

STUDIES OF CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

IN MAJOR METROPOLITAN AREAS

VOLUME II

Section I

Patterns of Behavior in Police and Citizen Transactions

by Donald J. Black

and Albert J. Reiss, Jr.

Section II

Career Orientations, Job Satisfaction,

And The Assessment of Law Enforcement Problems

By Police Officers

by Albert J. Reiss, Jr.

This report is being reproduced by the President's
Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration
of Justice as a reference document. The views
and findings contained herein are those of the
authors and are not necessarily endorsed by the
Commission or its staff.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME II

<u>Section I: PATTERNS OF BEHAVIOR IN POLICE AND CITIZEN TRANSACTIONS</u>	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Mobilization of the Police	2
Empirical Study of Police and Citizen Transactions	13
Profile of the Citizen Participants in Encounters	16
Some Aspects of Police-Citizen Interaction. .	26
Conduct of Officer and General Emotional State of Citizen	29
Conduct of Officer and General Demeanor of Citizen	33
Conduct of Officer and Sobriety of Citizen. .	37
'Prejudice' in Officer's Behavior and General Emotional State of Citizen	41
'Prejudice' in Officer's Behavior and Citizen's Demeanor	45
'Prejudice' of Officer and Sobriety of Citizen	48
Police Behavior and the Role of the Citizen in the Situation	51
Police-Suspect Transactions	57
Personal and Property Searches	80
Field Interrogations	94
Admissions or Confessions	108
The Use of Threats	113
Citizen Requests for Consultation with a Third Party	119
Apprising of Rights	124
Police Attitudes Toward Negroes	132

Section II: CAREER ORIENTATIONS, JOB SATISFACTION, AND THE ASSESSMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT PROBLEMS BY POLICE OFFICERS

Introduction	1
------------------------	---

	<u>Page</u>
Design of the Study	2
Officer Orientation to A Police Career and Police Morale	5
Officer Satisfaction with His Job	43
Officer Satisfaction with His Assignment. .	52
Officer Perceptions of Relations Between Police and the Public and Changes in Them .	71
Police and Relations with Local Government and its Legal System	94
Officer Perceptions of Problems in Law Enforcement and in Their Relations with the System of Justice	109
Concluding Note	123
<u>Appendix A: Survey Instruments for A Study of Police Attitudes</u>	1

PATTERNS OF BEHAVIOR IN POLICE AND CITIZEN TRANSACTIONS*

Donald J. Black and Albert J. Reiss, Jr.**

*The research reported herein was supported by Grant Award 006, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U. S. Department of Justice under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965. Publication does not necessarily reflect the views of officials in the Department of Justice.

**University of Michigan. Appreciation is expressed to Commissioner E. L. McNamara, City of Boston Police Department, Superintendent O. W. Wilson, Chicago Police Department, and Chief John B. Layton, Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D. C. for their cooperation in carrying out the research. The contributions of Howard Aldrich, Donald Dickson, and Maureen Mileski also are acknowledged.

Police organization in a broad sense inheres in both the organization of the legal system and that of the community. Fundamentally, the police mediate between the two systems. They are, on the one hand, the major representative of the legal system to the community and the major source of cases that are processed in the criminal justice system. On the other hand, the police adapt the universalistic demands of the law to the requirements of citizens in the community by a variety of formal and informal means including the discretionary decision.^{1/}

Police operations are a function of the organization's policies and resources. Any measure of police outputs, such as of the nature of transactions or relationships between citizens and the police, reflects particular policies of policing and resource allocation. Both the number and kinds of incidents or law violations processed by the police during a given time are a function of how police manpower and material are allocated. The more men proportionally that are assigned to traffic patrol, for example, the more traffic citations written, all else remaining the same. The number of law violations processed by the police is particularly subject to policies of policing and resource allocation where knowledge of the occurrence of violations derives from police detection rather than citizen detection.

^{1/} See Albert J. Reiss, Jr., and David J. Bordua, "Environment and Organization: A Perspective on the Police," in Bordua, (ed.), The Police: Six Sociological Essays, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967, pp. 25-55.

Increases in the rates of violation of traffic, liquor, gambling, narcotics, or prostitution statutes, for instance, generally reflect changes in policies and resources, since these offenses are known to the police largely through police rather than citizen initiative. Even when police detection of these offenses rests in information from citizens--as it often does--such as by complaints that originate as anonymous tips, or through informants developed by police officers, the initiative to pursue them lies far more with the police than it does when the citizen occupies the role of complainant.

Mobilization of the Police

The police far more often are initially mobilized through the action of private citizens than through police initiative. To a large degree this is true because citizens mobilize the police for municipal services or civil problems ranging from "sick calls" to civil matters such as landlord-tenant disputes. The volume of such calls for service varies among departments, but as many as one-half of all citizen calls to the police in large metropolitan police departments may involve noncriminal matters.^{2/} Even among criminal incidents, however, the majority of the cases handled by the police originate with mobilizations by citizens. There are a

^{2/}For a study of noncriminal services provided by metropolitan police see Elaine Cumming, Ian Cumming, and Laura Edell, "Policeman as Philosopher, Guide, and Friend," Social Problems, 12 (1965), pp. 276-286.

number of reasons why this is the case, the most important of which is the organizational nature of violative behavior itself. Most major crimes arise in private rather than public places--the crime is often an encroachment upon private welfare in a private place. Given the barriers to legal penetration of the private place, the police must rely upon the citizen to mobilize them for crimes occurring in private settings. Were access to such settings less difficult, it is unlikely that police detection of many major offenses would increase substantially, however, since a precise prediction of the time and place of occurrence is quite unlikely. As a consequence of these conditions, the police are primarily organized initially to react to citizen complaints.

Modern police departments employ primarily a reactive strategy and tactics. The core of the modern police department is the communications center and the mobile, radio-equipped patrol. The center is organized to receive telephone calls from citizens and to dispatch police vehicles or manpower in response to them. The distribution of manpower over the department's jurisdiction derives from an expectation of stability in the frequency of these citizen calls according to a temporal and spatial pattern. Police precincts or districts vary in the number of men and patrol cars assigned to them depending upon the expectation, given past experience, of a particular volume of citizen complaints for any given area and time. In this respect the citizens

of a given area unwittingly determine how many policemen will be assigned to patrol their locale. To a significant degree, moreover, they also determine their crime rate by making these complaints.

Complaints or incidents requiring police action originate not only by phoned communications to police departments, but also by citizens calling upon the police to act in a field location, by personal appearance at a police station, or by police officers observing behavior or incidents as they occur. Police departments refer to incidents or complaints that originate by mobilizing police units through the communication center as "calls-for-service", "dispatches", or "runs", the first term referring to the citizen's call or complaint and the latter terms to the fact that a mobile unit is radio-dispatched to take the complaint. A request for police action made by a citizen personally appearing at the police station is referred to as a "station complaint" or a "citizen station mobilization". All incidents arising in field settings are commonly referred to as "on-view" incidents, but a distinction can be made among them. A direct, in-the-field, citizen request for police action, usually by flagging a patrol car or a call to an officer on the beat, is sometimes referred to as a "field complaint" or a "citizen field mobilization". When an officer initiates contact and reports on an incident that occurs in his presence, it is referred to as an "on-view" mobilization. Any law violation occurring in an officer's presence that leads to an arrest with the officer as

complainant is an "on-view arrest".

These several types of mobilization will be more or less frequent in a police jurisdiction depending upon how a department assigns its men and utilizes technology to reach its goals. The more extensive the use of foot patrol, for example, the more on-view and field mobilizations there will be. The more operations are decentralized to local precinct stations, the more likely station complaints. The closer the calibration of motorized, radio patrol units to the expected volume of citizen calls, the fewer on-view and, perhaps, field mobilizations the motorized patrol will handle. The introduction of specialized units likewise influences the volume of particular kinds of mobilization. Tactical or "task force" units commonly increase the volume of "on-view" police work as may "preventive patrol", "booster car", "crime car" or "umbrella car" units. The differentiation of a department into specialized field units and its technological organization, in short, affect the proportionate distribution among the four types of mobilization by which inputs enter for processing in a police system.

The kinds of incidents the police handle are to a considerable extent determined by how they are mobilized. The more on-view work the police do, for example, the more incidents they will handle that citizens ordinarily do not directly "complain" about. Moving traffic violations typically involve on-view mobilization, as do most vice or "morals" offenses, and many crimes "in progress". On the other hand,

incidents that arise in private places, particularly places of residence, such as "domestic disturbances" and assaults, are a good deal less likely to involve on-view mobilization; incidents in private places seldom are visible to an officer on patrol.

The various types of mobilization, then, are organized channels of accessibility of the police to various kinds of incidents. Correlatively, they are channels of accessibility of citizens to the police. Insofar as the police organize for the dispatched mobilization, accessibility to the police is a function of accessibility to a telephone. The citizen in search of police service but without access to a telephone must flag down a police car or beat officer, go directly to a police station, or forego immediate complaint.

The likelihood that a citizen will be successful in mobilizing the police probably varies with the type of mobilization he undertakes. In some cities nearly every request by telephone for police service is answered promptly with a dispatch; in others, department or precinct policies and the availability of manpower determine whether a car will be dispatched. Some patrolmen seldom acknowledge citizens who try to mobilize them in the field while others almost always do so. One reason some citizens may personally go to the police station is that they think their chances of mobilizing the police are enhanced by personal appearance.

The amount of discretion a police officer exercises is still another factor that appears to be related to the form

of mobilization. An officer's behavior can be sanctioned to the degree that a department is able to obtain knowledge of what has occurred independently of the officer's willingness to report. Clearly an officer's report of citizen complaints of behavior and of his own conduct in a situation are subject to differences in control in each of the mobilization situations, since the organized opportunities to monitor police-citizen transactions vary by the type of mobilization. In the station mobilization supervisory personnel are almost always present. And in the dispatch situation the complaint, its assignment, and other aspects of the mobilization can be monitored, and officers can be required to make a report about the dispatched incident. Such monitoring is almost always absent in a field or an on-view mobilization. Furthermore, supervisory personnel can more readily monitor conduct when an officer is dispatched to a setting than when he is mobilized within it, since the officer controls communication about the nature and even existence of a field mobilization.

Citizen or extra-departmental control is intricately balanced with departmental control and likewise varies with the type of mobilization. When a department is formally organized to centrally receive and record citizen complaints, the citizen as well as the command is protected by control. Similarly, a personal appearance at a station, particularly if the citizen appears with others who may be regarded as witnesses, is more likely to insure a formal record and a degree of control. When a citizen mobilizes or encounters

the police in a field setting, however, he is far more dependent upon the presence of witnesses; in the absence of witnesses, record of police-citizen encounters rests with the testimony of citizen and officers, and with the formal record of the officer, if he decides to make one.

In all face-to-face encounters with the police, the degree of control that citizens can exercise immediately in the situation depends largely upon two factors: their status and their capability to undermine the means the police use to attain their goals, a "subversive capability". From the point of view taken here, both the status of citizens and their subversive capability are indicators of a citizen's sanctioning capacity over officer conduct.

A social "stage" for face-to-face encounters with citizens arises when the police meet citizens in a private or public setting. The police must move continually from setting to setting where the scenery, the actors, and the plot are frequently defined in very general and ambiguous terms such as "family trouble", "see a man about a complaint", or "take a B & E report at...". It is incumbent upon the officer to enter upon a variety of social scenes, to encounter actors in various social statuses and roles, and to figure out the plot. Indeed, the main task of the police often is to discover the plot and to learn more about the actors.

To identify the actors in the situation, the officer makes judgements about their status. The status of a citizen in police encounters takes two major forms; these may be

called his "social status" and his "situational status" or "role". A social status is one that a person carries with him from situation to situation, such as his sex, age, race, ethnic, or social class status. A situational status is one that is defined by particular circumstances or relationships in the setting or encounter. An officer may need to identify a citizen in the situation as a neighbor, customer, employer, husband, wife, or stranger. But in police encounters, there also are situational statuses or roles that are determined by the definition of the situation as a police matter. A striking feature of police work is that not infrequently the officer is confronted with an adversarial situation; there are those who call the police, the "complainants", and those who are to be policed, the "suspects" or "alleged offenders". Both complainants and suspects may have "witnesses". In other situations a citizen may be defined as "victim", such as a sick or injured person. There also may be an audience that includes "informants" and "bystanders".

It perhaps is self-evident that the distribution of situational statuses in police encounters has profound consequences for police behavior. Questions pertaining to the officer's autonomy in making decisions regarding invocation of the criminal law, for example, often are of central concern when police discretion is considered. In general, such decisions are discretionary for the patrolman only when a suspect is available for arrest in the immediate situation. The kind of situational statuses in a given mobilization

situation and whether or not the interaction that occurs is likely to be monitored by other citizens are measures of the opportunity to exercise discretion. Discretion in this sense, then, is a product of the situational social configuration rather than of the degree of departmental control.

This variety of discretionary opportunity, like that which derives from departmental control, varies among the four types of mobilization. The on-view mobilization is most likely to involve police-suspect interaction with no other citizens present. The "ideal type" of field mobilization is most likely to be a situation of police-suspect interaction with a complainant or other citizen mobilizer present. Station mobilizations are unlikely to include a suspect among the participants; rather, it is more likely that the only citizen(s) present will be complaining or asking for help. Finally, a dispatch is likely to take any of these organizational forms or to include no citizens or violators at all. The patrolman's discretion is greatest, then, in the on-view, next in the field mobilization, then in the dispatch, and least in the station mobilization. Coincidentally, situations in which the patrolman is monitored the least by the department, i.e., where departmental control is minimal, are the same situations in which he most often can exercise discretion by dint of the citizens' situational statuses.

What earlier was called the "subversive capability" of citizens may, however, dilute the effect of this order of opportunity to exercise discretion. Assuming that police

officers, like most other actors, prefer ordered and routinized social encounters to disorganized or unorganized and unpredictable encounters, then one "lever" or sanction that is available to citizens in encounters with the police is their capacity to disrupt it, particularly to "make trouble" by denying the legitimacy of police authority. This capacity may allow the citizen to "subvert" police aims in the face-to-face encounter.

Not infrequently a police-citizen encounter takes the form of a precarious balance of officer control and citizen submission. Police control not uncommonly is more apparent than real. Many officers realize that as they exercise authority, like other incumbents of such positions, they are in an important sense dependent for cooperation upon those over whom they have control. Unlike many persons in situations where authority is exercised, the police sometimes are faced with a dual set of clients in an adversary situation. Those who call the police are prepared to accept the officer's authority--at least at the outset. Those who are to be policed often do not. The major form of control open to the officer in such a situation is to assert authority.

The nightstick and arms may play a role in asserting authority as may the threat of arrest. But a police officer simply cannot threaten physical force or arrest every time he wants to assert his authority. While the uniform and badge may play a role in the assertion of control, they depend as do most other means of asserting authority on the willingness

of the citizen to accept the exercise of authority as legitimate.

If this is granted, then an important question attaches to the differences in the subversive capability of citizens across police-citizen encounters. In which kinds of face-to-face encounters, then, are citizens most likely to pose a threat to the order of the encounter? Put another way, in which kinds of situations is police-citizen conflict most likely to arise? Conflict occurs in police-citizen transactions whenever either party is asked or told to do something or submit to something with which he cannot or will not comply.

Though conflicts of this kind may arise in a variety of situations, doubtlessly they are most probable where there is police-suspect interaction. It is in the officer's encounter with a suspect that his control is most problematic. Paradoxically but understandably, therefore, when the officer must be most authoritative and superordinate he is most dependent upon citizen compliance and, hence, vulnerable to subversion of his aims in the situation. His vulnerability in this regard, further, is greatest in precisely those mobilization situations where his power to exercise discretion is greatest--as a statistical probability--and where departmental control or monitoring of his behavior is least. That is, given the likelihood of police-suspect interaction, citizen subversive capability is greatest in the on-view mobilization, then in order the field, the dispatch, and the station mobilizations. This ordering of mobilization

situations according to the capability for citizen subversion is in reverse order compared with the discretionary opportunities of the patrol officer. It may be, therefore, that the vulnerability of citizens on one dimension, e.g., the absence of departmental control over the officer in the encounter, is cancelled out by the citizen's social leverage on another dimension, i.e., his subversive capability. To the degree this is the case, police-citizen interaction will not differ markedly among the types of mobilization.

Empirical Study of Police and Citizen Transactions

By now it should be clear that a rather large number of factors apparently influence the behavior of police and citizens in their encounters. These include factors related to the status and role of the citizen and the officer, their predispositions and behavior in encounters, the type of mobilization situation, and the department's policies and system of command and control. While it is generally known that all of these factors and others related to the specific form of the encounter seem to influence both behavior within and the outcome of police-citizen encounters, there is lacking a base of empirical studies that permit one to say how and to what extent they actually influence the behavior of officers and citizens toward one another and to consider the consequences for the system of law and order.

To provide some answers to these questions, provision was made to undertake observation of the police and citizens

in actual encounters in the types of mobilization of the police specified above. For a period of seven weeks in the summer of 1966, observations were made of police-citizen encounters in Boston, Chicago, and Washington, D. C. These cities were selected because they vary in size among the major metropolitan centers, permitting some comparison of encounters by size of city.

For reasons of economy, not all police precincts or districts could be studied in any of the cities. Two police precincts were selected each in Boston and Chicago and four in Washington, D. C. Only precincts with fairly high crime rates were selected, to insure observation of a large number of encounters and because special interest attaches to crime in these areas. Within each city an attempt was made to secure one precinct that was made up primarily of Negro and another primarily of white residents. Where possible, an attempt was made to select precincts with considerable variation in their social class composition; yet given the criterion of a high crime rate, lower socio-economic status residents predominate in most precincts selected.

The patrol units and watches (shifts) were sampled in each of the precincts with all units given equal probability of selection. The late afternoon to midnight watch was given a weight equal to that of the two other watches combined. Observation was in progress seven days a week, but Thursday, Friday and Saturday watches were selected somewhat more frequently as no observer was given leave on these days. A total of 36 observers were equally divided among the three cities.

In the data collection, emphasis was placed upon gaining detailed descriptions of police and citizen behavior. It also was possible to acquire a substantial sample of police attitudes, though somewhat less systematically. The social and demographic characteristics of the participants as well as a detailed description of the settings and qualities of the encounters were also obtained.

A word about the validity of the data perhaps is appropriate. A study such as this, having so much relevance to public policy and controversy, gives rise to particularly serious concern regarding the authenticity or representativeness of the data. A major question pertains to whether or not police officers significantly alter their behavior in response to the presence of observers. The potential effectiveness of direct observation of the police is discussed and attested to in other studies.^{3/} No attempt is made to argue the matter here. Suffice it to say that the nature and consistency of the data themselves, such as those on the handling of suspects and on "prejudice", lend a good deal of weight to the credibility of the findings.

The sections that follow discuss salient findings pertaining to: 1) the racial and social class distribution of citizen participants in police encounters according to the means by which the police are mobilized; 2) the general demeanor and emotional states of citizens when they have

^{3/} Examples are Jerome H. Skolnick, Justice Without Trial, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966; and Michael Banton, The Policeman in the Community, London: Tavistock Publications, 1964.

dealings with the police, the general manner and signs of "prejudice" on the part of police officers when they encounter citizens, and the relationship between citizen and police behavior in face-to-face encounters; 3) police-suspect transactions according to the race and social class status of suspects and according to the type of police mobilization; and 4) the attitudes of police officers toward Negroes, according to the officer's race and the racial composition of the officer's assigned precinct.

Profile of the Citizen Participants in Encounters

Not all incidents handled by the police involve face-to-face contact with citizens. "Offenders", for instance, may have fled the scene before the police arrive to investigate. On some occasions the police arrive and are simply told their service no longer is needed, that no call ever was placed, or, indeed, no one responds to their knock at the door. The mobilization is terminated without much or any contact with citizens about an incident. Not all matters requiring police action need involve citizens in face-to-face encounters; at least there are occasions where no citizens are involved. This would be true, for example, for investigations of suspicious circumstances, safety hazards, vehicle violations, building checks, or injured animals.

Some mobilizations, furthermore, do not lead to police-citizen encounters because particular officers, or any officer on occasion, may not fulfill the requirements of

the mobilization. At times officers fail to respond to a radio dispatch as required either by perfunctory attention such as "driving by" or by submitting false information about the attention given. Likewise, they may ignore violations that occur in their "presence". This is especially true for a host of misdemeanors occurring in their presence, particularly such common ones as traffic violations, drinking in public, or vagrancy--violations where "discretion" is an easy excuse for ignoring them. On occasion, too, they may ignore citizen attempts to stop them, intentionally avoiding learning what the citizen wants--"If it's important they'll call the police."

For these reasons and others, 28 per cent of the total of 5,360 mobilization situations observed in this study did not involve police-citizen interaction. Most of these mobilizations were dispatches, as the vast majority of mobilizations are radio dispatched; 81 per cent of the mobilizations were dispatches and of these 31 per cent involved no contact with citizens. Fourteen per cent of the total mobilization situations were on-views, and 18 per cent of these were without police-citizen interaction. The remaining 5 per cent of the mobilizations were citizen field mobilizations, and in 25 per cent of these no citizen participants were involved in the handling of the incident.

The rationale for describing citizens in police encounters within the mobilization framework derives from an assumption that who has contact with the police is partially

related to how that contact originates. The decision that police action is appropriate is usually the citizen's in dispatched police contacts, at least in large police departments where only a small proportion of telephoned requests for police service can be refused on policy grounds. If an on-view mobilization results in police action, however, it is totally the officer's decision; he may initiate contact with whomever he so desires. It might be added that some critics of the police allege that officers disproportionately select minority group citizens for on-view contacts. In field encounters, officers have the opportunity to refuse a citizen's signal to stop; even if he stops an officer has the option of refusing to get involved in an incident. Still, a citizen makes the first move in a field mobilization, so it has features in common with both dispatch and on-view mobilizations. Each type of mobilization thus involves a distinct mode by which police-citizen transactions come into being; hence, each potentially selects citizens with particular social characteristics. The structure of mobilizations may also be related to what the police do in encounters with citizens. This matter is discussed later in the report.

The number of citizens in an encounter can vary considerably. When an encounter included more than five citizens, detailed information was acquired for the five most central participants in the situation; the remaining citizens were aggregated and described with less detail. These other citizens--mostly bystanders--are not treated in this report;

the race and class distributions pertain only to a maximum of five citizens per encounter. Counting only the first five citizens per situation, a total of 11,244 citizens were observed and described in detail.

Observers categorized citizens as white-collar and blue-collar in each encounter with the police. The categories refer to the two broad types of social class based largely on occupational status. Women and young persons were classified according to the social class of the head of their household. Observers had some difficulty fitting persons into these categories given the fact that they were not permitted to ask questions of citizens. Often the officers did not elicit any information that permitted making a judgement and/or the place where the encounter occurred rendered such a judgement ambiguous. The social class status of the participants was not ascertained for about one-third of all citizens. (See Table 1.) Roughly four of every five citizens of both races were either blue-collar or their class status could not be ascertained.

The observers had more trouble ascertaining the social class of white than of Negro citizens. Still, proportionally more white than Negro citizens were classified as white-collar in all three types of mobilization. (See Table 1.) Rather surprisingly, this was particularly evident in on-view situations wherein contact is wholly at the officer's discretion. A large number of the on-view mobilizations were traffic violations, but the proportion of white-collar,

Table 1: Per Cent Distribution by Social Class Status of Citizens in Encounters with the Police, by Race of Citizen and Type of Mobilization of the Police.

Race of Citizen	Type of Mobilization	Total Number	Total Per Cent	White-Collars	Blue-Collars	Class Not Ascertained	Per Cent of Mobilization Total
All Citizens	Dispatch	9172	101	10	55	36	100
	On-View	1515	100	9	53	38	100
White	Citizen-in-Field	557	100	11	55	34	100
	Dispatch	3746	100	16	42	42	41
	On-View	597	100	18	38	44	39
	Citizen-in-Field	261	100	16	51	33	47
Negro	Dispatch	4880	100	5	65	30	53
	On-View	809	99	3	66	30	53
	Citizen-in-Field	271	100	5	62	33	49
	Dispatch	118	100	18	55	27	1
Other Races	On-View	15	100	27	40	33	1
	Citizen-in-Field	7	*	*	*	*	1
Race Not Ascertained	Dispatch	428	100	12	43	45	5
	On-View	94	100	2	33	65	6
	Citizen-in-Field	18	99	22	33	44	3

*Per cent not calculated where there are fewer than 10 observations.

white persons involved remains higher than would have been expected. Contrariwise, the smallest proportion of white-collar Negroes is found in the on-view situations. These proportions, however, may be a function of the relatively small number of white-collar Negroes who reside in the precincts where the observation took place. Nevertheless, while this may account for the difference between the races, it cannot account for the differences between the on-view and the two other types of mobilization situation when Negroes alone are compared.

Because Table 1 includes up to five citizens per encounter, the proportions of each race and social class are partly affected by differences in the number of citizens of any race or social class present in encounters. The proportions in Table 1 are computed for all citizens, not for all encounters. Therefore, if more citizens tend to be present, for example, in police encounters with blue-collar than with white-collar citizens, the overall proportion of police encounters with at least one white-collar citizen is underestimated.

For all dispatch mobilizations, 41 per cent of the citizens were white and 53 per cent were Negro. More Negro citizens are present in the typical police encounter with Negroes, however, than whites are present in a typical police encounter with white citizens. (See Table 2.) While 27 per cent of the run encounters with whites involved only one citizen participant, the proportion is smaller for Negroes--

Table 2: Per Cent Distribution by Number of Citizens Present in Encounters with the Police, by Race of Citizen and Type of Mobilization of the Police.

Race of Citizen	Type of Mobilization	Total Number	Total Per Cent	Number of Citizens in Encounter				
				1	2	3	4	5 or more
All Citizens	Dispatch	3010	99	22	22	16	12	27
	On-View	614	101	39	20	14	7	21
	Citizen-in-Field	202	100	27	22	20	9	22
White	Dispatch	1351	100	27	24	16	11	22
	On-View	262	100	44	22	12	7	15
	Citizen-in-Field	104	100	32	25	19	6	18
Negro	Dispatch	1540	100	20	22	16	13	29
	On-View	315	99	38	17	16	6	22
	Citizen-in-Field	89	100	20	20	19	16	25

20 per cent. Likewise, fewer encounters with white citizens included five or more citizens in the situation than was the case for Negroes--22 per cent as compared to 29 per cent. This was true of police encounters for all three types of mobilization. When a police officer works in a Negro area, on the average, then, he must deal with larger groups of citizens than does an officer in a white area. From this point of view, officers in predominately Negro areas are faced with a greater problem of interpersonal control--merely by virtue of the larger numbers of citizens--than are officers in predominantly white areas.

More Negro than white citizens were observed in the aggregate of all citizens partly because an encounter with white citizens typically is smaller than one with Negro citizens. Among the encounters observed it follows that officers were a little more likely to have to deal with a white than a Negro as the central participant than they were to have to deal with white as compared with Negro citizens in the aggregate. This fact can be seen by comparing the race distribution for the central participants in encounters in Table 3 with the comparable distribution of all citizens in encounters in Table 1.

None of the tables in this report presents a distribution for encounters where citizens of both races were involved in an encounter. Such encounters were quite infrequent in the study, however. Forty-five per cent of all dispatched encounters involved a white citizen as the central participant;

Table 3: Per Cent Distribution of Citizen-Police Encounters, by Race of the Central Citizen Participant According to Type of Mobilization of the Police.

Race of Central Citizen Participant	All Mobilizations	Type of Mobilization		
		Dispatch	On-View	Citizen-in-Field
White	45	45	43	51
Negro	51	51	51	44
Other	1	1	2	2
Race Not Ascertained	3	3	4	3
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100
Total Number	3827	3010	614	203

in 51 per cent, the main participant was Negro. The distribution is very similar for on-view mobilizations, but a slight majority of the field mobilizations involved a white citizen as the main participant.

It is not immediately apparent why field mobilizations more often involve whites than Negroes as central participants. The observers reported 11 cases where police officers intentionally ignored a citizen who was attempting to flag them down on the street. Nine of these persons were Negroes. Assuming that all 11 cases would have resulted in incidents involving citizens, the proportions would be 50 per cent for whites and 46 per cent for Negroes. Nonetheless, more field mobilizations than dispatches or on-views still would involve police contact with white citizens.

When a social class distribution is computed for encounters according to the social class of the central participant rather than according to the class status of all citizens, the relative frequency of contacts with both white-collar and blue-collar citizens increases, while the proportion of cases where social class status was "not ascertained" decreases. This, in general, is true for both races. The more citizens present in a situation, the more difficulty observers apparently had in classifying persons according to their social class status.

In sum, the precincts selected resulted in observation of somewhat more Negro than white citizens in contact with the police. However, this resulted in good part because

more Negroes are present in police encounters with Negroes than whites are present in police encounters with whites. Hence, the sample of encounters was more evenly divided by race than the sample of citizens. The social class composition of dispatched and on-view mobilizations was roughly the same, while field mobilizations involve a slightly larger proportion of whites relative to Negroes. Finally, white-collar persons were disproportionately represented in encounters involving white citizens compared with those involving Negro citizens.

Some Aspects of Police-Citizen Interaction

Much of the recent controversy surrounding the police pertains to the proper legal restrictions on a police system in a democratic society. There also is considerable interest in defining appropriate "human relations" training and behavior of the modern police officer. It is recognized that a policeman not only deals with suspects or offenders but with complainants and victims as well, persons for whom legal responsibility is only a condition for but not a guarantee of social responsiveness on the part of the police officer.^{4/} Police administrators call for the training of "professional" as well as proficient law enforcement officers, men skilled in human management as well as crime detection and control. Finally, representatives of civil rights groups increasingly demand that the police treat Negroes not only as citizens but also as persons.

^{4/} This issue is discussed in David J. Bordua and Albert J. Reiss, Jr., "Sociology in Law Enforcement," in Paul Lazarsfeld, William Sewell, and Harold Wilensky, (eds.), The Uses of Sociology, forthcoming.

For a policeman on the beat, however, the major problem in encounters with citizens often is that of gaining control. That is always necessary when the nature of the incident is such that disorder or conflict is either present or imminent. A fair proportion of calls to the police in fact represent nothing more than the ordering of a social situation. Family trouble calls, neighbor disputes, and business disturbances, for example, frequently are of this nature. Furthermore, most officers realize that they must exert control in these situations by means of social skills rather than by means of the legal sanctions at their formal disposal. As one officer wryly commented to an observer: "You can't draw your gun every time somebody disagrees with you."

Related to the officer's problem of social control is one of self-control. Police officers sometimes speak of the job "getting to" them, that is, of job or role problems being experienced as personal troubles. New recruits to police work sometimes are advised to remember that citizens relate to "the uniform", not to "the man". In short, for the policeman on patrol, the human relations approach to transactions with citizens is likely to be seen as less urgent than the problem of social control but quite synonymous with the problem of self-control.

The relationship between officers and citizens is examined by summing the behavior of each officer and each citizen toward, or in the presence of, one another in an encounter. The behavior of a maximum of five citizens in

transactions with a maximum of two police officers, and vice versa, is described for each type of mobilization. A maximum of ten relationships then can be described for any police encounter with citizens. The total number, of course, generally is smaller for the typical police-citizen encounter.

Two aspects of police behavior are compared with various features of citizen behavior in encounters. One aspect of police behavior is the officer's conduct or general manner toward the citizen, i.e., whether or not the officer was hostile, brusque, business-like, good-humored, and whether or not he ridiculed the citizen. The second aspect of police behavior tabulated with citizen behavior is the degree to which in the judgement of the observer an officer's actions revealed signs of "prejudice" of any kind.

Because of the difficulty in determining whether the officer's or the citizen's behavior was antecedent, only relational qualities of behavior are described. When, for example, it is noted that in a given proportion of the cases the officer was "hostile" at the same time as the citizen was "antagonistic", it cannot be ascertained whether the officer was reacting to the citizen, or vice versa. Matters of what caused particular behavior responses are difficult to assess in any case since they involve motives and subtle cues as well as more visible signs of behavior.

The analysis of officer and citizen behavior in transactions focuses on the officer's behavior as it relates to the citizen's conduct, (rather than the other way around),

since the normative expectation is that police officers will respond in an equally "professional" manner to all citizens, regardless of the nature of the citizen behavior. If an officer shows signs of "prejudice", for example, from a normative standpoint it does not matter how the citizen was behaving toward him. Even in the limiting case where the specific form of the citizen's behavior must determine the officer's behavior, viz., where force is necessary to arrest or in self-defense, the officer is expected to use only the amount of force incident to a proper arrest. It is of interest, however, to see the conditions under which officers conform to or deviate from such normative expectations. The discussion proceeds, therefore, with an emphasis on police conduct as it varies in relation to citizen conduct. Comparisons are made only for transactions in dispatch and on-view mobilizations and for white and Negro citizens.

Conduct of Officer and General Emotional State of Citizen

Each citizen was classified as agitated, calm, or very detached on the basis of his outward, observable behavior. This means of classifying general emotional states is not a substitute for a means that would allow for the tapping of "actual" or internal emotional states; rather, only these outward indicators of emotional states are relevant to and capable of having a major effect on police behavior.

A majority of the citizens were outwardly calm in the presence of officers. This was true for both white and Negro

citizens in dispatch and on-view mobilizations. (See Table 4.) About three of every ten citizens of both races were agitated or excited in dispatched encounters, but Negroes were much less agitated in on-view mobilizations than were whites--one-fifth for Negroes as compared with almost one-third for whites. Negroes then seemingly are less overtly upset by the experience of being stopped in a public place by a police officer than are whites, though there is a possibility that police officers are more likely to intervene when whites are agitated in public situations than if Negroes are so agitated. Finally, Negroes more often were very detached than whites, particularly in on-view mobilizations. Police officers sometimes regard high detachment from a situation as an expression of hostility toward them; some citizen detachment may be in this sense a studied and hostile detachment.

Police officers acted in a business-like or routinized way for almost three-fourths of the encounters with citizens; in another 15 per cent of the encounters they were good-humored or jovial. They were openly hostile or provocative in one per cent of the encounters and brusque or authoritarian in 4 per cent. Ridicule and belittling means were employed in but 3 per cent of all encounters, being equally divided between open and more subtle forms of ridicule. Observers noted that at times the officer's behavior changed as he engaged in a give-and-take interaction with a citizen; in 4 per cent of all encounters, officers combined authoritarian or hostile behavior with some other form of conduct. Overall,

Table 4: Per Cent Distribution by General Emotional State and Race of Citizens, by Conduct of Police Officer Toward Citizen and Type of Mobilization of the Police.

General Emotional State of Citizen	Race	Total Num-ber of Mobiliza-tions ^{a/}		Per Cent by General Emotional State		Conduct of Police Officer Toward Citizen												Total Per Cent	
		D	OV	D	OV	Good Humored or Jovial		Business-like or Routinized		Ridiculed or Belittled		Authori-tarian or Hostile and Other(s)		Brusque or Authori-tarian		Hostile or Provo-cative			
						D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV
Agitated	White	1203	222	28	31	16	5	67	52	7	9	5	12	4	20	1	2	100	100
	Negro	2379	209	31	19	10	11	76	54	6	10	2	12	4	12	1	2	100	100
Calm	White	2867	448	66	63	25	20	65	63	3	5	1	3	4	4	1	5	100	100
	Negro	4708	729	61	67	13	12	81	69	3	6	2	7	3	8	-	1	100	100
Very Detached	White	221	23	5	3	13	9	69	43	5	4	3	4	10	39	1	-	100	100
	Negro	590	121	8	11	11	8	81	72	2	5	2	7	4	3	-	5	100	100
Not Ascer-tained	White	59	15	1	2	3	-	78	67	-	-	-	7	5	7	14	20	100	100
	Negro	80	36	1	3	6	-	90	78	-	14	-	-	4	8	-	-	100	100

^{a/} D = Dispatches; OV = On-Views

officers were hostile and/or brusque, or they openly or subtly ridiculed citizens in 11 per cent of the encounters.

Analysis revealed no striking differences in "unprofessional" police conduct by race or social class status of the citizens. If anything, police officers appear less hostile and brusque toward Negroes and to ridicule them less often than whites.

In Table 4, it may be seen that relationships between officers' and Negro citizens' conduct differ little from that among whites within each type of mobilization. However, it is noteworthy that police officers were quite consistently less business-like and less good-humored or jovial in on-view than in dispatched encounters; this is true whether the citizens were agitated, calm, or detached. On-views are a good deal more likely to involve police contact with suspects or offenders than are dispatched encounters, so it is not surprising that they are less jovial in such situations. Officers are more often brusque or authoritarian in on-view encounters, particularly so when citizens are agitated. The police also are more hostile or provocative in on-view than in dispatched encounters, regardless of the citizens' emotional states.

No matter what the citizen behavior, the police were more business-like toward Negroes than toward whites in both dispatched and on-view encounters. Correlatively, in dispatched encounters, they were more often good-humored toward whites compared to Negroes. In on-views, officers were more

good-humored toward Negroes than toward whites when the citizens were agitated, but more good-humored toward whites when the citizens were calm.

In general, policemen seem more hostile or authoritarian, or more likely to ridicule citizens of both races when the citizens are agitated than when they are calm or detached. This becomes clear when proportions are computed on the statistical base of officer behavior rather than that of citizen behavior. In 48 per cent of the encounters when an officer was hostile, the citizen was agitated or excited. Likewise, 35 per cent of the brusque or authoritarian police behavior, 42 per cent of open and 57 per cent of subtle ridicule of a citizen occurred when a person was agitated.

Conduct of Officer and General Demeanor of Citizens

It is not uncommon for police officers to complain about the lack of respect citizens show for their authority. While citizen conduct was not described from the policeman's point of view, observers categorized citizen behavior toward the police as very deferential, civil, or antagonistic.

The differences in general demeanor or deference between white and Negro citizens are very slight. (See Table 5.) More apparent are differences between citizen demeanor in dispatched as compared with on-view mobilizations. Although over three-fourths of both white and Negro citizens were civil toward the police in dispatched situations, the proportions fall to 69 per cent and 67 per cent, respectively, for on-view

Table 5: Per Cent Distribution by General Demeanor and Race of Citizens, by Conduct of Police Officer Toward Citizen and Type of Mobilization of the Police.

General Demeanor of Citizen	Race	Total Number of Mobilizations ^{a/}		Per Cent by Demeanor of Citizen		Conduct of Police Officer Toward Citizen												Total Per Cent	
						Good Humored or Jovial		Business-like or Routinized		Ridiculed or Belittled		Authoritarian or Hostile and Other(s)		Brusque or Authoritarian		Hostile or Provocative			
		D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV
Total	White	5012	709	100	100														
	Negro	7766	1153	100	100														
Very Deferential	White	547	81	11	11	35	19	56	52	3	6	3	13	2	10	1	-	100	100
	Negro	880	139	11	12	23	13	71	61	3	14	1	4	2	6	-	2	100	100
Civil	White	3945	488	79	69	21	17	68	65	4	5	2	4	4	7	1	2	100	100
	Negro	5944	766	77	67	11	9	82	74	3	4	1	5	3	7	-	1	100	100
Antagonistic	White	318	112	6	16	8	2	43	34	21	10	10	10	16	31	2	13	100	100
	Negro	544	175	7	15	7	4	60	52	14	19	3	8	14	14	2	3	100	100
Not Ascertained	White	202	28	4	4	9	11	79	67	3	4	-	-	7	4	2	14	100	100
	Negro	398	73	5	6	7	4	88	88	1	-	1	4	3	4	-	-	100	100

^{a/} D = Dispatches; OV = On-Views

encounters. These differences are accounted for by the greater number of citizens who are antagonistic toward the officers in on-view as compared with dispatched encounters. Twice as many whites and Negroes were antagonistic toward the police in on-view compared with dispatched mobilizations. This is partly understandable in the light of the greater proportions of offenders in on-view than in run situations. The proportion of citizens who were very deferential, i.e., who were very polite and outwardly respectful, is about the same for both races in both mobilization situations, a little over 10 per cent.

The conduct of the police varies somewhat with the degree of deference extended by citizens. When citizens are very deferential the officer is less likely to be businesslike but more likely to be good-humored or jovial than when the citizen is merely civil, neither extending himself to be very respectful nor behaving abrasively toward the officer. There also is some evidence that in on-view situations the officer is more apt to be brusque or authoritarian when the citizen is very deferential than when he is only civil; why this relationship arises is open to speculation.

Officers are a good deal more likely to be hostile and brusque and to ridicule citizens when citizens are antagonistic than when they show more "respect". While this is true for both whites and Negroes in both types of mobilizations, it is clearer for whites than for Negroes, and more evident in on-view encounters than in those to which the officers were dispatched by radio. When white citizens were antagonistic

in on-view situations, for example, the police were hostile, brusque, or they ridiculed the citizen in 64 per cent of the cases--this compares with a proportion of 44 per cent for Negroes in the same circumstances. While there is no evidence, then, that the police were more discriminatory toward Negroes than whites in this conduct, these are surprisingly high proportions for both races. Given a normative and "human relations" point of view, such police behavior is taken, as a general rule, to be "unprofessional".

It is important that the statistical base be borne in mind when these proportions are interpreted. The proportions in Table 5 are computed for a base of citizen behavior; the object is to determine how the police behave when citizens conduct themselves in various ways. Computing from a base of officer behavior, however, it may be seen how citizens behave when the police display various modes of conduct. While, for example, the police openly ridiculed citizens in about 2 per cent of the total cases when citizens were antagonistic, 43 per cent of the times when officers openly ridiculed citizens, citizens were behaving antagonistically. The same pattern is found for the other varieties of police "unprofessional" conduct, though the differences are not always so large. When citizens were antagonistic, the police were hostile or provocative during much of the interchange in 3 per cent of the cases, but 35 per cent of the hostile behavior of the police included antagonistic behavior by the citizens involved. Also, whereas the police were business-like

or routinized in 52 per cent of the cases when citizens were antagonistic, only 6 per cent of the business-like police conduct occurred when citizens were antagonistic toward them; by contrast, 79 per cent of police business-like behavior occurred when citizens were civil.

Two conclusions seem warranted: 1) Citizens who behave antagonistically toward the police are more likely to be treated in a hostile, authoritarian, or belittling manner by the police than are other citizens, and 2) though a majority of any kind of police behavior is directed at citizens who are civil toward them, a disproportionate part of "unprofessional" or negative police conduct is oriented toward citizens who extend no deference to them.

Conduct of Officer and Sobriety of Citizen

Police and citizen transactions can be influenced by the extent to which a citizen reveals that he is intoxicated or gives signs that he has been drinking. Though the validity of judgements of sobriety can be questioned, each of the five most central citizen participants was classified by the observer as "sober", "showed signs of drinking", or "drunk".

White and Negro citizens display few differences in sobriety. (See Table 6.) In dispatched encounters, 9 per cent of the white citizens showed signs of drinking; the proportion for Negroes was only a little higher at 11 per cent. Somewhat more of the citizens of both races showed signs of drinking in on-view encounters, 19 per cent of the white and 17 per cent

Table 6: Per Cent Distribution by Judged Level of Sobriety and Race of Citizens, by Conduct of Police Officer Toward Citizen and Type of Mobilization of the Police.

Judged Level of Sobriety	Race	Total Number of Mobilizations ^{a/}		Per Cent by Level of Sobriety		Conduct of Police Officer Toward Citizen										Total Per Cent			
						Good Humored or Jovial		Business-like or Routinized		Ridiculed or Belittled		Authoritarian or Hostile and Other(s)		Brusque or Authoritarian				Hostile or Provocative	
						D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV			D	OV
Total	White	5007	704	100	100														
	Negro	7710	1169	100	100														
Sober	White	3976	465	80	66	23	20	68	60	3	5	2	4	4	7	-	4	100	100
	Negro	5990	796	78	68	12	11	82	69	3	6	-	5	3	7	-	2	100	100
Some Evidence of Drinking	White	471	136	9	19	17	7	56	58	13	12	4	7	8	13	2	3	100	100
	Negro	867	201	11	17	12	11	75	67	7	8	2	3	3	10	1	1	100	100
Drunk	White	204	39	4	6	21	3	51	40	10	13	7	18	8	26	3	-	100	100
	Negro	289	53	4	5	10	4	62	39	10	10	4	27	13	16	1	4	100	100
Not Ascertained	White	356	64	7	9	11	5	63	53	13	6	2	5	8	23	3	8	100	100
	Negro	564	119	7	10	6	8	88	89	2	-	1	2	3	-	-	1	100	100

^{a/} D = Dispatches; OV = On-Views

of the Negro citizens. Drunkenness was less common for citizens of both races in both mobilization contexts. Only slightly more citizens of both races seemed drunk in on-view (6 per cent white and 5 per cent Negro) than in dispatched encounters (4 per cent of both races).

Over 20 per cent of the citizens in on-view encounters and almost 15 per cent of those in dispatched situations gave some evidence then of having been drinking. These are fairly high proportions when the enormous array of incidents that policemen handle is considered along with the fact that observations were made over all watches all days of the week (though to be sure about half of the observations occurred during the 4 p.m. to midnight watch).

Moreover, most observers in several of the police precincts reported their estimates of the number of citizens who had consumed alcohol before they arrived were conservative, since they were not always in a position to make a reliable assessment. Their impression was that drinking is so common at some levels of the society and among some groups, that a majority of these citizens may risk arrest on a drunkenness charge simply because they have been drinking if they do not conform to the expectations of the police. Correlatively, since they have been drinking, it is unclear how this fact may affect their behavior and, hence, pose an obstacle to police processing of the incident.

The general manner of the police in dealing with citizens who manifested various levels of sobriety is presented in

Table 6. Clearly citizens who were drunk or showed signs of drinking were dealt with more aggressively or abrasively by officers. On-view encounters involved proportionally more negativistic police behavior than did dispatched encounters. Also, whites were the targets of police hostility, brusqueness, and ridicule more often than were Negroes when signs of drinking were noticeable, but for drunken citizens there were no marked differences. Indeed, over one-half of the persons of both races who appeared drunk in on-view situations were treated with some form of belligerence by the officers. Excepting drunken persons in on-view situations, however, a majority of the persons who displayed signs of recent drinking or inebriation were handled in a business-like, if not a good-humored way by the officers.

Considering officers and their behavior toward citizens, we can examine the extent to which their "unprofessional" behavior occurred with citizens who had been drinking. At least one-fourth and as many as one-half of the officers who displayed some form of brusque, belittling, or aggressive behavior did so when citizens were either drunk or showed signs of drinking. For example, when officers openly ridiculed citizens, citizens showed signs of drinking in 35 per cent of the cases, and 15 per cent were drunk. To a significant extent, then, police behavior of an aggressive or authoritarian cast is disproportionately present in interactive relationships with persons who show signs of drinking or are drunk.

A final note might be added to this discussion. The data do not include cases in which drunken persons were treated as "non-persons", i.e., as inanimate objects without feelings or awareness of the situation at hand. Non-person treatment does not involve aggressiveness, brusqueness, or ridicule; rather, it involves a failure to relate to the person at all, a failure to acknowledge his presence as a legitimate participant. The observers occasionally mentioned that non-person treatment occurred toward drunks from time to time. These cases, however, would have been classified as instances of business-like, routinized police behavior, since, indeed, it is such on the surface. If anything, therefore, police behavior toward drunken persons that is at odds with "human relations" expectations is underestimated in the data presented above.

"Prejudice" in Officer's Behavior and General Emotional State of Citizen

The observers classified each police-citizen transaction in terms of what they judged to be the degree of "prejudice" evident in the behavior of the officer. They were asked to consider whether or not an officer would have behaved as he did were it not for something about the citizen's social status or identity. That is, did the policeman seem to behave in response to who the citizen was rather than to how the citizen behaved? Police behavior in relation to each citizen could be classified in any of the following three categories: "obviously prejudiced", "showed some signs of prejudice", and "showed no

signs of prejudice". It must be emphasized that this is a characterization of police behavior, not of police attitudes. Later in this report data are presented which show that the outward behavior of police officers differs quite substantially from their attitudes; this seems particularly so for police prejudice. Policemen are a good deal more prejudiced in their attitudes than they are prejudiced, i.e., discriminatory, in their behavior.

The police appeared "obviously prejudiced" in 2 per cent of the total encounters with citizens of both races and they showed some signs of prejudice in 6 per cent of the cases. Analysis of the data for dispatched encounters discloses no evidence that officers are disproportionately discriminatory toward Negroes. Just as aggressive conduct of officers is more characteristic of police interaction with whites than with Negroes, so prejudice as discrimination seems slightly more characteristic of police interaction with whites.

When the degree of prejudiced behavior by officers is related to the emotional states of citizens, again differences by race and type of mobilization are small and they are not altogether consistent. (See Table 7.) Consistency of differences by race or mobilization is not sufficient to allow for generalizations. Slightly more whites are treated with some signs of prejudiced behavior than are Negroes, though the stronger generalization speaks to the absence of evidence that Negroes are subject to more signs of prejudice than whites. Prejudiced behavior toward whites is most commonly displayed

Table 7: Per Cent Distribution by General Emotional State and Race of Citizen According to Degree of Prejudice in Officer's Behavior Toward Citizens and Type of Mobilization of the Police.

General Emotional State of Citizen	Race	Number of Mobilizations		Per Cent of Mobilizations		Degree of Prejudice in Officer's Behavior								Total Per Cent	
						Showed Obvious Prejudice.		Showed Some Signs of Prejudice		Showed No Signs of Prejudice					
		Dis- patches	On- Views	Dis- patches	On- Views	Dis- patches	On- Views	Dis- patches	On- Views	Dis- patches	On- Views	Dis- patches	On- Views		
Total	White	4985	725	100	100										
	Negro	7771	1198	100	100										
Agitated	White	1427	225	29	31	1	-	8	4	91	96	100	100		
	Negro	2394	296	31	25	2	3	5	5	93	92	100	100		
Calm	White	3222	458	65	63	1	2	4	3	95	95	100	100		
	Negro	4768	741	61	62	1	1	2	3	97	96	100	100		
Very Detached	White	268	27	5	4	-	-	10	15	90	85	100	100		
	Negro	524	136	7	11	-	2	6	8	94	90	100	100		
Not Ascer- tained	White	68	15	1	2	-	-	-	-	100	100	100	100		
	Negro	85	25	1	2	-	4	4	-	96	96	100	100		

as discrimination on the basis of ethnic status, e.g., Puerto Rican, though other group identities may be important, such as migrant or deviant group status. Obvious prejudice is slightly more frequent toward Negro than white citizens, but again the differences are small. It is also noteworthy that obvious prejudice is more closely related to the emotional state of the citizen than it is to his race.

It is clear that discrimination in the form of signs of prejudice is more likely to be discernible when citizens are agitated than when they are outwardly calm, whereas this is less apparent when discrimination occurs in the form of obvious prejudice. Yet when the proportions of each type of prejudiced behavior that occur when citizens manifest different emotional states are considered, the reverse is true:

Discrimination in the form of obvious prejudice occurs more frequently when citizens are agitated than when they are outwardly calm, whereas this is less evident when discrimination occurs in the form of signs of prejudice. Forty-eight per cent of the "obviously prejudiced" behavior by police officers occurred when citizens were agitated and but 28 per cent of the police behavior that manifested "signs of prejudice" took place when citizens were agitated. These proportions may be compared to those obtaining for police behavior with no signs of prejudice. Only 22 per cent of the unprejudiced treatment of citizens occurred when citizens were agitated. There is some evidence, then, that prejudiced police behavior differentially arises when citizens appear to be highly involved, to the point

of excitement, in police-citizen transactions.

"Prejudice" in Officer's Behavior and Citizen's Demeanor

Both degrees of discrimination more often were noticed in police behavior when both white and Negro citizens were behaving antagonistically toward the officers than when they were civil or very deferential. This is discernible in the data for both kinds of mobilization situation. (See Table 8.)

Although the differences by race are not altogether consistent, when citizens of either race behave antagonistically toward officers in dispatched encounters, they are most subject to prejudiced behavior from officers. This is most evident for white citizens in dispatched encounters where 28 per cent who behaved antagonistically were handled with "signs of prejudice" and 3 per cent with "obvious prejudice". Somewhat surprisingly, when Negro citizens behaved antagonistically toward officers, only 11 per cent were treated with "signs of prejudice" and 4 per cent with obvious prejudice". Overall, then, twice as many whites as Negroes who behaved antagonistically toward the police in dispatched encounters were handled with some form of discrimination.

Whatever the citizen behavior, whites more often than Negroes were handled with "signs of prejudice" in dispatched situations; Negroes were slightly more often treated with "signs of prejudice" in on-view encounters (if the cases wherein citizen behavior was not ascertained are excluded). "Obvious prejudice" in handling by officers, however, was

Table 8: Per Cent Distribution by General Demeanor and Race of Citizens According to Degree of Prejudice in Officer's Behavior Toward Citizens and Type of Mobilization of the Police.

General Demeanor of Citizen	Race	Number of Mobilizations		Per Cent of Mobilizations		Degree of Prejudice in Officer's Behavior								Total Per Cent	
		Dis-patches	On-Views	Dis-patches	On-Views	Showed Obvious Prejudice		Showed Some Signs of Prejudice		Showed No Signs of Prejudice					
						Dis-patches	On-Views	Dis-patches	On-Views	Dis-patches	On-Views	Dis-patches	On-Views	Dis-patches	On-Views
Total	White	4979	727	100	100										
	Negro	7905	1228	100	100										
Very Deferential	White	546	82	11	11	-	-	5	1	95	99	100	100	100	100
	Negro	911	168	12	14	1	-	4	5	95	95	100	100	100	100
Civil	White	3894	491	79	67	1	1	4	3	95	96	100	100	100	100
	Negro	5963	807	75	65	1	1	2	4	97	95	100	100	100	100
Antagonistic	White	316	113	6	16	3	3	28	6	69	91	100	100	100	100
	Negro	548	170	7	14	4	5	11	6	85	89	100	100	100	100
Not Ascertained	White	223	41	4	6	-	5	5	5	95	90	100	100	100	100
	Negro	483	83	6	7	1	6	3	-	96	94	100	100	100	100

slightly more common for Negroes when they were antagonistic than when whites were antagonistic, but the differences are so small as to be inconclusive.

Negativistic behavior by officers was more frequent when citizens were very deferential than might have been anticipated. Officers were more authoritarian toward citizens in on-view situations who were very deferential than toward those who were only civil. The data on "signs of prejudice", though not on "obvious prejudice", reveal a similar pattern for whites in dispatched encounters and Negroes in both types of mobilization, though the differences are very small. That there is no evidence that citizens were relatively exempt from "signs of prejudice" in police behavior, however, is of interest in itself. Although there is no evidence here of a temporal causal relation between police prejudiced behavior and citizen deference, it is clear that both were present in a given proportion of interactive relationships between individual officers and individual citizens.

When the proportions of officers who exhibit types of prejudice in their behavior are considered, there is evidence that the police display relatively more prejudice when citizens are antagonistic than when they are civil or very deferential, even though a majority of the prejudiced behavior by police officers is directed at citizens who behave in a civil manner. When officers showed no signs of prejudice, 12 per cent of the citizens were very deferential, 76 per cent were civil, and 7 per cent were antagonistic. When the officers showed "signs

of prejudice", 12 per cent of the citizens were very deferential, 56 per cent were civil and 28 per cent were antagonistic in their behavior. The respective proportions for "obvious prejudice" were 5 per cent, 63 per cent, and 25 per cent.

Citizens are disproportionately subject to prejudiced police behavior, then, when they behave antagonistically toward the police. And, a disproportionate "share" of the times that police behave in a prejudiced or discriminatory manner, they interact with citizens who are "disrespectful".

"Prejudice" of Officer and Sobriety of Citizen

Citizens who seemed as if they had been drinking before the police arrived were more often treated with prejudice than were citizens who seemed fully sober. This was particularly characteristic of the police-citizen relationships involving "signs of prejudice" by the officers, less so in relationships where citizens were handled with "obvious prejudice". (See Table 9.)

Negroes in on-view encounters who seemingly had been drinking alcoholic beverages were handled more often with either "obvious prejudice" or "signs of prejudice" than were whites, but 18 per cent of the whites in on-view situations whose sobriety was not ascertained were handled with "signs of prejudice". Yet in dispatched encounters more whites than Negroes were treated with "signs of prejudice" when they displayed some signs of drinking. Overall, however, Negroes

Table 9: Per Cent Distribution by Judged Level of Sobriety and Race of Citizens According to Degree of Prejudice in Officer's Behavior Toward Citizens and Type of Mobilization of the Police.

Judged Level of Sobriety	Race	Number of Mobilizations		Per Cent of Mobilizations		Degree of Prejudice in Officer's Behavior								Total Per Cent	
						Showed Obvious Prejudice		Showed Some Signs of Prejudice		Showed No Signs of Prejudice					
		Dis-patches	On-Views	Dis-patches	On-Views	Dis-patches	On-Views	Dis-patches	On-Views	Dis-patches	On-Views	Dis-patches	On-Views		
Total	White	4992	706	100	100										
	Negro	7917	1188	100	100										
Sober	White	3962	464	80	65	-	2	4	2	96	96	100	100		
	Negro	6137	804	77	66	1	1	2	1	97	98	100	100		
Some Signs of Drinking	White	469	139	9	20	2	-	11	3	87	97	100	100		
	Negro	889	206	11	17	2	1	4	8	94	91	100	100		
Drunk	White	214	42	4	6	3	2	12	7	85	91	100	100		
	Negro	291	49	4	4	2	8	16	20	81	72	99	100		
Not Ascer-tained	White	347	61	7	9	-	-	13	18	87	82	100	100		
	Negro	600	129	8	9	2	6	3	2	95	92	100	100		

in on-view situations were treated with some form of prejudice in 28 per cent of the cases in which they were classified as drunk, but only 9 per cent of all white citizens who were drunk were treated in this way.

Drunken citizens are in a highly vulnerable position in their relationships with the police. Ordinarily the setting of an on-view encounter with a drunk is a public place, making the drunk liable to arrest not only for drunkenness but for disorderly conduct as well. The police by contrast are subject to almost no departmental surveillance and control in the on-view encounter. The only surveillance, and hence control, of an officer's behavior in an on-view situation therefore comes from the drunk or the bystanders in a public place. Given these facts together with the condition that drunks are incapacitated somewhat by alcohol, they are particularly open to mistreatment by policemen. It is significant that in the on-view encounter where police discretion is greatest Negroes are disproportionately the objects of prejudiced police conduct. Free of bureaucratic and often of interpersonal constraints as well, an officer's prejudice gives way to discrimination. The behavior of officers toward Negro drunks then may help explain why Negroes typically are not more subject to prejudiced behavior by police officers than are whites. Normally, departmental and citizen controls as well as the kind of "definition of the situation" keep officer prejudice from eventuating in discrimination. The drunken person in an on-view situation is not a "normal" situation in this sense; it is one type of

encounter where police attitudes can manifest themselves in police behavior.

When officers exhibit prejudice in their behavior they are more likely to be involved with citizens who seem to have been drinking than when their behavior is without evidence of prejudice. Still, when officers exhibit some form of prejudiced behavior, a majority of the citizens they deal with show no signs of intoxication. A little over 50 per cent of all prejudiced behavior by officers was directed toward citizens who showed no signs that they had been drinking. Almost 80 per cent of the unprejudiced police behavior was directed at seemingly sober citizens. Nevertheless, the citizen who seems under the influence of alcohol, like the emotionally agitated citizen and the antagonistic citizen, is disproportionately present in encounters where the officer exhibits prejudiced behavior or discrimination.

Police Behavior and the Role of the Citizen in the Situation

Up to this point all of the citizens who had transactions with police officers during the observation period have been considered. Comparisons have been made to learn whether or not types of relationships between citizens and officers are affected by the race status of the citizen and the type of police mobilization. Whether their role or status in a particular encounter with the police had affected these relationships was not examined. Rather, persons were treated in the purely civic role of citizen. They were not seen in situational roles in

the encounter, as complaining to the police about an offense, asking for assistance of some kind, merely giving information to the police, or suspected as offenders, among other roles. Were there differences between the two races in the proportion of citizens in any role in police encounters as, for example, if there were relatively more "suspects" in encounters with whites than with Negroes, then there is a possibility these differences in role composition of encounters would have affected the differences we observed in police and citizen behavior. In our example, should "suspects" on the average behave more aggressively toward the police, then differences in the proportion of "suspects" in a race group or type of mobilization could account for the differences we observed in Tables 4 to 9. Analysis showed there were no significant differences by race in this respect; hence, we chose to ignore role differences in the comparisons already discussed.

It nevertheless is of interest to inquire if the police behave differently toward citizens when they are in one or another of the situational roles in police encounters. For example, is "unprofessional" or prejudiced police behavior solely directed at "suspects" or "offenders" rather than at other citizens? Do officers deviate from "human relations" expectations when they deal with complainants and victims as well?

Each citizen participant in police encounters was placed in one of the following eight role categories: complainant, member of complainant group, offender, member of offender

group, victim, member of victim group, informant, and bystander. These categories were not used as they are in either popular, legal, or police parlance, since all of these usages contain limitations or ambiguities which limit their usefulness in a field observation setting. Observers were given the following definitions: a complainant is a person who wants police action in response to what he sees as an "offense" of some kind; e.g., a man whose car has been stolen or a woman who complains about a noisy party is a complainant. A member of a complainant group is a person who supports or stands with the central complainant. An offender is either a person who is seen or treated as a possible violator of the law or as a person who is not fulfilling role obligations or expectations that the complainant regards as "legal". The first kind of offender is represented by a person accused of a larceny, the second kind by a man whose wife thinks he has been negligent in fulfilling his obligations as husband or head of the household. A member of an offender group is a person who supports or stands with the offender. A citizen is called a victim who needs or requests help or a service from the police in a situation that does not involve an "offense" or possible criminal violation of any kind, e.g., a sick or accidentally injured person. A member of a victim group is a person who supports or is behaviorally concerned about a victim. The informant is a participant who gives information relevant to the nature of any situation or incident but who does not support or stand with any of the more involved participants; he is, however, more than a mere guide or person who gives

of some form in 23 per cent of the cases; it was roughly the same for Negroes at 25 per cent. The proportion for white offenders in dispatched encounters was higher than that for Negroes, 29 per cent compared with 18 per cent for Negro offenders.

The differences between some of the other role categories are also of some interest. Complainants (and members of a complainant group) were second to offenders in the frequency of contact with aggressive or negativistic police officers. Citizens in distress as victims (or members of a victim group) were least often handled abrasively by the officers, though they were not totally exempt from such police behavior.

It was noted earlier that the police behaved in a good-humored fashion toward whites more often than toward Negroes, whereas the police are relatively more business-like or routinized when they deal with Negroes compared to whites. The police often are good-humored or jovial for the sake of "human relations" or "public relations", but this behavior also may express a more personal rather than a professional police relationship with some citizens. In both dispatched and on-view situations white victims were handled with good humor or joviality proportionately more than any other status-role category of citizens. But Negro victims less often were handled with good humor than were white offenders. It seems, then, that while policemen generally do not disproportionately behave aggressively or negatively toward Negroes, they disproportionately behave amiably or positively toward white

citizens. Police work with Negroes is kept more on "civil" or "bureaucratic" terms ("business-like" or "routinized") but less on "personal" ("good-humored" or "jovial") terms than is police work with white citizens.

Several findings from the observation study that suggest two paradoxes may be summarized now.

The first paradox relates to the dominant mode of conduct that police and citizens effect toward one another. The dominant mode of behavior of the police toward citizens is to treat them in a "business-like", "routinized", or "impersonal" fashion. Seventy-four per cent of all citizens in encounters were treated by the police in this way. Such conduct is often termed "bureaucratic" or "civil" and attributed to officials in civil service systems. Correlatively we find that the dominant mode of behavior of citizens toward officers is to respond in a "civil" fashion. Seventy-six per cent of all citizens were observed as behaving with civility toward the police. And as Table 5 shows, more often than not civil behavior by the police occurs with civil behavior by the citizen.

Herein lies a paradox, however. The citizen who treats the officer with civility may regard civility in the officer as a sign of disrespect. And, the officer who meets civility in the citizen may perceive it as a sign of disrespect. The paradox arises because of their reciprocal expectations. The citizen wants the officer to behave with more than civility; he wants to be treated as a "person" or with what has come to be termed, a "human relations" perspective. The officer wants

the citizen to behave with more than civility, to show deference toward his authority. It is striking that in a civil society, behavior with civility is not enough. Expectations for deference and for personal treatment lie outside a system of civil bureaucratic treatment. In part this arises because the police continue to operate within a "traditional bureaucracy" where legitimate authority is at the center while the citizen increasingly demands a "human relations bureaucracy" where the "person" is at the center. Clearly the problems lie in the structure and operation of organizations.

The second paradox arises from the differential treatment officers give citizens according to their race and the responses citizens make to such treatment. When the police officer departs from the model of civil treatment of citizens in a positive fashion by good-humored or jovial treatment of citizens, he is more likely to do so toward white than Negro citizens; 21 per cent of the white citizens were treated in this way as contrasted with 12 per cent of Negroes. Correlatively, when the officer departs from the model of civil treatment in a negative fashion, with hostile, authoritarian, or belittling behavior, he also is more likely to do so toward white than Negro citizens; roughly twice as many white as Negro citizens were treated with aggressive behavior by the police. Furthermore, the police act more harshly toward antagonistic white than they do toward antagonistic Negro citizens. The differences in treatment of whites and Negroes are largely accounted for by the fact that the police are more

likely to treat Negro citizens with civility; 80 per cent of all Negro citizens were treated in this way as contrasted with 66 per cent of all white citizens.

This suggests that when the police depart from the model of "civil treatment" of citizens, they are more likely to treat white than Negro citizens with both traditional "human relations" and traditional "punitive" perspectives. Indeed, there is somewhat of a paradox; why should the police treat white citizens both more positively and more negatively than Negro citizens? The answer may lie in the expectations of the police vis-a-vis white as contrasted with Negro citizens and the structure of the modern policing system. The structure of the modern policing system is still very traditional in the way that officers relate to citizens. The traditional human relations perspective was to use humor and joviality toward citizens as a means of obtaining conformity or relating to them; at the same time sanctions were generally punitive for failure to conform. This is the traditional way of behaving toward persons in terms of their conduct or the "face" they present to the police. At the same time it should be apparent that given these expectations, police officers are more likely to respond to a white citizen's behavior in this fashion since he is expected to behave toward the officer in the prescribed traditional ways. Negroes present somewhat of a different problem given the strong pressures both within and without police systems to have the officers behave positively toward the Negro citizen. The outcome is not a human relations

approach (often presumed to be taught to police officers) but increased civility in conduct toward them. The officer has an obligation to treat them with civility but hardly as "persons" in the traditional sense. Indeed, they may not regard Negroes as "persons" in the traditional sense. What is lacking, it seems, is a "human relations" approach toward both white and Negro citizens that is based on the rights and dignity of individuals and a recognition of them as persons rather than as clients. But again, paradoxically that problem is at the center of all civil service bureaucracies.

How the degree of "prejudice" police display toward citizens is related to the role a citizen has in their encounter is given in Table 11. Though officers slightly more often handled offenders with "signs of prejudice", both levels of prejudice occur with surprising frequency in all role categories. Indeed, police behavior was "obviously prejudiced" no more frequently for offenders than it was for victims, and the proportions for complainants and bystanders are similar to those for offenders and victims.

Police conduct toward citizens according to their roles in encounters is quite different for their prejudiced as compared with their aggressive and authoritarian conduct. Thus, 45 per cent of all "obviously prejudiced" police behavior and 46 per cent of all that showed "signs of prejudice" was directed at offenders, while 82 per cent of all hostile or provocative and 81 per cent of all brusque or authoritarian police behavior was directed at offenders. Similarly, while

Table 11: Per Cent Distribution by Role and Race of Citizen in Encounters with the Police According to Degree of Prejudice in Officer's Behavior Toward Citizen and Type of Mobilization of the Police.

Role of Citizen in Police Encounter	Race	Total Number of Mobilizations		Per Cent of Mobilizations		Degree of Prejudice in Officer's Behavior								Total Per Cent	
		D	OV	D	OV	Showed Obvious Prejudice		Showed Some Signs of Prejudice		Showed No Signs of Prejudice		D	OV		
						D	OV	D	OV	D	OV				
Total	White	4940	512	100	100										
	Negro	7862	1036	100	100										
Complainant/in Group	White	2391	42	48	8	-	2	4	-	96	98	100	100	100	
	Negro	3321	83	43	8	1	1	3	8	96	91	100	100	100	
Offender/in Group	White	1326	393	27	77	1	1	9	4	90	95	100	100	100	
	Negro	2261	739	29	71	1	2	4	4	95	94	100	100	100	
Victim/in Group	White	360	20	7	4	1	-	5	-	94	100	100	100	100	
	Negro	719	82	9	8	3	1	3	1	94	98	100	100	100	
Informant	White	330	12	7	2	-	-	3	-	97	100	100	100	100	
	Negro	418	8	5	1	1	*	1	*	98	*	100	100	100	
Bystander	White	477	41	10	8	1	-	4	-	95	100	100	100	100	
	Negro	1059	122	13	12	-	2	1	5	99	93	100	100	100	
Not Ascertained	White	56	4	1	1	-	*	-	*	100	*	100	100	100	
	Negro	84	2	1	**	-	*	2	*	98	*	100	100	100	

a/ D = Dispatches; OV = On-Views

*Per cent not calculated where there are fewer than 10 observations.

**Less than 0.5 per cent.

29 per cent of all "obviously prejudiced" police behavior and 37 per cent of all that showed "signs of prejudice" was directed at complainants, only 12 per cent of all hostile and provocative behavior was directed at them. Finally, it also is clear that victims are more subject to prejudiced police behavior than to hostile or provocative behavior; 17 per cent of all "obviously prejudiced" police behavior and 8 per cent of that showing "signs of prejudice" compared to only 2 per cent of the hostile or provocative police behavior was directed at victims.

Another way of viewing the contrast in the treatment police give citizens in various roles is to see how much more behavior is directed at them than would be expected given the amount of contact the police have with citizens in any given role. Thus 33 per cent of all police encounters include contacts with offenders. Yet, 46 per cent of all contacts where police show prejudice toward citizens and over 80 per cent of all contacts where they behave in a hostile or authoritarian manner are with offenders. Similar comparisons can be made for complainants and victims, who are included in 41 per cent and 8 per cent respectively of all police encounters.

The general negative conduct of policemen toward citizens evidenced as hostile or authoritarian behavior and as prejudiced or discriminatory behavior then must vary somewhat independently of one another. Such is to be expected, assuming that the general conduct of officers is in good part a reaction only to citizen behavior, while discrimination or prejudiced police

behavior may also be a reaction to the citizen's status or social identity. Since the general conduct of officers varies more by citizen role than does their prejudiced behavior, it probably is because citizen behavior varies considerably more with his role in the encounter than does his status or identity. Prejudiced police behavior may be oriented solely to a citizen's status or identity; his general conduct is a more specific response to how the citizen behaves in the situation.

The demeanor of citizens toward the police is related to their role in the encounter in Table 12. Although most citizens in any role are civil toward the police, this is least characteristic of offenders. Offenders are more often antagonistic toward the police than are citizens of any other role category. White offenders are somewhat less antagonistic toward the police than are Negroes in dispatched encounters, but they are more antagonistic than Negroes in on-view encounters. One-in-five white offenders responded with antagonistic behavior at being stopped, usually in a public place, by a policeman.

Victims are less frequently antagonistic toward officers than are citizens of any other role. Recalling that victims are as often targets of "obvious prejudice" as are offenders, they nonetheless are seldom the objects of aggressive police behavior. This finding supports the proposition that the general conduct of the police may vary independently of their prejudiced behavior, since police prejudice is partly a response to citizen identity while their general conduct is more a response to citizen behavior.

Table 12: Per Cent Distribution by General Demeanor and Race of Citizens
According to the Role of the Citizen in Encounter with the
Police and Type of Mobilization of the Police.

General Demeanor of Citizen	Race	Role of Citizen in Police Encounter											
		Complainant, or in Complainant Group ^{a/}		Offender, or in Offender Group		Victim, or in Victim Group		Informant		Bystander		Not Ascertained	
		D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV	D	OV
Total Number of Mobilizations	White	1697	26	988	311	304	20	254	11	386	35	55	1
	Negro	1950	52	1342	508	441	25	243	9	691	95	54	1
Per Cent of Mobilizations	White	46	6	27	77	8	5	7	3	10	9	4	**
	Negro	41	8	28	74	9	4	5	1	15	14	1	**
Very Deferential	White	12	23	7	9	14	15	9	-	3	8	4	*
	Negro	13	15	11	15	20	4	12	*	6	-	15	*
Civil	White	83	73	73	66	74	80	87	100	73	72	87	*
	Negro	80	83	68	65	69	88	81	*	68	65	77	*
Antagonistic	White	3	-	13	20	1	-	2	-	4	-	2	*
	Negro	3	2	16	14	3	-	3	*	5	5	2	*
Not Ascertained	White	2	4	7	5	11	5	2	-	20	20	7	*
	Negro	4	-	5	6	8	8	4	*	21	30	6	*
Total Per Cent	White	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	*
	Negro	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	*	100	100	100	*

^{a/} D = Dispatches; OV = On-Views

*Per cent not calculated where there are fewer than 10 observations.

**Less than 0.5 per cent.

The way that a citizen's role in encounters with the police affects his behavior toward them is brought into sharper relief if we examine what types of roles are found for each kind of citizen demeanor than if we examine the demeanor of citizens in each type of role. Looking first at antagonistic behavior toward the police, it is apparent that offenders account for a disproportionate share of the antagonistic behavior toward them, as 70 per cent of the antagonistic behavior of citizens observed in police encounters was accounted for by offenders. Though a large proportion of the hostile citizen behavior with which police officers are confronted is offender behavior, the fact that almost one-in-three cases of antagonistic conduct by citizens arises in interaction with complainants, victims, informants and bystanders is not insignificant; 17 per cent was by complainants, 2 per cent by victims, 2 per cent by informants, and 8 per cent was accounted for by bystanders. It is obvious that free flowing or harmonious interpersonal relations are problematic for police officers regardless of whom they have contact with. That bystanders comprise a problem for the police is evident in the fact that one-in-twelve cases of antagonistic behavior toward the police is by a bystander. That antagonistic behavior toward the police can arise from any citizen role in an encounter is consistent with the policeman's view that any encounter with citizens contains an element of unpredictability. As some officers say: "You never know when something will blow up in your face."

The general conduct and manifest "prejudice" of police officers have been statistically analyzed in this section for various behavioral characteristics of citizens who take part in relationships or transactions with policemen. It has become clear that citizens who are emotionally demonstrative, who behave antagonistically toward officers, who give evidence that they are under the influence of alcohol, and who are, as offenders, in an adversarial role relationship with officers are disproportionately the objects of police aggressiveness and open hostility in face-to-face situations. These same citizens, except those in the role of offender or suspect, are disproportionately the targets of prejudiced behavior or discrimination on the part of officers.

Comparisons according to the race of citizens have yielded no significant evidence that Negroes generally are more often the objects of police aggressiveness or prejudice than are whites; if anything, the reverse is the case. It appears, however, that while officers do not behave more often in a negative manner toward Negroes with hostility, brusqueness or ridicule, they less often treat them in a positive manner, with good humor or joviality. Policemen appear, therefore, to relate more "personally" toward whites. Their behavior toward Negroes may be correspondingly more "bureaucratic" or merely "civil".

Comparisons by type of police mobilization, whether the police were dispatched by radio to an encounter, or whether they initiated it themselves, do not usually reveal marked and consistent differences in officer or citizen behavior.

Variation in police conduct, then, is most strongly related to the way situations influence citizen and officer behavior. What officers bring to an encounter in the way of motivational predispositions may be less consequential in determining their behavior than are the conflicts and constraints that arise in the situational transactions with citizens. A clearer understanding of police-citizen transactions should strive for greater clarification of the patterns their behavior assumes in different kinds of transactions and circumstances. Less emphasis might well be given to what policemen and citizens think about one another. To the degree that citizen and officer attitudes and predispositions are important in understanding the behavior of both in encounters, it rests in an understanding of the conditions under which attitudes and predispositions carry over into their behavior. Equally if not more important, however, is an understanding of how the nature of encounters determines the behavior of both officers and citizens.

Police-Suspect Transactions

Officers in the patrol division of a police department come into contact with citizens who in one way or another are defined as "suspects" or "offenders", whether or not there technically is an arrest. Arrest always presumes that the citizen is defined as an offender, but many offenders never are arrested even following contact with the police. How a citizen comes to be defined as a suspect or offender is no single or simple

process in many police encounters. Where the violation of the law occurs in the presence of the officer, the officer may begin his relationship with a citizen presuming that he is dealing with an offender. But whenever the police are mobilized by citizens phoning the department, by citizens in field settings, or by coming into a police station, the police must somehow identify citizens in their respective roles that relate to police goals. Much of this identification depends upon soliciting information. They learn by questioning who are the complainants, offenders, witnesses, and other parties in the situation, whether this is a simple or a cross-complaint situation, and so on. But officers learn not only by questioning. Where, in the judgement of the officer, there is reason to believe he may be confronting an offender or "suspect" or a "suspicious" person who has committed or is committing a crime, he traditionally has utilized other means such as stopping and searching a person and his property in a public place or undertaking a search of the person's property on being called to or entering a private place.

There is considerable controversy over the nature of police procedures in identifying persons as suspects or offenders and in securing evidence that a criminal violation has been committed. The general procedures that are used--interviewing and investigation--are presumably not at issue. Rather, it is the conditions under which these occur. Some attempt was made in the observation studies, therefore, to gather information about what are generally termed personal and property searches,

field interrogations, confessions or admissions, the use of threats, citizen requests for consultation with an attorney or third party, and the officer's apprising a citizen of his constitutional rights in law enforcement encounters.

These terms all are subject to ambiguity of definition. Neither the police nor any sector of the legal system has been able to make clear in an operational sense precisely what is meant by such terms as "search", "interrogation", "confession", "threat", "request" or "an apprising", no matter how clear the language of the statement. For that reason, it was particularly difficult to translate what occurs in a field observational setting into the concepts of the legal system. Choosing but two examples, those of interrogation and confession, may make the problem clear. When does interviewing or questioning become an interrogation? A police officer comes into many situations with no prior knowledge of who the parties are when he meets them. He must interview people to get information, to define the situation, and to identify the parties in it. At what point, if any, is the interviewing an interrogation? When does some form of questioning become an oral confession? Are all admissions to be regarded as confessions, or only some?

Admittedly in the absence of a complete record of what went on in any police-citizen transaction, judgement enters into what is to be recorded as taking place. The language or concepts used to record what took place may also reflect judgements, albeit very subtle ones. This posed a problem in field recording, particularly since so many legal terms lack

precise operational definition in any scientific sense. For that reason, operational criteria were specified for each definition, criteria that may not always coincide with legal criteria.

Any form of questioning beyond a request for mere identification in a field setting that defined a person as a "suspect" or "offender" was called a field interrogation. Whenever such questioning brought forth some oral statement that identified the person as an offender, it was called an admission. The criteria make no assumption about the motivation of the officer in asking questions nor of the citizen in answering them. Furthermore, they do not assume that admissions were made to the form of questioning itself, e.g., as answers to a "direct" question. What was defined as a field interrogation and an admission by observational criteria does not necessarily correspond then with what goes on in "questioning" in a police station (or the so-called "interrogation room" at a station) nor with the formally acknowledged confession that is admitted as evidence in a trial proceeding.

A search was said to occur whenever an officer, with one exception, physically inspected the person or property of anyone. The exception was in searches of vehicles. Any intensive visual search of an automobile with a view to obtaining evidence was also defined as a search.

Defining the use of "threats" posed problems as well. Any time that the officer sought compliance from the citizen by making statements that he would arrest, detain, or take the

citizen to the station unless he complied were defined as threats. It should be clear that menacing statements to use force were not defined as threats. Such statements were included among types of constraints in the process of questioning. Constraints were classified according to whether they were verbal or physical constraints. Verbal constraints were any statements compelling citizens to comply on grounds of adverse consequences for failure to do so. These adverse consequences may have been insinuated or made explicit. They range from threats of detention or arrest to threats of physical violence. Physical constraints included simple constraints such as getting the person to enter the police vehicle, to physically holding or restraining the person, and to restraint at gunpoint. The criterion common to all of these is that constraint occurs whenever the citizen is in some way bound to a situation by more than authority in the relationship, bound by compelling or constraining influences communicated to the citizen in any way. Though some of the constraints may border on "voluntary" actions, such as entering a police vehicle on "invitation" of the officer, the point of view taken for the research was that a citizen is restrained to a degree whenever he is requested to enter "police territory" rather than continue where he was when the transaction began. Indeed, since the research occurred during the summer months, no such invitation seemed necessary to insure the comfort of officers and citizens.

Some statements that are commonly called threats were included within yet another classification. Observers were

asked to record the kinds of approaches officers made to citizens to get information. Approaches were classified according to whether the officer made a polite request to get information, simply began questioning, issued a rather impersonal summons to the citizen to approach the officer for questioning, or whether he issued a brusque or nasty command to the citizen to approach for the questioning. Quite clearly, the brusque or nasty commands include menacing statements that can be classified as threats.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty occurred in operationalizing the definition of an arrest. What the necessary and sufficient conditions are to comprise an arrest are far from clear. One criterion would be "booking" for an offense, but in the field setting observers were not always able to obtain that information given the requirement that they remain with the officers on a particular watch and assignment. Operationally an arrest was said to occur in a field setting whenever an officer announced that the citizen was under arrest, he called for a police vehicle to transport the persons to the station, or he transported them in the vehicle to which he was assigned on a "take you in" announcement. It is known that some of these persons were subsequently released without booking. For research purposes, they are classified as "arrests made", however.

Requests for consultation and apprising of rights were somewhat less of a problem. The main elements specified in the Miranda decision were looked for in any apprising of rights: the right to remain silent, that anything said might be held

against the citizen, the right to counsel, and that counsel would be appointed if the citizen could not afford it. Whether or not all of these are germane in a field setting is an open question as is the question of when the officer complies. For example, if an officer says only that an attorney will be appointed if the offender cannot afford one, does he imply that the person has a right to an attorney? Similarly, though a request to "make a call" was defined as a request for consultation, is it sufficient to constitute a citizen request for consultation?

In interpreting what follows, the reader must keep in mind that these operational definitions of the research investigation are based on criteria of observation, not those of a legal fiction or of practice in the legal system. The operationalization of legal concepts in research on the law enforcement system poses very real problems for both the legal scholar and the behavioral scientist. For scientific purposes, legal concepts are not readily made operational for research, particularly for observational research if motives are at stake. Yet for legal purposes, such operational concepts may raise more questions than they answer.

Transactions between police officers and suspects or offenders are examined in this section by considering whether the race and social class status of suspects or offenders and the type of mobilization of the police (whether a dispatched or an on-view mobilization) affects how officers conduct personal and property searches and interrogations, admissions

or "confessions", whether officers use threats and apprise of rights, and whether citizens request consultation with an attorney or other third party. Comparisons by social class status of citizens are not always possible, however. By selecting high crime rate precincts for the observational study, the opportunity to observe white-collar suspects was substantially reduced.

In the high crime rate precincts included in this study, 95 per cent of the mobilizations of the police patrol originate as either dispatches or on-views. The remaining 5 per cent are mobilizations by citizens in a field setting. Not all mobilizations eventuate in contact or transactions with citizens. Of those that led to contact with citizens, the great bulk, 79 per cent originated as dispatches. Another 16 per cent originated as on-view mobilizations. Mobilizations that lead to contacts with citizens are affected very little by the type of mobilization, since 81 per cent of all mobilizations originated as dispatches and 14 per cent as on-views. The probability that a mobilization will result in contact with a citizen, then, is roughly the same for dispatched as it is for on-view encounters.

The proportion of police encounters with suspects or offenders is not as heavily accounted for by dispatch situations as might appear. A total of 1,488 incidents involved police contact with suspects or possible offenders. Of that total, 61 per cent were dispatch encounters, 34 per cent were on-views, and 5 per cent were field mobilizations. During the observation, then, 1-in-3 police transactions with suspects or offenders

occurred through an officer's own initiative rather than in response to a citizen complaint.

It is not surprising that on-views account for a disproportionate share of the suspect contacts. When an officer initiates interaction with a person or group on the street or in a public place it typically relates to a suspicion or conviction on his part that violative behavior has occurred or is about to occur. A citizen in need of assistance simply is not visible to an officer on patrol. Consequently, 85 per cent of the on-view citizen contacts involved police interaction with a possible offender, while only 32 per cent of dispatched and 25 per cent of field mobilization contacts did so. (See Table 13.)

Many "offenders" in on-view situations, however, are merely traffic offenders. For these encounters many of the procedural restrictions of the criminal law are not as germane since generally only a summons is issued. Moreover, many dispatched mobilizations include "offenders" who are not very likely to be processed as offenders in the legal system, e.g., mischievous teenagers or unruly spouses in domestic squabbles. Indeed considerable discretion to arrest or detain is exercised in such encounters with citizens.

A very inclusive category of "offender" was used for the study. Included are any persons whom the police processed as offender by an arrest or at least transported to the station for booking. But also included are persons who at any point in the situational interaction the police treated at least for

Table 13: Per Cent Distributions of Police Encounters with Citizens That Involved Contact with Possible Offenders, of Per Cent Where One or More Arrests Were Made, and of Per Cent of Suspects Arrested, by Race and Social Class Status of Suspects According to Type of Mobilization of the Police.

Race and Social Class Status of Suspects	Total Number		Contact With Possible Offenders		One or More Arrests Made		Per Cent of Suspects Arrested			
							Dispatches		On-Views	
	Dis-patches	On-Views	Per Cent of Dis-patches	Per Cent of On-Views	Per Cent of Dis-patches	Per Cent of On-Views	Number of Sus-pects	Per Cent Arrested	Number of Sus-pects	Per Cent Arrested
All Citizens	2878	586	32	85	6	14	921	19	498	16
All Whites	1349	269	32	85	4	11	432	12	229	13
White-Collars	267	59	22	76	2	2	59	8	45	2
Blue-Collars	567	106	34	89	5	19	193	15	94	21
Class Not Ascer-tained	515	104	35	86	3	8	180	8	89	9
All Negroes	1529	317	32	86	9	17	489	28	273	20
White-Collars	98	9	15	*	2	*	15	13	*	*
Blue-Collars	1031	230	35	88	9	22	361	26	202	25
Class Not Ascer-tained	400	78	29	79	9	5	116	31	62	6

*Per cent not calculated where there are fewer than 10 observations.

a time as offenders, or against whom some citizen in the situation made an allegation to that effect. "Offenders" in this sense include persons who for some time were regarded as "suspects"; the terms, therefore, are used interchangeably in this discussion.

There are several reasons why the most common police-citizen transaction, the dispatch mobilization, usually does not involve police contact with a suspect. Ordinarily non-criminal incidents such as "sick calls", accidental injuries, problems with animals, and civil disputes originate as dispatched mobilizations. Added to these are the reports of crimes that are "cold", crimes that usually occur in the absence of the complainant, such as auto theft, burglary, larceny, and vandalism. For these situations usually only a complainant is present and the patrol officer simply fills out a report. There is no opportunity for contact with a suspect. Finally, even when dispatched mobilizations arise when a citizen telephones the police about an incident "in progress", the offenders may leave the scene before the police arrive. The offender quite commonly is gone before the police arrive in such serious crimes as burglary or robbery "in progress" and aggravated assaults, and in such situations as the peeping Tom, teenager rowdyism, fights, street disturbances, drinking or gambling in public, or other cases wherein the complainant reacts to what he sees as an offense in progress. Finally, even when the police arrive at a dispatched location, since the offender present in the situation not uncommonly is

a relative of or is known to the complainant, the "offender" status may be redefined before the arrival of the police.

The probability that a situation will involve police-suspect interaction is related not only to the type of mobilization but also to the social class status of the citizen participants. This probability, however, is not related to the race of the participants. (See Table 13.) Both dispatched and on-view police encounters with citizens are more likely to involve police-suspect interaction when blue-collar citizens are involved than when the participants are white-collar. Considering the dispatched situations only, it may be inferred that white-collar citizens less often directly confront offenders than do blue-collar citizens. Likewise, when the police initiate contact with white-collar citizens on the street, the citizens are less likely to be seen by the police as suspects than are blue-collar citizens in an on-view contact.

The probability that an arrest will be made is related somewhat differently to type of mobilization. On-view contacts, understandably, are more than twice as likely to result in arrest as are dispatched contacts. While 14 per cent of all on-view contacts with citizens result in an arrest, it is only 6 per cent for dispatched contacts. (See Table 13.) This ratio of arrests in on-view as compared with dispatched encounters is approximately the same as the ratio of contact with possible offenders in on-view as compared with dispatched contacts. This suggests that the mobilization difference in the probability of arrest is in good part a function of differences in the

probability of contact with a suspect in the two mobilization settings. And, indeed, while the probability that an arrest will be made is greater in an on-view than a dispatched contact (though more arrests are made in the former than the latter encounters), the probability that a contact with a possible offender will eventuate in an arrest is slightly greater in a dispatched than in an on-view encounter. Roughly one-in-five contacts with possible offenders in dispatched encounters eventuates in an arrest, while one-in-six contacts with possible offenders in on-views leads to an arrest. If this difference is taken as a rough measure of discretion to arrest, then again it appears that more discretion is exercised in on-view than in dispatched encounters. Much of this difference could be accounted for by more traffic offenders in the on-view mobilization, however.

The likelihood that a white citizen will be arrested is about the same in dispatched as in on-view mobilization encounters while a Negro citizen is more likely to be arrested in a dispatched than in an on-view encounter. Among white citizens, however, a white-collar citizen is more likely to be arrested in a dispatched than an on-view encounter while the reverse is true for blue-collar citizens. Among blue-collar Negroes, there are no differences in the probability of arrest by type of mobilization. Furthermore, among blue-collar citizens, it is only the white blue-collar citizen in a dispatched encounter who has a substantially lower probability of arrest. The least likely person to be arrested is a white-collar

citizen in an on-view encounter. Overall, class differences are somewhat more salient than race differences in explaining the patterns of arrest in dispatched and on-view encounters.

Personal and Property Searches

The probability of a search being conducted is about one-in-five for all suspects in dispatched and on-view mobilizations. (See Table 14.) Both whites and Negroes are slightly less likely to be searched in an on-view than in dispatched encounters. As for arrests, a white-collar citizen is more likely to be searched in a dispatched than an on-view encounter and the reverse is true for blue-collar whites. Again there are no differences in the likelihood of a search for Negro blue-collar citizens by the mobilization setting. In fact, the likelihood of a search being conducted is the same (a search for every 4 encounters) for all blue-collar citizens in dispatched settings where the likelihood is one-in-five for all citizens.

Personal searches are more comparable in dispatched and on-view encounters than are property searches, since the on-view property search almost invariably is a vehicle search rather than a search of premises. The conditions under which a vehicle search occurs probably bear a closer similarity to those accompanying a "stop and frisk" personal search than they do to ordinary searches of premises. Procedural restrictions on vehicle searches differ from those for other kinds of property searches, though at the present time they remain unclear

Table 14: Per Cent of Police Encounters with Suspects That Involved A Personal and/or Property Search and Per Cent Where An Interrogation Was Conducted, by Race and Social Class Status of Suspects According to Type of Mobilization of the Police.

Race and Social Class Status of Suspects	Total Number		Personal and/or Property Search		Interrogation Conducted	
	Dis-patches	On-Views	Per Cent of Dispatches	Per Cent of On-Views	Per Cent of Dispatches	Per Cent of On-Views
All Suspects ^{a/}	910	516	21	19	35	32
All Whites	424	219	17	15	31	29
White-Collars	60	43	20	5	30	19
Blue-Collars	189	92	18	24	38	40
Class Not Ascer-tained	175	84	14	11	25	21
All Negroes	486	265	25	22	38	34
White-Collars	15	8	12	*	53	*
Blue-Collars	360	196	25	25	38	34
Class Not Ascer-tained	109	61	26	11	36	34

^{a/} Includes all cases where race of citizens was not ascertained.
*Per cent not calculated where there are fewer than 10 observations.

from the point of view of the police officer. There is little logical basis, then, for comparing property searches by type of mobilization. That is, searches of premises and vehicle searches should not be compared.

Personal searches are conducted more frequently than property searches for both whites and Negroes, and in both types of mobilization encounters. This is a good deal more pronounced when the suspects are Negro than when they are white. (See Table 15.) Indeed, relative to the frequency with which they are "frisked", Negroes are rarely the objects of in-the-field property searches, particularly in dispatched encounters.

Observers judged whether or not the personal searches they witnessed appeared, in their opinion, to be necessary for the protection of the police officer. The legality of the personal search depends upon necessity for self-protection if it is not "incident to" an arrest and if permission is not asked and received. Personal searches ("frisks") occurred far more frequently than did arrests, so the observer's judgement was significant from a legal standpoint. This is particularly true, given that routine frisks after arrest, such as those conducted at the time of transportation of a suspect to the police station, are not included in these observations.

Observers in on-view encounters judged frisks necessary for the officer's protection less often when Negroes than whites were searched; the reverse is true for searches in dispatched mobilization encounters. (See Table 16.) These findings are consistent with presumptions about police and citizen

Table 15: Per Cent Distribution by Type of Search Conducted by the Police According to Type of Mobilization of the Police and Race of Suspect.

Type of Search Conducted	Dispatch Mobilizations			On-View Mobilizations		
	Total	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro
Personal	75	61	84	64	56	70
Property	18	31	9	23	38	13
Both Personal and Property	7	7	7	13	6	17
Total Per Cent	100	99	100	100	100	100
Total Number	187	70	117	99	34	60

Table 16: Per Cent Distribution of Personal Searches That An Observer Viewed As Necessary for the Protection of the Police Officer According to Type of Mobilization of the Police and Race of Citizen Searched.

Necessity of Search for Officer's Protection According to Observer Report	Dispatch Mobilizations			On-View Mobilizations		
	Total	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro
Viewed as Necessary	68	51	75	55	61	53
Viewed as Unnecessary	21	39	13	38	33	39
Not Ascertained	11	10	12	7	6	8
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total Number	157	49	108	72	18	51

behavior in the two situations. Assuming that police discretion is greater in the on-view encounter, it could also be assumed that officers will exercise that discretion more often with Negroes than whites (whether on grounds of a higher crime rate for Negroes than whites in these cities or on grounds of discrimination, or some other basis). Correlatively, aggravated assaults and other kinds of violence are more commonly observed for Negroes than whites in dispatched encounters in these cities so that the officer more likely would need to search Negroes than whites for his own protection in dispatched encounters.

Also consistent with this presumption is another finding on personal searches: officers more often ask Negro suspects for their permission before the frisk than whites in dispatch situations, but in on-views the reverse is found. The differences are very small, however. For dispatched encounters, permission was asked of Negroes in 6 per cent of the frisks; for whites the proportion was 2 per cent. In on-views, Negroes were asked in 8 per cent of the cases compared to 11 per cent for whites. The more significant finding probably is the rather small proportion of suspects--of either race--who are asked for permission before they are subjected to a personal search.

It should not be assumed that suspects expect the conditions for legality or even for what some may consider civility to be met when they have dealings with the police. If oral objections by suspects are any index of the degree of suspect

dissatisfaction, then it appears that whites more often than Negroes are dissatisfied with police conduct in personal search situations. A white suspect made an objection in 21 per cent of the personal searches in dispatched encounters and in 28 per cent of those that were conducted in on-view situations. The proportions for Negro suspects were 13 per cent for dispatches and 12 per cent for on-views.

It may be reasonable to view oral objections as an index of the degree to which police behavior is seen by the suspects as legitimate. Suspects may be inclined to consider searches as legitimate to the extent that they see themselves as criminally liable. A person in possession of stolen property, for example, might consider himself a legitimate target of a search even though he may not be a legal target. He may be, in fact, ignorant of the legal restrictions on search and seizure. Following this line of reasoning it becomes understandable that Negroes less often object to being frisked than do whites. Personal searches conducted on Negroes are over twice as productive of weapons as are those conducted on whites. (See Table 17.)

In on-view situations one-in-five frisks of a Negro yielded a gun; for whites the proportion was one-in-ten. For both whites and Negroes the on-view search is more likely to yield a gun than is the search in a dispatched encounter, but the proportion yielding either a gun or a knife remains constant--for whites it is one-in-ten, for Negroes, one-in-four. Nothing other than a gun or knife was found in an on-view

Table 17: Per Cent Distribution by Type of Weapon or Other Possible Evidence Obtained in Personal and Property Searches According to Type of Mobilization of the Police and Race of Citizen Searched.

Type of Weapon or Other Possible Evidence Obtained In Search	Personal Searches						Property Searches					
	Dispatch Mobilization			On-View Mobilization			Dispatch Mobilization			On-View Mobilization		
	Total	White	Negro	Total ^a	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro	Total ^a	White	Negro
Gun	10	6	12	18	11	22	22	12	32	5	6	6
Knife/Other Weapon	11	4	13	3	--	4	2	4	--	5	6	6
Stolen Property	2	4	1	--	--	--	4	4	5	3	--	6
Other	3	8	1	--	--	--	21	28	14	22	24	24
No Weapon or Other Evidence Found	74	78	73	79	89	74	51	52	49	65	64	58
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total Number	152	48	104	72	18	51	47	25	22	37	17	17

^a/Includes all cases where race of citizen was not ascertained.

frisk of whites or Negroes, but whites more often than Negroes were in possession of stolen property or other possibly incriminating evidence--such as narcotics "works"--in personal searches that occurred in dispatched encounters.

In sum, there are two differences by race in the conduct of searches in dispatched compared to on-view situations: while personal searches of Negroes more often are seen by the observer as necessary for the officer's protection in dispatched encounters, the reverse is true of on-view encounters. Likewise, Negroes more often than whites are asked for the permission to conduct a personal search in dispatched encounters, but the reverse is found in on-view situations. The similarities between dispatched and on-view mobilizations are, however, more striking. In both types of mobilization the police more frequently conduct personal searches on Negroes than on whites; Negroes object less often, but they are more likely to be carrying weapons than are whites. Statistically, then, there is a clear relationship in both dispatches and on-views between the number of personal search "attempts" and the number of "successes" when the races are compared. It is problematic whether police officers cognitively as well as behaviorally search those citizens upon whom their searches are most likely to be successful. The observations do not allow for inferences about police motivations. This "attempt-success ratio" is clear as a behavioral phenomenon, nevertheless.

Even though the data on personal searches do not include cases of routine frisks conducted at the police station or

prior to transportation to the police station, a majority of the personal searches observed were followed by transportation of the suspect to the police station. This was true of 75 per cent of the personal searches conducted in dispatched situations and of 70 per cent of those in on-view situations. Whether or not these frisks were "incident to arrest" is a question that cannot be handled here, since the criteria for technical or implied arrest are not sufficiently clear to allow for judgement by a field observer in any given case. Such a judgement moreover might be very difficult even for a legal specialist in many cases.

However, those frisks that did not eventuate in a trip to the police station--25 per cent for dispatches, and 30 per cent for on-views--may be further analyzed in terms of their legality. This may be done assuming that no arrest was made for these cases, since no one was taken to the police station; i.e., the frisks were not part of a chain of actions culminating in or leading to transportation to the police station. Assume further that the observer's judgement of the need for the officer's protection and the question of whether or not the suspect's permission was asked are the relevant issues regarding the legality of these personal searches.

An observer judged a frisk to be unnecessary for the officer's protection when he saw nothing about the citizen's behavior or the situation that warranted search for protection and the observer perceived no need for such a search to assure his own protection. There can be disagreement, of

course, as to whether an officer has criteria of "search for self-protection" that an observer does not perceive; this should be kept in mind in interpreting the data that follow. Forty-six per cent of the frisks conducted in dispatched situations that did not include any processing outside the field setting were seen by the observer as unnecessary for the officer's protection; for on-views, it was a good deal higher, 86 per cent. For only one of these dispatched searches and for one such on-view search was the suspect's permission requested before the frisk. The legality of a very large proportion of these personal searches then could be considered highly questionable in that most were unnecessary for the officer's protection and the citizen's permission to conduct the search was not requested.

Considering all personal searches whether or not there was some legal processing beyond the field setting, at least 11 per cent of those conducted in dispatched encounters and 24 per cent of those in on-view encounters are highly questionable by failure to satisfy at least one of the criteria: that the search was necessary for the officer's protection, that the citizen's permission was requested, or that the citizen was detained for further legal processing at the station. Assuming these are very minimal criteria for legality, the proportion where legality might be questioned undoubtedly is higher.

It should not be assumed, however, that frisks not eventuating in transportation of the suspect to the station

necessarily are unproductive of weapons or other possible evidence. Of the suspects frisked and released in the field in dispatched situations, 17 per cent were carrying weapons or other possible evidence; for on-views the proportion was 19 per cent. In one dispatched encounter a suspect was found to be carrying a gun, yet he was released. Whether or not these persons were released because the officers viewed the frisks as illegal, or thought that they would be so viewed in court, remains problematic.

Considering next those persons who were searched in the field and following which they were transported to the police station, another pattern is evident. When the suspect was eventually taken to the police station, the frisk conducted was both more likely to be seen by the observer as necessary for the officer's protection and permission of the suspect was more likely to have been asked than when the suspect was frisked but not taken to the station. Paradoxically, then, in both dispatches and on-views, a frisk conducted on seemingly legal grounds was likely to have still further legal grounds present when the action was taken. Statistically, the legal grounds were apt to be either present in abundance, or they were likely to be totally absent. It is interesting, for example, that permission was more likely to be asked of the suspect when the observer saw the frisk as necessary for the officer's protection than when it was seen as unnecessary for protection. It appears then that officers are at times unaware of legal criteria when the system presumes they

should be while at other times they may apply them when it is not expected they should do so.

Property searches conducted in the field by patrolmen seldom involve the use of a warrant to search. Instead, the variability in the entry of police usually turns on whether or not the citizen's permission is requested and obtained. In dispatched encounters a property search usually is a search of private premises such as a house, apartment, or hotel room. For citizens of both races the majority of premises searches did not involve a request for permission. Yet when made, Negroes were asked permission a little more often than were whites. For only one citizen, a Negro, was permission asked and refused; the police entered anyway. On the other hand, the only case where a warrant was used occurred in a search of a Negro's premises. It is not unusual for the police to conduct a search of the property of citizens of both races without a warrant when no one is present on or in the property; this was true of about one-fifth of the searches of property, and it was true for citizens of both races.

The on-view property searches, almost all vehicle searches, differ a little more when the races are compared. The police asked permission of whites in 29 per cent of the cases while the proportion for Negroes was only 7 per cent. The majority of vehicle searches did not involve such a request for vehicle operators of either race, then, but this was particularly characteristic of those involving Negro suspects. No vehicle searches were conducted with a search warrant.

CONTINUED

1 OF 3

The findings on the frequency of oral objections to searches of premises and vehicle searches are inconclusive when the race of property owners and operators is considered. Negroes objected to searches of premises a little more often than did whites while whites objected to vehicle searches a little more often than did Negroes. The differences are quite small, however, and in one-fourth of the vehicle searches for white operators the observer did not ascertain whether or not an objection was made. The more noteworthy finding is that white citizens object about twice as often to a personal search as they do to a property search, while no difference is found for Negroes. Negroes do not object to any kind of search as much as whites do to the personal search.

A weapon or other possible evidence is more likely to be found in a search of premises or of a vehicle than it is in a personal search, regardless of the race of the owner or operator. (See Table 17.) The major difference between whites and Negroes is in what is found in a search of premises. A gun more often is found on Negro premises even though the probability that something will be found is about equal in such searches for citizens of the two races. It is interesting, then, that whites object to property searches no more than Negroes do, and their "liability", operationally, is about equal to that of Negroes in property search situations. Whites object more to personal searches, where their "liability" is less than that of Negroes. Police conduct seemingly complements this pattern. Proportionately more (twice as many)

personal searches are conducted on Negroes as on whites, but the performing of property searches is roughly equal between the races.

Field Interrogations

A major problem in any field observation study is to define when a transaction occurs in the field. Subsumed within this problem, and particularly vexing in a study of police-citizen transactions, is the problem of operationally defining the units of transactions. The investigator must draw boundaries for phenomena that may be quite ambiguous for the participants themselves. A case in point is the field interrogation. At what point is questioning a simple request for information, and, properly speaking, at what point does questioning become an interrogation? Magnifying this methodological issue is the fact that it is concomitantly a legal issue.

Since the Miranda decision was handed down by the U. S. Supreme Court, one week after this study began, it has been obligatory for police officers to apprise suspects of their constitutional rights before commencing with an interrogation. However, it remains for the courts to clearly delineate the point at which questioning becomes interrogation and when, hence, the suspect must be apprised. The officer on the beat is at present somewhat confused by this ambiguity. One response the officer takes is to maintain the ambiguity itself, just as he sometimes "invites" a suspect to the police station to cover

himself against a false arrest suit. Of course this exacerbates the problem of definition for research purposes still more.

It was decided that a broad, rather inclusive concept of interrogation would be preferable to one that might prove too narrow after a resolution of the problem by the courts. The observers therefore were instructed to consider as an interrogation any questioning of a probing nature pertaining to anything beyond the person's identification that led to the definition of the person as a "suspect" or "offender". They were required, as a general rule, to view only persons classified as "offenders" (in the broad sense of this study) as targets of interrogation. Yet they also were encouraged to consider for inclusion as interrogations certain interviews with persons for whom arrest in the situation seemed unlikely, e.g., relatives and associates of suspects, or witnesses, where the goal was to obtain information identifying a suspect, particularly in the situation. There were cases observed, as it turned out, in which "third degree" methods were used against possible witnesses. Some cases are included among interrogations, then, that technically might be inappropriately classified as interrogations from a legal point of view. If anything, the sample overestimates the frequency of field interrogations.

Interrogations are conducted slightly more often in dispatched than in on-view encounters that involve police-suspect interaction. (See Table 14.) The difference, however, is so small as to be negligible. About one-third of the police-suspect encounters included an interrogation in both kinds of

mobilization situation. In on-view interrogation situations the largest difference is found between blue-collar whites and white-collar whites; the former are interrogated twice as often as the latter. Comparisons by race disclose smaller differences than do those according to social class status; these differences by race are in a direction indicating, in general, a greater frequency of interrogation for Negroes than for whites. Because of the small number of cases involving interrogation of white-collar suspects the analysis proceeds with comparisons by race only.

There are three major dimensions of police work that may be considered as possible loci of "discrimination" or particularistic treatment when police officers relate to citizens: conformity with criminal procedural rules, enforcement of the substantive law, and "human relations". The current controversy surrounding the police focuses primarily on criminal procedure, i.e., the protection of citizen rights, and "human relations" aspects of policing. It is recognized that much hostility can be generated between the police and citizens even when the law is equally enforced and when the constitutional rights of citizens are equally respected. It is in the "human relations" domain that such hostility can arise. A contemporary concern of police administrators therefore lies with extending police courtesy and civility to all citizens, including suspects. Such expressions as "sir", "please", "excuse me", and "thank-you" now are expected to be part of the working vocabulary of all police officers in all routine encounters

with citizens, though, of course, these civilities are nowhere prescribed in the written law. The manner as well as the official actions of police officers has come under public scrutiny.

How suspects are approached for field interrogations is one aspect of human relations in the area of police-suspect transactions. In dispatched encounters there is no significant difference between the manner in which whites were approached and the manner used in approaching Negroes for interrogation. (See Table 18.) More apparent is the failure of police officers to observe proprieties for citizens of either race. Both racial aggregates were composed largely of blue-collar citizens. Interrogations in dispatched encounters were initiated with a polite request in only 10 per cent of the cases. Brusqueness or nastiness was evident in the approaches more often than was courtesy.

The same pattern is found for the on-view interrogations, but brusque or nasty commands are even more common than polite requests, particularly for white suspects. Only one-in-twenty on-view interrogations began with a polite request; for interrogations in dispatched encounters, the frequency was one-in-ten. In both dispatched and on-view mobilizations, however, most of the interrogations simply began with the first question. There usually was neither a request nor a command. It may be that this direct approach is, from the point of view of a suspect, the most disarming of the several possibilities, since there is no implied alternative for him apart from

Table 18: Per Cent Distribution of Suspects Interrogated According to How They Were Approached by the Police, by Type of Mobilization of the Police and Race of Suspect.

Kind of Approach By the Police	Dispatch Mobilizations			On-View Mobilizations		
	Total	White	Negro	Total ^{a/}	White	Negro
Simply Began Questioning	69	71	67	66	60	70
Polite Request	10	10	10	6	7	5
Impersonal Summons	5	5	4	13	12	13
Brusque or Nasty Command	10	11	9	11	17	7
Combinations Including Brusque Command	4	3	6	3	3	4
Other Combinations	2	--	4	1	1	1
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total Number	463	209	254	243	94	131

^{a/}Total includes cases where race of citizen was not ascertained.

answering the question. From the perspective of the police it is an obvious way to assert authority, to "take charge" of the situation by asking questions. Furthermore, the participants often may view the interrogation as a "natural" part of an already on-going conversation; hence, the questions are taken as an anticipated but nevertheless spontaneous part of a routine police encounter and call for no introduction.

Any assumption that field interrogations typically are intimidating for the citizens concerned seems unwarranted. Most field interrogations of suspects involve something other than "pinning down" or evoking a confession from a suspect. Often, for example, the police merely are attempting to ascertain what occurred in the situation or what the evidence was that it occurred in a particular way to decide whether or not it is a situation that may lead to an arrest. Cross-complaint situations, such as fights and many miscellaneous "disturbances", involve disagreement among the citizens by their very definition. The police must find out what happened. Even when the police are questioning someone clearly charged by complainants as an offender or someone they may have made a decision to arrest, their probes are aimed more at piecing the incident together or learning something about the motives of the person involved than at gaining an admission of "guilt". Uniformed patrolmen, by virtue of the departmental division of labor, very seldom concern themselves with more than preliminary investigations of any kind. The more involved investigations are handled by the detective division, including the

lengthy interrogations in an interrogation room. Yet it would be equally mistaken to conclude that since the field patrol officer is generally limited to making a discretionary decision to effect an arrest on "complaint", when an incident occurs in his presence, or when there is reason to conclude that a person has committed a serious offense, he does not elicit much information that implicates the person as the offender and/or provides information that leads to evidence used in a trial proceeding. He does.

In any case, suspects occasionally do object to the questioning. In both dispatched and on-view encounters, white suspects object a little more frequently than do Negro suspects. White suspects objected in 15 per cent of the interrogations in dispatched encounters and in 13 per cent of those that originated as on-views. For Negroes these proportions were 10 per cent and 11 per cent, respectively. White suspects thus object somewhat more often to being "frisked" than they do to being interrogated. Negroes react roughly the same to these two police actions, though they object slightly more often to the personal search than to an interrogation.

Of course, the police sometimes both frisk and interrogate a suspect in the same field situation. Somewhat unexpectedly, suspects interrogated in situations that originated as dispatches are more likely to be frisked than are those interrogated in on-view situations. Whereas 30 per cent of the interrogations in dispatched encounters also included a frisk, this was the case in only 14 per cent of the on-view interrogations.

Further, while a majority of suspects who are both interrogated and frisked subsequently are taken to the police station, this is more likely to occur for on-view than dispatched mobilizations. Eighty-seven per cent of the on-views involving both an interrogation and a frisk compared to 70 per cent in dispatched mobilizations led to a trip to the station. This finding is at odds with the conception of on-view police work held by some critics of the police. These critics believe that patrolmen often stop, question, and frisk persons on the street, but release them, when the officers are allowed to do this at their own discretion. Opponents of "stop-and-frisk laws" view this as a form of "harassment". It seems, however, that the frisk-question-and-release pattern is more characteristic of police in dispatched than it is in on-view encounters. Arrest, on the other hand, is more characteristic of on-view than of dispatched mobilizations. Perhaps the more appropriate question, then, concerns the extent to which on-view arrest may be seen as "harassment". At the same time it should be remembered that frisks conducted in on-view situations--apart from whether or not interrogation was involved--seem more questionable, legally, than those conducted in dispatched encounters.

Another dimension of field interrogation is the kind of constraint that is applied to the suspect. The kind of constraint applied is one important technical criterion for ascertaining whether or not, in the absence of a police declaration, a person is legally under arrest. The means used for constraining or detaining suspects do not differ significantly

when interrogations in dispatched encounters are compared to those conducted in on-view situations. Differences may be found when the two races are compared, however. (See Table 19.)

Negroes are more often constrained, and constrained more firmly, than are white suspects in both on-view and dispatched mobilizations. Approximately twice as many Negroes as whites are taken to the station when they are interrogated in on-view situations. Forty-three per cent of the on-view interrogations of white suspects involved no constraint whatsoever, not even verbal constraint (e.g., "You're not going anywhere, pal."). For Negroes, the proportion given such total freedom of movement was only 28 per cent. It should be remembered, however, that what seems "no constraint" to an observer may not be experienced in the same way by a suspect. The mere presence of a police officer in itself may be taken as an implicit constraint by many citizens.

In any case, the majority of suspects of both races are constrained in some way short of arrest. Field detention is a form of low visibility police practice that seldom comes to the attention of the courts. When neither arrest nor the development of legal evidence is immediately their goal, police officers have a good deal of discretion to conduct interrogations however they see fit.

It therefore is interesting that, in general, more persons objected to being constrained during the interrogation than to the interrogation itself. While this was not true of white suspects in dispatched encounters, it was true of Negroes in

Table 19: Per Cent Distribution of Suspects Interrogated According to the Kind of Constraints Placed Upon Them During Interrogation, by Type of Mobilization of the Police and Race of Suspect.

Kind of Constraint During Interrogation	Dispatch Mobilizations			On-View Mobilizations		
	Total	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro
Taken to Station	12	10	14	12	8	17
Seated in Car	8	9	7	7	7	7
Other Physical Constraint	8	4	11	2	2	2
Verbal Constraint Only	9	7	11	13	13	14
Both Physical and Verbal Constraint	10	8	11	21	19	23
Other or Other Combinations	15	15	14	8	7	9
No Constraint	38	47	32	37	44	28
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total Number	426	184	242	224	83	129

such encounters, and both whites and Negroes objected more to the constraints than to the questioning in on-view situations. About one-in-ten interrogations of Negroes involved an objection to the questioning, but in closer to one-in-five interrogations a Negro suspect objected to the way he was detained. For whites the difference is not quite as large. The majority of objections to constraint were objections to what citizens saw as an improper or undue use of force. In short, then, suspects seem to object less to what is done in an interrogation than to how it is done. This is particularly characteristic of officer transactions with Negroes, the group against whom firm constraints are more likely to be applied.

There is some loss of information pertaining to the disposition of persons interrogated in the field. Occasionally the observers lost contact with the processing of suspects. This occurred whenever the officers being observed turned suspects over to other police personnel in the field or left the station before a disposition decision was reached. Consequently, in some cases it was not ascertained whether or not a given suspect was released by other officers in the field, released at the station, or booked. The data on disposition patterns therefore should be taken as estimates rather than as complete counts. Nevertheless, there is no reason to think that the data are less exact for one race than the other, so comparisons seem justifiable.

In both kinds of mobilization situations over 60 per cent of the persons interrogated were released at the field setting.

(See Table 20.) Also, for both dispatches and on-views there are noticeable differences in the proportion by race and social class released at the field setting. In dispatched encounters involving an interrogation white suspects are in general more likely to be released in the field than are Negro suspects. But the citizens of any race-social class status most likely to be released are white-collar Negroes. Those least likely to be released, of those for whom a class status was indicated, were blue-collar Negroes. White-collar and blue-collar whites hardly differ in the proportion released in dispatched encounters, however.

In on-view encounters, on the other hand, white-collar whites are a good deal more likely to be released than blue-collar persons of the same race, 80 per cent compared to 62 per cent. There was only one interrogation of a white-collar Negro in the on-view encounters, quite noteworthy in itself, so a class comparison for Negroes is not possible. The difference between blue-collar Negroes and blue-collar whites is insignificant, so there is no clear evidence of a difference by race in the likelihood of release at the field setting in on-view mobilization situations. Overall, then, release in the field seems related more to social class status than to race.

Of the suspects for whom a disposition after interrogation was ascertained, about one-in-ten, in both types of mobilization, was taken to the station but not booked. If transportation to the police station is taken as an operational definition of arrest, then these are the cases for whom the

Table 20: Per Cent Distributions of Suspects Who Were Interrogated and Released In Field Setting and of Per Cent of Interrogations In Which A Suspect Confessed, by Type of Mobilization of the Police and Race of Suspect.

Race and Social Class Status of Suspect	Suspects Interrogated and Released In Field Setting				Interrogations In Which A Suspect Made Admission			
	Total Number		Per Cent of Dispatches	Per Cent of On-Views	Total Number		Per Cent of Dispatches	Per Cent of On-Views
	Dis-patches	On-Views			Dis-patches	On-Views		
All Suspects ^{a/}	440	247	62	66	294	151	24	25
All Whites	191	96	65	66	131	56	21	18
White-Collars	28	15	68	80	18	8	28	*
Blue-Collars	92	52	71	62	72	33	21	12
Class Not Ascertained	71	29	58	66	41	15	17	20
All Negroes	249	140	59	64	163	86	26	31
White-Collars	12	1	83	*	8	1	*	*
Blue-Collars	183	108	58	59	120	64	24	34
Class Not Ascertained	52	31	56	81	35	31	34	16

^{a/} includes all cases where race of citizen was not ascertained.

*Per cent not calculated where there are fewer than 10 observations.

criminal process ends at the arrest level; included are only those suspects who were interrogated, however.

In both types of mobilization white suspects were more likely to be taken to the station and released than were Negroes. This is particularly clear when blue-collar whites are compared to blue-collar Negroes, especially in the on-views where 19 per cent of the blue-collar whites were taken to the station but not booked as opposed to 12 per cent of the blue-collar Negroes. In dispatched encounters the proportions for those groups were 12 and 8 per cent, respectively. Very few white-collar suspects of either race were interrogated, but it nevertheless seems worthy of mention that no such persons whatsoever were taken to the station and released soon thereafter.

The practice of taking a suspect to the station from the field setting when the evidence against him is insufficient for booking, or when the booking step is not taken for some other reason, is increasingly frowned upon as a police practice. It is argued that the trip to the station may be used as an harassment technique, a kind of unofficial sanction, if it is not controlled. In any case, whatever the police motives for this action may be, Negroes are no more subject to the "dry run" to the station than are whites; indeed, the practice is less frequent for Negroes. If there is any evidence of significant differential treatment in this regard, it is between the social classes rather than the races. But white-collar persons not only are unlikely to be taken to the station and then released; they also are less apt to be taken to the

station in the first place, when they are compared to blue-collar citizens. Negroes, on the other hand, while less likely to be released at the station are more likely to be arrested and booked than whites. From a Negro citizen's point of view, therefore, the fact that Negro suspects are less often taken on a "dry run" to the station may seem a dubious advantage. Of course, since differences in the type of offending behavior are not controlled in any of these comparisons, the race differences may be a consequence of type of violation of the law.

Admissions or Confessions

A "confession" or "admission" was witnessed in about one-fourth of the interrogation encounters in both kinds of mobilization situations. (See Table 20.) Larger differences are found between the races than between the social classes, though the paucity of white-collar cases makes comparison by class tenuous anyway. In general, Negro suspects make admissions proportionately more frequently in both dispatched and on-view encounters. This is particularly evident in on-view situations, where nearly one-in-three interrogation encounters with a Negro involved "admission of guilt"; for whites the proportion is closer to one-in-five. A comparison of only blue-collar Negroes with blue-collar whites in on-views reveals that the former were almost three times as likely to confess as the latter. It will be remembered that Negroes are interrogated a little more often than whites, relative to

their volume of contact with police officers. Negroes not only make admissions more often, but they object less often to being questioned. These findings are consistent with the sometimes apparent pattern of statistical relationships referred to earlier, the attempt-success ratio. To wit, certain police actions seem to be taken, i.e., attempted, in relation to the probability of their success. It should be emphasized that those Negroes upon whom personal searches and interrogations are especially "productive" by and large are blue-collar Negroes.

The great majority of persons who "confess" in field encounters do so very soon after interaction with the police officers begins. (See Table 21.) Moreover, the bulk of these early admissions are made voluntarily at the outset of the encounter, that is, without prompting or probing by the officers. In dispatched encounters 67 per cent of the white suspects who made admissions did so voluntarily; for Negro suspects the proportion was about the same, 69 per cent. Adding those who "confessed" after 10 minutes or less of questioning, these figures expand to 94 and 91 per cent, respectively.

In on-view situations there are race differences in this regard: 79 per cent of the whites orally confessed voluntarily, but only 38 per cent of the Negroes did so. Combining those who made admissions after 10 minutes or less of interrogation, the proportions are 93 per cent for whites and 69 per cent for Negroes. Though a majority of the Negroes do make an admission

Table 21: Per Cent Distribution of Suspects Who Made Admission by the Length of Interrogation Before Admission, by Type of Mobilization of the Police and Race.

Length of Interrogation Before Admission	Dispatch Mobilizations			On-View Mobilizations		
	Total	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro
Voluntary at Beginning	68	67	68	48	79	39
10 Minutes or Less	24	27	22	28	14	31
11-20 Minutes	4	3	4	9	--	12
21-30 Minutes	1	--	2	9	7	9
31-60 Minutes	--	--	--	2	--	3
1 Hour or More	1	--	2	--	--	--
Not Ascertained	2	3	2	4	--	6
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total Number	84	33	51	47	14	32

early in on-view interrogation situations, then, they tend to refrain from making admissions longer than do whites. When relatively lengthy interrogation does occur in field settings the suspects are more likely to be Negro than white; still, it is clear that patrolmen seldom engage in "sweat-box" interrogation.

It appears that suspects orally incriminate themselves in field setting more because they anticipate further police investigation than because they are subjected to it. They confess before they are "grilled" rather than as a result of intensive questioning. A few of the suspects in the sample made admissions before a personal search and a few before a property search. Again, these seem to be cases of anticipation rather than of incrimination per se. The popular conception of when and how oral confessions occur obviously does not hold for cases where the suspect is interrogated in the field setting. Indeed, the stereotyped conception of the interrogation itself is of that in the police station rather than in a private dwelling or on the street. Yet interrogations as such no doubt occur in field settings more often than in "interrogation rooms" since the volume of police-suspect contacts in the field is far greater than that in the station.

Furthermore, stereotypes concerning confession no doubt assume that a suspect's oral admission more or less assures him of a police "record" if not a court record. This was not true of the suspects who made admissions during the observation study. In both types of mobilization, a majority of the

persons who admitted violative behavior were not taken to the police station; rather, they were released at the field setting. Such release, of course, may properly lie within the officer's discretion. Of those who admitted violations in the dispatched encounter's, 60 per cent were released in the field; in on-view situations 54 per cent were released in the field. It seems that the high release rate of persons interrogated in the field, then, is not a consequence of the failure to obtain an admission of violative behavior. Indeed, the proportion released in the field of those who orally confess is nearly as high as the proportion released in the field who simply are interrogated.

It must be noted, of course, that much of the controversy over confessions relates to signed confessions obtained during interrogation (or perhaps more often before than after interrogation) by the detective divisions of the larger police departments. Much of what is at present debated in the area of confession relates to the "signed" admission of guilt that is submitted as evidence in the trial court proceeding. Nevertheless admission of guilt serves other ends in police work aside from providing court evidence. The criteria used by a policeman for deciding when to terminate a "case" may be quite different from those of a prosecutor. However, whether or not a voluntary confession acquired in the field is to be used as court evidence, it may be important for patrolmen to apprise suspects of their rights very early in the confrontation. Given the very high frequency of the

guilty plea in court, on the other hand, cases in which the suspect confesses before being warned of his rights may be quite invisible in the operating legal system.

The failure of the accused to contest the state's case may make illegal police tactics used in gaining confessions or admissions equally invisible. "Pressure" or "force" was applied during interrogations quite rarely in the cases observed. In some cases, however, force or threats of force even was used against a witness. In one case, for example, a boy's hair was pulled until he told the officers where his brother, the alleged offender in a stabbing, was hiding. In roughly 2 per cent of the interrogations observed it was reported that a "great deal of pressure" was used. The same proportion reportedly included a "moderate amount of pressure". The number of such cases is insufficient for comparisons to be made by race and class status of citizens. It perhaps is germane to point out that what an observer perceives as "pressure" and what a suspect experiences as "pressure" may be far removed in some if not many interrogation situations, much as in the case of "constraint". In this context the finding is pertinent that suspects object more to how they are interrogated, i.e., to the form of the interrogation, than they do to the content of the questions themselves.

The Use of Threats

It is not unusual for police officers to threaten suspects with arrest, detainment, or a trip to the station. They did

so in 22 per cent of the dispatched encounters with a suspect and in 15 per cent of the on-views in which a suspect was involved. This difference between dispatched and on-view mobilizations does not support an expectation that officers will display greater discretionary latitude in on-view, where there is less departmental control, than in dispatched encounters. For every race-class status group of citizens threats are more frequently used in dispatched than in on-view encounters. (See Table 22.) The frequencies for the race-class status groups vary similarly in both types of mobilization, however. White-collar suspects of each race are less likely to be threatened than are blue-collar suspects of the same race. Further, when the social class status of citizens is the same, Negroes in general are less apt to be threatened than are whites. A critic of the police might well expect differences by social class, but the differences by race status may seem surprising.

Various inferences could be drawn from these findings. On the one hand, to the extent that the use of such threats is understood, ipso facto, as evidence of improper police behavior, white citizens, especially blue-collar whites, are at a disadvantage. It should be borne in mind that for the most part these threats were not made in interrogation situations. Had they been connected to interrogations the inference of improper police conduct would of course be patent; on that matter the courts seem unequivocal. The justification for a judgement of improper police behavior is contingent upon the nature of the threat and the specific conditions under which it is made.

Table 22: Per Cent Distributions of Police Encounters With Suspects In Which Someone Was Threatened With Arrest or Field/Station Detention, of Per Cent in Which A Suspect Requested Permission to Consult An Attorney or Other Third Party, and of Per Cent of Police Encounters With Suspects Who Were Apprised of Their Rights, by Type of Mobilization of the Police and Race and Social Class Status of Suspects.

Race and Social Class of Suspects	Total Encounters With Suspects		Per Cent Threatened by Arrest or Detention		Per Cent Requested Permission to Consult Attorney or Third Party		Per Cent Apprised of Rights	
	Dis-patches	On-Views	Dis-patches	On-Views	Dis-patches	On-Views	Dis-patches	On-Views
All Suspects	896	512	22	15	.5	5	3	2
All Whites	413	217	24	16	3	5	2	1
White-Collars	60	43	20	7	3	5	--	2
Blue-Collars	188	92	27	23	4	6	4	1
Class Not Ascertained	165	82	22	13	3	3	1	1
All Negroes	483	264	21	13	6	5	5	3
White-Collars	17	8	18	*	13	*	--	*
Blue-Collars	355	195	21	12	6	7	5	3
Class Not Ascertained	111	61	25	15	6	--	5	3

*Per cent not calculated where there are fewer than 10 observations.

Threats may be divided into those that are "present-oriented" and those that are "future-oriented". The present-oriented threat is, legally, the more questionable. The officer uses the present-oriented threat to obtain the citizen's compliance with his demands in the immediate, face-to-face situation. Less questionable is the future-oriented or deterrence threat, the officer's threat that he will take action if the suspect repeats his violative behavior. A threat of this kind probably may be seen as "proper" and within the legal bounds of police discretion. The present-oriented threat, however, bears an affinity to what some critics of the police might call "intimidation" or "abuse of authority". In any case, it is clear that the present-oriented threat is a less diluted or more direct use of police coercive power than is the future-oriented threat.

A majority, 64 per cent, of the threats against whites in dispatched encounters were present-oriented; for Negroes the proportion was a little smaller, 56 per cent. Most of the remaining cases for both races were threats that the suspect would be taken to the station the "next time" he engaged in the behavior in question.

In on-view situations, the difference is in the opposite direction. A present-oriented threat was made against white suspects in only 24 per cent of the cases, as against a proportion of 42 per cent for Negro suspects. More Negroes than whites were cautioned with a future-oriented threat, 27 per cent compared to 21 per cent. This finding may be an

artifact, since for 42 per cent of the white cases and 24 per cent of the Negro cases the observer failed to specify the time implications of a threat to arrest. Had these been specified the on-view data may have taken a different form.

White suspects; then, are more likely to be threatened than Negro suspects and when they are, at least in dispatched encounters, they are more apt to be threatened in a relatively direct form. Yet white suspects are less likely than Negro suspects to be arrested or taken to the station. This seeming paradox makes interpretation of the data on threats difficult. Should Negroes be taken to the station under the same circumstances that whites are merely threatened with that action, then the greater likelihood of direct threats being used against whites is merely a form of leniency that they enjoy.

Many threats used by police officers contain an unspoken implication of leniency, an implication that the officer is willing to forgo invocation of the law. In the future-oriented threat the suspect is told that "next time" he will be arrested, but this implies, of course, that this time the law will not be invoked. In every case, on the other hand, it should not be assumed that the offender is criminally liable "this time". The citizen may be threatened for something that he did not do. Also, the future-oriented threat sometimes is used, for example, to deter behavior that the officer cannot act upon under any circumstances without a signed complaint by another citizen. This is almost invariably the case with misdemeanors not witnessed by a police officer.

Likewise, the future-oriented threat may be used to settle a civil matter, even though police authority to arrest is restricted in civil matters to events where civil and criminal matters overlap.

The implication when a present-oriented threat is made is that the person will not be taken to the station if he adjusts his behavior in the situation. If such threats usually are followed up by arrest when the citizen does not respond and if it can be assumed that all citizens do not respond, then it follows that some citizens are taken to the station not because of an offense but because of their behavior in the face-to-face encounter with the police. The immediate determinant of an arrest, in other words, may be a person's impropriety or failure to extend deference toward the officer rather than his violation of the law. This probably is particularly likely in petty offense situations, such as those involving drunkenness, disorderly conduct, or disturbing the peace.^{5/} The importance of situational contingencies in police decision-making has been largely neglected by students of legal discretion.

It is apparent that threats can be put to a variety of uses by police officers. The threat is a tool or means that can help the police realize what they see as appropriate ends

^{5/} A study of the relationship between the situational cooperativeness of juveniles and the sanctions imposed by youth officers is Irving Piliavin and Scott Briar, "Police Encounters with Juveniles," American Journal of Sociology, 70 (1964), pp. 206-214.

from one encounter to another, a means for exerting control over citizens. It has particularly low visibility, from the point of view of those interested in policing police work. Threats, by their nature, have no history beyond the situations in which they arise. Either compliance by the citizen or action by the officer cancels the threat out of existence.

Citizen Requests for Consultation With A Third Party

It sometimes is argued that the lower a person's social status the less likely it is that he will know how to protect his legal interests when he has dealings with the police. It is assumed that one's interests are best protected in this regard when he has benefit of legal counsel. Following such an argument, then, one would expect those with a relatively lower social status to be less likely to request consultation with an attorney or other third party when they encounter the police or find themselves faced with a possible legal charge.

Only 5 per cent of all police encounters with suspects involved a request for consultation with a third party. The proportion was identical in dispatched and in on-view encounters. The race-class differentials are, contrary to expectations, very small. (See Table 22.) Except for the social class comparison of Negroes in dispatched encounters, where there were only 15 white-collar Negroes, differences by social status are in an opposite direction from what might be expected. Blue-collar citizens seem no less likely to make such requests than do white-collar citizens. Further, Negroes

were in general more likely to request a third party than were whites, though the differences are slight. In both kinds of mobilization situations blue-collar Negro citizens more frequently requested a third party than did blue-collar white citizens. These differentials might not hold if the data were controlled for the type of offense for which the persons might be charged. Blue-collar persons and Negroes clearly are more likely to be involved in serious offenses and are more likely to be arrested than are white-collar persons and whites. Therefore it may be that Negroes, especially blue-collar Negroes, request a third party more often largely because they find themselves in more serious "trouble".

The conditions under which a third party is requested vary by type of mobilization and by race. (See Table 23.) Whites are more likely to request a third party before an interrogation in dispatched encounters than are Negroes and more so than when they are in on-view situations. The same differentials are found in the case of requests made at the time of arrest in the field. In on-view situations, however, 7 of 10 requests made by whites are at the time of booking at the station. This is the point at which most requests by Negroes are made for both dispatched and on-view mobilizations. Overall, the great majority of requests for consultation with a third party, then, occur when the suspect is taken into formal custody, when he is arrested in the field, or subsequently when he is booked at the station. No requests whatsoever, by persons of either race or class, were made before a personal or a property search.

Table 23: Per Cent Distribution of Suspects Who Requested Consultation With A Third Party According to Point in the Process When the Request Was Made, by Type of Mobilization of the Police and Race of Suspect.

Point in Process When Request Was Made	Dispatch Mobilizations			On-View Mobilizations		
	Total	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro
Before Interrogation	15	31	7	8	18	--
At the Time of Arrest in the Field	15	23	11	28	9	38
At the Time of Booking at the Station	60	38	71	64	73	62
Other	10	8	11	--	--	--
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total Number	41	13	28	25	11	13

Another dimension of requests for a third party pertains to whom the suspect requests for consultation. Assuming some relationship between social status as a consequence of education and sophistication about the law and legal rights, one should expect persons of higher status to request an attorney rather than someone else, such as a fellow family member or friend. Taking both races together a family member is more often requested than an attorney in dispatched encounters, but in on-view situations an attorney is requested slightly more often than a family member. (See Table 24.) In both types of mobilization whites more frequently request an attorney than do Negroes. Indeed, Negroes not only request a family member more often than an attorney in dispatched encounters, they also request a friend more often than an attorney. Negroes also are more likely to request some other "professional person", usually a bail bondsman, than are whites.

If a preference for someone other than an attorney is ill-advised from the point of view of protection of a suspect's legal welfare, then these differences are consistent with the expectation of status differentials in legal skill. Nevertheless, this expectation is lent no support by another finding: not one white-collar suspect requested an attorney in a dispatched encounter, and only two white-collar suspects, both white, did so in an on-view encounter with the police. The data therefore do not provide consistent evidence to support any current assumptions about who will request what kind of consultation. One possible explanation for the relatively

Table 24: Per Cent Distribution of Suspects Who Requested Consultation With Various Third Parties, by Type of Mobilization of the Police and Race.

Third Party Requested	Dispatch Mobilizations			On-View Mobilizations		
	Total	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro
Attorney	24	36	19	42	45	31
Family Member	44	50	41	38	37	38
Friend	20	7	26	12	18	8
Other "Professional Person"	12	7	15	8	--	23
Total Per Cent	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total Number	41	14	27	24	11	13

infrequent request for an attorney by all groups may be that few people know an attorney whom they can call in an "emergency". They may prefer to let a family or friend handle the problem for them. It is possible, too, that, given a usual limit of one phone call, they may want to insure that someone will immediately come to the police station to help them handle the situation, and for this they prefer to trust a family member or friend. More likely, when people are "in trouble", they seek support through sharing it with someone with whom they have a close personal relationship and someone whose advice they may trust.

Apprising of Rights

Whether in situations that officers handled in response to radio dispatch or in situations that they acted upon of their own volition, patrol officers in the precincts where observation took place seldom apprised suspects of their constitutional rights. A citizen was apprised of at least one of his rights in only 3 per cent of the police encounters with suspects in dispatched encounters and in 2 per cent of those in on-view situations. In the Miranda decision the U. S. Supreme Court held that the following points must be made when an officer apprises a citizen of his rights: 1) the right to remain silent, 2) anything said will be or can be held against him, 3) the right to an attorney, and 4) an attorney will be appointed if he cannot afford one. In the analysis, a person was considered to have been apprised or warned of his rights

if any of these points or something similar was stated by the officer. Considering the frequency of admissions, not to mention interrogations, the proportions apprised are somewhat surprising.

Comparisons by race-class groups are inconclusive owing to the magnitude of the proportions themselves and the small differences among status groups. The strongest generalization possible probably is that there is no evidence of race or social class differentials in apprising of rights. Since the proportion of Negro suspects who were interrogated was a little larger than that of white suspects, since a larger proportion of Negroes "confessed", and, finally, since relatively more Negroes were arrested, perhaps it could be argued that proportionately more Negroes should have been apprised of their rights. Indeed, to some extent this did occur, and, given the very small proportions for all race and class groups, one hardly could have expected a larger difference between Negroes and whites.

Analysis by race and social class of the several dimensions of apprising of rights does not seem advisable, given the small number of cases. There were only 31 cases in dispatched encounters, 22 of which were Negro suspects, and 9 of which were white. The total for on-views was 10; 7 were Negroes, and 3 were whites. (In a few of these cases more than one citizen was apprised of his rights in the same situation.) The remainder of this discussion therefore proceeds without respect to the race or social class status of the suspect.

The validity of an apprising of rights partly rests upon the point in a suspect's contact with the police at which he is given the warning. Must he be apprised at the time of arrest, before a field interrogation, after booking, or when? At present there has been no clear resolution of this question by the judiciary. The "narrowest" interpretation of the Miranda decision would be that a suspect must be informed of his rights only prior to in-custody interrogation. Broader interpretations include apprisings in field settings. The point in police-citizen transactions when warnings were observed during the field study are, therefore, of interest.

Most of the suspects who were apprised of their rights were given the warning either at the time of an arrest in the field or at the time of booking in the station. In dispatched mobilizations 39 per cent of the cases occurred at the time of a field arrest; in on-views the proportion was lower--20 per cent. More of the apprisings in on-view encounters took place at the time of booking at the station: 60 per cent as compared to 39 per cent in dispatched police-suspect transactions. Apprising of rights was infrequent immediately before an interrogation in both kinds of mobilization situation. Three per cent of the cases in dispatched encounters occurred at that point, while for on-views the proportion immediately before interrogation was 10 per cent. The remaining cases occurred at other miscellaneous points in the processing of suspects: during transportation to the police station, upon arrival at the station, during field detainment of a motorist and, indeed,

immediately after interrogation.

Another way of classifying the apprisings is in terms of where and when they took place. There is some debate as to whether or not the police should be required to warn suspects before arrival at the police station. One side of this debate holds that if the police are not required to warn suspects in the field they will purposely forestall transportation of suspects to the station. Since the courts have not yet decided this issue the field data may not be taken as evidence in the debate about a "police station warning" rule. In the absence of such a rule, however, a rather large proportion of the apprisings occurred prior to arrival at the police station.

In dispatched encounters 32 per cent of the cases occurred at the original field setting, and 13 per cent took place on the way to the station. For on-views 40 per cent of the warnings were given at the field setting, but none were made during transportation to the station. Thirty-two per cent of the cases in dispatched encounters occurred within 10 minutes of the suspect's arrival at the station, and 6 per cent came 11-20 minutes after arrival. Also in dispatched situations another 6 per cent of the cases occurred 31 or more minutes after entrance into the station; one of these cases did not take place until after the suspect had been in the police station for a full hour. The observers did not ascertain the length of time before the apprising of rights in the station in 10 per cent of the cases for dispatched mobilizations. Only 10 per cent of the on-view cases occurred within 10 minutes after

arrival at the station. Twenty per cent came between 11 and 20 minutes after that point, and 30 per cent occurred after 31 or more minutes. Two of these on-view cases occurred after an hour of station detention of the suspect.

These data on when and where suspects were apprised of their rights must be interpreted with the utmost caution given that only those cases where apprising of rights occurred while an observer was present are included. It is possible that a number of suspects were informed of their rights after the patrolman and hence the observer left the station. Still, we know that a good deal of probing for oral evidence took place prior to any apprising in a large number of cases. This of course does not mean that such cases would ever be challenged in a courtroom.

Since the Miranda decision in June, 1966, came a week after this study began, much interest attaches to how citizens are informed of their rights. Following the decision it has generally been assumed that an apprising of rights is not valid unless all four of the points adumbrated by the Supreme Court are mentioned when the suspect is warned. Including both dispatched and on-view encounters a total of only 3 cases involved mention of all four points specified by the Court in the Miranda decision. In dispatched encounters 23 per cent of the cases involved mention of only the right to remain silent and/or that anything said could be used as evidence in court. Thirty-two per cent included only the right to remain silent and the right to an attorney; in 19 per cent of the cases only

the right to an attorney was stated, and also in 19 per cent three of the four Miranda points were made in the warning.

In on-view situations only the right to remain silent and the right to an attorney were mentioned in 30 per cent of the cases, and merely the right to an attorney was mentioned for another 20 per cent. In one on-view case the right to an attorney and also the right to refuse to take a drunkometer test were stated, and in another case only the drunkometer warning, a variety of self-incrimination warning, was given. For the remaining on-view cases the specific statement of rights was not ascertained by the observer. In short, the great majority of cases where a suspect was apprised of his rights would be rejected as insufficient by contemporary courts of law.

Apart from the matter of which rights the police mentioned when warning suspects other conditions surrounding some of the cases would surely invalidate them or render them legally superfluous. In two cases the suspect was literally unconscious when he was "apprised". In two other cases the suspect was so drunk that the observer noted he was incapable of understanding the warning. It also should be pointed out that in a majority of the cases a confession by the suspect would have been or was unnecessary, since the offense in question was observed by the arresting officers so the suspect's criminal liability was not problematic. In those cases, therefore, the apprising of rights could function only to warn the suspect against further self-incrimination and to advise him of his right to an attorney.

Moreover, in nearly all of the cases in which the offense was not observed by the arresting officers an apparently reliable witness--usually the victim--observed the offense or the suspect orally "confessed". In one-half of the cases in which a suspect made an admission when his liability was uncertain, however, the admission was made prior to the apprising of rights.

Because the Miranda vs. Arizona decision was announced on June 13, 1966, one week after observation began, it is possible to examine whether there were any changes in police practice to implement the Miranda decision during the period of the study. Analysis may be made to see when and how suspects were apprised of their rights until six weeks after the decision.

When the data are tabulated by seven-day periods, it is possible to examine whether or not the effect of Miranda increased with time or whether the frequency of apprising of rights was merely a function of the number of suspects processed during any given week. This tabulation was made for dispatched mobilizations only.

Week of Observation	Per Cent of All Apprisings	Per Cent of All Cases With A Suspect
June 8-14	3	6
June 15-21	18	14
June 22-28	18	21
June 29-July 5	32	24
July 6-12	18	20
July 13-19	9	9
July 20-25	3	6

Bearing in mind that only a relatively small number of citizens were apprised of their rights, it nonetheless seems clear that the per cent of citizens who were informed of their rights during any week of the observation period was not too dissimilar from what one might expect, given the proportion of suspects observed during each week. Put another way, given a constant rate of apprising of rights one would expect that the distribution of apprising of rights would be like that of suspects. There is no evidence of an increase in compliance with the Miranda decision over time.

The manner in which citizens were apprised of their rights over time was also tabulated for dispatch mobilization encounters. There apparently are no significant differences over time in the points mentioned by officers in warning citizens of their rights. The officers mentioned no more of the points adumbrated in the Miranda decision toward the end of the observation period than they did earlier.

The dispatch mobilization data also were tabulated by race of suspect for apprising of rights over time. Again, the percentage distribution of suspects of each race who were apprised of their rights in the various weeks of the observation period is roughly but clearly similar to the percentage distribution of suspects of each race encountered by the police during the weeks of the observation.

In conclusion, it is apparent that officers on patrol rarely apprise citizens of their constitutional rights. This seems to be so for two reasons: 1) Situations for which the

warning is appropriate are uncommon in patrol work relative to detective work, and 2) patrolmen usually disregard their obligation to inform citizens of their legal rights. It is likely that both of these circumstances contribute to the outcome.

Police Attitudes Toward Negroes

Although the thrust of the police observation study was aimed at gathering behavioral data on police-citizen transactions, the contact with officers brought information on their attitudes as well. Since each observer rode or walked with officers for about eight hours a day, six days a week, much in the way of conversational interchange with policemen was part of the natural routine. In the context of intensive field observation conversation becomes a requirement not only of rapport but also of sociability. This is particularly evident when an observer accompanies an officer in a one-man patrol car or on a one-man foot beat; in these cases, indeed, the policeman may seize upon the opportunity for sociable interaction.

This situational advantage easily translates into a somewhat unique research medium--"conversational interviewing", as opposed to focussed and unfocussed interviewing. The situation was defined as an observation situation; it generally was not defined as one of an interview. Since often a good deal of camaraderie developed between the observers and the officers, such attitude data often are particularly "rich" in quality and content.

Police officers generally expressed attitudes toward Negroes. Although these attitudes were recorded and coded with considerable specificity, here they are arranged in broad categories to facilitate comparisons. Comparisons are made by race of the officer, whether white or Negro, and by the racial composition of the police precinct to which the officer is assigned, whether predominantly Negro, white, or mixed in residential population.

Five broad categories of attitudes toward Negroes are used: highly prejudiced or extremely anti-Negro, prejudiced or anti-Negro, neutral, pro-Negro, and "not classifiable" or "difficult to obtain information". "Highly prejudiced or extremely anti-Negro" was used when an officer referred to Negroes as sub-human, suggested an extreme solution to the "Negro problem", expressed dislike to the point of hatred, or used very pejorative nicknames when speaking of Negroes. The following exemplify the "highly prejudiced" officer: "These scum aren't people; they're animals in a jungle". "Hitler had the right idea. We oughta gas these niggers--they're ruining the country". "Bastard savages". "Maggots". "Filthy pigs". "They oughta ship 'em back where they came from". "Buffaloes".

An officer was placed in the second category--"prejudiced or anti-Negro"--if he simply showed general dislike for Negroes as a group without making "extreme" statements as in the first category: "These people don't have enough respect for law and order". "Most of these niggers are too lazy to work for a living". "The trouble with shines is the way they run down a

neighborhood--it's a real shame".

The third category--"neutral"--was used for an officer who spoke of Negroes descriptively, without judging them. He neither condemned nor defended Negroes, their advocates, or their critics: "The colored are about like anybody else". "The main problem is education--Negroes just don't get enough schooling". "There are all kinds of coloreds, some good, some bad".

The "pro-Negro" officer was outwardly sympathetic toward Negroes, or he defended Negroes against their critics: "These people deserve all the help they can get". "A.D.C. discriminates against Negroes". "They've been kept down too long. It's a disgrace for this country".

Finally, the category "not classifiable" (or "difficult to obtain information") was used for an officer who expressed no attitudes toward Negroes. This category was used when, in the observer's judgement, the officer appeared unwilling to discuss the topic because of the circumstances. For example, this category was used when an observer noted that Negroes were not discussed because a Negro officer was present, or vice versa, depending upon the race of the particular officer. Also, if the observer reported that the topic was "avoided", "too risky", or that the officer "would not commit himself" this category was used.

The distribution of officer attitudes may be seen in Table 25. Every officer who was observed during the study is included, so the percentages are computed on a base that

Table 25: Per Cent Distribution of Police Attitudes Toward Negroes According to Racial Composition of Police Precinct and Race of Officer.

Racial Composition of Police Precinct	Race of Officer	Total Number	Officer Attitude Toward Negroes						Total Per Cent
			Highly Prejudiced, Extremely Anti-Negro	Prejudiced, Anti-Negro	Neutral	Pro-Negro	Difficult to Obtain Information	No Relevant Observation	
Total	White	510	38	34	11	1	3	13	100
	Negro	94	4	14	30	16	12	24	100
Predominantly Negro	White	181	45	34	10	1	1	9	100
	Negro	43	9	19	21	7	16	28	100
Racially Mixed	White	180	34	32	10	1	4	19	100
	Negro	51	--	10	36	24	8	22	100
Predominantly White	White	149	36	36	13	2	3	11	100
	Negro	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

includes those officers for whom no information pertaining to attitudes toward Negroes was acquired, the "not ascertained" or "no relevant observation" cases. Attitudes of white officers more often were acquired than were those of Negro officers.

It is clear that the great majority of white officers in all of the precincts hold anti-Negro attitudes. In the predominantly Negro precincts over three-fourths of the white policemen expressed prejudiced or highly prejudiced sentiments toward members of the Negro race.. Only 1 per cent expressed attitudes sympathetic toward Negroes. A larger proportion of officers verbalized "highly prejudiced" attitudes in the heavily Negro precincts than did officers in either of the other two kinds of racially populated areas. However, there were more cases for which officers' attitudes were not ascertained in the racially mixed precincts, so the significance of the difference between officers in predominantly Negro precincts and those in the racially mixed precincts should not be taken as conclusive. On the other hand, it does appear that policemen who have official contacts primarily with white citizens are less extreme in the degree to which they are anti-Negro than are officers whose on-the-job contacts with citizens largely are the Negroes.

The attitudes of Negro policemen toward members of their own race allow for a comparison between those who are assigned to predominantly Negro precincts and those in racially mixed areas. However, no Negro officers were assigned to the

predominantly white precincts included in the observation study. Almost one-in-ten of the Negro policemen in the predominantly Negro precincts expressed extremely anti-Negro attitudes whereas none did in the racially mixed precincts. Remarks made by several of these "highly prejudiced" Negro policemen may be helpful in interpreting the data in Table 25:

1. "I'm talking to you as Negro, and I'm telling you these people are savages. And they're real dirty. We were never rich, but my mother kept us and our home clean."
2. "There have always been jobs for Negroes, but the f----- people are too stupid to go out and get an education. They all want the easy way out. Civil Rights has gotten them nothin' they didn't have before."
3. "These people are animals. They don't do anything for themselves. A.D.C. is pure socialized prostitution."

Nineteen per cent of the Negro officers in heavily Negro precincts were simply "prejudiced", but not extremely so; in the mixed areas the proportion was 10 per cent. Negro officers in racially mixed precincts were a good deal more likely to verbalize pro-Negro attitudes, 24 per cent did so, as compared to only 7 per cent in the largely Negro police districts. Though Negro officers, of course, are far less anti-Negro than white officers, the distribution of attitudes follows the same pattern as it does for the white policemen.

It is apparent that any assumptions concerning the degree to which increased contact or association with Negroes decreases prejudice against Negroes, as has been suggested and empirically supported by some social scientists, must take these findings

into consideration. Seemingly the nature of the interpersonal contacts themselves and the roles of the persons involved are crucial conditions that affect the validity of such an hypothesis. Also, policemen relate to Negroes as members of an organization, an organization with a belief system and goals of its own, rather than as individuals. This may be important in explaining their attitudes. Finally, indeed, it even may be that the methods employed in collecting the attitudes affected the data.

While the proportion of white police officers who reveal anti-Negro attitudes is quite striking, it is emphasized that inferences cannot be drawn from these verbalizations to the behavior of police officers when they interact with Negro citizens. A recurring theme in the observers' reports was the great disparity between the verbalized attitudes of officers, in the privacy of the patrol car, and the public conduct of officers in encounters with Negroes and members of other minority groups. There is a general paucity of evidence of discriminatory or prejudiced behavior on the part of police officers in face-to-face encounters with Negroes.

This study writes large the sociological caveat that attitudes or psychological predispositions may be very poor predictors of conduct. One might say that policemen, like other social actors, often are not quite so free to act out their feelings as they appear to be. No doubt this is equally true for the citizens who have contacts with police officers. Police-citizen transactions seemingly assume an empirical

uniformity that is to a significant extent independent of the attitudes of the participants involved. This uniformity apparently arises from a similarity in the impact of social controls and constraints present in situational encounters between police officers and citizens and from departmental controls. It follows that an understanding of the patterns of interaction and the outcomes of police-citizen transactions calls for an analysis of the elements in such organized controls and constraints.

CAREER ORIENTATIONS, JOB SATISFACTION,
AND THE ASSESSMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT PROBLEMS
BY POLICE OFFICERS*

by

Albert J. Reiss, Jr.**

May, 1967

*The research reported herein was supported by Grant Award 006, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U. S. Department of Justice under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965. Publication does not necessarily reflect the views of officials of the Department of Justice.

**The assistance of James Norr in the preparation of the schedule and of Howard Aldrich and Jack Faber in the preparation of tabular materials is gratefully acknowledged.

Relatively little attention has been given to empirical study of police organization and of the police occupation until recently. These studies now appearing tend to focus on police occupational culture as it relates to their particular role in a department or on its relationship to the bureaucratic style of the organization.¹ In almost every case, a single department or organization was studied, making comparison difficult since the studies are undertaken from a variety of perspectives and designs.

This paper reports on an investigation of police officers in selected precincts of three major metropolitan police departments, making possible some understanding of what may be core and what are variable features of police occupation and organization. Core features are assumed to be those that vary little as one moves from department to department while variable features are those that result from the administrative organization of a particular department or from the environment in which the police work.

The following major features of police work as an occupation and of police organization are considered: the nature of police careers, of police work, and of officer satisfaction with their job; police officer orientations toward their tasks in policing and of their relationships and transactions with the public that is policed; officer perceptions of how organizations and systems that affect law enforcement have

1. Michael Banton, The Policeman in the Community, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964; James Q. Wilson, "The Police and Their Problems: A Theory" in Carl J. Friedrich and Seymour E. Harris, (eds.), Public Policy XII, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963, pp. 189-216; Jerome Skolnick, Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in Democratic Society, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966; Elaine Cumming, Ian M. Cumming, and Laura Edell, "Policeman as Philosopher, Guide, and Friend," Social Problems, XII (Winter, 1965), pp. 276-297; Jack J. Preiss and Howard J. Ehrlich, An Examination of Role Theory: The Case of the State Police, Lincoln, Nebraska: The University of Nebraska Press, 1966.

influenced or changed police work. The study is companion to one on the observation of police behavior with citizens which investigated how officers and citizens behave in one another's presence.² By comparison, this study reports on how officers orient themselves to their work and the publics with which they deal or that affect their work. It is a study in perceptions and attitudes, not of actual behavior.

Design of the Study

The observational studies of the police, for reasons of economy, could not be undertaken in all police precincts or districts of Boston, Chicago, and Washington, D. C., the three cities selected for investigation. Two police precincts were selected each in Boston and Chicago and four in Washington, D. C. Only precincts with fairly high crime rates were selected to insure observation of a large number of police and citizen transactions within a relatively short period of time.

The two precincts in Boston are Dorchester and Roxbury. Dorchester is primarily a white residential area where the income of the inhabitants ranges from low to middle income. Irish people comprise the largest ethnic group. Among the white areas outside downtown Boston, Dorchester has the highest crime rate. The major housing project in the precinct is peopled mostly by Negroes, and there is a small Negro area bordering on the other precinct selected, Roxbury. Roxbury is largely made up of low income Negro families, though there are some middle income Negro families and some white families. The area has a very high crime rate for Boston; it is somewhat higher than that of Dorchester.

2. See Donald J. Black and Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Patterns of Behavior in Police and Citizen Transactions in this supplement.

In Chicago a predominately white and a predominately Negro area also were selected. Town Hall is primarily white, and, for a white area in Chicago, its crime rate is fairly high. There is a substantial number of low income Southern white migrants in Town Hall; about 20,000 Puerto Ricans also live in the area. There is considerable variation in income and ethnic composition of the inhabitants. Income groups are fairly segregated in the precinct with very low income, working class, middle income, and upper income areas quite clearly defined in space. A few Negro families are included in a housing project at one end of the precinct. Fillmore is in marked contrast to Town Hall. Except for a small Italian settlement, the area is made up primarily of Negro families, many of whom are recent migrants from the South. The average income is low, and the population has a high density. The crime rate is high, considerably higher than the Town Hall rate.

Police Precincts 6, 10, 13, and 14 were selected in Washington, D. C. Over 40 per cent of the population of the District resides in these four precincts. About two-thirds of the district population is nonwhite. About 90 per cent of the residents in the 14th precinct, three-fourths of those in the 10th and 13th, and a little more than one-half of those in the 6th are nonwhite. According to the Washington, D. C. Police Department Annual Report of 1965, the crime rates of 6 and 14 are somewhat lower than those for 10 and 13. From lowest to highest the crime rates of the four precincts rank as follows: 6, 14, 10, 13; they are so ordered in the tables of this report.

Within each of the precincts a simple probability sample of officers was selected for interview according to the survey questionnaire in Appendix A. Although the number of officers varies somewhat among the precincts, from 20 to 25 per cent of the officers in any precinct was interviewed. There were almost no refusals to interview. The following number of officers were interviewed in each of the precincts:

City	Precinct	Race of Officer		Total Officers
		White	Negro	
Boston	Dorchester	24	1	25
	Roxbury	23	2	25
Chicago	Town Hall	24	1	25
	Fillmore	14	11	25
Washington, D. C.	# 6	21	4	25
	#14	18	9	27
	#10	22	4	26
	#13	17	9	26
Total		163	41	204

Roughly four of every five officers interviewed is a white officer. The sample selection of nonwhite officers clearly reflects both the race composition of each department's complement of officers and policies of assignment by race to districts. The more white the district, the smaller the proportion of nonwhite officers in each of the cities. Dorchester in Boston and Town Hall in Chicago had almost no nonwhite officers assigned to the district; only one sample case was selected from each of these precincts. While most D. C. precincts have some Negro residents, the more nonwhite the precinct, the larger the proportion of nonwhite officers. Given the fact that Boston has only a very small percentage of Negroes on the force, only 3 of the nonwhite interviews are with Negro officers from Boston. When information is reported by race of officer, therefore, it largely reflects information for Chicago and Washington, D. C. It also is true that more than one-half of the white officers are from Washington, D. C., given the inclusion of four precincts from that city. Throughout the report when either city or precinct differences are important,

however, information is provided separately by city and precinct.

Officer Orientation to A Police Career and Police Morale

Police work falls among a selected number of career occupations. Unlike some career occupations, police work generally involves commitment to a particular occupational organization (a police department in a given jurisdiction) as well as commitment to a career as a police officer.

An attempt was made to isolate the major factors that police officers perceive as important elements in police work, particularly factors that lead them to make a commitment to police work and that engage them in their work. At the same time some effort was made to learn the degree to which an officer maintains a continuing commitment to both police work and to a given department in which he works. Broadly speaking this kind of commitment is affected by what is commonly termed the 'morale' of the officer and 'morale' in the department. No effort was made to develop a single measure of 'morale'; rather morale is inferred from responses the officer makes to factors about his career as a police officer, his satisfaction with his job, and his perceptions of the problems he has in being a police officer.

Within the police occupation, there is a movement toward 'professionalization' of the occupation. Elsewhere it has been noted that this movement has led more to the professionalization of police departments than to the professionalization of the police occupation.³ Though no specific measures of 'professionalization' of the occupation were developed for this study, it will be clear to the reader that some of the

3. See David J. Bordua and Albert J. Reiss, Jr., "Command, Control, and Charisma: Reflections on Police Bureaucracy," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 72 (July, 1966), pp. 68-76.

measures provide information on the extent of professionalization of police officers.

Police work has long been characterized as an occupation where both generational inheritance of the occupation and ethnic solidarities play major roles.⁴ The most recent 'ethnic' to enter major police departments of the United States is the American Negro. His entry for the most part is so recent that family membership within the occupation is rare. Whether ethnic and family solidarities will survive in the 'professionalized' department remains to be seen; yet its survival on any scale is doubtful, given the history of other occupations where entry is based on universalistic criteria.

Nonetheless it is of interest to regard an officer's commitment to his career by examining whether he regards police work as an occupation which he would like to have his son enter or which he would advise other young men to enter. Tables 1 and 4 provide information on the degree to which officers would advise their sons and other young men to enter police work.

White officers are twice as likely as Negro officers to advise a young man or their son to enter police work. About half of all white officers would advise a young man to enter police work and a fourth would advise their son to enter police work. Given the fact that mobility aspirations of police officers for the sons should be quite high, it is apparent that commitment to a police career is sufficiently great so that at least a fourth of all white officers would advise their sons to become a police officer. It is apparent in Table 4 that the commitment of Negro officers to police work as an avenue to mobility or as a desired career is substantially lower, a fact that will appear evident in other measures in this report.

4. See, for example, James Q. Wilson, "Generational and Ethnic Differences Among Career Police Officers," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXIX (March, 1964), pp. 522-28.

Nonetheless it is evident that a substantial proportion of all officers would not advise a young man to go into police work. About a third of both Negro and white officers would not advise a young man to go into police work and 55 per cent of white officers and 69 per cent of Negro officers would not advise their son to go into police work. If these verbalizations be taken as measures of dissatisfaction with the occupation--particularly the measure that they would not advise a young man to go into police work--then police work shows a substantial minority of dissatisfied officers. Negro officers are considerably more indecisive about whether they would advise a young man to go into police work since more than twice as many Negro as white officers indicated they might under some conditions advise a young man to enter police work; by contrast, however, they were less indecisive about advising their son to enter police work. Only half as many Negro as white officers indicated they would advise their son to enter police work on contingent conditions.

Further examination of Tables 1 and 4 indicate, nevertheless, that the proportion of officers who would advise a young man or their son to enter police work varies considerably by department and district to which one is assigned within a department. Hence, it would appear that job satisfaction and 'morale' affect one's willingness to advise a young man to enter police work. Chicago police officers are considerably more likely to advise both their sons and other young men to consider a career as a police officer. Almost one-half of all Chicago officers, regardless of district of assignment, would advise their son to go into police work; only about one-third would not advise their son to enter police work.

Officers assigned to the high crime rate Negro areas in each of the cities are less likely to advise a young man to enter police work and, except for Chicago, less likely to advise their son to enter police work. Some of this difference

is due to the fact that Negro officers are disproportionally assigned to these high crime rate Negro areas. Hence for white officers the differences by area of assignment are smaller than would appear in Tables 1 and 4. It seems doubtful that the presence of substantial numbers of Negroes on the police force or assigned to a district affects white officer commitment since there are only small differences between Boston with few Negro officers and Washington, D. C. with much larger numbers. Furthermore, Chicago, with the highest proportion of Negro officers among the three cities, shows the highest commitment.

It is possible that Negro officers are less committed to police careers for their sons or other young men because they are assigned to predominately Negro districts; the design of our study does not permit us to determine whether Negro officers assigned to predominately white districts have greater commitment. Other data, discussed below, suggest that the lower commitment of Negro officers relates both to factors that motivated Negro officers to enter police work and to some factors they specifically dislike about their job, though conceivably rationalization might play a role in their verbalizations of these reasons.

Tables 2 and 3 provide information on reasons officers give for advising a young man to enter or not enter police work. From Table 2, it is evident that Negro officers are more likely than white officers to say there is "nothing good" about police work--an indication of lower commitment to it as a career choice, though not necessarily of job satisfaction. Almost one-third of all Negro officers thought there was "nothing good" about police work (Table 2). Yet they were no more likely to give reasons why a young man should not enter police work than were white officers (Table 3).

Table 1: Per Cent of Police Officers Advising A Young Man To Go Into Police Work: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Would you advise a young man to go into police work?			
	Yes	Maybe	No	Per Cent Total
All Districts:	46	20	34	100
All white officers	50	17	33	100
All Negro officers	28	36	36	100
Boston:				
Dorchester	44	24	32	100
Roxbury	36	16	48	100
Chicago:				
Town Hall	72	17	11	100
Fillmore	56	13	31	100
Washington, D.C.:				
6	56	20	24	100
14	44	26	30	100
10	31	19	50	100
13	38	19	42	100

Table 2: Per Cent Distribution of Officers Reasons Given To A Young Man For What Is Especially Good About Police Work: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	What would you tell a young man that is especially good about police work?									Total Per Cent
	Nothing Good	Pay or Benefits	Security or Advancement	Variety in the Work	Working With People	Freedom and Responsibility	Prestige of Job	Important Work for Society	Work With Good Men	
All Districts:	20	23	20	13	16	2	2	2	3	101
All white officers	17	21	23	14	16	2	1	3	4	101
All Negro officers	31	31	14	6	16	--	3	--	--	101
Boston:										
Dorchester	16	16	12	20	20	4	4	4	4	100
Roxbury	36	12	28	4	8	--	--	4	8	100
Chicago:										
Town Hall	22	--	22	28	28	--	--	--	--	100
Fillmore	25	31	19	--	19	6	--	--	--	100
Washington, D.C.:										
6	4	28	24	12	16	4	4	4	4	100
14	29	30	15	11	15	--	--	--	--	100
10	0	38	23	12	19	4	--	--	4	100
13	27	27	15	15	4	--	4	4	4	100

-10-

Table 3: Per Cent Distribution of Officers Reasons Given To A Young Man About Why He Should Not Go Into Police Work: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Reasons Given Why A Young Man Should Not Go Into Police Work:										Total Per Cent
	Dangerous Work	Work Schedule	Red Tape	Low Salaries	Not Enough Chance To Get Ahead	Poor "Leadership" of Dept.	Too Little Public Respect	Too Many Restrictions On Police	Difficult For Family	No Reason Why He Shouldn't	
All Districts:	10	11	2	7	3	7	12	7	5	36	100
All white officers	9	9	2	7	3	6	12	9	5	38	100
All Negro officers	14	17	--	6	6	8	8	3	5	33	100
Boston:											
Dorchester	12	4	4	4	--	4	20	12	16	24	100
Roxbury	8	4	--	8	--	--	28	16	--	36	100
Chicago:											
Town Hall	17	11	--	11	--	6	--	--	--	55	100
Fillmore	--	6	--	6	6	6	--	--	13	63	100
Washington, D.C.:											
6	12	16	--	16	8	4	4	8	4	28	100
14	19	11	--	11	--	7	22	--	--	30	100
10	15	8	4	--	4	8	15	11	4	31	100
13	3	12	4	--	8	15	--	8	7	43	100

-11-

Table 4: Per Cent Distribution of Police Officers Who Would Advise A Son to Go Into Police Work by Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Would You Advise A Son of Yours to Be A Police Officer?				Total
	Yes	Depends	No	Don't Know	
All Districts:	26	13	57	4	100
All white officers	27	15	55	3	100
All Negro officers	14	8	69	8	99
Boston:					
Dorchester	36	12	52	--	100
Roxbury	20	4	68	8	100
Chicago:					
Town Hall	45	22	33	--	100
Fillmore	50	6	38	6	100
Washington, D.C.:					
6	12	24	56	8	100
14	26	11	59	4	100
10	15	12	65	8	100
13	15	15	69	--	99

While Negro officers were less likely than white officers to advise a young man to go into police work because of opportunities for security or advancement (Table 2), only 6 per cent of Negro as compared with 3 per cent of white officers give as a reason for their advising a young man not to enter police work that there is "not enough chance to get ahead." Furthermore, as Table 13 shows, only 10 per cent of the Negro officers wanting to leave the department gave as a reason that "promotion is too slow." Perception of lack of opportunity for advancement within the department then does not appear to be a major reason for the lower commitment of Negro officers to police work as a career occupation.

The main reasons officers give for advising a young man to go into police work relate to the salary and security aspects of the job, that one works with people rather than things, and that police work is variable in interest rather than routine. They do not view a police career in terms of "values," as for example the value it has as important work for the society, or as a job to be taken for the prestige that it confers, reasons sometimes closely associated with professional careers. Nor do they focus on the closeness of the working relationship with fellow officers, a factor suggested by some police literature. One gets the impression that police work is evaluated by officers as a job among jobs in a mass society. Among such jobs its "value" is that it pays reasonably well, provides a modicum of security, and that it has the advantage of lacking the routine quality of much work in modern society.

Focusing on reasons that officers would give a young man why he should not go into police work, officers do not appear to focus on a particular characteristic or set of characteristics. Such day to day factors of the job as the work schedule, the danger in the work, the salary received, the supervision given, and the "restrictions" imposed on the police account for the bulk of reasons. Even the response "too little

public respect" has an immediate quality to it--it is less the conferring of prestige in a broad sense that is meant than the fact that people do not treat one with "respect" in day to day contacts.

Overall, then, it is the day to day characteristics of police work that officers cite as factors for a young man to consider in entering a police career. This orientation to policing will become evident again as the specific likes and dislikes of officers about their job are evaluated in Tables 8 to 16 below.

Mention was made of the fact that traditionally the American police recruited from family, kinship, and ethnic networks. It is not known whether family and kinship networks ever accounted for a substantial proportion of the members in any police department though historically one or another ethnic groups came to dominate many American police departments. The most recent ethnic minority to dominate many American police departments were the Irish.

Given personal acquaintance networks as a basis for recruitment into the police, it has been assumed that many men who entered police departments did so as a "first" choice. They had been socialized within their communities to "want" to become a police officer. There is some evidence that such socialization toward a career in the police is declining, particularly as the universalistic standards of a civil service system becomes the basis for selection into police work.

Nonetheless there may be very real differences in the way that persons come to be recruited into the police via a civil service system. Though there are no statistical data available, the comment often is heard that Negroes are encouraged into police work through civil service or other counselors; they less often apply for police jobs when they seek civil service employment than do whites. Whether or not this is the case, there is considerable evidence in Table 5 that more Negro than white officers originally preferred some other kind of work

Table 5: Per Cent of Police Officers Agreeing They Would Have Preferred Police Work to Some Other Line of Work At Time They Entered Department and Kind of Work Preferred: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Preferred Other Kind of Work			Yes: Would Have Preferred Employment As:							Total Per Cent
	No	Can't Say	Yes	Prof. or Semi-Prof.	Bus. or Mgr.	Sales, Clerical, Kindred	Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Protective Service	Other/Don't Know	
All Districts:	67	6	27	31	7	7	15	5	16	19	100
All white officers	73	6	21	23	6	6	20	5	23	17	100
All Negro officers	38	6	56	40	10	5	5	5	10	25	100
Boston:											
Dorchester	80	--	20	20	--	20	20	40	--	--	100
Roxbury	68	4	28	14	28	14	14	--	--	30	100
Chicago:											
Town Hall	78	11	11	50	--	--	50	--	--	--	100
Fillmore	81	6	13	--	--	--	50	--	--	50	100
Washington, D.C.:											
6	72	--	28	43	--	14	--	--	28	15	100
14	59	15	26	43	--	--	14	--	14	29	100
10	58	3	39	30	--	10	10	--	50	--	100
13	50	8	42	33	18	--	8	--	8	33	100

when they entered police work. Over one-half of all Negro as compared with but one-fifth of all white officers indicated they preferred some other kind of work when they become a police officer.

That other factors may be operating, however, can be seen in the variation in preference for other employment by city. A much smaller proportion of the white and Negro officers in Chicago preferred some other kind of work when they entered the police department than did officers in Boston and Washington, D. C. Nonetheless, as Table 5 shows, Negro officers more than white officers indicated preferred jobs with more skill and prestige than police work at the time they entered police work. About twice as many Negro as white officers who preferred some other kind of work when they entered the police department wanted a professional or semi-professional job or to go into business or managerial occupations. White officers were more likely to select skilled or other protective service positions (such as fireman) as a preferred employment at the time they entered police work. For more Negro than white officers then, entering police work represented a lowering of their aspiration for employment. This in itself might account for their seemingly less commitment and satisfaction with police work as a career.

That the aspirations of both Negro and white officers for preferred employment at the time they went into police work were to a degree unrealistic is apparent from data in Table 6. Roughly a third of Negro and white officers indicated they lacked either the educational or other qualifications for their preferred employment. Negro officers more often mentioned the lack of economic or job security as a reason for not taking some other job while white officers more often mention the absence of employment opportunities as their reason for not going into a preferred line of work.

Table 7 shows that 15 per cent of white as compared with but 1 per cent of Negro officers have family members or

Table 6: Per Cent of Police Officers Who Agreed They Would Have Preferred Some Other Line of Work to Police Work At Time They Entered the Department by Reasons They Give for Not Going into That Line of Work: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Main Reason Given For Not Taking Other Job:					Total Per Cent
	Lack of Educational Qualifications	Lack of Other Qualif. or Experience	Lack of Economic or Job Security	No Job Openings At That Time	Can't Say	
All Districts:	23	10	23	29	15	100
All white officers	23	9	14	43	11	100
All Negro officers	20	15	30	10	25	100
Boston:						
Dorchester	20	--	40	40	--	100
Roxbury	--	--	72	14	14	100
Chicago:						
Town Hall	50	50	--	--	--	100
Fillmore	--	--	50	50	--	100
Washington, D.C.:						
6	72	--	--	14	14	100
14	14	14	29	29	14	100
10	10	10	10	50	20	100
13	25	17	8	25	25	100

Table 7: Per Cent Distribution of Main Reason Officer Gives for Deciding to Become A Police Officer by Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Main Reason for Decision to Become Police Officer:							Total
	Friends or Family in Police Work	Always Interested in Being A Policeman	Prestige and/or Respect of Job	Likes Working With People	Variety in the Work	Security in Job	Economic Attraction in Job	Other or Hard to Say
All Districts:								
All white officers	11	30	4	7	7	29	7	5
All Negro officers	15	30	1	6	7	29	5	7
	1	25	--	11	6	28	17	12
Boston:								
Dorchester	20	20	--	12	--	40	--	8
Roxbury	4	20	--	--	4	64	--	8
Chicago:								
Town Hall	17	39	--	6	11	28	--	--
Fillmore	6	38	--	6	--	44	--	6
Washington, D.C.:								
6	12	24	--	4	20	16	20	4
14	7	48	--	7	4	15	11	7
10	8	31	--	12	4	19	8	19
13	15	23	4	8	12	15	15	8

friends who influenced them to enter police work. There are few differences between Negro and white officers for other reasons given for the decision to enter police work. For both white and Negro officers, security of the job or an expression of always being interested in police work account for more than one-half of the decisions to enter police work. Indeed three-fourths of all white officers entered police work because of family or friends, an avowed long time interest in police work, or because of the security promised by the job. Less than one-half of the Negro officers entered for these reasons.

There are substantial differences among the cities as well. Washington, D. C. officers far less often than the officers in the other cities give security in the job as a reason for entering police work. While no officers in the other cities cited the economic attractiveness of the job as a reason for their decision, more than 10 per cent of the officers in D. C. did so.

What is surprising is that most officers do not mention either qualifications for the job or qualities of police work as their main reason for entering it (apart from the general statement that they always were interested in police work). This general absence of an interest in specific qualities of police work and of qualifications for it reflects, of course, a low degree of professionalization of police work itself. Perhaps some California police departments where junior college training programs prepare for police work might show a more 'professional' orientation among officers in their decision to enter police work.

That some other qualities of police work come to be valued after the officer enters the occupation is clear from Table 8. The most frequently chosen aspects of police work that are linked in comparison with other jobs are the variety in the job and a satisfaction that comes from working with people rather than objects. Again it is evident that officers do not see prestige as a characteristic of the job as few mention it. And indeed as Table 9 shows, the lack of public respect for police

Table 8: Per Cent Distribution of Characteristics Police Officers Give As To What Is Most Liked About Police Work Compared With Other Jobs: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Most Liked Characteristics Compared With Other Jobs										
	Work or Position Characteristics:						Satisfaction With:			Nothing Good About It	Total Per Cent
	Pay Fringe Benefits	Security of Job	Variety In Work	Responsibility of Position	Chance To Do Police Work	Prestige of Position	Working With People	Making Society Better	Men You Work With		
All Districts:	6	9	30	8	3	3	27	2	1	11	100
All white officers	5	10	31	8	2	3	26	2	1	13	101
All Negro officers	12	6	27	12	6	3	33	--	--	--	99
Boston:											
Dorchester	--	4	32	4	8	4	40	4	--	4	100
Roxbury	4	12	16	8	--	8	36	--	--	16	100
Chicago:											
Town Hall	--	17	50	--	--	--	22	6	--	5	100
Fillmore	13	6	25	19	6	--	18	--	--	13	100
Washington, D.C.:											
6	--	8	40	4	--	--	28	4	--	16	100
14	15	4	37	7	7	4	18	--	4	4	100
10	19	12	19	12	--	--	19	--	--	19	100
13	--	12	23	15	--	4	23	4	4	15	100

-20-

Table 9: Per Cent Distribution of Characteristics Police Officers Give As To What Is Least Liked About Police Work Compared With Other Jobs: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Least Liked Characteristics Compared With Other Jobs										
	Position or Work Characteristics:				System Characteristics:						Total Per Cent
	Hours or Work Schedule	Danger of Job	Salary and Fringe Benefits	Red Tape/Paper Work	Poor Promotion System	Questions Leadership or Supervision	Court or Others Restrict Police	Lack of Public Respect	No Family or Private Life	Can't Say	
All Districts:	36	2	7	1	2	10	7	23	2	10	100
All white officers	34	1	9	2	1	9	7	23	2	12	100
All Negro officers	44	6	--	--	3	11	3	25	3	6	101
Boston:											
Dorchester	32	--	16	4	4	12	--	16	4	12	100
Roxbury	24	--	8	--	4	12	--	32	--	20	100
Chicago:											
Town Hall	39	--	11	6	--	--	6	22	--	16	100
Fillmore	31	6	--	--	--	--	6	38	--	19	100
Washington, D.C.:											
6	52	--	--	4	--	8	8	12	--	16	100
14	44	4	4	4	--	11	15	15	--	3	100
10	23	--	11	--	--	12	19	35	--	--	100
13	38	4	4	--	4	19	--	12	8	11	100

-21-

officers is one of the main things that officers dislike about police work. Almost one-fourth of all Negro and white officers mention lack of public respect as one of the main things they least like about their job as compared with other jobs. Both a focusing on the lack of public respect and the demand for it evident in many of the responses of the police are indicative of problems in the professionalization of the police role. Police work is insufficiently professionalized to command that respect by simply being in the role and officers have too little professionalization to adopt neutrality toward the failure of clients (citizens) to extend respect.

That the day to day job characteristics are important to police officers as contrasted with the career characteristics is apparent from data in Tables 8 and 9. Like all shift workers, they voice substantial objection to the shift characteristics of the job.

A better picture of the characteristics of police work that appeal to police officers is provided by the ranking of factors in police work in Tables 10 and 11. At the same time the rankings are somewhat indicative of their satisfaction with the job as well. Officers were given several factors about police work and asked to rank order the three characteristics of the seven they most liked about police work. Among first choices, it is clear that both Negro and white officers selected "the feeling that comes from helping people" with greater frequency than any other factor. Forty per cent of the white officers and 56 per cent of the Negro officers gave this as their first choice. Job security and retirement plans and benefits were selected respectively as a first choice by about a fifth of all white but not Negro officers. Characteristics generally associated with the professions--the opportunity to make decisions on one's own and the prestige or respect one gets from the job are infrequently selected by officers. No doubt this stems from the fact that police work as presently organized gives the typical officer on patrol little opportunity

Table 10: Per Cent Distributions of First, Second, and Third Choices in What Police Officer Likes About Police Work by Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.*

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Things About the Position or Job:											
	The Pay			The Job Security			Retirement Plans and Benefits			The Prestige and Respect One Gets From the Job		
	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd
All Districts:												
All white officers	3	6	9	16	19	14	15	20	18	3	5	5
All Negro officers	1	4	6	20	18	13	16	21	16	3	5	4
	14	8	19	5	19	14	5	19	25	5	3	6
Boston:												
Dorchester	--	4	--	12	20	24	16	12	8	--	4	12
Roxbury	--	4	4	44	28	4	--	12	20	4	12	4
Chicago:												
Town Hall	--	--	6	17	25	6	17	22	22	--	17	--
Fillmore	6	6	13	6	19	12	13	19	6	6	6	--
Washington, D.C.:												
6	8	4	--	12	20	20	16	16	28	4	--	4
14	--	22	18	7	19	15	30	11	15	7	4	4
10	4	4	8	15	19	12	19	31	11	--	--	8
13	7	--	19	12	15	12	7	35	31	4	--	4

CONTINUED

Table 10: Per Cent Distributions of First, Second, and Third Choices in What Police Officer Likes About Police Work by Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.* (Continued)

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Things About Police Work:									Don't Know			Per Cent Total		
	The Feeling that Comes from Helping People			The Chance to Make Decisions on Your Own			The Variety in the Work								
	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd
All Districts:	43	15	12	4	12	12	15	21	25	1	2	5	100	100	100
All white officers	40	16	13	4	14	14	16	20	28	1	2	6	101	100	100
All Negro officers	56	14	11	3	6	14	8	28	8	3	3	3	99	100	100
Boston:															
Dorchester	60	16	4	4	24	12	8	20	40	--	--	--	100	100	100
Roxbury	52	16	16	--	12	8	--	16	28	--	--	16	100	100	100
Chicago:															
Town Hall	33	22	17	11	11	17	22	28	32	--	--	--	100	100	100
Fillmore	50	13	6	--	12	6	13	13	44	6	6	6	100	100	100
Washington, D.C.:															
6	28	24	16	4	8	12	28	28	16	--	--	4	100	100	100
14	48	11	11	--	7	22	7	22	15	--	--	--	100	100	100
10	39	8	11	8	12	8	11	19	23	--	4	--	100	100	100
13	35	15	14	4	12	12	31	23	8	4	7	19	100	100	100
										--	--	--	100	100	100

*This is a "forced choice" test.

*This is a "forced choice" item: "Here is a list of things some officers like about police work. (Hands Card) Would you please tell me which thing on this list you like best about police work? Which comes next? And which do you like third best?"

Table 11: Rank of Officer Choices of Things Most Liked About Police Work by Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Factors About Position:															
	The Pay				The Job Security				Retirement Plans and Benefits				The Prestige and Respect One Gets from the Job			
	1st	2nd	3rd	All	1st	2nd	3rd	All	1st	2nd	3rd	All	1st	2nd	3rd	All
All Districts:	6.5	6	6	6	2	4	3	4	3.5	2	2	3	6.5	7	7	7
All white officers	7	7	6	6.5	2	3	4.5	4	3.5	1	2	3	6	6	7	6.5
All Negro officers	2	5	2	5	5	2.5	3.5	6	5	2.5	1	2.5	5	7	7	7
Boston:																
Dorchester	6.5	6.5	7	7	3	2.5	2	3	2	5	5	5	6.5	6.5	3.5	6
Roxbury	5.5	7	6	7	2	1	6	2	5.5	5	2	4	3	5	6	5.5
Chicago:																
Town Hall	6	6.5	5.5	7	6	6.5	5.5	5	3	2.5	2	3	6	4	7	6
Fillmore	5	6.5	3	5	5	1	2	3	2.5	2	5	4	5	6.5	7	7
Washington, D.C.:																
6	5	6	7	6	3.5	3	2	4	2	4	1	3	6.5	7	6	7
14	6.5	1.5	2	5	4	3	4	4	2	4.5	4	2	4	7	7	7
10	6	6	7	6	3	2.5	2	4	2	1	3.5	1	7	6.5	5.5	7
13	4.5	6.5	3	6	3	3.5	4.5	4	4.5	1	1	1	6.5	7	7	7

CONTINUED

Table 11: Rank of Officer Choices of Things Most Liked About Police Work by Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer. (Continued)

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Factors About Work:													
	The Feeling that Comes From Helping People					The Chance to Make Decisions On Your Own					The Variety in the Work			
	1st	2nd	3rd	All		1st	2nd	3rd	All		1st	2nd	3rd	All
All Districts:														
All white officers	1	3	4.5	1		5	5	4.5	5		3.5	1	1	2
All Negro officers	1	4	4.5	1		5	5	3	5		3.5	2	1	2
	1	4	5	1		7	6	3.5	2.5		3	1	6	4
Boston:														
Dorchester	1	4	6	1		5	1	3.5	4		4	2.5	1	2
Roxbury	1	2.5	3	1		5.5	5	4	5.5		5.5	2.5	1	3
Chicago:														
Town Hall	1	2.5	3.5	2		4	5	3.5	4		2	1	1	1
Fillmore	1	3.5	5	2		7	5	5	6		2.5	3.5	1	1
Washington, D.C.:														
6	1	2	3.5	2		6.5	5	5	5		3.5	1	3.5	1
14	1	4.5	6	1		6.5	6	1	6		4	1.5	4	3
10	1	5	3.5	2		5	4	5.5	5		4	2.5	1	3
13	1	3.5	2	2		6.5	5	4.5	5		2	2	6	3

to make other than routine decisions on his own (though he does hold the important discretionary decision to arrest) and the prestige and respect offered police in their work clearly lie below officer expectations, this latter despite the fact that police work is one of the few occupations in the U. S. for which prestige has risen in the past 15 years.

Table 12 summarizes the per cent of officers who selected each of the seven factors as something liked about police work as a first, second, or third choice. Overall qualities of the work itself--working with people and variety in the work--are most often selected by officers. At least one-half of all officers, however, selected qualities of the job, either--the security and fringe benefits it offers. Again it is clear that the two factors that are least regarding about police work to officers today are the salary reward it offers and the prestige or respect increment one gets from the job. Interestingly enough the two are closely tied together in that higher pay would undoubtedly have an effect on the prestige of police work.

The morale in a department, the degree of satisfaction with ones work, and the kind of commitment one has to police work as a career all affect ones willingness to leave police work after entering. At the same time the decision to leave or not is affected by pragmatic considerations of personal and financial investments in ones job and opportunities to enter equally or more attractive kinds of work. It is difficult to assess which among these factors is more important in determining whether a man will consider leaving a job such as police work and which affect his decision to stay. Furthermore, the design of the study is such that no information is available on those who made a decision to leave and did so; information is available only on those who indicated they considered leaving and who at least for the time being have opted to stay. Reasons from this residual population, however, provide some indication of commitments to and satisfactions with police

Table 12: Per Cent of Police Officers Selecting Seven Things Liked About Police Work As A First, Second or Third Choice by Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Factors About Position:				Factors About Work:		
	Pay	Job Security	Retirement Plans and Benefits	Prestige and Respect One Gets from Job	Feeling That Comes from Helping People	Chance to Make Decisions on Your Own	Variety in the Work
All Districts:							
All white officers	18	49	53	13	70	28	61
All Negro officers	13	50	53	13	69	32	64
	42	39	50	14	81	50	44
Boston:							
Dorchester	4	56	38	16	80	40	68
Roxbury	8	76	32	20	84	20	44
Chicago:							
Town Hall	6	25	61	17	72	39	82
Fillmore	25	40	38	12	69	18	70
Washington, D.C.:							
6	12	52	60	8	68	24	72
14	40	41	56	15	70	29	44
10	16	46	61	8	58	28	53
13	26	39	73	8	64	28	62

work, even though it is not possible to assess them as separate factors nor whether they are the main reasons for wanting to leave or stay.

Tables 13 to 17 provide information on officer considerations about leaving police work or the department, their reasons for wanting to leave, and why they remained on the force. The data in these tables should not be taken as an indication of current dissatisfaction, however, since they relate considerations about leaving since the time the officer joined the force.

Somewhat under one-half of all officers indicate they considered leaving the police department after becoming a police officer. Negroes were somewhat more likely to have considered leaving than white officers, but the differences are not great. The single most important reason for wanting to leave for other work is the pay offered police officers--31 per cent indicated considering leaving for that reason. More white than Negro officers considered leaving for that reason. A surprising minority of 12 per cent indicate their main reason for wanting to leave is that they have lost interest in police work. About 10 per cent give as their main reason dissatisfaction with the shift work and 11 per cent voice dissatisfaction with lack of public respect of them in their work. All in all, the pay, hours, and promotion conditions of the job account for about one-half of all expressed dissatisfaction--conditions that are in theory subject to administrative control by the department.

Officers who say they considered leaving the department were specifically asked whether they were in any way dissatisfied with the opportunity for advancement or with the men with whom they worked on assignment. When specifically asked, almost one-half of the officers who considered leaving indicate some dissatisfaction with the opportunity for advancement. Almost three-fifths of all Negro officers and four-fifths of all white officers who considered leaving indicated dissatisfaction with the opportunities to advance in the department. Roughly one-fourth of all officers also indicated some dissatisfaction in

Table 13: Per Cent of Officers Who Have Considered Leaving the Department and Per Cent Distribution of Main Reasons They Give for Wanting to Leave for Some Other Kind of Work by Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Per Cent Thought About Leaving	Main Reason for Wanting to Leave:					
		Job Conditions:			Personal/Job Reasons:		
		Better Hours or Schedule	Better Pay	Promotion Too Slow	Lost Interest In Police Work	Insecure About Future	Wife/Family Objects
All Districts:	47	10	31	7	12	2	7
All white officers	45	10	36	5	10	3	7
All Negro officers	53	16	21	10	16	--	5
Boston:							
Dorchester	52	15	46	--	--	8	8
Roxbury	32	--	75	--	--	--	--
Chicago:							
Town Hall	22	--	25	25	25	--	25
Fillmore	44	14	43	--	--	--	14
Washington, D.C.:							
6	52	15	23	8	15	8	--
14	41	18	9	9	9	--	9
10	62	12	19	12	25	--	--
13	62	--	32	6	13	--	13

-30-

CONTINUED

Table 13: Per Cent of Officers Who Have Considered Leaving the Department and Per Cent Distribution of Main Reasons They Give for Wanting to Leave for Some Other Kind of Work by Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer. (Continued)

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Main Reason for Wanting to Leave:			All Other Reasons	Per Cent Total
	Changes in Society/Dept.				
	Public Disrespect and Apathy	Social Conditions of Work/ City	Politics In- and Outside Dept.		
All Districts:	11	1	7	12	100
All white officers	11	2	8	7	99
All Negro officers	11	--	--	22	101
Boston:					
Dorchester	15	--	8	--	100
Roxbury	13	--	--	12	100
Chicago:					
Town Hall	--	--	--	--	100
Fillmore	14	--	--	14	99
Washington, D.C.:					
6	--	--	8	23	100
14	27	--	9	9	99
10	12	6	12	--	98
13	6	--	6	24	100

-31-

Table 14: Per Cent Among Officers Who Have Considered Leaving Department Who Expressed Some Dissatisfaction With Opportunity to Advance and/or With Men With Whom They Were Working for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Per Cent Thought About Leaving	Dissatisfied With:	
		Opportunity for Advancement	Men With Whom He Was Working
All Districts:	47	46	27
All white officers	45	40	23
All Negro officers	53	58	31
Boston:			
Dorchester	52	46	23
Roxbury	32	22	11
Chicago:			
Town Hall	22	50	25
Fillmore	44	57	29
Washington, D.C.:			
6	52	54	39
14	41	18	9
10	52	57	25
13	62	50	38

Table 15: Per Cent of Police Officers Who Have Not Considered Leaving the Force and Per Cent Distribution of Main Reasons They Give for Remaining on the Force for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Per Cent Never Considered Leaving	Main Reason for Wanting to Stay:							All Other Reasons	Don't Know	Per Cent Total
		Job Considerations:			Personal Reasons:			Possible Rewards:			
		Like the Work	Good Pay	Security or Retirement Benefits	Ties to Community	Not Qualified for Other Work	Too Old to Change	Chance To Get Ahead			
All Districts:	53	19	10	32	5	6	1	1	4	12	100
All white officers	55	27	8	36	6	6	1	--	4	12	100
All Negro officers	47	33	17	22	--	6	--	5	5	12	100
Boston:											
Dorchester	48	31	8	39	8	--	--	--	--	16	100
Roxbury	68	18	--	47	12	12	--	--	6	6	99
Chicago:											
Town Hall	78	37	--	44	--	14	--	--	5	--	100
Fillmore	56	40	10	30	--	--	--	--	10	10	100
Washington, D.C.:											
6	48	36	14	29	--	--	--	--	--	21	100
14	59	28	17	17	11	--	5	5	5	12	100
10	48	9	27	18	9	9	--	--	--	27	99
13	38	18	9	46	--	18	--	--	--	9	100

Table 16: Per Cent Distribution of Main Reasons Officers Who Considered Leaving the Department Give for Not Leaving the Force for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Negative Factors in Changing Jobs				Positive Factors in Work			All Other	Per Cent Total
	Risk of Financial Security Too Great	No Good Opportunity	Lack Proper Qualifications for Other Jobs	Risk of Change or Security	Non-financial Rewards of Job Outweigh Financial	My Responsibility to Stay			
All Districts:	52	3	6	11	12	1	15	100	
All white officers	55	4	5	8	12	1	14	100	
All Negro officers	37	--	11	21	11	--	21	101	
Boston:									
Dorchester	54	--	8	8	15	8	7	100	
Roxbury	56	--	--	--	22	--	22	100	
Chicago:									
Town Hall	50	--	25	25	--	--	--	100	
Fillmore	43	--	14	--	14	--	29	100	
Washington, D.C.:									
6	46	8	8	8	15	--	15	100	
14	55	18	9	9	--	--	9	100	
10	57	6	--	13	12	--	12	100	
13	44	6	6	13	13	--	19	101	

Table 17: Per Cent of Officers Who Considered Leaving the Department and Regarded Retirement or/and Friends on the Force as Factors Influencing Their Decision to Remain by Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Per Cent Thought About Leaving	Of Those Considered Leaving Per Cent Who Considered:		Per Cent Actually Looked for Another Job
		Retirement Benefits Influenced Decision to Stay	Friends in the Department Influenced Decision to Stay	
All Districts:	47	47	19	31
All white officers	45	49	21	29
All Negro officers	53	26	11	37
Boston:				
Dorchester	52	39	15	39
Roxbury	32	44	44	11
Chicago:				
Town Hall	22	100	33	25
Fillmore	44	29	29	57
Washington, D.C.:				
6	52	39	15	31
14	41	36	9	27
10	52	57	12	32
13	62	57	23	25

working with particular men in the department as a consideration in considering leaving. The proportion is somewhat greater for Negro than white officers; almost a third of all Negro officers who considered leaving expressed some dissatisfaction in working with particular men on assignment.

Among the three police departments, officers in Chicago were somewhat less likely to have thought about leaving the department than were officers in Boston and they were considerably less likely to have considered so than were officers in Washington, D. C. If considerations of leaving a department are taken as a measure of job dissatisfaction and morale, then the greatest morale and job dissatisfaction problems lie in the D. C. department.

Some indication of what holds men to police work can be gained by examining the reasons officers give for wanting to stay in police work when they have never thought about leaving as compared with the reasons officers give for staying when they have thought about leaving the department. The most striking difference is that 29 per cent of the officers who never thought about leaving the department indicate they stay in police work because they like it. No officer who elected to stay after considering leaving specifically mentioned liking the job as a reason for wanting to stay, though 12 per cent felt that there were rewards in police work that outweighed the financial losses they potentially sustain by remaining in police work.

What may be even more striking to some is that a substantial proportion of officers focus on the financial aspects of police work as reasons for staying. Among those who wanted to leave, 52 per cent felt that they risk too much financial security by leaving the department while of those who never considered leaving, 32 per cent mention the job security and retirement benefits as attractive features and another 10 per cent appear satisfied with their pay as police officers. When inquired specifically whether retirement benefits influenced

their decision to stay in the department, 47 per cent of all officers who considered leaving said that it did. By way of contrast, only 19 per cent felt that friends in the department were influential in their decision to stay. Again it seems clear that the personal networks in police departments are not major elements overall in retaining men in police work.

There no doubt is a selective factor operating in police work such that those who leave are willing to risk financial security. Such self-selection undoubtedly results in police departments being left with a disproportionate number of persons who are "security" oriented. Whether correlatively this means that police departments lose a kind of talent that is willing to risk opportunity for advancement and greater rewards elsewhere is not known. Studies of job movement out of police work suggest that job shifts out of police work are not necessarily more rewarding in terms of security or financial rewards.

From Table 16 it also is evident that difficulties in changing jobs is more of a factor in the decision to stay in police work than are rewarding factors about police work. Almost three-fourths of all officers who decided to stay, stayed because they did not want to risk rewards by leaving, that they saw no good opportunity to gain by leaving, or that they lacked the proper qualifications for preferred jobs. Given the fact that these officers comprise almost one-half of all officers in these districts, about one-fourth of all the officers in these police districts are in police work because they perceive no viable alternatives to it.

If one regards the reasons officers give for staying in police work whether or not they considered leaving at some time, it seems obvious that the rewards attached to the job, as in most occupations, are a major factor in considerations about remaining in that kind of work or in a particular job. Were police work to permit more ready transfer of fringe benefits, undoubtedly job turnover in police departments

would be much greater.

Considerations to leave the department are not entirely "thought processes" of officers. Table 17 indicates that 31 per cent of all officers who considered leaving the department actively looked for other employment. It would be of interest to know whether this group of officers differs from those who actually left the department voluntarily for other employment, particularly with a view to knowing whether those who remain are less employable in the labor market.

It is commonly assumed that police work is different from other occupations in a number of important respects, particularly in that it involves a shift work schedule and that the job involves risk of physical violence against the officer. Shift work is not in itself peculiar to the police occupation. Unlike much shift work, however, police work has additional schedule problems, forcing rotation for daily and monthly periods as well. Police officers are not unlike many shift workers, nonetheless, in their complaints about the hours they work and of how their work schedule interferes with their social life and their performance on the job. What is more, although police work ranks among the more hazardous occupations, it has become less dangerous with time and in this respect.

It should be noted in the previous section that officers do not mention with any frequency the hazardous nature of their work as a factor with a police career. On the other hand, officers mentioned the danger of police work less than they liked about it; Negro officers were more likely than white officers to remark about the danger of the work, yet only 6 per cent of all officers mentioned it as the characteristic they least liked. Officers did not mention the threat to their lives as a factor in their considering other

Nonetheless, officers do mention that their wives are bothered by a fear for the safety of their husband in his work; 37 per cent of all officers said their wife was concerned about their safety while at work. More of the officers in high crime rate areas of Washington, D. C. mentioned this as a concern of their wife than did officers in other precincts.

Officers more commonly mentioned that being a police officer affects their social life and that of their family in other ways; 36 per cent of all officers believe their wife and children have some difficulty in being friends with others because of their being a police officer. There are few differences by race of officer, but officers in the white areas of Boston and Chicago were more likely to mention such difficulties. The main factor officers mention as affecting the social life of their families (Table 18) is their own work schedule. Almost one-half of the officers who said their wife and children experience some difficulty in being friends with others mentioned their own work schedule as the reason why it was difficult for them. Another 22 per cent mentioned the negative image of police officers as a factor in this difficulty for the family; more Negro than white officers felt that way.

Mention has been made of the fact that police officer's wives are most bothered by fear of safety for their husband in his work (Table 19). Only a slightly smaller proportion--34 per cent--believe their wife also is bothered by their work schedule. These seem to be the two principal factors then that concern police officer's wives in the view of their husbands.

Police officers themselves believe that being a police officer affects them in some ways in their off-duty behavior. Three-fourths of all police officers feel they must keep up their reputation while off duty (Table 20). Furthermore, about an equal proportion state that being a police officer has changed their social life. For the most part, however, the main way it affects their social life is a consequence of their work schedule restricting the amount of time they have for

Table 18: Per Cent Distribution of Reasons Why Being A Police Officer Makes It Difficult for Wife and Children to be Friends With Others: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.^{a/}

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Per Cent Believing It Is		Reasons Why It Is Difficult for Wife and Children:					Total Per Cent
	Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Work Schedule	Danger of Job	Live Up To Ideal of Policeman	Negative Evaluations of Policemen	All Other	
All Districts:	19	17	46	4	15	22	13	100
All white officers	19	19	50	3	14	22	11	100
All Negro officers	17	13	--	18	27	37	18	100
Boston:								
Dorchester	32	12	28	--	18	36	18	100
Roxbury	16	8	17	--	17	50	17	101
Chicago:								
Town Hall	39	6	37	--	13	37	13	100
Fillmore	6	29	50	--	--	25	25	100
Washington, D.C.:								
6	8	15	67	17	17	--	--	101
14	26	12	39	8	31	15	8	101
10	8	24	75	--	12	--	12	99
13	15	31	59	8	16	8	8	99

^{a/} There are on the average only 10 officers per precinct who believe it is difficult for their wife or/and children to be friends with others; precinct percentage differences are, therefore, subject to high sampling variability.

Table 19: Per Cent Distribution of "Other Things" That Bother Officer's Wife About His Being A Police Officer: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Fear For His Safety	Being Left Alone At Night	His Work Schedule	Lack of Contact With Children	His Income	All Other	No Wife	Total Per Cent
All Districts:	37	2	34	1	*	11	15	100
All white officers	37	3	34	1	1	10	14	100
All Negro officers	42	--	31	--	--	8	19	100
Boston:								
Dorchester	32	--	32	--	--	28	8	100
Roxbury	36	--	40	--	--	12	12	100
Chicago:								
Town Hall	33	--	44	6	--	6	11	100
Fillmore	6	--	56	--	--	13	25	100
Washington, D.C.:								
6	27	4	50	--	--	--	19	100
14	44	11	26	--	--	--	19	100
10	52	--	16	4	--	12	16	100
13	54	--	19	--	4	15	8	100

*Less than 0.5 per cent

Table 20: Per Cent Distribution of How Police Officers Perceive Their Social Life Is Affected by Being A Police Officer.

Factors in Social Life	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
When off duty, do you feel you must act in a way that keeps up your reputation as a police officer?			
Yes	75	74	81
In what ways does this affect your social life?			
Restraints on how he behaves	11	13	3
Restraints on where he goes	9	8	14
Restraints on choice of with whom he goes	2	1	3
General restriction of social life	5	4	8
No restriction on social life	70	71	68
How has being a police officer changed your social life?			
Not changed in any way	28	26	36
Work schedule restricts time for it	46	50	25
Limits where he can go	4	4	3
Limits with whom he can go	4	4	6
Unspecified limitations	10	8	17
Other limitations	6	6	3

social life. This is a common complaint of all shift workers since evening work restricts the social life to particular hours of daylight or to "off" days. More to the point, days off are generally patterned different for police than for most shift work, thereby limiting social contacts severely on week-ends and holidays.

Only 8 per cent of all officers said that being a police officer changed where they could go and with whom they could go. A somewhat larger proportion (11 per cent) said that being a police officer had some effect on how they behave; 9 per cent said it restrained them from going some places and 2 per cent said it affected with whom they could go places. Yet overall, most police officers emphasize that the main restrictions are not on behavior, choices of places to go, or of friends. They rather maintain that they must behave within certain general limits that sustain their reputation as a police officer. In that sense police officers are more like most professionals who behave in keeping with a reputation of themselves in their work role. The seeming contradiction is more apparent than real. Behaving in accordance with a general ideal of oneself as in maintaining a professional reputation is not generally viewed as restraining or restrictive of how one behaves, where one goes, or with whom one goes.

Officer Satisfaction with His Job

Satisfaction in work involves a rather large number of attributes that relate to the salary and perquisites of the job, to the specific nature of the assignment and relations with others in it, to one's opportunity to move ahead and one's rate of movement, and to conditions of work. Not all of these features of police work were investigated in the survey. In this section the major features of salary and service rewards, the opportunity for, and rate of, promotion, the character of supervision, and of how the rules and regulations of the department affect the officer are examined in terms of officer

satisfaction with them.

The large majority of police officers are somewhat dissatisfied with their rate of pay (see Table 21). Only one per cent is completely satisfied with their salary; 27 per cent are generally satisfied with it. Almost a third are not at all satisfied with their salary. Police officers in Chicago are least satisfied with their rate of pay despite the fact that they enjoy about the same pay scale as officers in the other departments. Negro officers are somewhat more likely than white officers to be not at all satisfied with their salary.

Despite their dissatisfaction with their rate of pay, police officers generally entertain rather modest aspirations for starting salaries in the department--the modal recommendation for a starting salary is \$6501-\$7500. Fewer than five per cent of the officers believe it should be as high as \$8500; no Negro officer set a starting salary that high. Given aspirations for professional status, salary aspirations of police officers are generally closer to the salary of public school teachers than to that for other professionals.

Any rank system of promotion has built within it restricted opportunities for movement in the system since the most common ranks are low in status and pay within the system. For police departments, the common rank is that of patrolman; the large majority of police officers at any time are patrolman and a substantial majority of any cohort never attains beyond the rank of patrolman unless there is considerable attrition from the cohort.

For this reason it is difficult to assess the actual opportunities for promotion in a system beyond that built into the rank system. Since one-half of all police officers believe their opportunities for promotion are excellent or good, it seems that they are more optimistic than the rank system provides opportunities for advancement. That one-half regard their opportunities as fair or poor is not at all surprising

Table 21: Per Cent Distribution of Satisfaction With Salary for Police Officers in Eight Precincts of Three Cities and by Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Would you say that you are:				How much (salary) do you think a beginning officer in the department ought to get now?						Total Per Cent
	Com-pletely Satis-fied	Gener-ally Satis-fied	Not Too Satis-fied	Not At All Satis-fied	\$6500 or Less	\$6501 to \$7500	\$7501 to \$8500	\$8501 to \$9500	\$9501 or More	Can't Say	
All Districts:											
All white officers	1	27	40	32	22	47	24	3	2	2	100
All Negro officers	3	26	42	30	24	44	23	3	3	3	100
Boston:											
Dorchester Roxbury	4	48	28	20	60	8	12	--	8	12	100
Chicago:											
Town Hall Fillmore	--	11	39	50	33	33	28	6	--	--	100
Washington, D.C.:											
6	4	24	56	16	8	68	20	4	--	--	100
14	--	22	37	41	19	59	18	--	4	--	100
10	--	19	42	39	15	62	19	4	--	--	100
13	4	42	23	31	8	69	19	--	4	--	100

since it is likely that at least that many will never attain beyond the rank of patrolman.

Negro officers are inclined to view their opportunities for promotion less optimistically than do white officers. Yet 4 of every 10 Negro officers regard their changes as good or excellent. Only half as many Negro as white officers believe their chances are excellent, however (Table 22).

Officers are likely to express dissatisfaction with the promotion exams. More officers express some dissatisfaction than satisfaction with the promotion exams in their department. There is striking variation in satisfaction with promotion exams by city, however. Officers in Washington, D. C. are least likely to be acquainted with the examination system and more likely to be dissatisfied with it if they know it than are officers in Boston and Chicago, though the difference from Chicago is less substantial.

Table 23 provides information on officers assessment of the specific merit of promotion exams. While about one-fourth did not believe they could assess their merit, the remaining officers are not in substantial agreement as to their merit. Another fourth believes they are good as they are. Roughly 10 to 15 per cent mention the inequality of opportunity to get ahead as a consequence of the exams, the arbitrary or unfair nature of them, and their great reliance on rote learning or memory (see Table 23). Some of these are not uncommon complaints for any form of examination. Such complaints should be quite evident for examinations that have as important consequences for advancement as do promotion examinations in police departments. Perhaps the surprising fact is that police officers regard promotion examinations with as much satisfaction as they do, given their centrality in deciding an officer's 'fate' in the system.

Table 24 summarizes officer satisfaction with service ratings. The general picture is not unlike that for promotion examinations with only slightly less than one-half of all

Table 22: Per Cent Distribution of How Police Officers Assess Promotion Opportunities and Exams in Their Department for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Promotion opportunities are:				How satisfied are you with promotion exams?					Total Per Cent
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Completely Satisfied	Generally Satisfied	Not Too Satisfied	Not At All Satisfied	Don't Know	
All Districts:										100
All white officers	12	38	26	24	9	29	20	24	18	100
All Negro officers	13	39	26	22	10	32	19	23	16	100
Boston:										100
Dorchester Roxbury	20	32	28	16	16	60	12	4	8	100
Chicago:										100
Town Hall Fillmore	6	44	22	28	6	44	17	33	--	100
Washington, D.C.:										100
6	8	44	24	24	4	12	28	12	44	100
14	15	37	18	30	4	11	26	22	37	100
10	--	35	39	23	--	12	27	46	15	100
13	8	46	15	31	19	19	12	23	27	100

Table 23: Per Cent Distribution of Officer Assessments of Merit of Promotion Exams for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and by Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Promotion Exams:							Total Per Cent
	Give Unequal Opportunity to Get Ahead	Are Arbitrary or Unfairly Prepared	Place Too Much Emphasis On Memory	Given Too Infrequently	Should be Sole Criterion for Promotion	Are Good As They Are	Don't Know About Them	
All Districts:	12	14	10	3	7	27	27	100
All white officers	12	12	13	3	6	29	25	100
All Negro officers	11	22	--	3	11	17	36	100
Boston:								
Dorchester	--	4	28	--	--	48	20	100
Roxbury	8	4	16	--	--	52	20	100
Chicago:								
Town Hall	28	17	6	--	--	44	5	100
Fillmore	13	13	6	6	--	25	37	100
Washington, D.C.:								
6	12	8	8	4	16	12	40	100
14	11	11	--	11	15	7	45	100
10	27	15	15	4	8	4	27	100
13	--	35	4	--	11	23	28	101

CONTINUED
2 OF 3

Table 24: Per Cent Distribution of Officer Assessment of Service Ratings in His Department by Race of Officer.

Service Rating Assessments	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
How satisfied are you with service ratings?			
Completely satisfied	11	11	11
Generally satisfied	36	35	39
Not too satisfied	15	12	28
Not at all satisfied	29	32	17
Can't say	9	10	5
Fairness of ratings:			
Ratings are fair/just	25	27	14
Ratings are unfair/unjust	28	28	25
Ratings affect officer adversely	*	1	--
Ratings affect officer positively	8	5	19
Officer doesn't comment on fairness	39	39	42
Negative qualities of ratings:			
Standards are unjust or discriminatory	9	6	20
Ratings based on insufficient observation/knowledge	18	18	19
Personality conflicts affect ratings	6	7	--
Favoritism in ratings	8	9	6
Other negative features	6	6	5
Can't say	11	11	11
No negative qualities to ratings	42	43	39
Has officer received merit citations or awards?			
Yes	56	57	47

*0.5 per cent or less

officers expressing some satisfaction with the system of service ratings. Officers who comment on the fairness of the ratings are roughly equally divided on the justness of them and indeed 42 per cent of the officers did not mention any negative quality for the ratings. The main dissatisfaction with the ratings stems from the fact that they are personal judgements. Officers are well aware of the fact that the extent of the acquaintance a superior officer has of an officer can affect his rating. Such ratings are less likely to have universalistic criteria than do examinations. Hence officers mention the fact that personality conflicts or favoritism enter into such ratings or that they are based on special discriminatory standards or upon insufficient knowledge and observation; 41 per cent of the negative criticism of ratings dealt with this general absence of universalistic criteria for service ratings.

Given both the rank structure of police departments and its bureaucratic organization around a supervision rather than a professional model of decision making, the supervisor and supervision is central to an operating police department. Almost a third of all officers are not satisfied with the supervision system. While there are no substantial differences among the cities, there is somewhat greater satisfaction with the supervision system in Chicago than in the other cities. No officers in Chicago said they were not at all satisfied with the supervision given them. Indeed since objectively there is more supervision of officers in Chicago than in the other two cities, it is apparent that provision for supervision does not entail dissatisfaction with it. Officers in Washington, D. C. were most critical of the supervision given them and most likely to mention factors that could be improved about their supervision. They were the most likely to criticize the kind of leadership in their supervisory system and to criticize their supervisors for failure to support them in their work role (see Table 25). Negro and white officers do not differ substantially in their ratings of satisfaction with the supervision system.

Table 25: Per Cent Distribution of How Satisfied Police Officers Are With Supervisors in Their Department for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and by Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Would you say that you are:				Things that could be improved about supervision:						Total Per Cent
	Com-pletely Satis-fied	Gener-ally Satis-fied	Not Too Satis-fied	Not At All Satis-fied	Noth-ing in Parti-cular	Give Men More Sup-port	Provide More Leader-ship	Seek Advice of Men	More Con-structive Atti-tude	All Other	
All Districts:	18	51	27	4	39	14	14	10	7	16	100
All white officers	19	51	27	3	41	15	13	9	6	16	100
All Negro officers	14	53	25	8	31	8	17	14	8	22	100
Boston:											
Dorchester Roxbury	28 12	36 64	32 24	4 --	52 48	-- 8	12 4	12 4	-- 16	24 20	100 100
Chicago:											
Town Hall Fillmore	45 19	33 69	22 12	-- --	61 50	6 13	-- 6	-- 13	11 --	22 18	100 100
Washington, D.C.:											
6	8	28	60	4	8	20	36	4	8	24	100
14	8	56	22	11	26	19	19	15	7	15	101
10	8	65	23	4	39	23	8	--	15	15	100
13	15	62	15	8	23	23	27	15	4	8	100

An attempt was made to assess some particular characteristics of the supervisory system in the departments. In general, there appears to be considerable dissatisfaction with the communication with the supervisor, particularly with the capacity of men to affect or influence their supervisors by suggestions about policies and procedures. More than one-half of all officers do not believe they can influence their supervisors and 65 per cent of them seldom or never make suggestions to their supervisors about police policies or procedures. Indeed almost one-third never made any suggestions to their supervisors. See Table 26.

While it cannot be assumed that all suggestions are equally valuable nor that officer suggestions are necessarily in the best interest of the system, the general characterization of relations with supervisory officers would not permit a very high professionalization of the police work role. Nor are the changes in rules or procedures that officers would make (see Table 27) largely changes in the direction of more professionalization of their work role. Only 7 per cent expressed dissatisfaction with the paramilitary features of police departments, features that hinder effective professional police work in their judgement. Most other recommended changes (see Table 27) would or should affect their professionalization very little.

Officer Satisfaction with His Assignment

The officers sampled for this study are those assigned to the command at the district or precinct level of police departments. Excluded therefore are all officers assigned to specialized units whether staff or command functions. Detectives or plainclothesmen attached to a detective division of headquarters therefore are excluded unless they are assigned to the command of a precinct or district. Sixty-five per cent of the officers in the sample are assigned to the routine patrol

Table 26: Per Cent Distribution of Officer Assessment of Supervisors and Their Behavior Toward Them by Race of Officer.

Assessment of Supervisors and of Own Behavior Toward Them	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
How often in 1965 and 1966 have you suggested a different or better way of doing police work to your supervisory officers?			
Never	37	36	44
Once or twice	30	30	28
Three to five times	10	9	14
Six to ten times	6	8	--
More than ten times	17	17	14
How often do your supervisory officers go along with your suggestions of different or better ways of doing police work?			
Very rarely or never	26	24	36
Occasionally	16	17	11
About half of the time	8	9	3
Almost all of the time	16	16	13
Has no way of knowing	3	4	3
Never gives suggestions	31	30	44
When you don't like some policy or procedure concerning police work, how often do you tell your opinion to one of your supervisory officers?			
Very rarely or never	38	38	42
Occasionally	27	27	28
About half of the time	6	6	3
Almost all of the time	29	29	27
How satisfied are you with the influence men at your rank have on how things are done in the department?			
Completed satisfied	6	7	2
Generally satisfied	35	36	28
Not too satisfied	26	25	31
Not at all satisfied	32	30	39
Can't say	1	2	--

Table 27: Per Cent Distribution of Changes in Rules or Procedures That Police Officers Would Like to See Made for Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and by Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	What changes/improvements could be made?							Total Per Cent
	None	Changes "In Paper Work"	Court Time Policies	Policies About Hours/Assignments	Promotion Policies	Para-military Organizations	All Other	
All Districts:	43	12	1	10	2	7	25	100
All white officers	44	12	1	8	1	6	28	100
All Negro officers	36	11	3	17	6	11	26	100
Boston:								
Dorchester	52	12	--	12	4	--	20	100
Roxbury	60	8	--	12	4	--	16	100
Chicago:								
Town Hall	61	6	--	--	--	11	22	100
Fillmore	56	--	--	13	--	--	31	100
Washington, D.C.:								
6	32	16	4	12	--	16	20	100
14	30	15	--	19	--	7	29	100
10	23	15	8	12	4	--	38	100
13	34	15	--	4	4	23	20	100

function; 16 per cent performed duties in the station; another 10 per cent were supervisory or command officers; 9 per cent were plainclothesmen.

While there are differences among the officers then in the kind of assignment they have in the district, all share a common orientation toward being assigned to a particular district. It is common within police departments to rank districts according to their "desirability." Within the departments studied, the more desirable assignment was to Dorchester in Boston, to Town Hall in Chicago and to District # 6 in Washington, D. C. An attempt was made to assess how officers felt about their assignment to a particular district, given differences among them in their work role in that district. This information is provided in Tables 28 to 34.

Officers assigned to the "more desirable" district in each of the cities were more likely than those assigned to "less desirable" districts to say that the kind of officer required for their district was the same as that for any other district in the city (see Table 28). Officers assigned to the high crime rate Negro area studied in each city were unlikely to say that an officer needed no special qualifications for assignment to the district. And only 6 per cent of all Negro as compared with 18 per cent of all white officers felt that an officer for their district should have the same qualifications as an officer for any other district.

There is a seemingly universalistic quality to this response of officers that the kind of policeman necessary for their district is the same as that for any other district. And indeed some of the main characteristics that officers mention as necessary for a person working in their district are ones that professional police officers would argue characterizes all professional police work, e.g., the ability to meet and work with people, impartiality, fairness, and tolerance in dealing with citizens, or an intelligent officer who exercises judgement responsibly. Yet it seems clear that officers who work in Negro

Table 28: Per Cent Distribution of Main Characteristic Police Officers Attribute to Kind of Officer It Takes to Work in the District (Precinct) to Which He is Assigned in Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Human Relations Characteristics:			Personal Characteristics:				All Other	Don't Know	Per Cent Total
	Same As Any Other District	Able to Meet/Work With/or Understand People	Impartial, Fair, Tolerant	One Who Can Deal With Negroes	Intelligent, Good Judgment	Tough, Aggressive Officer	Able to Take A Lot	Low Ambition		
All Districts:	15	19	10	4	16	8	12	2	8	100
All white officers	18	17	9	3	15	9	14	1	7	100
All Negro officers	6	28	11	6	17	8	11	3	8	100
Boston:										
Dorchester Roxbury	20 12	12 16	-- 8	-- 4	20 12	8 --	16 36	-- --	12 4	100 100
Chicago:										
Town Hall Fillmore	40 6	17 13	-- 31	-- 6	11 25	11 6	11 --	-- --	7 --	100 100
Washington, D.C.:										
6	24	12	12	--	24	--	4	4	8	100
14	11	26	4	11	11	7	7	4	19	100
10	12	27	12	4	12	12	15	--	6	100
13	4	27	15	4	15	19	4	4	8	100

areas are more likely than those working in the white areas to mention "interpersonal" or "human relations" qualities of officers as necessary for working with Negro citizens. This difference could be a consequence of selective assignment of white officers to such high crime Negro residential areas.

In the aggregate, officers were somewhat more likely to mention qualities that helped the officer "alone" in his work and not the citizen--he should be a tough or aggressive officer (8 per cent), one who is 'able to take a lot' (12 per cent) or one who is intelligent or uses good judgement (16 per cent).

But almost equally prominent among the characteristics mentioned as necessary for police work in the district to which they were assigned are characteristics for good relations with the citizens in the area, or "interpersonal characteristics." Such characteristics are more often emphasized as necessary for an officer in the high crime rate Negro than white areas.

In all areas with a high proportion of Negroes some officers mentioned specifically the necessity for having an officer who could deal with Negroes (see Table 28). Yet overall officers were more likely to mention universalistic attributes such as the ability to meet and work with or understand people (19 per cent of all officers) or the capacity to be impartial, fair, or tolerant (10 per cent). These characteristics are generally less often mentioned as necessary for officers assigned to white than Negro areas in each city, and they are more often emphasized as main characteristics of officers by Negro than white officers.

Police officers commonly assess territories to be policed in terms of the 'action' there. Generally younger officers prefer to be 'where the action is' while older officers express a preference for the 'quiet' district. Since assignments to police districts tend to be made on that basis, there is a somewhat higher average age for officers in 'quiet' than

'active' districts. While that is the case for the districts in this study, there are substantial differences in age of officers among the cities with Boston police officers having the highest average age, a consequence of a tenure and retirement system that coerces retention of officers.

Recall that the areas selected were high crime Negro and white areas in these cities, though the Negro areas had higher average crime rates than the white areas. To a degree, comparison across these cities is artifactual however since the question as posed to officers was relative to the district and area of the city. Except for districts # 6 and # 14 in Washington, D. C., more than one-half of all the officers said they were assigned to a beat or territory that was more active than others in the city (see Table 29). In the aggregate, nevertheless, 71 per cent of all officers would choose to be assigned to that district; only 18 per cent would select assignment elsewhere. There is considerably more desire to be assigned elsewhere on the part of officers in all D. C. precincts. For Boston and Chicago, this desire for reassignment is much greater for officers assigned to the Negro 'active' than the white 'active' districts. There are no substantial differences among white and Negro officers in their desire for reassignment (Table 29).

Given the strong preference for remaining in their present assignment, it is of some interest to learn what it is that officers like about the district (see Table 30). The two dominant reasons for liking a district are that it is an 'active' district or that the officer 'knows the people well', each being selected by 29 per cent of the officers. This is not surprising since it is altogether consistent with the preferences officers express for police work as compared with other jobs. Recall that in Table 8, 27 per cent of all officers said the thing they most liked about police work was the 'satisfaction in working with people' and that 30 per cent said the thing they most liked was 'variety in the work.'

Table 29: Per Cent Distributions of Officers Characterization of Beat to Which Assigned and Preference for Assignment to A Police District by Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	How is the beat/area to which you are assigned?					If you had your choice, would you rather work in the district to which you are assigned or somewhere else?				
	Fairly Quiet	About Average	More Active	Can't Say	Total Per Cent	Assigned to Same District	Hard to Say	Assigned Somewhere Else	Can't Say	Total Per Cent
All Districts:	12	26	56	6	100	71	9	18	2	100
All white officers	11	24	58	7	100	69	10	18	3	100
All Negro officers	14	31	50	5	100	78	8	14	--	100
Boston:										
Dorchester	8	28	60	4	100	76	16	8	--	100
Roxbury	4	4	92	--	100	68	--	32	--	100
Chicago:										
Town Hall	6	33	56	5	100	89	--	6	6	100
Fillmore	--	13	81	6	100	81	--	19	--	100
Washington, D.C.:										
6	31	39	19	11	100	62	8	19	11	100
14	15	48	26	11	100	63	11	26	--	100
10	12	8	68	12	100	56	24	20	--	100
13	15	27	58	--	100	69	15	15	--	100

Table 30: Per Cent Distribution of Main Thing Police Officer Likes About the District to Which He Is Assigned: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police, District, and Race of Officer	Likes Nothing About It	Per Cent Distribution for Officers With 'Likes':										Total Per Cent
		Characteristics of People or District					Characteristics of Work, Officers, Officials					
		Knows People Well	People Don't Cause Trouble	Good Class of People	Active District	Officials Are Good	Men Are Good	Easy to Work Here	All Other	Can't Say		
All Districts:	8	29	1	7	29	9	13	2	6	4	100	
All white officers	9	26	1	6	35	9	15	1	4	3	100	
All Negro officers	6	41	--	9	12	12	3	3	14	6	100	
Boston:												
Dorchester	12	45	--	5	36	--	9	--	--	5	100	
Roxbury	12	23	--	5	40	14	14	--	4	--	100	
Chicago:												
Town Hall	11	25	--	13	13	31	6	6	--	6	100	
Fillmore	--	--	--	--	44	19	19	6	--	12	100	
Washington, D.C.:												
6	19	42	--	19	9	9	9	6	--	6	100	
14	--	37	--	7	7	7	26	--	11	4	99	
10	4	12	4	--	46	--	17	--	13	8	100	
13	4	36	--	8	36	4	4	--	12	--	100	

*0.5 per cent or less

'Action' provides 'variety in the work.' And 'knowing people well' perhaps makes it more satisfying to work with them. There are substantial differences by race of officer with 41 per cent of Negro officers liking the district because they know the people well as compared with only 26 per cent of white officers. Furthermore, there are substantial differences by both city and district of assignment. No Negro or white officers in Chicago's Fillmore district liked the district because they 'know the people well'; rather 44 per cent of the officers like it because it is 'active.' Generally, too, white officers mention liking a district because they 'know people well' when assigned to white areas while the reverse is true for Negro areas. Since almost no officers lived in these high crime rate areas (except for Boston's Dorchester), knowing the people may be more a function of 'identity' than of 'prior acquaintance.'

There are a substantial minority of officers who eschew universalistic standards for police work and take what some might describe as a 'less professional' stance toward clients (a matter not uncommon among the established professionals it should be noted). Thus 8 per cent of all officers liked nothing about working in their district and 7 per cent liked a 'good class of people.' There also is a minority that likes the district because they 'like the men.' This was true for 15 per cent of all white but only 3 per cent of all Negro officers, probably owing to the fact that Negro officers feel less widely accepted in the district. Liking for the men is more generally common in the high crime rate Negro than white areas. This may seem surprising to some, but observation indicated that the men assigned to these areas often feel strong comaraderie because they were 'banished' to the area or because they are more dependent upon one another for mutual protection. In such an area, no one wants to be with an officer who potentially endangers the safety of another officer.

Some further indication of the officer's relationship to the district to which he is assigned is found in Table 31 where officer expressions of dislike for the area are examined. Almost 4 of every 10 officers disliked nothing about the district of assignment with no differences between Negro and white officers in this respect. There were considerably more expressions of dissatisfaction with the characteristics of the community and its residents than for characteristics of the work situation. Yet 18 per cent of all officers expressed some dislike for the officials in their district. Ten per cent of all officers (all white) disliked their area because they felt it was hard to deal with Negroes; an additional 14 per cent referred to the 'kind of people' in their area. These were generally references to the class or ethnic status of the citizens to be policed, e.g., Puerto Ricans, 'low class,' or 'hillbillies.' Fourteen per cent also mentioned disliking the lack of public respect for officers and 17 per cent did not like the crime patterns of the area.

There are very substantial differences by city and police district. No Chicago police officer selected the poor quality of officials in his district as a main thing disliked about it while such complaints were fairly common in Boston and Washington, D. C.; furthermore, Chicago police officers were less likely to single out Negroes as being hard to deal with and more likely to focus on the 'kind of people' their class or status attributes. It is difficult to know whether such differences are genuine ones.

Though police officers generally are satisfied with the district to which they are assigned, they are very conscious of law enforcement and administrative problems for their district. It always is difficult to assess the 'merit' of such complaints since complaints about work are highly institutionalized among American workers. The main information that one gains from a simple analysis of such complaints such as that in Tables 32 and 33 is a comparison of the relative

Table 31: Per Cent Distribution of Main Thing Police Officer Dislikes About the District to Which He Is Assigned: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Per Cent Who Dislike Nothing	Per Cent Distribution For Officers With 'Dislikes':										All Other	Total Per Cent
		Characteristics of Community					Characteristics of Work or Officials						
		Lack of Public Respect	Kind of People In ₁ /Area	Negroes Hard To Deal With	Kinds of Crime In Area	Ped Tape	Poor Offi- cials	Beat Too Slow	Personal Incon- 2/ venience				
All Districts:													
All white officers	39	14	14	10	17	1	18	3	3			20	100
All Negro officers	39	14	15	11	17	1	16	3	4			19	100
	39	14	14	--	18	--	23	4	--			27	100
Boston:													
Dorchester	64	11	11	11	33	--	22	--	--			11	99
Roxbury	28	22	6	6	28	--	11	--	--			27	100
Chicago:													
Town Hall	83	--	33	--	--	--	--	33	--			33	99
Fillmore	56	29	29	--	--	--	--	--	--			42	100
Washington, D.C.:													
6	50	--	15	15	22	--	15	8	15			8	98
14	7	8	16	16	--	4	32	8	--			16	100
10	20	20	10	10	10	--	15	--	10			25	100
13	27	16	16	5	32	--	16	--	--			16	101

¹/No specific mention of race but mention of "class of people", "juveniles", etc.

²/E.g., too far from home; poor eating places; etc.

frequencies of types of complaints.

Officers were queried as to the main problem they had in doing their job in the precinct or district to which they were assigned. About one in every five officers said they had no main problem; this was more true for Negro than white officers (see Table 32). For those officers who mentioned having problems in doing their job, the most common complaints were against the public (29 per cent) and against the police administration (17 per cent). The third most common target of complaint was the courts, either the U. S. Supreme Court for its decisions affecting police work or the local courts for their leniency (11 per cent of all officers). There is some variation in target of complaint by city and police district. Again we note that complaints about poor police administration are somewhat lower among officers in Chicago than among officers in the other cities. There were no complaints about police bureaucracy in Chicago and fewer proportionally about poor police administration. Complaints among police bureaucracy and poor police administration are highest among officers in Washington, D. C.

Observation of the police indicated that a common complaint of officers is that it is difficult to get to know people. A variety of reasons are given for this opinion. Table 33 summarizes officer opinions about the ease or difficulty in getting to know people in their district and reasons justifying their opinion.

Just over one-half of all the officers believed that it was easy to get to know people in their district but almost 9 of every 10 Negro officers believed it was easy to get to know them. An additional 13 per cent of all officers felt it was easy to get to know some people but not others. Almost a third of all officers, however, believe that it is hard to get to know people in their district. The main reason given in Table 33 that it is hard to get to know people in their district is public distrust of the police with 12 per cent

Table 32: Per Cent Distribution of Main Problem Officer Perceives in Doing His Job in the Precinct to Which He Is Assigned: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	No Main Problem	Per Cent Distribution for Officers Mentioning Problems:							Total Per Cent
		Publics Cause Problems	Slum or Bad Neighborhood	Civil Rights or Political Pressures	High Crime Area	Court Decisions or Leniency	Poor Police Administration	Police Bureau-crazy	
All Districts:	22	29	3	4	3	11	17	8	100
All white officers	20	30	3	5	2	12	17	9	100
All Negro officers	31	24	8	4	4	8	16	--	100
Boston:									
Dorchester Roxbury	20 12	40 36	-- 5	-- 9	-- 9	20 18	25 9	5 --	100 100
Chicago:									
Town Hall Fillmore	33 18	25 46	-- --	-- --	-- 8	8 --	17 8	-- --	100 100
Washington, D.C.:									
6	8	21	--	--	4	8	25	4	100
14	11	29	4	8	--	17	17	13	101
10	28	17	11	6	--	6	22	17	101
13	31	22	--	--	--	17	28	11	100

Table 33: Per Cent Distribution of Ease or Difficulties in Getting to Know People Who Live or Work in the Precinct to Which Officer is Assigned: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Ease in Getting to Know People:			Reasons Given Why Hard to Get to Know Citizens:						Total Per Cent
	Easy	Easy Only for Some Kinds	Hard	Public Distrust of Police	Race Is Barrier	Mobile Patrol	Police Are Too Busy	High Transiency of Citizens	All Other	
All Districts:	53	13	32	41	12	14	6	5	22	100
All white officers	48	14	36	42	13	16	6	5	18	100
All Negro officers	89	6	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	(a)
Boston:										
Dorchester	60	12	28	10	--	40	10	10	30	100
Roxbury	32	8	56	31	13	19	6	6	25	100
Chicago:										
Town Hall	61	6	33	29	--	29	--	14	29	101
Fillmore	44	19	31	43	14	--	--	14	29	100
Washington, D.C.:										
6	62	12	23	45	22	22	11	--	--	100
14	48	26	26	43	14	7	--	--	35	99
10	48	4	48	69	23	--	8	--	--	100
13	69	15	15	56	--	--	11	--	33	100

^{a/}The number of officers is too small to compute a reliable percentage distribution.

believing that race is the main barrier, and 14 per cent that it is the mobilization of the patrol that is responsible. Generally officers assigned to Negro areas are far more likely to mention public distrust of the police and white officers assigned to Negro areas in Chicago and Boston were the only white officers in those cities to mention that race is a barrier to getting to know people. The high transiency of citizens is considered a factor in Boston and Chicago but not among D. C. officers.

Officers were asked to express an opinion about what they thought the most important thing was that could be done to reduce crime in their area. As agents of law enforcement they regard themselves as responsible 'to a degree' for the level of crime in the district; for the most part they believe that police work is effective in reducing crime. Indeed only 8 per cent of the officers (see Table 34) believed that the main thing to be done in reducing crime in the area was to change social conditions in the area. No other suggestions made by officers focused on general environmental or community and family conditions that are considered in the causal nexus of crime.

Not surprisingly 44 per cent of all officers believe that more and better police work is the main thing that can be done to reduce crime in their district. There are no substantial differences between Negro and white officers in this respect. About 1 in 4 believe that changes in the courts and in court decisions would have an effect on crime in the area. From data presented later, it is clear that they regard local courts as too lenient to deter criminals and the U. S. Supreme Court decisions as 'favoring criminals' by making police less effective. Not unexpectedly, about 13 per cent of officers believe that the local people should accept more leadership in getting cooperation and respect for the police as a means of reducing crime.

Table 34: Per Cent Distribution of Most Important Thing Officer Believes Would Be Done To Reduce Crime in District Where He Works: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Better and More Police/Work	Change Social Conditions in Area	Changes in Courts or Court Decisions	Public Leadership and Respect for Police	Better Procedures for Juveniles	All Other	Can't Say	Total Per Cent
All Districts:								
All white officers	44	8	24	13	1	7	3.	100
All Negro officers	44	9	24	12	1	6	4	100
	36	14	22	17	--	8	3	100
Boston:								
Dorchester	64	--	20	12	4	--	--	100
Roxbury	40	12	20	8	--	--	20	100
Chicago:								
Town Hall	44	11	6	33	--	--	6	100
Fillmore	38	13	13	6	--	18	12	100
Washington, D.C.:								
6	58	4	19	19	--	--	--	100
14	44	7	22	15	4	4	4	100
10	32	12	40	--	--	8	8	100
13	27	8	46	12	--	8	--	101

Do the police regard themselves as having changed in their relations with the public as a consequence of changes in the past few years? Three of every 4 police officers believe that the police have changed in the past few years in the way that they act toward the public; 7 of 10 white and 8 of 10 Negro officers believe the police have changed (see Table 35). While a minority of 12 per cent believe the police have changed primarily by enforcing laws less rigorously and ignoring more crime, 19 per cent believe that the police are more cautious in undertaking investigative work and in their handling of citizens and 4 per cent believe they are more hesitant to use force.

Only 3 per cent of the officers specifically mentioned that they thought police officers today are more 'professional' in their work, an indication at least that officers do not see changes as increasing their professional orientation. Yet some of the changes they mention are clearly changes in keeping with the 'professionalization' of police work. At least one in four officers mentioned changes in police handling of citizens such that police officers are more polite and courteous in their treatment of citizens and that they maintain better police-community relations. This was true for twice as many Negro (39 per cent) as white (21 per cent) officers, however. Indeed the major difference between Negro and white officers in their perception of changes in police behavior during the past few years is that more Negro than white officers see changes in better handling of citizens as 'persons' while white officers more often mention the 'impersonal' treatment of citizens through caution in investigation and in dealing with citizens in terms of their 'rights.'

Officers do perceive police work today as more hazardous than five years ago; 8 of every 10 officers in Table 35 see it as more hazardous today. Their perceptions are not in keeping with the declining homicide rate for police officers though it is possible that officers today more often deal with physical

Table 35: Per Cent Distribution of How Police Officers Perceive Their Work and Behavior Toward Public Has Changed by Race of Officer.

Perceptions of Work and Behavior	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
Have police changed the way they act toward public (in last five years)?			
Changed	75	72	83
Not changed	23	25	17
Can't say	2	3	--
In what ways have they (police) changed?			
Not changed	23	25	17
More polite/courteous/better community relations	24	21	39
More cautious in investigation or handling of citizens	19	22	6
More hesitant to use force	4	4	3
Enforce laws less rigorously/ignore more	12	13	11
More professional in doing police work	3	3	3
All other changes	11	10	15
Can't say	4	3	6
Is police work more hazardous today than five years ago?			
Yes	80	82	72
Factors that make police work more hazardous:			
Not less hazardous	20	18	25
Public hostile/uncooperative	9	9	11
Public more often armed today	18	18	19
Disrespect for law/order/police	13	12	16
More serious crime/criminals today	19	20	14
Courts don't back the police	11	12	6
All other	10	10	9

aggression toward them that results in minor injury.

Regardless of whether or not police work actually is more hazardous today, officers define it as so and probably act on the basis of such definitions. Table 35 indicates that officers are by no means of a single mind in assigning reasons for the increase in danger to police officers. Nonetheless if one assumes that the 18 per cent who mention the public being more often armed today and the 19 per cent who mention more serious crimes and criminals abroad today, it would appear that 37 per cent of the police officers focus on threats to them from criminals and persons who are armed, since the more serious offenses so far as officers are concerned involve the use of dangerous weapons. Changes in the general public are regarded as increasing the hazards of police work for another 22 per cent of officers in that 13 per cent mention disrespect for law, order, and the police and 9 per cent mention public hostility and lack of cooperation from the public as factors. Finally, a minority of 11 per cent believe that the failure of the courts to back the police makes their work more hazardous.

Officer Perceptions of Relations Between Police and the Public and Changes in Them

The central feature of police work for the officer assigned to a police district is transactions with the public. Though officers engage in transactions with other officers and with other members of the legal system, their primary work is with citizens who engage them as complainants and offenders or in calls for service. Both within the professionalization movement for the police and within public movements to make police officers accountable there is a growing emphasis on what is termed "police-community" relations. These movements would change the ways that the police behave toward the public. Elements in the community relations movement would change the behavior of the public toward the police as well.

How do police officers perceive the public as having changed and as changing in their relations with the police? It has been noted previously that police officers regard themselves as having changed and that a sizeable minority see changes in the way that they handle citizens. Do they perceive corollary changes in the public?

In order to avoid structuring the response of officers to this general area, officers were first queried as to the ways that they see police work as having changed since they joined the department. A minority of 22 per cent of all officers regard police work as having changed very little since they joined the department; most of this failure to perceive change is due to the fact that the officer is a recent recruit to the department. Almost all officers who have been with the department several years regard police work as having changed.

The main way they see police work as having changed is because of changes in society (see Table 36). The two major changes they emphasize focus on the twinned symbols for police today--lack of public respect and judicial restriction; 20 per cent of officers see the public as respecting police less today and 13 per cent see changes in legality as more restrictive of them in their work.

Given the oft mentioned complaint that there is less 'real' police work today and more demand for 'service,' it is surprising that officers do not give it more prominence in their assessment of changes in police work.

There are almost no differences between Negro and white officers in their perceptions of how police work has changed. There are some marked differences by city, however. Washington, D. C. officers more often mention changes in public respect than do officers in the other cities while Boston officers most often mention the restrictiveness of the court. There are relatively few complaints about changes toward less administrative support of the police but most of these occur among

Table 36: Per cent Distribution of Ways Police Officers Say That Police Work Has Changed Since He Joined the Department by Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Changes in Society:				Changes in Dept./Work:					Other Ways	Not Much Change	Per Cent Total
	Public Lacks Respect for Police	More Community Pressures	Law and Courts Restrict Police	More Crime and Work	No Administrative Backing	Dept. Is Inadequate/Low Morale	Less Real Police Work/More Service	Less Opportunity than Anticipated				
All Districts:	20	2	13	7	4	3	7	6	16	22	100	
All white officers	20	1	12	8	4	3	9	7	14	22	100	
All Negro officers	22	3	14	3	3	3	--	3	22	28	101	
Boston:												
Dorchester	12	--	20	4	--	4	4	16	12	28	100	
Roxbury	20	--	32	8	--	4	4	4	24	4	100	
Chicago:												
Town Hall	--	--	5	5	5	--	17	--	28	39	99	
Fillmore	19	--	6	6	--	13	6	--	25	25	100	
Washington, D.C.:												
6	36	--	8	4	4	4	8	8	--	28	100	
14	33	7	7	19	4	4	7	--	15	4	100	
10	27	--	8	4	12	--	11	11	8	19	100	
13	8	4	11	4	4	--	4	4	27	34	100	

officers in D. C.

A majority of police officers see public opinion as having changed since they joined the department, although 39 per cent of all Negro officers and 31 per cent of all white officers see it as much the same as when they joined (Table 37). Sixty per cent of all officers see the way the public behaves as having changed for the worse; only 6 per cent see public behavior as having changed for the 'better.' Officers in Chicago are more likely to see public behavior as remaining the same since they joined the department and fewer proportionally see it as having changed for the worse as compared with officers in Washington, D. C. and Chicago. Generally officers in the high crime rate Negro areas are more likely to regard public behavior as having changed for the worse.

Among those who see public behavior as having changed since they joined the department (Table 37), 62 per cent attribute the change in public behavior to organizations or groups that make it difficult for the police to do their work by arousing the public against the police. Officers in Washington, D. C. are most likely to attribute the change to groups or organizations; three-fourths of the officers in D. C. attribute changes in public behavior to groups or organizations. Indeed, as Table 37 makes clear, they attribute it specifically to civil rights groups. Police officers in Chicago are least likely to attribute such changes to civil rights groups. After civil rights groups, officers are most likely to charge the newspapers with having changed public behavior. Only a small proportion of all officers attribute these changes to Communist or radical sources, though 7 per cent believe such groups or individuals to be the source of changes in public behavior toward the police.

Police officers as they make contact with the public often are questioned about police matters or about crime, particularly specific crimes that come to the attention of the public. Their reactions to comment and complaints from the public is described in Table 38. Six of every 10 police officers report that they

Table 37: Per Cent Distribution of How Police Officers View Public Opinion As Changing Since Starting With the Department and Organizations or Groups Responsible for More Difficult Role of the Police: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Do you think that the public behaves:				Believes Organizations or Groups Make It Difficult	Organizations or Groups Responsible for Public Not Understanding Police						Total Per Cent
	Better	Worse	Much the Same	Don't Know		Civil Rights Groups	Communists	Radicals or Ind.	News-papers	All Others	Can't Say	
All Districts:												
All white officers	6	60	31	3	62	72	2	5	11	4	6	100
All Negro officers	7	62	29	2	64	74	1	4	12	5	4	100
	--	53	39	8	56	65	10	5	10	--	10	100
Boston:												
Dorchester	12	60	24	4	40	80	--	--	10	--	10	100
Roxbury	8	76	12	4	52	75	--	8	--	4	3	100
Chicago:												
Town Hall	11	44	44	--	50	22	11	11	11	33	11	99
Fillmore	6	56	31	6	50	50	--	--	25	12	12	99
Washington, D.C.:												
6	--	62	38	--	81	75	10	--	15	--	--	100
14	7	63	26	4	70	79	--	5	--	--	6	100
10	--	60	36	4	72	72	--	6	--	--	6	100
13	--	73	23	4	77	81	--	--	14	--	5	100

Table 38: Per Cent Distribution of How Police Officers View Public Comment and Complaints About Police Officers or Their Department by Race of Officer.

Public Comments and Complaints	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
How often people who know you are a police officer talk with you about police matters or crime:			
Frequently	63	60	78
Occasionally	20	22	14
Rarely	12	14	8
Never	5	4	--
What kinds of police matters do they usually ask you about?			
Crime news	28	28	25
Crime problem	8	6	13
Their traffic or other police problems	36	37	36
Complaints about policemen	1	1	3
Sympathy for police	2	1	3
My work	13	14	8
Are people (who know you are a police officer) ever critical of what police are doing?			
Yes	52	46	78
Sometimes	22	25	17
No	21	23	6
How officer feels when people are critical of police:			
Understanding or unconcerned	34	32	46
Affectively neutral	8	6	15
Somewhat defensive	16	15	18
Defensive	26	30	12
Hostile	16	17	9
In talking with people outside the department, how often do you feel you have to defend it and what officers do?			
Frequently	32	31	33
Occasionally	37	39	36
Rarely	25	25	25
Never	5	5	6

CONTINUED

Table 38: Per Cent Distribution of How Police Officers View Public Comment and Complaints About Police Officers or Their Department by Race of Officer. (Continued)

Public Comments and Complaints	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
How obligated does officer feel to defend department and officers:			
Never feels obligated	5	5	6
Obligated out of pride for solidarity with department	8	9	3
Obligated because expected to do so in job	12	12	14
Obligated to defend honor of department	10	8	19
Obligated, but resents necessity to do so	12	14	3
Defends but no feeling of obligation	48	47	50
Other	5	5	5
How officer feels about justness of public criticism of the police:			
Public is wrong or un-justified	9	8	11
Public doesn't understand or is unreasonable	12	9	17
Police are more often right than wrong	8	8	8
Public criticism is helpful	6	6	8
All other	3	3	6
No mention of justness of criticism	62	66	50

are frequently queried about police matters or crime news. The most common matter with which they are confronted, however, are traffic problems. Crimes in the news pose the next most common topic of complaint. About one-half of all the officers say that they hear complaints about the police but over three-fourths of all Negro as compared with less than one-half of all white officers report receiving complaints that are critical of the police. While a third of all police officers indicate they receive such complaints with understanding or general lack of emotional concern and an additional 8 per cent say they are not emotionally involved in such complaints, the majority of police officers by their own admission say they respond with defensiveness or hostility to criticisms of the police (Table 38). Indeed 16 per cent of all police officers indicate they are quite hostile to complaints that are critical of the police. Negro officers indicate that they are more often understanding or affectively neutral than are white officers.

Should one regard affective neutrality as a condition of practice in a professional role then police officers do not generally respond to criticism in a professional manner; Negro officers would appear more 'professional' in this respect than white officers.

That criticism of the department is not a rare event is clear from the fact that only 30 per cent of all officers say they rarely or never have to defend the department and what officers do against public criticism. Almost all officers feel obligated to defend the department when it is criticized suggesting at least high commitment to police work and organization. Only 5 per cent of all officers (Table 38) say that they never feel obligated to do so with no differences by race of officers. That the obligation may not stem from single pride and solidarity with other officers is suggested by the fact that somewhat less than 10 per cent feel obligated to defend the department or police officers out of such a commitment.

About 10 per cent feel obligated to defend the honor of the department and another 10 per cent because they feel it is an expectation for the job. Yet almost one-half of all officers say that while they defend the department--perhaps out of some sense of identification with it and commitment to police work--they do not feel obligated to do so and 12 per cent feel obligated but resent the necessity to do so. One gets the impression that officers resent the necessity to defend the department or other officers, that they are by no means strongly obligated to defend it, but that defend it they do. Perhaps the main reason that this is so is that the typical police officer does not respond to public criticism as just and reasonable. Only 6 per cent of all officers see such criticism as helpful.

Police contacts with the public are often temporary or transitory. Many transactions are of limited duration in time and space. If the public is to cooperate with them, the police are dependent upon a general commitment from the public to cooperate with the police rather than upon personal knowledge or acquaintance of the public with the officer. In short, such cooperation must be based on mutual claims and expectations that sustain cooperation.

Police officers do not see the public as highly cooperative. A majority of police officers maintain that people rarely or never cooperate in giving them information, though Negro officers have a more favorable view of the public in this respect than do white officers, Table 39. Much of the difference between Negro and white officers, however, can be accounted for by the fact that white officers do not see the Negro population as cooperative with them in giving information. Officers divide fairly equally among three main reasons why citizens do not cooperate with the police in giving information: fear or distrust of the police; fear of reprisal if they do so; and, low involvement or general apathy toward law enforcement and their responsibility to maintain law and order. There are

Table 39: Per Cent Distribution of Cooperation From Public As Perceived by Police Officers: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Frequency People Cooperate by Giving Information:				Reasons Officers Give Why Citizens Fail to Offer Information					Total Per Cent
	Often	Some-times	Rarely	Never	Fear, Dislike, Distrust of Police	Fear, Repri-sal	Low Involvement or Apathy	All Other	Can't Say	
All Districts:										
All white officers	23	9	48	13	27	28	31	9	5	100
All Negro officers	21	10	49	14	27	28	30	10	5	100
	39	8	36	8	31	33	25	8	3	100
Boston:										
Dorchester Roxbury	24	12	48	12	12	32	48	8	--	100
	4	--	68	8	24	24	36	8	8	100
Chicago:										
Town Hall Fillmore	50	11	17	17	22	6	50	11	11	100
	38	--	38	6	56	19	13	--	12	100
Washington, D.C.:										
6	19	23	42	12	19	35	35	4	7	100
14	26	7	59	7	33	30	19	19	--	101
10	8	8	60	24	36	28	20	16	--	100
13	27	8	38	19	19	39	27	11	4	100

few differences between Negro and white officers in their perceptions of why citizens generally fail to cooperate in giving information leading one to conclude that the core problem is the relationship between the white officer and the Negro citizen: Negro citizens generally do not regard it as in their interest to cooperate with the white officer by giving information. There is some evidence for this also in Table 39 in city and precinct differences. Generally officers in Negro areas are more likely than officers in white areas to emphasize fear, dislike, or distrust of the police as a reason why citizens withhold information and less likely to give low involvement or apathy as a reason for withholding information. The observation studies provide some support for these perceptions of the police. White officers in Negro areas more frequently encounter a 'wall of silence' than do Negro officers when dealing with Negro citizens.

The more general perceptions of officers toward their work with the public, of the opinions they regard the public as holding, and of changes in them might suggest that police officers regard the public as a monolithic organization. They, of course, do not as the data in Table 40 make amply clear. Officers were queried about their perceptions of change in dealing with various segments of the public and they differentiate rather sharply among them. They regard their relationships with professional and working class people as having changed the least; roughly three-fourths of all officers see them as about the same to deal with as formerly. Indeed about 11 per cent of all officers see professional people and 6 per cent see working class people as easier to deal with than formerly. There are no differences in the perception of Negro and white officers with respect to dealings with working class people but Negro officers are more inclined to see professional people as somewhat harder to deal with than do white officers.

A majority of officers see motorists as having changed very little in terms of degree of difficulty in dealing with

Table 40: Per Cent Distribution of Police Officer Perceptions of Change in How Hard It Is To Deal With Segments of The Public Now As Compared With Whom They Started With The Department by Race of Officer.

Type of Change and Race of Officer	Motorists	Juveniles	Professional People	Working Class	Negroes	People in Your Precinct
All officers						
Harder	31	80	11	15	65	45
Same	62	17	74	78	27	44
Easier	4	2	11	6	3	7
Can't say	3	1	4	1	5	4
White officers						
Harder	30	81	8	15	70	49
Same	62	17	77	79	23	41
Easier	5	1	12	5	3	5
Can't say	3	1	3	1	4	5
Negro officers						
Harder	33	78	20	17	44	31
Same	61	17	64	72	42	56
Easier	--	5	8	6	3	11
Can't say	6	--	8	5	11	2

them but 31 per cent say that they are harder to deal with than formerly; again Negro and white officers do not differ in their perceptions about motorists (Table 40).

The greatest changes officers perceive in dealing with the public occur for their transactions with Negroes and juveniles; 8 of every 10 officers see juveniles as harder to deal with, regardless of the race of officers; 65 per cent of all officers see Negro citizens as harder to deal with, although 70 per cent of white as compared with 44 per cent of all Negro officers share that perception. Few officers see juveniles or Negroes as easier to deal with.

Officers were queried about the way that they saw each of these groups as changing if their perception was that police relations with them had changed (see Table 41). They see professional people who changed favorably toward the police as more rational and understanding, more cooperative, or more supportive of the police. Similarly, they see working class people as changing more favorably in these ways.

Motorists are seen as more complaining (8 per cent) or more openly hostile (11 per cent) when they are viewed as changing negatively in their relations with the police.

The main ways that police see juveniles as changing are that they are more aggressive, defiant, and rebellious (24 per cent), show less respect for law and authority (20 per cent), and that they are more aware of the restrictions on police conduct (22 per cent). Negroes are seen as more oriented toward civil rights in police-citizen transactions (17 per cent), as agitated or incited by civil rights groups (12 per cent), and as more hostile or belligerent (11 per cent). Furthermore 8 per cent of all officers see them as demanding preferential treatment and 7 per cent as showing less respect for the police and the law.

Observation studies of police and citizen transactions bear out this rank order of difficulty in police-citizen transactions. Officer relations with juveniles are most

Table 41: Police Officer Perceptions and Orientations Toward Public Behavior and Opinions by Race of Officer.

Opinions or Behavior of Public	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
Has the general public's opinion of the police changed in the past five years?			
Yes	83	83	83
Major ways public opinion has changed:			
Less respect for police now	30	27	42
Public more critical of the police	21	23	14
Loss of public support	3	3	3
Less public understanding of police problems	2	3	--
More sympathy for criminals	*	1	--
Loss of police powers	3	3	--
Demand for social rather than police service	*	1	--
Other negative opinion	2	2	3
Public now more favorable to police	16	17	14
No change in public opinion	17	17	17
From view point of man on patrol, does public behave better, worse, or about the same as when you started with the department?			
Better	6	7	--
Worse	60	62	53
Much the same	31	29	39
Don't know	3	2	8
In what ways do they behave differently?			
Less respect for police now	34	35	28
Public is less disciplined now	3	3	3
General breakdown of law and order	16	16	17
Juveniles commit more crimes/more gangs	3	4	3
People commit more crimes	3	3	6
Police officers have more positive effect on public	5	6	3
No change really	34	31	44

*0.5 per cent or less

CONTINUED

Table 41: Police Officer Perceptions and Orientations Toward Public Behavior and Opinions by Race of Officer.
(Continued)

Opinions or Behavior of Public	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
What do you think public's view of police work is?			
It is an "easy" job	32	34	25
View police as incompetent/dishonest/brutal/necessary evil	14	12	17
View police as authoritarian or harassing them	10	9	17
See police role as intervention rather than prevention	18	18	17
It's a dangerous job	4	4	6
Other	7	8	3
Can't say	15	15	15
What do you think the public does not understand about what it's like to be a police officer?			
Don't understand the law or their responsibility for it	27	28	22
That changes in laws have led to loss of police powers	7	9	--
How complex police work and departments are	35	34	42
That police are not dishonest/brutal/or harassers	19	19	19
Other	6	4	11
Can't say	6	6	6
How motorists have changed since officer started:			
Viewed as <u>unchanged</u>	62	62	61
Changes viewed <u>favorably</u> by officer	4	5	3
More aware of laws	(2)	(2)	(3)
Less argumentative	(*)	(1)	(-)
Other favorable change	(2)	(2)	(-)
Changes viewed <u>unfavorably</u> by officer	24	23	25
More complaining	(8)	(8)	(8)
More open hostility	(11)	(11)	(11)
Other unfavorable change	(5)	(4)	(6)
Changes viewed with <u>neutrality</u> by officer	2	3	--
Can't say	8	7	11

*0.5 per cent or less

CONTINUED

Table 41: Police Officer Perceptions and Orientations Toward Public Behavior and Opinions by Race of Officer.
(Continued)

Opinions or Behavior of Public	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
How working class people have changed since officer started:			
Viewed as <u>unchanged</u>	78	79	72
Changes viewed <u>unfavorably</u> by officer	16	15	15
More legalistic in argument	(3)	(3)	(3)
More critical of police	(6)	(6)	(6)
Don't want to get involved	(2)	(1)	(3)
Other unfavorable change	(5)	(5)	(3)
Changes viewed <u>favorably</u> by officer	5	5	6
More rational and responsible	(2)	(2)	(3)
Other favorable change	(3)	(3)	(3)
Can't say	1	1	7
How Negroes have changed since officer started:			
Viewed as <u>unchanged</u>	27	23	42
More hostile/aggressive/belligerent	11	12	8
Less cooperative	3	3	6
Less respect for police and law	7	9	--
Demand preferential treatment	8	9	3
Oriented to civil rights in transactions	17	15	25
Incited/agitated by civil rights groups	12	15	--
Other unfavorable change	4	4	3
Other favorable change	3	3	3
Can't say	7	7	10

CONTINUED

Table 41: Police Officer Perceptions and Orientations Toward Public Behavior and Opinions by Race of Officer.
(Continued)

Opinions or Behavior of Public	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
How juveniles have changed since officer started:			
Viewed as <u>unchanged</u>	17	17	17
More aggressive/defiant/rebellious	24	25	14
Less respect for law/authority/truth	20	22	14
More juvenile gangs	5	4	8
Awareness of restrictions on police conduct	22	20	28
No fear of punishment from courts	3	3	6
Other unfavorable change	6	6	8
Can't say	3	3	5
How professional people have changed since officer started:			
Viewed as <u>unchanged</u>	74	77	64
Changes viewed <u>unfavorably</u> by officer	10	9	16
More legalistic in argument	(3)	(2)	(8)
Less respect for authority	(2)	(3)	(-)
Other unfavorable changes	(5)	(4)	(8)
Changes viewed <u>favorably</u> by officer	11	11	12
More rational and understanding	(4)	(4)	(3)
More cooperative	(3)	(3)	(3)
More support for police	(3)	(3)	(3)
Other favorable change	(1)	(1)	(3)
Can't say	5	3	8

CONTINUED

Table 41: Police Officer Perceptions and Orientations Toward Public Behavior and Opinions by Race of Officer.
(Continued)

Opinions or Behavior of Public	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
How people in precinct have changed since officer started:			
Viewed as <u>unchanged</u>	44	41	56
More hostile/aggressive/belligerent	5	7	--
Less cooperative	3	3	3
Less respect for police and law	8	9	3
Negroes are the main problem	13	14	11
Lower class/poorer people are problem	5	6	--
All other changes	14	14	14
Hard to say	8	6	13
Does public help as much as they should when they see police officers in trouble or needing help?			
No	87	87	89
How could public help police officers more?			
Assist police officer in trouble	81	82	78
By providing information being a witness	4	4	6
By not hindering police work at scene	5	5	6
All other ways	1	--	3
Can't say	9	9	7
Reasons why public doesn't help police more:			
Apathetic/don't want to get involved	40	44	22
Fear retaliation	15	14	22
Fear of injury if help police	3	4	--
Don't like the police	24	21	39
All other reasons	9	7	11
Can't say	9	10	6

exacerbated, regardless of the race of the juvenile. Indeed, there is evidence that officers contribute to the exacerbation of that relationship treating juveniles with less civility and more often as nonpersons. While observation studies make it difficult to conclude that Negro citizens pose more difficulty for white and Negro officers in routine police transactions, Negroes more often present problems for the police in these cities in situations of disorder. Thus, the aggregate of citizens may not present a problem; it is the relationship with a minority of Negro citizens that exacerbates police-Negro citizen relationships.

Ways that public opinion toward the police have changed also were explored in more detail (see Table 41). Eight of every 10 Negro and white officers verbalized opinions about the way that the public's opinion of the police and their problems have changed in the past five years. A minority of 16 per cent of the officers see the public as more favorable to the police than formerly and 17 per cent see no change in public opinion. Yet 67 per cent of all white and Negro officers see the public as changing less favorably toward the police. The main change they see is that the public confers less respect than formerly and indeed 42 per cent of the Negro officers as compared with 27 per cent of the white officers see this as the major negative change. A substantial minority of officers perceive the public as more critical of the police with 21 per cent of all white officers and 14 per cent of all Negro officers voiding such discontent. Again, this may be somewhat surprising since opinion poll data suggest far more favorable opinion and sympathy for the police. Quite clearly the police culture has not been responsive to changes in public opinion about the police. Perhaps their perceptions are molded more by mass media stories about the police and their own 'occasional' rather than routine experiences in transactions with the public than by reports of opinion change.

Similarly, in Table 41 the man on patrol views the public as having less respect for the police now with at least a third of all officers seeing this as the major change in public behavior toward the patrol officer. Observational studies suggest that this change is more one of the citizen showing civility rather than deference to the officer. What the officer means then by a loss of respect from the public may be more a loss of deference toward his authority than a loss of respect for him as a civil officer.

It is not uncommon for workers that deal with the public to regard the public in uncomplimentary terms. Even professionals hold such views if in no other form than to regard the public as 'less informed' and 'incompetent' with respect to their specialization. Such perceptions are not without some basis in reality. The public is necessarily in the aggregate less informed. Perhaps it is not surprising then that the police view of how the public regards police work is not a favorable one. See Table 41.

A common complaint of police officers is not only that the public fails to cooperate with the police by providing necessary information as already noted but that it does not support or come to the officer's aid when he is in trouble. Indeed, 87 per cent of all officers do not believe that the public helps as much as they should when they see police officers in trouble or needing help. There are no differences among police officers in this respect according to their race. The primary form of assistance officers want from the public is assistance when in trouble, though a minority of officers would like more cooperation from them as witnesses, or by less intervention in police work at the scene of transaction with citizens.

Police officers view this failure of citizens to help them when in trouble as due mainly to apathy, fear of retaliation if they help, and dislike for the police. See Table 41. White officers twice as often as Negro officers (44 compared

with 22 per cent) regard apathy or disengagement from involvement with the police as the major factor why the public doesn't help the police more. Negro officers more often regard it as fear of retaliation or dislike of the police that accounts for the public's failure to help them. Negro officers may be closer to the truth in this respect, at least so far as Negro citizens are concerned. A substantial segment of the Negro community appears to share a distrust and dislike of the police to the degree that they either ostracize or retaliate against those who would cooperate with the police.

Officers in these high crime rate areas share the perception that crimes of violence are increasing with 84 per cent of all officers sharing that perception (see Table 42). Yet police officers in Chicago are far less likely to believe they are increasing in Chicago while 96 per cent of all officers in Washington, D. C. share this view. These striking differences by city may have a basis in reality or they may be shaped by local perceptions and channels of communication.

The major reason that officers believe crimes of violence are increasing is that crime goes unpunished with 40 per cent of all officers believing that to be the main factor. Officers in D. C. are more likely to give that as the major reason than officers in the other cities.

Police officers seem very concerned with their prestige status and a perceived lack of respect from the public. As the data in Table 43 show 59 per cent of all police officers believe that their prestige is lower today than 20 years ago, their being no difference in this perception by race of officer. What is most striking in Table 43, however, is that this view is not shared equally among officers according to the city where they work. Over 50 per cent of the police officers in Chicago believe that their prestige is higher today than 20 years ago and only slightly more than one-fourth believe that it is lower. By way of contrast, over 75 per cent of the officers in Washington, D. C. believe that their prestige is

Table 42: Per Cent Distribution of How Police Officers Perceive Incidence of Crimes of Violence Today As Compared With Five Years Ago: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Are crimes of violence?			Why is violence increasing?							Total Per Cent
	Increasing	About the Same	Decreasing	More Fire-arms Today	Not Enough Police Protection	Crime Goes Unpunished	Changes in Family/Society	Not Enough Opportunities	All Other	Doesn't Apply	
All Districts:	84	13	3	4	3	40	13	6	20	14	100
All white officers	83	14	3	3	4	39	13	6	20	14	99
All Negro officers	89	8	3	8	--	44	14	6	19	8	99
Boston:											
Dorchester	88	12	--	--	16	24	24	--	24	12	100
Roxbury	84	16	--	--	4	20	20	8	32	16	100
Chicago:											
Town Hall	44	44	11	6	--	22	11	--	17	44	100
Fillmore	63	31	6	6	--	12	13	--	38	31	100
Washington, D.C.:											
6	96	4	--	--	--	56	20	12	8	4	100
14	96	4	--	4	4	59	--	15	15	4	101
10	96	4	--	4	4	69	4	--	15	4	100
13	96	4	--	12	--	46	15	4	19	4	100

-92-

Table 43: Per Cent Distribution of How Police Officers Regard Public View of Prestige of Police Work Today As Compared With Twenty Years Ago: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Does Public Now Rate Prestige of Policemen:					Total Per Cent
	Higher	About the Same	Lower	Can't Say		
All Districts:	26	9	59	6		100
All white officers	27	9	59	5		100
All Negro officers	22	11	58	9		100
Boston:						
Dorchester	20	12	64	4		100
Roxbury	24	4	60	12		100
Chicago:						
Town Hall	50	22	28	--		100
Fillmore	56	--	25	19		100
Washington, D.C.:						
6	16	8	76	--		100
14	22	4	70	4		100
10	4	4	85	7		100
13	23	15	58	4		100

-93-

lower and less than one-fourth that it is higher. The pattern for officers in Boston is similar to that in D. C. While a number of factors undoubtedly influence the perception of officers in each city, there seems little doubt that the modernization of policing in Chicago has substantially increased the public confidence of Chicago's citizenry in their police. Such public confidence clearly may have enhanced the average officer's perception of his own status. Though one does not have a measure of it, undoubtedly efforts of the administration of Chicago's police department to 'upgrade' the quality of officer's in the department may also have affected officer perceptions of their prestige.

Quite clearly, the perceptions of police officers in Chicago are more in keeping with national changes in opinion of the prestige of the police occupation. The 1963 study of the National Opinion Research Center showed that the prestige level of police officers changed substantially between 1947 and 1963 while that of lawyers and judges did not.⁵

Police and Relations with Local Government and Its Legal System

Police departments are related to local government in a variety of ways. The most important of these are that a department usually is dependent upon local government for financial support and it is accountable to local officials primarily through appointment and accountability of the chief. The relationship for one of the three metropolitan departments selected for study does not fit this general model for police departments in the United States. The Washington, D. C. department while related to the government of the District of Columbia

5. See Robert W. Hodge, Paul M. Siegel, and Peter H. Rossi, "Occupational Prestige in the United States, 1925-1963," American Journal of Sociology, 70 (November, 1964), Table 1, pp. 290-292.

is ultimately responsible not only to its Commissioners but to the U. S. Congress as well. In practice it is dependent upon the Congress for financial resources as well as accountable to its Committees. There are some differences between the Boston and Chicago departments in their relationship to local government as well. Illinois police departments seem more 'immune' from state legislative control and processes than are Massachusetts departments.

These differences in structure of the departments in a local government system may account for some of the differences observed in officer views of local government as it relates to their police department.

There are, furthermore, differences in the judicial systems as they relate to the police departments in each of the three municipal corporations. It is difficult to know whether these differences account for officer views of their relationship to the public prosecutor and the various courts of jurisdiction or not. The study was not designed to examine such causal relationships.

Police officers in each of the cities were asked about their views of the efforts of local government to deal with crime in their city. As Table 44 shows, most officers do not believe that their local government has done a very good job in fighting crime in the city. While two-fifths of all officers believe they have done a fairly good job, an equal proportion believe they have not done a good job. Negro and white officers differ little in their perceptions of the job that local government has done to fight crime in Chicago and Washington, D. C.

There are substantial differences among the cities however. They are particularly striking in that officers in Chicago are far more supportive of the job that local government has done to deal with crime than are officers in Boston and Washington, D. C. Indeed over two-fifths of the officers in Chicago believe that the city government has done a very good job and only 15 per cent believe that they have not done a good job. By

Table 44: Per Cent Distribution of Perceptions Officers Have of Job Local Government Has Done to Fight Crime in City: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Local Government Support:		
	Very Good Job	Fairly Good Job	Not Too Good A Job
All Districts:	15	42	41
All white officers	16	41	41
All Negro officers	14	47	39
Boston:			
Dorchester	20	24	52
Roxbury	--	48	48
Chicago:			
Town Hall	39	44	17
Fillmore	44	44	13
Washington, D.C.:			
6	4	46	50
14	11	45	45
10	8	28	52
13	12	46	39

contrast, almost 50 per cent of the officers in Boston and Washington, D. C. regard their government as not having done a good job. Objectively, the Chicago department is in a far better resource position than are the Boston or Washington, D. C. departments. Whether or not the city of Chicago has done more to fight crime apart from their support of the police department than has government in Boston or Washington, D. C., their resource and other forms of support for the police department has won them substantial support from the police.

Officers were questioned about ways they thought local government had failed to support the police. See Table 45. Chicago officers were more likely to be critical of the salary support than were officers in Boston and Washington, D. C. Officers in the D. C. department were particularly critical of interference in the police department as compared with the officers in Boston and Chicago. Over one-third of the D. C. officers criticized this aspect of relationships with local government. Boston officers were particularly sensitive to the need for more manpower, mobile units, and better equipment--a perception that was shared by the observers of the police in these areas of Boston.

Quite clearly, the 'failures' of local government as perceived by the police are highly contingent upon the way government has supported the police department. Officer priorities about 'needs' will reflect an historical pattern of support. In Chicago where manpower and equipment are modern and where political interference in the affairs of the department have been minimized, despite salary increase, officers remain dissatisfied about the level of salaries for police officers. In Boston, the day to day work with insufficient manpower and poor equipment gives a higher priority to such resources than to salaries. Perhaps officers in D. C. are particularly sensitive to what they perceive as 'government intervention' because during this period they were subject not only to the usual relationships with government but they

Table 45: Per Cent Distribution of Perceptions Police Officers Have of Failure of Local Government to Support the Police: Eight Police Districts in Three Cities and Race of Officer.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Need More Man-power or Mobile Units	Need Better Salaries	Need Better Equipment	Support Police By Less Interference	No Plan for Police	Should Give More Backing In Courts	Too Political To Resist Pressures	Educate Public About Police Problems	All Other	Don't Know	Total Per Cent
All Districts:											
All white officers	11	21	6	22	3	3	7	2	5	20	100
All Negro officers	11	23	7	22	3	3	6	1	4	19	99
	6	14	--	17	--	8	11	6	17	22	101
Boston:											
Dorchester	28	12	16	8	12	4	--	--	--	20	100
Roxbury	16	16	16	8	--	8	16	--	5	15	100
Chicago:											
Town Hall	11	50	6	17	--	--	--	--	--	16	100
Fillmore	6	31	6	6	--	--	--	6	--	44	100
Washington, D.C.:											
6	--	8	--	46	--	4	15	--	8	19	100
14	15	26	7	19	--	--	7	4	7	15	100
10	8	12	--	36	8	--	8	--	--	28	100
13	--	23	--	27	--	8	4	4	8	26	100

were under investigation by the President's Commission on Crime for the District of Columbia. Many were resentful of this investigation.

Some further indication of how officers view support from local government is provided in Table 46 where officers were asked whether they thought their local government had done things to make it harder for the police to do their work and if so in ways it is harder. Four of every 10 officers believe that local government has done things that make it harder for the police to do their work. However there are proportionally fewer officers in Chicago who voice that view--only about 20 per cent. By comparison roughly one-half of the officers in D. C. believe that local government has made it harder for them to do their job while 30 per cent in Boston hold that view.

Considering only those officers who believe that local government has made the job harder, their major complaints are that local government interferes with police powers and that the officials are too critical of the police department. No officer in Chicago, however, argued that local government interfered with police powers while almost 50 per cent did so in Washington, D. C. and 36 per cent felt so in Boston. Chicago officers were most likely to argue that there were too many regulations for police--an argument that probably is directed as much at the administration of the department as it is at local government.

Police officers come into regular contact with the public prosecutors and the courts, particularly when they are on patrol or detective investigation. Quite commonly police officers assess the behavior of particular prosecutors and judges. No attempt was made, however, to obtain information on evaluations of specific persons; rather an attempt was made to assess how they felt the courts and the legal system generally related to their work and the problems of policing. In the next section, their views in relation to the larger system of law enforcement and criminal justice will be examined. Here only

Table 46: Per Cent Distribution of Things Local Government Has Done To Make It Harder To Do Police Work.

City, Police District, and Race of Officer	Per Cent Believing It Has Been Made Harder	Reason Given Why It Is Harder:							All Other	Can't Say	Total Per Cent
		Submits to Civil Rights Groups	Interferes With Police Powers	Cuts Manpower	Not Strict Enough in Courts	Play Politics To Get Ahead	Criticizes Police Dept.	Too Many Regulations			
All Districts:											
All white officers	39	8	39	8	3	1	22	4	11	4	100
All Negro officers	41	10	40	8	3	2	22	5	8	3	101
	25	--	33	--	--	--	22	--	33	11	99
Boston:											
Dorchester	36	--	22	45	11	11	--	--	11	--	100
Roxbury	24	--	17	17	--	--	17	17	17	17	102
Chicago:											
Town Hall	11	--	--	33	--	--	33	33	--	--	99
Fillmore	31	--	--	40	--	--	--	40	--	20	100
Washington, D.C.:											
6	54	7	43	--	7	--	21	--	7	14	99
14	41	27	37	--	--	--	27	--	9	--	100
10	48	8	58	--	--	--	17	--	17	--	100
13	54	7	50	--	--	--	29	7	7	--	100

a/ Includes limitation of police powers to patrol, interrogate and investigate.

those jurisdictions are considered with which the officer can be presumed to have had actual contact--the local prosecutors, the local juvenile, municipal, and criminal courts (assuming general equivalence of the D. C. courts with those in the states). Furthermore, officers were questioned primarily about their views of the sentencing behavior of judges, particularly as to its fairness.

On the whole, as data in Table 47 show, police officers do not perceive jurists as being 'fair, just, or about right' in their sentencing and disposition behavior. Only 26 per cent of the officers regarded jurists in the municipal court as exercising fair or just behavior in sentencing and disposition of cases and it was but 14 per cent for criminal court jurists. Judges of the juvenile court were seen as exercising 'proper judgement' by only 16 per cent of the judges. Generally judges are seen as too lenient in their sentencing behavior or the dispositions they make of cases that appear before them. Indeed three-fourths of all criminal court judges were perceived as either too lenient or as exercising judgement in relation to laws that are inadequate. Roughly 60 per cent of municipal court judges are viewed in a similar vein, though officers more often mentioned leniency either in granting probation or in dealing with recidivists. The same comments were offered by 54 per cent of the officers about juvenile court judges.

While there are some differences in the way that Negro and white officers perceive judicial behavior, they are not on the whole great. Negro officers see juvenile court judges as more lenient than do white officers and they are somewhat less likely to see any judges as 'fair, just or proper' in their judicial behavior. It seems apparent that this judgement is based almost entirely on their perceiving these judges as 'too lenient' rather than on any judgement about the discriminatory application of justice toward Negroes.

There are very substantial differences by political jurisdiction, however. Police officers in Chicago are far more

Table 47: Per Cent Distribution of How Police Officers Perceive Sentencing Behavior of Judges in Criminal, Municipal, and Juvenile Courts and of Statutes on Crimes or Misdemeanors for Three Cities and by Race of Officer.

Sentencing Behavior of Judges	All Officers	City			Race of Officer	
		Boston	Chicago	D.C.	White	Negro
In criminal courts:						
Judges are too lenient	14	8	9	12	13	17
Sentences/laws/appeals are inadequate or lenient	61	68	26	71	60	64
Depends upon the judge	3	2	3	6	4	3
Influence gets people off	2	2	6	--	2	--
Fair/just/about right	14	14	41	6	15	8
Other	6	6	15	4	6	8
In municipal courts:						
Judges too lenient/too easy to get probation	48	48	23	57	47	56
Too lenient for recidivists	11	8	9	14	11	11
Judges are inconsistent	8	6	6	11	9	6
Influence gets people off	2	4	3	--	2	--
Fair/just/about right	26	24	53	16	27	19
Other	5	10	6	2	4	8
In juvenile courts:						
Judges too lenient/too easy to get probation	42	44	35	42	38	58
Too lenient for recidivists	12	6	15	15	12	14
Law is too lenient for juveniles	8	2	3	14	9	3
Fair/just/about right	16	28	15	9	17	11
Other	22	20	32	20	23	14
Laws that are too harsh:						
None	93	96	94	90	94	89
Misdemeanors mentioned	5	4	3	7	3	11
Felonies	2	--	3	3	3	--
Laws that are too lenient:						
None	52	32	47	64	50	64
Index crimes, except auto	12	8	21	13	11	17
Auto theft/joy riding	11	42	3	--	12	8
Juvenile statutes	1	4	3	--	1	--
Dangerous weapons	3	--	3	4	3	3
Misdemeanors mentioned	20	14	23	19	23	9

inclined than those in Boston or D. C. to see municipal and criminal court judges as 'fair or just' and much less likely to see them as exercising leniency in their handling of cases.

Given their perception of the way that judges dispose of cases, officers also were asked whether they regard the statutes as setting standards that are too lenient or too harsh toward offenders. Almost all officers (93 per cent) as Table 47 shows, do not believe that the statutes are too harsh. A minority of 5 per cent of the officers mentioned specific misdemeanor statutes that they regarded as too harsh, but there was no common agreement among them on specific statutes.

Almost one-half of the officers see some statutes as too lenient. This was more true for white than Negro officers and for officers in Boston than in Chicago and for officers in both cities than for officers in D. C. Boston officers are particularly critical of the auto theft statute, one that classifies most auto thefts as misdemeanor. Under the Massachusetts code, auto theft to be classified as a felony must show proof either of intent to deprive the owner of his property or that it was used in the commission of a felony. Chicago and D. C. officers were more likely to mention the leniency of statutes for major index crimes other than auto theft. A small percentage of officers in Chicago and D. C. are dissatisfied with the statutes for possession of dangerous weapons.

Perhaps it will be surprising to some that police officers are more positive in their judgements about prosecutors than they are in their judgements of jurists. Apparently judges are regarded as more 'responsible' for their dissatisfaction with the system of justice than are prosecutors.

Roughly one-half of all police officers perceive the public prosecutor as doing a very good (21 per cent) or a pretty good (34 per cent) job--see Table 48. Only 7 per cent see him as doing a job that is 'not good.' Negro officers are more negative in their evaluation of public prosecutors than are white officers. One notes substantial variation by

Table 48: Per Cent Distribution of How Police Officers Perceive the Job Being Done by Public Prosecutor's Office for Three Cities and by Race of Officer.

Public Prosecutor's Behavior	All Officers	City			Race of Officer	
		Boston	Chicago	D.C.	White	Negro
Kind of job public prosecutor is doing:						
Very good	21	32	38	11	23	14
Pretty good	34	34	32	24	34	31
Fair	30	4	12	49	29	36
Not good	7	--	3	13	7	8
Can't say	8	10	15	3	7	11
Reasons for doing kind of job (done):						
Negative evaluations:	36	2	12	57	35	42
Men are too inexperienced/leave too quickly	(17)	(--)	(12)	(25)	(17)	(17)
Reduce charges for convictions	(11)	(2)	(--)	(20)	(12)	(8)
Nolle prosee too easily	(4)	(--)	(--)	(8)	(4)	(6)
Other negative evaluation	(4)	(6)	(--)	(4)	(2)	(11)
Positive evaluations:	52	74	74	34	54	44
Cooperative with police	(9)	(12)	(21)	(4)	(9)	(11)
Capable/do best they can	(43)	(62)	(53)	(30)	(45)	(31)
Can't say	12	24	15	9	11	14
Does public prosecutor usually handle the cases you present in the way that he should?						
Yes	66	80	76	55	69	56
Reasons for handling them as he does:						
Negative evaluations:	22	2	12	35	21	32
Reduces charges to get convictions	(8)	(--)	(--)	(16)	(9)	(6)
Gives them too little attention	(6)	(2)	(6)	(9)	(6)	(6)
All right after he reduces charge	(3)	(--)	(--)	(4)	(3)	(3)
Does best he can given leniency of courts	(2)	(--)	(--)	(3)	(2)	(6)
Other negative evaluation	(3)	(--)	(6)	(3)	(1)	(11)
Positive evaluations:	53	68	67	40	55	41
Cooperative with police	(30)	(40)	(32)	(22)	(32)	(19)
Best they can with experience they have	(23)	(28)	(35)	(18)	(23)	(22)
Can't say	25	30	21	25	24	27

CONTINUED

Table 48: Per Cent Distribution of How Police Officers Perceive the Job Being Done by Public Prosecutor's Office for Three Cities and by Race of Officer. (Continued)

Public Prosecutor's Behavior	All Officers	City			Race of Officer	
		Boston	Chicago	D.C.	White	Negro
Do you think the public prosecutor generally is more interested in winning a case in court or more interested in justice?						
Winning a case	33	18	50	36	33	33
Both	3	8	3	1	4	--
Justice	44	52	35	41	41	58
Hard to say	20	22	12	3	22	9
Why do you feel that way (about what he does)?						
He wants to use it to get ahead/for prestige	10	8	24	7	10	11
He wants to win	10	4	15	10	11	3
Not personally involved/just a job	14	22	15	11	15	5
He takes an oath of justice	8	10	3	7	9	8
Careful about evidence	7	8	6	9	6	14
All other	11	6	6	15	9	19
Can't really say	40	42	32	42	40	39
Can relationship between police and prosecutor be improved?						
Yes	39	12	44	49	39	39
In what ways (can it be improved)?						
Not change prosecutors on cases	4	2	--	4	4	6
Should investigate more	6	--	9	8	6	6
Should not reduce charges as often	3	--	--	4	1	8
Should know more about police work or work closer with police	21	8	20	28	22	14
Police should be trained better in law	*	2	3	--	1	--
All other	5	2	9	6	5	6
Hard to say	61	86	59	51	61	61

*0.5 per cent or less

jurisdiction as well. Officers in Boston are most positive in their evaluation of the work of the public prosecutor with 86 per cent viewing them as doing a very good or pretty good job; the same is true for 68 per cent of the officers in Chicago. Only 35 per cent of the officers in D. C. rated public prosecutors that highly.

Considering the positive and negative evaluations officers make of the public prosecutor, it is noteworthy that in their positive evaluations they give far less emphasis to cooperation with the police than they do to their assessment of his capability, or at least that he is 'doing the best he can,' given the system of justice. Yet officers on the whole are supportive of the way that the prosecutor handles the cases they bring before him since two-thirds of all officers believe that the prosecutor usually handles the cases they present to him as he should. White officers were more likely to feel that way than were Negro officers and again Boston officers were most likely to be satisfied and D. C. officers least likely to be satisfied.

It should be kept in mind, of course, that officer assessments do not necessarily reflect actual differences in standards of public prosecutors. Yet the negative evaluations of officers provide some clues as to what it is that they regard as 'failure' in the public prosecutor. In these terms, officers particularly mention matters such as the inexperience of public prosecutors--17 per cent of all officers, the practice of reducing charges to get convictions, to give too little attention to cases, or to exercise nolle prosequi too readily. These all are practices that commonly associated with the office of public prosecutor.

Officers were specifically queried about some of these practices. They were asked, for example, whether the public prosecutor generally was more interested in winning a case or in seeing that justice was done. At least a third of all officers feel that prosecutors are more interested in winning a case.

All in all while almost 4 of every 10 officers believe that the relationship between police and prosecutors could be improved, they focus in their concrete suggestions for improvement of the relationship primarily by emphasizing either a closer working relationship between the police officer and the prosecutor or in urging that prosecutors should develop a better understanding of police work. Their specific objections in his area often center on the contention that prosecutors do not bother to acquaint themselves with the case or to discuss it with the officer prior to their appearance in open court.

What officers don't comment about in specific terms as they assess the operations of local government and the local system of justice are of as much interest as what they do volunteer information about. It is somewhat surprising that officers rarely focused their dissatisfaction with local government agencies on either programs of 'human relations' or 'civil rights' or on their exercise of judicial power with respect to the decisions of the appellate courts or of the U. S. Supreme court. That officers have strong convictions on these matters is apparent in the discussion of the final section.

Since officers commonly regard probation as an ineffective means of dealing with offenders, attention was given to their perception of the kind of job done by probation officers. Only 28 per cent of all officers believe probation officers do a very good or pretty good job, though one-fourth of all officers do not believe they are in a position to make an evaluation of the work of probation officers--Table 49. Over 20 per cent see them as doing a job that is not very good. Negro officers are somewhat less likely than white officers to rate probation officers as pretty good and officers in Chicago are least likely to rate probation officers as doing a good job.

Over a third of all officers find it hard to assess how probation officers could do a better job, either because they have too little contact with them or they do not feel capable of such a judgement. Officers expressing a specific opinion

Table 49: Per Cent Distribution of How Police Officers Perceive the Kind of Work Probation Officers Do With Juvenile Offenders for Three Cities and by Race of Officer.

Work That Probation Officers Do	All Officers	City			Race of Officer	
		Boston	Chicago	D.C.	White	Negro
Kind of job that probation officers do:						
Very good	10	26	3	4	10	11
Pretty good	18	36	3	16	20	8
Fair	24	18	21	29	21	39
Not very good	22	12	38	22	23	20
Can't say	25	8	35	29	26	22
In what ways could they do a better job?						
Should have more contact with juveniles	24	22	35	22	24	25
Need more probation officers	12	8	6	16	12	14
Probation officers are limited in job they can do	15	12	6	19	14	19
Other ways	10	6	15	10	8	17
Do a good job	3	14	--	--	4	--
Hard to say or know, including no contact	36	38	38	33	38	25

are most likely to mention that probation officers should have more contact with juveniles or that they regard them as having very limited possibilities for what they can do with juveniles.

Officer Perceptions of Problems in Law Enforcement and in Their Relations with the System of Justice

It is common within police departments to comment adversely about decisions of the U. S. Supreme Court. Some attempt was made to assess the degree of consensus among officers about the effect of such decisions on their work. Their views are presented in Table 50.

Officers do not perceive the major recent decisions of the court that affect the legality of means exercised by the police as equally problematic for their work. Six of every 10 officers see the rulings regarding the legality of search of persons as making problems for them in their work; only 48 per cent see the rulings on seizure of evidence as making problems in their work, and 45 per cent see problems with respect to confessions. But 70 per cent of all officers see the rulings on interrogation or questioning of suspects as affecting their work. In part these differences in proportions of officers reflects the fact that the large majority are on patrol and in part it reflects the range of applicability of a decision. It is evident for example that the rulings on interrogation apply to a larger volume of work of the officer than do the rulings on search or seizure of evidence.

The net effect of the decisions on legality of means used by the police, however, is too align the police against the court. Indeed 90 per cent of all officers perceive the court as having 'gone too far.' This includes 95 per cent of all white as compared with 69 per cent of all Negro officers, however. Indeed Negro officers are less likely to 'line up' against any of the court's decisions than are white officers.

Table 50: Per Cent Distribution of Police Officers Perceptions About Problems in Law Enforcement and Supreme Court Decisions by Race of Officer.

Decisions and Problems	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
Are there any special problems that the Supreme Court's ruling concerning <u>search</u> of persons makes for you in your work?			
Yes	61	63	56
What are they?			
No problems	38	37	44
Hinder you in making decision to search	26	27	19
Difficult to have positive assurance	8	9	3
Difficult to protect yourself	6	6	6
Restriction in getting evidence	5	5	6
All other	8	8	11
Can't really say	9	8	11
What are the conditions under which you think an officer should be allowed to search?			
Reasonable assurance it will provide evidence	15	15	14
Reasonable assurance "wrong" was done/suspicion	48	52	28
Officer's protection	7	8	3
Following arrest	5	4	6
"Stop and search"	6	6	6
Known criminals	3	3	3
Can't say	6	4	14
Present rule acceptable	10	9	22
Are there special problems that the Supreme Court's rulings concerning <u>seizure of evidence</u> makes for you in your work?			
Yes	48	49	44
What are they?			
No problems	52	51	56
Warrants are too technical/specific	11	12	6
Expanded need/use for warrant	7	9	--
Loose evidence because of time in getting warrant	12	11	17
Loose convictions because of technicalities	8	8	8
All other	10	9	13

CONTINUED

Table 50: Per Cent Distribution of Police Officers Perceptions About Problems in Law Enforcement and Supreme Court Decisions by Race of Officer. (Continued)

Decisions and Problems	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
Under what conditions do you believe a police officer should be allowed to seize evidence?			
Reasonable assurance evidence there or crime committed	36	37	36
When he believes suspect will destroy evidence	3	2	8
When you apprehend someone or see evidence	23	24	14
Immediately on arrest	7	7	6
All other	3	4	--
Present rule is adequate	16	13	25
Can't say	12	13	11
Are there any special problems that the Supreme Court's rulings on <u>interrogation</u> or <u>questioning of suspects</u> makes for you in your work?			
Yes	70	71	64
What are they?			
No problems	30	28	36
Loss of information if advise on rights	31	34	14
Difficulty in getting information increased	19	19	22
Restriction to on-view arrest	2	2	3
Loss of bona fide confession	3	3	6
All other restrictions	4	4	3
Hard to say	12	10	17
What do you think the rules ought to be for interrogation of persons?			
No limitations so long as force is not used	19	17	28
Reasonable amount of time without attorney present	21	21	19
Attorney should not be mandatory	33	36	19
Rules should be less utopian/unrealistic	2	2	3
According to Miranda decision	14	12	22
All other	4	5	--
Can't say	7	7	9

CONTINUED

Table 50: Per Cent Distribution of Police Officers Perceptions About Problems in Law Enforcement and Supreme Court Decisions by Race of Officer. (Continued)

Decisions and Problems	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
Has the court rulings on <u>confessions</u> made any problems for you in your work?			
Yes	45	47	36
In what ways has it made a difference?			
No particular difference	55	53	64
Confessions are worthless now	14	15	11
Restrictions on confessions are too great	9	9	8
More difficult to develop a case/get information	7	7	6
Reduces number of convictions/jeporadizes conviction	6	8	--
All other	3	2	3
Can't say	7	7	8
What do you think the rules should be for confessions?			
Any confession should be admissible	29	33	11
If you have evidence <u>and</u> he confesses	6	4	11
Any voluntary confession if "legally" obtained	37	38	33
If obtained when a lawyer is present	1	2	--
According to court decision	10	7	28
All other	6	7	--
Can't say	11	10	17
In general, do you think that the U.S. Supreme Court has gone too far, not far enough, or about right in making rules favoring and protecting criminal offenders?			
Too far	90	95	69
About right	9	5	28
Not far enough	--	--	--
Can't say	1	*	3

*0.5 per cent or less

CONTINUED

Table 50: Per Cent Distribution of Police Officers Perceptions About Problems in Law Enforcement and Supreme Court Decisions by Race of Officer. (Continued)

Decisions and Problems	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
Why do you feel this way (about the U.S. Supreme Court)?			
Curtails effectiveness of police work	30	34	14
Helps criminals/gives consideration to criminals	34	34	33
Fails to protect society/victims of crime	15	14	17
"People's" rights should be protected	7	5	17
All other	4	4	3
Can't say	10	9	17

266-262 O - 67 - 17

The data in Table 50 also provide information on what problems the officer regards each decision as having created for him and what conditions he regards as proper, or what he would regard as a proper ruling.

So far as the rulings concerning search of persons are concerned, officers feel that it restricts them in their decision to search a person. It is suggested that officers do not regard search for protection of the officer as the most important grounds for a search of the person; rather that they want to search persons for evidence. Almost one-half of all officers believe that suspicion of wrong-doing or 'reasonable assurance' that in the opinion of the officer wrong was done is sufficient grounds for search of the person; an additional 15 per cent believe that the officer only have 'good reason' to believe that a search will provide evidence of 'wrong-doing.' Search of the person would appear to be perceived by officers primarily as a means of securing evidence rather than as a means of self-protection. Yet this may only be an artifact of the condition that search for self-protection is considered a legal means.

Complaints about seizure of evidence focus primarily on the technical nature of the warrants and the time lost in securing them, conditions that have the effect that evidence and convictions are lost. Again officers focus on their being allowed discretion in the decision to seize evidence, discretion of the sort that if they have good reason to believe that a crime has been committed, they be permitted to seize the evidence. About one in five officers would limit this to the case where an arrest has been made or the officer sees the evidence on investigation.

Officers perceive the rulings on interrogation or questioning of suspects as increasing their difficulty in getting information. About 20 per cent of all officers believe there should be no limits on interrogation so long as force is not used; 21 per cent would restrict it to a 'reasonable amount of time' when

an attorney is not present, and one-third believe it should not be mandatory to advise of the right to an attorney or to have one present during interrogation if the citizen requests it.

So far as rulings on confessions are concerned, officers are inclined to regard the restrictions as obviating the confession and would opt either for any confession to be admissible as evidence or to permit voluntary confessions if it cannot be shown that the police used improper means in obtaining them; the burden would lie with the defendant.

Both within and without police departments there is considerable controversy about what constitutes police matters. There are demands that services from the police be increased so that in many cities noncriminal matters loom large as 'police business,' others would not provide such services from a 'professional' police.

There are problems of how the law is to be enforced within a community, given variation among communities in their toleration of law enforcement. At the present time the residents of many communities are far from in agreement about the propriety of demonstrations and sit-ins, or of picketing by interest groups. Yet the police must cope with them, maintaining public order in the face of controversy.

How, on the whole, do the police view their role as agents of law enforcement, given some of the major changes through which our society is going? How do line officers see police work, given the limited manpower of most departments? How would line officers allocate work for their role? Table 51 provides some information related to these questions.

Earlier in Table 35 it was noted that three-fourths of all police officers believe they have changed over the last few years in the way they act toward the public. They regard themselves as more polite and courteous with the citizen (24 per cent) and as more cautious in dealing with citizens in investigation (19 per cent). A minority of 12 per cent believe the

Table 51: Per Cent Distribution of Police Behavior and Perceptions of Enforcement As A Response to Perceptions of Court and Public Expectations or Requirements by Race of Officer.

Police Enforcement of Law	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
Do you think that on the whole the police have become too lenient in dealing with people who are suspected of breaking the law?			
Yes	36	38	25
In what ways is that so?			
Not less lenient	65	62	75
Forced to by court decisions	30	33	19
Lack of support for police	2	2	3
Other	3	3	3
Do you think that demonstrations, sit-ins and picketing sponsored by groups should be allowed?			
Yes	62	56	86
Yes and no	10	10	6
No	26	31	6
Can't say	2	3	2
Why do you say that?			
It's their constitutional right	36	31	58
Lawful if done in lawful manner	32	32	30
Not lawful as trespass	3	4	--
More legitimate ways to protest or harms cause	12	14	3
Causes police problems such as riots/traffic/etc.	6	7	3
All other	4	4	3
Can't say	7	8	3
Do you think that demonstrations are a main cause of violence these days?			
Yes	64	70	39

CONTINUED

Table 51: Per Cent Distribution of Police Behavior and Perceptions of Enforcement As A Response to Perceptions of Court and Public Expectations or Requirements by Race of Officer.
(Continued)

Police Enforcement of Law	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
Do you think that your department is able to handle these situations the way they should be handled?			
Yes	66	64	78
Inadequate, manpower or equipment	14	15	8
Not enough command or staff support	6	6	3
Laws are inadequate	4	4	3
Better trained officers needed	2	2	3
All other	8	9	5
Are there things that should be done about these situations that would make it easier for you to deal with them?			
Yes	75	78	61
Stronger show of force	(17)	(18)	(11)
Laws to regulate sit-ins	(24)	(28)	(6)
Give police use of other means to control	(14)	(14)	(14)
Increase human relations program	(8)	(6)	(19)
Laws prohibiting sit-ins	(5)	(6)	(--)
Hard to know	(7)	(6)	(11)
No	25	22	39
Are there any things you think the police should spend more of their time than they do now?			
Yes	55	55	56
Street/foot patrol	(13)	(13)	(14)
Criminal investigation/prosecution	(13)	(12)	(17)
Crime prevention	(10)	(12)	(--)
Police-community relations	(7)	(4)	(20)
Police training	(7)	(8)	(--)
Inform public about police/crime	(1)	(1)	(3)
All other	(3)	(3)	(--)
No	44	43	44

CONTINUED

Table 51: Per Cent Distribution of Police Behavior and Perceptions of Enforcement As A Response to Perceptions of Court and Public Expectations or Requirements by Race of Officer.
(Continued)

Police Enforcement of Law	All Officers	White Officers	Negro Officers
Are there any things that police should spend <u>less</u> of their time on than they <u>do</u> now?			
Yes	67	70	56
Clerical duties/paper work	(18)	(20)	(11)
School crossings	(6)	(6)	(6)
Hospital or sick calls	(7)	(7)	(6)
Police detach for private enterprise	(8)	(6)	(20)
Traffic	(10)	(11)	(3)
Other non-police services	(18)	(20)	(10)
No	33	30	44
As an officer, do you feel that you have a tougher time dealing with some kinds of people than others?			
Yes	87	86	89
People who physically resist officer	(12)	(12)	(14)
People who are aggressive or belligerent	(18)	(19)	(14)
Gang members or "teenagers"	(11)	(12)	(8)
Known criminals	(12)	(10)	(19)
Deviants	(3)	(3)	(6)
Lower class/uneducated persons	(12)	(11)	(17)
Negroes	(7)	(8)	(3)
All others	(5)	(5)	(3)
Can't say	(6)	(6)	(5)

major way police have changed is that they enforce the law less rigorously or that they ignore more violations. This raises the question whether on the whole police officers believe officers have become too lenient in dealing with people who are suspected of breaking the law.

One runs the risk in questioning people about how their fellowmen think, feel, or behave, that they perceive others as different from them in terms of cultural stereotypes that everyone affirms publicly but which none will acknowledge privately. There is pluralistic ignorance; everyone affirms a stereotype that no one accepts privately. It may be that many police believe other police officers are too lenient, yet no police officer believes that he has become too lenient. Though such is a logical possibility, the observation study provided a sufficient number of incidents where officers either failed to enforce the law or released someone after detention because they regarded changes in the society now would not support their enforcing the law or detaining that person. How widespread or common such changes in enforcement practices are is hard to say. Of the officers in these high crime rate areas, 38 per cent of all white officers and 25 per cent of all Negro officers believe that on the whole the police have become too lenient in dealing with people who are suspected of breaking the law (Table 51). Those who believe the police have become more lenient attribute leniency to the major decisions of the U. S. Supreme Court. Almost a third of all officers say that police are more lenient because of the court decisions regarding legality of police means of enforcement.

It is the obligation of the police to maintain law and order. In recent years, demonstrations, sit-ins, and picketing associated most particularly with the civil rights movement and the Viet Nam war have occasioned problems of law enforcement for the police. Negro officers (86 per cent) more than white officers (56 per cent) believe that demonstrations, sit-ins, and picketing sponsored by groups should be allowed (Table 51).

Indeed, only 6 per cent of all Negro officers but 31 per cent of all white officers believe it should not be allowed.

Those who would allow demonstrations argue either that it is a constitutional right or that it is lawful if done in a lawful manner. Not surprisingly almost twice as many Negro (58 per cent) as white (31 per cent) officers argue that it is a constitutional right while virtually the same per cent of white (32 per cent) and Negro (30 per cent) officers say that it is lawful if done in a lawful manner.

Those who would not allow demonstrations are most likely to argue that there are more 'legitimate' ways to protest or that it 'harms their cause' with 14 per cent of all white and only 3 per cent of all Negro officers holding that argument. Four per cent of all white officers argue it is unlawful to trespass and 7 per cent that they should not be allowed because they lead to riots or other police problems.

Despite their support of the right to demonstrate, 70 per cent of the white officers and 39 per cent of the Negro officers regard demonstrations as a main cause of violence these days. On the whole, 66 per cent of all officers believe that their department is able to cope with these situations. A substantial minority, nevertheless, believes that there is inadequate manpower or equipment, lack of staff or command support, or that there is need for better officer training to deal with such situations.

Three-fourths of all officers believe that things could be done to make it easier to cope with demonstrations and situations that bring violence. This group includes 61 per cent of all Negro officers. Only 19 per cent of all Negro officers and 6 per cent of all white officers believe that an increase in, or a change in, the 'human relations' program of the police department would make it easier for them to deal with such situations. Rather substantial percentages want a stronger show of force (17 per cent), laws to regulate sit-ins (24 per cent) or the provision for other means of controlling

large groups (14 per cent). A minority of six per cent of all white officers would prohibit sit-ins.

That the police regard groups differently in terms of the law enforcement problems they present was made clear by examining their perceptions of how various groups had changed in terms of their difficulty in dealing with them (Tables 40 and 41). Officers also were asked whether they had a 'tougher' time dealing with some kinds of people than others (Table 51); 87 per cent of all officers agreed they did, with race of officer making no difference in response. Those who are familiar with police officer culture will not be surprised by the information in Table 51 which shows that officers do not focus primarily on ethnic, class, or race groups in their assessment of difficulty in dealing with people. While 12 per cent of all officers mentioned lower class or uneducated persons as harder to deal with and 7 per cent specifically mentioned Negroes, the majority of responses relate to behavior that the culture defines as inappropriate toward an officer or that arouses his emotions. Officers are particularly aroused by what they regard as lack of respect for their authority, as being 'outsmarted,' or by deliberate flouting of authority through unconventional behavior. Not surprisingly then more officers select people who physically resist them or who are aggressive or belligerent toward them as persons who give them a 'tough' time--as indeed they do. Known criminals, and teenagers or gang members also are viewed as giving them a 'tough' time. There seems to be a strong 'reality base' in these perceptions, since characteristically although contacts with them do not comprise the bulk of police work, they create more immediate problems of asserting authority and maintaining control in situations.

Finally, Table 51 provides some information about how officers think the department should spend either more or less time of officers. It is clear that they would eliminate most non-police services such as school crossing, hospital or sick calls, and other such as animal calls. A minority of 10 per cent

would eliminate traffic control from a police department and 8 per cent would turn all details for private enterprise functions over to private police.

There is the usual caviling about 'too much paper work,' perhaps the most common complaint of policemen. To a degree their complaints and laments reflect the poor allocation of paper work to officer manpower in most police departments. But to a degree they represent a misconception of both bureaucratic and professional organization. Paper work is essential in any bureaucratic organization that processes clients. With increased professionalization of police work, paper processing may be allocated to functionally specialized clerical roles more than now is the case. Yet the obligation on the part of the officer to commit information to a system of 'paper' may grow rather than decline.

A slight majority of police officers would change the allocation of how police officers now spend their time. Thirteen per cent of all officers would allocate more men to street or foot patrol and 13 per cent would allocate more men to criminal investigation. Only 10 per cent see a greater crime prevention role for the police and 7 per cent would give more attention to police-community relations (20 per cent of all Negro officers, however)--see Table 51. Finally, only 7 per cent would allocate more time to police training.

Although the survey did not specifically explore police ideology about professionalization or any officers desire for more professional training, there is a surprising lack of commitment to professionalization of the police and to additional training disclosed in the survey data, given the many opportunities to voluntarily answer in terms of professional commitment and goals. It perhaps is not unfair to say that the current cadre's investments do not lie in 'high' professionalization of task but in the professionalization of the occupation to increase rewards.

Concluding Note

A caveat about interpretation of these data must be introduced at the end as well as the beginning. Given the sample of officers from high crime rate areas of three cities, care should be taken in generalizing not only to a universe of all police officers but even to a universe of all officers in a given city. To the degree that place of assignment affects response or to the degree there is selection of officers in assignment, the results for a given city may differ from sample results. Furthermore, the relative proportions of Negro and white officers are somewhat different for the city as a whole than for the aggregated sample precincts in the study.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

A STUDY OF POLICE ATTITUDES

Survey Research Center
The University of Michigan
Project 947
June, 1966

Sam. Bk. No. _____

Do not write in above spaces.

A STUDY OF POLICE ATTITUDES

1. Place Interviewer's Label Here
2. PSU: _____
3. Your Int. No. _____
4. Date of Int. _____
5. Length of Int. _____

I'm _____ from the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan. As you know the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Criminal Justice has asked us to study some of the problems in crime and law enforcement. We especially want your answers as a police officer -- how these problems appear to you as someone who is an expert on the day-to-day affairs and work of policemen. Your answers to these questions are strictly confidential -- the information is presented in statistical form and no names are used. The first things we'd like to ask you about are how you became a police officer.

1. Could you tell us why did you decide to become a police officer?

2. When did you first join the (Washington/Chicago/Boston) Police Department? _____ (Month) _____ (Year)

3. How old were you then?
_____ Years

(IF R JOINED DEPARTMENT AFTER 1959 ASK Q. 4; IF JOINED BEFORE, SKIP TO Q. 5)

4. Were you a police cadet?

1. Yes

2. No

- 4a. How long were you a cadet? _____ Years

5. At the time you first took up police work, would you have preferred some other line of work if you could have gotten into it?

1. Yes

2. No

8. Don't know

5a. What kind of work would you have preferred? _____

5b. What are the main reasons you didn't go (on) in that kind of work?

6. Compared to other jobs, what is it you like most about being a police officer?

7. Is there anything else you particularly like? _____

8. Compared to other jobs, what do you like least about being a police officer?

8a. Is there anything else you dislike? _____

9. Suppose a young man asks you about going into police work? Would you advise him to go into police work?

1. Yes

2. Maybe

3. No

9a. What would you tell him is especially good about it?

Anything else? _____

9b. Are there any things you would warn him about in going into police work? (Describe)

9c. Why would you tell him not to go into police work?

Any other reasons? _____

9d. Are there any good things you would tell him about police work? (Describe)

10. Would you advise a son of yours to be a police officer?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Depends 4. Don't know

11. Here is a list of things which some officers like about police work. (HAND CARD A). Would you please tell me which thing on this list you like best about police work? (PLACE A "1" NEXT TO BEST LIKED ITEM)

- a. _____ the feeling that comes from helping people
- b. _____ the pay
- c. _____ the chance to make decisions on your own
- d. _____ the job security
- e. _____ the prestige and respect one gets from the job
- f. _____ the retirement plans and benefits
- g. _____ the variety in the work

11a. Which comes next? (PUT "2" NEXT TO SECOND CHOICE)

11b. And which do you like third best? (PUT "3" NEXT TO THIRD CHOICE)

12. In what ways have you changed your opinion of police work since you joined the department?

13. Since you have been in this police department, have you ever thought about leaving for some other kind of work?

1. Yes

2. No

SKIP TO Q. 14 ON P. 6

13a. What are the main reasons that made you consider leaving?

(IF NOT SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED, ASK:)

13b. When you considered leaving, did you feel there was too little opportunity for advancement?

1. Yes

2. No

(IF NOT SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED, ASK:)

13c. Were you in any way dissatisfied with the men with whom you were working?

1. Yes

2. No

13d. What are the main considerations that kept you from leaving the force?

(IF NOT SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED, ASK:)

13e. Was the time you had put in toward retirement or the retirement benefits a factor in your deciding to stay?

1. Yes

2. No

(IF NOT SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED, ASK:)

13f. Did your friends in the department have any effect on your deciding to stay?

1. Yes

2. No

(SERIES CONTINUES NEXT PAGE)

(ASK IF EVER THOUGHT ABOUT LEAVING)

13g. Have you ever actually looked for another job instead of police work since you have been on the force?

1. Yes 2. No → SKIP TO Q. 15

13h. Did you find anything that you thought you might like better?

1. Yes 2. No → SKIP TO Q. 15

13i. What was the job?

13j. Why didn't you take it?

GO TO Q. 15

(ASK IF R NEVER THOUGHT ABOUT LEAVING)

14. What are the main considerations that keep you from leaving the force?

15. Not everyone can do police work. What kind of man would you say it takes to do police work?

16. What kind of officer does it take to work in the (R's district or precinct) where you are assigned?

17. What is your present assignment in your (district/precinct)? (JUST CHECK THE APPROPRIATE CATEGORY)

1. Foot patrol, walking a beat
2. Motor patrol, scout car, squad car
3. Wagon, transport prisoners
4. Lock up
5. Other (Specify) _____
6. Desk Sergeant
7. Supervising sergeant
8. Watch lieutenant

(IF 1-5, ASK:)

17a. Do you work alone or with a partner?

1. Alone

2. Partner

17b. How many partners do you ordinarily work with? _____

18. If you had your choice, what assignment would be your preference?

1. R chooses present assignment

2. R chooses assignment different from present (Specify): _____

19. What is your present rank in the department?

1. recruit or trainee

2. patrolman

3. corporal

4. sergeant

5. lieutenant

6. captain

7. other (Specify): _____

19a. How long have you held this rank? _____ Months _____ Years

20. How is the beat or area to which you are assigned: fairly quiet, about average, or more active than most?

1. Fairly quiet 2. About average 3. More active

21. If you had your choice, would you rather work in the (district/precinct) to which you are assigned or would you rather work somewhere else?

1. Assigned precinct 2. Hard to say 3. Somewhere else

21a. What do you especially like about working in this particular (district/precinct)?

21b. What, if any, things don't you like about this particular (district/precinct)?

21c. What don't you like about working in this particular (district/precinct)?

21d. What, if any, things do you like?

22. What are the main problems for you in doing your job in this (district/precinct)?

23. Is it pretty easy to get to know people who live or work in your (district/precinct)?

1. Yes 2. Yes and No 3. No

ASK BOTH 23a and 23b

23a. Other than the people you deal with on police matters, what kinds of people do you talk with most often? (IF DOESN'T UNDERSTAND, SAY: "Like businessmen, juveniles, or any special kind.")

23b. What makes it hard to get to know them?

24. How often do people in your (district/precinct) cooperate by giving you information that helps in your work?

(IF NEVER, SKIP TO Q. 25)

24a. What kinds of information do they give you?

25. Why do you think some people don't offer you information?

26. What do you think is the most important thing that could be done to cut down on crime in the precinct or district where you work?

27. How do you feel about the city government, (the mayor and council/the District Commission), and its support of the police department. Do you think they are doing a very good job, a fairly good job, or not too good a job when it comes to fighting crime in this city?

1. Very good job 2. Fairly good job 3. Not too good a job

27a. What are some of the things they have done to support the police?

27b. What other things, if any, haven't they done that you think they should do?

27c. Have they done any things that make it harder to do police work?

1. Yes 2. No

27d. What?

27e. In what ways do you feel they haven't done all they could?

27f. Have they done any things that make it harder to do police work?

1. Yes 2. No

27g. What?

28. Turning now to a different subject, one of the things we'd like to find out is how a police officer's family and friends look at his job. First, would you tell me whether you are married, single, widowed, or divorced?

1. Married 2. Widowed 3. Divorced 4. Single

5. Other (Specify) _____

(SKIP TO Q. 32, P. 12)

29. Have you had any children?

1. Yes

2. No

29a. How many? _____

29b. How many are now living with you at home? _____

(IF MARRIED, ASK Q. 30-31; IF DIVORCED OR WIDOWED, SKIP TO Q. 32, P. 12.)

30. Would you say that being a police officer makes it more difficult than usual for your wife and children to make friends with others?

1. Yes

2. No

3. Don't know → (SKIP TO Q. 31)

30a. What makes it hard for them?

30b. Is it hard for them in any way? (IF YES ASK "HOW?")

31. What (other) things, if any, bother or disturb your wife about your being a police officer?

Anything else? _____

(ASK EVERYONE)

32. Now would you please think of the two men who are not relatives with whom you spend the most time in your off-duty hours. They may be policemen or not. We'd like to ask several questions about each, such as where you met them, so could you give me just their first names so that we can talk about them without getting mixed up?

FIRST FRIEND'S FIRST NAME: _____

SECOND FRIENDS'S FIRST NAME: _____

(IF R REFUSES OR CAN'T GIVE THE NAMES OF TWO FRIENDS, NOTE HERE THE REASONS WHY:)

32X. _____

33A. Where did you meet (FIRST FRIEND)? _____

33B. And (SECOND FRIEND), where did you meet him? _____

34A. What is the main job your friends do? Let's take (FIRST FRIEND) first. What is his job? _____

(JOB)

34a. What does he do in his job? _____

34B. And (SECOND FRIEND), what is his job? _____

(JOB)

34b. What does he do in his job? _____

35. All in all, how often do you usually get together with _____ outside of work? (CHECK FOR BOTH FRIENDS):

FIRST SECOND

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Nearly every day |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Once a week |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Two or three times a month |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Once a month |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Several times a year |

- 35a. Do you often get together with both of these men at the same time?

1. Yes

2. No

(IF R MARRIED, ASK Q. 36 and 37; IF NOT MARRIED, SKIP TO Q. 38.)

36. When you get together, would you say that your wives are usually along, sometimes along, or rarely along? (CHECK FOR BOTH FRIENDS):

FIRST SECOND

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Usually |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Sometimes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Rarely |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Never |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0. Friend not married |

37. How about your wives, do they frequently, fairly often, sometimes, or rarely get together on their own. (CHECK FOR BOTH FRIENDS):

FIRST SECOND

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Frequently |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Sometimes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Rarely |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Never |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 0. Friend not married |

(ASK EVERYONE)

38. When you go out where people know you are a police officer, how often do they want to talk with you about police matters or crime? Would you say this happens frequently, occasionally, or rarely?

1. Frequently 2. Occasionally 3. Rarely 4. Never

38a. What kinds of police matters do they usually ask you about?

38b. Are they ever critical of what the police are doing?

1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No

37c. How do you feel when they are critical of the police?

(IF R ANSWERS IN TERMS OF WHAT HE DOES, E.G., "I try to explain.", RECORD ANSWER ABOVE BUT REPEAT QUESTION WITH EMPHASIS ON FEEL.)

39. When you are off duty, do you feel that you must act in a way that keeps up your reputation as a police officer?

1. Yes 2. No (SKIP TO Q. 40)

39a. In what ways does this affect your social life?

39b. How do you feel about this?

40. In what ways, if any, has being a police officer changed your social life?

41. In talking with people outside the department, how often do you feel you have to defend the department and what other officers do? Would you say this happens frequently, occasionally, or rarely?

1. Frequently 2. Occasionally 3. Rarely 4. Never 5. Don't know

41a. How do you feel about having to do that?

(IF R ANSWERS IN TERMS OF WHAT HE DOES, E.G., "I try to explain." RECORD ANSWER ABOVE BUT REPEAT QUESTION WITH EMPHASIS ON "FEEL".)

42. How often do you usually get together with other police officers off the job (including the friend(s) you just mentioned [IF FRIENDS ARE POLICE OFFICERS])?

Times per Week Month Year

(IF EVER GETS TOGETHER)

- 42a. Do you now work with any of the police officers you see off the job?

1. Yes 2. No

42b. Did you ever work with any of these men?

1. Yes 2. No

- 42c. When you get together socially with other officers is it usually the same group of policemen?

1. Yes 2. No

43. Aside from the people living with you, do you spend your off-duty time mainly with other officers or mainly with people who are not in the department?

1. Mainly with other officers → (GO TO Q. 44)

2. Mainly with people outside the department

3. About half and half

43a. Are the people outside the department with whom you spend time mostly relatives or mostly other friends?

1. Relatives

2. Other friends

44. Now we'd like to turn to a slightly different topic--the general public's opinion of the police. Do you think that the general public's opinion of the police has changed in the past five years?

1. Yes

2. No

8. Don't know

44a. In what ways has it changed?

45. From the point of view of the man on patrol, do you think the public in general behaves better, worse, or about the same, as they did when you started with the department?

1. Better

2. Worse

3. Much the same

8. Don't know

45a. In what ways do you think they behave differently (better/worse)?

45b. Do you think the public understands what it is like to be a police officer?

1. Yes

2. No

8. Don't know

45c. What do you think the public's view of police work is?

45h. What do you think the public's view of police work is?

45d. Are there any things you think they don't understand about what it's like to be a police officer? (DESCRIBE)

45i. What are the main things they don't understand about it?

45e. Are there any things that might make it hard for them to understand what it's like to be an officer and do police work? (DESCRIBE)

45j. What makes it hard for them to understand what it's like to be an officer and do police work?

(SERIES CONTINUES NEXT PAGE)

(SERIES CONTINUES NEXT PAGE)

(IF NOT SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED)

45f. Are there any organizations or groups that make it hard for the public to understand police work?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know

45g. Which ones? _____

45x. Any others? _____

(IF NOT SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED)

45k. Are there any organizations or groups that make it hard for the public to understand police work?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know

45l. Which ones? _____

45m. Any others? _____

→ (ASK EVERYONE)

45-N. When is the last time you were called to do police work when off duty?

- ___ 1. This past week
- ___ 2. This past month
- ___ 3. Within the past three months
- ___ 4. Within the past six months
- ___ 5. Within the past year
- ___ 6. Within the past two years
- ___ 7. More than two years ago
- ___ 8. Never → SKIP TO Q. 45-0.

45-Na. What kind of work were you called to do then? _____

45-0. When is the last time you made an arrest while off duty?

- ___ 1. This past week
- ___ 2. This past month
- ___ 3. Within the past three months
- ___ 4. Within the past six months
- ___ 5. Within the past year
- ___ 6. Within the past two years
- ___ 7. More than two years ago
- ___ 8. Never → SKIP TO Q. 46.

45-0a. What kind of arrest was that? _____

46. Now I'd like to know whether there are any particular sections of the public who have changed in how hard they are to deal with as compared to when you started with the department? How about motorists?

Would you say they are harder, about the same, or easier to deal with as compared to when you started?

(ASK WHETHER HARDER, SAME, OR EASIER ABOUT a-f. AFTER ASKING ABOUT ALL OF a-f, THEN ASK Q. 46a--"In what ways?" ABOUT EACH THAT R ANSWERS "EASIER" OR "HARDER".)

	Q. 46	Q. 46a. In what ways?
a. Motorists	1. Harder	_____
	2. Same	_____
	3. Easier	_____
b. Juveniles or teenagers	1. Harder	_____
	2. Same	_____
	3. Easier	_____
c. Professional people like doctors and teachers	1. Harder	_____
	2. Same	_____
	3. Easier	_____
d. Working class people	1. Harder	_____
	2. Same	_____
	3. Easier	_____
e. Negroes	1. Harder	_____
	2. Same	_____
	3. Easier	_____
f. People in your present precinct	1. Harder	_____
	2. Same	_____
	3. Easier	_____

47. In the last few years, do you think that the police have changed in the way they act toward the public?

1. Have changed

2. Have not changed

3. Don't know

47a. In what ways have they changed? _____

48. Do you think that in general the public helps as much as they should when they see police officers in trouble and needing help?

1. Yes

2. No

3. Don't know

48a. In what ways could they help more? _____

48b. Why do you think they don't help more? _____

49. How would you say the general public rates police work today as compared with 20 years ago right after World War II? Would you say they now rate the prestige of policemen higher, about the same, or lower than they did 20 years ago?

1. Higher

2. Same

3. Lower

CONTINUED

3 OF 3

49A. Do you think that police work is more hazardous today than it was five years ago?

1. Yes

2. No

49Aa. What makes it more hazardous? _____

49B. Do you feel that crimes of violence are increasing, or decreasing, or about the same as they were five years ago?

1. Increasing

2. About the same

3. Decreasing

49Ba. Why do you think that is happening? _____

50. Now I'd like to ask you how satisfied you are with some of the things about your work? First, how about salary: Would you say you are completely satisfied, generally satisfied, not too satisfied, or not at all satisfied with your present salary? (CHECK BELOW)

___ (1) Completely satisfied

___ (2) Generally satisfied

___ (3) Not too satisfied

___ (4) Not at all satisfied

51. About what would you say would be the right amount, before taxes and deductions, an officer with your experience should be paid?

\$ _____ ☐ Weekly ☐ Monthly ☐ Yearly

52. How much do you think a beginning officer in the department ought to get now?

\$ _____ ☐ Weekly ☐ Monthly ☐ Yearly

53. How about your supervisors in the department: Would you say you are completely satisfied, generally satisfied, not too satisfied, or not at all satisfied with your supervisors in the department? (CHECK BELOW)

- ____ (1) Completely satisfied
____ (2) Generally satisfied
____ (3) Not too satisfied
____ (4) Not at all satisfied

53a. Are there any things you particularly like about your supervisors? (IF YES, DESCRIBE)

53b. Are there any things you think can be improved about your supervisors? (IF YES, DESCRIBE)

54. About how often in 1965 and 1966 have you suggested to your supervisory officers a different or better way of doing police work? (HAND CARD B AND CHECK BELOW)

- ____ a. Never had occasion to do this in 1965 and 1966 → SKIP TO Q. 56
____ b. Once or twice
____ c. About three times
____ d. About five times
____ e. Six to ten times
____ f. More than ten times in 1965 and 1966

55. How often do your supervisory officers go along with your suggestions of different or better ways of doing police work? (HAND CARD C AND CHECK R's RESPONSE BELOW)

- ____ a. Very rarely or never
____ b. Occasionally
____ c. About half of the time
____ d. Most of the time
____ e. Almost all of the time

56. When you don't like some policy or procedure concerning police work, how often do you tell your opinion to one of your supervisory officers? (HAND CARD C AND CHECK BELOW)

- ____ a. Very rarely or never
____ b. Occasionally
____ c. About half of the time
____ d. Most of the time
____ e. Almost all of the time

57. How satisfied are you with the influence people at your rank have on how things are done in the department? Would you say you are (READ ALTERNATIVES):

- ____ (1) Completely satisfied
____ (2) Generally satisfied
____ (3) Not too satisfied
____ (4) Not at all satisfied

58. Are there any rules and procedures in the department that affect you in your work which you think could be improved?

1. Yes

2. No

58a. Which ones? _____

59. How would you assess your long-term opportunities for future promotion on the force? Would you say they are (READ ALTERNATIVES):

1. Excellent

2. Good

3. Fair

4. Poor

60. How about the promotion exams in the department: How satisfied are you with them? Would you say you are (READ ALTERNATIVES):

- ____ (1) Completely satisfied
____ (2) Generally satisfied
____ (3) Not too satisfied
____ (4) Not at all satisfied
____ (5) Don't know about the exams

60a. Why do you feel this way? _____

61. When did you last take a department promotion exam?

____ Date (IF NEVER TAKEN AN EXAM, SKIP TO Q. 52)

61a. What exam was that?

- ____ 1. Sergeant
____ 2. Detective
____ 3. Lieutenant or above
____ 4. Other (Specify) _____

61b. How did you do on it? _____

(SERIES CONTINUES NEXT PAGE)

(ASK IF R HAS TAKEN AN EXAM)

61c. How many times have you taken a promotion exam?

____ Times

(ASK EVERYONE)

62. What do you think is the highest rank that you are likely to reach on the force?

63. How about the service ratings in the department: How satisfied are you with them? Would you say you are (READ ALTERNATIVES):

- ____ (1) Completely satisfied
____ (2) Generally satisfied
____ (3) Not too satisfied
____ (4) Not at all satisfied
____ (5) Don't know

63a. Why do you feel this way? _____

64. Have you received any merit citations or awards from the department?

1. Yes

2. No

64a. What were they? _____

65. Now I'd like to ask you how you feel about the laws and sentences that are usually handed out in criminal cases. First, how about the judges of the criminal courts here in (Washington/Chicago/Boston). Do you think the sentences they hand out are too lenient, too harsh, or about right? (PROBE FOR FULL AND COMPLETE RESPONSE, E.G., "In what ways?")

66. How about the judges of the municipal courts here in (Washington/Chicago/Boston). Do you think the sentences they hand out are too lenient, too harsh, or about right? (PROBE FOR FULL AND COMPLETE RESPONSE, E.G., "In what ways?")

67. Now how about the judges of the juvenile court here in (Washington/Chicago/Boston). Do you think the way they deal with the juveniles is too lenient, too harsh, or about right? (PROBE FOR FULL AND COMPLETE RESPONSE, E.G., "In what ways?")

68. How about the laws? Do you feel that there are any laws or statutes on crimes and misdemeanors that are too harsh?

1. Yes

2. No

68a. Which ones?

69. Do you feel that there are any laws or statutes on crimes and misdemeanors that are too lenient?

1. Yes

2. No

69a. Which ones?

70. About how many times were you in court last month?

_____ Times → (IF NO TIMES, SKIP TO Q. 71)

70a. About how much time did it take, on the average, for each of these appearances?

_____ Hours

71. How do you feel about spending (that much time/time) in court?

72. Next, we'd like to ask you about the public prosecutors office. On the whole do you think that the public prosecutors here in (Washington/Chicago/Boston) do a very good job, a pretty good job, only a fair job or a not very good job?

1. Very good

2. Pretty good

3. Fair

4. Not good

5. Don't know

72a. In what ways is that so?

73. Do you feel that the public prosecutor usually handles the cases you present in the way he should?

1. Yes

2. No

3. Don't know

(GO TO Q. 74)

73a. Why do you feel this way? _____

74. Do you think that the public prosecutor generally is more interested in winning a case in court or more interested in justice?

1. Winning

2. Justice

3. Don't know

74a. Why do you feel that way? _____

75. Are there any ways that you think the relationship between the police officers and the public prosecutors could be improved?

1. Yes

2. No

3. Don't know

75a. In what ways? _____

76. What do you think about the kind of work that probation officers do with juvenile offenders? Do you think they do a very good job, a pretty good job, only a fair job, or a not very good job?

1. Very good

2. Pretty good

3. Fair

4. Not very good

76a. In what ways could they do a better job? _____

77. Now I'd like to return to some problems you encounter in your work? First, are there any special problems that the Supreme Court's rulings concerning search of persons make for you in your work?

1. Yes

2. No

77a. What are they? _____

78. Under what conditions do you think a police officer should be allowed to search persons, that is, what do you think the rule should be?

79. Are there any special problems that the Supreme Court's rulings concerning seizure of evidence makes for you in your work?

1. Yes

2. No

79a. What are they? _____

80. Under what conditions do you think a police officer should be allowed to seize evidence, that is, what do you think the rule should be?

81. Now how about the rulings in relation to interrogation or questioning of persons and confessions. Are there any special problems that the Supreme Court's rulings on interrogation or questioning of suspects make for you in your work?

1. Yes

2. No

81a. What are they? _____

82. What do you think the rules ought to be for interrogation of persons?

83. How about confessions? Has the courts rulings on confessions made any problems for you in your work?

1. Yes

2. No

3. Don't know

83a. In what ways has it made a difference? _____

84. What do you think the rules should be for confessions? _____

85. In general, do you think that the U.S. Supreme Court has gone too far, not far enough, or about right in making rules favoring and protecting criminal offenders?

1. Too far

2. About right

3. Not far enough

85a. Why do you feel this way? _____

86. Do you think that on the whole the police have become too lenient in dealing with people who are suspected of breaking the law?

1. Yes

2. No

86a. In what ways is that so? _____

87. On a slightly different subject--how the police department spends its time--are there any things you think the police should spend more of their time on than they do now?

1. Yes

2. No

87a. On what things should they spend more time? _____

88. Are there any things you think the police should spend less of their time on than they do now?

1. Yes

2. No

88a. On what things should they spend less time? _____

Any others? _____

88A. These days the statistics on crime in cities show that Negroes have a higher rate of crime than do white people. Why do you think this is so?

88B. What would you say are the main reasons people commit crimes? _____

88C. As an officer, do you feel that you have to be tougher in dealing with some kinds of people than others?

1. Yes

2. No

88Ca. What kinds of people do you have to be more tough with?

88D. These days a police department has to deal with demonstrations, sit-ins, and picketing sponsored by groups or movements. Do you think that they should be allowed to demonstrate, sit-in, or picket?

1. Yes

2. No

8. Don't know

88E. Why do you say that? _____

88F. Do you think that such demonstrations are a main cause of violence these days?

1. Yes

2. No

8. Don't know

88G. Do you think your department is able to handle these situations the way they should be handled?

1. Yes

2. No

8. Don't know

88Ga. Why not? _____

88H. Are there any things that should be done about these situations that would make them easier to deal with them?

1. Yes

2. No

88Ha. What? _____

89. Now just a few questions about your background and we'll be through.
What was your age at your last birthday?

_____ Years

90. How many years of school did you complete?

0-8 grades	9-11 some high school	12 high school graduate	Vocational training	13-15 some college	16 college graduate	17 more graduate training
---------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------

(IF NECESSARY)

a. Do you have a high school diploma? 1. Yes 2. No	b. Do you have a high school diploma? 1. Yes 2. No	c. What college degree do you have? _____
--	--	--

91. What was the first full-time job (other than in the armed forces) you ever held for more than six months?

91a. What kind of work did you do on that job? _____

91b. For how long did you work at that job?
_____ Years _____ Months

92. Of all jobs you ever had, what was the job you held longest before going into police work?

_____ Same as first job (DESCRIBED IN Q. 91-91b) → SKIP TO Q. 93

_____ Other (Specify job) _____

92a. What kind of work did you do on that job? _____

92b. For how long did you work at that job? _____

93. At the time you first took up police work, what was your main job? (IF UNEMPLOYED OR NOT WORKING THEN INDICATE THIS AND USE LAST MAIN JOB. IF TWO OR MORE JOBS, DETERMINE WHICH WAS MAIN JOB AND ASK ABOUT THAT.)

_____ 0. None--went into police work without ever holding another job
GO TO Q. 94

_____ 1. Same as first job (Described in Q. 91-91b) → GO TO Q. 94

_____ 2. Same as longest job (Described in Q. 92-92b) → GO TO Q. 94

_____ 3. Other (Specify job) _____

93a. What kind of work did you do on that job? _____

93b. In what business or industry was that job? (IF NECESSARY, ASK, "What line of business or type of industry was it in?")

94. What were your main reasons for leaving that job? _____

95. What was the job that your father worked at the longest? _____

95a. What kind of work did he do on that job? _____

96. Besides being a police officer, do you have any other regular or part time job?

1. Yes

2. No

96a. What job(s) is that?

96b. What kind of work do you do on that (these) job(s)?

96c. About how much do you make in a year (from this work outside the department)? (HAND CARD D) Just give me the letter on the card that fits.

- ☐ a. Under \$300
- ☐ b. \$300-\$499
- ☐ c. \$500-\$999
- ☐ d. \$1,000-\$1,999
- ☐ e. \$2,000-\$4,999
- ☐ f. \$5,000 and over

96d. If your salary with the department included that amount, would you still want the right to hold a second job?

96e. Why don't you?

(IF R MENTIONS, "The department doesn't allow it." ASK)

96f. Should the department allow men to hold outside jobs?

1. Yes

2. No

96g. What?

97. Are any of your relatives police officers?

1. Yes

2. No

97a. Which?

- ☐ grandfather ☐ one ☐ both
- ☐ father
- ☐ brother → How many? ☐
- ☐ son → How many? ☐
- ☐ father-in-law
- ☐ brother-in-law → How many? ☐
- ☐ cousins → How many? ☐
- ☐ uncles → How many? ☐
- ☐ nephew → How many? ☐
- ☐ other (Specify ☐ How many? ☐

98. Do you have a religious preference? That is, are you either Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish or something else?

1. Protestant

2. Roman Catholic

3. Jewish

4. Other ☐

(IF PROTESTANT:

98a. What specific denomination is that?

(IF JEWISH)

98b. Do you consider yourself Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, or none of these?

(FOR WHITE R'S, ASK:)

99. What nationality background do you think of yourself as having--that is, besides being American Canadian? (like, Irish, German, Italian, Scottish)

100. In what country was your father born?

1. USA

2. Other (Specify) ☐

100a. Where did your earlier ancestors live before coming to this country?

101. Do you belong to any organizations made up entirely of police officers?

1. Yes

2. No

101a. To which ones do you belong?

102. Do you belong to any clubs or organizations other than ones connected with police work?

1. Yes

2. No

102a. To which ones do you belong? (RECORD THE NAMES OF ALL ORGANIZATIONS THAT R MENTIONS IN 102b. BELOW, AND THEN ASK FOR EACH ORGANIZATION MENTIONED):

102b. Would you consider yourself an active member of _____?

NAMES OF ORGANIZATIONS

ACTIVE MEMBER

a. _____	1. Yes	2. No
b. _____	1. Yes	2. No
c. _____	1. Yes	2. No
d. _____	1. Yes	2. No

103. Thank you for your co-operation. That completes the questions we have. Is there anything else you'd like to mention about police work or the problems of crime that you think the National Crime Commission ought to be informed about?

104. Thank you again.

THUMBNAIL: TO BE COMPLETED IMMEDIATELY AFTER LEAVING RESPONDENT'S HOUSE

T-1. R's Race:

1. white

2. Negro

3. oriental

4. other (Describe) _____

Description of Property:

T-2. What kind of place does R live in? (CHECK ONE)

Single family dwelling

___1. Single story

___2. Multiple story

Trailer

___3. Mobile

___4. Permanent foundation

Other

___5. Flat in two or three family house

___6. Flat in four family house

___7. Apartment building

7a. How many other dwelling units in this building? _____
(BEST GUESS WILL DO)

___8. Did not interview R at his home

The Interview Situation:

T-3. How cooperative was R? (CHECK ONE)

___1. Very cooperative throughout

___2. Average

___3. Poor throughout

___4. Started poor, became good

___5. Started good, became poor

T-4. Who else was present during the interview and what effect did this have?

____ Only R Present

<u>Person(s) Present</u>	<u>How Long</u>	<u>What Effect</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

T-5. How honest and open was R in answering the questions? _____

T-6. Rate R's ability to communicate and express himself verbally, his oral presentation:

- ____ 1. Great deal of trouble putting his ideas into words
____ 2. Some trouble putting his ideas into words
____ 3. No trouble communicating his ideas
____ 4. Expressed himself with greater than average clarity and precise-
ness

T-7. Did R have a distinguishable accent:

☐ 1. Yes

☐ 2. No

Specify which:

☐ 1. Negro

☐ 2. Southern white (include hillbilly)

☐ 3. Irish

☐ 4. Italian

☐ 5. Other (Specify) _____

T-8. Was R trying to "show off" or impress you?

☐ 1. Very much so

☐ 2. A number of times

☐ 3. A few times only

☐ 4. Not at
all

T-9. Thumbnail sketch: (RECORD ON BACK)

END