

In-Service Training Program for  
Effective Police Work in the  
Changing City

City of Pittsburgh, Office of the Mayor  
OLEA Award Number 126

**In-Service Training Program for Effective  
Police Work in the Changing City**

**Report of a project funded by:**

**The Office of Law Enforcement Assistance  
United States Department of Justice  
Washington, D. C.**

**and**

**The City of Pittsburgh**

**Submitted by:**

**The City of Pittsburgh  
Joseph M. Barr, Mayor**

**Commission on Human Relations  
David B. Washington, Executive Director**

**Department of Public Safety  
David W. Craig, Director  
James W. Slusser, Superintendent, Bureau of Police**

**October, 1968**

Project Staff

Kenneth R. Whipps, M.A., Director, on leave from the Department of Sociology,  
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh

Manuel Deese, B.A., Assistant Director, on leave from the Commission on Human  
Relations, City of Pittsburgh

Theresa Dunn, Secretary

Christine Wisniewski, Secretary

---

David B. Washington, Executive Director, Commission on Human Relations

David W. Craig, Director, Department of Public Safety

James W. Slusser, Superintendent, Bureau of Police

Commander William Moore, Director, Community Relations Division, Bureau of Police

Sergeant Andrew Daley, Community Relations Division, Bureau of Police

Commander Edward Patterson, liaison, Bureau of Police

Commander George W. Purvis, Former Director, Pittsburgh Police Academy

Sergeant Patrick J. Moore, Instructor, Pittsburgh Police Academy

Assistant Superintendent William Gilmore, Bureau of Police

William C. Gawlas, liaison, Commission on Human Relations

Elizabeth A. Wolfskill, liaison, Commission on Human Relations

Margery R. Boichel, research, Commission on Human Relations

Robert Mast, research, University of Pittsburgh

Mary Grace Sweeney, public information, Commission on Human Relations

Barbara Navari, Secretary

KENNETH R. WHIPPS--Biographical Sketch

**BORN:** Auburn, New York; July 11, 1913

**EDUCATION:** Notre Dame University, South Bend, Indiana, B.A.  
Syracuse (N.Y.) University, Maxwell School of  
Citizenship, M.A.  
Additional graduate study at the University of  
Buffalo, Carnegie-Mellon University, Duquesne  
University

**PRESENT POSITION:** Assistant Professor of Sociology, Duquesne University,  
Pittsburgh.

**FORMER POSITIONS:** Director, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance  
Project, City of Pittsburgh.

Supervisor of Probation Officers, Allegheny County  
Criminal Court and Allegheny County Juvenile Court.

Supervisor of Counselors, Domestic Relations Court,  
Pittsburgh.

Teaching positions: Wheeling (W.Va.) College, Carnegie-  
Mellon University, Western Pennsylvania Penitentiary,  
Pittsburgh Police Academy.

**RELATED ACTIVITIES:** Consultant, Mercy Hospital, Pittsburgh, Pa. (Conducted  
human relations training program for hospital  
security guards.)

Former Director of Social Services, Boystown of  
McKeesport, Pennsylvania.

Member, Examining Board of applicants to probation  
service, Allegheny County Criminal Court.

MANUEL DEESE--Biographical Sketch

BORN: Toomsboro, Georgia - November 8, 1941

EDUCATION: Pittsburgh Public Schools  
Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland,  
B.A., Political Science, January, 1964.  
Detroit College of Law, 1964-65.

PRESENT POSITIONS: Chief of Compliance, Pittsburgh Commission  
on Human Relations  
Consultant, Community Relations Service,  
United States Department of Justice

FORMER POSITIONS: Assistant Director, Office of Law Enforcement  
Assistance Project, City of Pittsburgh  
Field Representative, Pittsburgh Commission  
on Human Relations

RELATED ACTIVITIES: Consultant, Urban Intergroup Relations Center,  
University of Pittsburgh

Consultant, Mercy Hospital, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
(Conducted human relations training program for  
hospital security guards)

Member, Planning Committee, National Association  
of Intergroup Relations Officials (NAIRO) -  
Police-Community Relations Board, Washington, D. C.

AFFILIATIONS: Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Pittsburgh Graduate Chapter  
Morgan State College Alumni Association  
Board of Directors, Association of Black Social Workers  
of Western Pennsylvania  
Member, Advisory Committee, Employment and Economic  
Development Department, Pittsburgh Urban League  
Member, National Association for the Advancement  
of Colored People

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

Division I.	Review of the Main Points in the Application.....	1
Division II.	Consultants in Planning.....	7
Division III.	Review of Subject Matter Selection, Recruitment of Speakers, Experience of Other Cities.....	12
Division IV.	Publicity.....	18
Division V.	Group Leader Selection and Participation.....	20
Division VI.	Police Participation and Cooperation.....	32
Division VII.	Liaison for Citizen Involvement.....	36
Division VIII.	Analysis of the Speakers.....	39
Division IX.	Diary History of the Project.....	44
Division X.	Activity Following the Actual Training Session.....	57
Division XI.	Prognosis and Recommendation for a Future Similar Program..	61
Division XII.	Research and Evaluation.....	64
	Introduction.....	66
	Opinions of the Participants Concerning the Program.....	77
	Profile of the Participants.....	83
	The Effect of the Program Participants.....	98
	Patterns of Change in Response to Police-Community Situations.....	110
	Patterns of Change in Response to a Racial Future.....	123
	Conclusions.....	148

Appendices

A.	Consultants in Planning.....	152
B.	Speaker Biographies.....	154
C.	Publicity (enclosed envelope).....	
D.	Police Group Leaders.....	155
E.	Civilian Group Leaders.....	158
F.	Research Evaluation.....	167

Division I

REVIEW OF THE MAIN POINTS IN THE APPLICATION

In 1955 the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations initiated a three-hour course in human relations training for recruit police officers. The commencement of the human relations course was a direct outgrowth of the alleged killing of a police officer by Aloysius Spaulding in the Hill District section of the City of Pittsburgh. Tension in the community following this incident was extremely high and the Commission on Human Relations immediately implemented the course in an effort to bridge the gap between the police and community. Prior to the initiation of the recruit course in human relations, there was but one in-service training program for police officers during the term of the late Mayor David L. Lawrence.

Police recruit training in human relations in the City of Pittsburgh has gradually developed into a 10-hour integral part of the curriculum of new recruit officers.

In 1966 the Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations in cooperation with the Department of Public Safety submitted a proposal to the Office of Economic Opportunity for a grant of \$102,177.64. The purpose of the proposal for grant allocations was to conduct a 9-week training program in community relations for Pittsburgh Bureau of Police personnel as a part of the Community Action program for the City of Pittsburgh. Grants were authorized under Title II-A, Section 206 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Detroit, Michigan and Newark, New Jersey were among the first cities to receive a grant from OEO to train police personnel in human relations.

"The proposed training program under the OEO proposal would have given each officer 24 hours of lecture and small group discussions devoted to (1) providing Pittsburgh Police with the knowledge and skills to effectively deal with public safety situations involving the poor and racial minorities, and (2) to generally improving relations between police and residents of Community Action Program neighborhoods."

The original OEO proposal for human relations training for police officers stated that a high proportion of Pittsburgh police activity is concentrated in the priority areas of the city's program. As the city's original community action proposal in 1964 pointed out, "areas with the greatest delinquency problems in the city are those with high scores from other poverty indicators," with highest delinquency rates concentrated in the North Side and the Hill District, followed by Garfield, East Liberty, Homewood, the South Side and the Hazelwood-Greenfield areas.

The proposal went on to state that the need for improvement in the relations between the police and the community is important, not only for its own sake, but also for the continuation of the Community Action Program. Pittsburgh's original request for funds under Section 206 of Title II-A, Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, was favorably received by the OEO Training and Technical Assistance program, but subsequently rejected due to a Congressional cut-back in funds.

Following the Congressional cut-back in funds allocated by OEO for training and technical assistance, the City of Pittsburgh, in conjunction with the Department of Public Safety and the Commission on Human Relations, applied for federal funds under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 (LEAA). The original application was altered and brought into conformity with the guidelines set forth by the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965.

The refined application was submitted to the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U. S. Department of Justice in December, 1966. In February, 1967, the City of Pittsburgh was granted \$48,598 (grantee contribution \$57,816) by the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, United States Department of Justice, to embark upon an in-service training program in human relations for 500 police officers in the pilot phase of the project. This is approximately 1/3 of the total Pittsburgh Bureau of Police personnel. The project would run for 9 months and would be composed of the following stages: pre-project planning; training; and evaluation. In the initial training program, 500 police officers would be selected from the patrol, traffic and detective division to participate in the project. No standards were designed to select the police officers who would participate in the project. Each officer would receive a total of 24 hours in human relations training over a 6-week period. The course consisted of lectures in sociology, psychology, intergroup relations, civil rights, religion and police-community relations. Such lectures were deemed important in that they set the stage for understanding the urban problem.

A large portion of hostility directed toward police officers is found in the poorer areas of the city where there are high crime rates, tension, misunderstanding and distrust. Since 1964, incidents involving the police have precipitated ghetto riots in our metropolitan centers. "Most, if not all, of the riots of the past summers in the northern racial ghettos, have been sparked by some hostile confrontation between Negro citizens and police officers. Those who have studied these situations point out that they are typically triggered by a relatively minor incident, such as an arrest for drunken driving or behavior, as the case in both Philadelphia and Watts."

The most common complaints of members of the ghetto regarding the police are: (1) belief that the police disregard the civil liberties and constitutional rights of disadvantaged citizens, with charges of police brutality; (2) inferior quality of service and protection in the poorer neighborhoods; and (3) the role that the police are believed by ghetto residents to play in crime and corruption within the ghetto.

Mayor Barr in his letter to the United States Department of Justice requesting the grant stated, "In Pittsburgh, as in other large urban centers, a high proportion of Police activity is concentrated in our impoverished ghetto areas. In these neighborhoods, there exists a lack of confidence on the part of some members of the community in the Bureau of Police's intention or capacity to deal with their grievances. This, of course, generates a climate of tension with which the city must deal in order to meet its responsibilities to the total community. In this proposed project, Police will be trained to assume leadership in ameliorating this tension."

According to the application, the program as constructed is focused toward the police, and therefore may seem a one-sided and possibly unfair attack on the problem. But a start must be made somewhere, and difficulties experienced and sometimes even created by police officers indicate that such an approach, even though one-sided, must be attempted. Perhaps insights and results from this program can aid in future community relations efforts of the Bureau of Police as it strives to improve its image in the community. But, prior to this, policemen themselves need to take a hard honest look at their present image to see if in it there are not certain elements whose improvement would improve the image as a whole, and would better police-citizen communication. It is recognized

that the police are never going to be "popular," in the sense that they please everyone; yet there remains the conviction that certain changes in police behavior would create within the public, and particularly within the minority community, the feeling that the police are fair and just in their day-to-day operations.

The City of Pittsburgh's human relations training program was captioned, "In-Service Training for Effective Police Work in the Changing City." Objectives of the project were:

- to further the professional development of law enforcement personnel, with particular regard to the implications of professionalism in equal protection of the law for all persons, and respect for their rights as persons.
- to provide an opportunity for sharing of points of view between Bureau of Police personnel and residents of the community so that each has some appreciation of the obstacles to the establishment of better police-community relationships and each develops a commitment to overcome these obstacles.
- to give police an opportunity to understand themselves as persons and to evaluate their attitudes and beliefs.
- to help Pittsburgh Police personnel gain an understanding of the historical, social, and economic forces which influence the behavior of socially and economically disadvantaged segments of our society, including racial and other minority groups.
- to provide police personnel with insights into the nature of prejudice and minority group attitudes.

- to aid police in acquiring an appreciation of the Civil Rights Movement, the demonstrations for slum clearance and code enforcement, the picketing to end de facto segregation in the schools, the direct action and protest group efforts to gain entrance for the Negro in certain job markets and employment situations.
- to aid police in gaining a significant understanding of rumor, of the communications system which operates in many low-income neighborhoods, and of the relationship of rumor-spreading to the engendering of riot situations.
- to help police to acquire the skills to meet police situations involving the poor and minority groups with firm objectivity.
- to help police officers to accept integrated situations.
- to facilitate the recognition by police of the role of the various community relations and human development programs in the City of Pittsburgh and to motivate police to make more effective use of the agencies involved in such programs.
- to insure that police recognize their responsibility under federal, state, and local civil rights laws.

## Division II

### CONSULTANTS IN PLANNING

Almost from the beginning, it became apparent that careful decision would be necessary to avoid making the training program so heavily academic that the police officers would lose interest in it. At the same time, it was obvious that a program which would be wholly directed from all police background would fail to give the rounded instruction which is a must if the emerging police officer of today and tomorrow is to be equipped to handle contemporary problems in police work.

From the list of consultants which appears in the Appendix, it can be seen that the greatest number of advisors were from the professional field of corrections or from schools of learning. The majority of these people contacted were not retained on a professional basis, but were cooperative enough to give a few hours of their time because of their generic or specific interest in the field of law enforcement and/or in the problems of community adjustment.

Of particular value was the advice given by training officers and heads of enforcement divisions in regard to in-service training programs which they have directed or participated in during the past years. Some of their knowledge of local police history was invaluable in that a real effort was made to avoid procedures which had been found in the past to be distasteful to the police. With the cooperation of the officers of the Bureau of Public Safety and the Superintendent of Police, it was arranged so that as far as possible police officers did not have a 12-hour day because of having to attend the training

sessions. In the same way, it was worked out by the Bureau of Public Safety that any officer who did have to work in this manner was paid on an hourly basis for his extra time. In the planning and in the holding of the classes, there was repeated reference to the fact that the rank and file of the police department do not like compensatory time off and do not trust administration to return such time in a satisfactory manner.

Of particular help was the advice given by the two men in the police-community relations units since they are experienced in arranging such programs for the police recruits. Inspector William Moore and Officer Andrew Daly contributed a great deal of professional advice and personal wisdom and knowledge which was most useful in keeping the program on a workable level.

Also on a practical level were the services given by Captain George Purvis, Director of the Police Academy, Sergeant Patrick Moore of the Police Academy, and Sergeant Edward Patterson in charge of Personnel Records. These individuals became concerned about the program as we presented it, to the extent that Captain Purvis and Sergeant Patterson were able to go with the Director of OLEA to observe the Detroit, Michigan, program in operation.

On an academic level, there was considerable advice given by three university professors who did not feel that they wanted to become professional consultants but whose interest in urban affairs compelled them to give a great deal of their time and talent. Dr. Chester Jurczak was especially valuable in suggesting an approach in which the established history of some minority groups might vividly demonstrate that the Negro-white tension is not hopeless. Dr. Veronica Maz attended two of the police group leader training sessions, and from her study of urban-rural police activities was able to suggest refinements in the training

program. Although she was never called on to participate in the program, Dr. Maz was a back-up speaker in the event that we would have an unforeseen difficulty. Dr. Bruno Casile, Professor of Guidance, assisted greatly in the initial consideration of how we might appreciate the emotional difficulty of our students who would be involved. We were especially fortunate that Fr. Francis Duffy made himself available as a consultant and as a speaker. In addition to a professional participation, he attended frequent meetings as the program progressed.

The work of Dr. Mary Chisholm in Group Dynamics and of Dr. Rolf Von Eckartsberg, Professor of Psychology, gave a brilliant display of team participation.

In our visit to Detroit to secure the services of Commissioner Ray Girardin and of Dr. Hideya Kumata, the latter was able to give us an hour and a half of consultation without fee because of his interest in the program.

Separate mention should be made of some brilliant consultation services which came from the trip to Detroit, Michigan. In the first instance, Commissioner Girardin was most helpful and enthusiastic in telling his staff to help us in any way possible. In the second place, Inspector Bernard Winckoski, Director of Inspectional Services for the Detroit Police, had been named to be in charge of a similar training program, and he was most generous in sharing all kinds of information. Third, Lt. Adelbert Welles, as an assistant in charge of the training program, gave us every possible efficient use of the Detroit experience.

We were able to bring about an excellent combination of the two main groups' points of view. Inspector Bernard Winckoski of Detroit and Dr. Frank Cizon of

Loyola University came to Pittsburgh to meet with the Director, the Assistant Director and Professor Francis Duffy who has been mentioned above. Since Dr. Cizon is a consultant on police-community relations and since Fr. Duffy has 25 years of experience with various correctional institutions and is currently chaplain of the Pittsburgh Fraternal Order of Police, there was a tremendously valuable pool of information evolved.

A spin-off benefit resulted from nearly all contacts with consultants. A demonstration of this is our contacts with members of the Bar Association, including Eric Springer, Chairman of the Commission on Human Relations and David Washington, Executive Director of the Commission on Human Relations. These men were able to give us the past workings of the Commission in a small attempt to explain to the police the problems of the minority groups and to help us plan what points of interest would be the most valuable.

Consulting with Milton Susman, Esq., we found an extremely capable speaker who later participated in the training sessions and made a real impact on the officers. Another attorney with whom we consulted was Patrick Tamilia, Director of Domestic Relations Court. He had fine insight into existing community difficulties. Mr. Tamilia further gave us aid and encouragement by acting as a back-up speaker similar to that mentioned earlier for Dr. Veronica Maz. Although we did not call on his services in this capacity, it relaxed any tension that we would have had that we would some day not have a speaker.

Another type of consultant was found in the contacts with social agencies. Two of these people became sufficiently interested to become group leaders when the program developed. One of these was Walter Crocker, Supervisor of Probation Officers at the Allegheny County Juvenile Court. As a volunteer consultant, he

was able to give us much of the feeling prevalent in the ghetto settlement houses in which he has been connected. Similarly, Russell L. Bradley, Executive Director of the Pittsburgh Office of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, became a group leader. He helped us to secure planning material and shared with us his experience in the area of police-community relations.

In concluding this division, it should be pointed out that it was necessary to bring together the well-known national professional consultants with the local consultants on at least one occasion. Experience taught us that it would have been beneficial to do this earlier than we did. However, we did learn that there is a good deal of talent within the local areas and that it may be difficult to get them to participate fully in the planning stages. Many of these people, however, are willing to volunteer brief periods of time without compensation because they are interested in the training of police officers. Some of these people may be so pressed for time that they are available only at luncheon periods. While this has some drawbacks, it is entirely possible to accomplish something concrete and useful in a half-hour period. We found that it is necessary to talk to innumerable people before you can be certain just which ones have suitable resources. Of course, a great deal of time is spent reflecting on contacts with the professional world and estimating the probable value of people who have been in such a program or in similar programs or in similar employment in the past.

Division III

REVIEW OF SUBJECT MATTER SELECTION, RECRUITMENT OF  
SPEAKERS, EXPERIENCE OF OTHER CITIES

The initial planning called for distribution to the police of appropriate reading material. The Director and Assistant Director examined many monographs, publications, magazine articles and newspapers. From the many articles considered, we decided to select the ones which were most pertinent and most pointed in their approach.

Some of the material is old in that it was used previously by other police departments. Some of it is new, such as the 1967 publication of "The Policeman Looks at Himself." To add weight to the practicality of these articles, it was decided to write a paper designed particularly for the Pittsburgh Police Department. This paper is titled, "Prejudice - Asset or Liability?"

In order to give the police officer a sense of individuality, each man was given a folder including this material with his name typed on the folder.

We were fortunate in having copies available of Commissioner Ray Girardin's article "After the riots: Force won't settle anything." We felt that this was particularly meaningful since it was distributed to the men on the day that Commissioner Girardin made a personal appearance and address. We did not attempt to put any "heavy" reading material into this because we wanted it to have as much circulation as possible and we wanted to establish the police motif in the entire program.

A real difficulty was encountered when we realized that as much as possible we would like to give the officer-student the same material for each of the 10 classes of 50 men. The best way to do this would be to have strong speakers for the entire week. But this, for the most part, is impossible. Our opening week was titled "Police Work as a Profession," and was directly related to Commissioner Girardin's main contention that the role of a competent police officer has indeed become professional! Commissioner Girardin's impact on the police group and on the community in general was electrifying. Mention will be made in the next division of the reaction of mass media to this gentleman.

We do strongly recommend that the opening session of any training program have as its main speaker a person who is easily acceptable and identifiable as police-oriented. An awkward situation can develop in the second week of the training program. To avoid the impasse which might result by an abrupt presentation of an academic person, it is well to have an individual who is at least quasi-police in background. For our purposes, we were able to get the Federal Bureau of Investigation agent who is coordinator of police training programs in Western Pennsylvania, Eastern Ohio and in West Virginia. This made an excellent bridge between the first week of direct police functioning to a consideration of how the community understands or seems to understand the duties of the police officer. These remarks by Agent James Treher were particularly good as he demonstrated to the police that generally it is a matter of the individual police officer presenting himself properly to the community.

In addition to paving the way for persons of academic background, Agent Treher was able to give the police a feeling of familiarity with the experiences

of other communities, particularly as he spoke of his police work in the southern states.

A part of Agent Treher's talk touched on the lack of communication between the majority groups and/or the minority groups. Agent Treher was able to give us 10 sessions so that we had two well-established weeks for the students to use as a spring-board to a slightly different consideration.

After these weeks, we used a variety of speakers for several reasons. First, we found it impossible to obtain speakers for a full week due to their own professional commitments. Secondly, we felt that there is some question of whether we should attempt to have a speaker for five consecutive days of two sessions a day because it becomes obvious that the person is fatigued and also he tends to feel as if he could not quite believe that he had not talked to these same men before.

As our brilliant lecturer, Dr. Hideya Kumata said to a police audience, "Excuse me for thinking that I spoke to you before, but you know that all cops look alike."

There is a value in having two or more speakers in a week because once the tempo has been set, the police-students are inclined to exchange opinions about "our speaker" versus "your speaker." We were pleased when several officers asked us why they had not heard the "other" speaker talk. We felt that it indicated an intelligent curiosity to know what the other officers were talking about.

In the Appendix, there is a list of the speakers that we used, their general areas of interest, and the subject matter they covered. For details of these speakers, see Division VIII, "Analysis of the Speakers."

## EXPERIENCES OF OTHER CITIES

Invaluable help was given by the police personnel of Newark, New Jersey and Detroit, Michigan. On August 24 and 25, Director Whipps was able to take advantage of an invitation from the Newark Police Department to spend two days getting the material we would like to have. This was not long after Newark had their disastrous riot. If any motivation were needed to try to develop a good police training program in the area of community relations, it was found here. The citizens of Newark were still upset by their near catastrophe and it was reassuring to find that everyone wanted to share his experience. Director Threatt of the Newark Community Relations Center is a civilian who had headed the Newark training program in police-community relations. In discussing their program, he pointed out some areas which had not been well received by the police. The first impression was that perhaps the police cannot tolerate a militant speaker.

In continuing this general line of thought with the Newark Police, there seems a possibility that there is value in having a militant speaker, but certainly some preparation is necessary before the police accept this section of training.

The police were particularly annoyed by the presence of a speaker who they alleged had a criminal background. The feeling about this was so intense that it had interfered with the operation of the training program, and hampered the communication which otherwise might have been very valuable.

Director Whipps had an opportunity to talk to the Assistant Superintendent of Police, several police captains and sergeants, and a few patrolmen. These men

were bitter of what they considered unjust criticism by the news media after their harrowing days of the riot.

There was a general air of dislike of training programs of the type which we were planning. It was encouraging however, to find that in continued conversation with these men, they extended encouragement and were sincere in wanting to help so that the Pittsburgh program could profit by their history.

The visit to Newark made an impact on the type of Lay Group Leaders which were selected in Pittsburgh. It was the initial idea that it would be well to have Lay Group Leaders who could at least in a small way relate or identify with the police in their own background. This is discussed in detail in Section V.

In Detroit, Michigan, constructive suggestions and criticism were given by Commissioner of Police, Ray Girardin, Inspector Bernard Winckoski, Director of Inspectional Services, and Lieutenant Adelbert Welles. The latter two gentlemen had been placed in charge of the police training program. Since they had already had a 1967 training program and were planning a program for January of 1968, they had a wealth of material which they generously had shared with us.

Detroit, too, had experienced a severe riot in 1967 and it had renewed their zeal to give the police the best possible training program in the area of police-community relations.

Detroit seemed to have made so much effort that on January 5, Director Whipps went to Detroit with Captain George Purvis of the Police Training Academy and Sergeant Edward Patterson in charge of Personnel Records.. In addition to getting more information and suggestions from Detroit, the Pittsburgh Police were

recharged and revitalized by the enthusiasm of the Detroit Police. I believe that this visit so close to the beginning of our program gave us additional impetus.

An additional benefit of the second Detroit visit was an hour and a half consultation of the three Pittsburgh men with Dr. Hideya Kumata and Lieutenant Adelbert Welles, who is in charge of the actual training sessions there. A further development was the agreement between Director Whipps and Bernard Winckoski that Director Whipps would be an emergency back-up speaker for the 1968 classes to repay partially the courtesies and concrete help which the Detroit Police gave us. As a result of this cooperation, we were able to get Commissioner Ray Girardin for an entire week as our first week speaker. We would heartily recommend the Personnel of the Detroit Police Department to any city which is preparing a program of this type. Their cooperation and advice was evident in all of our contacts with them.

Division IV

PUBLICITY

The area of publicity seems to be one in which every type of professional person envisions himself as a highly-qualified reporter and public relations man. The Director and Assistant Director of OLEA were careful to give suggestions on what we considered news to the Public Information Officer and then to leave it entirely in the hands of this person.

We strongly recommend that publicity should be placed entirely in the hands of a Public Information person who is already well established in the local city. It is not practical nor desirable to bring in an outside person, however talented he may be. We state this because it becomes obvious that the police like to work with someone whom they already know. They readily cooperated with Miss Mary Grace Sweeney because of her experience in Human Relations Police Training.

In our instance we used the services of this Public Information Officer who is permanently attached to Mayor Barr's Commission on Human Relations. She has a knowledge and sympathy of the program and is experienced in knowing what appeals most to a particular media. Probably the best demonstration is the exhibits which are included in the Appendix.

It can be pointed out that there are two natural opportunities to get publicity for the training sessions. The first is when the program is announced. This automatically can be tied in with the appointment of the Director whose background can probably make a suitable news item. The second appealing situation is the opening session at the Police Training Academy. In the Pittsburgh

area, we planned news conferences with emphasis that we would present a nationally-known Ray Girardin. Reference was made to a magazine publication and his general background. A third possibility which has not yet been explored will be the announcement of the report on the findings from the research group.

When our program was first announced in July, it was given publicity in both daily newspapers and in the Sunday paper with photos included in all accounts. During the first week of classes, there were two television appearances and four radio broadcasts for Commissioner Ray Girardin. This was followed by three television appearances for the Director as well as five radio spots.

In the event that you obtain the services of a particularly colorful speaker, the media seems to respond well. When Atlantic City Police Captain Robert Lamb, Jr. spoke, he was given television appearances and write-ups in all the local papers. We have had a total of ten newspaper stories for the program in addition to times mentioned for the original announcement of the program.

When the publicity is given, police representatives should be included in every session if it is at all possible. They appreciate this consideration and it is one more harmonizing opportunity.

WOLW

## Division V

### GROUP LEADER SELECTION AND PARTICIPATION

Each class session was limited to fifty police officers. Following the lectures and brief break, the men reconvened and were given an explanation of the next step. Five groups of ten officers were chosen, and each group was given a room in which to hold their individual meeting. Assigned to each group of ten were a Police Group Leader and a Lay Group Leader.

From the exchange of information in Newark, New Jersey, and Detroit, Michigan, we came to the conclusion that these small sessions had the greatest potential value, but at the same time, they were probably the most difficult to arrange. From these two cities, we learned that there was a double jeopardy. In the Newark course of training, it seemed that the extensive use of grass roots people tended to get almost completely out of control. In the early Detroit sessions of 1967, it seemed to us that the use of only Police Group Leaders for the police officers' discussions led to a police-dominated point of view which had little to offer in the way of constructive give and take. Our concern was that unless we could find two leaders of different types and background, we would have little opportunity for acculturation.

It was relatively simple to come to the conclusion that we would select a Police Group Leader who was verbal, outgoing, and inclined to favor police training generally. When it came to the selection of the Lay Group Leader, again falling back on the police experience of many other cities, we realized that the police officers generally have a difficult time accepting anyone who has not had police experience. In order to bridge this gap as quickly as possible,

we determined to enlist the aid of professional people whose background was with an agency or agencies which had at least some identity with authoritarian focus. The Director and Assistant Director compiled a list of possible Lay Group Leaders and reviewed them often in an attempt to get those Lay Group Leaders who were energetic, interested in the principles generally, and who were willing to make some sacrifice to improve the background of the men who will probably shortly be exposed to extreme racial tension. In general, we found these civilians and professionals in the fields of Social Work, Education, Civil Rights, Probation, and Corrections.

We drew our Lay Group Personnel from such agencies as Urban League, Criminal Court, Juvenile Court, Boys Clubs, Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs, street workers of racially tense areas, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Inc., Allegheny County Behavior Clinic, Narcotics Treatment Program, School Guidance Departments, Community Mental Health Centers, State Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, Alcoholism Clinic, State Correctional Institution at Pittsburgh, United States Probation Office, Area Youth Programs, and clergy who have been associated with both the militant and non-militant background groups in the ghetto areas.

It was necessary to go into so many fields, not only to give a cross cultural exposure, but because we had two hundred Lay Group Leader positions to fill. It might be noted at this point that in the entire program, we successfully had active participation in one hundred ninety-eight Lay Group Leader situations. It was obviously much easier to use a single Group Leader in as many sessions as possible, not only for our own convenience, but so that he might become proficient from repeated contact with the police.

We decided to limit the actual number of sessions for any one Leader to ten sessions so that he would not become stale. To some of the Lay Group Leaders, we assigned ten sessions in one week. For others, we scheduled five mornings in one week and five mornings or afternoons in the following week. This was done with a view to keeping the part-time temporary person interested in his project and to keep necessary communication with him at a minimum. It did not seem practical to enlist the aid of any Lay Group Leader unless he could give us at least four to six sessions.

Individual biographies of each Lay Group Leader are included in the Appendix. The same arrangement of biographies for the Police Group Leaders is included in the Appendix.

The Police Group Leaders were selected by the Bureau of Public Safety through the combined efforts of the Director, the Superintendent of Police, and the Assistant Superintendents. We requested that these men be natural leaders, although we did not suggest that these must be officers of rank, the Police Department chose fifteen men for us, five of whom were Lieutenants, three were Sergeants, five were Detectives, and the others Community Relations or Dispatcher of Patrolmen rank. The assignments were made to include five men for the afternoon sessions, five men for the morning sessions, and five alternates in case of illness or emergency duty for any of the ten regulars.

We found out that this does not work as well as the plan would suggest because there was a lack of a central person who could immediately be contacted at all times so that notice could be quickly sent to bring in one of the alternates.

Several times there were only four Police Group Leaders, and sometimes only three Police Group Leaders. On most of these occasions we were able to use one of the two police "Brass" who were often present and who took a lively interest in the program. On two occasions when we were very short of Police Group Leaders, we divided into only four groups and used one of the Lay Group Leaders as a fill-in. This was an interesting experiment, and while we were pleased that the Lay Group Leader tried to assume the social role of having police background, it was impossible for him to completely and consistently remain in the police background role. We would not recommend this experience be used in any other city. It should be regarded strictly as a dubious emergency procedure.

Of the fifteen Police Group Leaders assigned, only ten participated consistently and enthusiastically. This will account for the discrepancy in the Appendix where we indicate that special certificates of merit were issued to only ten of these fifteen Police Group Leaders.

The Police Group Leaders and the Lay Group Leaders were trained together. This had the advantage of each group being exposed to each other, and gave the police in particular an opportunity to experience the strong interaction of the small group sessions which were to come later in the program.

Eight 2½-hour sessions were scheduled for the group leaders. The first two sessions were conducted by Dr. Mary Chisholm, Professor of Sociology and Dr. Rolf Von Eckartsberg, Professor of Psychology. These two people have been working as a team for some time in the area of Social Dynamics. The initial reaction from the group leaders was one of dismay as these people begin at a very high level. They are expert, however, in going back and forth over the material until the

trainee begins to develop confidence that he has found out what their message is. Almost from the outset, the men were placed in groups and were compelled to discuss real or fancied subject matter.

In the first session, the film, "The Eyes of the Beholder," gave a vivid illustration of what the dynamics team had been stressing.

In the second session, the film on hospital administration and supervision emphasized the difficulties in the area of communication.

The Project Director handled the third session in emphasizing the basic principles and the natural tendencies we all have toward prejudice and discrimination. We worked in with this role strain and role conflict as probable situations in which the group leaders soon would find themselves. We were fortunate to have additional help in the first session from Dr. Francis Duffy, Professor of Sociology, and in the second session to have the participation of Dr. Veronica Maz, Professor from St. Bonaventure University.

The fourth session was conducted by Dr. Duffy, who has rather easy acceptance in that he had been recently elected to Chaplain of the Pittsburgh Fraternal Order of Police. In this fourth session, he stressed various types of problems and various approaches in a generalistic way to the solution of these problems. He, too, spent considerable time in exploring the possibilities of communication and the several ways in which communication may be blocked partially or entirely.

The fifth session was conducted by the Assistant Project Director, who gave the officers a detailed history of how the program came into being. This was done when we realized that very few of them had any idea of the background of the program.

The sixth session was conducted by Dr. Maz, who is a specialist in the ethnics group area, and who was able to convey with understanding the development of the many minority groups in the United States.

The seventh session was a review of case history material by the Director, Professor Kenneth R. Whipps, with the two purposes of having the Police give their professional opinion about the types of histories which we might present to the police-students as well as having them actually participate as group leaders in turn.

This session was composed almost entirely of Police Group Leaders. They were critical of some of the material so much so that revision was obvious. In any of the case history material which we used in the training sessions, we had the benefit of the reaction of these Police Group Leaders. Sometimes in addition to offering criticism, an individual officer would recall a case history which had gone badly or which had gone without participation in a previous police-community relations situation. Here we obtained valued insight of police reaction.

Beginning with the second session, we used inter-related material or a film which brought some of the police spirit into the proposed program as well as about the topic at hand. In another program, we would suggest careful explanation of the program on an individual basis before the Group Leaders are assigned to the program. We would also consider the value of asking for volunteers as Police Group Leaders.

There are two occasions where you can expect a real ventilation of attitudes and prejudices. One is in the sessions with the Police Group Leaders, the other is through the Police Training Program.

The Police Group Leaders themselves have prejudices and have a need to exhibit these feelings. This can probably be done in one or two training sessions.

Since these men are leaders and if properly selected, we can expect that they will make rapid progress toward prejudice control and toward a sense of responsibility.

There is a value which can be drawn from this type of ventilation session when the officer is able to improve his introspection. It can be pointed out to him that the very feelings which he has been experiencing are going to be exhibited perhaps to even a more marked degree when the small groups at the academy begin to function. We felt that the intense feelings of the Police Group Leaders were to be expected, and we felt it was a sign of progress to have them make it so obvious.

The final session was again conducted by Dr. Duffy with emphasis on the parallel structure of the family and the structure of a Police Department. The necessity of give and take, cooperation, role fulfillment, and common goal, were the main ideas advanced.

In most of these sessions, when time permitted, the practices of group leadership for small groups was used.

In general, it was felt that the Police could attend more of these training sessions than did the lay people; the lay people to a considerable extent represent social agencies where they have had frequent participation in training sessions of this general format. All have participated as students and most have participated as group leaders. In addition, the full time occupants of the lay people made it impossible for any one to attend all of these sessions. This is not to suggest that the Police Group Leaders were beginning from scratch. We asked Police Group Leaders who had had participation in other police-community

relations conferences, and some of them took to their new role very easily. It has been said already that toward the end of the program, these Police Group Leaders were taking real enjoyment from their new assignments, and most of them expressed regret that the program was ending.

We would recommend that all ten of the regular Police Group Leaders be used again if the balance of the Police Department is given such in-service training.

In review, it seems preferable that all the Police and Lay Group Leaders should attend all of the sessions. This would give maxi-knowledge of each other, awareness of the capability and willingness of the other group leader for those times in small group discussions when the interactions became intense and sometimes down right rude.

It can be expected that even the Police Group Leaders will resent this type of program in the beginning, but if they are the proper persons for this, they should begin to appreciate the opportunity by the second or third session.

We found that in spite of the similarity of background and training for the Lay Group Leaders, that their approach and participation tended to be quite individualistic. One of the drawbacks was that since these people were from such institutions as the Behavior Clinic and the Penitentiary, the Police were inclined to take advantage of the opportunity to ask them about their individual work. It was sometimes difficult for the Lay Group Leaders to get the Police back on the subject matter at hand. Ordinarily, one hour to an hour and one half was allotted to the small group participation. This time included a final reconvening of the fifty police officers so that they could exchange views as to

what they had covered in the small group sessions. Sometimes the group brought back almost identical attitudes and sometimes it was obvious that they had discussed subject matter far removed from that offered by the lecturer.

Some Lay Group Leaders were slightly rigid in adhering to the lecturer's subject matter, and this led to some role strain with the police officers. More commonly, the Lay Group Leaders let the police officers begin with whatever topics they wanted, particularly in the first small group session. It was found that this often served as a sign of ventilation and seemed to be a very healthy release for their feelings.

The variety of approaches by the Lay Group Leaders was echoed by the variety of the preconceived notions on the part of the officers in the small group session. In one session, the attitude and views expressed by the Group Leader were so diametrically opposed to the attitude of the students that profanity and disagreement prevailed. This session was resolved when eight of the ten officers walked out of the group and refused to return. It is interesting to note that the two officers who remained were as much in disagreement as the others, but they were able to see a value in this blunt, open, hard core difference of opinions.

It should be noted that many of the Lay Group Leaders were black, and for some of the police officers, it was probably their first encounter with a well-educated, verbal, poised, middle-classed black person.

The Police Group Leaders were slightly hesitant in the first few sessions, but the ten who came to stay began to enjoy their role and to ask questions about group leadership, and to obviously look forward to a new speaker. It

seems particularly likely that these same men would be a solid basis of group leaders for any future project.

It is possible that too many questions were directed at these group leaders in areas in which they could not be held responsible. This included such things as different interpretation of commands at the local stations, discrimination in regard to favorite shifts and assignments, and regressions toward the local government administration. There seems to be no way to get away from this type of ventilation, however, unless perhaps a particular session would be set up and suggested to the men as a one-time overall clearing house of complaints. It is doubtful if even then this would completely eradicate this type of gripe session.

We felt that the small group sessions had the greatest value for ventilating opinions and attitudes, and interaction of black and white police officers which they felt had not been equated before. Although there is no limit to the type of group that you may have on any one day, for the most part you will find that there will be one or two individuals who will try to dominate the groups and two or three who will be quite happy to sit quietly without interaction. The Police Group Leaders and the Lay Group Leaders must work as a team to prevent this from happening.

There is a value to having at least one individual who wants to dominate, in that he can keep the social interaction moving. If he is carefully handled, he can be the cog in the machinery.

There will be a tendency for the police to insist that the Police Group Leaders explain all of the problems which have accumulated as far as police policy, city administration, and "unfair" appointments are concerned. This may

be handled as a personal preference by the Police Group Leader as he judiciously determines what answer may be useful. But it is not fair to let him be an object of derision; even without knowledge of police affairs, the Lay Group Leader may by his very ignorance be able to point out to the men that this individual Police Group Leader is not responsible any more than they are for the activity in the entire Police Bureau.

Many, if indeed not most, of the training sessions, were shouting groups. It sometimes became so controversial that the men in one room could be heard by the men in another room.

What actually provokes the indignation is not the same in any day. Sometimes it is something that the speaker has said, although much of this should be ventilated in the question and answer period at the end of the lecture. Sometimes it depends on a current event such as remarks by Rap Brown or Stokely Carmichael, etc. This is an invaluable opportunity to explain to the excited individual just what some of these militant leaders stand for. Sometimes the explosion was touched off by a display of a Lay Group Leader, such as being a representative of a social agency of which they do not approve. During the week that we had a lecture by two minority group people, we had a very excited session. This may have been due to the lectures, although there seemed to be stress on the fact that our black group leader was provocative and highly critical of the police, based on his own experience and early living in a ghetto district. This was the most intense session that we had and resulted in eight of the group walking out to express their disgust and rejection of his philosophy.

As extreme as this reaction was, we feel that it had a real value since all of the men who walked away from a situation did so because they realized that their control was gone. Secondly, it was a fine demonstration that at least

some people can endure a very hot personalized debate. Both of the Group Leaders remained in the session as did two of the students. Third, this is similar to the military advanced training program, where live ammunition is used to instill in the soldier an idea of what it is really like to be under fire. Fourth, there is a possibility that upon later reflection, these men might realize that this is only a sample of what they are going to get in "the long hot summer."

Both the Police and the Lay Group Leaders were nearly unanimous in their determination that a second presentation of such a program would be easier, smoother, and more beneficial. As acculturated as each group became, it is interesting to note that the Police thought that the Lay Group Leaders should identify with the police generally, and that the Lay Group Leaders felt that the Police should have a broadened point of view even before entering into the program. Nearly all the group participants acknowledged that they had failed to realize how narrow an attitude they had had about the "other group." A great deal of self-awareness and self-introspect was obvious in the statements which were made. These statements have been checked and appear in the Appendix.

Division VI

POLICE PARTICIPATION AND COOPERATION

It is axiomatic that police departments historically have been distrustful of individuals or groups outside of the police department. While this is not the time to go into a lengthy history of law enforcement, it is certainly understandable how the police came to feel this way. Nationally and internationally the police have been abused by corrupt government, and have been used as a pawn by the rulers of many governments and have been generally placed in the middle of groups who dislike law enforcement and equally vehement groups who crave police favors.

The purpose of these remarks is to establish a background for the proposition that it is most difficult for an "outsider" or "outsiders" to be accepted by the police. This is particularly true when it comes to arranging a course of instruction for the police.

From his own ancient history, the Director of Project OLEA was aware of this and tried continually to bridge the gap between police and the "outsider." There was some success.

In general it may be better to have the training program handled as was the Detroit program. That is to establish it as a police-run program, and at the same time to bring in academicians and people directly experienced in the correctional area.

The "outsider" has to spend considerable time developing one-to-one rapport, and with the case of a large police department, this is quite impossible.

In the local situations, we concentrated most of our acquaintance in the beginning with the police administration. This is essential and should in no way be minimized. However, no real success can be attained until the rank and file of the department can get to know the OLEA staff. In our case we feel that the police generally did not come to know our staff until the program was nearly finished. If we had the same rapport established before the program that we were able to achieve by the end of the program, it would have been tremendously more easy for us and undoubtedly would have made the entire program more acceptable to the students.

An indication of this is the recent invitation on the part of the Fraternal Order of Police for the Director to speak at one of their meetings and possibly to write an article for the Fraternal Order of Police magazine.

The conclusion to recommend that the training program be controlled by the department is not easy to state. For many reasons it is felt that it was a good idea to have the program set up by someone who is in the teaching field. Regardless of this, the bulk of the advantages from this type of program are more than off-set by the possibilities within the department of getting total cooperation, understanding and acceptance.

We are emphasizing this because we feel that we made as great an effort as could be achieved by any "outsider." On the asset side, we had police personal friendship experience (long past) on the part of the OLEA Director. We had the close personal friendship between the Director and one of the Fraternal Order of Police Chaplains. We had the close personal friendship between the Director and one of the Fraternal Order of Police Chaplains. We had innumerable contacts through the last 15 years between the Director and many people from the coorectional field. It is difficult to see what more would have been available in any other community.

Perhaps a parallel can be drawn between the police as a minority group and the many other minority groups which are the basis of our concern today. The police group has been so abused by outer forces that they have tended to turn within themselves. Perhaps it could be a real value to the community to develop this thought and to make all citizens aware of it. It is one of the persistent dangers to good law enforcement and at the same time it is a danger that could be removed by cooperation and appreciation of a general public.

Consideration should be given also to the fact that communication is naturally so much better within the police group that an "outsider" sometimes is left high and dry on current involvement. This type of situation is vividly demonstrated by the fact that mid-way through the training program, a new commander was appointed at the Police Training Academy. No notice was given to the Director of OLEA and it was awkward to learn it through a newspaper account. It was particularly difficult to have no advance opportunity to become acquainted with the new commander. It is to the credit of OLEA staff and to the new commander that everyone involved tried desperately to make up for this totally unnecessary set-back.

The only other difficulty that need be mentioned was the fact that we frequently failed to have the five Police Group Leaders which had been promised to us. When we pointed this out to the Public Safety Director and simultaneously mentioned that the students requested police "brass" be sent to attend these sessions, there was an immediate partial positive response. We did get at that point good cooperation from the attending police "brass," some of whom went far beyond what was reasonably necessary to help us.

However, we continued to fall short of a full complement of Police Group Leaders. It was only the initiative of some of the police "brass" to try to fill in that gave us a chance to continue an effective program.

Division VII

LIAISON FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

INTRODUCTION

Mr. William Gawlas, Community Organization Worker, Commission on Human Relations, joined the OLEA project staff in September, 1967, as a full-time liaison between the Commission on Human Relations and Project OLEA.

As set forth in the funding proposal (Page 5, Continuation Sheets 17-21), citizen representatives of the eight Pittsburgh CAP target neighborhood councils were to be "invited to participate in a limited way in the project." This limited involvement was to begin with neighborhood representatives electing two of their number to serve on a Project Advisory Committee beginning with the first phase of the Project (pre-project planning). The hoped-for inclusion of citizens was not accomplished, which is explained below. The importance of this failure may be seen in the nearly total absence of neighborhood representatives during the Project Training phase.

Chronological perspective may be helpful in describing the situation as it emerged.

In July, 1967, Mr. Kenneth Whipps and Mr. Manuel Deese began work as Project Director and Assistant Project Director, respectively. The project would run from July, 1967, to March, 1968. According to the revised schedule, the pre-project planning phase was to run from July to September, 1967, with the training phase to follow.

Project staff had designated October 30, 1967, as the starting date for the implementation of phase II (training sessions) of the grant. The project as revised was scheduled to terminate February 21, 1968. After consultation with the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance and Bureau of Police officials, it was the consensus of both groups to reschedule phase II until January 8, 1968. Project staff immediately contacted the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U. S. Department of Justice and was granted an extension of the project until April 30, 1968.

The Project Advisory Committee was the sole means of citizen participation. The major portion of limited citizen involvement allowed by the funding proposal was that two "Neighborhood Representatives" from each of the eight CAP communities in Pittsburgh (a total number of 16) could "attend some formal project presentations."

The experiences of the Newark, New Jersey, Police Department indicated that if citizens and police were combined in discussion groups, very little could be accomplished, because of the hostility, suspicion, and past confrontations between the groups.

The Neighborhood Representatives (as designated by their CAP Citizens Councils) would be expected to attend at least one orientation session at which they would be informed about the Project. They would then be expected to make the information available to their representative Councils.

All of the functions of citizen representatives, except participation in a Project Advisory Committee, were described in communications by mail and personal contact to CAP Coordinators and Citizen Council Presidents in all eight Pittsburgh CAP neighborhoods.

Their response--as witnessed in attendance at one Citizens' Orientation Session (only 7 persons from 3 CAP neighborhoods) and in attendance at formal Project presentations during the 6-week training phase (total for the course was 10 persons, including one man who sat in on 4 different sessions).

## Division VIII

### ANALYSIS OF THE SPEAKERS

Reference should be made here to Division III, Recruitment of Speakers. It would give the reader a more complete insight to keep in mind the purpose of the leaders as they were chosen and arranged in sequence.

The lead-off speaker, Commissioner Ray Girardin of the Detroit Police Department fulfilled his role extremely well. Commissioner Girardin spoke on a high level although in a practical manner. Even the police officer who could see no immediate professionalism in his work had to be encouraged by the hope which Commissioner Girardin imparted. Commissioner Girardin spoke so convincingly that there were only a few questions asked at the end of his talks.

In the second week, it was evident that from the questions asked there would have been more during the first week except for the conviction exhibited by the speaker of the first week. James Treher was asked a large number of questions, some of which he could answer and many of which were in areas of local administration for which he could not be expected to take responsibility. The combination, however, was very useful in getting the police started into the group talks and into some self soul-searching.

In the third week, we had two speakers, Dr. Hideya Kumata was vividly energetic as he combined stinging remarks with exaggerated physical movement. The fine reception given him gave us the impression that the program was making real progress. He lectured on the difficulties of communication and stressed the fact that you cannot hope to accomplish a great deal because the recipient

is reluctant to set aside his life-long ideas. In the latter part of the same week, however, we realized that there was still a great amount to be done. The second speaker, Captain Robert Lamb, Jr. of the Atlantic City Police Department, was the equal of Dr. Kumata, but he was not as well accepted. Captain Lamb's talk was a beautiful combination of the history of the American Negro, combined with twenty years of police experience on the part of one of that minority group.

In the fourth week, we presented three speakers. The general topic was Prejudice and Discrimination and the lead-off speaker was Reverend Francis Duffy who is also a full professor of Sociology. Since he himself has an extensive police-associated background, he was fairly readily accepted. A different approach was used with the second speaker, Dr. Eugene Youngue, Jr. who is a psychiatrist. He also was able to give some insights of the psychological history of the American Negro, which should have been very valuable if they had been fully accepted by the students. We doubt that this acceptance happened, which will be explained in the final paragraph of this division. The final speaker of this week was Milton Susman, Esq. Mr. Susman is a forceful speaker who had the happy facility of establishing rapport almost immediately. He was abrupt in explaining that his own background is of a minority group since he is Hebrew. He achieved excellent give and take with the officers who seemed more impressed by his congenial manner than by his actual content. However, the overall impression was that they accepted the content because they first accepted him as a person. His talk was bombastic and of a level which had both a direct flavor and a kind of home-spun appeal.

The fifth week was one which we had anticipated as extremely beneficial because we felt that it is fairly easy to see where we have made good progress in the United States in the areas of Religious Minorities. Our hope was that this progress would encourage the students to feel that similar progress in race relations can be expected in the future.

In this week, we provided a variety of speakers in the expectations that every religious group might have some representation. We used a Roman Catholic priest of Hebrew background who had been born in Berlin and who had spent most of his life in Africa. We also used a Methodist minister who had considerable contact with law enforcement. We used a Monsignor who has been the leader in the Ecumenical Movement and who was known locally as the individual who arranged for the recent installation of an Episcopal bishop in the Cathedral of the Catholic Diocese. We also used a black professor from the School of Social Work who has had many practical contacts in the areas of religious controversy and cooperation.

It is difficult to fully understand why this week in general did not work as well as the other weeks. In the first place, there seemed to be a feeling on the part of the police that "we know all about that - why bother with it?" Secondly, some hostility was mentioned in the area of Church-State separation, although ordinarily this would have a good point. Third, there did not seem to be a natural interest on the part of many students, which may, speculatively, be a reflection of the national scene. Fourth, this may have been the point in the program where fatigue was setting in and that will be mentioned in our final section. At this point, in the future we would suggest a break.

In the sixth week, we returned to a police speaker to try to conclude with a note of reference to the first and second weeks, which had gone so well. For this purpose, we brought in Lieutenant Adelbert Welles, from the Detroit Police Department. Lieutenant Welles, it will be recalled, has been Deputy Director of the actual training sessions of Detroit Police in the same type of instruction. Again it was noticeable that he was well received, based mainly on the fact that "he is one of us." Lieutenant Welles was originally scheduled to speak for three days, but when our police speaker for the last two days was unable to leave his own city, we persuaded Lieutenant Welles to stay for one more day. On the final day, we brought in Leonard Karter who had been in charge of a police-community relations program in the City of Erie, Pennsylvania. This session was particularly interesting in that the students were willing to give Mr. Karter a quasi-acceptance based on the fact that he is working with police constantly although he is not really a police officer. Also in the final session, we found an anticipated spirit of "now that the program is over, it really wasn't so bad." It might be mentioned here that this expression has been heard frequently ever since.

We tried to learn from the police which speaker appealed to them most, and there is little question that Dr. Kumata was most happily received. It is most interesting that few of the police could put into words what they thought he gave them. It was partly his personality that attracted them, and at the same time, he gave them some kind of intangible assurance that what he was saying was good for them to know. Some of the officers replied that they did not care for the week on Religious Minorities. Perhaps it is to be expected with a predominantly white police department that there was a general rejection of

three of our Negro speakers: Psychiatrist Youngue, Reverend Grey, and Captain Lamb. We believe that this is understandable in a general way if you are careful to recall that this is an encounter with a black person of highly-trained intelligence, resource, and success. This statement in no way detracts from the usefulness of having these people who are not received with enthusiasm, for having people of this type adds stimulation to the program.

As a conclusion to this part of the program, we encourage any prospective planning to devote as much time as possible to the selection of their speakers, and to anticipate that some of them will be less than cordially welcomed.

Division IX

DIARY HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

July 3, 1967

Kenneth R. Whipps began as Director, Project OLEA.

Due to lack of furniture, it was necessary for me to use other offices on a casual basis.

July 5, 1967

Inspection of Task Force Reports.

July 6, 1967

Selection of Assistant Director, Project OLEA. Manuel Deese is chosen because of his specific advantage of employment with CHR along with a good academic and experience background.

July 7, 1967

Forms completed for payroll office. It was necessary to find three City of Pittsburgh residents who would vouch for accuracy of K. R. Whipps' application. Patrick Tamilia, Esq., Hilary Modrak, J. Shenkel cooperated.

July 10, 1967

Sworn into office for Project OLEA, on the payroll of the City of Pittsburgh.

General approval was given for Manuel Deese to be Assistant Director, contingent on his release from CHR staff of David Washington, Executive Director.

July 11-14, 1967

Recruiting Lay Group Leaders.

July 15, 1967

Dr. Francis Duffy reviewed OLEA proposal and potential.

Arranged through him to meet with Assistant Superintendent Mulvey.

July 17, 1967

Miss Brenda Duckett began as secretary. To postpone having second secretary until volume of work picks up.

July 18, 1967

Review with David Washington of 1st Quarterly Progress Report. This is an inclusion of all the CHR affords as well as the recent brief service of K. R. Whipps.

July 19, 1967

First Quarterly Progress Report sent by Certified Mail to OLEA, Washington, D. C.

Attended the annual meeting of the Western Pennsylvania Railway Police Association at Lourola's Farm in Greentree, Pennsylvania.

July 20, 1967

Attended Fraternal Order of Police meeting, City of Pittsburgh.

July 21, 1967

Ordered 600 copies of "The Policeman Looks at Himself."

July 24, 1967

Rockwell Hall, Duquesne University. Attended Commission on Human Relations meeting.

July 25, 1967

Absent due to illness.

July 26, 1967

CHR working diligently to head off a threatened "Rent Strike" in the City of Pittsburgh.

Sent copies of OLEA Quarterly Progress Report to Mayor Barr and Councilman Kuhn.

July 27, 1967

Consultation with Dr. Chester Jurczak on minorities - attitudes address.

July 28, 1967

Meeting with C. Norman Brown, Public Information Director, Duquesne University. Possible tie-in with their media to increase coverage on Project OLEA.

July 31, 1967

Manuel Deese began as Assistant Project Director, OLEA.

August 14, 1967

Conferred with Mr. Maurice Kelsey, Economic Development Supervisor, Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs, relative to OLEA Project.

August 16, 1967

Pittsburgh Press gives a column and photo to "Police Get Race Problem Professor."

August 17, 1967

Met with Mr. Kenneth Garrison, Detached Youth Worker, Centre Avenue YMCA, relative to youth attitudes and the police.

Consultation with Mr. Russell L. Bradley, Executive Director, NCCJ, concerning the police training programs in Washington, D. C., and the community responsibility of the police.

Ordered 600 copies of "The Police and Community Conflict," from NCCJ.

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette gives a column and photo to "Professor will Teach City Police."

August 18, 1967

Discussed with Mr. Martin Samuels, Community Mental Health Specialist, St. Francis Hospital, the possibility of his acting as a lay group discussion leader during the training period.

August 20, 1967

Sunday Pittsburgh Press gives a four column and group photo (Whipps, Asst. Director Deese, and Police Sergeant Edward Patterson) to "New Era Brings Class to Police."

Kenneth R. Whipps, Manuel Deese, Sergeant Edward Patterson, and Superintendent James Slusser, interviewed by Mr. John Place, The Pittsburgh Press.

August 22, 1967

Reviewed with Arthur L. Burt, Director, Alcoholism Clinic, Mercy Hospital, the objectives of the OLEA program.

August 23, 1967

Met with Mr. Stuart Strothers, Assistant Director, Economic Development and Employment, Pittsburgh Urban League, regarding the Negro community and police affairs.

Wrote Mr. Robert M. Frehse, Executive Director, Michigan Region NCCJ, relative to the brochure entitled "Group Discussion...Concise Suggestions for Participants."

August 24, 1967

Auburn, New York Citizen, Advertisers gives column and photo to "Former Auburnian to Direct Training of Pittsburgh Police."

August 24-25, 1967

Kenneth R. Whipps, Project Director, visited Newark, New Jersey, to discuss with Police and human relations officials their police-community relations training program under OLEA.

August 25, 1967

Visited and discussed with Mr. Robert Ruffin, Associate Director, Neighborhood Centers Association, his participation in OLEA project as a group discussion leader.

August 26, 1967

Pittsburgh Courier article entitled, "Police Human Relations Program Underway, Finally."

September 11, 1967

Full Commission Meeting, held in Rockwell Hall, Duquesne University.

September 13, 1967

Commission on Human Relations staff meeting.

September 15, 1967

Project staff and Commission on Human Relations staff viewed films dealing with community and intergroup relations problems at the Northside Branch of Carnegie Library.

September 19, 1967

Project staff met with Commission on Human Relations and Bureau of Police officials to organize and plan the implementation of Project OLEA.

September 20, 1967

Christine Wisniewski interviewed for the position of secretary.

Mr. Stuart Shannonhouse, Chairman, Pittsburgh Chapter National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials, requested that the Project staff give a

presentation on Police-Community Relations, at its next meeting on September 28, 1967.

September 25, 1967

Christine Wisniewski began work as secretary for Project OLEA.

Mrs. Margery R. Boichel, Research Specialist, CHR, conferred with project staff relative to the questionnaire to be used during the training program, and persons to contact regarding evaluation material.

September 27, 1967

Kenneth R. Whipps conferred with Dr. Veronica Maz, St. Bonaventure University, regarding police training material.

September 28, 1967

Project staff due to meet with Commission on Human Relations representatives and police officials in Commission Conference Room in an effort to finalize the starting date of OLEA.

Project staff discussed "Police-Community Relations in Pittsburgh and the United States in General," at the monthly meeting of the Pittsburgh Chapter National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials, Pittsburgh Urban League Conference Room.

Project staff met with Captain Purvis, Sergeant Edward Patterson, to discuss plans for the selection of trainees and program format.

Staff sent notices to all group leaders regarding the Project to date.

October 2, 1967

Full Commission Meeting, Rockwell Hall, Duquesne University.

Kenneth Whipps consulted with Dr. Mary Chisholm, Professor of Sociology and Dr. Chester Jurczak, Professor of Sociology, with particular emphasis on group leader training.

October 3, 1967

Project staff met with Commission on Human Relations personnel to formulate plans for the meeting with Mr. Paul Estaver, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U. S. Department of Justice.

October 4, 1967

All day session with Mr. Paul Estaver, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U. S. Department of Justice. Mr. Estaver reviewed project plans with Commission on Human Relations staff and made suggestions concerning the format. During the afternoon session, project staff, Commission on Human Relations personnel met with Public Safety Director David W. Craig and Superintendent James W. Slusser to formulate plans for the opening session of the training program.

October 5, 1967

Pittsburgh Police Recruit Training began at the Police Academy.

Staff telephoned Inspector Bernard Winckoski, Detroit Police Department, on advice of Paul Estaver to act as a planning consultant in the Pittsburgh project.

October 6, 1967

Meeting was set up between project staff and planning consultants, Dr. Frank

Cizon, Professor of Social Work, Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois, and District Inspector Bernard Winckoski for October 10, 1967.

October 9, 1967

Second Quarterly Report sent to the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U. S. Department of Justice.

October 10, 1967

Manuel Deese met with Assistant Superintendent Gilmore and Police Academy training personnel to discuss the selection of police trainees and curriculum format.

Manuel Deese discussed the training program at the weekly meeting of the Pittsburgh Police District Inspectors.

Project staff discussed and reviewed the training programs of Detroit, Michigan and Lake County, Indiana with Dr. Frank Cizon, Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois, District Inspector Bernard Winckoski, Detroit Police Department, and Father Francis Duffy, Duquesne University.

During the afternoon session, project staff and planning consultants met with Commission on Human Relations personnel and Pittsburgh Police officials.

October 11, 1967

Theresa Dunn began work as secretary for Project OLEA.

Project staff held an evening meeting with Community Action Program Advisory Representatives in the Public Safety Building to discuss their involvement.

October 11, 1967 (continued)

Later that evening, Manuel Deese attempted to meet with Charles Harris, Chairman Police Affairs Units, NAACP, to discuss community sentiment and police action in the ghetto.

October 17, 1967

Weekly planning meeting with Assistant Superintendent Gilmore and Police Academy training personnel.

Project staff reviewed training program with Mr. Frederick Gray, Consultant, Community Relations Service, U. S. Department of Justice.

October 21, 1967

The first three-hour training session for police and civilian group leaders was held in the Public Safety Building and conducted by Dr. Mary Chisholm, Professor of Sociology and Dr. Rolf Von Eckartsberg, Professor of Psychology, Duquesne University.

October 23, 1967

Second training session for police and civilian group leaders conducted by the same personnel as October 21, 1967.

October 26, 1967

Manuel Deese reviewed the group leader training sessions with William Montgomery, Health Consultant, Pennsylvania Department of Health.

October 30, 1967

OLEA training program was scheduled to commence, but postponed to January 8, 1968.

October 31, 1967

Training session for group leaders, review of previous two sessions and discussion of case history material.

November 5, 1967

Full Commission on Human Relations meeting, Rockwell Hall, Duquesne University.

November 9, 1967

Weekly training meeting of police group leaders with particular emphasis on case studies.

November 16, 1967

Police group leader training session.

November 20, 1967

Kenneth R. Whipps, Director, Project OLEA, visited the Detroit Police Department and discussed the Detroit program with District Inspector Bernard Winckoski, Lieutenant Adelbert Welles, and Sergeant Ray Losche. Professor

Whipps also recruited Police Commissioner Ray Girardin as a speaker for the training program.

November 27, 1967

Police group leader training session.

December 4, 1967

Project staff reviewed OLEA activities to date at the monthly Commission on Human Relations meeting.

December 8, 1967

Third Quarterly Report due at the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U. S. Department of Justice, by January 20, 1968.

December 13, 1967

Weekly police and civilian group leader training session in the Assembly Room of the Public Safety Building.

Lecture "Role of the Group Leader" by Father Francis Duffy, Professor of Sociology, Duquesne University.

December 20, 1967

Police group leader training session. Mrs. Margery Boichel, Research Specialist, Commission on Human Relations, pre-tested a questionnaire developed for the project on the police group leaders to determine time and propriety.

Division X

Section 11 ACTIVITY FOLLOWING THE ACTUAL TRAINING SESSION

Our general thought immediately after the program was to continue the foundation which we had begun for another phase of the training program. While it is not immediately foreseeable that the training program will be repeated, there is no question that the remaining 2/3 of the Pittsburgh Police would benefit from this program.

The preliminary stage to such continuation, of course, is found in this report itself. Beyond this, we tried to take advantage of the good will created within this program by sending letters of appreciation to everyone involved. There were three groups to whom we were anxious to extend our thanks.

First was the Group Leaders, including both the Police Group Leaders and Civilian Group Leaders. Since the people who did participate went out of their way beyond any financial remuneration or any duty assignment from their higher authority. This included back-up Civilian Group Leaders, including two who were never called upon to participate, but who removed any anxiety that we could have had if we had need of an emergency call-up.

Secondly was the personnel of the Police Training Academy, including people who did not participate directly, but who were in evidence throughout the sessions and whose presence tended to create an aura of acceptance (this included both the fire department and the police department instructors assigned to the academy). Also we found it expedient to extend thanks to

some of the police officers who participated beyond any obligation to do so, but whose presence and enthusiasm was so marked that they encouraged the students to a considerable degree.

Third, this group included the many guest speakers whose reimbursement from us could not adequately compensate them for their time and interest. We want to hold this pool of speakers, so we made certain that they were given both verbal and written gratitude. Some of these people in turn replied to express their enthusiasm. One such unexpected letter is from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, who was pleased that his office had cooperated so extensively.

We had two back-up speakers whose services were held in abeyance. Like the back-up lay group leaders mentioned above, these people were a source of reliance as we knew that we could produce either of them on very short notice. It is impossible to over-estimate the value of such people even if they are not used.

In the months after the end of the program, we have continued to keep in touch with the news media in the possibility that we will get further mention. There is a good chance that we will have a write-up in the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce Magazine.

In order to let the individual police officer know that we were still working in their behalf, we sent out a newsletter on April 3, 1968, to express our appreciation of their cooperation and to demonstrate to them that we are still working for them. This was done by giving them a list of the five talks the Director of OLEA has given since the termination of the training sessions.

The logic of this lies in the fact that in all of the talks, we have been careful to work in a favorable mention of the City of Pittsburgh Police. On April 23, we sent out a second newsletter to the police officers in which we congratulated them for their controlled behavior in the near riot in which they were involved two weeks earlier.

Special certificates have been printed for the ten police group leaders whose work in this field was excellent. These are signed by the Director of Public Safety, David Craig; the Chairman of the Commission on Human Relations, Eric Springer, and the Director of OLEA, Kenneth Whipps. Certificates of completion of the training sessions have been mailed to their individual stations and inasmuch as possible have been accompanied by visits from the Director and the Assistant Director.

It was necessary to triple-check on the reimbursement of the group leaders and the speakers. We felt that with the pressure and excitement of the training classes, it was easily possible to overlook an individual. We further found that in the usual bureaucratic procedures, that it is equally easy for the government to overlook an individual. To avoid any unpleasant incidents, we have kept in active contact with our local people to the extent of knowing by casual inquiry that they had been paid. We have found that there is a tendency for some financial requests to get lost in the time zone of bureaucracy; i.e., the longer an item has been requested and not paid, the greater becomes the chance that it has gone astray.

Project staff has participated as a panelist in the human relations training sessions conducted for police recruits at the Police Training Academy.

The Assistant Director was invited to become a member of the planning committee of the Department of Police-Community Relations within the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials, Washington, D. C.

CONFIDENTIAL

Division XI

PROGNOSIS AND RECOMMENDATION FOR A FUTURE SIMILAR PROGRAM

At this time we can only speculate on what the long-term benefits of the program may be. Since the termination of the training sessions, we have had a large scale civil disorder in the City of Pittsburgh. There have been innumerable remarks made in favor of the Pittsburgh Police in the aftermath of this disorder. While no one is saying that the Pittsburgh Police have become perfect, practically every remark has been to the effect that the Pittsburgh Police certainly maintained their tempers in the face of deliberate and extreme provocation. There have been suggestions that this is the beginning of professionalism. There have been concrete compliments in the form of suggested pay increase.

The police themselves feel that they were subjected to a most difficult several days of law-breaking and they are not quite sure what could have been done or should have been done to avoid such a disturbance. This, of course, reflects the community-wide apprehension of what we should take as preventive steps.

Our immediate suggestion of what should be done promptly is simply to train the other 2/3 of the Pittsburgh Police in police-community relations. We have an excellent start and it should be followed-up advantageously. The money to do it apparently will have to be arranged in a different way due to the re-allocation of funds for this. We have no controversy over the source of the funds whether it be Federal, State, City, or indeed, even private funds.

If there is sincere interest in developing one phase (and of course, this is only one area) of peace in the community, we feel that no single approach is more important than this broadening of the background of our law enforcement people. We have some specific suggestions that might aid the planning and carrying out of a future program. We found that the 500 officers a week for six weeks is almost too intense for the training staff, for the officers, for the Group Leaders and even for the clerical work which must be continued. We would recommend that even in a speeded up program, there be a break period of two weeks between three-week segments of such a program. We would like to suggest that if it is possible to be done, it would be easier to take a group of police, for example 50, and give them an entire course of five days. This could be difficult since it might interfere with personnel procedures, but it might give the police a total view of what they are to accomplish without the fatigue and interruption of duty.

Another possibility would be to have either morning or afternoon sessions rather than to try the almost impossible arrangement of conducting three and one-half hour sessions, both in the morning and in the afternoon. This does not allow for even a lunch break, which is essential to get the program set up for the next group.

Originally, it was thought by many people that 21 hours of human relations is more than is necessary for the students to understand police-community relations. Most of these critics have come to agree that nothing worthwhile would be accomplished in a shorter session. We would strongly recommend that if it is possible, the men should be given 30 hours. This would allow for a more gradual approach from the socio-psychological background, and could

provide a base on which the future speakers could build more substantially. Many of the individual officers who completed the program have told us that it came to them rather abruptly and that they could see now that a longer session might have made the program more acceptable. We would heartily recommend that the police-students in the future be prepared very carefully for their training program and that this be done as far ahead as possible, so that they will have time to consider and to accept it.

RESEARCH EVALUATION  
of the  
In-Service Training Program  
for  
Effective Police Work in the Changing City

by  
Robert H. Mast, Ph. D., University of Pittsburgh  
and  
Howard P. Myers, University of Pittsburgh

## PREFACE

This report constitutes an effort at objective evaluation of the impact of the in-service training program as well as an explanation to account for such impact. Major responsibility for initiation of the evaluation project, coordination of effort, background research and numerous research tasks rests with Mrs. Margery R. Boichel, Research Specialist, Commission on Human Relations. Dr. Robert Mast, University of Pittsburgh, and Dr. Herbert Aurbach, Pennsylvania State University, served as consultants to the evaluation effort and were responsible for the majority of the questionnaire. Many other individuals, too numerous to mention, participated in various consultative ways. Data processing and analysis was under the supervision of Robert Mast. The sole responsibility for presentation and interpretation of findings rests with the authors.

## I. INTRODUCTION

### Objectives of Evaluation

The stated purpose of the training program was to broaden the range of behavioral responses available to officers in a variety of settings. The purpose was less to impart knowledge than to alter police behavior in a direction that is consonant with professional standards relevant to intergroup relations. Obviously, those responsible for conceiving and staffing the training program desired positive spin-offs such as prejudice reduction, greater insight into selves on the part of participants, greater appreciation of the civil rights movement, greater acceptance of integration and greater knowledge of relevant social facts. These would be considered highly desirable results of a successful training experience. Yet, if such desirable products did not materialize as such, or were not capable of being measured, there was an implicit or explicit belief that if future behavior was influenced in the direction of training goals, the training program would have served a useful purpose.

Those responsible for training evaluation were charged with the responsibility of developing instruments capable of measuring impact on behavior, with less attention to impact on attitudes. At the same time, it is highly likely that an experience significant enough to have a measurable impact on behavior would likewise have an impact on attitudes. Thus, it is to be assumed that a strong relationship exists between attitudes and behavior. But the exact nature of the relationship is, at best, a fuzzy one. Some will assert that no behavior takes place without a preceding attitude programming the actor in a relatively specific direction. Others will note that such

programming is not necessarily responsive to attitudes, but is more a product of a set of conditioning experiences. In the latter argument, a case can be made for the efficacy of rules, laws, professional standards, etc., that program actors and serve to provide them with action propensities that are touched off under the stimulus of selected cues. If this argument is sound, police officers exposed to a set of conditioning factors such as were intended in the training program would tend to respond in professionally "desirable" ways when confronted with actual community experiences.

Another factor influenced the design for evaluation of training. It was decided that an experience as short as the Pittsburgh training program would not have an influence on participants of significant magnitude to warrant the attempt to measure attitude change. Intergroup relations attitudes are deeply imbedded and do not change easily, at least through the vehicle of training programs. Further, much is already known about the patterns of police attitudes in intergroup relations and it did not seem that the effort to measure attitude change would yield significant results, nor would the results be very different from previous findings by other researchers.

Thus, the main objective of evaluation was decided to be one which would attempt to measure the extent to which the training experience influenced the behavior tendency of officers across a variety of simulated situations.

## The Questionnaire

### 1. Police-Community Situations

With the above general objective in mind, a fairly extensive search for existing tests and scales was made to locate a standardized measure of training impact. Some were located but rejected since they lacked the specificity necessary to the Pittsburgh training program. Various prejudice tests were reviewed but rejected as being not particularly meaningful for the present situation. It was decided that the most meaningful evaluation should be based on officer response to a series of critical incidents that would reflect, as closely as possible, realistic police-community situations. Accordingly, a set of 12 scenarios were developed which reflected situations that police might encounter in Pittsburgh.<sup>1</sup> Eleven of the 12 situations involved a racial component. That is, the terms Negro, black or ghetto were incorporated in the scenario. Three of the situations involved protests by Negro or inter-racial groups. Two situations involved interracial couples. Two situations involved lone Negro men who were in white neighborhoods. Two situations showed groups of Negro and white youths in confrontation with each other. One situation portrayed a group of noisy Negro teenagers while another showed several Negro youths in confrontation with a Negro officer. The final situation portrayed a woman in a neighborhood known for prostitution.

A set of response categories were developed for each situation that reflected a wide range of alternative behaviors that could be selected by officers

---

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Herbert Aurbach had major responsibility for developing the scenarios. He was assisted by Professor Henry Gutenplan of the Center for Crime and Law Enforcement, Pennsylvania State University.

in response to the situation. Since the response categories varied widely in terms of professional decision and desirable community relations, it was believed that the average score for each officer trainee would be a reasonable measure of his anticipated behavior in real situations. It was decided to have trainees respond to the 12 situations both at the beginning and the end of the program. The differences in scores should reflect the impact of the program, all things being equal. A panel of judges was requested to rank the response categories to each situation according to criteria of good police work and good community relations. Accordingly, rankings were made by five judges<sup>1</sup> and the average of their rankings was taken as the optimal or most correct pattern of response from a professional point of view.<sup>2</sup>

2. Racial Perceptions. Since standard prejudice tests were rejected as not particularly meaningful for this research, other routes were used to measure perceptions of trainees toward race relations.

a. Racial tension. On the assumption that perceived tension between the races is a partial determinant of behavior, trainees were asked to use an 11-point "tension scale" to rate tension between the races in the U. S. and in Pittsburgh, both today and in five years. These

---

<sup>1</sup>Judges who ranked the situational response categories were as follows:  
Mr. David W. Craig, Director, Department of Public Safety, City of Pittsburgh  
Professor Henry Gutenplan, Center for Crime and Law Enforcement, Pennsylvania State University  
Inspector Bernard Winckoski, Department of Police, City of Detroit  
Detective William Moore, Department of Public Safety, City of Pittsburgh  
Officer Andrew Daley, Department of Public Safety, City of Pittsburgh.

<sup>2</sup>See the final section of this report for the situations and the "correct" response patterns.

measures were taken only at the beginning of the training sessions (Time 1).

- b. Future racial outcomes. On the assumption that one's perception of the future strongly determines his present behavior, trainees were asked to use an 11-point "likelihood scale" to rate the likelihood of the "racial problem" turning out in the following ways:

- "There is complete mixing of whites and Negroes in all areas of economic, political, and social life."
- "The majority of Negroes and whites are integrated in economic, political, and social life."
- "The majority of Negroes and whites are segregated in economic, political, and social life."
- "There is complete separation of whites and Negroes in all areas of economic, political, and social life."

Trainees also were asked to use a seven-point "desirability scale" to rate the desirability of each of the above futures. The likelihood and desirability measures were taken both at the beginning and the end of the training program (Time 1 and Time 2).

- c. Racial knowledge. On the assumption that factual knowledge is a partial determinant of present behavior, trainees were asked whether the non-white races have a lower inborn intelligence than whites, what percentage of Pittsburgh is Negro and what percentage of the Pittsburgh police force is Negro. These measures were taken both at Time 1 and Time 2.

3. Orientations Toward Police Work as a Profession. On the assumption that attitudes toward police work are importantly related to race-community orientations, trainees were asked whether college courses could be helpful to policemen

in their work, how demanding police work was becoming today and whether there is a need to improve the public image of the police.

4. Authoritarianism. Past research has shown that policemen, as a group, tend to score high on authoritarianism, but that there is a certain amount of variance within the group. Thus, a standardized eleven-item authoritarian scale was administered to the trainees as a variable with explanatory potential.

5. Social-Structural Attachments. The associations and memberships of people are partial determinants of their behavior. Thus, trainees were asked their marital status, number of children, number of households in their neighborhoods that contain personal friends, the number of organizations (exclusive of FOP) to which they belong and, using a five-item work integration scale, the degree to which they are attached to their specific police units.

6. Social Mobility. In view of the importance of social mobility in partially determining attitudes and behaviors, the trainees were asked the location of father's birthplace, father's occupation, and parent's financial condition while the trainees were growing up.

7. Other Personal Information. Other information known to be relevant to behavior were asked trainees: education, religious preference and strength of belief, age and race.

8. Work Identification. To locate trainees in their work system, they were asked their police assignment (traffic, beat, detective, service, inspections), rank and number of years in law enforcement.

9. Objective Evaluation. Trainees were asked to evaluate the program in terms of its interest, usefulness and provision of new information. They also were asked to indicate which sessions were most and least informative and useful.

The above areas of information became, for analytic purposes, the research variables of the present study. The questionnaire was pretested for time and comprehensibility on about 10 individuals (policemen, intergroup relations workers and others) and certain modifications were made as a result. Two questionnaires were actually administered to trainees, each taking about one half hour. The first (Time 1) was given on the first day of the program and the second (Time 2) was administered on the last day. With the exception of items that were repeated (e.g., community situations, perception of future racial outcomes, racial knowledge), items identifying respondents' individual characteristics were split between Time 1 and Time 2.

The questionnaires were self-administered and instructions were given by a member of the program staff. In Time 1 each trainee was provided a questionnaire with a randomly selected number visible on the front page. Trainees were told that the number could not identify them in any way. They were instructed to remember or record the number since they would be expected to write it on the Time 2 questionnaire. This technique was used so that anonymity would be assured and so that both Time 1 and Time 2 questionnaires could be matched for later analysis.

#### The Study Sample

Since trainees were required by the program to complete the questionnaires, all trainees became part of the study sample. The selection of trainees was

not systematic. The Department of Public Safety had sole responsibility for selection. Each ranking precinct officer was instructed by the Department of Public Safety to supply a given number of trainees from three shifts. The precinct officer apparently had complete autonomy in his choices and took into account such factors as manpower availability and shift work. It is not known if such criteria as personal interest or disposition were taken into account. At any rate, it is believed that a reasonably random selection process was applied and that a fair cross-section of Pittsburgh policemen became members of the training program.

Trainees returning usable questionnaires in Time 1 numbered 426. Several questionnaires were thrown out of the sample because of improper completion or failure to cooperate. Time 2 returns numbered 379, a drop of 47 from Time 1. This reduction can be accounted for by dropouts from the program, sickness, and questionnaires with unusable data.

#### Data Processing

The 805 raw questionnaires were edited, a coding scheme was formatted, and responses were tabulated and punched onto two IBM cards per respondent (the first for Time 1; the second for Time 2). Data from the cards were then transferred onto magnetic tape for application to the IBM 7090 computer. A high level of quality control and error check was maintained throughout these processes.

### Limitations to the Research

1. The questionnaire. Though the questionnaire was the only feasible technique for this particular research, it has significant limitations. The half-hour time limitation required an instrument that was as concise as possible. Thus, much interesting data could not be collected. Since it was self-administered, a great risk was taken that instructions would not be followed or that lower cooperation would result. Indeed, such a result did occur, especially in Time 2 when approximately 33 per cent of the respondents failed to record their identification number. This group could not be analyzed in the panel design which is reported later. It is believed that some trainees forgot their numbers, others did not believe that the questionnaires would be confidential, and others just did not take the training program very seriously.
2. Internal problems. Both the response rate in Time 2 and possibly certain substantive data were influenced by the attitudes of trainees that were produced by factors internal to the training program. First, it might be noted that trainees were somewhat of a captive audience, some of whom participated with reluctance and others of whom were quite hostile to the goals of the program. It was reported that some group leaders were too "radical" in their approach. It was reported also that the purpose of the program was viewed as quite ambiguous by certain trainees. Another consideration may be the fact that the proportion of group leaders who were Negro was considerably higher than their proportion in the population, and they were "professional" types. Some trainees apparently were upset by the change of the commander of the Police Academy (a popular person) during the third week of training. These

are examples of internal problems that could have affected the responses of trainees and possibly produced certain spurious results in the data.

3. External problems. Ideas and events that were external to the program were obvious limitations that could not be controlled. For example, shortly prior to the training program a racial disturbance broke out at Oliver High School in which the police were conspicuously involved. This, the "revolutionary" mode of the times, and other unknown factors might be responsible for selected distortion by trainees that might have exerted a large influence on their perceptions and capability of receiving program material. These factors, of course, cannot be controlled scientifically, so we cannot measure their impact on trainees. In addition, such factors reduce the confidence that can be imparted to the measures of the program's impact on the behavior potential of trainees.

Finally, it should be noted that the present role and level of responsibility of the police officer is a most difficult one. He is self-conscious and doubtlessly confused over his role in civil rights problems about which he has various pre-judgements, some correct and some very much in error. The ambiguous nature of police relations with the community is a factor that may have caused some trainees to respond to the program with suspicion and could have influenced their responses to the questionnaire.

The various limitations noted above suggest that a certain amount of caution must be exercised in the interpretation of data from the questionnaire. These limitations, joined to the difficulty of measuring in the abstract the impact of a training experience, cast certain reservations on the validity of findings. The data presentation should be viewed with the above limitations in mind.

### Organization of Findings

The presentation and interpretation of data from the questionnaires has the following organization:

Chapter II describes the pattern of evaluation of the program as reported by the trainees. Chapter III describes selected personal characteristics of the trainee population.

Chapter IV describes group response patterns of Time 1 as compared to group response patterns of Time 2. This will permit an analysis of program impact on all trainees in Time 1 compared to Time 2 according to their propensity to behave (police-community situations) and according to selected perceptions (racial perceptions, orientations toward police work).

Chapters V and VI reports the panel design. Here an analysis is made of those trainees whose scores between Time 1 and Time 2 showed no change, changed positively (toward program goals) or changed negatively (away from program goals) on the police-community situations and on one of the racial futures. A comparison of the characteristics of the changers and non-changers is made.

Chapter VII is a summary of findings and tentative conclusions that might be drawn from the data patterns.

## II. OPINIONS OF THE PARTICIPANTS CONCERNING THE PROGRAM

Policemen who participated in the program evaluated it in somewhat mixed terms. Asked how they would rate the program as a whole, about a third of them responded with a definitely favorable evaluation, as shown in Table 1. About a third were not so favorably disposed, giving it only a fair rating. The remaining third were either critical of the program or equivocal, not certain quite how to rate it.

TABLE 1

Rating by Participants of the Program as a Whole

(in percentages)

Excellent	6.9
Good	22.7
Fair	34.7
Poor	23.2
Uncertain	12.5
	<u>100.0</u> (375)*

Inspection of Table 2 shows that the pattern of responses regarding how interesting the participants found the program is similar to that of the responses regarding the program as a whole. Asked how interesting it was,

---

\*The number of participants responding to each question varies considerably depending on several factors: whether the question was or was not answered and whether the question was administered in Time 1 or Time 2. There was a reduction of 47 in the number of participants from Time 1 to Time 2.

about two-thirds of the trainees responded favorably, saying that it was either very interesting or moderately interesting. Almost a third, however, did not find it interesting and five per cent could not decide.

TABLE 2

Rating by Participants of How Interesting They Found the Program  
(in percentages)

Very interesting	23.9
Moderately interesting	39.5
Not very interesting	31.6
Undecided	5.0
	<hr/>
	100.0 (377)

As shown in Table 3, however, the pattern of responses shifts somewhat regarding the practicality of the program. Asked how useful they thought the program was, almost four out of ten of the participants responded unfavorably. Although almost half found it useful, two-thirds of them (114) considered it only of moderate utility. Fourteen per cent of all of the trainees were undecided.

TABLE 3

Rating by Participants of How Useful They Thought the Training  
Would Be in Their Work

(in percentages)

Very useful	16.5
Moderately useful	30.3
Not very useful	39.4
Don't know yet	13.8
	<hr/>
	100.0 (376)

Asked if they thought the program provided them with new ways of looking at old problems, about a third responded positively, as can be seen in Table 4. Half, however, responded negatively. The remaining eighteen per cent said that they did not know.

TABLE 4

Rating by Participants of Whether the Program  
Provided New Ways of Looking at Old Problems

(in percentages)

Yes	31.0
No	51.0
Don't know yet	18.0
	<hr/>
	100.0 (377)

Looking for an explanation of the somewhat mixed character of the responses of the participants to the program as whole, attention is turned to the evaluation of individual sessions. Inspection of Table 5 shows that, with the exception of the session on religious minorities, all sessions were received with about the same degree of favorability. On the average, five of the sessions received between seventeen and nineteen per cent of the endorsement. These were the sessions that dealt with (1) police work as a profession, (2) police problems with racial overtones, (3) police-citizen communication, (4) prejudice and discrimination, and (6) summation and prospect.

TABLE 5

Rating by Participants of Sessions  
Found Most Informative and Useful

(in percentages)

(1) Police work as a profession	18.6
(2) Police problems with racial overtones	19.7
(3) Police-citizen communication	17.4
(4) Prejudice and discrimination	18.6
(5) Religious minorities	6.6
(6) Summation and prospect	19.1
	<hr/>
	100.0 (334)

Since trainees were also asked to evaluate individual sessions in terms of being least informative and useful, it is possible to discover if all facets of the program were as uniformly negatively evaluated as they were almost uniformly positively evaluated. A look at Table 6 shows that this is not the case. Clearly those sessions that dealt with (1) police work as a profession, (2) police problems with racial overtones, and (6) summation and prospect were rated least informative and useful by smaller proportions of participants than those sessions that dealt with (3) police-citizen communication, (4) prejudice and discrimination, and (5) religious minorities.

TABLE 6

Rating by Participants of Sessions  
Found Least Informative and Useful

(in percentages)

(1) Police work as a profession	7.6
(2) Police problems with racial overtones	4.0
(3) Police-citizen communication	17.8
(4) Prejudice and discrimination	17.0
(5) Religious minorities	44.9
(6) Summation and prospect	8.7
	<hr/>
	100.0 (276)

Add to this the fact that the latter sessions (3, 4, and 5) were conducted primarily by people not directly involved in law enforcement work, it would seem that what the participants did not find useful or informative was that aspect of the program that was perceived as least relevant to the mainstream of police work.

Insofar as the purpose of the program was to make more relevant this aspect of the program, it is problematic whether it succeeded. What represents success, however, is not as straightforward as it might appear at first glance. First of all, success has to do with how well the goals and purposes of the program were articulated. It also has to do with how well what has been articulated was received by the trainees. This, however, is confounded by the fact that a myriad of forces impinge on each of the participants, in some cases facilitating and in others impeding their understanding and acceptance of what they have received. Since it is not the purpose of this study to

investigate the articulation of the program, attention is focused elsewhere. Suffice it to say, however, that how well the goals of the program were articulated is an important consideration, one that remains to be explored in further research.

A possibly good indicator of success in this program--one that relates primarily to that of reception, understanding, and acceptance of the goals of the program--is the extent to which participation in the program effected a change in the orientation of the trainees to act in certain situations. Before pursuing this proposition, however, it is important first to consider something about the people who participated in the program.

### III. PROFILE OF THE PARTICIPANTS

As Table 7 shows, the modal age interval for trainees in the program is 36-40. Almost a fourth fall in this range. About forty per cent of the participants were over 40 years of age. About thirty-five per cent were 35 or younger.

TABLE 7

Present Age .	
(in percentages)	
Under 26	3.6
26-30	16.3
31-35	16.5
36-40	22.5
41-45	19.2
46-50	11.7
51-55	7.0
Over 55	3.2
	<hr/>
	100.0 (412)

The majority of participants completed high school. Those who attended college constitute about fifteen per cent of all trainees. As indicated in Table 8, about a fourth completed less than twelve years of schooling. A considerable plurality of them, however, completed 1-3 years of high school.

TABLE 8

## Level of Education

(in percentages)

Some grade school	.7
Completed grade school	2.7
Some high school	23.6
Completed high school	55.8
Some college	16.5
Completed college	.7
	<hr/>
	100.0 (411)

Of those participants for whom there is data on race, it can be said that about ten per cent were Negro and 90 per cent were white. Eight subjects preferred not to tell their race. These data are presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9

## Race

(in percentages)

Negro	8.9
White	89.2
Preferred not to answer	1.9
	<hr/>
	100.0 (415)

About seventy per cent of the trainees, when asked where their fathers were born, responded by saying the United States. Thirty per cent are sons

of fathers who were not American born, members of the so-called first generation of Americans. As shown in Table 10, they come from a variety of ethnic backgrounds.

TABLE 10

Birthplace of Father  
(in percentages)

USA	70.7
Poland	5.4
Italy	5.1
Ireland	7.0
Czechoslovakia	1.1
Germany	1.7
Great Britain	1.4
Hungary	1.4
Austria	1.4
Yugoslavia	1.1
USSR	1.4
Other	2.3
	<hr/>
	100.0 (355)

According to Table 11, among those whose fathers were born abroad, about a fourth are of Irish descent. Those of Polish and Italian descent are evenly represented at about twenty per cent each.

TABLE 11  
 Birthplace of Foreign Born Father  
 (in percentages)

Poland	18.3
Italy	17.3
Ireland	24.0
Czechoslovakia	3.9
Germany	5.8
Great Britain	4.8
Hungary	4.8
Austria	4.8
Yugoslavia	3.9
USSR	4.8
Other	7.6
	<hr/>
	100.0 (104)

These data serve to provide a descriptive profile of the trainees. They fail, however, to characterize the kind of detail that are important to an understanding of basic factors that underlie the behavior of the participants. In the remainder of this chapter an effort is made to present some of these factors. The characterization focuses on them in terms of such influential environments as childhood, work, and community.

Although by childhood environment is understood a wide variety of psychological and sociological factors, all of which come to play roles of varying significance in the formation of the adult personality, his style of life, and the status positions he holds as a member of his community, data in

this study afford only a limited consideration of these matters. Of the numerous social factors that affect such development, three--race, ethnicity, and education--have already been discussed. Equally important are such additional matters as authoritarianism and social mobility.

Since the topic of authoritarianism has already been treated in connection with a program similar to the one being discussed here,<sup>1</sup> only a brief summary of findings concerning selected items are presented. These items come from the F-scale, an instrument that was administered to participants before the program commenced. Briefly, by authoritarianism is understood a way of viewing the social environment which reflects a lack of tolerance for differences among individuals and groups and a reliance on power as a means of dealing with those who do not conform to the strictly conventional standards to which there is strong commitment.

Analysis of the data in Table 12 tentatively shows that trainees in the program tend to be somewhat more authoritarian on the average (with a mean of 4.8) than those individuals in other studies on which a similar index was standardized (e.g., university students, male prisoners, employment service men veterans).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Francis Cizon, School of Social Work, Loyola University, Chicago, undated and untitled manuscript.

<sup>2</sup>T. W. Adorno and others, The Authoritarian Personality, New York: Science Editions, 1964.

TABLE 12

Average Scores from an Eleven-Item F-Scale  
Measuring Authoritarianism

(in percentages)

1.0 - 1.9 (Low)	.3
2.0 - 2.9	2.2
3.0 - 3.9	13.9
4.0 - 4.9	37.2
5.0 - 5.9	35.7
6.0 - 6.9	9.4
7.0 (High)	1.3
	<hr/>
	100.0 (403)

Mean Score  $\bar{X}$  = 4.8

Data concerning intergenerational mobility--movement from one social stratum to another over two generations--provide evidence to suggest that, for many of the trainees, there was a definite change. As Table 13 shows, about two-thirds of them reported that their fathers were engaged in manual work. Since police work is considered nonmanual, this represents a change upward from one social stratum to another over two generations. For over forty per cent of the participants this represents an upward change of two social strata--from manual work of low prestige (e.g., unskilled or semi-skilled work) to nonmanual work of moderate prestige. For thirteen per cent there was not only no change in social class from one generation to the other but also no change in the occupation--they reported that their fathers were public safety workers too.

TABLE 13  
Occupation of Father  
(in percentages)

Workman or laborer	23.5
Private household worker	.3
Service worker	1.7
Semi-skilled worker	19.2
Skilled worker or foreman	21.5
Farm owner or manager	.3
Clerical worker	3.8
Public safety worker	13.8
Salesman	2.6
Manager or executive	2.9
Proprietor or owner	5.2
Professional	5.2
	<hr/>
	100.0 (344)

By virtue of its connection with social status, occupation figures prominently in determining the nature of contacts people have with others in everyday life.

About half of the participants have been engaged in law enforcement work for up to ten years. Almost one out of ten has been in this line of work for twenty or more years. As Table 14 shows, about a third have been policemen for less than five years.

TABLE 14

Number of Years Engaged in Law Enforcement Work  
(in percentages)

Less than 2	10.7
2 - 4	25.9
5 - 9	14.8
10 - 19	39.7
20 - 29	8.2
30 or more	.7
	<hr/>
	100.0 (413)

As Table 15 shows, the overwhelming majority of the participants come from the Operations Division, with four out of five having a beat as their work assignment.

TABLE 15

Work Assignment  
(in percentages)

Operations Division ( Traffic	13.9
Operations Division ( Beat	80.3
Detective Division	2.2
Service Division	1.9
Inspections Division	1.7
	<hr/>
	100.0 (360)

As regards the attitudes of the participants towards the professional training and skill of police work, eighty-five per cent of them asserted that

it is becoming much more demanding than ever before. Only a very small proportion (3.5 per cent) felt it was either basically no different or less demanding, according to Table 16.

TABLE 16

Attitude toward Professional Training  
and Skill of Police Work

(in percentages)

Becoming much more demanding	85.5
Becoming somewhat more demanding	10.2
Basically no different than it ever was	2.4
Somewhat less demanding	1.1
Much less demanding	.8
	<hr/>
	100.0 (374)

Over half the participants, when asked about their feelings of belonging to their unit, responded by saying that they really felt a part of their unit. As can be seen in Table 17, only a fourth actually indicated some reservation.

TABLE 17

Feeling of Belonging to Unit

(in percentages)

Really a part of my unit	54.3
Included in most ways	19.9
Included in some ways but not others	21.2
Don't feel I really belong	2.7
Not certain	1.9
	<hr/>
	100.0 (411)

In Table 18, it is interesting to note that participants are somewhat ambivalent about remaining in their present unit or moving to another unit. These data are presented in Table 18.

TABLE 18

Feeling of Commitment to Unit  
(in percentages)

Would want very much to move	5.5
Would rather move than stay	4.8
Would make no difference	15.5
Would rather stay than move	39.3
Would want very much to stay	25.2
Not certain	9.7
	<u>100.0</u> (420)

Since work is only one facet of the total configuration of activities that shape the way men behave in everyday life, it is important to consider at least some of the other facets in order to complete the profile.

Religious preferences are shown in Table 19. Being almost the reverse of the pattern for the United States as a whole, exactly two-thirds of the trainees are Catholic and about one-fourth are Protestant.

TABLE 19  
 Religious Preference  
 (in percentages)

Catholic	66.7
Protestant	22.1
Jewish	1.1
Orthodox	.9
Other	1.1
None	3.1
Prefer not to answer	5.0
	<hr/>
	100.0 (357)

Recognizing the increasingly secular nature of religious life in America today and the fact that preference and religiosity are not always equated, participants were asked to rate the strength of their religious beliefs. Although a little over a half said that it is strong or very strong, as Table 20 shows, four out of ten reported beliefs of moderate to no strength. About five per cent had no opinion.

TABLE 20  
 Strength of Religious Belief  
 (in percentages)

Very strong	28.9
Strong	25.9
Moderate	36.2
Not very strong	3.3
Not strong at all	1.4
No opinion	4.4
	<hr/>
	100.0 (367)

Although it is obvious that religion may play an important role in determining the attitudes people have towards each other and the way they behave in everyday life, it may not be so obvious that the number and nature of ties that bind people to their family, their work, and the broader community in which they reside may have such influence too.

As might be expected, most of the trainees are married. According to Table 21, only about fifteen per cent either have not been married or are divorced, separated, or widowed. Those who are married now or who were previously married have had an average of 2.8 children (see Table 22). Although only loosely comparable, this is somewhat above the national average for families in the same occupational category as policemen.

TABLE 21

## Marital Status

(in percentages)

Single, never married	9.5
Married	83.9
Divorced	2.5
Separated	2.5
Widowed	1.6
	<hr/>
	100.0 (368)

TABLE 22  
 Number of Children  
 (in percentages)

None	10.0
1	12.2
2	24.4
3	21.6
4	17.2
5	8.7
6	2.5
7	2.5
8	.6
9	.3
	<hr/>
	100.0 (320)

Mean Score  $\bar{X}$  = 2.8

Beyond contacts with members of the immediate family, the majority of participants report having at least some contact with personal friends who live in their neighborhood. As shown in Table 23, only one out of ten reports having no such contact.

AS-110-11-11-11  
 11-11-11

TABLE 23

Number of Households in the Neighborhood  
that Contain People Considered to be Personal Friends

(in percentages)

None	11.5
1 - 2	15.3
3 - 4	15.9
5 - 8	15.1
9 or more	31.5
Not sure	10.7
	<hr/>
	100.0 (365)

As regards contacts with people in somewhat more formal settings, inspection of Table 24 shows that trainees belong to an average of two voluntary organizations. A little over a fourth said that they belong to none.

TABLE 24  
 Number of Organizations  
 (in percentages)

None	28.6
1	16.1
2	19.7
3	14.8
4	11.6
5	4.2
6	2.4
7	.6
8	1.2
9	-
10	.8
	<hr/>
	100.0 (335)

Mean Score  $\bar{X}$  = 2.0

Having gained some understanding of the background characteristics of the participants, attention is now turned to evaluation of the success of the program.

#### IV. THE EFFECT OF THE PROGRAM ON PARTICIPANTS

Inspection of Table 25 shows that for the majority of the participants the level of racial tension in the United States today is high. For one out of five it is extremely high. Comparing perceptions of tension levels for today and for 1973, proportionately more think things will be less tense in the next five years than it is now. Nevertheless, the majority still feel that the level of tension will remain high.

As regards the present level of racial tension in Pittsburgh, participants are about evenly divided in their opinions, with about a third each saying low, moderate, and high. Comparing the present with the future, however, it is interesting to note that the proportion saying that it is now moderate decreases as the proportions saying that it will be low or that it will be high increase. Although a clear majority of the participants sees a tense future for the country as a whole, opinions are somewhat divided regarding the future of Pittsburgh.

AM-100  
THE  
BOND

TABLE 25

Opinions about Racial Tension in the United States  
and in Pittsburgh Today and in 1973

(in percentages)

	United States		Pittsburgh	
	Today	1973	Today	1973
0 (No tension)	.2	1.9	1.2	3.1
1	-	1.9	2.4	5.2
2	1.2	4.1	8.5	9.3
3	4.3	8.8	11.3	11.2
4	3.8	4.8	11.1	8.1
5 (Moderate tension)	21.3	22.7	35.4	22.2
6	6.1	6.7	8.3	6.7
7	18.0	7.6	7.3	8.3
8	19.1	8.8	6.4	8.3
9	5.0	8.1	2.4	5.2
10 (High tension)	21.0	24.6	5.7	12.4
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	(423)	(419)	(423)	(420)

Mean Score  $\bar{X}$  = 7.08     $\bar{X}$  = 6.52     $\bar{X}$  = 5.05     $\bar{X}$  = 5.36

Opinions about racial tension reflect the impact of attitudes and knowledge concerning race relations. Now we will consider attitudes in connection with any gross effect that the program may have had.

Asked their opinions about what they desire as outcomes of the racial problem, trainees were afforded an opportunity to express their attitudes

ASH-MOON-23  
 100.

toward Negro-white relations before and after the program. Inspection of Tables 26 and 27 show that all outcomes are seen as moderately undesirable by the majority of the participants, either before or after the program. However, a number of minor changes did occur. Perhaps the most significant change was the one regarding total segregation as an outcome. After the program there occurred a drop in the proportion of those who had been neutral before. Some of those who were neutral earlier became either more or less desirous of total segregation as an outcome of the racial problem. Most notable is the fact that so little change occurred between Time 1 and Time 2. This is to be expected if such ratings reflect attitudes that are highly resistant to change.

TABLE 26

Before and After Ratings of Partial and Total Integration of the Races as Desirable Outcomes of the Racial Problem

(in percentages)

	Partial Integration		Total Integration	
	Before	After	Before	After
1 (Very undesirable)	16.4	17.4	25.1	26.6
2	7.8	9.0	9.5	9.8
3	14.2	11.2	9.7	11.4
4 (Neutral)	28.7	28.1	31.4	28.8
5	12.1	14.2	9.0	8.7
6	7.6	8.7	5.9	6.8
7 (Very desirable)	13.3	11.4	9.5	7.9
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	(422)	(367)	(423)	(368)
Mean Score	$\bar{X} = 3.88$	$\bar{X} = 3.84$	$\bar{X} = 3.45$	$\bar{X} = 3.35$

ASH-MOON-23  
 100.

TABLE 27

Before and After Ratings of Partial and Total Segregation  
of the Races as Desirable Outcomes of the Racial Problem

(in percentages)

	Partial Segregation		Total Segregation	
	Before	After	Before	After
1 (Very undesirable)	21.5	17.7	22.0	19.0
2	10.5	10.9	8.1	10.9
3	10.7	12.8	10.3	12.5
4 (Neutral)	31.7	30.3	37.3	30.1
5	11.7	10.6	8.1	9.5
6	4.8	4.6	5.5	4.1
7 (Very desirable)	9.1	13.1	8.6	13.9
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	(419)	(367)	(418)	(368)

Mean Score  $\bar{X} = 3.52$

$\bar{X} = 3.71$

$\bar{X} = 3.52$

$\bar{X} = 3.68$

TABLE 28

Before and After Ratings of Partial and Total Integration  
as Likely Outcomes of the Racial Problem

(in percentages)

	Partial Integration		Total Integration	
	Before	After	Before	After
0 (Impossible)	7.4	12.1	22.3	26.9
1	3.3	3.0	8.1	7.1
2	6.0	6.7	7.8	6.5
3	10.3	9.1	10.4	9.8
4	7.2	7.5	5.2	8.7
5 (50-50 chance)	30.6	28.0	20.1	22.6
6	4.8	6.5	3.1	4.6
7	7.7	6.7	5.9	3.8
8	11.2	8.6	6.4	3.5
9	3.6	4.8	3.8	2.4
10 (Certain)	7.9	7.0	6.9	4.1
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	(418)	(372)	(422)	(368)

Mean Score  $\bar{X} = 5.11$     $\bar{X} = 4.82$     $\bar{X} = 3.91$     $\bar{X} = 3.42$

TABLE 29

Before and After Ratings of Partial and Total Segregation  
as Likely Outcomes of the Racial Problem

(in percentages)

	Partial Segregation		Total Segregation	
	Before	After	Before	After
0 (Impossible)	10.8	7.0	43.0	28.3
1	4.9	4.3	7.3	10.2
2	8.7	8.6	10.6	8.9
3	8.0	11.3	7.1	8.9
4	7.0	6.5	4.3	6.2
5 (50-50 chance)	37.1	33.6	20.1	23.2
6	4.2	5.1	1.2	3.0
7	5.4	7.3	1.4	1.9
8	5.6	5.1	.7	2.7
9	1.9	1.9	-	.8
10 (Certain)	6.3	9.4	4.3	5.9
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	(426)	(372)	(423)	(371)
Mean Score	$\bar{X} = 4.48$	$\bar{X} = 4.83$	$\bar{X} = 2.33$	$\bar{X} = 3.15$

Tables 28 and 29 report responses to the likelihood of the four outcomes. The patterns of responses to the likelihood of racial outcomes are quite similar to those of the desirability of outcomes. On the average, partial integration and total integration are seen as less likely as racial outcomes when Time 1 is compared to Time 2. However, partial segregation and total segregation are seen as more likely when the two time points are compared. These findings are at the group level of analysis, where the scores of all Time 1 respondents are compared to those of all Time 2 respondents. At a later point, we will analyze sub-groups which changed positively and those which changed negatively.

Turning attention to participants' racial knowledge, analysis shows that the effect of the program was mixed. As Table 30 shows, the proportion of those who were not sure regarding the validity of the thesis that nonwhite races have lower inborn intelligence decreased while the proportions affirming or denying it increased.

TABLE 30

Before and After Perceptions Regarding Validity of Thesis  
that Nonwhite Races Have Lower Inborn Intelligence than Whites

(in percentages)

	Before	After
True	27.7	30.5
Not sure	19.4	13.6
False (correct)	52.9	55.9
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	(418)	(374)

A look at Tables 31 and 32, however, reveals a different pattern of responses. Asked to estimate the percentage of the population of Pittsburgh that is Negro and the percentage of the police force that is Negro, the proportion of participants who were approximately correct after the program is higher.

TABLE 31

Before and After Estimation of Percentage  
of Population of Pittsburgh that is Negro

(in percentages)

	Before	After
1 - 9	1.7	1.7
10 - 14	12.2	10.5
15 - 19 (correct)	13.9	29.0
20 - 24	19.0	25.4
25 - 29	10.5	8.6
30 - 39	30.9	19.1
40 - 49	9.7	4.7
50 - 59	.9	.5
60 and over	1.2	.5
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	(411)	(362)

TABLE 32

Before and After Estimation of Percentage  
of Police Force of Pittsburgh that is Negro

(in percentages)

	Before	After
1 - 9 (correct)	29.5	38.0
10 - 14	29.5	29.3
15 - 19	16.9	15.5
20 - 24	14.4	13.5
25 - 29	5.0	1.4
30 - 39	4.0	1.4
40 - 49	0.7	0.9
50 - 59	-	-
60 and over	-	-
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100.0	100.0
	(403)	(355)

The fact that these changes occurred suggests the possibility that the program might have effected changes in how trainees came to define hypothetical situations in which they were called upon to indicate appropriate courses of action. Analysis of the data confirms this supposition, showing

that not only did a large plurality change but a majority changed in a manner that conformed with the experts. (See Table 33).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 3. The following is an example of a police-community situation and its response categories, ranked in order of preference according to the experts. In the questionnaire the response categories are not so ranked.

While on patrol with another officer, you come upon two Negro teenage boys loafing in front of a business establishment. The owner is angrily ordering them away, claiming they are having a bad effect on his business. The boys protest to you that they were not doing anything and make some very nasty remarks to your partner, who is also Negro. Your partner then clubs one of the boys injuring him slightly and twists the other's arm shoving him to the ground. You would:

1. Inform your partner privately that you are making a record of the incident, that he has acted improperly and you would not support the arrest of either boy. Suggest that he apologize to this boy.
2. Refuse to be listed as one of the arresting officers, assuming that your partner chooses to arrest the boys, and also refuse at the boys hearing to corroborate your partner's justification for hitting them.
3. Inform both boys in the presence of your partner and the store owner that you consider the incident unfortunate and would so testify in the event of their arrest. Advise them to respect the rights of the store owner and send them on their way.
4. Assist your partner in arresting the boy who has been clubbed on a charge of Assault and Battery, Resisting Arrest and Disorderly Conduct.
5. Arrest both boys for Loitering and Resisting Arrest and request the store owner to file a formal complaint against the boys.

TABLE 33

Extent and Direction of Before-After Change in Orientation  
to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

6		6.2	
5	(high positive change)	8.1	
4		6.2	51.5
3		9.3	
2	(low positive change)	11.8	
1		9.9	
0	(no change)	12.4	12.4
-1		9.3	
-2	(low negative change)	4.4	
-3		5.6	36.1
-4		6.2	
-5	(high negative change)	2.5	
-6		8.1	
		100.0	
		(161)*	

\* This number represents those respondents who recorded their ID number on the Time 2 questionnaire and also who responded to each of the twelve situations. In the absence of either of these two conditions, it was necessary to drop the individual from the analysis.

Tentatively, on the basis of these limited findings it would seem that less changes occurred in attitudes or abstract knowledge concerning race relations than in orientations to act in police-community situations. Insofar as the goals of the program were to effect such changes, these findings tend to confirm program success. It is a significant finding that a majority of the participants were positive changers. The significance lies in the fact that so large a proportion of the trainees changed in a direction that was prescribed by the experts (positive change).

That so many changed in a negative direction is also a significant finding. Its significance, however, lies in the fact that it affords an opportunity to analyze divergent, but potentially revealing, patterns of responses.

### V. PATTERNS OF CHANGE IN RESPONSE TO POLICE-COMMUNITY SITUATIONS

As might be expected, positive changers tended to evaluate the program more favorably than negative changers. Proportionately more positive changers rated it above average than did negative changers. As shown in Table 34, however, more of those not changing tended to rate it poor.

TABLE 34

Overall Rating of Program, by Change in Orientation  
to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

Rating of Program

	Above average	Average	Below average	
Negative change	28.9	57.8	13.3	100.0 (45)
Non- change	23.5	29.4	47.1	100.0 (17)
Positive change	39.7	46.6	13.7	100.0 (73)

A similar pattern is found in connection with responses to specific matters, such as how interesting and useful trainees found the problem to be. As regards the former, inspection of Table 35 shows a rather interesting set of trends. With the exception of those who did not change, it is obvious that higher proportions of the participants were only moderately interested in the program.

Proportionately more positive changers tended to find it interesting than did negative changers and non-changers.

TABLE 35

Rating by Participants of How Interesting They Found the Program,  
by Change in Orientation to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

Interest in Program

	Very interesting	Moderately interesting	Not very interesting	
Negative change	23.9	43.5	32.6	100.0 (46)
Non- change	10.5	42.1	47.4	100.0 (19)
Positive change	28.7	53.8	17.5	100.0 (80)

As regards the utility of the program, a majority of those who did not change did not find it very useful. Among those who did change, proportionately more of the negative changers said that they did not find the program useful. Proportionately more of the positive changers did find it very useful (See Table 36).

TABLE 36

Rating by Participants of How Useful They Thought the Training Would be  
in Their Work, by Change in Orientation  
to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

Usefulness to Work

	Very useful	Moderately useful	Not very useful	
Negative change	17.5	35.0	47.5	100.0 (40)
Non- change	11.8	23.5	64.7	100.0 (17)
Positive change	20.8	47.2	32.0	100.0 (72)

Asked if they thought the program provided new ways of looking at old problems, more from all three types were of the opinion that it had not. As Table 37 shows, however, proportionately more positive changers said that it did provide new ways than those who changed negatively or those who did not change at all.

TABLE 37

Rating by Participants of Whether the Program Provided  
New Ways of Looking at Old Problems, by Change in Orientation  
to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

	New Ways			
	Yes	Don't know	No	
Negative change	34.7	22.4	42.9	100.0 (49)
Non-change	20.0	5.0	75.0	100.0 (20)
Positive change	37.8	18.3	43.9	100.0 (82)

Nevertheless, as can be seen in Table 38, negative changers did find something informative and useful about the program. In the evaluation of individual sessions, proportionately more of them were impressed by such topics as police-citizen communication, prejudice and discrimination, and religious minorities than were those who changed positively or did not change at all. It is important to note that, although the differences are small, they are not insignificant. It is negative changers--rather than positive changers--who tended to evaluate more highly that aspect of the program that was perceived as less relevant by the majority of the participants. Why this is the case poses a problem, one whose analysis may also provide cues to why positive changers tended to take the opposite tack.

TABLE 38

Rating by Participants of Sessions in Terms of Which They Found  
Most Informative and Useful, by Change in Orientation  
to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

	Type Session		
	Professionally Oriented (1, 2, and 6)*	Race relations Oriented (3, 4, and 5)**	
Negative change	47.8	52.2	100.0 (46)
Non- change	55.6	44.4	100.0 (18)
Positive change	51.9	48.1	100.0 (77)

A possible explanation is that negative changers rated the professional aspect of the program lower than positive changers because they are less involved in or committed to the professionally conventional considerations that are important to positive changers. Should this be the case, it is logical to expect that negative changers will have been engaged in law enforcement work fewer years than positive changers. By virtue of experience

- 
- \*1. Police Work as a Profession.
  - 2. Police Problems with Racial Overtones
  - 6. Summation and Prospect

- \*\*3. Police-Citizen Communication
- 4. Prejudice and Discrimination
- 5. Religious Minorities--Do They Matter Today?

alone, positive changers would have had more opportunity to become professionalized than negative changers.

As indicated in Table 39, the majority of positive changers and non-changers has been involved in law enforcement work for less than ten years. Inconsistent with the thesis concerning professionalization, the majority of negative changers has been engaged in this line of work for ten or more years.

TABLE 39

Number of Years Engaged in Law Enforcement Work,  
by Change in Orientation to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

	Years in Law Enforcement		
	Less than ten years	Ten or more years	
Negative Change	45.8	54.2	100.0 (48)
Non- change	60.0	40.0	100.0 (20)
Positive change	51.9	48.1	100.0 (81)

Paradoxically, however, compared with positive changers proportionately fewer of the negative changers stated that professional training and skill of police work is much more demanding today. As Table 40 shows, fewer than nine out of ten of the positive changers asserted that it is much more demanding, whereas only eight in ten of the negative changers said that they felt this way.

TABLE 40

Attitude toward Professional Training and Skill of Police Work,  
by Change in Orientation to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

	Attitude Toward Police Work		
	Much more demanding	Less than much more demanding	
Negative change	79.2	20.8	100.0 (48)
Non- change	90.0	10.0	100.0 (20)
Positive change	92.7	7.3	100.0 (82)

If the attitude that police work is much more demanding today can be considered as expressive of a professional ethos, and, if holding such an attitude is an integral part of professionalization, it would seem that negative changers, at least a sizeable proportion of them, are less than desirably professionalized.

As regards racial tension in the United States today, proportionately more negative changers said that it is high, as shown in Table 41, while proportionately more also said that it is low.

TABLE 41

Opinion about Racial Tension in the United States Today  
by Change in Orientation to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

Level of Racial Tension in the U. S. A.

	Low	Moderate	High	
Negative change	12.2	16.3	71.5	100.0 (49)
Non-change	10.0	30.0	60.0	100.0 (20)
Positive change	7.3	23.2	69.5	100.0 (82)

Looking at Table 42, essentially the same pattern obtains as regards the perception of racial tension in Pittsburgh today. Compared to positive changers, proportionately more negative changers said that it is high and more said it is low.

TABLE 42

Opinion about Racial Tension in Pittsburgh Today  
by Change in Orientation to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

Level of Racial Tension in Pittsburgh

	Low	Moderate	High	
Negative change	36.7	28.6	34.7	100.0 (49)
Non-change	40.0	35.0	25.0	100.0 (20)
Positive change	30.5	45.1	24.4	100.0 (82)

Negative changers seem to be polarized in their perceptions of racial tension. This suggests that they may have characteristics which are different from those of positive changers. Findings in Tables 43-44 tend to support this proposition.

Asked how men stick together and get along in their unit, higher proportions of negative changers believed the relationships were better and higher proportions believed them worse than did positive changers.

TABLE 43

Extent to Which Men Stick Together in the Unit  
by Change in Orientation to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations  
(in percentages)

Extent to Which Men Stick Together				
	Better	Same	Worse	
Negative change	41.7	43.7	14.6	100.0 (48)
Non-change	35.0	50.0	15.0	100.0 (20)
Positive change	38.3	53.1	8.6	100.0 (81)

TABLE 44

Extent to Which Men Get Along in the Unit  
by Change in Orientation to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

	Extent to Which Men Get Along			
	Better	Same	Worse	
Negative change	38.3	53.2	8.5	100.0 (47)
Non-change	35.0	65.0	-	100.0 (20)
Positive change	31.7	61.0	-7.3	100.0 (82)

If in their work environment they tend to be divided in terms of social cohesion, in the broader milieu they also tend to be divided in terms of certain social characteristics.

Tables 45 and 46 show that proportionately more negative changers live in neighborhoods in which there are no households with personal friends, while proportionately more belong to many voluntary organizations.

TABLE 45

Number of Households in Neighborhood that Contain People  
Considered to be Personal Friends by Change in Orientation  
to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

Personal Friends in the Neighborhood

	None	Few	Some	Many	
Negative change	20.5	25.7	20.5	33.3	100.0 (39)
Non-change	5.6	38.9	16.6	38.9	100.0 (18)
Positive change	12.2	29.7	18.9	39.2	100.0 (74)

TABLE 46

Number of Organizations to which Participants Belong  
by Change in Orientation to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

Number of Organizations

	None	Few	Many	
Negative change	28.3	23.9	47.8	100.0 (46)
Non-change	33.3	33.3	33.4	100.0 (18)
Positive change	35.1	29.8	35.1	100.0 (77)

Asked about the financial condition of the family during childhood, negative changers again polarized, with proportionately more saying that they were barely able to make a living and that they had it comfortable. As Table 47 shows, the majority of positive changers described themselves as having had merely the necessities.

TABLE 47

Financial Condition of Family during Childhood of Participant  
by Change in Orientation to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

	Financial Condition of Family			
	Barely able to make living	Had the necessities	Comfortable	
Negative change	27.1	37.5	35.4	100.0 (48)
Non- change	15.8	57.9	26.3	100.0 (19)
Positive change	14.8	53.1	32.1	100.0 (81)

In terms of education a similar pattern of polarization occurs again. As compared to positive changers, a higher proportion of negative changers had less than twelve years and more had more than twelve years of schooling. Almost two-thirds of the positive changers were high school graduates, having had no more or no less than twelve years of education. (See Table 48).

TABLE 48

Years of Education by Change in Orientation  
to Act in Twelve Hypothetical Situations

(in percentages)

## Years of Education

	Less than 12	12	More than 12	
Negative change	34.0	42.6	23.4	100.0 (47)
Non-change	15.0	70.0	15.0	100.0 (20)
Positive change	18.7	63.8	17.5	100.0 (80)

In summary, these findings suggest that negative changers are more heterogeneous than positive changers. The data show polarization occurring in perception of racial tension, interpersonal relations, childhood financial condition, education and social cohesion on the job. The explanation for such results is not immediately forthcoming, but additional research would likely assist in understanding.

## VI. PATTERNS OF CHANGE IN RESPONSE TO A RACIAL FUTURE

To this point the major part of the analysis has dealt with patterns of change in response to police-community situations. The main concern was with pre-behavioral tendencies in hypothetical situations in which policemen may sometimes find themselves. We located some interesting patterns of change from Time 1 to Time 2. Some participants changed in the direction of more professional behavior while others changed in the direction of less professional behavior. At times, there were striking differences in the characteristics of the two change groupings.

Now we will turn attention to the analysis of another dimension, one which is more in the area of attitudes. In the planning stage of this research it was decided not to attempt to measure attitude change due to the high probability that little basic change would take place during the duration of the training program. At the same time, several perceptual items were inserted in the questionnaire which dealt with the future outcome of the racial problem. It is well established that the ideas and beliefs an individual holds with regard to future states of affairs have considerable bearing on his attitudes and behavioral tendencies in the present. In this sense, one's view of the future tends to program the present. For example, if an individual believes that integration will be the final outcome of the racial problem there is a reasonable likelihood that he will begin to adapt to such a belief system, both in his attitudes and behaviors. Similarly, if he believes that segregation will be the final outcome, he will adapt to that belief system. At the same time, if he finds integration or segregation desirable, while believing in the inevitability of either alternative, his present attitudes and behaviors should be even more firmly influenced.

Thus, there are two dimensions of future perceptions. The first is the objective or cognitive--the extent to which an event or set of events is viewed as probable. The second is the subjective or affective--the extent to which an event or set of events is viewed as desirable. The present behavior of individuals is partially a function of the interaction of both the probabilities and desirabilities which are attributed to the future. As we know and understand more about such perceptions of the future, the more we are able to predict the way individuals will behave in present concrete situations.

For these theoretical reasons, a series of four future racial outcomes were introduced into the questionnaires at both Time 1 and Time 2. In brief, the outcomes posed were: "the majority of whites and Negroes are segregated"; "there is complete separation of whites and Negroes"; "the majority of whites and Negroes are integrated"; and "there is complete mixing of whites and Negroes." On the assumption that the training experience may influence the participants' appraisal of the future, objectively and/or subjectively, the outcomes were given at both time points. It was believed possible that trainees may receive new information or a reinterpretation of existing information to the extent that racial futures may appear different upon retest. Trainees recorded their perceptions of the probability of the racial futures on an eleven point scale ranging from "impossible to happen" to "certain to happen." They also recorded perceptions of the desirability of the futures on a seven point scale ranging from "very desirable" to "very undesirable." Each outcome was scored for each trainee and the difference between Time 1 and Time 2 was computed.

Several assumptions were made by the investigators for purposes of evaluation and analysis. Any trainee whose score changed in the direction of greater probability or desirability of integration as an outcome, was defined as a "positive changer." In contrast, any trainee whose score changed in the direction of greater probability or desirability of segregation as an outcome was defined as a "negative changer." Any trainee whose score did not change was defined as a "no changer." These definitions were based on our interpretation of the goals of the training program as regards the desired future of race relations in the United States.

For present purposes, one of the racial outcomes, or conclusions, is selected for detailed analysis: THE MAJORITY OF NEGROES AND WHITES ARE SEGREGATED IN ECONOMIC, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL LIFE. Trainees were asked to score their perceived desirability and probability for this proposition as the way the "racial problem" might turn out at some future time. The probability of this proposition is an indicator of what trainees believe will be the outcome, while the desirability reflects their feeling for what is wanted.

The meaning of the outcome selected for detailed analysis bears looking into briefly. For the majority of Negroes and whites to be segregated, as the way the "race problem" will turn out, suggests a situation very much like the present status quo. This implies that little, if any, progress toward "liberal" integration goals is made in the future course of race relations. Those finding such an outcome desirable are satisfied with the present state of affairs, while those finding the outcome not desirable are not so satisfied. Those finding it undesirable may wish that the future would bring more integration, or they could wish that total segregation would result. Such desires reflect sentiments and feelings of

a deeply personal nature. On the other hand, those who attribute a high, low or moderate probability to the majority of Negroes and whites being segregated ostensibly are reflecting their belief in what actually will occur at some future time. A lower probability suggests that the society will find and employ devices to meet liberal, integration goals, while a higher probability that the races will be segregated suggests that the status quo will always remain. How it occurs that individuals attribute various desirabilities and probabilities is a function of a complex set of individual attributes, perceptions and experiences. How it occurs that individuals change in their desirability and probability attributions is, perhaps, an even more complicated arrangement of characteristics. However, the purpose of this section is to make the effort to locate certain of those characteristics which are correlated with the tendency to change as a result of a learning experience. Let us now turn to the data.

TABLE 49

Desirability and Probability of the Racial Conclusion:  
 "The Majority of Negroes and Whites are Segregated,"  
 by Time when Measured

(in percentages)

DESIRABILITY	Time One	Time Two
Lower (-3 to -1)	42.7	41.4
Neutral (0)	31.7	30.2
Higher (+1 to +3)	25.6	28.4
	<u>100.0 (419)</u>	<u>100.0 (367)</u>
	Mean = 3.52	Mean = 3.71
PROBABILITY	Time One	Time Two
Lower (0 to 3)	32.4	31.2
Moderate (4 to 6)	48.3	45.2
Higher (7 to 10)	19.3	23.6
	<u>100.0 (426)</u>	<u>100.0 (372)</u>
	Mean = 4.48	Mean = 4.83

In Table 49 it is seen that a higher proportion of trainees attributed a lower desirability to the outcome. Fewer attributed a neutral desirability and still fewer attributed a higher desirability. This was the case in both time points. Since the outcome is basically negative from the point of view of liberal, integration goals, we can tentatively conclude that police trainees do not strongly support racial structures in which the majority of Negroes and whites are segregated. It should be noted that a small change occurred between Time 1 and Time 2 in the category attributing a higher desirability to the outcome. This could suggest that, on a group basis, the training program had a slightly negative impact.

The probability section of Table 49 shows that the vast majority of trainees consider the prospects of the majority being segregated as having a lower or moderate probability. Certainly, few trainees considered the probability to be high. As with the desirability attributions, however, the total group changed slightly from Time 1 to Time 2 in favor of a higher probability, suggesting that a tiny proportion received information in the program which influenced their evaluations of this racial future in a direction contrary to integration goals. We can tentatively conclude that the police trainees do not believe very strongly that the society will be segregationist in the future. Based on this preliminary data, it can be stated that the majority of policemen appear to support values that are consistent with liberal, integration goals. This is stated with the knowledge that earlier data may have suggested an alternative conclusion, namely, that policemen tend to score high on authoritarianism. While authoritarianism may seem contradictory to the present findings, there may be less inconsistency than seems apparent. Authoritarianism is a personality characteristic which, of course,

may become behaviorally manifested in interpersonal relationships, especially with regard to race relations. At the same time, it may be speculated that support of integrationist, rather than segregationist, values may act as a counter-force on authoritarian behavioral tendencies. In effect, what seems probable is that, though policemen tend to exhibit authoritarian characteristics, they also tend to support the dominant societal-based values dealing with race relations. Indeed, such a combination may be anxiety producing for certain individuals, but it may be also functional for the somewhat difficult role performed by policemen in the racial context.

The attributed desirability and probability of the racial outcome has been presented for all trainees as a group. Next, Table 50 shows the direction of change by trainees from their scores on Time 2 as compared to Time 1.

TABLE 50

Change from Time One to Time Two in Desirability  
and Probability of the Racial Conclusion:  
"The Majority of Negroes and Whites are Segregated"

(in percentages)

	DESIRABILITY	PROBABILITY
Positive Change	26.6	33.3
No Change	39.2	29.4
Negative Change	34.2	37.3
	100.0 (199)*	100.0 (201)*

\*These figures represent the number of trainees who completed the applicable questions at both Time 1 and Time 2. In order to compute a change score, it was necessary to have scores at both time points.

In Table 50 "positive change" is defined as a lower desirability or probability attributed to the racial outcome, "negative change" is a higher desirability or probability and "no change" is self-explanatory. The table does not show the degree of change, only the direction. About 200 trainees could be scored at both time points. This represents a little less than half of the total enrollment. Unfortunately, we cannot evaluate the scores of the non-respondents, though the reason for their non-response may, in itself, be important and revealing.

Of the 200 who did respond, about one-quarter changed positively according to their desirability, while one-third changed positively according to probability. A little over one-third of respondents changed negatively according to desirability and probability. There were four respondents out of each ten who did not change in their attributed desirability, while there were three in ten whose probability attribution did not change. It is very likely that trainees' scores at Time 2 reflect a reasonably true measure of program impact since the six weeks between Time 1 and Time 2 probably was long enough for trainees to have forgotten their exact Time 1 score.

For those who changed, Table 50 clearly shows that a higher proportion changed negatively, especially as to the desirability of the races being segregated, and, to a lesser extent, as to the probability of this proposition. Since it is not possible to assess the impact of non-program events on the attitudes of trainees, it will be assumed that changes in scores are a function of the training program. Thus, it is necessary to consider the nature of program impact on trainees' perceptions of the racial future presently under analysis. The intent of the program was to influence trainees' professional orientations toward the police role as well as to present and interpret information relevant to race relations. We

found earlier that the program was somewhat successful in changing likely behavior in a variety of police-community situations since the positive changers exceeded the negative changers. In the present analysis, however, the negative changers slightly exceed the positive changers. Obviously, a different component in race relations is being examined. This component apparently bears upon and stems from a composite of information inputs to which trainees were exposed. We know from earlier data that trainees became more aware of objectifiable information about the proportion of Negroes both in Pittsburgh and on the police force. From that point of view, participants became more highly trained. However, around one-third of those who were scored tended to respond to the program's information and messages in a manner that is interpreted as being away from the Institute's goals. We do not know why this occurred. Apparently, all who are exposed to training programs do not respond in ways that are desired; some respond in opposite ways. It is important to determine the characteristics of those who change positively in contrast to those who change negatively. An examination of such difference will now be undertaken.

TABLE 51

Change in Desirability and Probability of the Racial Conclusion:  
 "The Majority of Negroes and Whites are Segregated,"  
 by How Program is Rated

(in percentages)

**DESIRABILITY  
CHANGE**

	RATING				Total
	Excellent - good	Fair	Poor	Uncertain	
Positive	29.4	39.2	21.6	9.8	100.0 (51)
No change	35.9	42.3	14.1	7.7	100.0 (8)
Negative	20.6	38.2	25.0	16.2	100.0 (68)

**PROBABILITY  
CHANGE**

	RATING				Total
	Excellent - good	Fair	Poor	Uncertain	
Positive	36.4	37.9	18.2	7.5	100.0 (66)
No change	33.9	39.0	16.9	10.2	100.0 (59)
Negative	20.5	43.8	21.9	13.8	100.0 (73)

In Table 51 the rating of the program by trainees is presented. Those not changing in their desirability attribution rated the program higher than either the positive or negative changers. Comparing the latter groups, the positive changers had higher ratings than the negative changers.

TABLE 52

Change in Desirability and Probability of the Racial Conclusion:  
 "The Majority of Negroes and Whites are Segregated,"  
 by Usefulness of Program to Work

(in percentages)

DESIRABILITY  
CHANGE

USEFULNESS TO WORK

	Very Useful	Moderately	Not very Useful	Don't Know	Total
Positive	17.3	30.8	36.5	15.4	100.0 (52)
No change	21.8	33.3	33.3	11.5	100.0 (78)
Negative	10.5	32.8	43.3	13.4	100.0 (67)

PROBABILITY  
CHANGE

USEFULNESS TO WORK

	Very Useful	Moderately	Not very Useful	Don't Know	Total
Positive	21.5	30.8	40.0	7.7	100.0 (65)
No change	22.1	30.5	30.5	16.9	100.0 (59)
Negative	10.8	35.2	37.8	16.2	100.0 (74)

With regard to the usefulness of the program to trainees' work, Table 52 shows very similar trends to those in Table 51. Of course, rating of program and usefulness to work are very similar so similar response patterns are to be expected. Tentatively, it may be suggested that those responding positively to the messages of the program tend also to find the program interesting and useful, in contrast to those responding negatively to program messages.

TABLE 53

Change in Desirability and Probability of the Racial Conclusion:  
 "The Majority of Negroes and Whites are Segregated,"  
 by Years in Law Enforcement

(in percentages)

DESIRABILITY  
CHANGE

	YEARS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT		
	To Nine Years	Above Nine Years	Total
Positive	50.0	50.0	100.0 (50)
No change	46.8	53.2	100.0 (77)
Negative	57.6	42.4	100.0 (66)

PROBABILITY  
CHANGE

	YEARS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT		
	To Nine Years	Above Nine Years	Total
Positive	53.8	46.2	100.0 (65)
No change	42.4	57.6	100.0 (59)
Negative	53.5	46.5	100.0 (71)

The relationship of years in law enforcement work to desirability and probability change is presented in Table 53. Among those with up to nine years in law enforcement work, a higher proportion were negative desirability changers than among those with above nine years experience. In contrast, years in law enforcement made no difference in probability change.

TABLE 54

Change in Desirability and Probability of the Racial Conclusion:  
 "The Majority of Negroes and Whites are Segregated,"  
 by Participation in Previous Police Training Programs

(in percentages)

DESIRABILITY  
CHANGE

	PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION		
	Yes	No	Total
Positive	29.4	70.6	100.0 (51)
No change	38.2	61.8	100.0 (76)
Negative	43.1	56.9	100.0 (65)

PROBABILITY  
CHANGE

	PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION		
	Yes	No	Total
Positive	38.5	61.5	100.0 (65)
No change	36.8	63.2	100.0 (57)
Negative	37.5	62.5	100.0 (72)

Very similar to years in law enforcement work are the findings in Table 54 which shows participation in previous police training programs. A higher proportion of those with previous training were negative desirability changers. As with years in law enforcement, previous participation in training programs made no difference in probability change. Tables 53 and 54, thus, suggest that those who have been in police work longer and those who have had no special police training programs are more likely to change their attitudes in the direction of program goals. This tentative inference is made with respect only to the kind of change which is presently being analyzed. This finding contradicts earlier findings with regard to police-community situations, in which it

was determined that a higher proportion of those with fewer years in law enforcement tend to be positive changers. Apparently, the relationship of years of experience to change as a result of a training program is a complex phenomenon.

TABLE 55

Change in Desirability and Probability of the Racial Conclusion:  
 "The Majority of Negroes and Whites are Segregated,"  
 by Change in Response to Twelve Police-Community Situations

(in percentages)

DESIRABILITY  
 CHANGE

CHANGE IN RESPONSE TO SITUATIONS

	Positive	No change	Negative	Total
Positive	52.5	17.5	30.0	100.0 (40)
No change	63.8	10.3	25.9	100.0 (58)
Negative	47.1	11.8	41.2	100.0 (51)

PROBABILITY  
 CHANGE

CHANGE IN RESPONSE TO SITUATIONS

	Positive	No change	Negative	Total
Positive	59.2	10.2	30.6	100.0 (49)
No change	53.2	21.3	25.5	100.0 (47)
Negative	53.8	7.7	38.5	100.0 (52)

Table 55 presents the relationship of change in response to the police-community situations to change in the desirability and probability of the racial outcome. Table 55 merges the two major analytical dimensions of this study. The relationship is not striking but is adequate to tentatively conclude that positive change in one dimension is somewhat associated with positive change in the other. The same is true for the negative component. What Table 55 tends

to suggest is that the training program had decided positive impact upon a selected group of trainees, both as to change in professional behavior propensities as well as to change in attribution of desirability and probability of the racial future. It should be understood, however, that the police-community situations are very different from the racial outcome. Indeed, these two dimensions draw upon quite different perceptions and feelings. There is enough evidence in Table 55, however, to justify the tentative conclusion that the message of the program did get across to certain trainees both professionally and in the area of racial attitudes.

TABLE 56

Change in Desirability and Probability of the Racial Conclusion:  
 "The Majority of Negroes and Whites are Segregated,"  
 by Change in Desirability and Probability of:  
 "There is Complete Separation of Whites and Negroes"

(in percentages)

## CHANGE IN COMPLETE SEPARATION DESIRABILITY

CHANGE IN MAJORITY SEGREGATION DESIRABILITY	Positive	No change	Negative	Total
Positive	56.6	24.5	18.9	100.0 (53)
No change	17.9	66.7	15.4	100.0 (78)
Negative	13.6	19.7	65.7	100.0 (66)

## CHANGE IN COMPLETE SEPARATION PROBABILITY

CHANGE IN MAJORITY SEGREGATION PROBABILITY	Positive	No change	Negative	Total
Positive	36.9	32.3	30.8	100.0 (65)
No change	25.9	55.1	19.0	100.0 (58)
Negative	21.6	35.2	43.2	100.0 (74)

Approaching program impact differently, Table 56 merges change in the main analytical variable of this section ("the majority are segregated") with change in another racial outcome, "there is complete separation of whites and Negroes." In this relationship, two propositions dealing with future segregation are posed--"the majority are segregated" and "all are segregated." It is probable that those who do not support segregation goals, as such, will not support either partial segregation or total segregation. Table 56 dramatically shows that positive change in one outcome is accompanied by positive change in the other. The same is true in the negative dimension. This is especially evident in the attributed desirability of the two outcomes. Of those who changed positively in the "majority segregation" outcome, 56.6 per cent also changed positively and only 18.9 per cent changed negatively in the "complete separation" outcome. Conversely, of those changing negatively in the "majority segregation" outcome, 65.7 per cent changed negatively and only 13.6 per cent changed positively in the "complete separation" outcome. The pattern in the probability attributions is not as striking, but nevertheless shows the same direction of changes. It is also interesting to note that a quite high proportion of trainees did not change for both outcomes.

Measured in two different, but related, ways, orientations toward racial futures on the part of certain trainees appear to be subject to change in very determinate directions--positive and negative. For another significant sector of the trainee population, there is no discernable change in orientation. Clearly, one group changes positively, another changes negatively while a third is not subject to change. The implications of these findings suggest that training programs must consider the separate needs and characteristics of the audience to be optimally effective. Some are resistant to change, some are positively predisposed and others are negatively predisposed. More will be said of this later.

TABLE 57

Change in Desirability and Probability of the Racial Conclusion:  
 "The Majority of Negroes and Whites are Segregated,"  
 by Change in Desirability and Probability of:  
 "The Majority of Whites and Negroes are Integrated"

(in percentages)

CHANGE IN MAJORITY INTEGRATION DESIRABILITY

CHANGE IN MAJORITY SEGREGATION DESIRABILITY	Positive	No change	Negative	Total
Positive	47.2	22.6	30.2	100.0 (53)
No change	21.8	60.3	17.9	100.0 (78)
Negative	23.5	26.5	50.0	100.0 (68)

CHANGE IN MAJORITY INTEGRATION PROBABILITY

CHANGE IN MAJORITY SEGREGATION PROBABILITY	Positive	No change	Negative	Total
Positive	28.8	42.4	28.8	100.0 (66)
No change	27.1	44.1	28.8	100.0 (59)
Negative	31.1	29.7	39.2	100.0 (74)

Table 57 shows the relationship of change toward the segregation outcome to change toward an integration outcome: "the majority of whites and Negroes are integrated in economic, political and social life." A positive change in the "integration" outcome would mean higher desirability and probability for that racial outcome. We find in Table 57, insofar as desirability attribution is concerned, that positive change in one outcome is strongly accompanied by positive change in the other outcome. The same is true in the negative dimension. These findings are very compatible with those in Table 56.

However, a different picture appears in the probability attribution in Table 57. There is a tendency for negative changers in one outcome to be negative changers in the other outcome. But this is not so for the positive changers, and no immediate reason appears to account for this alteration of pattern.

TABLE 58

Change in Desirability and Probability of the Racial Conclusion:  
 "The Majority of Negroes and Whites are Segregated,"  
 by Response to the Proposition:  
 "Negro Intelligence is Lower than Whites" (Time two)

(in percentages)

DESIRABILITY  
CHANGE

	"NEGRO INTELLIGENCE IS LOWER THAN WHITES"			
	True	False	Not sure	Total
Positive	24.5	60.4	15.1	100.0 (53)
No change	24.4	67.9	7.7	100.0 (78)
Negative	35.3	55.9	8.8	100.0 (68)

PROBABILITY  
CHANGE

	"NEGRO INTELLIGENCE IS LOWER THAN WHITES"			
	True	False	Not sure	Total
Positive	29.2	60.0	10.8	100.0 (65)
No change	23.7	69.5	6.8	100.0 (59)
Negative	30.7	57.3	12.0	100.0 (75)

Returning now to the effort to further explicate the differences between positive and negative changers in the segregation outcome, Table 58 presents trainees' beliefs whether Negro intelligence is lower than whites. Negative desirability changers more strongly believe Negro intelligence to be lower than

do positive desirability changers. A higher proportion of positive changers are not sure. For the probability attribution, a higher proportion of those who did not change believe the intelligence proposition to be false.

TABLE 59

Change in Desirability and Probability of the Racial Conclusion:  
"The Majority of Negroes and Whites are Segregated,"  
by Strength of Religious Belief

(in percentages)

DESIRABILITY  
CHANGE

	STRENGTH OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF		
	Very Strong or Strong	Moderate or Not Strong	Total
Positive	67.3	32.7	100.0 (49)
No change	52.0	48.0	100.0 (75)
Negative	60.7	39.3	100.0 (61)

PROBABILITY  
CHANGE

	STRENGTH OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF		
	Very Strong or Strong	Moderate or Not Strong	Total
Positive	62.5	37.5	100.0 (64)
No change	59.6	40.4	100.0 (57)
Negative	53.7	46.3	100.0 (67)

For both desirability and probability attributions in Table 59, higher proportions of positive changers have stronger religious beliefs than do negative changers. To have strong religious beliefs suggests both the possibilities of ideological commitments and social attachments. Either, presumably,

might have a direct bearing on stronger support for liberal, integration goals if the religious ideology and social attachments are compatible with such goals. Table 60 amplifies this discussion somewhat.

TABLE 60

Change in Desirability and Probability of the Racial Conclusion:  
 "The Majority of Negroes and Whites are Segregated,"  
 by Number of Households with Friends

(in percentages)

DESIRABILITY  
CHANGE

	HOUSEHOLDS WITH FRIENDS			
	None	1 - 4	Above 4	Total
Positive	7.1	26.2	66.7	100.0 (42)
No change	18.6	25.7	55.7	100.0 (70)
Negative	16.9	33.9	49.2	100.0 (59)

PROBABILITY  
CHANGE

	HOUSEHOLDS WITH FRIENDS			
	None	1 - 4	Above 4	Total
Positive	11.5	26.2	62.3	100.0 (61)
No change	13.7	25.5	60.8	100.0 (51)
Negative	18.1	34.4	47.5	100.0 (61)

There is a fairly strong association between having many (above 4) households with friends and being a positive changer, both in desirability and probability. For trainees with fewer than four households with friends, higher proportions are negative changers. These findings underscore the hypothesis that the greater the social attachments, the greater the inclination to change toward liberal, integration goals. It is possible to present an argument to

the effect that only under conditions in which the religious ideology and the friends are supportive of liberal, integration goals can we predict positive change after exposure to a training program. This may be plausible. At the same time, it is possible to argue the opposite--under conditions in which religious ideology and friends are not supportive of liberal, integration goals, a training program will have an effect which is contrary to the previous attachments. The latter argument, in effect, suggests the possibility that resocialization or relearning takes place. To fully understand which, if either, of the two arguments is correct, additional research appears necessary.

TABLE 61

Change in Desirability and Probability of the Racial Conclusion:  
 "The Majority of Negroes and Whites are Segregated,"  
 by Education

(in percentages)

DESIRABILITY  
CHANGE

	EDUCATION			
	Less than High School	High School	College	Total
Positive	16.0	66.0	18.0	100.0 (50)
No change	36.8	44.7	18.5	100.0 (76)
Negative	19.7	59.1	21.2	100.0 (66)

PROBABILITY  
CHANGE

	EDUCATION			
	Less than High School	High School	College	Total
Positive	23.1	60.0	16.9	100.0 (65)
No change	28.8	57.6	13.6	100.0 (59)
Negative	28.2	45.1	26.7	100.0 (71)

Table 61 shows a most interesting relationship between positive or negative change and education. Higher proportions of those with less than high school or with some college are negative changers, while a higher proportion of high school graduates are positive changers. This pattern pertains to both the desirability and probability attributions. We are reminded, also, that a similar pattern obtained in the analysis of change in response to the police-community situations. Since this finding has been located in both analyses in this paper, we choose to think that a most interesting, and potentially important, set of conditions exist in the educational background of policemen, insofar, at least, as such background is related to the tendency to change positively or negatively in a training program. Speculation is possible as to the explanation for these findings, but our data, as presently constituted, are inadequate for proper development.

To summarize the findings in this section, it would appear useful to present a profile of the characteristics of positive changers and negative changers. This will be presented both for the desirability (Table 62) and probability (Table 63) attributions.

TABLE 62

## DESIRABILITY CHANGE

**STRONG POSITIVE CHANGE**  
(10% or higher difference)

Program was excellent or good

Did not participate in past training programs

Changed positively in response to "complete separation" outcome

Changed positively in response to "majority integration" outcome

Greater number of friends

**STRONG NEGATIVE CHANGE**  
(10% or higher difference)

Did participate in past training programs

Changed negatively in response to police-community situations

Changed negatively in response to "complete separation" outcome

Changed negatively in response to "majority integration" outcome

True to proposition that Negro intelligence is lower

Had lower number of friends

**WEAK POSITIVE CHANGE**  
(Less than 10% difference)

Program was very useful to work

Changed positively in response to police-community situations

Had more than 10 years in police work

False or not sure to proposition that Negro intelligence is lower than whites

Had stronger religion

Completed high school

**WEAK NEGATIVE CHANGE**  
(Less than 10% difference)

Program was poor, or was uncertain

Program was not very useful to work

Had less than 10 years in police work

Had weaker religion

Had less than high school education or some college

TABLE 63

## PROBABILITY CHANGE

STRONG POSITIVE CHANGE (10% or higher difference)	WEAK POSITIVE CHANGE (Less than 10% difference)
Program was very useful to work	Program was excellent or good
Changed positively in response to "complete separation" outcome	Changed positively in response to police-community situations
Had stronger religion	Changed negatively in response to "majority integration" outcome
Had greater number of friends	False to proposition that Negro intelligence is lower than whites
Completed high school	
STRONG NEGATIVE CHANGE (10% or higher difference)	WEAK NEGATIVE CHANGE (Less than 10% difference)
Changed negatively in response to police-community situations	Program was poor, or was uncertain
Changed negatively in response to "complete separation" outcome	Had less than high school or had some college
Changed negatively in response to "majority integration" outcome	
Had weaker religion	
Had fewer number of friends	

Tables 62 and 63 show rather clear-cut differences in the profiles of the positive and negative changers. In general, higher proportions of positive changers, contrasted to negative changers, saw the training program as good and useful to their work. Higher proportions of positive changers also changed positively in response to the police-community situations and other racial outcomes, whereas the negative changers changed negatively to the other items. Positive changers appear to have more friends and stronger attachment to their religion. They tend to not agree to the extent of negative changers

that Negro intelligence is lower than whites. Higher proportions of positive changers tended to be high school graduates, while higher proportions of negative changers tended to have achieved less than high school or had some college. Thus, positive changers tend to adjust to training program in line with program goals and appear to believe that the program is beneficial; they tend to be moderately well educated; socially, they appear to be better integrated and more attached to groups; and they appear to be more in tune with and accepting of socially accepted facts. Negative changers tend to embrace characteristics somewhat opposite to the positive changers.

This section has dwelt upon one attitudinal-type measure designed to compare the trainees in terms of perceptions of a future state of affairs in race relations. In general, there were not directional differences in the desirability and probability components, but frequently we located differences in emphasis. Basically, both probability and desirability attributions were in the same direction. This is taken to mean that the emotional and intellectual components of the trainees' orientations toward race relations are not particularly separable. One component tends to follow the other. We can speculate that a kind of uni-dimensional cognitive process operates among trainees, insofar as the present measurements are concerned.

The "outcome" approach did, however, distinguish among trainees. The positive and negative changers were clearly separated and we were able to establish profiles of the different characteristics held by each group. In all probability, other attitude-type measures would have similarly distinguished. But for reasons indicated at the beginning of this section, such attitudes were not measured. If, as was speculated earlier, present behavior is partially

conditioned by the perception of the future, then we have a basis to think that rather specific sets of police trainees can be expected to view the future positively while another set views it negatively. There is little reason to think that their present behavior will not reflect such future perceptions.

SEARCHED  
SERIALIZED  
INDEXED  
FILED

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

This analysis has tried to do three basic things. First, it provided general data about the characteristics of the trainees as a whole. Second, it showed the extent to which the trainees changed as a group from Time 1 to Time 2, and this was done both for the police-community situations test and for the "outcomes" test. Lastly, it isolated and described the characteristics of those trainees who changed in the direction of program goals and those who changed away from program goals.

In regard to the first effort, it appears probable that the sample of trainees was fairly representative of the population of policemen, both in Pittsburgh and nationally. We showed that the trainees did not particularly evaluate the program as excellent, but a substantial proportion viewed it as good or fair. More viewed it as interesting than not interesting and more viewed it as useful than not useful. From the point of view of the participants themselves, it can be said that the program was moderately successful. It would appear that future programs of this nature should build on this body of participants' evaluation and introduce new program aspects that both increase interest and perceived utility. It seems apparent also that program content that is most easily assimilated and seems more directly relevant to day-to-day police needs should be emphasized. Perhaps less attention should be given to the more abstract aspects of intergroup relations. It is our impression that policemen are a "practical" group who want concrete material that can be practically utilized. The extent to which this is so requires further research. But it is eminently logical that a group with the average educational levels of our sample, who also are beset with the profound confusion and frustration of today's policeman, who are under tremendous pressure

from diverse groups to effect rapid change, and who tend to be relatively authoritarian, can benefit best by programs which are geared toward practical application.

The extent to which trainees changed from Time 1 to Time 2 on our tests is an overall measure of program success. It was evident that in the police-community situations there was a decided change in the direction indicated by the experts to be more professional. These situations were fairly critical tests of program impact. From the data it is possible to say that the trainees became more professionalized and the program was moderately successful.

From the point of view of establishing a sensitivity and sympathy in the trainees for liberal, integration goals in the society, the program cannot be viewed as highly successful. A higher proportion changed negatively than changed positively. Apparently, in the process of taking in and assimilating program material relevant to this issue, forces were operating that had a counter-impact on participants. It is difficult to speculate on the nature of these forces. Yet it is possible to think that certain program emphases, lectures or group discussions missed their mark; they backfired, in effect. Here, obviously, is an area of education that is most difficult to grapple with. It has long been a somewhat nebulous and tricky matter. Clearly, however, new educational devices must continually be sought which will influence deeper sentiments that are internalized within most Americans.

From the point of view of program goals in general, it is clear that the influence of the program on professional behavioral aspects is more important and more desirable. Indeed, this is the area in which the program had the greatest impact. It has been often noted that if behavior can be influenced

in respect to racial affairs, it is highly likely that attitude changes will follow. If this is true, and there is little reason to think it is not, the program was successful in meeting its training goals. Of course, a caution must be raised. Our behavioral measures were taken in the abstract. In effect, we measured the propensity to behave, rather than actual behavior. We think, however, that the propensity to behave is the first step in actual behavior patterns. It is quite apparent that a follow-up study of actual behavior in concrete situations would be of first order importance. We highly recommend that such possibilities be investigated by the Bureau of Public Safety.

Our third major analytical effort was to isolate and describe the characteristics of the positive, negative and no-change groups. This was done for both the behavioral and attitudinal measures. We reasonably clearly delineated and profiled sets of trainees that appear to respond to program content and goals in a positive direction. For both the situations and the outcome, individuals with similar characteristics tend to be positive changers--they appear to be more tied in to social groups; more favorable to the program and find it more useful; more likely to high school graduates rather than less than or more than high school; more professionally oriented; more likely to change positively along several dimensions at the same time. Many of the characteristics of the negative changers were opposite those of the positive changers. We think that the positive changers are a kind of cooperative, educable and conceivably a leadership type. They may be easier molded by educational programs, but this condition may prevail only for such programs as fit their ideological tendency. The negative changers may tend to be more alienated, hostile, less educable and lack the leadership traits that are necessary in the area of intergroup relations.

Negative changers probably are experiencing difficulties in professionalization. The negative change group appears to be polarized on certain characteristics which suggests that the group, analytically speaking, is a more heterogeneous one. Realistically, those individuals who are positive changers probably can be counted on to perform better in concrete situations and are more prone to take appropriate courses of action from the point of race relations. It is obvious that if such individuals can be identified, they should be further counseled and placed in positions where their behavioral and attitudinal propensities can contribute to problem solution. Of course, this enters the domain of personnel selection and goes somewhat away from the main focus of this report. One can say, at the same time, that ultimately proper personnel selection is a key factor in conflict resolution and problem solution. It would seem to be one of the most important areas for future research in police-community affairs.

From the point of view of the researchers, the ground has been scratched, but considerably more ploughing is necessary. The area of inquiry is a fairly complex one, but not unmanageable, or, by no means impossible of creative solution. The adage that more research is mandated is here most apparent. We located fairly important and reasonably interesting patterns of behavior and attitude. We firmly think that further efforts must be made to explore in greater depth some of the findings and implications of the findings. This is most evident in the midst of growing tension in the urban centers. Resolutions must be found; creative solutions must be suggested. Some of these will come from research efforts.

## Appendix A

## Consultants in Planning

Police

David W. Craig, Public Safety Director; former City Solicitor; former President, American Society of Planning Officials; Adjunct Professor, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh.

Andrew Daly, Sergeant, Police-Community Relations Division.

William J. Gilmore, Assistant Superintendent, Commanding Operations.

Patrick Moore, Sergeant-Instructor, Police Training Academy.

William H. Moore, Commander, Police-Community Relations Division; former detective, burglary squad.

Edward Patterson, Commander, Personnel and Finance Division; former sergeant.

George W. Purvis, Commander, Crimes Against Property Division, Detective Branch; former Captain and Director, Police Training Academy.

James W. Slusser, Superintendent, Bureau of Police; Lieutenant Colonel, U. S. Army.

Academic

Bruno Casile, Ph.D., Professor of Guidance, School of Education, Duquesne University.

Mary Chisholm, Ph.D., Professor of Group Dynamics, Duquesne University.

Francis Duffy, Father, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology, Duquesne University; Chaplain for the Pittsburgh Fraternal Order of Police.

Rolf Von Eckartsberg, Professor of Psychology, Duquesne University.

Chester Jurczyk, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology, Duquesne University; Authority on Ethnic Groups and Minority Groups in Urban Settings.

Academic (continued)

Hideya Kumata, Ph.D., Professor of Communication; Director, International Communication Institute, Michigan State University.

Veronica Maz, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology, St. Bonaventure University.

Special Consultants

Frank Cizon, Ph.D., Professor of Social Work, Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois; Consultant, Police-Community Relations, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U. S. Department of Justice.

Ray Girardin, Commissioner, Department of Police, Detroit, Michigan; former police reporter, Detroit News; former Director, Recorder's Court; former Executive Secretary, Mayor of Detroit.

Adelbert Welles, Lieutenant and Deputy Director, Human Resources - Research and Development Bureau, Detroit Police Department.

Bernard Winckoski, Inspector and Director, Inspectional Services, Detroit Police Department.

Bar Association

Eric W. Springer, Esq., Chairman, Pittsburgh Mayor's Commission on Human Relations; former Director of Compliance, U. S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; Professor, Graduate School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh.

Milton Susman, Esq., Director of Continuing Education, Duquesne University.

Patrick Tamilia, Esq., Director, Domestic Relations Court.

David B. Washington, Esq., Executive Director, Pittsburgh Mayor's Commission on Human Relations.

Social Agencies

Russell L. Bradley, Executive Director, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Western Pennsylvania and West Virginia Region.

Walter Crocker, Supervisor, Allegheny County Juvenile Court, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Ernest A. Minneci, Administrative Assistant, Behavior Clinic of the Criminal Court, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

## Appendix B

## Speaker Biographies

Francis R. Duffy, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology, Duquesne University; Chaplain for the Pittsburgh Fraternal Order of Police; Lieutenant Colonel, U. S. Army Reserve.

Ray Girardin, Commissioner of Police, Detroit, Michigan; former police reporter for the Detroit News; Executive Secretary to the Mayor; former Director of Recorder's Court.

Frederick Gray, Minister, St. Paul AME Church; former board member, Urban League of Pittsburgh; board member, Pittsburgh Branch YMCA; board member, Greater Allegheny Monongahela Housing Corporation.

Leonard Karter, Executive Director, Erie Commission on Human Relations, Erie, Pennsylvania; former field representative, Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations.

Robert Lamb, Jr., Captain and Commanding Officer, Police-Community Relations Units, Atlantic City Police Department; former sergeant.

Ernest Minneci, Administrative Assistant, Allegheny County Behavior Clinic of Criminal Court; former Probation Officer, Allegheny County Criminal Court; member, board of directors, Grubstake, Inc.; member, The International Society of Criminology.

Anton Morgenroth, C.S.Sp., Professor of Theology, African Institute, Duquesne University.

Andrew Pauley, Monsignor, St. Paul's Cathedral; Consultant to Bishop John J. Wright; Commissioner, Mayor's Commission on Human Relations.

Milton K. Susman, Esq., Director, Continuing Education Department, Duquesne University; member, Allegheny Bar Association; columnist, Jewish Chronicle of Pittsburgh.

James E. Treher, Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation; police training instructor in Western Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio.

Adelbert Welles, Lieutenant, Detroit Police Department; Deputy Director of Human Resources in the Research and Development Bureau.

Harold White, Professor of Social Work, University of Pittsburgh; advisor, Narcotics Addiction Center; supervisor, field trainees at the Allegheny County Juvenile Court.

Eugene L. Youngue, M.D., Psychiatrist, member, AMA; secretary, Council on Hospitals and Education; Allegheny County Medical Society; Associate, American College of Physicians; American Psychiatric Society; American Academy of Neurology; Diplomat, American Board of Neurology and Psychiatry; board member, Pittsburgh Board of Education; Urban League of Pittsburgh Education and Health Committee; Lieutenant Colonel, U. S. Army Reserve.

## Appendix D

## Police Group Leaders

Sergeant Harvey Adams received his Bachelor of Arts degree from West Virginia State College in 1950. He has taken courses in Community Relations at Chatham College and Northwestern University.

Sergeant Adams was appointed to the Bureau of Police in 1954 and worked for nine years as a beat patrolman in the #2 Station. He later served two years at #9 Station as a plainclothesman. In 1967 he was promoted to sergeant and re-assigned to #2 Station. Sergeant Adams is currently assigned to #3 Station, located in the Lawrenceville section of the City of Pittsburgh.

Sergeant Andrew Daly is a native of the City of Pittsburgh and received his Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Pittsburgh. Sergeant Daly was appointed to the Bureau of Police in 1955, and spent 12 years as a beat patrolman in the Hill District.

Officer Daly was promoted to sergeant in April, 1968, and is currently assigned to the Police-Community Relations Division.

Lieutenant James Flannigan is a native Pittsburgher. He attended Duquesne University, the University of Minnesota and has taken courses at the Allegheny County Community College. Lt. Flannigan was appointed to the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police in November, 1957. He began his police career as a plainclothesman assigned to #4 Station and eventually became a member of the Youth Squad.

In April, 1965, he was promoted to the rank of sergeant and assigned to Stations #8 and #5.

In May, 1966, Mr. Flannigan was appointed lieutenant and assigned as Shift Commander in the Traffic Division, and then as Shift Commander at #1 Station. Lt. Flannigan is currently assigned to the General Inspection Division.

Sergeant Herman Mitchell was appointed to the Bureau of Police in 1958. At the completion of his training at the Police Academy, Sergeant Mitchell then became an under-cover agent for the Bureau's Narcotic Squad and the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. While assigned as an under-cover agent, he was responsible for the arrest and conviction of ten narcotics pushers. Upon completing this assignment, he was then assigned to the Traffic Division where he spent eight years.

Sergeant Mitchell later spent two years in the Detective Division. Mr. Mitchell was appointed sergeant in 1967 and is currently assigned to the Mt. Washington Station.

Commander William H. Moore is a native Pittsburgher and a graduate of Fifth Avenue High School. Commander Moore attended West Virginia State College and pursued a major in physical education. He has been a student and participant at the National Center on Police-Community Relations, Michigan State University.

Mr. Moore was promoted to Commander of the Police-Community Relations Division in April, 1968. Prior to this, he was assigned to the Detective Branch as a member of the burglary squad.

Lieutenant Harry Mulholland has been a member of the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police for 12 years. Lt. Mulholland attended Duquesne University and pursued courses in psychology.

Lt. Mulholland has had three years' experience with the Youth Squad; six years duty with the police emergency vehicles and one year with the Canine Squad.

He is a member of the Police Drill Team, and a member of the Police Pistol Team. Lt. Mulholland is currently assigned to #4 Station as a Shift Lieutenant. He also serves in the capacity of Acting Inspector of the Police Tactical Unit.

Detective John J. Nee has been a member of the Bureau of Police for the past 12 years, and worked as a beat patrolman, radio-car man and ambulance man. He is currently assigned to the Homicide Division of the Detective Branch.

Detective Nee attended Duquesne University and has taken courses at the University of Pittsburgh and Indiana University of Pennsylvania. He is presently attending Allegheny County Community College part-time and pursuing courses in Criminal Justice and Law Enforcement.

Sergeant Pete Rentzperes was appointed to the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police in 1952. Sergeant Rentzperes previously worked as a beat patrolman, radio-car patrolman, and sergeant in the Hill District, Homewood-Brushton, and the North Side.

Sergeant Rentzperes attended the University of Pittsburgh for one year and graduated from Business Training College. He has taken special courses in police science at the University of Pittsburgh and Northwestern University Traffic Institute.

Officer Charles R. Schweinberg was appointed to the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police on February 12, 1951. He began his police career in the Strip District as a beat patrolman, and then was assigned to the radio-car patrol. In May, 1958, he was assigned to the K-9 Division, and worked in every section of the City of Pittsburgh.

Officer Schweinberg is currently assigned to the Communications Division as a radio operator.

Detective Steve Terscak received his appointment to the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police on November 1, 1957.

Detective Terscak was assigned to the Detective Bureau in 1959 and worked in the Narcotics Division for two years. In 1965 he was assigned as a supervisor of the Robbery Squad, and in 1966 he served in a similar capacity with the Burglary Squad. He is currently assigned to the Homicide and Sex Crime Section as a supervisor.

Detective Terscak attends the Allegheny County Community College part-time and is pursuing a degree in Police Science. He has taken courses in police-community relations at Michigan State University, and criminal law courses at the University of Pittsburgh.

## Appendix E

## Civilian Group Leaders

ROBERT T. AARONS

Education

B.A. - University of Pittsburgh  
M.S.W. - University of Pittsburgh

Related Experience

Counsellor: Allegheny County Domestic Relations Court  
Supervisor: Correctional Services for the Salvation Army

Present Position: Social Worker in the Narcotic Addiction Treatment  
Program of Western Pennsylvania

RUSSELL L. BRADLEY

Education

B.A. - Yale University  
M.A. - Columbia University

Related Experience

18 years college professor  
5 years college administrator  
NCCJ, Geneva, Switzerland  
NCCJ, Washington, D. C.

Present Position: Executive Director, NCCJ - Western Pennsylvania and  
West Virginia Region

ARTHUR L. BURT

Education

B.A. & B.S. - Baldwin Wallace College  
M.S.W. - University of Pittsburgh

Arthur L. Burt (continued)

Related Experience

Friendly Inn Settlement House - Cleveland, Ohio  
 Neighborhood House - Cleveland, Ohio  
 Department of Public Welfare - Cleveland, Ohio  
 Soho House - Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
 Anna B. Heldman Center - Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
 Administrator, Alcoholism Clinic, Mercy Hospital, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Present Position: Area Director - Model Cities Program

WALTER CROCKER

Education

B.A. - Lincoln University  
 M.A. - University of Pittsburgh

Related Experience

Centre Avenue YMCA  
 Hill District Area Youth Program

Present Position: Supervisor, Allegheny County Juvenile Court

KENNETH GARRISON

Education

B.A. - Clarion State College

Related Experience

Sewickley Community Center  
 Outdoor Education Program - Pittsburgh Public Schools  
 Pennsylvania Youth Development Center

Present Position: Director, Area Youth Program, Hill District section,  
 City of Pittsburgh

PAUL HOOK

Education

B.A. - Duquesne University

Related Experience

Allegheny County Juvenile Court  
Counsellor - Boystown of McKeesport, Pennsylvania

Present Position: Guidance Counsellor, Penn Hills School District

ROBERT JACISIN

Education

B.A. - Duquesne University  
M.ED. - Duquesne University  
Post-graduate work at the University of Arkansas  
Certified School Psychologist - Pennsylvania and New York  
Registered Psychologist - Illinois

Related Experience

Auberle Memorial Home for Boys

Present Position: Psychologist, Camp Hill and State Correctional Institute  
of Pittsburgh

MAURICE KELSEY

Education

A.B. - University of Pittsburgh  
Graduate work: Howard University School of Law  
Graduate School of Social Work, University of Pittsburgh  
Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of  
Pittsburgh

Related Experience

Special Policeman, General Service Administration  
Allegheny County Juvenile Court

Present Position: Economic Development Supervisor, Pennsylvania Department of  
Community Affairs

HAROLD KELTON

Education

B.A. - University of Pittsburgh

Related Experience

National Union Insurance Company  
Allegheny County Juvenile Court  
Pennsylvania Board of Parole

Present Position: U. S. Probation Officer, Federal Court, Western District  
of Pennsylvania

WALTER MC COY

Education

B.A. - Huston - Tillotson College  
M.A. - Duquesne University  
Carnegie Mellon University (certificate in Community Action)

Related Experience

Detached Worker in ghetto areas of Houston, Texas and Pittsburgh,  
Pennsylvania

Present Position: Neighborhood Development Supervisor, The Hill House  
Association

EDWARD MELODINI

Education

B.A. - Duquesne University  
M.A. - Duquesne University

Related Experience

Allegheny County Criminal Court  
Counsellor, Poverty Program

Present Position: Rehabilitation Supervisor, St. Francis General Hospital

ERNEST A. MINNECI

Education

B.S. - Duke University  
Graduate work - University of Pittsburgh and Duquesne University

Related Experience

Allegheny County Criminal Court

Present Position: Administrative Assistant, Behavior Clinic of the  
Criminal Court

HILARY MODRAK

Education

A.B. - Duquesne University  
Graduate work - St. Vincents College

Related Experience

Catholic Youth Bureau  
Allegheny County Juvenile Court  
Kingsley House Association  
Salvation Army  
Pittsburgh Board of Education  
Auberle Memorial Home for Boys

Present Position: Probation Officer, Allegheny County Criminal Court

WILLIAM R. MONTGOMERY

Education

A.B. - Wilberforce University  
M.S.W. - University of Pittsburgh

Related Experience

Centre Avenue YMCA  
Termon Avenue Home for Children  
Pennsylvania Youth Development Center (Morganza)  
Urban League of Pittsburgh  
Business and Job Development Corporation  
Pennsylvania Department of Health  
Duquesne University

Present Position: Director, Community Organizations, Planned Parenthood Center

RALPH PROCTOR

Education

B.S. - University of Pittsburgh  
Graduate School of Social Work, University of Pittsburgh

Related Experience

Mellon National Bank  
Community Action Program, South West Pittsburgh  
Urban League of Pittsburgh

Present Position: Supervisor, Public Relations Department, H. J. Heinz Company

GEORGE RISKO, ACSW

Education

B.A. - University of Pittsburgh  
M.S.W. - Carnegie-Mellon University

Related Experience

Soho Community Center  
Department of Public Welfare  
Allegheny County Juvenile Court  
Lecturer: Carnegie-Mellon University; Wheeling College; Duquesne University

Present Position: Probation Training Officer, Allegheny County Juvenile Court

WILLIAM R. ROBINSON

Education

B.A. - Ohio State University  
Graduate work - Howard University School of Law  
Completed course requirements for M.A. at Duquesne University

Related Experience

Wells Fargo Bank, Sacramento, California  
Urban League of Pittsburgh

Present Position: Director, Economic Development and Employment Department,  
Urban League of Pittsburgh

ROBERT A. RUFFIN

Education

B.A. - Johnson C. Smith University  
M.S.W. - University of Pittsburgh

Related Experience

Addison Center Community House  
Pressley House  
North Side Community Action Program  
Neighborhood Centers Association

Present Position: Consultant, Community Mental Health Center, St. Francis  
General Hospital

MARTIN SAMUELS

Education

B.S. - University of Pittsburgh  
M.A. - West Virginia University

Related Experience

Business and Job Development Corporation

Present Position: Psychiatric Social Worker, Community Mental Health Center

College teaching: Pennsylvania State University, Department of Continuing  
Education; and Community College of Allegheny County

WILLIAM SHAFFER

Education

B.A. - University of Pittsburgh

Related Experience

Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations  
Employer Group Insurance Companies

Present Position: Western Pennsylvania Area Director, American Jewish Committee

JOHN SHENKEL

Education

University of Pittsburgh

Related Experience

Claims Investigator, Insurance Group  
Enforcement Officer, Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board

Present Position: Supervisor, Probation Office, Criminal Court, Allegheny County

REVEREND OBADIAH LEE SIMMS

Education

B.A. - Virginia Union University  
B.D. - Virginia Union University

Community Affiliations

Board of Directors, North Side Child Care Community Services  
North Side Negro Clergy  
Allegheny County Health and Welfare Services  
Urban League of Pittsburgh  
North Side Committee on Human Resources  
President Eisenhower's Committee on Children and Youth, 1956

Present Position: Pastor, Metropolitan Baptist Church

VERNON W. SIMMS

Education

A.B. - Dartmouth College  
Graduate student, Duquesne University School of Law

Related Experience

Bank of America  
Ford Motor Company  
Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations

Present Position: Economic Development and Employment Department, Urban League of Pittsburgh

STEWART W. STROTHERS

Education

B.S. - University of Pittsburgh  
Graduate School of Education, Masters Program, University of Pittsburgh

Related Experience

Pennsylvania Department of Labor  
Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare  
Urban League of Pittsburgh

Present Position: Veterans Affairs Coordinator, Urban League of Pittsburgh

## Appendix F

## Research Evaluation

Following are the police-community situations with response categories in the order of professional correctness as defined by the five experts who consulted in this study.

1. You and your partner are called to a tenement apartment where a heated argument between a man and a woman is in progress. The woman--a small, disheveled Negro in her thirties--points at a drunken white man around 40 whom she identifies as her husband. She complains that he has been abusive and has threatened to beat her. She appears frightened. He denies threatening her. There are no witnesses. You would:
  - (1) Ask the man to accompany you outside while your partner talks to the woman; try to calm him down, warn him of the consequences if he physically abuses the woman, and generally try to smooth things out to avoid the necessity of an arrest.
  - (2) Warn the man that if he hits his wife, he can be arrested.
  - (3) Tell the woman she can have her husband arrested if she is willing to come to the station and write out a complaint.
  - (4) Tell the woman you cannot interfere in family quarrels unless some physical force has been used and that she will have to go to an alderman and swear out a peace warrant before you can do anything.
  - (5) Find out whether the woman is a prostitute and her "husband" really her procurer or a customer.

2. You respond to a complaint on a Friday night from an elderly sick person about a "noisy mob" in a nearby park. You find a group of animated Negro teenagers talking and laughing loudly in a well-lit playground. You see no evidence of disorder or other unlawful activity. You would:
  - (1) Approach the group, tell them there has been a complaint about the noise they are making from a person who is ill, and request them to be less noisy.
  - (2) Let the group know in no uncertain terms that any more such conduct will not be tolerated.
  - (3) Observe the youths at a discreet distance to try to catch them in an act of misconduct before moving in to arrest them.
  - (4) Consider this a potentially dangerous situation and order the youths to disperse immediately.
  - (5) Call the station house for a wagon and bring the whole gang into the station on a charge of disorderly conduct.
  
3. You and another officer in a patrol car observe an angry confrontation of two groups of youths, one black, one white, apparently ready to fight. The location is within the black ghetto but near its outer edge. You would:
  - (1) Try to reason with the two groups and get them to resolve their differences.
  - (2) Call in to ask the commander of the district to come to the scene to break up the confrontation and ask him to send additional police to the perimeter of the scene.
  - (3) Call for help and then concentrate on getting the white youths out of the ghetto area.
  - (4) Call for help and then concentrate on dispersing the Negro youths.
  - (5) Call for all available cars to come at once to the scene.

4. A large group of teenage boys and girls, both black and white, are peaceably picketing in front of the Board of Public Education carrying signs protesting racial discrimination in the public schools. They are singing and chanting and are interfering with, though not blocking, normal entry into the building. They are neither violent nor threatening. As the responsible police official on the scene, you would:
- (1) Explain the pickets' lawful rights and limitations to their leader and then leave them alone so long as they remain non-violent and reasonably orderly.
  - (2) Order the pickets to quiet down and refrain from interfering with entry into the building.
  - (3) Limit picketing to only a few representatives and disperse the remainder to prevent a disturbance.
  - (4) Allow the demonstration to continue, but warn the girls of the harm they are doing themselves by their participation.
  - (5) Disperse the pickets and not allow them to demonstrate.
5. A small group of Negro demonstrators are peaceably picketing in front of a police station protesting an incident of alleged police brutality. A much larger group of angry whites has gathered and is heckling and threatening the Negro demonstrators. Some of the whites are carrying signs reading "Support Your Police." As the responsible official at the scene, you would:
- (1) Take no action other than surveillance unless things "get out of hand."
  - (2) Disperse those white bystanders who are making threats and make clear to others that the pickets have a right to protest as long as they do so peacefully.
  - (3) Arrest the white hecklers for disorderly conduct.
  - (4) Disperse both the pickets and the bystanders to prevent any incidents from occurring.
  - (5) Disperse the Negro pickets, arresting them if necessary to prevent violence from occurring.
6. While on night patrol, in a poor area known to be frequented by prostitutes, you see a young woman, previously unknown to you, on the street looking about in a strange manner. When you stop her, she claims to be extremely ill and to be looking for a taxicab to take her to the hospital. You would:
- (1) Call for the ambulance or a car to take her to the nearest hospital.
  - (2) Take her into the precinct station and then call for the ambulance.
  - (3) Leave her alone and continue your patrol.
  - (4) Arrest her on suspicion.

7. While on patrol with another officer, you come upon two Negro teenage boys loafing in front of a business establishment. The owner is angrily ordering them away, claiming they are having a bad effect on his business. The boys protest to you that they were not doing anything and make some very nasty remarks to your partner, who is also Negro. Your partner then clubs one of the boys injuring him slightly and twists the other's arm shoving him to the ground. You would:
- (1) Inform your partner privately that you are making a record of the incident, that he has acted improperly and you would not support the arrest of either boy. Suggest that he apologize to the boys.
  - (2) Refuse to be listed as one of the arresting officers, assuming that your partner chooses to arrest the boys, and also refuse at the boys' hearing to corroborate your partner's justification for hitting them.
  - (3) Inform both boys in the presence of your partner and the store owner that you consider the incident unfortunate and would so testify in the event of their arrest. Advise them to respect the rights of the store owner and send them on their way.
  - (4) Assist your partner in arresting the boy who has been clubbed on a charge of Assault and Battery, Resisting Arrest and Disorderly Conduct.
  - (5) Arrest both boys for Loitering and Resisting Arrest and request the store owner to file a formal complaint against the boys.
8. You are patrolling a quiet residential neighborhood in a wealthy all-white section. Shortly after midnight you observe a middle-aged Negro man walking down the street. You ask him to identify himself and explain his presence. He claims he is Judge Frederick Douglas Jefferson of Baltimore and is on his way to his parked car following a visit to friends in the neighborhood. You would:
- (1) Apologize for having detained him, realizing that no police action was indicated in the first place.
  - (2) Ask him for positive identification and release him if he produces it.
  - (3) Investigate his story by seeking the identity of his hosts with the purpose of returning to their house in company with the suspect to see if they corroborate his story.
  - (4) Ask him to come along with you to the station in order to verify his story.
  - (5) Arrest him on suspicion.

9. While on traffic duty Friday at 6:30 p.m. at a busy intersection in the heart of the black ghetto, you observe a car run a red light. You signal it to pull over and proceed as usual to ask for the driver's papers and begin to write up a ticket for his violation. The streets are crowded with pedestrians, virtually all of them Negro as is the driver of the car, and a number of curious onlookers begin to take an interest in what you are doing. Then an angry woman begins to shake her fist and shout at you, accusing you of always picking on black folks for the slightest things while ignoring the really big criminals. You would:

- (1) Complete your ticket writing as calmly and rapidly as possible and return to your post directing traffic.
- (2) Explain to the woman that you are doing your duty and that drivers who fail to stop at red lights endanger the lives of pedestrians like herself and especially of small children.
- (3) Forget about the ticket, give the driver a warning and get out of there as fast as possible.
- (4) Tell her to mind her own business.
- (5) Threaten her with arrest if she doesn't shut up.

10. You are called to the scene of a burglary in an apartment house in a middle-class residential neighborhood. As you approach, a Negro man in working clothes carrying a small canvas bag is walking hurriedly in the vicinity of the building. You would:

- (1) Tell him that he is not under arrest nor are his movements to be construed as being constricted. Tell him you would appreciate knowing what his business was in the vicinity and what was in the bag, since there was a burglary reported there a short time ago.
- (2) Observe and note his description carefully. Follow him unobtrusively to see where he goes and how he leaves the area.
- (3) Order him to halt and identify himself and to show the contents of his bag voluntarily or else be arrested on suspicion.
- (4) Order him not to move while you search his canvas bag to see if it contains burglary tools or loot.
- (5) Order him to halt, handcuff him, confiscate his bag and place him under arrest.

11. Following a high school football game, there is a slight disturbance and police are called. When they arrive, they find a bus with six broken windows and dozens of Negro and white youths milling about, each accusing the other of breaking the windows. You would:

- (1) Find the bus driver and ask him for a statement. Disperse the crowd and arrest no one unless directly implicated by the driver's statement.
- (2) Make a record of the names and addresses of witnesses to the incident. Request those making accusations against others to file formal complaints at the police station.
- (3) Arrest both Negro and white leaders.
- (4) Arrest the white leaders.
- (5) Arrest the Negro leaders.

12. While patrolling lower Centre Avenue at 3 a.m. one July morning, your partner stops a Negro man and white woman, walking arm in arm, for questioning for possible prostitution or narcotics violations. They are angered by your interference and the man protests that they are married, that they are out for a stroll in the cooler night air and that your stopping them is an instance of bigoted harassment. You would:

- (1) Politely apologize and continue on your patrol.
- (2) Take no action, as none is indicated.
- (3) Explain that you were just making a routine check and advise them that it is unwise to be walking the streets at such a late hour. Make a note of their description for future reference.
- (4) Ask to see their identification and arrest them on suspicion if they cannot verify that they are married.
- (5) Arrest the man for disorderly conduct and resisting arrest and the woman on suspicion of prostitution.