1.2 (2)	167
Glendale PD	70.0 (7)	30.0 (3)	---	10
Total	63.3 (112)	35.6 (63)	1.1 (2)	177
Generalist Approach				
Scottsdale PD	35.3 (6)	64.7 (11)	---	17
Tempe PD	36.4 (4)	54.5 (6)	9.1 (1)	11
Chandler PD	33.3 (4)	66.7 (8)	---	12
Total	40.0 (16)	62.5 (25)	2.5 (1)	40
Split-Force Approach				
Gilbert PD	42.9 (3)	57.1 (4)	---	7
Peoria PD	50.0 (3)	50.0 (3)	---	6
Total	46.2 (6)	53.8 (7)	---	13
	$x^2 = 17.38$			

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

Finally, Table 5.8 reveals the majority of police recruits from all of the police agencies report spending time talking with business owners and managers. In particular, the majority of recruits for each of the agencies report spending at least 1-5 hours per week talking with business owners and managers. Recruits working in the Scottsdale and Gilbert Police Department were slightly more likely to report spending 6-10 hours per week talking with business owners and mangers. The differences across police agencies, however, were not significant.

Table 5.8. Hours per Week Spent Talking with Business Owners/Managers by Agency

	None % (n)	1-5 hrs % (n)	6-10 hrs % (n)	11-20 hrs % (n)	Total n
Mixed Approach					
Phoenix PD	18.5 (31)	69.0 (116)	10.7 (18)	1.8 (3)	168
Glendale PD	---	100.0 (10)	---	---	10
Total	17.4 (31)	70.8 (126)	10.1 (18)	1.7 (3)	178
Generalist Approach					
Scottsdale PD	5.9 (1)	64.7 (11)	23.5 (4)	5.9 (1)	17
Tempe PD	9.1 (1)	63.6 (7)	18.2 (2)	9.1 (1)	11
Chandler PD	8.3 (1)	75.0 (9)	16.7 (2)	---	12
Total	7.5 (3)	67.5 (27)	20.0 (8)	5.0 (2)	40
Split-Force Approach					
Gilbert PD	14.3 (1)	85.7 (6)	---	---	7
Peoria PD	---	50.0 (3)	33.3 (2)	16.7 (2)	6
Total	7.7 (1)	69.2 (9)	15.4 (2)	15.4 (2)	13
	$x^2 = 22.47$				

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

Police Recruits' Community Policing Activities across Police Agencies and Precincts

Analysis of the interview data reveals that the Police Personnel Survey did not capture the complexity of how police recruits define community policing and the wide variety of activities they engage in, which they consider to be community policing. In fact, when patrol officers were asked to define community policing, patrol officers used a wide variety of terms and concepts. Moreover, when patrol officers were asked to identify the community policing practices they engage in, patrol officers from each of the agencies and police precincts identified a wide variety of practices and activities. Some of the more common community policing practices and activities police recruits identified engaging in within their first year on the job were interacting with citizens, interacting with kids, interacting with blockwatch members, interacting with business owners and convenience store clerks, foot patrol, concentrated neighborhood patrol/hot spot patrol, vacation watches of residences, mediation of neighbor disputes, contact apartment complex managers, conduct home security surveys, work on beat projects, and traffic enforcement. Some recruits went so far as to identify everything they do as

community policing, since most everything they do involves interacting with the community in some way. One the other hand, some recruits reported they did not engage in any community policing activities within their first year of police work.

Table 5.9 reveals how often police recruits from the Glendale, Scottsdale, Tempe, Chandler, Gilbert and Peoria Police Departments, as well as the six Phoenix Precincts, self-reported engaging each of the community policing activities.[17] The percentages and frequencies reported in the table are simply an attempt to display the qualitative data that was gathered during interviews with police recruits in manner that allows the reader to visualize the differences and similarities that emerged across agencies and precincts. Police agencies are also grouped according to the community policing approach they have adopted, in an effort to reveal possible differences and similarities in patrol officers' community policing practices based upon community policing approach.

Following Table 5.9, is an analysis and presentation of the interview that is summarized in the table. I use numerous quotes from the interviews with police recruits to present a more in-depth picture of their involvement in community policing activities during their first year of police work. I also attempt to use the interview data to reveal the numerous differences and similarities across police agencies and precincts in regards to patrol officers' involvement in community policing activities.

---

[17] The frequencies reported in Table 2 represent how often each of the activities were reported by patrol officers at Time 3 and Time 4, not the number of officers that reported engaging in each of the activities. The data is reported in this manner because the sample size for each agency was small and the intent was to reveal the variation of community policing activities within and across agencies.

Interact with Citizens. One of the most interesting findings in Table 5.9 is that the majority of police recruits identified interacting with citizens as the most common community policing activity they engaged in within their first year on the job. In addition, police recruits from mixed approach and split-force approach police agencies were slightly more likely to report interacting with citizens as a common community policing activity they have engaged in, than recruits from generalist approach police agencies. One possible reason for this difference is that police recruits from mixed approach and split-force approach police agencies tend to concentrate more heavily on responding to calls for service and are not necessarily expected to spend the extra time interacting with citizens; rather, interacting with citizen is the responsibility of the community policing specialist in the department. Thus, when patrol officers from these agencies spend extra time on a call or go out of their way to interact with citizens they consider community policing. Police recruits from generalist approach police agencies, however, learn that all patrol officers are expected to respond calls for service and engage in community policing; thus, spending extra time on a call or going out of their way to interact with citizens is more likely to be identified as simply a part of patrol work.

Table 5.9. Frequency of Self-Reported COP Activities by Agency

COP Approach/ Police Agency	Interact with Citizens % (n)	Interact with Kids % (n)	Interact with Blockwatch % (n)	Interact w/ Business Owners % (n)	Interact w/ Convenience Store Clerks % (n)	Interact w/ Apartment Managers % (n)	CNP/Hot Spot Patrol % (n)	Mediate Neighbor Disputes % (n)
Mixed Approach								
Phoenix PD	28.7 (91)	7.9 (25)	8.2 (26)	5.7 (18)	7.3 (23)	3.5 (11)	18.0 (57)	5.0 (16)
Cactus Park	16.1 (9)	7.1 (4)	3.6 (2)	5.4 (3)	3.6 (2)	8.9 (5)	26.8 (15)	8.9 (5)
Central City	34.9 (15)	9.3 (4)	7.0 (3)	4.7 (2)	11.6 (5)	----	11.6 (5)	----
Desert Horizon	28.1 (16)	7.0 (4)	5.3 (3)	3.5 (2)	5.3 (3)	3.5 (2)	19.3 (11)	12.3 (7)
Maryvale	29.4 (15)	11.8 (6)	17.6 (9)	7.8 (4)	3.9 (2)	----	7.8 (4)	5.9 (3)
South Mt.	38.9 (21)	7.4 (4)	9.3 (5)	5.6 (3)	9.3 (5)	----	22.2 (12)	----
Squaw Peak	28.3 (15)	5.7 (3)	5.7 (3)	7.5 (4)	11.3 (6)	7.5 (4)	18.9 (10)	1.9 (1)
Glendale PD	11.4 (4)	17.1 (6)	2.9 (1)	4.4 (4)	----	5.7 (2)	17.1 (6)	5.7 (2)
Total	27.1 (95)	8.8 (31)	7.4 (26)	6.3 (22)	6.6 (23)	3.7 (13)	17.9 (63)	5.1 (18)
Generalist App								
Scottsdale PD	10.0 (5)	6.0 (3)	4.0 (2)	20.0 (10)	6.0 (3)	4.0 (2)	10.0 (5)	2.0 (1)
Tempe PD	10.3 (3)	13.8 (4)	17.2 (5)	6.9 (2)	6.9 (2)	3.4 (1)	3.4 (1)	3.4 (1)
Chandler PD	15.4 (4)	7.7 (2)	30.8 (8)	3.8 (1)	----	----	11.5 (3)	----
Total	11.4 (12)	8.6 (9)	14.3 (15)	12.4 (13)	4.8 (5)	2.9 (3)	8.6 (9)	1.9 (2)
Split-Force App								
Gilbert PD	26.7 (4)	6.7 (1)	----	26.7 (4)	----	----	----	6.7 (1)
Peoria PD	33.3 (3)	22.2 (2)	----	22.2 (2)	----	----	----	11.1 (1)
Total	29.2 (7)	12.5 (3)	----	25.0 (6)	----	----	----	8.3 (2)

Table 5.9, cont.

COP Approach/ Police Agency	Home Security Surveys % (n)	Beat Projects % (n)	Vacation Watches of Residences % (n)	Foot Patrol % (n)	Traffic Enforcement % (n)	Every Call Involves COP % (n)	Haven't Engaged in COP Activities % (n)
Mixed Approach							
Phoenix PD	0.6 (2)	0.6 (2)	1.3 (4)	0.6 (2)	1.6 (5)	2.8 (9)	8.2 (26)
Cactus Park	---	---	---	1.8 (1)	1.8 (1)	3.6 (2)	12.5 (7)
Central City	---	---	---	2.3 (1)	---	2.3 (1)	16.3 (7)
Desert Horizon	---	---	3.5 (2)	---	1.8 (1)	1.8 (1)	8.8 (5)
Maryvale	---	2.0 (1)	2.0 (1)	---	3.9 (2)	7.8 (4)	3.9 (2)
South Mountain	3.7 (2)	1.9 (1)	---	---	---	---	1.9 (1)
Squaw Peak	---	---	1.9 (1)	---	1.9 (1)	1.9 (1)	7.5 (4)
Glendale PD	---	6.7 (3)	2.9 (1)	5.7 (2)	5.7 (2)	5.7 (2)	---
Total	0.6 (2)	1.4 (5)	1.4 (5)	1.1 (4)	2.0 (7)	3.1 (11)	7.4 (26)
Generalist Approach							
Scottsdale PD	---	18.0 (9)	4.0 (2)	6.0 (3)	4.0 (2)	---	6.0 (3)
Tempe PD	6.9 (2)	17.2 (5)	---	---	3.4 (1)	---	6.9 (2)
Chandler PD	11.5 (3)	3.8 (1)	3.8 (1)	3.8 (1)	7.7 (2)	---	---
Total	4.8 (5)	14.3 (15)	2.9 (3)	3.8 (4)	4.8 (5)	---	4.8 (5)
Split-force Approach							
Gilbert PD	---	6.7 (1)	6.7 (1)	---	13.3 (2)	---	6.7 (1)
Peoria PD	---	11.1 (1)	---	---	---	---	---
Total	---	8.3 (2)	4.2 (1)	---	8.3 (2)	---	4.2 (1)

Conversely, interview data revealed that across police agencies and precincts, regardless of the community policing approach adopted, patrol officers tended to define community policing as interacting with citizens for the purpose of gathering information and identifying and solving community crime problems.[18] In particular, numerous police recruits from the Tempe Police Department, an agency that has adopted a generalist approach to community policing, defined community policing as a joint effort between the police department and the community it serves.

> It's a combination of community members doing their own share of the work to keep their community safe and free from crime . . . and the police trying to get out on the street and witness crime and deal with it immediately, as well as answer calls for service that the community brings to the attention of the police. (Tempe patrol officer)

Police recruits from the Cactus Park, Desert Horizon, and Squaw Peak Precincts, as well as officers from the Glendale and Chandler Police Departments, often conceptualized community policing to mean more than just crime fighting and arresting people, but doing the job to serve the community's needs and meet the community's concerns in an effort to reduce the distance between the police and the community. As one South Mountain officer explained,

> What I learned in the academy was try and get out there and not really look to arrest people and enforce the laws, but develop a better relationship with the people and let them know that they can approach you and that you'll be helpful. Every meeting that they have with the police doesn't necessarily have to be a negative one. (South Mountain Precinct patrol officer)

Concomitantly, when Phoenix police recruits were asked to identify community policing activities they had engaged in, the majority of officers from each of the precincts reported finding time between radio calls to interact with citizens and/or spending extra time on a call for

---

[18] Citizens are frequently identified as residents, business people, members of neighborhood organizations, and others invested in the area (see Parks et al., 1999).

service talking to complainants, victims, and witnesses. Officers maintain they use these interactions to get to know the neighborhoods and the people that live there, gather information about what's going on in the neighborhoods, solicit citizen input as to what the problems in the neighborhood are and possible solutions, answer citizens questions, and educate citizens about crime and crime prevention. Officers also reported using such interactions as an opportunity to refer citizens to other city agencies and services that are available to help them deal with their problem(s). Interestingly, one Cactus Park officer identified his interactions with citizens as "a proactive way of managing crime, instead of reacting all of the time." Two other Phoenix officers stated:

> When we go out on calls, if there's a citizen complaining we generally try and find out what's going on with them and what the trouble areas are in their neighborhood. Like over on East Adams, we had a lady that had a lot of problems, she called us and we were out there for quite a while talking to her, trying to find out what her problems were. She knew the houses and the people in the area that were the problems. So after that we started spending a lot more time in that area contacting those people, doing what we could on our side to help alleviate the problems that she said they were having. (Central City Precinct patrol officer)

> When we go to the projects it's not just dealing with the call and leaving . . . sometimes you have to do that because it's so busy and we're so low manpowered, but on the slower nights it's nice to stay and talk to the people and play with and talk to the kids that are always coming up to us and asking for stickers . . . you get some feedback [from them]. People say you guys have come in and cleaned up this neighborhood and you guys have done a good job, other people may say you need more officers down there, that coroner's bad. (South Mountain Precinct patrol officer)

In fact, in an effort to encourage Phoenix patrol officers to interact with citizens and get involved in community policing, the Phoenix Police Department added Quality Service Opportunities (QSOs) to patrol officers' daily logs and performance evaluations. QSOs include interacting with and/or helping citizens who did not called the police. For example, contacting a citizen on the street to provide help or directions, or providing a stranded motorist with a ride is

considered a QSO. Thus, it is not surprising that some Phoenix police recruits referred to the practice of interacting with citizens as "QSOs."

Across the various police agencies, recruits that reported taking the time to interact with citizens recognized that a positive police-public relationship helps them do their job. For example, a number of police recruits acknowledged that because patrol officers are typically so busy chasing radio calls and can't be everywhere all of the time, they depend upon the support and cooperation of the community to identify problems, report crimes, and provide information when a crime occurs. As one Central City officer explained, "If we can get a good relationship with them, they will feel that the police are working with them versus against them . . . and that they can trust in us to help them whenever they give us a call." Moreover, some recruits also recognize that if community policing is going to work, community members need to get involved and take an active role in trying to deter crime and make their community a better place.

> Community policing means getting the community involved . . . not only living in the community, but also becoming part of the community. As a police officer, we depend upon the community to solve a lot of the crimes. So, community policing is having the citizens just be more informed, more educated, and more involved. They need to form some type of network, and we will be able to aid them to make the community a much better community. (Squaw Peak Precinct patrol officer)

In fact, police recruits from the Scottsdale and Gilbert Police Departments not only identified community policing as interacting with citizens, but also maintained the it involves citizen involvement in identifying and solving community problems, preventing crimes, and protecting themselves from victimization. Officers from both of these agencies identified citizen involvement as one of the essential components to developing long-term solutions to community crime problems.

Interact with Kids. Some police recruits from each of the police precincts and agencies identified taking time between radio calls to interact with kids as a community policing activity

they engaged during their first on the job (see Table 5.9). In particular, numerous officers from the Phoenix, Tempe, and Glendale Police Departments reported handing out junior police badges and stickers to kids. One Phoenix officer even reported handing out Halloween candy from their patrol car. All of these officers maintained they engage in these interactions with kids in an effort to let kids see the police not just as law enforcers, but also as nice guys.

On the other hand, some Glendale officers identified making contacts with juveniles shortly before curfew to advise them on curfew laws as a community policing activity. And Scottsdale officers identified sitting in their patrol car in a city park to do paperwork for a couple of hours as community policing.

Interact with Blockwatch. An interesting finding that emerges in Table 5.9 is that police recruits from police agencies that adopted a mixed approach or generalist approach to community policing identified interacting with blockwatch groups as part of their community policing activities; while police recruits from police agencies that adopted a split-force approach did not identify interacting with blockwatch groups.

A closer look at Table 5.3 reveals that police recruits from the Chandler Police Department, a department that adopted a generalist approach to community policing, identified interacting with blockwatchs as the most common community policing activity they engaged in within their first year on the job. In addition, Chandler officers identified interacting with blockwatchs as a community policing activity they engaged in, more often than did officers from any of the other police agencies or precincts. Interview data revealed that Chandler officers frequently reported attending beat/blockwatch meetings to find out what problems exist within the community, as well as to encourage citizen involvement in their neighborhoods. As one officer explained,

Community policing is getting the community together in one place, asking them what problems they're having in their neighborhood, and responding to those problems with either some sort of police action or referring them to other departments that are better equipped to handle their problems. The community is more aware of what's going on in their neighborhoods, therefore, you have to get together and share information with the citizens and get information from them. (Chandler patrol officer)

Chandler officers identified interacting with beat/blockwatch groups largely because each patrol officer is assigned to a beat area, as part of the department's generalist community policing approach. As part of their beat assignment, patrol officers are expected to respond to the complaints and concerns of citizens in their beat area. In addition, officers are required to attend bi-monthly beat meetings, which are also attended by blockwatch members. The beat meetings provide a forum for the community and police to interact, for questions and answers to be exchanged, for information to be shared, and feedback provided. Chandler officers recognized that department administrators place emphasis on blockwatch programs and officers' attendance at beat meetings.

Our department tries…they give you a beat, once you're put into a beat you have what we call beat integrity, in the sense that you're there for two years. You may change shifts, but you can't leave that beat for two years. That's an effort by administrators to get you used to not only the area, but also the people. They [the citizens] get to know you . . . and they know more of what's going on in their neighborhoods then we do . . . then it's efficient for us, because it makes it a lot easier to get the job done and get information. (Chandler patrol officer)

Another interesting finding that emerges, is that Maryvale Precinct patrol officers reported interacting with blockwatch captains and attending blockwatch meetings more often than did officers from the other Phoenix precincts. One possible explanation for this difference is that police recruits assigned to the Maryvale Precinct for their field training were required to spend one week of their field training with a precinct Community Action Officer (CAO). CAOs are the community and problem-solving policing specialists in the Phoenix Police Department,

responsible for attending blockwatch meetings and working with blockwatch captains and members in an effort to gather information about neighborhood problems and help citizens' address and solve these problems.

> I've been to two neighborhood meetings and I think it's very effective. A lot of times the person that runs the neighborhood blockwatch is the noisiest person in the neighborhood; they know everything about everybody. It's great for us because we find out information about drug houses or incidents that are happening, domestic violence, and children taking advantage of their grandparents. These are things that we need to know about and it really helps out that the blockwatch will let us know what's going on and what crimes are happening in what areas. They do all that work for us and they inform us about it; it makes our job a lot easier. (Maryvale Precinct patrol officer)

In fact, several Maryvale officers reported learning the value of attending blockwatch meetings and interacting with blockwatch captains from both the CAOs and their field training officers.

Interact with Businesses Owners and Store Clerks. When officers were asked to identify community policing activities they had engaged in, officers from all of the police agencies and precincts identified interacting with business owners and store clerks, mainly convenience store clerks (Table 5.9). Scottsdale officers, in particular, frequently identified interacting with local bar and store owners, store clerks, and security guards at the business establishments in their beat area. Some Scottsdale officers even reported performing foot patrol in shopping malls and plazas and in the downtown bar district. In fact, two officers reported going from business-to-business and encouraging business owners to fill out emergency locator cards which provide information for the police as to who to contact if there is a problem at their business establishment, especially after the store closes. Other Scottsdale officers identified checking on convenience store clerks, particularly at night, as community policing activities they regularly engage in. Scottsdale officers recognized these activities as an important dimension of community policing, in light of

the fact that Scottsdale is one of America's leading resort communities, known for attracting tourists to its many resorts/hotels, shops, and businesses.

> My beat is primarily commercial stores and resorts. They had a big problem with fraudulent travelers checks that were generated by computers. Alot of times there's really no set way for clerks to know how to recognize one [a fraudulent travelers check] or what phone numbers to call to initiate a little bit of investigation before they actually take them as cash value. So I went around and educated storeowners. Also, at one point we apprehended someone with 100 travelers checks in an area that prior to that had many reports of false ones [travelers checks] being issued. (Scottsdale patrol officer)

Another Scottsdale officer explained how he worked with a hotel in his beat area to solve a problem it was having with patrons from a near by nightclub.

> We had complaints from a hotel around 5th Ave. and Goldwater. They were having problems on weekends with criminal damage being caused by the drunken patrons from the nightclub . . . What I did was work with the security guards. I talked to them on the weekends and they identified the trouble spots where all the people walk. I sat and wrote a report around the area one night. We got a call, criminal damage in progress; a guy broke a window right there at a nearby business. We scooped him up like that and made an arrest. They [hotel managers] were very pleased. We work well with the security guards and that's when community policing pays off, when you can ultimately solve a problem; in this case making an arrest. (Scottsdale patrol officer)

In the Scottsdale Police Department, is not unusual for problem areas existing around business establishments to become formalized beat projects that individual officers or a squad of officer's work over a period of time.

Another interesting finding that emerges in Table 5.9 is that police recruits from the Gilbert and Peoria Police Departments, both agencies that adopted a split-force approach to community policing and were in the early stage of implementing community policing, frequently identified interacting with business owners and store clerks as community policing. For patrol officers in these agencies, community policing was essentially limited to interacting with citizens and business owners. As one Gilbert officer explained, "We do a lot of business checks, we

actually go in and talk to the managers and storeowners to see what kind of problems they're having . . . if they're seeing gang members hanging out or if they're having gas drive-offs. Just basically anything out of the ordinary that's taking place at their business."

Although Glendale officers did not identify interacting with business owners and store clerks near as often as officers from some of the other agencies; some of the officers did, however, recognize that business owners could often provide the police with information about problems in the area.

> Whenever we are identifying a problem area, we'll get out and talk to people in the area. We make sure we always contact the business owners, [even though] they don't live there, and they've got a vested interest in what is going on in the area. At the same time, because they don't live there, they're in a good position for us to get some good and honest information. (Glendale patrol officer)

Concentrated Neighborhood Patrol (CNP). A large number of Phoenix police officers frequently reported engaging in concentrated neighborhood patrol (CNP). On the one hand, CNP is similar to the concept of hot spot patrol, in that it includes activities such as random patrol of neighborhoods, alleys, and high crime areas, and checking for suspicious activities, persons and vehicles in order to detect and deter criminal activity. On the other hand, CNP is promoted as a form of community policing, since officers are expected to interact with citizens, kids, business owners, and store clerks while they randomly patrol neighborhoods, alleys, and high crime areas. CNP is a category that has been added to patrol officers' daily logs and performance evaluations in recent years.

An interesting finding that emerged in the qualitative data is that police recruits from the Phoenix Precincts defined CNP in different ways. For instance, police recruits from the Central City Precinct added conducting surveillance on known drug houses and contacting blockwatch members to their CNP activities. South Mountain officers included watching for speeders in

145

particular areas and doing paperwork in a public setting where they can be visible to their CNP activities. Finally, both Squaw Peak and Desert Horizon Precinct officers added patrolling apartment complexes and vacation watches to their description of CNP activities.

> We do a lot of concentrated neighborhood patrol if there aren't any calls at the time. What we'll do is a lot of patrolling in certain neighborhoods where maybe we have a big problem with drugs or where we've had recent shootings or a lot of aggravated assaults. We try to patrol those areas more then some of the other areas where we may not receive calls for a week or so at a time. So we try to narrow in on areas that need it. (Cactus Park Precinct patrol officer)
> They say we need to do CNP, so we drive through trouble areas, drive through apartment complexes . . . occasionally there's a few businesses that we go to repeatedly, but they're mostly convenience stores. Besides the CNP, there's really not too much community policing. (Central City Precinct patrol officer)

> We go into certain Circle K's that have stations for us, with phones, where we can do paperwork and call in reports. We go in there and meet the clerks and do work in there where we can be seen. We don't stay in the car all the time; we get out and walk around, talk to people and get to know them . . . It's on our worksheet when we do those things. We have to log it all, so they know exactly where we were, what we were doing, and that we were doing things for our community policing. (Squaw Peak Precinct patrol officer)

> When we have time we'll do what is called concentrated neighborhood patrol, where we cruise our beat area and talk to neighbors that are outside, but there aren't a whole lot on third shift, but occasionally there is so and so watering his lawn or something. We'll stop and talk to him and ask what kind of problems they've been having in the neighborhood, if there's any particular houses that they're having problems with, any suspicious activity or vehicles in the area. Just kind of a chance to initiate some contact on a non-criminal level. You know, so we can maybe prevent some crime in their neighborhood from happening, as opposed to reacting to the crime that's been committed. (Maryvale Precinct patrol officer)

It was apparent from the interview data that police recruits from each of the precincts learned, within the first year of their police careers, to tailor their CNP activities to those they felt most comfortable with and/or those that are most convenient based upon the shift and beat area they are working. For instance, some recruits reported engaging only in the patrol aspect of CNP; while other officers, particularly those that worked third shift (i.e., 9:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.),

maintained the only forms of CNP they were able to engage were patrolling neighborhoods and high crime areas to check for suspicious activities and persons, as well as interacting with convenience store clerks (i.e., third shift officers maintained the only businesses open during third shift were convenience stores).

Police recruits from the Glendale and Scottsdale Police Departments also frequently reported routine patrol as one of the community policing activities they engaged in within their first year on the job. Unlike, Phoenix police recruits, Glendale and Scottsdale recruits did not use the term concentrated neighborhood patrol to describe their activities because their agency had not adopted such a term.

> We make a lot of passbyes of the places that are open throughout the night, like convenience stores, because those places are obviously a target for crime. We go to a lot of the apartment complexes at night, blacked out looking for people who may be stealing cars or may have a stolen vehicle left there. We just drive through the community looking for things. We do this every night. (Glendale patrol officer)

Mediate Neighbor Disputes. Table 5.9 reveals that several police recruits from the Cactus Park and Desert Horizon Precincts identified taking the time to mediate and resolve neighbor disputes as community policing. Recruits maintained that mediating neighbor disputes is a form of community policing because such disputes are frequently civil matters, not criminal. Thus, taking the time to listen to both sides of the argument and attempting to help the neighbors find a permanent or temporary solution or agreement, or referring them to a city service that formally mediates such disputes was considered community policing.

Conduct Home Security Surveys. A community policing activity that mainly Chandler and Tempe police recruits reported engaging in was conducting home security surveys for residents who want to know how to better secure their homes.

We will go out and do a home security survey of somebody's house, it takes about an hour. [We] let them know what areas they may want to improve on to help them avoid being a target for burglars, whether it is door locks, lighting, or landscaping. I've done a number of home security surveys. In post academy we had a nine-hour training block on crime prevention techniques, home security surveys, and beat meetings. So every patrol officer in Chandler, including the new recruits, definitely has to participate in that, it's a major part [of Chandler's community policing]. (Chandler patrol officer)

This finding is based largely on the fact that the Chandler and Tempe Police Departments have adopted a generalist approach to community policing, and as a result, they do not have community policing specialists to conduct home security survey. Thus, conducting home security surveys becomes the responsibility of the patrol officer. Scottsdale police recruits, on the other hand, did not report conducting home security surveys as one of the community policing activities they engage in, largely because the Scottsdale Police Department has two community relations officers that specialist in C.P.T.E.D.

Working on Beat Projects. Table 5.9 reveals that mainly police recruits from the Scottsdale, Tempe, and Glendale Police Departments reported working on beat projects as one of the community policing activities they engaged in during their first year on the job. This finding is based largely on the fact that Scottsdale, Tempe and Glendale Police Departments were the only agencies, at the time the study was conducted, that required patrol officers to engage in beat or problem-oriented policing projects. In addition, in each of these agencies patrol officers were also assigned to one-year fixed beat assignments. The rational for establishing fixed beat assignments was that patrol officers would get to know the citizens in their beat area of responsibility, and citizens would get to know patrol officers. More importantly, it is assumed that patrol officers assigned to fixed beat assignments would get to know the crime and disorder problems in their beat and engage in problem-solving in an effort to curb or eliminate the crime and disorder problems. As one Glendale officer explained,

You get to know what looks normal and what is not normal, what car is out of place, what people are out of place . . . you get to know the area that you are policing as opposed to covering a different beat every night and not being in touch with the community. I believe that is a basic theme behind community policing, is the officer getting to know that area little bit better. (Glendale patrol officer)

Despite the fact that the Scottsdale, Tempe, and Chandler Police Departments have each adopted a generalist approach to community policing, each of these agencies have adopted different strategies for incorporating problem-oriented policing into the patrol bureau. As part of the Glendale Police Departments' efforts to integrate problem-oriented policing into the patrol bureau, police administrators request that each squad of patrol officers have at least one working POP Project. In addition, patrol officers are expected to work with other patrol officers and supervisors, as well as members of the Community Action Team (CAT), to develop and organize a plan to deal with and address the beat problem.

We have programs where if you have a problem in the neighborhood or in an area, officers can get with the citizens and other officers and get up a plan of what to do with that problem, how they can deal with it, how they can change it to make it better . . . If it makes them feel better about a situation, they can change a situation from bad to good. I enjoy that, I think that's what community policing is all about: the community and the police working together. (Glendale patrol officer)

Interview data revealed in the Tempe Police Department, beat projects are developed in a fashion similar to in Glendale Police Department. As one officer explained, "each officer looks through the beat to find something that they think is a problem and then they work toward solutions to solve that problem . . . and it is reviewed by supervisors." Other Tempe officers reported that beat projects are often identified and developed based upon input from citizens and the patrol supervisor. Tempe officers maintained that working on beat projects has required them to work with other patrol officers and blockwatch groups. They maintain they often attend blockwatch meetings where they can exchange information with citizens.

In this quiet neighborhood, there is a certain house that has been having a lot of problems as far as drug activity and partying. This one group of people moved into this house and created chaos, so we're constantly working with that one home . . . The second generation in the house is starting to cause problems the same way the first generation did, so I am kind of the focus point for the other people who live in that area. They contact me to see what I can do about getting these things taken care of. We respond to citizens' requests, even things like people parking where they are not supposed to be parking in neighborhoods . . . areas where people are speeding. We go into those areas and try to slow the people down and that is community policing because we have kids in those areas and they are the main concern. (Tempe patrol officer)

The beat I work in has a problem with gang members that hang out in a certain area at night and it disturbs the neighbors. When I am working, if they are out there and having bonfires and goofing around . . . my going through there and keeping those kids out of there is community policing. It helps out the neighborhood. It's not a big project. (Tempe patrol officer)

Finally, in the Scottsdale Police Department, when the study began, police administrators required every patrol officer to have a beat project. During the course of the study, however, police administrators decided it would be more effective to have more than one squad of patrol officers working the same beat project versus individual officers working individual beat projects. Thus, Scottsdale administrators redesigned its beat projects so that squads of patrol officers who work the same beat area, yet vary by shift and days off, would work together on one or more beat projects. To coordinate officers' efforts across shifts and days, formal beat project folders were created. Patrol officers were subsequently expected to log their daily activities on the beat project (i.e., contacts made, surveillance conducted, and enforcement efforts taken) in the beat project folders. The types of beat projects Scottsdale patrol officers reported working on varied significantly, from working with a car dealerships to stop customers from test driving vehicles and speeding through a residential area, to dealing with skate boarders who were causing property damage and vandalism at Coronado High School, to teaming up with narcotics

officers and detectives for a period of three months to shut down a known methamphetamine drug house.

In order to better understand how patrol officers come to understand the problems that characterize their beat area, patrol officers were asked in the Police Personnel Survey to identify how frequently they use different sources of information, such as: citizen complaints, community meetings, personal observations, supervisors, and so on. Table 5.10 reveals the mean value score for each police agency which reveals how often police recruits report using each of the different sources of information to identify and understand the problems that characterize their beat area. The mean value score is based upon a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1) never to 4) almost always.

Table 5.10 reveals that significant differences emerge across police agencies in the use of community meetings to understand beat problems. In particular, police recruits working in the Chandler Police Department were significantly more likely to rely on information obtained through community meetings to understand the problems that characterize their beat area, than police recruits from any other police agency. In addition, police recruits working in the Phoenix and Glendale Police Departments were significantly less likely to rely on information obtained through community meetings.

Another interesting finding that emerges in the table, is that police recruits from each of the police agencies most often rely on traditional sources of information, such as citizen complaints, personal observations, department data, and supervisors, to identify and understand the problems that characterize their beat area. Police recruits are less likely to use community surveys, council persons, or other city departments and agencies to identify and understand the problems that characterize their beat area.

Table 5.10. Mean Score for Frequency by which Sources of Information are used to Recognize a Problem by Agency

	Citizen Complaint	Community Meeting	Community Survey	Department Data	Personal Observation	Supervisor	Council Person	Other City Dept/Agency
Mixed Approach								
Phoenix PD	2.75	1.49	1.39	2.23	3.04	2.29	1.28	1.63
Glendale PD	2.89	1.44	1.33	2.44	3.11	2.22	1.44	1.78
Generalist App.								
Scottsdale PD	2.69	1.81	1.44	2.63	3.25	2.44	1.19	1.63
Tempe PD	2.45	1.91	1.30	2.09	3.00	2.55	1.18	1.91
Chandler PD	3.25	2.42	1.75	2.17	3.25	2.08	1.25	1.75
Split-Force App.								
Gilbert PD	2.86	1.57	1.29	2.14	3.14	2.29	1.14	1.71
Peoria PD	3.33	1.67	1.50	2.50	3.33	2.17	1.50	2.00
F	1.28	4.80*	.90	.91	.47	.63	.59	.63

* $p \leq .01$; ** $p \leq .05$

Every Call Involves Community Policing. A small percentage of patrol officers from police agencies that had adopted a mixed approach to community policing were able to identify every call they go on as an opportunity for community policing. As two different officers explained,

> Just about every call you go on, you deal with the call and then you deal with about five or ten other issues that are going on in that persons life . . . A lot of the time, the reason they call you there isn't why you're there. The reason you're there is because they need someone to yell at, they need someone to listen to their problems; then they need someone to tell them it's all going to be ok, we're going to help you out, you're not by yourself. (Central City Precinct patrol officer)

> Every time I talk to somebody it is community based policing. I am always talking to people that are making a complaint against somebody else or that wants contact on a call, and that is when you are always being forced to communicate with the public . . . and you try to give a positive image. So everyday, almost every call you go to it [community policing] is involved. (Maryvale Precinct patrol officer)

I Haven't Engaged in Community Policing Activities. Table 5.9 reveals that a number of police recruits from the majority of police agencies, except the Peoria and Glendale Police Departments, reported that they have not engaged in any community policing activities within their first year on the job. Moreover, patrol officers from the Phoenix Police Department were more likely to report they have not engaged in any community policing activities within their first year on the job.

Interview data revealed that police recruits who reported they have not engaged in community policing activities identified mainly four reasons for their lack of participation in community policing. One reason was that there are community policing specialists in the department who are responsible for engaging in community policing. A second reason is that there are simply not a lot of opportunities to engage in community policing because there is simply not enough time due to workload and calls for service. A third reason for the lack of

involvement of police recruits in community policing was shift assignment. Officers that worked second and third shifts often reported there are few people on the streets, during their shift, with whom they can practice community policing. Finally, some recruits maintained that during the field training process they were so busy with training and testing that they had no time to engage in community policing activities; therefore, they were not exposed to it and tended not engage in such activities after completing the field training process.

Several police recruits from the South Mountain Precinct actually identified the police and community as separate entities that do not work well together, and therefore maintained that patrol work should remain strictly reactive in nature.

> [Community policing] is kind of a political word . . . what they want it to mean is that we go out and intermingle with the community and solve their problems. That's a great goal, but there are not enough of us for the huge area that we cover. There's ten officers covering a massive area. We couldn't possibly get out into the community like they want us to. . . It's a nice theory, but I think we're just too big. (South Mountain Precinct patrol officer)

SUMMARY

The findings presented in this chapter reveal both similarities and differences across police agencies in the time police recruits reported engaging in community policing in general, as well as specific community policing activities. Some of these differences appear to be based upon the community policing approach a police department has adopted. One of the major findings, however, is that the majority of police recruits across the seven police agencies reported they spend no time during their 40-hour work week engaging in community policing activities. Among police recruits that did report spending time engaged in community policing, the majority of officers in the sample reported spending 1-4 hours of their 40-hour work week engaging in community policing activities.

Differences and similarities also emerged among Phoenix Precincts in the amount of time police recruits reported engaging in community policing. Police recruits working in the Cactus Park, Squaw Peak, and Central City Precincts were more likely to report they spend no time during the week engaging in community policing activities; while police recruits from the Maryvale Precinct were more likely to report spending time engaged in community policing.

The findings presented in this chapter further reveal that the community policing approach a police department adopts determines not only the amount of time patrol officers spend engaged in community policing, it also plays a role in shaping the types of community policing activities patrol officers engage in. In particular, police recruits working in police agencies that adopted a generalist approach to community policing were more likely to report engaging in a wide range of community policing activities, such as : interacting with citizens, kids, blockwatch members and business owners; working on beat projects; concentrated neighborhood patrol or hot spot patrol; foot patrol; and conducting home security survey. Patrol officers working in police agencies that have adopted a mixed approach to community policing tended to report engaging in community policing activities such as interacting with citizens and engaging in CNP between radio calls. Finally, police recruits working in police agencies that adopt a split-force approach to community policing identified involvement in fewer community policing activities than patrol officers working in police agencies that have adopted either a mixed approach or generalist approach to community policing. Police recruits in split-force approach police agencies were more likely to be limited to interacting with citizens, kids, and business owners.

CHAPTER 6

COPS WHO QUIT: VALUE CONFLICTS AND MISTAKEN BELIEFS

ABOUT THE NATURE OF POLICE WORK

As previously noted, despite the high direct costs of recruiting, selecting, and training police personnel and the indirect costs of waiting for recruits to achieve a "street wise" competence, the resignation of police officers remains a neglected topic in the police literature (Fielding and Fielding, 1987; Sparger and Giacopassi, 1978). Findings from the few studies that do exist provide limited opportunity for understanding why police recruits drop out of basic training and why rookie police officers quit police work.

This study is significant because it afforded the opportunity to track police recruits who left police work during the course of the study, the first 16 months of their police careers, and determine if and how dropouts individual characteristics and attitudes toward police work differed systematically from non-dropouts. In addition, this study is one of the first systematic attempts to explore the various reasons or motivations police recruits provided for "dropping out" of police work. In keeping with the objectives of this study, the data presented in this chapter are used to test the assumption advanced by Fielding and Fielding (1987), that those who resign from police work within the early period of police training and service experience a high level of conflict between the version of policing embodied in their ideal of police service and the reality of policing in practice.

Sample of Dropouts

Of the 446 police recruits that were included in the initial survey assessment, 114 or 25.6% resigned from police work during the period of the research, which included the 16 month period starting with each recruits entry into the basic training academy. Fifty-three (11.9%) of

the recruits dropped out of the basic training academy, 18 (4%) dropped out during the field training process, and 43 (9.6%) dropped out within the first year of probation.

Questionnaires were mailed via certified mail to the 114 police recruits that dropped out of police work during the course of the study. Thirty-two dropouts (28.1%) returned the questionnaire.[19] Of the 32 dropouts that returned the questionnaire, 15 dropped out of the training academy, 7 dropped out during the field training process, and 12 dropped out after completing field training but prior to the end of their one-year probationary period. Dropouts that returned the questionnaire also consented to participate in a telephone interview which consisted of a series of open-ended questions developed to tap seven information domains: reasons for entering police work, reasons for leaving police work, perceptions of training academy experiences, perceptions of department experiences, expectations about police work, conflicting realities of police work, and recommendations for academy and department changes.

Dropouts versus Non-Dropouts: Individual Characteristics

Using data collected from the Police Personnel Survey at Time 1, dropouts were compared to non-dropouts on individual characteristics including gender, age, race/ethnicity, education, marital status, prior military experience, and prior law enforcement experience. Table 6.1 reveals that although the number of females is small, it is noteworthy that there was no statistically significant difference between males (25.1%) and females (28.3%) in rate of dropout. Significant differences did emerge, however, in rates of dropout among racial/ethnic groups. One of the most interesting findings is that Native Americans had the highest rate of

---

[19] Two of the main obstacles to tracking down dropouts was change of addresses and refusal to accept the certified letter.

Table 6.1. Comparison of Non-Dropouts to Dropouts on Individual Characteristics

	Non-Dropouts % (n)	Dropouts % (n)	χ^2
Gender			
Male	74.7 (298)	25.3 (101)	.19
Female	71.7 (33)	28.3 (13)	
Race/Ethnicity			
Anglo/White	77.7 (265)	22.3 (76)	9.04*
Hispanic/Latino	61.4 (35)	38.6 (22)	
African-Americans	85.7 (12)	14.3 (2)	
Native Americans	14.3 (2)	85.7 (12)	
Asian Americans	90.9 (10)	9.1 (1)	
Other	85.7 (6)	14.3 (1)	
Age Group			
20-24	76.3 (122)	23.8 (38)	1.28
25-29	74.6 (135)	25.4 (46)	
30-34	74.1 (43)	25.9 (15)	
35 and over	68.1 (32)	31.9 (15)	
Marital Status			
Single	73.3 (162)	26.7 (59)	6.12*
Married	78.4 (152)	21.6 (42)	
Separated/Divorced	57.1 (16)	42.9 (12)	
Level of Education			
High School/G.E.D. Diploma	62.1 (36)	37.9 (22)	10.65*
Some College	75.8 (163)	24.2 (52)	
4-Year College Degree	81.2 (108)	18.8 (25)	
Graduate Courses	63.2 (24)	36.8 (14)	
Prior Military			
Yes	74.7 (118)	25.3 (40)	.01
No	74.3 (211)	25.7 (73)	
Prior Law Enforcement			
Yes	74.0 (77)	26.0 (27)	.02
No	74.6 (253)	25.4 (86)	

*$p \leq .01$; **$p \leq .05$

dropout (85.7%).[20] Furthermore, Hispanics (38.6%) were significantly more likely to dropout of police work than Anglos (22.3%). Anglos, however, were more likely to dropout of police work

---

[20] Further analysis revealed that 78.6% (n = 11) of the Native Americans dropped out of the training academy.

than African Americans (14.3%). Asian-Americans were least likely to dropout of police work (9.1%).[21]

Significant differences also emerged in rates of dropout based upon marital status. In particular, police recruits that were separated or divorced upon entering the training academy were more likely to dropout of police work within the first 16-months of their police careers, than police recruits that were single or married upon entering the training academy. In regards to level of education, police recruits with a high school/G.E.D. diploma or graduate courses upon entering the training academy were more likely to dropout of police work within the first 16 months of their police careers than police recruits with some college or a 4-year college degree. Further analysis revealed that police recruits with a high school/G.E.D. diploma or graduate courses upon entering the training academy were more likely to dropout of the 16-week basic training program, than during or after the field training process. Finally, there were no significant differences in rates of dropout based upon age, prior military experience, or prior law enforcement.

Dropouts versus Non-Dropouts: Attitude and Belief Differences

Independent sample t-tests were used to assess differences in means between non-dropouts and dropouts on each of the job dimension and satisfaction scales, the community policing-related scales, the problem solving knowledge and skills scales, and cultural sensitivity scales (see Table 7.2). These comparisons are from Time 1 or pre-academy measurement only.[22] When mean scores for dropouts and non-dropouts were compared for each of these multi-item

---

[21] Further analysis reveal that Asian-Americans and African-Americans tended not to drop out of the training academy, but rather tended to dropout during and after the field training process.

scales, no significant differences emerged. The attitudes and beliefs of dropouts and non-dropouts did not differ significantly when they entered the academy (Time 1).

Table 6.2. Comparison of Non-Dropouts to Dropouts on Pre-Academy Attitudes.

Scales	Non-Dropouts n=330		Dropouts n=115		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t
Job Dimensions and Satisfaction					
Skill Variety	12.78	1.58	12.49	1.73	-1.67
Task Identity	10.32	2.17	10.09	1.87	-1.01
Job Autonomy	14.15	2.57	14.04	2.60	-.41
Work with Others	8.92	1.04	8.88	1.10	-.35
Job Feedback	7.77	1.03	7.68	1.15	-.82
Peer/Supervisor Feedback	7.79	1.32	7.63	1.52	-1.13
Job Involvement	12.52	1.79	12.63	1.62	.60
Job Challenges/Personal Growth	27.39	2.77	27.13	3.12	-.85
Receptivity to Change	22.35	2.61	22.28	2.65	-.24
Organizational Satisfaction	16.26	2.21	15.90	2.34	-1.49
Community Policing Scales					
Support for Community Policing	31.01	4.04	30.50	4.24	-1.15
Support for Traditional Policing	13.68	1.54	13.62	1.68	-.34
Orientation to Community Policing	35.55	3.16	35.37	3.25	-.53
Patrol Responsiveness to Community	34.57	4.83	34.24	4.96	-.62
Police-Public Relations	21.96	2.90	22.50	3.28	1.65
Problem-Solving Knowledge/Skills					
Orient to Problem-Solving Policing	35.37	3.75	34.94	4.22	-1.03
Problem-Solving Capability	13.87	2.64	14.20	2.80	1.12
Cultural Sensitivity					
Ability to Assess Needs of Diverse Groups	19.70	3.72	19.49	3.92	-.53
Ability to Assess Needs of Culturally Diverse Groups	14.17	2.27	14.51	2.35	1.38

[22] Statistical comparisons were also made for Time 2 and Time 3. While Time 2 revealed no significant differences, Time 3 revealed significant differences on the job autonomy scale and the orientation to community policing scale. The mean value score for dropouts (x=15.02) was slightly lower than non-dropouts (x=15.78); however, the difference was small. On the orientation to community policing scale, the mean value score for dropouts (x=33.94) was lower than non-dropouts (x=35.15). In other words, police recruits that dropped out of police work after field training, yet prior to the end of the one-year probationary period were less oriented to community policing at Time 3, than non-dropouts.

Reasons for Dropping Out of Police Work

Individuals who enter police work face the decision whether to stay or dropout at various stages early in their career—during basic training, field training, and within the first year of "street work." During the telephone interview, dropouts were asked to explain why they left police work. Interview data revealed that recruits who dropped out of police work did so in a variety of ways: some police recruits self-initiated their dropout, while other recruits were removed by training academy administrators or the police agency that hired them. Thus, I identify categorize police recruits' reasons for dropping out into three categories: self-initiated, academy-initiated, and department-initiated. Among the 32 dropouts that participated in the telephone interviews, 19 (59.4%) reported they self-initiated their dropout, 9 (28.1%) reported their dropout was initiated by training academy administrator, and 4 (12.5%) reported their dropout was initiated by the department that hired them.

Table 6.3. Reasons for Dropout by Point of Dropout for the Sample of Dropouts

	Training Academy Dropout % (n)	Field Training Dropout % (n)	Prior to End of 1-Year Probationary Period Dropout % (n)	Total % (n)
Self-Initiated	35.7 (5)	85.7 (6)	72.7 (8)	59.4 (19)
Academy-Initiated	64.3 (9)	---	---	28.1 (9)
Department-Initiated	---	14.3 (1)	27.3 (3)	12.5 (4)

Self-Initiated Dropout. Police recruits who self-initiated dropping out of basic training disclosed experiencing conflicts in expectations and beliefs about police work while attending the training academy. Three of the police recruits that self-initiated dropout at this stage identified the source of conflict as academy experiences that were inconsistent or contradictory to their sense of self and their cognition's about what police work should be. For instance, one dropout explained, "within the first four days of basic training I heard instructors lecture on the

161

'cold reality' of shooting someone." This dropout proceeded to explain how he struggled with the reality that he might have to shoot someone and wondered whether he would be able to psychologically handle shooting someone, because it conflicted with his personal values. He reported that he dropped out within the first week of basic training because of the internal conflict the reality of shooting someone caused him.

Two other recruits maintained that the training academy environment, in particular the inappropriate and unethical behaviors of their classmates and academy officers, was the reason they quit the training academy.

> I was discouraged with the system and the lack of integrity . . . I witnessed cover-ups and officers not being truthful. Police officers are supposed to be held to a higher level of integrity than the general public and I didn't see that . . . I always thought police work was to uphold justice, and that is just not the case . . . It was the atmosphere more than anything else. (Training Academy Dropout)

> I was tired of it; tired of the attitudes . . . my coworkers' attitudes were very different than mine. I wanted to do something for the community, but the other cops were unbelievable; some of them were egotistical maniacs. It was like if you're a moron in here, you must be a moron out there. (Training Academy Dropout)

The other two police recruits that self-initiated dropout from the training academy identified family and personal problems (e.g., difficulties going to the academy so far away from home) as reasons for quitting the training academy.

Among the six police recruits that self-initiated dropout out during the field training process, four of recruits reported that they self-initiated dropout because the realities of police work conflicted with their ideals of police work. Dimensions of the job that conflicted with their ideals of police work included the stress and risk of the job, problems with field training officers, running call-to-call, the immense amount of paperwork that is required (interviewees describe themselves as "a mobile secretary with a gun"), the politics that guides assignments and

162

promotions, and the possibility of being sued for doing your job. For many recruits, the dissonance they were experiencing was due to the cumulative and interactive effects of several of these realities. For instance, as one officer explained,

> I thought I knew what police work was all about . . . In the academy, they tell you about the paperwork and how you will need to document details, but they don't tell you that paperwork is 99.5% of what you do and that only .5% will be contact with people and hands on work. That was disappointing. I knew there was paperwork involved but I didn't know how much. I don't enjoy paperwork. It isn't even the paperwork, but that you are not taught procedures for documenting . . . Also, the field training process was a major part of my reasons to quit police work. I always considered a police officer to be a public servant, but the majority of police work is the documentation of crime and not necessarily helping victims. I looked forward to helping victims. In the academy, the instructors preached community policing, but once your working the streets there is no chance of doing that. Everything is running call-to-call, and there is no opportunity to get out and talk to citizens. Even with victims, there is no time to document and assist them, or say, "Here are some things you can do" or "These are your rights." It is so high volume that it prevents that kind of interaction. The reality of the work is show up, document, and leave. (Field Training Dropout)

Another dropout explained,

> My agency is shooting themselves in the foot with the way they run the field training program; they don't want to nurture their people. The field training process is like the military; they make you feel like crap. I guess they see it as a "right of passage." It doesn't appeal to me though, or to others I know. FTOs are trying to be assholes on purpose, they think they're "the shit." It does not create a good learning environment. I started my field training at the north precinct and I had a woman FTO. She had zero personality and she offered no positive reinforcement, it was always negative. I resigned because of her.
> Researcher: Were there any other reasons you had for leaving police work?
> Dropout: I didn't expect all of the paperwork. I was a "mobile secretary with a gun." Also, I didn't know so much politics was involved. You have to always watch your butt because everyone is ready to tell on you. When I was with the female FTO we went to another cops apartment on a call about a stolen car. It turned out that he was not calling to report a stolen car, but that all his police gear was stolen out of his car. The female FTO got him fired because she thought he was lying. Officers don't look out for other officers anymore. Plus, you have to worry about being sued. (Field Training Dropout)

The other two police recruits who self-initiated dropout during the field training process identified family problems and stress as the reasons for quitting police work. One female officer explained,

> My children were having a hard time adjusting to it . . . My husband is a police officer and has been for eight years, and the kids were used to me being home when he worked nights. The kids were o.k. while I was working days, but when I switched to nights my son began biting his nails and my daughter wasn't sleeping very well. (Field Training Dropout)

Finally, eight police recruits reported that they self-initiated dropout after completing the field training process, but prior to the completion of their one-year probationary period, mainly because of problems within the work environment and because the realities of the job conflicted with their expectations of what police work should be. Work environment problems included concerns about heavy-handed policing, fellow officers who provoked subjects into fights, and lack of community policing.

> It was the politics and policies. I responded to a fight and when I got there the two subjects involved were already separated. I went to interview the subject, there were like six officers there. One of the subjects had been drinking so he was a little out of it. But the other officers weren't going to talk to him. It was like they just pushed the subject until he was provoked enough to fight. It was too much. I guess I saw too much of that. (One-Year Probationary Dropout)

> Police work was not what I thought it was; it was dull work at a fast pace, it was monotonous. Nothing we did was that important . . . domestic violence, shoplifting, and accidents were all we did. The pace was uncomfortable. There is a lot of work and the encounters I had were not that pleasant . . . and you know they will happen again because they are the kinds of calls you respond to over and over, and there is nothing you can do to stop that . . . It was the pace. You have to listen to the radio, constantly watch your surroundings, and respond to calls all at the same time. (One-Year Probationary Dropout)

> I was not prepared for it; not ready for the bad neighborhoods and drugs. I was used to college life. I also had problems with my training sergeant. I felt like I was discriminated against. It was not in the sexual sense, but I was not treated the way I should have been. I have heard other female officers have had similar problems. (One-Year Probationary Dropout)

Police recruits whom self-initiated dropout at each of the various stages reported experiencing some degree of pre-termination conflict, in particular related to police work and the work environment.

Academy-Initiated Dropout. Police recruits terminated from basic training by academy administrators were terminated for several reasons, including medical withdrawal, breaking academy rules and academic failure. The most common reason for academy-initiated removal was medical withdrawal due to injury. Six of the nine academy-initiated dropouts explained how they injured their knees, ankles, and shins during the physical training activities at the training academy. The Phoenix Regional Training Academy requires that recruits participate in a regimented physical training schedule, which includes running several miles each day on desert mountain trails, completing obstacles courses, and maintaining an advanced weightlifting program. Recruits who miss more than five conditioning days receive a medical withdrawal due to injury. As one dropout explained,

> I hit my heel while jumping the wall on the obstacle course. I tried to recuperate; however, I am still suffering from the injury. There are no security measures taken at the academy to protect the cadets from injury. I landed wrong and nobody helped me get to the top of the hill. Fifteen minutes after I injured myself, another recruit broke his kneecap on the wall. I was on crutches for a couple of days and than I was dismissed because I couldn't keep up with the program. It was injustice because I wasn't given the chance to go back and continue. At the time, I was 48 years old and now I am 50 and I don't feel like going back and starting over. They broke my dream. (Training Academy Dropout)

Two of the six academy-initiated dropouts explained that academy administrators forced them to resign from basic training after they broke training academy rules and regulations.

> There was a problem during the hiring procedure. I was going through the hiring process with a friend and you are not supposed to discuss any of the questions asked during the oral board with others. I was telling my friend how it went and mentioned one of the questions. One of the officers overheard me and told me I should not have done that. I'm thinking, "Oh great, that's it, it's over." But nothing ever happened. Then, six months later, the officer who overheard me

wrote a memo reporting the incident. They gave me the option to resign or be terminated; I resigned. (Training Academy Dropout)

It was not by choice that I left the training academy. I violated one of the [academy] regulations by having a second job. Actually there was more to it than that. There was a man who was in the academy with me who was kicked out for sexual harassment. I was one of the ones who pointed him out [to academy administrators]. He [the officer I turned in for sexual harassment] found out that I had a second job and basically got the Black Coalition involved. He was suing the city saying it was discrimination that I could have a second job, which was a violation of the rules, and he was fired for violating the rules.
Researcher: Do you think the training academy acted properly letting you go?
Dropout: I can understand why they stuck to the letter of the law, I mean the guy was going to sue them, but I think they should have gone by the spirit of the law. I did violate a regulation, however, I was working for a moving company at $60,000 a year, and then went to being a recruit making about $20,000. What I do on my own time should not affect my work. I mean I was just delivering pizzas to help support my wife and make the mortgage payment. Yes, it violated a rule, but they should have looked more at the circumstances surrounding it. (Training Academy Dropout)

Police recruits whose dropout was initiated by academy administrators did not report experiencing the same pre-termination conflicts related to police work and the work environment that self-initiated dropouts disclosed. Conversely, academy-initiated dropouts expressed a higher level of post-termination conflict surrounding their injury, the inability to complete the training academy, and being forced to leave police work.

Department-Initiated Dropout. Four of the dropouts revealed they were terminated by the police agency that hired them. As Table 6.2 reveals, one recruit was terminated during the field training process and three recruits were terminated after completing the field training process and prior to the end of their one-year probationary period. The three recruits terminated after completing the field training process, but prior to the end of their one-year probationary period, reported they were terminated on the basis of inadequate performance and/or making mistakes on the job. One female recruit hinted to the fact that she experienced some form of gender discrimination from her immediate sergeant.

My supervisor said I had an unsatisfactory probation. I was given the option to quit or be terminated and I chose to be terminated. I had a problem with report writing and I asked for additional training. I had two different sergeants and the second one felt I had a problem with my writing. He would give my reports harsh critiques and things like that. I submitted several memos stating that I knew he was unhappy with my reports and requesting additional training. The memos were completely unacknowledged. Then I had an on-duty accident. They tried to make it look as though I fell asleep, I didn't fall asleep . . . My union representative didn't believe I feel asleep either. Then there was a report of another accident that disappeared or got lost . . . after 11 to 14 days it reappeared. They said there was no way that it could have just vanished and resurfaced and they believed that I just turned it in. (One-Year Probationary Dropout)

The one officer terminated during the field training process revealed that his department fired him after he uncovered a fellow veteran patrol officers' involvement in sexual misconduct and broke the chain of command in his efforts to report it.

What really happened was that one-day I was with my FTO and there was this woman throwing a fit with the front desk attendant. I pulled her aside to talk to her and find out what the problem was. I checked her driver's license to find out that she had 4 to 5 warrants for unpaid speeding tickets. My FTO was there and I put her in cuffs. She told me that Officer X was supposed to take care of the tickets . . . He was meeting her in San Diego where they were supposedly engaging in sex. The Lt. and Officer X came in and they told me to leave. I asked them if I should write a report on this and the Lt. told me no. I wrote a report anyway and it disappeared . . . There was no mention of what happened to it. I tried to take it to the Lt., but he said I broke the chain of command. I probably didn't use the best judgement. It's still a "good ole' boy small town." Both Officer X and myself were let go at the same time. The attitude at the *** Police Department is don't buck the system. (Field Training Dropout)
I spent 8 weeks with my FTO . . . than I took 3 weeks off and came back with a different FTO . . . I returned after 3 weeks off and realized that I lacked confidence. I was making mistakes, which I wouldn't have made earlier. For instance, I went on a call and thought another officer cleared it on the radio, but they didn't; I finally got to the call much later. That small mistake began to snowball into more mistakes . . . I was also having family problems, such as I was going through a divorce and I had a pregnant teenage daughter. (Field Training Dropout)

Similar to academy-initiated dropouts, department-initiated dropouts expressed post-termination conflict; moreover, several dropouts were engaged in efforts to enter back into police work.

SUMMARY

In general, the quantitative data gathered via the Police Personnel Survey revealed that dropouts attitudes related to police work did not differ systematically from non-dropouts upon entering the training academy (Time 1), completion of academy training (Time 2), and completion of the field training process (Time 3). Conversely, qualitative data gathered via telephone interviews with dropouts revealed that police recruits who self-initiated resignation from police work within the first 16-months of their policing careers experienced a high level of pre-termination conflict and dissonance when the realities of police work differed from their ideals or expectations of police work. The various dimensions of the job and work environment that conflicted with their ideals of police work included the stress and risk of the job, problems with field training officers, running call-to-call, the immense amount of paperwork that is required, the politics that guides assignments and promotions, the possibility of being sued for doing one's job, heavy-handed policing, fellow officers who provoked subjects into fights, and lack of community policing. For many recruits, the conflict they experienced culminated from the cumulative effects of several of these characteristics of the occupational culture of policing. This conflict provoked a state of dissonance for the police recruit and ultimately the decision to quit, rather than change their beliefs and attitudes to a more realistic perspective of police work. This finding provides support for Fielding and Fielding's (1987) assumption that those who resign from police work within the early period of police training and service experience a high level of conflict between the version of policing embodied in their ideal of police service and the reality of policing in practice.

On the other hand, police recruits whom academy administrators terminated or the police agency that hired them did not report experiencing the same pre-termination conflicts related to

police work and the work environment that self-initiated dropouts disclosed. Rather, for the majority of these academy-initiated and department-initiated dropouts the termination was unexpected or not planned; thus they expressed a higher level of post-termination conflict surrounding their injury, the inability to complete the training academy, and being forced to leave police work. Thus, it was not surprising that several of these dropouts expressed the desire or identified the efforts in which they were engaged to enter back into police work.

These findings not only reveal the various reasons and motivations for dropping out of police work, but also reveal significant differences in rates of dropout based upon individual characteristics. One of the most interesting findings was that Native Americans had the highest rate of dropout at 85.7%. Furthermore, Hispanics (38.6%) and Anglos (22.3%) were significantly more likely to dropout of police work than African-Americans (14.3%) and Asian-Americans (9.1%). Significant differences also emerged in rates of dropout based upon marital status: police recruits that were separated or divorced upon entering the training academy were more likely to dropout of police work within the first 16-months of their police careers, than police recruits that were single or married upon entering the training academy. In regards to level of education, police recruits with a high school/G.E.D. diploma or graduate courses upon entering the training academy were more likely to dropout of police work within the first 16 months of their police careers than police recruits with some college or a 4-year college degree. No Significant differences in rates of dropout were based upon gender, age, prior military experience or prior law enforcement.

Finally, these findings also provide support for the theory of the process of occupational socialization, whereby recruits learn the required behaviors, supportive attitudes, and norms and values for organizational and occupational membership. This process of occupational

socialization occurs through both formal and informal training and exposure to the unique demands of police work (Manning, 1977; Skolnick, 1966; Van Maanen, 1973). Included in the process of occupational socialization are stages of career contingency and development (e.g., academy training, field training, one-year probationary period), which represent crucial points at which police recruits and officers may choose to withdraw from further commitment or continuation in the socialization process (Matza, 1967). Similar to Fielding and Fielding's hypothesis, Van Maanen (1975) insisted police recruits experience temporary states of anomie or alienation (e.g., conflict or dissonance) during the early stage of their police careers, which forces some recruits to reconsider their situated identity and place in the organization. Accordingly, the decision to quit or continue is typically contingent upon on the police recruits or officers' stake in conformity and commitment to the occupational, organizational, and work group norms and values.

The present study draws on the perspectives of cognitive dissonance and occupational socialization to help identify the factors involved in the voluntary and involuntary employment separation of police officers in the earliest stages of the police career. In an occupation, such as policing, which is characterized by conformity, those who are most likely to leave are found to be those whose early idealism is quickly in conflict with the pragmatic or realistic perspective (Fielding and Fielding 1987).

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

During the last decade of the 20th century, there was a widespread movement initiated by a growing number of police administrators across the nation 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. The shift in the American policing paradigm has required that outdated attitudes and beliefs about policing be replaced with new attitudes and beliefs that are consistent with community policing and problem-oriented policing philosophies and strategies. In a typical fashion, police agencies have developed a variety training programs to bring about the necessary changes in officers' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors and further the implementation of community policing. For example, there have been a variety of in-service training programs and seminars offered through the national network of Regional Community Policing Institutes sponsored by the Office of Community Oriented Policing.

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, principals and practices during basic academy training. In fact, police training academies across the United States have incorporated community policing and problem-solving policing into their recruit training in several ways, including adding separate or stand alone training modules/ related to community policing and/or revising basic training curricula in order to incorporated community policing philosophies and practices into some or all recruit courses. In spite of the heavy reliance on both academy and in-service training to produce cognitive changes supportive of community policing

and problem-solving policing, there has been little research conducted to assess the effectiveness of that training on shaping police recruits attitudes and behaviors.

The overall goal of this study was to learn more about the impacts of basic training, field training, and work environment on shaping police recruits' attitudes and beliefs related to policing in general, but more specifically, community policing, problem-solving policing and police-citizen interactions. To accomplish the overall goal of the study, I evaluated the extent to which the Phoenix Regional Police Training Academy's basic training program, which incorporated community policing and problem-oriented policing principals throughout the basic police training curriculum, produced desired changes in officers' attitudes and beliefs related to community policing, problem-oriented policing, and police-citizen interactions. Although the objective was to estimate the effects of the basic training curriculum on a panel of police recruits, in doing so I was also interested in identifying the potential mediating effects of individual characteristics and pre-existing attitudes about policing that police recruits bring to the training academy. Next, I tracked a panel of training academy graduates through the first year of their police careers, in their respective police agencies, to evaluate the effects of field training, occupational socialization, and different work environments (department size, serving constituencies with different needs and demands) and community policing approaches on police recruits' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors related to traditional policing, community policing, problem-oriented policing, and police-citizen interactions. Finally, following police recruits overtime provided an opportunity to learn about those recruits who dropped out of police work; in particular, how their individual characteristics and values and beliefs differ systematically from non-dropouts.

Impact of Basic Academy Training

The direct assessment of the impact of academy training on police recruits' attitudes and beliefs related to various dimensions of the job, as well as community policing, problem-solving policing, and cultural sensitivity indicates, in general, that basic training effects are generally inconsistent and of a small magnitude, depending on the construct measured. With regard to those attitudes and beliefs most directly related to community policing, it appears that training has the desired effect, but that initial training gains tend to dissipate as recruits leave the academy and progress through the field training process and the very early stages of their police careers. Baseline level scores consistently explained most of the variance in police recruits attitudinal change. Other weak predictors include police agencies ranking on the patrol officers are required to engage in community policing activities scale and individual characteristics such as education, age, and prior military experience.

In several of the regression models, academy class also had a significant effect on attitude change. This finding has potentially important policy implications for the organization and delivery of academy training. Several possible explanations of class effects can be offered. For example, there could be instructor differences from one class to the next or perhaps differences in indigenous student leadership across classes that result in differential emphasis on community policing-related values. 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. Buerger (1998: 45) illustrates this possibility in a quote based upon correspondence with a training supervisor.

"...were just spouting the official line on everything, all the while strongly suggesting that it was all bullshit and that we would learn the real stuff on the street-'ya know, we

can't tell you to slap the shit out of those punk gangbangers back in the alley here, but don't worry about that, you'll learn soon enough. So what we have to say is that you have to be equally respectful of everyone's rights, treat everyone exactly the same. That's what we have to tell you while you are here at the academy.' . . . They repeatedly told us that 'when you get out on the street, you will do things differently from what we teach here—and you damn well better do it the way its done on the street—NOT what we teach here. What we teach here,' they often said, 'is the official bullshit to cover out butts legally, not the real deal.'"

In addition, differences in student composition from one class to another could produce a dynamic or class effect that promotes or impedes the development of attitudinal and belief systems supportive of community policing. This finding suggests that effectiveness of an academy curriculum may be uneven from one class to the next, and that attention needs to be paid to understanding and mediating those influences responsible for producing differential outcomes.

Perhaps the most important point that can be made about the impact of academy training on police recruits' attitudes and beliefs related to community policing and problem-solving policing is that the basic belief systems of police recruits about the nature of policing is firmly established by the time they arrive at the academy. During the timeframe of this study, the best predictor of attitude change was by far the attitudes and beliefs that police recruits brought with them to the academy. In other words, police recruits are not empty vessels to be filled with new attitudes and values 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 while not completely impervious to change, are very difficult to change. 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.

Impact of Police Agency Work Environment

The gains the training academy has 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, structures, programs or practices in place to support community. In other words, the police agency, through its leadership and organizational arrangements, structure and programs, sets the tone for community policing. When leaders are on board and the organization is configured to practice community 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.

Findings from the Community Policing Survey indicate that across the board, police agencies whose recruits participated in the study were squarely committed to community policing philosophies and practices. In addition, the leaders of these agencies perceived substantial benefits were to be derived from community policing. In fact, each of these agencies had made several structural adjustments to put community policing into practice, and some of these police agencies had adopted community policing early on. At least as indicated by findings

from the Community Policing Survey, the possibility that police recruits would leave the training academy and return to police agencies non-supportive of community policing was slim; rather, the police agencies included in this study were quite supportive of community policing.

Impact of Field Training Experience

The field training phase of the police recruits' career presents the first real opportunity for the recruit to do real police work. It also represents an important training opportunity for reinforcing and further developing community policing and problem-solving policing-related academy training gains. At the same time, however, field training represents an opportunity to negate these gains. Since the field training process takes place immediately after recruits leave the academy, it might be the single best place to expose the recruit to community policing and problem-solving policing practices, and that in turn could couple or link police practice with academy reform training.

Interviews with field training officers and police recruits revealed there was some emphasis placed on community policing and/or problem solving during field training process, although the vast majority of field training time is allocated to focusing on developing skills such as officer safety, communicating with the public, learning to use the radio, making traffic stops, and report writing. There is little evidence of a formal and/or systematic approach to incorporating community policing and/or problem-solving training into the field training process. This seems unfortunate, since field training presents an immediate opportunity to further shape police recruit's views of the nature of police work and police-public relations.

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 field training officers 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 training as part of the field training process, and most importantly, training field training officers to do community policing training are two important steps that could be taken to sustain and expand community policing and problem-solving policing training gains made in the training academy.

Community Policing Practices: Police Recruits "In Action"

The cross-site analysis of community policing approaches and practices in the seven Phoenix metropolitan area police agencies that employed police recruits from the study sample revealed the use of three distinct community policing approaches, a generalist approach, a split-force approach, and a mixed approach. The possibility existed that one approach or another would determine the extent to which police recruits changed their attitudes to community policing and problem-solving policing and would engage in community policing and problem-solving activities. In fact, the community policing approach a policy agency has adopted does appear to determine to some degree the amount of time officers spent engaging in community policing. More often, the community policing approach a policy agency has adopted determines the types of community policing activities performed by police recruits. For instance, police recruits working in police departments with a generalist approach tend to engage in a broader spectrum of community policing activities, than do their counterparts working in departments with a split-force approach or mixed model.

Moreover, it does appear that the approach to community policing adopted by a police agency makes a difference on police officer attitudes and beliefs related to community policing. At a general level, there was evidence of a department effect on attitude change. One of the

limitations of the case study analysis is that only two of the police agencies, the Phoenix and Glendale Police Departments, used the mixed model. Both of these police departments, but especially the Phoenix Police Department, have a much higher volume of calls for service than the other departments; so making cross-department/cross-approach comparisons is difficult. Another limitation of the study is that the time frame of the present study is probably too limited to detect any long-term effects that different approaches to community policing has on police officers' attitude and belief systems.

Cops Who Quit

The final component of the study was to follow-up on police recruits who quit, failed, or were terminated from the training academy or the police agency that hired them within the first 16 months of their policing careers. One possibility was that this group might be systematically different in their attitudes toward policing work in general, as well as toward community policing, problem-solving policing, and/or cultural diversity, in comparison to those who remained in policing. Evidence in support of this possibility would have implications for the recruitment of officers. A comparison of scores on each of the attitude measurement scales, however, revealed no significant differences between those who quit (or were terminated) and those who stayed in police work.

In sum, the evidence generated by this study calls into question the utility of basic police academy training for affecting changes in police recruits' attitudes and beliefs related to community policing, problem-solving policing and cultural diversity. This study did not examine the training curriculum in detail, and no assessment of actual dosage or exposure to community policing related training content was made. Training in support of community policing must start with the development of awareness of its principals and practices, and this is where the academy

should continue to focus, making recruits aware. However, academy taught principals and need to be coupled more closely to police practice, and community policing training needs to place much greater emphasis on the development of community policing skills and the use of these skills in police work. Officers who possess community-policing skills, who know how to apply their skills to daily police work, and who see tangible outcomes from their application are likely to develop the cognitive systems that result in attitudes, values, and beliefs consistent with and support of community policing.

REFERENCES

Alex, N. (1969). *Black in Blue: A Study of the Negro Policeman*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Boydstun, J.E. and M.E. Sherry (1975). *San Diego Community Profile: Final Report*. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

Buerger, M.E. (1998). Police Training as a Pentecost: Using Tools Singularly Ill-Suited to the Purpose of Reform. *Police Quarterly*, 1(1): 27-63.

Buerger, M.E., Cohen, E.G., and A.J. Petrosino (1995). Defining the Hot Spot of Crime: Operationalizing Theoretical Concepts for Field Research. In J.E. Eck and D. Weisburd (eds.), *Crime and Place* (pp.237-258). Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Buzawa, E.S. (1981). "The Role of Race in Predicting Job Attitudes of Patrol Officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 9:63-77,

Cook, T.D. and D.T. Campbell (1979). *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues of Field Settings*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Cordner, G.W. (1997). Community Policing: Elements and Effects. In R.G. Dunham and G.P. Alpert (eds.), *Critical Issues in Policing, 3/E* (pp. 451-468). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Couper, D.C. and S.H. Lobitz (1991). *Quality Policing: The Madison Experience*. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

D'Andrea, M., J. Daniels and R. Heck (1991). Evaluating the Impact of Multicultural Counseling Training. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70: 143-150.

Dantzker, G., A.J. Lurigio, S. Hartnett, S. Houmes and S. Davidsdottir (forthcoming, 1995). Preparing Police Officers for Community Policing: An Evaluation of Training for Chicago's Alternative Policing Strategy. *Police Studies*.

Dunham, R.B., J.B. Herman (1975). Development of a Female Faces Scale for Measuring Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60: 629-631.

Dunham, R.B., F.J. Smith, and R.S. Blackburn (1977). Validation of the Index of Organizational Reactions with the JDI, the MSQ, and the Faces Scale. *Academy of Management Journal*, 20: 420-432.

Eck, J.E. and W. Spelman (1987). *Problem-Solving*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Felkenes, G.T. and J.R. Schroedel (1993). A Case Study of Minority Women in Policing. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 4:65-87.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fielding, N.G. (1988). *Joining Forces: Police Training, Socialization, and Occupational Competences*. New York: Routledge.

Fielding, N.G. and J.L. Fielding (1987). A Study of Resignation during British Police Training. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 15(1):24-36.

Goldstein (1990). *Problem-Oriented Policing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Greene, J.R., W.T. Bergman, and E.J. McLaughlin (1994). Implementing Community Policing: Cultural and Structural Change in Police Organizations. In D.P. Rosenbaum's (Ed.), *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises* (pp. 147-166). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Greene, J.R. and S.H. Decker (1989). Police and Community Perceptions of the Community Role in Policing: The Philadelphia Experience. *The Howard Journal*, 28: 105-123.

Greene, J.R. and S. Mastrofski (1988). *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality*, New York: Praeger.

Haarr, R.N. (1997). Patterns of Interaction in a Police Patrol Bureau: Race and Gender Patterns of Integration. *Justice Quarterly*, 14(1): 53-85.

Hackman, J.R. and G.R. Oldham (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69: 250-279.

Hayeslip, D.W. and G.W. Cordner (1987). The Effects of Community-Oriented Patrol on Police Officer Attitudes. *American Journal of Police*, 4: 95-119.

Kazdin, A.E. (1982). *Single-Case Research Designs: Methods for Clinical and Applied Settings*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lurigio, A.J. (1994, 1995). *Police Personnel Survey*. Loyola University-Chicago, Department of Criminal Justice.

Lurigio, A.J. and D.P. Rosenbaum (1994). The Impact of Community Policing on Police Personnel: A Review of the Literature. In D.P. Rosenbaum's (Ed.), *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises* (pp. 147-166). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lurigio, A.L. and W.G. Skogan (1994). Winning the Hearts and Minds of Police Officers: An Assessment of Staff Perceptions of Community Policing in Chicago. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40(3): 315-330.

Lurigio, A.J and W.G. Skogan (1998). Community Policing in Chicago: Bringing Officers on Board. *Police Quarterly*, 1(1): 1-25.

Manning, P.K. (1977). *Police Work*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Mastrofski and Ritti (1996). Police Training and the Effects of Organization on Drunk Driving Enforcement. *Justice Quarterly*, 13(2):290-320.

McEwen et al. (1997). Community Policing Training Survey: Draft Report.

Martin, S.E. (1980). *Breaking and Entering: Policewomen on Patrol*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Martin, S.E. (1990). *On the Move: The Status of Women in Policing*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Martin, S.E. (1994). Outsider Within the Station House: The Impact of Race and Gender on Black Women Police. *Social Problems*, 41:383-400.

Parks, R.B., Mastrofski, S.D., DeJong, C. and M.K. Gray (1999). How Officers Spend Their Time with the Community. *Justice Quarterly*, 16(3):483-518.

Rosenbaum, D.P. (1994). *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

_____ (1993). *Police Personnel Survey*. The University of Illinois at Chicago, Center for Research in Law and Justice.

Rosenbaum, D.P. and A.J. Lurigio (1994). An Inside Look at Community Policing Reform: Definitions, Organizational Changes, and Evaluation Findings. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40(3): 299-314.

Rosenbaum, D.P., S. Yeh and D.L. Wilkinson (1994). Impact of Community Policing on Police Personnel: A Quasi-Experimental Test. *Crime & Delinquency*, 4(3): 331-353.

Sadd, S. and R. Grinc (1993). *Issues in Community Policing: An Evaluation of Eight Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing Projects* (Final Technical Report). New York: Vera Institute.

Schwartz, A.I. and S.N. Clarren (1977). *The Cincinnati Team Policing Experiment: A Summary Report*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute and Police Foundation.

Singleton, G.W. and J. Teahan (1978). Effects of Job-Related Stress on the Physical and Psychological Adjustment of Police Officers. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 6(3):355-361.

Skogan, W.G. (1990). *Disorder and Community Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighborhoods*. New York: Free Press.

Skolnick, J. (1966). *Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in a Democratic Society*. New York: Wiley.

Skolnick, J.H. and D.H. Bayley (1989). *Community Policing: Issues and Practices Around the World*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Sparger, J.R. and D.J. Giacopassi (1978). Swearing In and Swearing Off: A Comparison of Cops' and Ex-Cops' Attitudes Toward the Workplace. In *Police and Law Enforcement* (pp.35-54). New York, NY: AMS.

Sparrow, M.K., M.H. Moore, and D.M. Kennedy (1990). *Beyond 911: A New Era for Policing*. New York: Basic Books.

Trojanowicz, R.C. (1982). *An Evaluation of the Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program in Flint, Michigan*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

_____ (1983). An Evaluation of a Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program: The Flint, Michigan Project. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 2: 410-419.

_____ (1986). Evaluating a Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program: The Flint, Michigan Project. In D.P. Rosenbaum (Ed.), *Community Crime Prevention: Does it Work?* (pp. 157-178). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Trojanowicz, R.C. and B. Bucqueroux (1989). *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*. Cincinnati: Anderson.

Weisel, D.L. and J.E. Eck (1994). Toward a Practical Approach to Organizational Change. In D.P. Rosenbaum's (Ed.), *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises* (pp. 53-72). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Weisburd, D., J.E. McElroy and P. Hardyman (1988). Challenges to Supervision in Community Policing: Observations on a Pilot Project. In J.R. Greene and S.D. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?* (pp. 89-102). New York: Praeger.

Wilkinson, D.L. and D.P. Rosenbaum (1994). The Effects of Organizational Structure on Community Policing: A Comparison of Two Cities. In D.P. Rosenbaum's (Eds.) *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wilson, D.G. and S.F. Bennett (1994). Officers' Response to Community Policing: Variations on a Theme. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40(3): 354-470.

Wycoff, M.A. (1993). *Community Policing: A National Survey.* Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Wycoff, M.A. and W.G. Skogan (1993). *Quality Policing in Madison: An Evaluation of its Implementation and Impact* (Final Technical Report). Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation.

Wycoff, M.A. and W.G. Skogan (1994). The Effect of a Community Policing Management Style on Officers' Attitudes. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40(3): pp. 371-383.

Van Maanen, J. (1973). Observation on the Making of Policemen. *Human Organizations*, 32(4):407-418.

Van Maanen, J. (1975). Police Socialization: A Longitudinal Examination of Job Attitudes in an Urban Police Department. *Administration Science Quarterly*, 20(2):207-228.

Appendix A

Item Key for Scales

Job Dimension

Skill Variety
12 - My job assignment requires me to do many different things at work, using a variety of my skills and talents.
15 – My job assignment requires me to use a number of complex and high-level skills.
17R – My job assignment is quite simple and repetitive.

Task Identity
11 – My job assignment involves doing a "whole" and identifiable piece of work. In other words, my job involves tasks with an obvious beginning and end.
14R – My job is arranged so that I do not have the chance to do an entire piece of work from beginning to end (e.g., clearing a case).
18 – My job provides me with the chance to finish completely the pieces of work I have started.

Autonomy
10 – My job assignment permits me to decide on my own how to do the job.
19 – My job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.
25 – I feel I have enough authority in my job.
26 – I have enough discretion in my job to make effective decisions.

Work with Others
20 – My present job assignment requires me to work closely with other people.
23 – My present job assignment requires a lot of cooperative work with other people.

Job Feedback
21 – My job itself provides me with information about my work performance. In other words, the actual work itself provides clues about my performance besides that received from my supervisors and coworkers.
22 – Just doing the work required by my job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.

Peer/Supervisory Feedback
13 – My supervisors or coworkers let me know how well I am doing on the job.
16 – My supervisors often let me know how well I am performing.

Job Satisfaction

Job Involvement
35 – I like the kind of work I do very much.
36 – I enjoy nearly all the things I do on my job.
37 – I like the employees I work with a great deal.

Organizational Commitment
49 – From my experience, I feel our management in general treats its employees quite well.
119 – The law enforcement agency I am employed by is one of the best in the country.
120 – This law enforcement agency I am employed by is open to suggests for change.
121 – I have confidence that the command staff picks the most qualified person for the best job.

Job Challenges/Creates Personal Growth
How much you personally would like to have each of the following present in your job.
27 – Stimulating and challenging work.
28 – A chance to exercise independent thought and action in my job.
29 – Opportunities to learn new things from my work.
30 – Opportunities to be creative and imaginative in my work.
31 – Opportunities for personal growth and development in my job.
32 – A sense of worthwhile accomplishment from my work.

Receptivity to Change
42 – I look forward to changes at work.
43 – I am inclined to try new ideas.
44 – I often suggest new approaches for doing things.
53R – Most changes are irritating.
54R – I usually hesitate to try new ideas.
50R – Trying new ideas is risky.

Attitudes Toward Community Policing

Support for Community Oriented Policing
How much of the agency's/department's resources should be committed to the activities listed below?
67 - Patrolling on foot in neighborhoods.
68 - Patrolling on bikes in neighborhoods.
69- Marketing police service to the public.
72- Getting to know juveniles.
73- Understanding problems of minority groups.
74 - Explaining crime prevention techniques to citizens.
75 – Handling special events.
78 - Researching and solving problems.
79- Coordinating with other agencies to improve the quality of life in the city.
80 - Working with citizen groups to resolve local problems.

Support for Traditional Policing
How much of the agency's/department's resources should be committed to the activities listed below?
70 – Assisting persons in emergencies.
71 – Helping settle family disputes.
76 – Responding to calls for service.
77 – Checking buildings and residences.

Orientation to Community-Oriented Policing

102 - Police officer should make frequent informal contacts with the people in their beat.

104 - Police officers should try to solve non-crime problems in their beat.

107 – Crime in their beat is not the only problem that police officers should be concerned about.

109 - Police officers should work with citizens to try and solve problems in their beat.

111- Assisting citizens can be as important as enforcing the law.

112- Citizens know more about what goes on in their area than the officers who patrol there.

113- The prevention of crime is the joint responsibility of the community and the police.

114- Lowering citizens' fear of crime should be just as high a priority for the department as cutting the crime rate.

116- Without citizen cooperation, the majority of crimes would never be solved.

Patrol Responsiveness to Community

How would you rate the general patrol functions with respect to the areas listed below?

55 – Effectiveness in handling non-criminal street activity

56 – Prevention of crime

57 – Rapid response to calls for service

58 – Reducing citizen fear of crime in the community

59 – Promoting good police community relations

60 – Cost effectiveness: "giving the public its money's worth"

61 – Obtaining support from business merchants

65 – In delivering a full range of police service

66 - In obtaining support for community minority groups

Positive Police-Public Relations

100R - Most police do not respect the police.

101- The relationship between the police and the people is very good.

103R- Citizens do not understand the problems of the police.

115R - Most people have no idea of how difficult a police officer's job is.

153R - Citizens will never trust police enough to work together effectively.

167 - The public shows a lot of respect for law enforcement officers.

168R - The public is more apt to obstruct law enforcement work than to cooperate.

Problem-Solving Knowledge and Skills

Problem-Solving Capability

How qualified do you feel to do each of the following?

124 - Identify community problems?

125 - Use problem-solving techniques to analyze problems?

126 - Develop solutions to community problems?

127- Evaluate solutions to see how well they work?

128- Work with beat residents to solve problems in the neighborhood?

Orientation toward Problem-Solving Policing
148 - Police will be able to analyze local problems and find underlying patterns that connect them.
149 - Police will be able to prioritize among a broad range of local problems.
150R - Department expectations of what citizens should do to solve neighborhood problems are unrealistic.
151R - Police are so focused on crime and violence in the community that they will never find the time to address other concerns.
154 - Citizens will be able to prevent crime before they occur.
155 - Citizens will be able to analyze local problems and find underlying patterns that connect them.
156 - Citizens will be able to prioritize among a broad range of local problems.
157R - Citizens' expectations of what police should do to solve neighborhood problems are unrealistic.
158R - Citizens are so focused on crime and violence in the community that they will never find the time to address other concerns.
159R - It is very unrealistic to expect citizens to continually attend local beat meetings.

Coworker Support for Community Policing

Coworker Support for Community Policing

Thinking of those officers with whom you identify the closest, how much importance do you think they attach to the following actions?
249 – Patrolling on foot in neighborhoods.
250 – Patrolling on bikes in neighborhoods.
253 – Promoting good police-community relations
255 – Obtaining support from business merchants
256 - Obtaining support from community minority groups
257 – Getting to know juveniles
258 – Understanding problems of minority groups
259 – Explaining crime prevention techniques to citizens
261 – Researching and solving problems
262 – Coordinating with other agencies to improve the quality of life in the city
263 – Working with citizen groups to resolve local problems
264 – Participating in community clean-up and graffiti removal programs

Coworker Support for Traditional Policing

Thinking of those officers with whom you identify the closest, how much importance do you think they attach to the following actions?
251 – Rapid response to calls for service
252 – Reducing citizen fear of crime in the community
254 – Cost effectiveness: "giving the public its money's worth"
260 – Checking buildings and residences

Multicultural Sensitivity

Ability to Assess Policing Needs of Diverse Community Groups
226 – How would you rate your ability to accurately assess the policing needs of women?
227 - How would you rate your ability to accurately assess the policing needs of men?
228 - How would you rate your ability to accurately assess the policing needs of elderly citizens?
229 - How would you rate your ability to accurately assess the policing needs of gay men?
230 - How would you rate your ability to accurately assess the policing needs of lesbian women?
231 - How would you rate your ability to accurately assess the policing needs of handicapped persons?
232 - How would you rate your ability to accurately assess the policing needs of persons who come from very poor socioeconomic backgrounds?

Ability to Assess Needs and Interact with Diverse Cultural Groups
213 – How would you rate your ability to conduct an effective police citizen interaction with a person from a cultural background significantly different from you own?
215 – How would you rate your ability to effectively assess the policing needs of a person from a cultural background significantly different from your own?
216 – In general, how would you rate yourself in terms of being able to effectively deal with biases, discrimination, and prejudices directed at you by a citizen in a policing situation?
219 – In general, how would you rate your ability to accurately articulate a citizen's problem who comes from a cultural group significantly different from your own?
221 – How would you rate your ability to identify the strengths and weaknesses of police methods in terms of their use with persons from different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds?
223 – In general, how would you rate your skill level in terms of being able to provide appropriate police services to culturally different citizens?

DEMOGRAPHICS

233 - Gender
234 - Ethnicity/Race
236 - Age
237 - Prior Military Experience
239 - Prior Law Enforcement Experience
248 - Highest Level of Education Completed
2 - Agency Hired by/Working for

Police Personnel Survey

```
┌─────────────────────────────────┐
│           For Office Use Only    │
│                                  │
│   ID#_____             │
│                                  │
│   Study #_____           │
│                                  │
└─────────────────────────────────┘
```

```
┌───────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                           │
│              POLICE PERSONNEL SURVEY                       │
│                                                           │
│                   December 1995                           │
│                                                           │
│                GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS                        │
│                                                           │
└───────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

Please read each question carefully and circle the number that best corresponds with your answer to the question.

Please circle only one answer per question.

It is important that you respond openly and honestly. A group of researchers from Arizona State University West, in partnership with the Phoenix Regional Police Academy is conducting this survey. **No one in your agency or any other police department will have access to your answers.** Only summary statistics and aggregate responses will be shared with police departments.

In order to guarantee confidentiality you will be identified by code number only, not by your name. Please do not put your name anywhere on the survey. When you finish the questionnaire please return it to the survey team representative.

Instructions: The following questions ask you to describe your job assignment as OBJECTIVELY as you possibly can. Do not use this part of the questionnaire to express how much you like or dislike your assignment or immediate supervisor. Rather, circle the response that best describes the extent to which you agree or disagree that the items correctly describe your job assignment.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
1.	My job assignment permits me to decide on my own how to do the job.	1	2	3	4	5	(10)
2	My job assignment involves doing a "whole" and identifiable piece of work. In other words, my job involves tasks with an obvious beginning and end.	1	2	3	4	5	(11)
3.	My job assignment requires me to do many different things at work, using a variety of my skills and talents.	1	2	3	4	5	(12)
4.	My supervisors or co-workers let me know how well I am doing on the job.	1	2	3	4	5	(13)
5.	My job is arranged so that I do not have the chance to do an entire piece of work from beginning to end (e.g., clearing a case).	1	2	3	4	5	(14)
6.	My job assignment requires me to use a number of complex and high-level skills.	1	2	3	4	5	(15)
7.	My supervisors often let me know how well I am performing.	1	2	3	4	5	(16)
8.	My job assignment is quite simple and repetitive.	1	2	3	4	5	(17)
9.	My job provides me with the chance to finish completely the pieces of work I have started.	1	2	3	4	5	(18)
10.	My job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.	1	2	3	4	5	(19)
11.	My present job assignment requires me to work closely with other people.	1	2	3	4	5	(20)
12.	My job itself provides me with information about my work performance. In other words, the actual work itself provides clues about my performance besides that received from my supervisors and co-workers.	1	2	3	4	5	(21)
13.	Just doing the work required by my job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.	1	2	3	4	5	(22)
14.	My present job assignment requires a lot of cooperative work with other people.	1	2	3	4	5	(23)
15.	I always know what my immediate supervisor expects of me in terms of my performance.	1	2	3	4	5	(24)
16.	I feel I have enough authority in my job.	1	2	3	4	5	(25)
17.	I have enough discretion in my job to make effective decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	(26)

Instructions: Listed below are a number of characteristics that could be present in any job assignment. However, people often differ as to how much they would like to have each characteristic present in their own job. We are interested in learning how much you personally would like to have each of the following present in your job.

		Very Undesirable	Undesirable	Neutral	Desirable	Very Desirable	
18.	Stimulating and challenging work.	1	2	3	4	5	(27)
19.	A chance to exercise independent thought and action in my job.	1	2	3	4	5	(28)
20.	Opportunities to learn new things from my work.	1	2	3	4	5	(29)
21.	Opportunities to be creative and imaginative in my work.	1	2	3	4	5	(30)
22.	Opportunities for personal growth and development in my job.	1	2	3	4	5	(31)
23.	A sense of worthwhile accomplishment from my work.	1	2	3	4	5	(32)

Instructions: The following questions pertain to your job, yourself, and the law enforcement agency you work for. Again, please circle the number that best corresponds to your level of agreement with the following statements.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
24.	I am dissatisfied with the amount of work I am expected to do.	1	2	3	4	5	(33)
25.	This law enforcement agency is a good organization to work for.	1	2	3	4	5	(34)
26.	I like the kind of work I do very much.	1	2	3	4	5	(35)
27.	I enjoy nearly all the things I do on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	(36)
28.	I like the employees I work with a great deal.	1	2	3	4	5	(37)
29.	In general, I have much say and influence over what goes on in regards to my job.	1	2	3	4	5	(38)
30.	The amount of work I am expected to do makes it difficult for me to do my job well.	1	2	3	4	5	(39)
31.	My supervisor frequently seeks my opinion when a problem comes up involving my job environment.	1	2	3	4	5	(40)
32.	The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.	1	2	3	4	5	(41)
33.	I look forward to changes at work.	1	2	3	4	5	(42)
34.	I am inclined to try new ideas.	1	2	3	4	5	(43)
35.	I often suggest new approaches for doing things.	1	2	3	4	5	(44)

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
36.	I am very much involved personally with my job.	1	2	3	4	5	(45)
37.	If I have a suggestion for improving my job in some way, it is easy for me to communicate my ideas to management.	1	2	3	4	5	(46)
38.	My workload is seldom too heavy.	1	2	3	4	5	(47)
39.	The example my fellow employees set encourages me to work hard.	1	2	3	4	5	(48)
40.	From my experience, I feel our management in general treats its employees quite well.	1	2	3	4	5	(49)
41.	Trying new ideas is risky.	1	2	3	4	5	(50)
42.	It would be very hard for me to leave the department now even if I wanted to.	1	2	3	4	5	(51)
43.	Right now, staying with this law enforcement agency is as much as necessity as it is a desire.	1	2	3	4	5	(52)
44.	Most changes are irritating.	1	2	3	4	5	(53)
45.	I usually hesitate to try new ideas.	1	2	3	4	5	(54)

Instructions: Please circle the number that best corresponds to your answer to the following questions.

46. How would you rate the general patrol functions with respect to the areas listed below? Please circle the response which best describes your opinion.

		Very Negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Very Positive	
a)	Effectiveness in handling non-criminal street activity	1	2	3	4	5	(55)
b)	Prevention of crime	1	2	3	4	5	(56)
c)	Rapid response to calls for service	1	2	3	4	5	(57)
d)	Reducing citizen fear of crime in the community	1	2	3	4	5	(58)
e)	Promoting good police-community relations	1	2	3	4	5	(59)
f)	Cost effectiveness: "giving the public its money's worth"	1	2	3	4	5	(60)
g)	Obtaining support from business merchants	1	2	3	4	5	(61)
h)	Ability to collect information on the beat	1	2	3	4	5	(62)
i)	Knowledge of activities on the beat	1	2	3	4	5	(63)
j)	As a training ground for recruits	1	2	3	4	5	(64)
k)	In delivering a full range of police service	1	2	3	4	5	(65)

		Very Negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Very Positive	
l)	In obtaining support from community minority groups	1	2	3	4	5	(66)

47. How much of the agency's/department's resources should be committed to the activities listed below? Please circle the response that best describes your opinion.

		None	Small Amount	Moderate Amount	Large Amount	
a)	Patrolling on foot in neighborhoods	1	2	3	4	(67)
b)	Patrolling on bikes in neighborhoods	1	2	3	4	(68)
c)	Marketing police service to the public	1	2	3	4	(69)
d)	Assisting persons in emergencies	1	2	3	4	(70)
e)	Helping settle family disputes	1	2	3	4	(71)
f)	Getting to know juveniles	1	2	3	4	(72)
g)	Understanding problems of minority groups	1	2	3	4	(73)
h)	Explaining crime prevention techniques to citizens	1	2	3	4	(74)
i)	Handling special events	1	2	3	4	(75)
j)	Responding to calls for service	1	2	3	4	(76)
k)	Checking buildings and residences.	1	2	3	4	(77)
l)	Researching and solving problems	1	2	3	4	(78)
m)	Coordinating with other agencies to improve the quality of life in the city	1	2	3	4	(79)
n)	Working with citizen groups to resolve local problems	1	2	3	4	(80)

48. In an average week, how many hours ON THE JOB do you spend:

		None	1 – 5	6 - 10	11 - 20	21 or More	
a)	On foot patrol	1	2	3	4	5	(81)
b)	On bike patrol	1	2	3	4	5	(82)
c)	In a marked/unmarked squad car	1	2	3	4	5	(83)
d)	Inside the station or an office	1	2	3	4	5	(84)
e)	Attending meetings with the public present	1	2	3	4	5	(85)
f)	Talking to citizens one-on-one	1	2	3	4	5	(86)
g)	Filling out paperwork	1	2	3	4	5	(87)
h)	Contacting other city or state agencies to get them involved with a problem	1	2	3	4	5	(88)

	None	1 – 5	6 - 10	11 - 20	21 or More	
i) Talking with business owners/managers	1	2	3	4	5	(89)

49. Think about the problems you believe characterize your beat. How frequently did the following sources of information contribute to your recognition of a problem?

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	
a) Citizen complaint	1	2	3	4	(90)
b) Community meeting	1	2	3	4	(91)
c) Community survey	1	2	3	4	(92)
d) Departmental data	1	2	3	4	(93)
e) Personal observation	1	2	3	4	(94)
f) Supervisor	1	2	3	4	(95)
g) Council person	1	2	3	4	(96)
h) Other city department/agency	1	2	3	4	(97)

Instructions: Listed below are a number of statements specifically related to police work and law enforcement. Circle the number that best corresponds to the level of your agreement with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
50. Police know better than citizens which police services are required in an area.	1	2	3	4	5	(98)
51. All laws should be enforced at all times; otherwise, people lose respect for the law.	1	2	3	4	5	(99)
52. Most people do not respect the police.	1	2	3	4	5	(100)
53. The relationship between the police and the people is very good.	1	2	3	4	5	(101)
54. Police officers should make frequent informal contacts with the people in their beat.	1	2	3	4	5	(102)
55. Citizens do not understand the problems of the police.	1	2	3	4	5	(103)
56. Police officers should try to solve noncrime problems in their beat.	1	2	3	4	5	(104)
57. An officer on foot patrol can learn more about neighborhood problems than can an officer in a patrol car.	1	2	3	4	5	(105)
58. The use of foot patrols is a waste of personnel.	1	2	3	4	5	(106)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
59. Crime in their beat is not the only problem that police officers should be concerned about.	1	2	3	4	5	(107)
60. Police officers should remember that enforcing the law is by far their most important responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5	(108)
61. Police officers should work with citizens to try and solve problems in their beat.	1	2	3	4	5	(109)
62. The presence of motor patrol cars reduces citizens' fear of crime more effectively than do foot patrols.	1	2	3	4	5	(110)
63. Assisting citizens can be as important as enforcing the law.	1	2	3	4	5	(111)
64. Citizens know more about what goes on in their area than the officers who patrol there.	1	2	3	4	5	(112)
65. The prevention of crime is the joint responsibility of the community and the police.	1	2	3	4	5	(113)
66. Lowering citizens' fear of crime should be just as high a priority for the department as cutting the crime rate.	1	2	3	4	5	(114)
67. Most people have no idea how difficult a police officer's job is.	1	2	3	4	5	(115)
68. Without citizen cooperation, the majority of crimes would never be solved.	1	2	3	4	5	(116)
69. Police officers should avoid too much contact with citizens.	1	2	3	4	5	(117)
70. Police officers have reason to be distrustful of most citizens.	1	2	3	4	5	(118)
71. The law enforcement agency I am employed by is one of the best in the country.	1	2	3	4	5	(119)
72. This law enforcement agency I am employed by is open to suggestions for change.	1	2	3	4	5	(120)
73. I have confidence that the command staff picks the most qualified person for the best job.	1	2	3	4	5	(121)

PROGRAM-RELATED QUESTIONS

74. How familiar are you with the concepts of community-based policing?

Not at All Familiar.............................	1	
A Little or Somewhat Familiar................	2	
Moderately Familiar............................	3	
Very Familiar....................................	4	(122)

75. How familiar are you with the concepts of problem-solving policing?

Not at All Familiar.............................	1	
A Little or Somewhat Familiar................	2	
Moderately Familiar............................	3	
Very Familiar....................................	4	(123)

76. How qualified do you feel to do each of the following?

		Very Unqualified	Unqualified	Qualified	Very Qualified	
a)	Identify community problems?	1	2	3	4	(124)
b)	Use problem-solving techniques to analyze problems?	1	2	3	4	(125)
c)	Develop solutions to community problems?	1	2	3	4	(126)
d)	Evaluate solutions to see how well they work?	1	2	3	4	(127)

		Very Unqualified	Unqualified	Qualified	Very Qualified	
e)	Work with beat residents to solve problems in the neighborhood?	1	2	3	4	(128)

77. Have you heard about Neighborhood Policing Officers (NPO)?

Yes...	1	
No..	2	(129)

78. Are you interested in working on being a Neighborhood Policing Officer (NPO)?

I'm already in a NPO unit....................	1	
Yes...	2	
No..	3	(130)

TRAINING QUESTIONS

81. Please rate the following types of training in your Police Department:

		Not Available	Less Than Adequate	More Than Adequate	Than Adequate	
a)	General police skill training (firearms, self-defense, driving skills)	1	2	3	4	(133)
b)	Special police training (crime prevention, street and drug interdiction, etc.)	1	2	3	4	(134)
c)	Cultural awareness training	1	2	3	4	(135)
d)	Human relations skills (public relations, sensitivity, conflict mediation)	1	2	3	4	(136)
e)	Professional/career development skills (coping with stress)	1	2	3	4	(137)
f)	Other (Specify)_____	1	2	3	4	(138)

Instructions: Listed below are a number of questions specifically related to police and citizens working together to solve neighborhood problems. Circle the number that best corresponds to your agreement with each.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
83.	Police are quite open to the opinions of citizens.	1	2	3	4	5	(145)
84.	Police will never trust citizens enough to work together effectively.	1	2	3	4	5	(146)
85.	Police will be able to prevent crimes before they occur.	1	2	3	4	5	(147)
86.	Police will be able to analyze local problems and find underlying patterns that connect them.	1	2	3	4	5	(148)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
87. Police will be able to prioritize among a broad range of local problems.	1	2	3	4	5	(149)
88. Department expectations of what citizens should do to solve neighborhood problems are unrealistic.	1	2	3	4	5	(150)
89. Police are so focused on crime and violence in the community that they will never find the time to address other concerns.	1	2	3	4	5	(151)
90. Citizens are quite open to the opinions of police.	1	2	3	4	5	(152)
91. Citizens will never trust police enough to work together effectively.	1	2	3	4	5	(153)
92. Citizens will be able to prevent crimes before they occur.	1	2	3	4	5	(154)
93. Citizens will be able to analyze local problems and find underlying patterns that connect them.	1	2	3	4	5	(155)
94. Citizens will be able to prioritize among a broad range of local problems.	1	2	3	4	5	(156)
95. Citizens' expectations of what police should do to solve neighborhood problems are unrealistic.	1	2	3	4	5	(157)
96. Citizens are so focused on crime and violence in the community that they will never find the time to address other concerns.	1	2	3	4	5	(158)
97. It is very unrealistic to expect citizens to continually attend local beat meetings.	1	2	3	4	5	(159)

Instructions: Listed below are a number of statements specifically related to police work and law enforcement. Circle the number that best corresponds to the level of your agreement with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
98. The best arrests are made as a result of hard work and intelligent dedication to duty.	1	2	3	4	5	(160)
99. The average police administrator is very interested in his/her subordinates.	1	2	3	4	5	(161)
100. When testifying in court, officers are treated as criminals when they take the witness stand.	1	2	3	4	5	(162)
101. The average departmental complaint is the result of pressure from top management for superiors to give out complaints.	1	2	3	4	5	(163)
102. The newspapers try to help police departments by giving prominent coverage to items favorable to police.	1	2	3	4	5	(164)
103. The average law enforcement officer is dedicated to the high ideals of police service and would not hesitate to perform police duty even though he/she may have to work overtime.	1	2	3	4	5	(165)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
104. The majority of special assignments in the department depend on who you know, not on merit.	1	2	3	4	5	(166)
105. The public shows a lot of respect for law enforcement officers.	1	2	3	4	5	(167)
106. The public is more apt to obstruct law enforcement work than to cooperate.	1	2	3	4	5	(168)
107. Police academy training of recruits might as well be cut in half.	1	2	3	4	5	(169)
108. The average arrest is made because officers are dedicated to performing their duty properly.	1	2	3	4	5	(170)
109. When a police officer is the focus of an internal affairs investigation, he/she will be presumed guilty even when he/she can prove otherwise.	1	2	3	4	5	(171)
110. The rules and regulations of police work are fair and sensible in regulating conduct on- and off-duty.	1	2	3	4	5	(172)

Instructions: The following questions pertain to multicultural awareness and knowledge. Again, please circle the number that best corresponds to your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
111. Culture is not external but comes from within a person.	1	2	3	4	(173)
112. One of the potential negative consequences about gaining information concerning specific cultures is that police officers might stereotype members of those cultural groups according to the information they have gained.	1	2	3	4	(174)
113. How would you react to the following statements? While policing emphasizes the concepts "to protect and serve," to be "impartial and fair", and to be "honest", it has frequently become a form of oppression to control large groups of people.	1	2	3	4	(175)
114. The law enforcement profession has failed to meet the police service needs of ethnic minorities.	1	2	3	4	(176)
115. Uncertainty and stress often result from multicultural interactions because people are not sure what to expect from each other.	1	2	3	4	(177)
116. The legitimacy and effectiveness of law enforcement would be enhanced if police officers consciously supported universal definitions of professionalism.	1	2	3	4	(178)
117. Self-awareness, self-fulfillment, and self-discovery are important measures in most police-citizen interactions.	1	2	3	4	(179)
118. Even in multicultural police-citizen interactions, basic implicit concepts, such as "fairness" and "justice" are not difficult to understand.	1	2	3	4	(180)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
119. Promoting a citizens sense of satisfaction is usually a safe goal to strive for in most police-citizen interactions.	1	2	3	4	(181)
120. While a person's natural support system (i.e., family, friends, etc) plays an important role during a period of personal crisis, formal police intervention tends to result in more constructive outcomes.	1	2	3	4	(182)
121. How would you react to the following statement? In general, police services should be directed toward assisting citizens to deal with stressful incidents and community problems.	1	2	3	4	(183)
122. Police officers need to change the way they think in order to deal with complex human behavior.	1	2	3	4	(184)
123. Crime problems vary with the culture of the citizen.	1	2	3	4	(185)
124. There are some basic policing skills that are applicable to create successful outcomes regardless of the citizen's cultural background.	1	2	3	4	(186)
125. What do you think of the following statement? Vigilantes and police use similar techniques.	1	2	3	4	(187)
126. In policing, treating citizens differently is not necessarily thought to be discriminatory.	1	2	3	4	(188)
127. In the early grades of formal schooling in the United States, the academic achievement of ethnic minorities, such as African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans is close to the achievement of White mainstream students.	1	2	3	4	(189)
128. Research indicates that in the early elementary school grades girls and boys achieve about equally in mathematics and science.	1	2	3	4	(190)
129. Most of the immigrant and ethnic groups in Europe, Australia, and Canada face problems similar to those experienced by ethnic groups in the United States.	1	2	3	4	(191)
130. In policing, citizens from different ethnic/cultural backgrounds should be given the same treatment that White mainstream citizens receive.	1	2	3	4	(192)
131. The difficulty with the concept of integration is bias in favor of the dominant culture.	1	2	3	4	(193)
132. Persons of different race and ethnic backgrounds are underrepresented in law enforcement.	1	2	3	4	(194)

Please circle the number that best corresponds to your level of awareness with the following statements.

	Very Limited	Limited	Fairly Aware	Very Aware	
133. At this time in your life, how would you rate yourself in terms of understanding how your cultural background has influenced the way you think and act?	1	2	3	4	(195)
134. At this point in your life, how would you rate your understanding of the impact of the way you think and act when interacting with persons of different cultural backgrounds?	1	2	3	4	(196)
135. In general, how would you rate your level of awareness regarding different cultural customs and beliefs?	1	2	3	4	(197)
136. At the present time, how would you generally rate yourself in terms of being able to accurately compare your own cultural perspective with that of a person from another culture?	1	2	3	4	(198)
137. In a multicultural police-citizen interaction, how well do you think you could distinguish "intentional" or "threatening" communication signals from "accidental" or "normal" communication signals.	1	2	3	4	(199)
138. How would you rate your understanding of the concept of "fairness" in terms of goals, objectives, and methods of policing culturally different citizens.	1	2	3	4	(200)

At the present time, how would you rate your own understanding of the following terms:

	Very Limited	Limited	Good	Very Good	
139. "Culture"	1	2	3	4	(201)
140. "Ethnicity"	1	2	3	4	(202)
141. "Racism"	1	2	3	4	(203)
142. "Integration"	1	2	3	4	(204)
143. "Prejudice"	1	2	3	4	(205)
144. "Multicultural Policing"	1	2	3	4	(206)
145. "Ethnocentrism"	1	2	3	4	(207)
146. "Multiple Cultures"	1	2	3	4	(208)
147. "First Impressions"	1	2	3	4	(209)
148. "Stereotypes"	1	2	3	4	(210)
149. "Policing Across Cultures"	1	2	3	4	(211)
150. "Cultural Stereotyping"	1	2	3	4	(212)

	Very Limited	Limited	Good	Very Good	
151. How would you rate your ability to conduct an effective police-citizen interaction with a person from a cultural background significantly different from your own?	1	2	3	4	(213)
152. How well would you rate your ability to distinguish "formal" and "informal" policing strategies?	1	2	3	4	(214)
153. How would you rate your ability to effectively assess the policing needs of a person from a cultural background significantly different from your own.	1	2	3	4	(215)
154. In general, how would you relate yourself in terms of being able to effectively deal with biases, discrimination, and prejudices directed at you by a citizen in a policing situation.	1	2	3	4	(216)
155. How well would you rate your ability to accurately identify culturally biased assumptions as they relate to the process of policing?	1	2	3	4	(217)
156. How well would you rate your ability to explain police methods and strategies and the situations in which they should be used as they relate to your job.	1	2	3	4	(218)
157. In general, how would you rate your ability to accurately articulate a citizen's problem who comes from a cultural group significantly different from your own?	1	2	3	4	(219)
158. How well would you rate your ability to analyze cultural needs in the community you police.	1	2	3	4	(220)
159. How would you rate your ability to identify the strengths and weaknesses of police methods in terms of their use with persons from different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds?	1	2	3	4	(221)
160. How would you rate your ability to understand multicultural training?	1	2	3	4	(222)
161. In general, how would you rate your skill level in terms of being able to provide appropriate police services to culturally different citizens.	1	2	3	4	(223)
162. How would you rate your ability to effectively seek information from another criminal justice agency concerning the needs of a citizen whose cultural background is significantly different from your own.	1	2	3	4	(224)
163. How would you rate your ability to effectively secure information and resources to better serve citizens of different cultural backgrounds?	1	2	3	4	(225)
164. How would you rate your ability to accurately assess the policing needs of women?	1	2	3	4	(226)
165. How would you rate your ability to accurately assess the policing needs of men?	1	2	3	4	(227)
166. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the policing needs of elderly citizens?	1	2	3	4	(228)
167. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the policing needs of gay men?	1	2	3	4	(229)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
168. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the policing needs of lesbian women?	1	2	3	4	(230)
169. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the policing needs of handicapped persons?	1	2	3	4	(231)
170. How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the policing needs of persons who come from very poor socioeconomic backgrounds?	1	2	3	4	(232)

DEMOGRAPHICS

171. What is your gender?

Male.. 1
Female.. 2   (233)

172. What is your ethnic background?

Black/African-American............................ 1
Hispanic/Mexican-American....................... 2
White/Caucasian..................................... 3
Asian-American....................................... 4
Native American...................................... 5
Other (Specify)_____ 6   (234)

173. What is your current marital status?

Single... 1
Single, but living with a partner.................. 2
Married... 3
Married, but separated.............................. 4
Divorced... 5
Widowed... 6   (235)

174. What is your age? _____   (236)

175. What is your current assignment? (Circle one)

Recruit in the academy............................. 1
Patrol Division....................................... 2
Investigations Division............................. 3
Community Services Division.................... 4
Other (Specify)_____ 5   (241)

176. If you are a patrol officer, please specify the area of the city you work most frequently either on a permanent or relief basis.

City of Phoenix Police Department

South Mountain Precinct (400)................... 1
Central City Precinct (500)........................ 2
Desert Horizon Precinct (600)................... 3
Squaw Peak Precinct (700)........................ 4
Maryvale Precinct (800)........................... 5
Cactus Park Precinct (900)........................ 6
Don't have a district assignment................ 7   (243)

Maricopa/Mahove/Coconino County Sheriff's Offices

District I 8
District II 9
District III 10
District IV 11

177. What shift or time of day do you work?

1st Shift - Patrol	1
2nd Shift - Patrol	2
3rd Shift - Patrol	3
Relief Schedule	4
1st Shift - Investigations	5
2nd Shift - Investigations	6
3rd Shift - Investigations	7
Mon - Fri, 8 a.m. - 5 p.m	8
Other (Specify)_____	9

(247)

178. What is the highest level of formal education you have completed? (Circle only one)

High school graduate or G.E.D	1
Some technical school, but did not graduate	2
Technical school graduate	3
Some college, but did not graduate	4
Junior college graduate	5
College graduate	6
Some graduate courses, but did not complete degree	7
Graduate degree	8

(248)

179. On a monthly basis, how many hours of extra training do you receive from your agency?

1 - 3 hours	1
4 - 6 hours	2
8 - 10 hours	3
11 - 13 hours	4
14 - 16 hours	5
17 hours or more	6

(265)

180. If you attended college or technical school, what was your area of study?

Accounting	1	Law	15
Agriculture	2	Medicine/Health	16
Architecture/Urban Planning	3	Military	17
Arts - Performing/Creative	4	Nursing	18
Auto Mechanics	5	Physical Therapy	19
Business	6	Physical Sciences/Math	20
Communication	7	Political Science	21
Computer Science	8	Public Administration	22
Construction	9	Psychology	23
Criminal Justice/Criminology	10	Recreation/Tourism	24
Education	11	Social Work	25
Engineering	12	Sociology	26
Forestry	13		
Journalism	14		(266)

181. Identify your last 2 job experiences. _____   (267)

_____   (268)

182. When growing up, what was your parent's socio-economic status?

Upper class	1
Upper middle class	2
Middle class	3
Lower middle class	4
Lower class	5

(269)

183. How many children did you parents have?

One	1	
Two	2	
Three	3	
Four	4	
Five	5	
Six	6	
Seven or more	7	(270)

184. What is your order of birth in your family?

First born	1	
Middle born	2	
Last born	3	(271)

185. Do you work a second job?

Yes	1	
No	2	(272)

186. Check the hobbies and/or extra curricular activities you engage in?

_____ Team Sports (e.g., football, soccer, baseball, rugby)
_____ Individual Sports (e.g., running, swimming, biking, bowling, lifting weights)
_____ Outdoor Activities (e.g., hiking, canoeing, camping)
_____ Own/Ride Horses
_____ Hunt
_____ Create Art (e.g., paint, draw, crafts)
_____ Write Short Stories
_____ Read Books
_____ Watch Tv
_____ Go to Movies
_____ Donate Time to Charity
_____ Serf the Internet
_____ Spend Time with your Children
_____ Go to Bars and/or Nightclubs
_____ Play a Musical Instrument
_____ Attend college

Police Personnel Interview: Time 3

Date:
Officer Name:
Police Department:
Precinct/District:

1. Why did you choose law enforcement?
2. What do you like most about your job?
3. What do you dislike about the job?
4. How many weeks did you spend in field training?
5. How many field training officers did you have?
6. How would you describe your field training experience?
7. Too what degree do you feel that the lessons you learned in the training academy were reinforced by your field training officer?
8. Did you receive any contradictory messages during field training from the lessons you learned at the police academy?
9. Since you began working for the ___ Police Department, what events have occurred to change your view of policing?
10. Since you began working for the ___ Police Department, what events have occurred to change your view of the community?
11. Have there been any citizen complaints filed against you? Can you tell me about them?
12. Since you began working for the ___ Police Department, what events have occurred to change your view of the ___ Police Department?
13. Does the department inspire the very best in you in the way of job performance? How do they do that?
14. What does community policing mean to you? Can you give any examples of community policing practices you engage in?
15. What do you see the major benefits to you personally from community policing?
16. How would you describe the organizational support you receive for your community policing efforts?
17. In the ___ Police Department, to what degree does community policing play a role in shaping the style of policing the community receives?
18. How do you view the communities role of working with the police?
19. Do you think community policing will be an integral part of the future of policing?
20. What do you see as the main drawbacks of community policing?
21. Can you identify any lessons or training that you wish you would have received at the training academy, but did not?

Police Personnel Interview: Time 4

Date:
Officer Name:
Police Department:
Precinct/District:

1. How would you describe your first year in law enforcement?
2. Since you began working for the _____ Police Department, what events, if any, have occurred to change your view of policing?
3. Since you began working for the ___ Police Department, what events, if any, have occurred to change your view of the community?
4. Have there been any citizen complaints filed against you yet? If so, for what?
5. Since you began working for the ___ Police Department, what events, if any, have occurred to change your view of the ___ Police Department, either for the positive or the negative?
6. Does the department inspire the very best in you in the way of job performance? How do they do that?
7. Since you began working for the ___ Police Department have you received any community policing training?
   a. If yes, can you tell me what type of training it was?
   b. Was problem-solving policing a part of that training?
   c. Can you recall your experiences in the community policing training?
   d. Have your views of community policing changed as a result of this training? In what way? Why?
   e. What effect, if any, has the community policing training impact the way you do your job?
8. On a weekly basis, what percentage of your time do you spend doing community policing?
9. Does your department require that you spend time doing community policing? How much time?
   a. If yes . . . is community policing something you really want to do?
   b. If no . . . does your department let you do community policing?
10. Can you give some examples of community policing practices you engage in?
11. How often do you turn information over to a community policing officer?
12. What do you see as the major benefits to you personally from community policing?
13. How would you describe the departmental support you receive for your community policing efforts?
   a. Do your fellow officers encourage you to engage in community policing activities? If so, how?
   b. Does your Sergeant encourage you to engage in community policing activities? If so, how?
   c. Do you hear about officers receiving recognition for their community policing efforts? If so, for what?

14. What does problem-solving policing mean to you?
15. Can you give some examples of problem-solving policing you engage in? Do you do this on a regular basis?
16. What do you view as the communities role of working with the police?
17. What do you see as the main drawbacks of community policing as implemented in the ___ Police Department?

Field Training Officer Interview

Date:
Officer Name:
Police Department:
Precinct/District:

1. How long have you been a field training officer?
2. How long have you been a police officer?
3. How many hours of FTO training did you receive in order to become an FTO?
4. Can you tell me about that training, what was it like, what sort of topics were covered?
5. Does your agency require that you continue to get training on an annual basis or some other systematic basis in order to remain an active FTO?
6. From your point of view, what skills does an officer in training (OIT) need to learn as part of the field training process?
7. Are there any skills that you place special emphasis on?
8. Is community policing included in the field training process? If so, how?
9. Is problem-solving policing included in the field training process? If so, how?
10. Are there any skills that you feel new recruits are lacking in or missing when they come to you from the academy?

Dropout Interview

Date:
Officer Name:
Police Department:
Precinct/District:

1. What were your reasons for entering police work?
2. Why did you leave police work?
3. Were there any other reasons you had for leaving police work?
4. Did you leave because you didn't liked police work?
5. How would you describe your experience at the training academy?
   a. Was it a positive or negative experience? What about it was positive/negative?
6. What was your best experience at the training academy?
7. What was your worst experience at the training academy?
8. Did it seem that the training you received at the academy was what you needed to do the job?
9. How would you describe your experience working for the police department?
   a. Was it a positive or negative experience? What about it was positive/negative?
10. What was the best thing about working for the police department?
11. What was the worst thing about working for the police department?
12. Was police work what you expected?
13. Can you make any recommendations that might improve the training academy experience?
14. Can you make any recommendations that might improve the field training experience?
15. What do you do now?