If you have issues viewing or accessing this file contact us at NCJRS.gov.

IDENTIFICATION OF WORK AND FAMILY SERVICES FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL

Report prepared for the:
National Institute of Justice
Grant #95-IJ-CX-0113
June, 1997

by
Robert P. Delprino, Ph.D.
Karen O'Quin, Ph.D.
Cheryl Kennedy, B.A.

In Conjunction with the Police Research and Education Project (PREP)
750 First Street, N.E. Suite 920
Washington, D.C. 20002

delprino@ojp.usdoj.gov
716-878-6669

This project was supported under award number #95-IJ-CX-0113 from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

-Working Draft-

IDENTIFICATION OF WORK AND FAMILY SERVICES FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

I. Objective
- A. Phase I: Pilot Study
- B. Phase II: Police Officer Questionnaire
- C. Phase III: Agency Questionnaire

II. Nature of the Problem
- A. Research Findings Related to the Problem
  - 1. Introduction
  - 2. Work and Family Issues in Law Enforcement

III. Methodology and Results
- A. Phase I: Pilot Study Methodology and Results
  - 1. Development of the Work and Family Issues in Law Enforcement Questionnaire (WFILE)
  - 2. Description of the WFILE
  - 3. Method
    - a. Sample
    - b. Procedure
  - 4. Results
- B. Phase II: Police Officer Questionnaire Methodology and Results
  - 1. Development of the Police Officer Questionnaire
  - 2. Method
    - a. Sample Selection
    - b. Participants
    - c. Procedure
    - d. Results
- C. Phase III: Agency Questionnaire Methodology and Results
  - 1. Development of the Agency Questionnaire (Work and Family Support Services For Law Enforcement Questionnaire)
  - 2. Method
    - a. Sample Development
    - b. Participants
    - c. Procedure
    - d. Results
- D. Discussion

References

Appendices

Appendix A-1	Work and Family Issues in Law Enforcement Questionnaire (WFILE)
Appendix A-2	WFILE Descriptive Tables
Appendix A-3	WFILE Cover Letters

Appendix A-4	Factor Analysis and Reliability Analysis for Erie County Study
Appendix B-1	Police Officer Questionnaire (POQ)
Appendix B-2	POQ Cover Letter: 1st Mailing
Appendix B-3	POQ Cover Letter: 2nd Mailing
Appendix B-4	POQ Total Descriptive Tables
Appendix B-5	POQ Descriptive Tables By Six Areas
Appendix B-6	Factor Analysis and Reliability Analysis for Officer Questionnaire Compared to Erie County Study (Tables 1-11)
Appendix B-7	Comparing the Six Areas on Scale Score Variables from the Officer Questionnaire
Appendix C-1	Agency Questionnaire (AQ) (Work and Family Support Services for Law Enforcement)
Appendix C-2	AQ Cover Letters
Appendix C-3	AQ Tables 1-8

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The goals of this three-phase project were first, to provide current information on work and family issues from the police officer's perspective and second, to identify the existence and prevalence of work and family programs currently offered nationally by law enforcement agencies.

PHASE I

The first phase of this project was a pilot study to develop a questionnaire to study work and family issues in law enforcement. The Work and Family Issues in Law Enforcement Questionnaire (WFILE) was developed and distributed to 1800 officers representing 21 agencies in Western New York. Surveys were delivered to each police agency for distribution and returned via self addressed stamped envelopes. Useable questionnaires were returned by 597 (33.2%) officers.

The majority of officers who responded to the survey were patrol officers with an average of 16 years working in law enforcement. Respondents were predominately male, white, married and had some college experience.

The results of this phase of the project indicated that for these officers, work and family experiences influenced each other and that the family compensated for what was lacking in the job. Conflict between oficers' roles as parent and spouse were minimal. A major finding in this phase of the project was a significant lack of knowledge among officers as to what programs were available to assist them and their family members. For

example, although all of the police officers who participated in this phase had access to some form of an Employee Assistance Program (EAP), only 58% knew that an EAP was available to officers. Of those who knew about it, only 12% reported having used it. In addition to providing information for the law enforcement community in Western New York, the goal of Phase I was to provide data that could be used to develop the Police Officer Questionnaire in Phase II.

PHASE II

The Police Officer Questionnaire (POQ) was developed based on modifications made to the WFILE. This 148 item questionnaire was sent to 4480 officers from New York, NY and surrounding agencies, Dallas, TX and surrounding agencies,and Minneapolis, MN and surrounding agencies. Useable responses were received from 1632 (36.4%) officers representing 51 agencies.

The majority of respondents were male, white and married. More than half had a college degree with an average of 13 years in law enforcement. The primary job titles of respondents included payrol officer, sergeant, and detective.

Over one fourth of respondents reported that they experienced quite a bit to a great deal of stress as a result of the job. When asked to identify from a list of 14 stress-related symptoms how many they had experienced within the last month, 25 percent of the respondents indicated that they had experienced headaches, back problems, allergies and sleeplessness within the last month. When the number of symptoms reported per officer

were summed, 68 percent of the respondents indicated that they had experienced at least one symptom within the last month with some officers reporting as many as 8 stress-related symptoms. Surprisingly, New York City and Dallas officers reported less stress than officers from the New York area, Dallas area, Minneapolis and the Minnesota area.

For this group of officers the job appeared not to have a great impact on their relationship with their spouse or partner. Spouse/partner support seemed to be more in the form of traits of the spouse/partner such as attitude, sense of humor, understanding and communication about the job. For these officers spouses/partners were less likely to provide support by facilitating use of counseling, support groups or educational programs.

The results indicate that officers with children seem to be more greatly impacted by incidents that involve children and thought about their own children during those incidents. It is likely that these officers could benefit from some type of debriefing after being involved in incidents that involve children to minimize the negative effects on the officer and family.

When asked how supportive their supervisors, fellow officers, union or management were for an officer seeking assistance, overall top management was rated as less supportive than the other groups. From a list of ways the agency could better assist officers, highest ratings were given to mandating

confidentiality, reducing stigma for seeking assistance and adopting a Law Enforcement Officer's Bill of Rights.

While officers were aware of the availability of several services, there were wide variations across geographic areas in awareness. Actual use of services was low. Officers indicated that they were most willing to participate in post-shooting debriefing for the officer and spouse and counseling for families of officers killed in the line of duty. Officers showed least willingness to use group therapy and peer counseling.

PHASE III

To identify what services law enforcement agencies provided for officers and their family members, the Work and Family Support Services for Law Enforcement Questionnaire was developed (also called the Agency Questionnaire, AQ). This questionnaire identified providers of services, types of services offered, agencies' obstacles to use of services, agencies' enhancement of services and organizational impact.

The AQ was sent to 587 law enforcement agencies throughout the United States. Usable surveys were returned by 380 agencies (64.7%) representing 48 state agencies, 166 agencies serving populations of 25,000 to 49,999, 84 agencies serving populations of 50,000 to 99,999 and 82 agencies serving populations over 100,000. The number of male officers in the agencies ranged from 5 to 31,845 and the number of female officers ranged from 1 to 5,620.

The most common service providers identified by agencies

were chaplains, reported by 245 of 380 agencies that responded to that item. One agency reported having 60 chaplains who provided services to officers. Forty-three agencies reported that the chaplains were also sworn law enforcement officers. The next most common providers were EAP coordinators followed by psychologists and psychiatrists, social workers comprised the smallest category. Of agencies that specified qualifications for providers, more than half of them cited state licensure, certification or a doctoral degree.

The AQ listed 29 services related to work and family support. The most frequently reported service provided by agencies was post-shooting debriefing. Other services provided by at least 80 percent of the agencies included counseling, EAPs, work-out facilities, training in domestic violence, and insurance that provided mental health treatment. The majority of the 29 services were provided by fewer than half of the agencies. Less popular services included EAPs specially designed for law enforcement, family orientation programs, programs on work and family issues for recruits and officers throughout their careers, family firearm safety, group therapy, crisis telephone service, or flexible work schedules. A very small number of agencies provided child care services (2%, n=7).

For these agencies, nothing stood out as a major obstacle in the use of services, but highest ratings were given to budgetary concerns, lack of personnel to provide services, and the stigma associated with seeking assistance. Managers' use of programs to

target officers for disciplinary action received the lowest rating as an obstacle to service use.

To facilitate development, awareness and acceptance of services more than 50 percent of the agencies reported that they mandated confidentiality, provided information on the benefit of services, provided training at the academy level, trained supervisors on access, use and referral of services, allowed officers to attend counseling while on duty, provided funding for services, allowed officers to provide peer support on the job and had a public policy statement of support from administration. Only 26 percent of the agencies indicated that they had plans to increase the number of family programs within the next two years.

In terms of the organization, while 90 percent of the agencies had mission statements, few included reference to work and family (23%). A little over a third of the agencies kept utilizations statistics on services, but very few agencies (n=28) had conducted impact studies or planned to do so within the next year. Such impact studies would be very effective in identifying the real value of work and family support services to agencies, officers and their family members.

The nature of police stress and its impact on the law enforcement family have been documented since the 1970s. The results of this project contributes comprehensive data that can enhance the understanding of the current state of work and family issues with which law enforcement families must contend. Also, the information provided can assist agencies in developing

services for officers and their family members that will meet their needs and make the best use of resources. This project provides a bench mark of the type of work and family support programs offered by agencies nationally. What is needed in the future is greater awareness of and trust in support programs by officers to increase their knowledge of and willingness to use the services. Agencies need to be more proactive in recognizing the benefits of work and family support services, providing such services to their officers, and measuring their impact. More needs to be done to encourage police agencies to adopt policies that include services for families, promote the development of effective intervention strategies and encourage officers to participate.

INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 1995, the Police Research and Education Project (PREP) was awarded a grant from the National Institute of Justice to assist in that agency's goal to develop and implement policies and programs to reduce stress and promote law enforcement family well-being. The following report summarizes the results of three surveys designed to identify police officers' family-related stress factors and organizational programs available to assist law enforcement officers and their families.

I. OBJECTIVE

An objective of this project was to identify from the police officers' perspective the nature and extent of work and family issues which influenced them and to assess their knowledge of and willingness to use provided support services. A second objective was to identify the existence and prevalence of work and family programs for law enforcement families that are currently utilized by law enforcement agencies. The following three phase approach was used to meet the objectives stated above:

A. Phase I: Pilot Study

Pilot data were collected from 597 law enforcement officers representing municipal, suburban, and rural police agencies in Western New York. The Work and Family Issues in Law Enforcement Questionnaire (WFILE, Delprino & Kennedy, 1994) was developed specifically for this pilot study.

B. Phase II: Police Officer Questionnaire

Based on results obtained in Phase I, the WFILE was modified to develop the "Police Officer Questionnaire" (POQ). The POQ was administered to officers in police agencies in three geographical locations in the Northeast (New York, New York and surrounding areas), Midwest (Minneapolis, Minnesota and surrounding areas), and the Southwest (Dallas, Texas and surrounding areas). Analyses were conducted to allow for comparisons among agencies based on geographic location.

C. Phase III: Agency Questionnaire

Information gained from Phase II was used in part in the development of the "Agency Questionnaire" (AQ). The AQ was administered to a national sample of State, municipal, suburban, and rural police agencies. The goal of this survey was to identify the extent and nature of programs offered by law enforcement agencies across the United States to address police officers' stress and family well-being. Analyses identified the existence of programs offered by agencies, providers of services, obstacles related to the use of programs, and steps taken to facilitate program development and use.

II. NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

In the past 20 years more than 150 articles, several books and numerous manuals have been published on police stress. By comparison, the empirical research findings on the relationship between police stress and family life is lacking. These earlier works provide useful insight into police stress and family life,

however, the police family requires greater attention. Although they do not carry a badge or a gun, family members suffer vicariously as a result of the stress the officer experiences from the job (Sleek, 1993). Greater understanding can be gained and assistance provided by the evaluation of objective empirical data.

In addition, the minimal research findings of the 1970s may not be generalizable to the current state of the police family. The work environment of law enforcement officers has changed due in part to escalating crime rates, greater restrictions placed on how the officers perform the job, and the introduction of new technology (Ainsworth, 1995; National Institute of Justice, 1997). In the past 20 years, the structure and function of the family has also evolved due to changing demographics of the work force, as well as changing attitudes and values among workers (Zedeck, 1992).

One way to assist officers and their family members to reduce stress and promote law enforcement family well-being is through training. However, offering training or providing services to officers and their families without a thorough analysis of needs or identification of current programs may result in programs that do not directly address the concerns of those receiving the services. A needs assessment would make apparent the objectives of training programs and services to be offered (Goldstein, 1991) and further identify critical issues which should be addressed. Also, identifying nationally the

existence and effectiveness of programs would assist agencies in developing programs that would best meet their needs and resources.

Ellison and Genz (1983) indicated that no comprehensive data existed at that time which supported the assertion of high rates of family dysfunction attributed to careers in law enforcement. This lack of data apparently continues in this decade as indicated by Scrivner's testimony on police stress and family well being before the U.S. House of Representatives Selection Committee on Children, Youth, and Families:

> "The incidence and prevalence of police family problems, while believed to be significant, are not known because no systematic data collection has been performed nationwide. This lack of empirical evidence limits the understanding of the extent of family problems. More importantly, it impedes the development of effective intervention strategies. Finally, the lack of data makes it difficult to encourage police departments to adopt policies that include services for families." (Police Stress, 1991, p. 8)

Current information about the stressors experienced by officers and their family members in addition to the perceived need, effectiveness, and willingness to use programs, would allow agencies to develop family-friendly policies and programs that will be maximally effective.

Also, given the potential cost of developing programs, identifying work and family issues from the officers' perspective can ensure that such programs are focused, cost-effective, and address officers' and family members' needs. Policies and programs that are developed based on identified officers' needs may less likely be perceived as being imposed on the officers and

therefore may have a greater chance of success.

In addition, the identification of work and family programs currently used across the nation by police agencies will provide agencies with models of programs that they can implement. Such information would increase general knowledge on a national level to provide a benchmark of the extent, nature and effectiveness of work and family programs in police departments.

In sum, the state of the art indicates a strong need for empirical data to define the full extent of law enforcement officer stress, family well being and identification of effective intervention strategies. Documenting the factors that are related to work and family issues in law enforcement is critical if relevant services are to be provided to officers and their family members. Police agencies need to identify and implement programs that are most effective in responding to officers' and family members' concerns to make best use of financial and community resources. Through the use of surveys of officers and law enforcement agencies, this project adds to empirical data on law enforcement families to identify the need and existence of programs which can guide the development of training and intervention programs.

A. Research Findings Related to the Problem

1. Introduction

It has been argued that the work-place and the family are the two most central institutions in an individual's life (Mortimer, Lorence & Kumka, 1986). In the past it was assumed

that these two spheres of an individual's life could remain separate. More recent trends indicate that these spheres are not usually separate domains. What occurs in one will typically influence the other (Zedeck, 1992).

Social and employee attitude changes, in addition to legislation, have contributed to the increased attention given to work and family issues. Also, the family structure has changed significantly in the past two decades (Thomas & Ganster, 1995). These changes have resulted in greater conflict between the spheres of work and family (Kraut, 1990). Workers' attitudes have been identified as placing greater emphasis upon quality of life and in linking work, private life and leisure (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Kanter, 1977).

Given the changing nature of the workplace, some companies have initiated policies and organizational programs such as Employee Assistance Programs to assist employees in dealing with work and family issues. Legislative actions such as the Family Medical Leave Act of 1993 have also increased the attention given to this topic. Although some organizations have begun to address work and family issues, changes in the family structure have typically not been accompanied by equally significant changes in law enforcement agencies' policies toward work and family. These issues are a legitimate organizational concern, because failure to address them may result in the loss of valuable workers or productivity (Friedman & Galinsky, 1992).

Research has shown that work-family conflicts can be major

sources of stress and can have a profound negative impact on individuals' satisfaction in both work and family life. The conflict can lead to increased depression and lowering of overall life satisfaction (Schneer & Reitman, 1993).

Thomas and Ganster (1995) indicate that specific organizational approaches such as supervisory support and flexible scheduling may alleviate many effects of work-family conflict and thereby play a mediating role in employees' ability to deal with stress resulting from the conflict. Greenhaus, Bedeian and Mossholder (1987) provided evidence that perceptions of nonsupportive work environment were associated with low levels of marital adjustment and quality of life and high levels of work-family conflict. Therefore it is not enough just to have family-supportive policies. Employees must know that the programs exist and supervisors must support their use. Innovative polices and programs cannot yield their intended effects if they exist within an unsupportive culture (Friedman & Galinsky, 1992).

2. Work and Family Issues in Law Enforcement

The influence of a career in law enforcement on the officer's family has been documented since the 1970s and 1980s (Cain, 1973; Jacques & Mutchnick, 1979; Maynard & Maynard, 1982; Maynard, Maynard, Mccubbin & Shao, 1980; Ready, 1979; Saper, 1980; Reiser, 1978; Stenmark, DePiano, Wackwitz, Cannon & Walfish, 1982; Stratton & Stratton, 1982). Although much of this earlier literature is anecdotal, it does indicate that some

police agencies in the past have paid attention to work and family issues in policing. In a national survey of police agencies by Delprino and Bahn (1988), 42% of the respondents indicated that their agency did provide some form of counseling to police officers' family members. Approximately 52% of the respondents indicated that counseling was offered to the officer for personal and family problems. However, the perceived need for each form of counseling was much higher (i.e., 60% and 72% respectively).

A common theme in this literature has been that the occupational demands and the stressful nature of police work have a great impact on the family life of police officers (Bibbins, 1986). The responsibilities associated with police work are so great that often they result in behaviors and circumstances that supplant family life relations and transform both the individual and the family (Niederhoffer & Niederhoffer, 1978). Burke (1993) found that for police officers, work-family conflict was significantly related to measures of emotional well-being. Such findings may not be surprising considering that the police family has been called a high risk life-style (Depue, 1981).

Factors that can adversely influence an officer both on and off the job include physical and psychological threats that are unique to police work, court leniency with criminals, negative press accounts of the police, and perceived lack of support from supervisors and fellow officers. These stressors can lead officers to isolate themselves from the public and their family

members (Maynard, Maynard, McCubbin & Shao, 1980; Violanti & Marshall, 1983). In addition, the public criticism that officers may experience can lead their spouses and children to feel isolated and segregated (Wrightsman, Nietzel & Fortune, 1994).

Not only can the officer's job impact the family but the family can also influence the officer's ability to cope with the stress associated with the job. Research indicates that married officers report lower levels of job satisfaction than do single officers (Buzawa, 1984; Preiss & Ehrlich, 1966). Burke (1988) reported that officers with greater work-family conflict were less satisfied with their jobs. One explanation may be that the demands of a family are not compatible with the long hours, changing shifts, and inherent dangers of police work. It has been reported that family objections to police work sometimes lead officers to leave law enforcement (Burke, 1988; Buzawa, 1984).

Family members can also be a critical support system for the officer, and family stability may be a valid predictor of success in police work (Bibbins, 1986). A police officer can expect his/her level of marital satisfaction to be a pervasive influence on professional attitude and performance (Stenmark, DePiano, Wackwitz, Cannon & Walfish, 1982; Elliott, Bingham, Nielsen & Warner, 1986). Kirkcaldy (1993) reported that support received from the home environment and time management were two facets that helped officers cope with stress.

There has been a renewed interest in understanding the

issues faced by police families and supporting them to deal with the stress that appears to be inherent in police work. The renewed interest is evident by the hearing held on this topic before the House of Representatives Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families (Police Stress, 1991), national conferences on the police family sponsored by agencies such as the FBI (Reese & Scrivner, 1994), and current writings on this topic (Anderson, Swenson, & Clay, 1995; Blau, 1994; Janik, 1995; Kirschman, 1997; White & Honig, 1995). The goal of the current report is to add to the existing body of knowledge of the police family by providing systematic data collection, as called for by Ellison, Genz (1983) and Scrivner (Police Stress, 1991), to contribute to understanding the nature and extent of problems faced by police families and developing effective intervention strategies.

III. Methodology And Results

The methodology includes information on the research plan utilized for each of the three phases of this project. In addition, the results obtained from each phase are presented and discussed.

A. Phase I: Pilot Study Methodology and Results

This section presents the development of the Work and Family Issues in Law Enforcement Questionnaire (WFILE), information about the sample, and a summary of the findings.

1. Development of the Work and Family Issues in Law Enforcement Questionnaire (WFILE)

The WFILE was developed in two steps. First, a review of the literature was conducted. Second, structured telephone

interviews with eight law enforcement officers and 13 mental health professionals who worked with officers and their family members provided the basis for the WFILE. The structured interview was designed to ascertain the primary concerns and issues of police officers with regard to work and family. Interview participants represented city, county, state and federal law enforcement agencies. The mean age of the 21 participants in the structured interviews was 45. Participants also had an average of 16 years of experience working with law enforcement personnel. Responses obtained from the open-ended items of the telephone interviews were content analyzed (Weber, 1985) and were used in the development of the WFILE.

2. Description of the WFILE

The WFILE consisted of 178 items. Several items were grouped together to form scales (Appendix A-1). The first 17 items requested demographic information about the respondent. The remaining items consisted of open-ended questions, Likert type items, and scales which measured:

a. Work and Family Orientation

b. Work and Family Issues

c. Job's Influence on Spouse/Significant Other

d. Spouse/Significant Other Support

e. Influence of Parental Role on the Job

f. Job's Influence on Relationship with Children

g. Job's Influence on Relationships and Friendships

h. Knowledge of Programs to Assist with Work and Family Issues

i. Willingness to use Programs to Assist with Work and Family Issues

j. Department's Ability to Assist Officers with Work and Family Issues

k. Relationship with Officer's Partner

3. Method

a. Sample

Participants were 597 law enforcement officers from 21 agencies located in Western New York. The agencies included county, metropolitan, suburban and rural police departments. Descriptive statistics for the responses to the WFILE are presented in Table 1, Appendix A-2.

The majority of police officers who responded to the survey were patrol officers. Other titles included chief, captain, lieutenant, detective and sergeant. The majority of respondents were male (n=541). The average age of participants was 40 years (SD=8.20). Most of the respondents were white (n=540). An overwhelming majority had indicated that they had some college experience (n=517). Seventy-five percent (n=446) indicated that they were married and 80 percent (n=489) reported that they had children. As a group, police officers reported having worked an average of 15.75 years (SD=8.23) in law enforcement. A little over one-third (35.7%, n=213) of police officers also reported that they had other family members who worked or had worked in law enforcement.

b. Procedure

The WFILE was distributed to 1800 officers serving in police

agencies in Western New York. Each officer received a cover letter (Appendix A-3) eliciting his or her support, a copy of the WFILE and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope. The Erie County Department of Central Police Services assisted in the delivery and collection of completed surveys. The Erie County Department of Central Police Services is responsible for the training of recruits for all 21 police agencies in Erie County. In addition, this agency oversees the forensic laboratory, communications and information systems for all police agencies in Erie County.

Surveys were delivered by Central Police Services to each agency. The chiefs of each agency were requested to distribute the survey to their officers. Therefore, every officer in each agency was given an opportunity to participate. Officers were asked to return their completed questionnaires to the Erie County Employee Assistance Program. The County's EAP was chosen as the site for the return of the questionnaire because it was believed that it would enhance the officers' need of confidentiality and anonymity of their responses. Of the 1800 questionnaires distributed, 597 usable questionnaires were returned, providing a 33.2% return rate.

4. Results

Question 18 of the WFILE consisted of 21 items intended to measure officers' work-family orientation. The orientation of an individual explains his or her perception of the relationship between work and family. Three major theories in the field of

work and family relationships include spillover theory, compensation theory, and segmentation theory. Spillover theory states that there are no boundaries for behavior. What occurs in the work environment and the family environment are similar (Staines, 1980). Work attitudes and behaviors become ingrained and carry over into home life (Kando & Summers, 1971). Compensation theory states that there is an inverse relationship between work and family (Staines, 1980). Individuals make different investments of themselves in both, so that what is lacking in one is made up for or compensated for in the other (Evans & Bartolome, 1984). Segmentation theory postulates that the spheres of work and family are distinct and do not influence each other (Evans & Bartolome, 1984). This theory indicates that individuals are able to compartmentalize work and family so that there is no overlap from one to the other.

Examining the work and family items on pages 4 and 5 of Appendix A-2, it is clear that respondents on average tended to agree that their work and family experiences influence each other. For this sample of officers, it appeared that the family compensated for what was lacking in the job.

Question 19 consisted of 15 items designed to measure concepts that the officers considered to be issues for them and their family members as a result of being a police officer (page 6 of Appendix A-2). Although officers did not indicate any of the items to be very much an issue for them or their family members, the item which addressed the officer's tendency to be

overprotective of family members received the highest mean score (M=3.55, SD=1.13). Other items viewed as somewhat of an issue were the physiological demands that are placed on the body, changes in eating, sleeping and exercising patterns, the job requiring them to be away from the family, and missing important family events.

Items that were not considered issues for police officers in this study and which received low mean ratings included the relationship between the officers and their work partner, conflict between the role of officer and parent, marital conflict, and the job becoming a priority over the family.

Question 21, which consisted of 18 items, asked participants to identify how a career in law enforcement influenced their relationships with their spouses/significant others (page 7 of Appendix A-2). Although officers indicated that they spent time with their spouse/significant other and that they socialized with others outside of the department, they also indicated that they were very protective of their spouses/significant others. For this sample of officers, it appears that few of them argued with their spouse/significant other about the job or considered their relationship secondary compared to relationships with other officers.

To the global question of how supportive the officers felt their spouse/significant other was to their career in law enforcement (page 8 of Appendix A-2), officers believed that their spouse/significant other was supportive. Question 23 of

the WFILE presented a list of ways in which the spouse/significant other may provide support to the officer. Officers indicated that important support that they receive from their spouse/significant other included the ability to be flexible in scheduling family events, maintaining a good sense of humor, having a positive attitude, maintaining good communication and attempting to better understand the job (pages 8-9, Appendix A-2). Officers reported that their spouses/significant others rarely participated in any support groups or educational seminars on law enforcement, and rarely facilitated access to counseling.

The questionnaire also addressed police officers' children. While most police officers indicated that their children were very supportive of them and their careers, they also would not strongly encourage their children to choose law enforcement as a career (page 9 of Appendix A-2). Question 27, which consisted of five items, asked officers to identify how being a parent influenced them in relationship to their job (pages 9-10 of Appendix A-3). Officers reported that calls with children tended to have a greater effect on them. They believed that they were more understanding in situations that involve children and that they were more aware of issues that affect children and teenagers. Overall, police officers believed that being a parent influenced how they perform on the job. The eight items which made up question 29, asked officers to identify how the job influenced them as parents (page 10 of Appendix A-2). The highest mean scores were reported for items that described the

officers as very protective of their children, and setting high standards for them.

A number of items assessed support of parents and siblings and friendships on and off the job (pages 11-12 of Appendix A-2). Most officers considered their parents and siblings to be supportive of them.

Question 32, which consisted of 17 items, was concerned with how being a police officer influenced one's relationships and friendships with non-family members. While officers indicated that they believed they were treated differently when others find out they are police officers and that people expected them to adhere to a higher set of standards, officers also reported that they had many friends outside of the department and that they do participated in non-department related activities.

The next section of the questionnaire dealt with services offered to help officers (pages 13-15 of Appendix A-2). Throughout the questionnaire, respondents were given the opportunity to make written comments about work and family issues. In reference to services provided by the agency one officer commented:

> "For 24 years I have heard this is a high stress, high divorce, high abuse profession, well it certainly is! Not once has a program been offered where the family could come in and see what they are a part of (my first family of 18 years does not know what the inside of the station looks like). Nobody would spend $1 for prevention which led to high self-stress, divorce, and at one time excessive drinking. I have only heard of one token program for after the fact, and I don't believe this is even being done now. With before hand education I believe 90% of the problems could be solved before they are uncontrollable. I would rather retire before ask for help now. Respectfully submitted."

This quote is indicative of what was found to be a lack of knowledge among police officers as to what programs are available to assist them and their family members. To address the awareness, use and perceived need of agency's programs and services, 12 programs and services identified from the literature and interviews with police officers and mental health care professionals were presented in questions 34a, 34b and 35.

Responses to these items indicated that the officers were not fully aware of programs available to assist them and their family members. For example, although all of the police officers who participated in this study had access to some form of an Employee Assistance Program, only 58% knew their agency offered EAPs to officers. Of those who knew about it, only 12% reported having used this service.

Two other services were offered by a fair number of agencies, as indicated by fairly high "yes" responses: training at the academy level on work and family issues, and training on health and wellness. Less than 5% of officers were aware of spouse or family support groups or any programs for their children. Reported usage of services was above 50% for some of the services offered (page 14 of Appendix A-2): training at the academy level on work and family issues, family day at the academy, family orientation program, training/workshops on work and family issues throughout one's career, and training on health and wellness. Reported usage was low for the remaining services, although EAP usage was the highest of these at 11.7%.

The next set of questions assessed respondents' willingness to use particular services if confronted with a difficult situation at home or work (page 15 of Appendix A-2). Officers indicated a fairly high willingness to use programs or services if confronted with such a situation. Responses averaged between "unsure" and "probably would use service" for all items. Respondents were most willing to use training on health and wellness.

Question 36 presented 10 statements about how the department could assist officers with work and family issues (page 16 of Appendix A-2). Reducing the stigma of seeking assistance received the highest mean score, followed by publicizing the availability of programs to officers and family members. It was also relatively important for this sample of officers to have more services provided at the academy level, develop programs specifically designed for officers and to have the upper echelon of the department acknowledge support of programs (all rated 3.5 or better).

The items included in question 37 were intended to provide information about the officers' relationships with their partner and family members. Fewer than half of the respondents indicated that they worked regularly with a partner. The response to items in this question indicated that the officers trusted their partners and that the officers' spouses/significant others knew the partners. However, officers who responded to these items did not indicate that their partners knew more about them than their

family members nor that it was easier to talk to their partners about their concerns than a family member.

Data reduction

Many of the items on the questionnaire were highly related to each other. Data reduction was used to examine which items formed reliable subscales and which items would be likely candidates to retain for future research.

Different parts of the WFILE were factor-analyzed separately. First, the 21 theoretically-derived items meant to measure work-family orientation (spillover, segmentation, and compensation) were subjected to factor analysis (principal components, Varimax rotation). Results yielded five factors with eigenvalues of 4.65, 1.85, 1.44, 1.34, and 1.12, accounting for 22.1%, 8.8%, 6.8%, 6.4%, and 5.3% of the variance, respectively. Items in each of the factors were analyzed for reliability; factors 4 and 5 had unacceptably low reliability ($\alpha < .4$), thus were not considered further. For the other three factors, items were deleted which had low item-total correlations, and for which coefficient alpha would increase if the items were deleted. These three factors (subscales) were labelled "work-family spillover" (items originally meant to measure spillover and segmentation were not seen as separate issues by our respondents), "compensation", which included items that seemed to measure family nurturance, and "communication of work experiences". Items composing those subscales, their reliabilities, means and standard deviations are presented in Table 2 (Appendix A-4).

Subscale scores were computed by averaging the items in each subscale.

An identical set of analyses were performed for the 15 work and family issues items. The factor analysis yielded three factors. The eigenvalues and variance accounted for by each factor are presented in Table 2, Appendix A-4. Reliability analyses of each subscale showed that no items could be deleted without decreasing coefficient alpha. These subscales were labelled "occupational effects on the family," "negative effects on the family," and "personal stress." Items composing those subscales, their reliabilities, means and standard deviations are presented in Table 2, Appendix A-4.

The items relating to spousal relationship and support issues were entered into two factor analyses because of differences in the response format of two different parts of the WFILE questionnaire. The first, with 18 items, yielded five factors. The eigenvalues and variance accounted for by each factor are presented in Table 2. Items in each factor which decreased coefficient alpha were deleted, and the resulting reliabilities are presented in Table 2 as well. The second factor analysis, with 13 items, yielded two factors. The eigenvalues and variance accounted for by each factor are presented in Table 2. Items in each factor which decreased coefficient alpha were deleted, and the resulting reliabilities are presented in Table 2 as well.

The factor analysis of the 17 items in the work friendships

scale yielded three factors (see Table 2). Items composing the factors are presented in Table 2 as well. Two items were recoded so that a high score indicated difficulty in establishing friendships with other officers, and items were averaged.

For items related to children, two factor analyses were carried out, because of differences in the response format of two different parts of the questionnaire. The first, with five items, yielded a single factor (see Table 2). The second, with 13 items, yielded three factors. The eigenvalues and variance accounted for by each factor are presented in Table 2.

Construction of the Police Officer Questionnaire

In addition to providing information for the law enforcement community in Western New York, the primary goal of the pilot study was to provide data that could be used to develop the Police Officer Questionnaire in Phase II.

The results in Table 2 were carefully examined, as well as item-total correlations for items in each subscale. Items that seemed to be awkward or unclear in phrasing were rewritten. Some subscales were not considered for inclusion on the Police Officer Questionnaire because they measured constructs peripheral to the central considerations of the research, and because of concerns about the Police Officer Questionnaire becoming too lengthy for easy response. Some subscales were shortened for the same reason.

The final Police Officer Questionnaire is presented in Appendix B-1. All of the major concepts from the Erie County

Study were included (in shortened form) in the Police Officer Questionnaire with the exception of the items assessing relationship with the partner. These items were not included because it was expected that a large percentage of the Police Officer Questionnaire respondents would not be working with a partner.

B. Phase II: Police Officer Questionnaire Methodology and Results

This section will present the development of the Police Officer Questionnaire (POQ), the sample to which it was distributed and a summary of the findings.

1. Development of the Police Officer Questionnaire

The POQ was developed based on modifications made to the WFILE developed in Phase I. The POQ consists of 148 items (Appendix B-1). Demographic information in the POQ was modified to include information on the officer's childcare and eldercare responsibilities (items 15, 16). In addition, officers were asked to report if they were previously married (item 13).

For the POQ, four items were included to measure officers' health, exercise, alcohol and tobacco use (items 19-22). Two additional items measured overall job stress (item 24) and the number of health related stress symptoms experienced within the last month (item 23).

Items 126 through 135 were added to address issues of concern to the Police Research and Education Project (PREP), a sister organization of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO) and its membership. Some of these items

include collective bargaining, the Law Enforcement Officer's Bill of Rights, residency requirements and high speed pursuit policies.

2. Method

a. Sample Selection

A power analysis was conducted to determine the appropriate sample size. The results of the power analysis indicated that to observe an effect size of .2 at a .05 level of significance and a power level of .80, a sample of approximately 400 responses from each group was needed (Babbie, 1992; Cohen, 1988; National Education Association, 1965). Prior to distribution of surveys, a 70 percent response rate was anticipated. Therefore, to receive approximately 400 surveys, 560 surveys needed to be distributed to each group. Samples were drawn from six different groups which included New York, New York and surrounding areas, Minneapolis, Minnesota and surrounding areas, and Dallas, Texas and surrounding areas. These areas were chosen because of their geographic location (i.e. Northeast, Midwest, Southwest) and because it was anticipated that enhanced cooperation would be achieved because of NAPO's representation in each of these areas. The New York City Police Department was triple sampled to account for the larger number of officers within that department relative to the other departments sampled.

b. Participants

Useable responses were received from 1632 officers (36.43%). Officers who responded to the questionnaire represented

metropolitan, suburban, rural and county police agencies ranging in size from under 20 sworn officers to over 1,000 sworn officers. The majority of respondents represented agencies with over 500 sworn officers (58.1%, n=948). The largest number of respondents came from the state of New York, followed by Minnesota and Texas. As expected, the single largest agency was New York City, followed by Minneapolis and Dallas.

The majority of respondents identified their job title as police officer, sergeant or detective (90%, n=1468). Other job titles of respondents included captain, chief, and lieutenant. The majority of respondents were male (87.2%, n=1421), and the average age of respondents was 37 years with an average of 13 years on the job. The majority of respondents were white (85.1%, n=1382).

In terms of education, 92.7% (n=1511) of respondents to this question indicated that they had at least some college education with 52.3 % (n=852) indicating that they had earned an Associate's or Bachelor's degree.

The majority of officers were currently married (72.6, n=1180), with 9.2% indicating they were currently divorced. When officers who were currently married, divorced or widowed were asked if it was their first marriage, 77.6% (n=975) indicated it was their first marriage and 22.5% (n=281) reported that they had been previously married.

Of the 68.9% (1118) of officers who reported that they had children, 30.9% (n=502) reported that they were caring for pre-

school children. In addition, 9% (n=147) of respondents had elder-care responsibilities. Less than half (41.4%, n=657) had other family members who worked in law enforcement.

A little more than half (53.4%, n=871) reported that their shift did not change, and the majority (65.9%, n=1023) did not work with a partner.

c. Procedure

The Police Officer Questionnaire (POQ) was sent to the homes of a total of 4,480 police officers. Officers who received the survey were randomly selected. Within each metropolitan agency, department personnel randomly selected 560 officers (New York City randomly selected 1680 officers) to participate in the project. For the surrounding agencies, the local union used its membership lists to randomly select officers. Two identical sets of mailing labels were produced by each department or union to allow for two mailings of the survey instrument to the same sample over a three week period.

For both mailings, each area was provided with sealed envelopes containing a survey instrument, business reply envelope and a cover letter signed by union representatives, and/or the department's police commissioner (Appendix B-2). For the second mailing, a different cover letter was used (Appendix B-3).

Officers returned completed surveys to researchers at Buffalo State College. Upon return, each survey was coded with a subject identification number. Item number two of the survey requested the officers to write in the name of their agency.

Each agency was given an identification number, and this information was recorded on the survey. Each survey was then scanned to develop a data base of all responses.

d. Results: Officer Questionnaire

Descriptive information on all variables is presented in Appendix B-4. Appendix B-5 includes analysis of demographic variables, overall (total) means for all continuous variables, as well as breakdowns by area. For three of the demographic variables reported, categories were collapsed to allow for more meaningful comparisons among areas (so that there would not be large numbers of empty or nearly-empty cells). For job title, we compared "police officer" to all other titles. For ethnicity, we compared white (majority) to all other categories (minority). For marital status, we combined divorced and widowed categories into "previously married."

Comparing the Six Areas

Descriptive statistics comparing the six areas are presented in Tables 4-9 (Appendix B-5, pages 1-58). Because of missing data, the number of cases differs from item to item. In many instances, items are labelled in the tables by their number on the questionnaire (e.g., Q10 is item 10 on the questionnaire). The questionnaire itself is included as Appendix B-1 for easy reference.

For variables answered on nominal scales, chi square statistics were used to compare areas. For variables answered on interval scales, one-way analyses of variance were used to

compare the six areas. The Tukey HSD post-hoc test was chosen because it is generally regarded as the best procedure for controlling the familywise error rate when making all pairwise comparisons among many group means (Howell, 1982, p. 353), and gives good protection from both Type I and Type II errors (Heiman, 1995).

Comparing the Six Areas: Demographic Variables

With regard to average age, the officers from New York City were significantly younger, by approximately three years, than those from other areas. There were also significant differences among areas in years in law enforcement. New York City and Dallas area officers reported the fewest years in law enforcement, with New York City area and Minnesota area officers reporting the most.

For job title, we compared the title of police officer with all other titles; almost 60% were police officers, with no significant differences among areas. For current assignment, approximately 3/4 of the officers reported "patrol". There were no significant differences among areas.

The vast majority of the respondents were male. The percentage of female officers ranged from a high of 17.1% in New York City to a low of 5.9% in the Dallas area (see Appendix B-5, Table 4, page 4). The percentage of minorities was fairly high in New York City and Dallas (approaching 25%), and rather low in the Minnesota area (less than 4%).

With regard to education, the highest percentage of college

graduates was in Dallas, followed by the Minnesota area. Similar percentages of college graduates were reported in the remaining four areas.

The majority of respondents were not military veterans (Q10). The highest percentage of veterans was reported in Minneapolis and the Dallas area, with New York City reporting the lowest percentage of veterans.

In New York City and the New York City area, more than half of the respondents had another family member who worked in law enforcement (Q12). The lowest percentage of officers reporting another family member who worked in law enforcement was the Minnesota area.

The majority of officers in all areas reported that they were currently married (Q13). The percentage of previously-married officers was lowest in the New York City area and in the Minnesota area, and highest in the Dallas area and Dallas.

The majority of officers reported that they had children (Q14). The lowest percentage of officers with children was in New York City. Slightly less than 1/3 of the officers had preschool children living with them (Q15), with no differences among areas.

Few of the officers in Dallas and the Minnesota area reported caring for an elderly parent or relative (Q16). The highest percentage of officers who reported that they cared for an elderly parent or relative were from the New York City area and from New York City.

More than half of the officers in New York City and Minneapolis reported that they worked with a partner (Q18). Few of the officers in the Dallas area, the New York City area, and the Minnesota area worked with a partner.

There were significant differences among areas in the frequency with which shifts changed (Q17). More than half of the officers in the New York City area reported that their shifts changed more than monthly. New York City and the Minnesota area also reported fairly frequent shift changes. The lowest frequency of shift changes occurred in Dallas, where more than 80% of the officers reported that their shift did not change.

Comparing the Six Areas: Stress and Health-Related Variables

Interestingly, there were no significant differences among areas in reported health during the past month (Table 5, Q19, Appendix B-5), or in days per week participating in vigorous exercise (Q20). On average, officers in all areas reported that their health was between "good" and "very good", and that they exercised between two and three days per week.

To further explore health issues, participants were presented with a list of health- related problems and asked to identify how many of these problems they experienced within the last month. The four most commonly reported symptoms included headaches (29.1%, n=405), back problems (27.3%, n=446), allergies (24.8%, n=405) and sleeplessness (24.6%, n=401). The number of health problems reported ranged from 0 to 8. A total of 67.8% (n=1105) of the respondents to this item indicated that they

experienced at least one health problem within the last month. The fewest health problems were reported in New York City and Dallas. The highest number of health problems were reported in the New York City area, Minneapolis, and the Dallas area.

There were significant differences among areas in number of alcoholic drinks during the past week (Q21), and in number of cigarettes smoked per day (Q22). The lowest levels of drinking alcohol were reported in Dallas and the Dallas area, while the highest levels were reported in Minneapolis and the Minnesota area. The lowest levels of smoking were reported in Dallas, and the highest levels of smoking were reported in Minneapolis, New York City, and the New York City area. In absolute terms, the reported levels of drinking alcohol and smoking were low in all areas.

Of the 1613 officers who responded to the question of how much stress they experienced on the job, 66.4% (n=1233) indicated that they experienced quite a bit to a great deal of stress. Overall stress experienced on the job varied significantly by area (Q24). The lowest levels of stress were reported by New York City and Dallas officers. The highest levels of stress were reported by Minneapolis officers.

Comparing the Six Areas: Work and Family Variables

Overall, the officers agreed that leisure activities after work helped to revitalize them (M=4.06, SD=.90, n=1628). As a group, officers indicated that they rarely discuss the job with family members (M=2.42, SD=1.21, n=1622).

Among the areas, there were significant differences in whether officers reported that work and family influenced each other (Q25). Officers in New York City were the least likely to agree with this statement, whereas officers in Minneapolis and the Minnesota area were most likely to agree. Similarly, officers in New York City were most likely to agree that work and family do not influence each other (Q27), and least likely to agree that conflicts at work carry over into home life (Q28). Officers in all areas were equally likely to agree that the family makes up for difficulty on the job (Q26).

Officers in the Minnesota area were more likely than officers in New York City and the New York City area to agree that they talk about work with family members (Q29). New York City officers were less likely than those in Minnesota or Texas to agree that behaviors lacking at work were pursued in family life (Q30). New York City officers were more likely than officers in Minnesota to agree that their work and family roles remain separate (Q31).

There were no differences among areas in the likelihood of discussing family experiences with coworkers (Q32 and Q35). Similarly, officers from all areas were equally likely to agree that they viewed their family as a haven from the job (Q36), and that leisure activities after work revitalized them (Q38).

New York City officers were significantly less likely than those from the Minnesota area to agree that family helped them release negative feelings from the job (Q33). New York City

officers were significantly less likely than officers from all other areas to agree that feelings from work come home (Q34). Similarly, New York City officers were most likely to agree that the job did not affect interactions with family (Q37).

Officers from the New York City area were more likely than those in the Minnesota area to agree that they do not discuss the job with family members (Q39).

Officers from the Minnesota area were more likely than those from New York City or Dallas to spend time outside work with other officers (Q40) and less likely than those in the Dallas area or the New York City area to agree that they were cautious in developing friendships with other officers (Q44). Officers in the Minnesota area were more likely than those in New York City and Dallas to agree that their families interacted with other police families (Q43). There were no differences among areas in developing and maintaining friendships with other officers (Q41 and Q42).

Comparing the Six Areas: Impact of Issues

The items in this section of the questionnaire dealt with how the job impacts the family. The tendency to be protective of family members received the highest mean rating (M=5.49, SD=1.21). Overall, officers reported little conflict between their work and family roles (M=2.21, SD=1.10).

Officers in New York City, Dallas, and the New York City area were less likely than those in Minneapolis or the Minnesota area to say that the job becomes a priority over the family

least impactful in New York City, the New York City area, and Dallas, and most impactful in Minneapolis. Similarly, the issue that the job requires you to be away from family (Q56) was rated as least impactful in New York City and the Dallas area, and most impactful in Minneapolis.

"Public criticism of officers influences family members" (Q57) was rated as most impactful in Minneapolis, which was higher than all other areas.

The issue that family members lack understanding of the job (Q58) was rated most impactful in Minneapolis, which was significantly higher than in the Minnesota area.

The tendency to be protective of family members (Q59) was rated as highest in the Dallas area and the New York City area, both of which were significantly higher than the Minnesota area.

Comparing the Six Areas: Relationship with Spouse/Partner

Overall officers reported that their career in law enforcement rarely influenced their relationship with their spouse/partner and that they rarely argue about the job (M=1.88, SD=.90)

Officers in New York City were significantly less likely to say that the job influences their relationship with spouse/partner (Q60) than officers in Minneapolis or the Minnesota area. Officers in New York City, Dallas, and the Dallas area were least likely to say that job stress leads them to withdraw from their spouse/partner (Q61).

Similarly, New York City officers were also least likely to

say that the mood they are in as a result of the job influences the mood of the spouse/partner (Q62); Minneapolis officers were highest on this variable. Officers from the Minnesota area and Dallas officers were least likely to say that "We argue about my job" (Q63); Minneapolis officers were highest on this variable.

Comparing the Six Areas: Spouse/Partner Support

There were no differences across areas on most of the spouse support variables. Officers in all areas were equally likely to say that their spouses try to understand the job (Q64), communicate well (Q65), are willing to join a spouse support group (Q66), are willing to facilitate access to counseling (Q67), maintain a positive attitude (Q68), and maintain a good sense of humor (Q69). However, the grand means indicate that spouse willingness to join a spouse support group and willingness to facilitate access to counseling were rated quite a bit lower than their ratings on the other types of support.

The only differences across areas were found, first, for "would participate in educational activities related to law enforcement" (Q70), on which New York City officers rated their spouses significantly lower than officers in the Minnesota area, Dallas, and the Dallas area. Second, officers in Minneapolis rated their spouses significantly less willing to attend activities sponsored by the agency (Q71) than officers in most of the other areas.

Comparing the Six Areas: Family Support of Career

As a group, this sample of officers perceived that their

spouse/partner, children and parents were very supportive of their careers in law enforcement. Officers in Dallas reported that their spouse/partner was more supportive of their career in law enforcement (Q72) than officers in New York City or the New York City area. There were no differences across areas in whether children or parents were supportive of the respondent's career (Q73 and Q74).

Comparing the Six Areas: Parenthood and Child Variables

This sample of officers perceived themselves as being aware and understanding of issues that involve children and families as well as being able to work well with children and teenagers. Calls that involve children had some impact on officers. It appears that this sample of officers would not encourage their own children to enter law enforcement.

New York City and New York City area officers were most likely to agree that they were understanding in situations involving children and families (Q75). Similarly, New York City and New York City area officers were most likely to agree that they had a great awareness of issues that affect children and teenagers (Q76); Minneapolis officers were lowest on this variable. New York City and New York City area officers were also most likely to agree that they could work well with children and teenagers (Q77). New York City and New York City area officers were also most likely to agree that calls that involve children had a great effect on them (Q78); officers from the Minnesota area were lowest on this variable.

New York City area officers were most likely to agree that when they respond to calls that involve children, they think of their own children (Q79); officers from Minneapolis and New York City were least likely to agree with this statement. Minnesota area officers were significantly more likely to agree that they would encourage their children to enter law enforcement (Q80) than officers from Dallas, the Dallas area, or Minneapolis. There were no differences across areas in the extent to which the job limited the amount of time officers spent with their children (Q81).

Comparing the Six Areas: Availability of Programs/Services

Officers were asked to indicate whether their departments offered a list of programs or services. More than 50% of respondents were aware of the following services: Employee Assistance Program (74.8%, n=1209), counseling for family members (64.1%, n=1031), post-shooting debriefing (63.2%, n=1017), insurance for mental health treatment (55.4%, n=891), and counseling for families of officers killed in the line of duty (53.3%, n=857).

There were significant differences across areas in officers' reports of the availability of all of the programs or services listed. First, with regard to the Employee Assistance Program (QA82), the three highest areas were Minneapolis, New York City, and the Minnesota area (all above 80%); next were the New York City area and the Dallas area (about 60%). In Dallas, fewer than half of the officers indicated that an EAP was available.

With regard to counseling for law enforcement family members (QA83), similar results were found for the three highest areas, which were Minneapolis, New York City, and the Dallas (all above 75%). Next came the Minnesota area and the Dallas area (about 51%). The New York City area reported the lowest availability of counseling for law enforcement family members.

Officers reported very low availability of child care on a 24-hour basis (QA84), with the highest availability in New York City (6.6% of the officers). Fairly low availability of marital and child support groups (QA85) was reported, with the highest levels of availability in New York City and Minneapolis.

Stress reduction programs (QA86) were reported as being available by more than half of the officers in New York City and Dallas; the lowest availability of these programs was reported in the New York City area. Stress education for recruits and families (QA87) was reported as most available in the cities (Dallas, New York City and Minneapolis), and least available in the surrounding areas.

Post-shooting debriefing for officers and their spouses (QA88) was most available in Minneapolis and the Minnesota area. New York City, Dallas and the Dallas area were next. Only about 30% of the officers in the New York City area reported availability of such programs.

Officers reported fairly low availability of group therapy (QA89), with the service most available in New York City and Minneapolis. Hypertension clinics (QA90) were fairly available

in New York City, but nowhere else. Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis (QA91) was most available in Minneapolis and the Minnesota area, with the lowest availability reported in the New York City area. Family crisis telephone services on a 24-hour basis (QA92) were reported as available by fewer than half the officers in any area. Although New York City had the highest availability, at 47.5%, only 5% of the officers in the Dallas area reported availability of these services.

Relatively few officers reported availability of counseling for law enforcement personnel exposed to HIV (QA93). New York City reported the highest availability, and the Dallas area reported the lowest.

For peer counseling (QA94), the highest levels were reported in the cities (Dallas, Minneapolis, and New York City). The New York City area reported the lowest availability of peer counseling. New York City officers reported highest availability of counseling for families of personnel killed in the line of duty (QA95)--almost 75%, with New York City area officers reporting the lowest availability, only 17%.

Most areas reported fairly low availability (26% or less) of seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling or overeating (QA96); New York City was an exception, with more than half the officers reporting availability of such seminars.

No area had more than 35% of its officers reporting availability of family orientation programs (e.g., spouse awareness, precinct visit, etc.; QA97). The highest were

Minneapolis and Dallas. Minneapolis and Dallas also reported the highest availability of programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits (QA98), although no area was higher than 31%.

Availability of programs geared toward work and family issues throughout an officer's career (QA99) was fairly low in all areas; the highest was New York City with 16.3%. With regard to mental health treatment provided independently by insurance (QA100), Minneapolis and the Minnesota area reported the highest availability. All areas except Dallas (34.5%) had more than half of the officers reporting this service.

Comparing the Six Areas: Usage of Programs/Services

Officers who indicated awareness of programs were asked to identify if they had ever used the service. Overall usage was very low for services such as EAPs (16.4%, n=198) and family counseling (12.1%, n=125). The greatest usage for officers aware of programs was reported for: stress education for law enforcement recruit and family (30.5%, n=157), family orientation programs (28.9%, n=105) and programs on work and family for recruits (28%, n=68).

Usage levels of Employee Assistance Programs (QB82) were highest in Minneapolis (almost 29%) and lowest in Dallas (2.4%). With regard to counseling for law enforcement family members (QB83), reported usage levels were highest in Dallas and Minneapolis, and lowest in New York City and the New York City area.

No officers in any areas reported using child care on a 24-hour basis (QB84). Very low usage was also reported for marital and child support groups (QB85), although the usage was highest in Minneapolis (5.2%).

Highest usage of stress reduction programs (QB86) was reported in Dallas, with the lowest usage in the New York City area and New York City. Similar results were found for stress education for recruits and families (QB87), with highest usage reported in Dallas, and the lowest usage in the New York City area and New York City.

With regard to usage of post-shooting debriefing for officers and their spouses (QB88), three areas reported similar levels of usage--Minneapolis, the Minnesota area and the Dallas area all reported 10-12% usage. The lowest usage was in the New York City area, where only .5% of officers reported using this service.

Very few officers reported using group therapy (QB89), and there were no significant differences across areas. Usage of hypertension clinics (QB90) was also very low; however, officers in New York City reported significantly higher usage (4.6%) than officers in other areas. Usage of critical incident response on a 24-hour basis (QB91) was low--below 5%--in every location except the Minnesota area, where 16.4% of the respondents reported using this service.

Very few officers reported using family crisis telephone services on a 24-hour basis (QB92), and there were no differences

across areas. Similarly, very few officers reported using counseling for law enforcement personnel exposed to HIV (QB93), and there were no differences across areas.

Although usage of peer counseling (QB94) was generally low, Minneapolis officers reported using this service most (6.9%). Very few officers reported using counseling for families of personnel killed in the line of duty (QB95), and there were no differences across areas. Similarly, few officers reported using seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling or overeating (QB96), and there were no differences across areas.

Usage of family orientation programs (e.g., spouse awareness, precinct visit, etc.; QB97) was fairly low, but highest in Minneapolis and the Minnesota area, with Dallas also reporting usage above 8%. Usage of programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits (QB98) was highest in Minneapolis.

Usage of programs geared toward work and family issues throughout an officer's career (QB99) was lower than 5% in all areas, although the Minnesota area and Dallas had the highest usage. There were no differences across areas in usage of mental health treatment provided independently by insurance (QB100).

Comparing the Six Areas: Willingness to Use Programs/Services

Officers were asked to indicate their willingness to use listed services if confronted with a difficult situation at home or work. Responses ranged from 1 = definitely would not use service to 5 = definitely would use service. Overall, officers indicated they were most willing to use post-shooting debriefing

(M=4.2, SD=1.00) and counseling for families of officers killed in the line of duty (M=4.09, SD=1.05). They were least willing to use group therapy (M=2.68, M=1.14)

There were no significant differences across areas in willingness to use an Employee Assistance Program (Q101); officers in all areas were slightly above "unsure" toward "probably would" use the service.

With regard to counseling for law enforcement family members (Q102), officers in New York City were least likely to be willing to use the service. There were no significant differences across areas in willingness to use child care on a 24-hour basis (Q103).

New York City officers were least willing to use marital and child support groups (Q104). New York City and Minneapolis officers were least willing to use stress reduction programs (Q105) and stress education for recruits and families (Q106).

New York City officers were least willing to use post-shooting debriefing for officers and their spouses (Q107); officers in the Minnesota area were most willing to use these services. There were no differences across areas in willingness to use group therapy (Q108); officers in all areas were on the "probably would not use" side of unsure.

Officers in Minneapolis were least willing to use hypertension clinics (Q109). Officers in the Minnesota area were most willing to use critical incident response on a 24-hour basis (Q110); officers in New York City were least willing to use this service.

There were no differences across areas in willingness to use family crisis telephone services on a 24-hour basis (Q111). Officers in New York City were least willing to use counseling for law enforcement personnel exposed to HIV (Q112); they were significantly less willing to use this service than officers in the New York City area and the Minnesota area.

There were no differences across areas in willingness to use peer counseling (Q113). Officers in the Minnesota area were most willing to use counseling for families of personnel killed in the line of duty (Q114); they were significantly more likely to be willing to use this service than officers in New York City, the New York City area, Minneapolis, or Dallas.

There were no differences across areas in willingness to use seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling or overeating (Q115). Officers in New York City were significantly less willing to use family orientation programs (e.g., spouse awareness, precinct visit, etc.; Q116) than officers in the Minnesota area or the Dallas area. The same pattern was found for programs geared toward work and family issues throughout an officer's career (Q118): officers in New York City were significantly less willing to use these programs than officers in the Minnesota area or the Dallas area.

There were no differences across areas in willingness to use programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits (Q117) or mental health treatment provided independently by insurance (QB119).

Comparing the Six Areas: Organizational Issues

In response to items that address officers' perception of how supportive their supervisor, fellow officer, union and management were to an officer seeking assistance, officers believed that top management was least supportive (M=2.93, SD=1.24). Officers did not indicate strongly that the stigma of seeking assistance or confidentiality were issues.

Officers in the New York City area were least likely to agree that their supervisor was supportive of officers who seek counseling (Q120); officers in Minneapolis and the Minnesota area were most likely to agree with this statement.

Officers in the Minnesota area were significantly more likely to agree that top management supports counseling (Q121) than officers in any other area. Officers in New York City were more likely to agree that there was a stigma associated with counseling in their organization (Q122) than officers in any other area.

Officers in the Minnesota area were significantly more likely than officers in New York City to agree that fellow officers back up officers seeking counseling (Q123). Officers in the Dallas area were least likely to agree that their union supports officers who seek counseling (Q124).

Officers in the Minnesota area were significantly less likely than officers in Dallas to agree that confidentiality of services was a problem in their organizations (Q125), and officers from both areas were significantly less likely than

officers in New York City and the New York City area to agree with this statement.

Comparing the Six Areas: Agency Policies

A little more than half of the officers (56.3%, n=885) indicated that the agency required officers involved in critical incidents to attend counseling. New York City officers were most likely to say "yes," and New York City area officers were most likely to say "no" to the question of whether it is a policy in the organization to require officers involved in a critical incident to go to counseling (Q126).

For the question on whether the agency has a collective bargaining agreement (Q127), we collapsed all the "yes" responses into one category to avoid empty cells. High percentages of agencies in New York and Minnesota had collective bargaining agreements; few in Texas did.

The majority of agencies provided health insurance for their members (99.2%, n=1441). Significant differences across areas were found in whether the agency provided health insurance (Q128). In New York City and the New York City area, retirees as well as current employees were generally provided for. There was much greater variability in the other areas.

The majority of officers reported having a Law Enforcement Officer's Bill of Rights (63.1%, n=867). Minnesota area and Minneapolis officers were most likely to have a Law Enforcement Officer's Bill of Rights (Q129), followed by New York City and the New York City area. Respondents in Texas were much less

likely to have a Law Enforcement Officer's Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights was more likely to be provided by contractual provision (Q129con) or by department policy (Q129dept) in the New York City area and New York City. In Minneapolis and the Minnesota area, the Bill of Rights was more likely to be provided by statute (Q129stat). Local ordinance seldom provided the Bill of Rights (Q129loc), but it was more likely in the New York City area and Minneapolis.

Officers in New York City were most likely to say that their agency had a residency requirement (Q130) for all officers; in Minneapolis, the residency requirement was only for new hires. The Minnesota area and Texas generally did not have residency requirements.

The majority of officers in all areas reported that their agency offered a tax deferred pension plan (Q131), although the rates were lowest in the New York City area and Dallas.

Officers were asked to indicate in which types of investigations they had the right to legal representation. More than 50% of officers in all areas said they had such a right in Internal Affairs investigations (Q132ia), although the rates were relatively low in the Dallas area, Dallas, and Minneapolis. In criminal investigations (Q132crim), more than 90% of officers in all areas had the right to legal representation, and there were no differences across areas. Legal representation in civilian review board investigations (Q132civ) varied from a low of 24% in the Dallas area to a high of 77% in New York City. There were no

differences across areas in "other" responses (Q132oth).

Respondents were asked to indicate in which types of investigations they had the right to remain silent. For Internal Affairs investigations (Q133ia), most officers did not have the right to remain silent, although the "yes" responses ranged from a low of 7% in Dallas to a high of 38.8% in the New York City area. In criminal investigations (Q133crim), most officers reported that they did have the right to remain silent, although New York City officers reported the lowest percentage of "yes" responses (73.6%). For civilian review board (Q133civ) investigations, the majority of officers did not have the right to remain silent; the range of "yes" responses was from 10.2% in Minneapolis to 47.5% in Dallas. There were no differences across areas in "other" responses (Q133oth).

The majority of officers reported that their agencies had a formal policy regarding the "high-speed pursuit" of people suspected of a violent crime (Q134). Minneapolis officers were least likely to report such a policy. In New York City and the New York City area, "sometimes" was the most common answer to whether officers were allowed to engage in high-speed pursuit (Q135). More than 80% of officers in Minneapolis and the Minnesota area were allowed to engage in high-speed pursuit, while in Texas, around 60% said "yes."

Comparing the Six Areas: Agency's Ability to Help Officers

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which a list of policies would enhance their agency's ability to help

officers. Officers rated all policies very positively. The top five policies identified that could be taken by the agency included: mandating confidentiality (M=4.16, SD=1.05), reducing the stigma for seeking assistance (M=4.15, SD=.96), adopting a Law Enforcement Officer's Bill of Rights (M=4.07, SD=1.07), publicizing programs to officers and family members (M=4.03, SD=.97) and providing off-site services (M=4.03, SD=.98).

Officers in New York City, the New York City area, and Dallas were most likely to rate mandating confidentiality (Q136) highly. Officers in the Dallas area rated offering more programs for police families (Q137) higher than those in Minneapolis and the Minnesota area.

There were no differences across areas in ratings for developing programs designed specifically for officers (Q138), providing programs early in the officer's career (Q139), developing a policy statement that indicates support of programs (Q140), top management acknowledges support (Q141), or deliver programs at the local/field level (Q142).

Officers in the Minnesota area rated providing off-site services (Q143) least helpful. Officers in the Minnesota area also rated reducing the stigma associated with seeking assistance (Q144) as less helpful than officers in New York City or the New York City area.

There were no differences across areas as to the extent to which publicizing available programs (Q145) was seen as helpful.

Officers in the Minnesota area rated adopting a Law

Enforcement Officer's Bill of Rights (Q146) least helpful. Officers in the Minnesota area also rated allowing for the formation of a police association/union (Q147) as least helpful. Finally, officers in Dallas and the Dallas area rated allowing the police association to engage in collective bargaining for officers (Q148) as most helpful; officers in the Minnesota area rated this item as least helpful.

Factor analyses and reliability analyses

Many of the items on the questionnaire were highly related to each other. Data reduction was used to examine which items formed reliable subscales.

Different parts of the Police Officer Questionnaire were factor-analyzed separately. Results of the factor analyses and reliability analyses, which parallel those conducted on the WFILE, are presented in Table 10 (Appendix B-6). It is encouraging to compare the results obtained on the Officer Questionnaire with those obtained in a different sample in the Erie County study. Even though the items are somewhat different due to rewriting and shortening of the questionnaire, there is a considerable amount of convergence.

Comparing Subscale Scores Across the Six Areas

Subscale scores were computed for all subscales in Table 10 by averaging across the items in the subscale. Table 11 (Appendix B-11) presents the oneway analyses of variance which examine differences across the six areas on these subscale scores.

The spillover/segmentation subscale showed significant differences across the six areas. Officers in New York City were significantly less likely to report spillover than officers in any other area; highest levels of spillover were reported by Minneapolis and Minnesota area officers. Compensation was also significant. Again, officers in New York City had lower scores than officers in all other areas except the New York City area.

There were no differences across the six areas in discussing family with coworkers. Officers in New York City and the New York City area were less likely to discuss job with family than officers in the Minnesota area.

Officers in Minneapolis reported significantly higher levels of negative effects of job on family than officers in any other area. Similarly, Minneapolis officers reported greater occupational effects on family than officers in any other area. Higher levels of personal stress were reported in Minneapolis than in New York City, the Minnesota area, or Dallas.

There were no significant differences across areas in difficulty in forming friendships with other officers. Officers in the Minnesota area were significantly more likely to interact with other officers outside of work than those in New York City or Dallas.

Officers in Minneapolis were more likely than those in New York City or Dallas to say that their job affected their relationship with their spouse. There were no significant differences across areas in positive attitude of spouse or in

spouse willingness to help by attending agency activities, etc. Similarly, there were no differences across areas in family support of the respondent's career in law enforcement.

Officers in New York City and the New York City area were most likely to agree that children affected them; officers in Minneapolis and Dallas were least likely to agree. There were no significant differences across areas in the extent to which officers reported thinking about their children on the job.

C. Phase III: Agency Questionnaire Methodology and Results

This section presents the development of the Agency Questionnaire (Work and Family Support Services for Law Enforcement Questionnaire), the sample to which it was distributed and a summary of the findings.

1. Development of the Agency Questionnaire (Work and Family Support Services for Law Enforcement Questionnaire)

The Work and Family Support Services for Law Enforcement Questionnaire, hereafter called the Agency Questionnaire (AQ), was developed for the project. The questionnaire consisted of 82 items (Appendix C-1).

Eight items requested demographic information on the agency and individual responding to the survey. The remaining items requested information on the following areas:

a. Service Providers

b. Types of Services Provided

c. Agencies' Obstacles to Use of Services

d. Agencies' Enhancement of Services

e. Organizational Impact

Items for the AQ survey were developed based on information collected from the literature, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Part W-Family Support, subsection 2303(b)) and a previous survey developed to identify services provided by law enforcement agencies (Delprino & Bahn, 1988).

2. Method

a. Sample Development

The AQ was sent to a total of 587 law enforcement agencies throughout the United States. A stratified sample was developed which first included the 49 primary state law enforcement agencies. Primary state police agencies are those agencies that are administered by the state and which have general law enforcement authority throughout the state. The state of Hawaii does not retain a discretely defined state police agency. The seven inhabited islands are organized into four autonomous counties with police departments having jurisdiction covering the entire county.

Next, non-state law enforcement agencies were divided into strata based on the population they serve. It has been estimated that 80 percent of the approximately 18,000 law enforcement agencies in the United States are classified as small departments (Police Stress, 1991). Using a stratified sample increased the probability that the agencies selected would be representative of those in the population (Leary, 1995).

Based on information provided by the National Public Safety Information Bureau, 50 percent of the agencies that served

populations of 25,000 to 49,999 (n=286); 50,000 to 99,999 (n=154) and 100,000 or more (n=98) were randomly selected. The survey was sent to these 587 randomly selected agencies.

b. Participants

Useable surveys were returned by 380 agencies resulting in a total response rate of 65%. As indicated in Table 1 (Appendix C-3), 48 (98%) responses were received from the state agencies contacted. For agencies serving populations of 25,000 to 49,999, 166 (58%) surveys were returned. Agencies which provided services to a population of 50,000 to 99,999 returned 84 (54.5%) surveys. Finally, agencies serving a population of 100,000 or more returned 82 (83.7%) of the surveys sent.

The number of male officers in the agencies ranged from 5 to 31,845 with an average 530 (SD=1954). The number of female officers ranged from 1 to 5,620 with departments reporting an average of 78 (SD=362) female officers. Table 2 (Appendix C-3) indicates the number of male and female officers within each of the different types of agencies.

The majority of the respondents (53.9%, n=205) had job titles that included chief, captain, lieutenant or sergeant. Others included Psychologist, EAP Coordinator, and Director of Training. One department reported having a Family Assistance Officer on staff.

Respondents were predominantly male (81.3%, n=309; female, 15.8%, n=60) and had an average of 21.1 years working in law enforcement with an average of 7.6 years in their current job.

Graduate degrees were held by 33.9% (n=129) of the respondents. Associates or Bachelor's degrees were reported as the highest level of education earned by an additional 31.1% (n=118) of respondents.

c. Procedure

Prior to sending the survey to the 587 agencies, each survey was coded with a 5 digit identification number for the purpose of identifying non-respondents. The first three digits of the code represented a specific identification number assigned to each agency. The fourth digit of the code identified the strata in which the agency was grouped (i.e. state, 25,000-49,999, 50,000-99,999, 100,000 or more). The last digit indicated first or second mailing of the survey.

A survey, cover letter (Appendix C-2) and business reply envelope were sent to each agency in the sample. The cover letter was addressed to the Chief of the agency for convenience. The envelope, however, was addressed with the name of the head of each agency. Mailing labels were developed by the National Public Safety Information Bureau. Three weeks after the first mailing, a second mailing was carried out. The second mailing was sent to only non-respondents.

Completed surveys were returned to researchers at Buffalo State College. Data entry was performed and verified by employees of Computing Services at Buffalo State College.

d. Results

The results of the AQ are presented in a descriptive format.

This questionnaire identified service providers, types of services provided, agencies' obstacles to use of services, steps taken by agencies to enhance services and the organizational impact of services on the agency,

Service Providers

The AQ provided a list of seven titles of providers of services to officers and their family members. Table 3, Appendix C-3 presents the mean number of providers, standard deviation and number of organizations that have providers with each title broken down by each of the categories in the sample as well as for the total sample. Chaplains were reported as the most common service providers by agencies, with 245 agencies (64.5%) identifying chaplains as a provider. One agency reported having 60 chaplains that provide services, and 43 agencies reported that the chaplains were also sworn law enforcement officers (Table 4, Appendix C-3). The next most commonly reported provider was EAP coordinators, reported by 230 agencies (60.5%), with 44 agencies reporting that the coordinator was also a sworn law enforcement officer. Psychologists and psychiatrists were identified by 201 agencies (52.9%) as providers of services, 13 of whom were also sworn officers. The lowest frequency providers of services identified by respondents was social workers (n=47, 12.4%). Respondents were given an opportunity to identify other providers not listed. The most frequently reported providers of services included critical incident stress debriefing teams, victim advocates or counselors, and contractors such as a city or town

EAP coordinators who provided services on an as needed basis.

The majority of agencies reported that they had specific qualifications for those who provide services (67.6%, n=244). Of the agencies that specified qualifications, the majority specified state licensure (65.6%, n=160) and specialized training (61.9%, n=151). More than half of the agencies that specify qualifications identified certification (54.9%, n=134) or doctorates (51.8%, n=116) as being required by providers of services. The qualification least specified by agencies was masters degree (36.9%, n=90).

Availability of Services for Officers and Family Members

The AQ presented 29 services related to work and family support. Respondents idicated whether the programs were provided by the agency and how they were provided (i.e., in-house, service exists as a separate unit within the agency; external, service contracted with outside group; both, in-house and external). For each service, respondents also identified if the service was provided to family members (Table 5.1 through 5.5, Appendix C-3).

The most highly reported service provided by agencies was post-shooting debriefing (94%, n=344). All of the 47 state agencies that responded to this item reported that the service was provided. More than half of the agencies also provided this service to family members (53.1%, n=147). Other services that were provided by at least 80 percent of agencies included counseling (89%, n=325) and EAPs (87.9%, n=327). More than half of the agencies reported that these programs were provided

externally (58.6%, n=218; 54.2%, n=198 respectively) and the majority of agencies made these two services available to family members (79.9%, n=246; 78%, n=223 respectively). In addition, work-out facilities (84.1%, n=305) and training in domestic violence (83.7, n=289) were common services provided. Agencies rarely used external sources for training in domestic violence (105, n=37), and fewer than 30 percent made these services available to family members (29.8%, n=71; 17.4%, n=42 respectively). Insurance providing mental health treatment was reported as being offered by 82.8 percent (n=301) of respondents. This service was provided primarily as an external service (65%, n=241) and was available to family members (85.5%, n=219).

Just under 80 percent (79.4, n=2910) of the agencies provided critical incident response on a 24-hour basis. Half of the agencies provided this service to family members (51.7%, n=121). Smaller agencies were less likely to provide this service (25,000-49,999, 38.2%, n=34; 50,000-99,999, 40.4%, n=19) for family members than larger agencies (100,000 or more, 64.1%, n=41; state, 79.4%, n=27).

Short term counseling (under 6 months) for personnel killed in the line of duty was provided by 71.9% (n=265) of the agencies. Agencies also made this service readily available to family members (73.3%, n=165). Fewer agencies provided services beyond six months (55.8%, n=204) or made this service available for the family (66%, n=122).

More than half of the agencies provided stress education for

officers on the job (66.4%, n=241) and stress education for recruits (64.1%, n=232). Approximately 25 percent of the agencies made these services available to family members (24%, n=50; 25.1%, n=51 respectively). Smaller agencies (25,000-49,999) were less likely to provide stress education to recruits (48.7%, n=76) or to offer training to recruits family members (8.8%, n=6) compared to the other three groups of agencies.

Other services provided by at least 50 percent of the agencies included counseling for officers exposed to HIV (64.3%, n=234), health and wellness programs (63.1%, n=231), peer support (56.2, n=205) and stress reduction programs (50%, n=219).

Less popular services included EAP specifically designed for law enforcement (46.1%, n=164), family orientation programs (42.6%, n=157), seminars (40.6%, n=150), and programs on work and family issues for recruits (36.7%, n=134) or officers throughout their careers (27.7%, n=107). Larger agencies (100,000 or more) and state agencies were more likely to provide programs for recruits than other agencies.

Family issues related to firearm safety were provided by 31.7 percent (n=115) of respondents. Thirty percent or less of the agencies provided group therapy (30.3, n=109), 24-hour crisis telephone service (29.9%, n=108) or flexible work schedules to meet family needs (29.1%, n=108).

A very small number of agencies provided 24-hour child care (2%, n=7) hypertension clinics (20.5%, n=74) or marital and child support groups (21.4%, n=114). Of all the agencies, almost one

half (48.2%, n=38) of the agencies from a population of 100,000 or more provided marital and child support groups.

Agencies' Obstacles to Use of Services

Twelve obstacles and potential problems related to use of services by agencies were presented (Table 6, Appendix C-3)). Respondents rated each item on a five point scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). None of the 12 items was reported to be a major obstacle. The highest mean ratings were recorded for budgetary concerns (M=3.52, SD=1.32), stigma associated with seeking assistance (M=3.29, SD=1.14) and lack of personnel who can the provide service (M=3.20, SD=1.30). The lowest mean ratings were recorded for use of programs by management to discipline officers (M=2.01, SD= 1.20), lack of union support (M=2.32, SD=1.11) and family members lack of support of services (M=2.40, SD=1.04).

Oneway ANOVA's comparing the four strata (state, 25,000-49,999, 50,000-99,999, 100,000 or more) indicated that significant differences existed between agencies based on budgetary concerns ($F(3, 371)= 4.5$, $p<.01$) and availability of personnel who can provide services($F(3, 369)= 4.4$, $p<.01$). The Tukey HSD post hoc test indicated that agencies that served populations of 100,000 or more viewed budgetary constraints as significantly less of a concern than smaller agencies servicing populations between 25,000 to 49,999. The larger agencies also viewed lack of personnel to provide services as significantly less of a concern than the two other groups of city agencies

(i.e. 25,000-49,999 and 50,000-99,999).

Agencies Actions in Facilitating the Development, Awareness or Acceptance of Services

Participants were asked to identify how their agencies facilitated development, awareness or acceptance of services (Table 7, Appendix C-3). Overall, agencies appeared to be active in this regard.

Mandating confidentiality was the most frequently reported step taken by agencies to facilitate services, reported by 85.1% of respondents (n=321). Other steps taken by agencies, reported by more than 65 percent of respondents, included providing information on benefits of services (76.8%, n=288), training at the academy (69.8%, n=263), training of supervisors on access, use and referral of services (68.5%, n=256), release time for counseling appointments (67%, n=254), and providing funding for services (66.5%, n=250).

Agencies were less likely to collaborate with unions to develop and increase knowledge of programs (37.6%, n=130) or increase the number of family programs (26.1%, n=98).

Organizational Impact of Services on the Agency

A number of items in the AQ addressed the impact that work and family support services may have on the organization (Table 8, Appendix C-3). Participants were asked to rate their perception of the impact of work and family stress issues on the agency. Ratings were made on a five point scale (1=to a very slight extent to 5=to a very large extent). With a mean rating

overall of 3.18 (SD=.97) participants did not feel strongly either way about the impact of work and family stress on the agency. However, there were differences between the agencies in response to this item (F(3, 360)= 5.88, p=.001). Comparisons between the agencies indicated that smaller agencies serving a population of 25,000 to 49,999 (M=3.02, SD=.91) reported a significantly lower impact of stress on the agency than state agencies (M=3.57, SD.97) or agencies serving populations over 100,000 (m=3.37, SD=.88). Also, agencies serving populations between 50,000 to 99,999 (M=3.06, SD=.95) reported significantly less of an impact than state agencies.

The majority of agencies reported having a mission statement (90.6%, n=338). Far fewer, (22.7%, n=73), included reference to work and family in the mission statement. Also, the majority of agencies provided some form of mental health services (89.5%, n=334). Fewer agencies reported having a formalized psychological services unit (28.9%, n=109) with larger agencies (100,000 or more) reporting the highest percentage (54.9%, n=45).

Overall, about one-third of the agencies (32.3%, n=120) indicated plans to increase programs that address work and family issues within the next two years. More than half of the state agencies that responded (55.3%, n=26) indicated plans to enlarge or implement programs. Few of the agencies supplied services to other agencies (22.3%, n=82). It appears that state agencies and larger agencies (100,000 or more) were more likely to provide services (37%, n=17, 33.8%, n=27 respectively) to other agencies.

In an attempt to determine whether agencies take steps to identify the benefits of work and family programs, participants were asked to report if the agency kept utilization statistics or conducted impact studies of programs' effectiveness. A little over a third of respondents (36.2%, n=131) reported keeping utilization statistics. It appears that agencies that kept utilization statistics were more likely to be larger agencies (state, 48.9%, n=22; 100,000 or more, 62.5%, n=50). Few agencies had conducted impact studies (7.6%, n=28) nor plan to do so within the next year (9.1%, n=29).

Discussion

The results of this project has contributed to the collection of comprehensive data called for by Ellison and Genz (1983) and Scrivner's testimony (Police Stress, 1991), to provide empirical evidence of issues faced by police families. This project has provided information of work and family issues from the officers perspective, as well as how police agencies nationally are addressing work and family issues and providing support for the police family.

Phase I, Pilot Study

In Phase I, the Pilot Phase of this project, officers indicated that they probably would be willing to use services to assist them in dealing with job related stress if they were confronted with a difficult situation at work or home. It was surprising that only 58% of the respondents were aware of an EAP to which they had access. At the time the Work and Family Issues

in Law Enforcement Questionnaire (WFILE) was distributed, all officers in the sample had access to an established law enforcement EAP. There are few empirical studies of law enforcement EAPs, however in the implementation of a State police EAP, Reichman and Beidel (1989) reported that in the third year of an evaluation of the EAP, 85% of survey respondents knew of the EAPs existence. Asen and Colon (1995) reported that 100% of officers from four municipalities that participated in their study were aware of the EAP that serves their company and 51.3% even attended EAP training. Although the local program was promoted as a success, the results of Phase I support the usefulness of periodic needs assessment as suggested by the National Institute of Justice (1997). Such needs assessments can identify gaps in efforts to reduce stress and stress-related problems, as well as better familiarize officers and family members with available programs.

Through the use of the WFILE, it was clear that for officers participating in this survey, work and family issues do influence each other. Officers from Phase I reported that their families compensated for what was lacking in the job. While officers indicated that their career as a police officer tended to make them overprotective of their spouse/partner and children, these officers did not report that their career in law enforcement negatively impacted their relationship with their spouse/partner or children. They reported that they viewed family members as supportive of their career in law enforcement, that they related

well with their spouse/partner, and that the job was not a priority over the family. These findings contradict some authors views of a career in law enforcement as a jealous mistress (Niederhoffer & Niederhoffer, 1978) or the police family as a high-risk life style (Depue, 1981). The support from the spouse/partner came in the form of what appeared to be personal traits of the spouse such as a good sense of humor, or having a positive attitude. Spouses/partners were reported as less likely to participate in support groups or training. Such information may require law enforcement agencies to give greater attention as to how they may market training programs designed for officers' spouses/partners.

Phase II, Police Officer Questionnaire

The results of Phase II supported many of the findings in Phase I in regards to the impact that a career in law enforcement has on the police family. It appears that regardless of location, officers share many of the same experiences. Officers in Phase II, agreed that the family is often a haven from the job, that their spouses/partners were supportive of them in their careers, that they do not discuss work at home, and that they are protective of their spouse/partner and children. This supports the concept that the family can compensate for what is lacking at work (Evans & Bartolome, 1984; Staines, 1980). It is important for law enforcement organizations to provide training, counseling, and support to families of officers so that they will be sources of support rather than an additional source of stress

for the officer (National Institute of Justice, 1997).

In addition, officers perceived little role conflict between their roles as an officer and that of a spouse or parent. Brett, Stroh, and Reilly (1992) found that role conflict can be directly related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, marital satisfaction and psychological functioning. By providing training on stress management and techniques, organizations can be active in addressing and treating the causes of stress rather than reactive after the negative consequences have already impacted the police family.

Similar, to what officers reported in Phase I, officers in this phase believed that their job did not impact their relationship with their spouse/partner. However, when officers who were married, widowed or divorced were asked to indicate if this was their first marriage, 22.5% of officers reported that this was not their first marriage. Combined with those officers who were currently divorced (9.2%), a total 31.7% of these respondents were married at least once before. Although officers here reported that they have been previously married, officers also reported little relationship conflict and high degrees of spouse support. This finding is supported by Rogers (1977) who found that second marriages generally fare better because both partners know better of what to expect from the relationship.

Interestingly, many of the expectations set at the beginning of this project were challenged by the results. It was believed that officers from New York City would report higher levels of

stress and conflict. However, officers from New York City were younger, healthier and reported lower levels of stress from the job. The officers from Minnesota, however, reported that they did experience higher degrees of occupational and personal stress. Officers in Minnesota also reported that they talked about the job at home, spent more time outside of work with other officers and that their work and family roles were less likely to remain separate. This impact can be supported by spillover theory of work and family relations which states that what occurs in one domain will impact or carry over into the other (Staines, 1980). Organizations and administrators can be instrumental in diminishing workplace stressors and conflict that may carry over into family relations thereby increasing job and marital satisfaction.

Unlike the WFILE, the POQ did contain questions about the officers health. Officers, overall, perceived themselves to be healthy and exercised on a regular basis. The four most commonly cited health problems from this sample of officers were headaches, back problems, sleeplessness and allergies. Although the number of health related problems across regions is not alarming, it does call attention to the fact that law enforcement officers are experiencing stress-related health problems. This finding implies that it is important that officers continue to receive stress awareness and management training.

As a group, officers had a greater awareness of services that are available to them and their families than officers in

Phase I. For example, 74.8% of officers were aware that an EAP was available to assist them compared to 58% of officers in Phase I. Analysis of the Agency Questionnaire, (Phase III) indicated that it is typically the larger police agencies that are able to provide a greater variety of services. Perhaps there are culture differences between agencies represented in Phase I and Phase II that can explain the difference in awareness. Further research would be needed to identify the impact of agencies' cultural differences on officers knowledge of services.

Also, officers reported the availability of more programs for them and their family members at the recruit level. Although, it is a very positive trend, it is not enough. Officers need to have training at all stages of their careers. Hurell, McLaney and Murphy (1990) and Osipow and Doty (1985) reported that significant differences exist between job satisfaction, perceived health status, age, and career stages in respect to how stress impacts the individual. This supports Burke (1989) who reports that officers with 6 to 16 years on the job report higher levels of job dissatisfaction, more stress related health problems, burnout, greater work-family conflict and take more sick time. Law enforcement organizations need to recognize and respect these differences and make efforts to develop and deliver training to officers throughout their different career stages to address their special issues.

Interestingly, officers from New York City reported that they had many services to choose from but that they were

experiencing lesser degrees of stress than the other groups. The New York City area officers, experiencing higher degrees of stress, reported having fewer services available to them. Overall, officers did report a willingness to use existing programs if confronted with a difficult situation at home or work. A striking finding was that officers in New York City had access to a post-shooting debriefing program, but only .5% had reported ever using the service. The underutilization of this service may be related to what New York City officers reported as a perceived stigma associated with seeking assistance in their organization.

This was similar to findings in Phase I, in which officers reported that the stigma associated with seeking assistance, confidentiality and lack of support from upper management were a hindrance to seeking assistance. In contrast, officers from Minneapolis believed that management and their fellow officers were supportive of those who sought assistance. These officers were also less likely to think that confidentiality was a problem. This may explain why while usage of services as a whole among groups was low, greatest use of services was reported from Minneapolis officers. Additional benefits of organizational support and assistance can include decreased sick-time, increased officer morale, productivity, agency efficiency, police family-well-being, job satisfaction, and the officers ability to cope with inherent job stressors (MacLennan, 1992; National Institute of Justice, 1997; U.S. Department of Justice, 1992).

Officers in Phase I and II reported that reducing stigma and mandating confidentiality would enhance the agencies ability to deliver services to officers and families. In addition, officers in Phase II reported providing off-site services and adopting a Law Enforcement Officers Bill of Rights would also facilitate the use of services. Off-site services give the officer a choice, and decreases fear of being stigmatized, or the chance that other members of the department would find out that the officer is making use of services. An additional benefit of off-site services is that they are generally less expensive, less bureaucratic, and provide greater autonomy (National institute of Justice, 1997).

Phases I and II of this study have provided some insight from the officer's perspective of issues that can influence the work-family relationship. The results obtained should be viewed with some caution. While they confirm many of the issues from the literature on the police family, the results of both Phase I and Phase II are based on modest response rates. Although it was not possible in this study, it should be determined if the tenor of nonrespondents views of work and family issues was similar in its variability to that of respondents, or if any consistent bias resulted from officers who refused to participate in the study.

Phase III, Agency Questionnaire

Phase III of this project identified the extent and nature of programs offered by law enforcement agencies across the United States to address police officers' stress and family well-being.

It was interesting to note that psychologists and psychiatrists were not identified as the most common providers of services to officers and their family members. It was department chaplains who were reported to be the most common provider of services, with one agency reporting 60 department chaplains.

Territo and Vetter (1981) reported that early attempts to assist troubled officers was through the use of police chaplains in the department. The chaplain was usually a local priest, minister or rabbi who voluntarily worked with the agency. They may have aided officers in their job duties such as delivering death notifications. Also chaplains provided assistance to officers and family members during troubled times. Kincaid (1994) states that the chaplain can assist law enforcement personnel in balancing job requirements with personnel needs and thereby alleviate some of the stress associated with the law enforcement profession. This assistance can aid in creating a healthy home and work environment. Some of the reported duties of chaplains have included teaching in-service classes on stress management, or participation on recruit training to discuss with recruits and family members about potential problems. However, while most law enforcement agencies have the services of one or more volunteer or paid chaplains, most reported chaplains were used infrequently for stress services (National Institute of Justice, 1997).

Although the focus of the Agency Questionnaire was not to identify the particular services offered by each provider, such

information would be useful and document the role that providers play in the police organization. Some studies have identified the core functions of police psychologists (Bergen, Aceto & Chadziewicz, 1992; Scrivner, 1994). Given their extensive involvement in police departments, identification of the core job functions of police chaplains would also be useful in guiding these providers in the assistance they can offer to officers and their family members. It appears that police chaplains are a very valuable asset to the police department and may be the unsung heros of law enforcement.

Although it was not a majority, a number of agencies also reported having providers who were also sworn officers. While being a nonmember may be an advantage at times, having providers who are also members of the force and fully understand the culture in which officers must operate can be very useful. Such individuals will have an easier time of gaining credibility from other officers while providing competent care.

While a fair number of services offered by agencies are also made available to family members, the majority of services provided by the agencies focus primarily on or are for the officer. The most commonly offered service was post-shooting debriefing. For officers killed in the line of duty, police agencies were more likely to provide short-term counseling (under 6 months) as compared to long-term counseling (6 months or more). It is possible that the majority of organizations depend on organizations such as Concerns of Police Survivors (C.O.P.S) to

provide long-term care services needed by officers and family members. Services such as counseling were also commonly offered. For this survey, 89% of the responding agencies identified counseling as a service offered. This is an increase from results of an earlier national survey (Delprino & Bahn, 1988) which reported that 53.2% of state and metropolitan agencies used counseling services.

In terms of the percentage of agencies within a strata to offer services, it appears that police agencies serving a population over 100,000 are more likely to offer the majority of services presented on the survey. Comparing services that are directly related to family members, larger police organizations are more likely to offer these services than smaller agencies. Services such as child care, marital and child support groups, family firearm safety, programs geared towards work and family issues for recruits and officers on the job, and flexible work schedules to meet family demands were offered by fewer than 37% of responding police agencies. Family orientation programs were offered by 42.6% of the agencies.

In law enforcement, stress is an enduring problem by the nature of police work itself. Since the 1970's it has been recognized that the members of the officer's family are also impacted by the stress associated with the law enforcement career (Durner, Kroeker, Miller & Reynolds, 1975; Hageman, 1978; Megerson, 1976; Maslach & Jackson, 1979; Simpson, 1978; Stratton, 1975). In recent years the police family has received greater

provide work and family support services to their officers.

It was clear from the respondents that mandating confidentiality was the primary step that an agency could take to facilitate the development, awareness and acceptance of services. An initial step in this area is the development and distribution of a confidentiality statement to department members (National Institute of Justice, 1997). Although such a statement may not guarantee an increased acceptance of services, such a statement can alleviate fears that participation in programs will become publicly known and have a negative impact on the officer's career.

A high percentage of agencies reported that they took steps to identify the benefits of the services to the department as a means to facilitate development, awareness and acceptance of services. More information is needed as to how the benefits of these services are identified. Very few of the agencies reported that they have conducted impact studies of the programs effectiveness or plan to do so within the next year. Impact studies are a logical and important step in the development of law enforcement stress programs for officers and their family members. Information on how such programs influence officers' job and family satisfaction, job performance, absenteeism, turnover, stress related disability pensions, organizational effectiveness and community satisfaction are of a few of the outcomes that should be measured to enhance the development of effective intervention strategies and encourage police

departments to adopt policies that include services for the police family.

Although a number of organizations have begun to address work and family issues, changes in the family structure have typically not been accompanied by equally significant changes in law enforcement agencies' policies toward work and family. Galinsky, Friedman and Hernandez (1991) identified three stages that organizations go through in responding to family needs. Stage one involves the development of a programmatic approach in which the organization identifies employees needs and introduces some interventions. In stage two, family needs are viewed as a legitimate business concern, receive the support of upper management and are integrated with the company's personnel policies, programs and benefits. It appears that law enforcement organizations have made some inroads in these first two stages.

The third stage may be the most challenging for law enforcement organizations. Stage three acknowledges that it is one thing to have family support policies but quite another to ensure that employees know of their existence and supervisors support these programs. In this stage companies realize that innovative policies and programs will not yield their intended effects in an unsupportive culture. This stage involves changing the organizational culture to more openly acknowledge employees' family and personnel situations. However, cultures particularly the police culture may not be easily changed. The police culture places a premium on being in control of your emotions and of the

situation, and following the dictates of rank and protocol. Socialization into the police culture takes place very early in the officer's career. The police academy serves as a psychological crucible in which occupational identities are formed (Bahn, 1984). If the academy experience minimizes training in the social services aspects of policing, it is unlikely that the officer will seek assistance from community agencies to try to solve community problems (Ainsworth, 1995). Similarly this orientation may make it unlikely for the officer to seek out assistance with personal or family problems. The culture is transmitted further by the officer's supervisor. Poor supervision and lack of management support are management practices that can contribute to organizational sources of stress (U. S. Department of Justice, 1990).

Despite the challenge, law enforcement organizations can not afford not to address and reduce the influence of stress on the police family. In doing so, the law enforcement organization can have a significant impact on officers, family members, the organization and the community they serve. This study has provided information that can assist police agencies to develop and provide services that will meet the officers and family members needs and make best use of organizational resources. For the future, organizations need to focus on enhancing knowledge and willingness to use services. In addition, agencies need to be more proactive in measuring the impact of work and family support services on the officers and the organization.

References

References

Ainsworth, P. B. (1995). Psychology and policing in a changing world. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Anderson, W., Swenson, D., & Clay, D. (1995). Stress management for law enforcement officers. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Asen, J. & Cohen, I. (1995). Acceptance and use of police department employee assistance programs. Employee Assistance Quarterly, 11, 45-54.

Babbie, E. (1992). The practice of social research (6th ed.). New York: Wadsworth Inc.

Bahn, C. (1984). Police socialization in the eighties: Strains in the forging of an occupational identity. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 12.

Bergen, G. T., Aceto, R. T., & Chadziewicz, M. M. (1992). Job satisfaction of police psychologists. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 19, 314-329.

Bibbins, V. E. (1986). The quality of family and marital life of police personnel. In J.T. Reese & H.A. Goldstein (Eds.), Psychological services for law enforcement: A compilation of papers submitted to the national symposium of police psychological services, F.B.I. Academy, Quantico, Virginia (Stock No. 027-0000--1266-3, pp. 423-427). Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Blau, T. H. (1994). Psychological services for law enforcement. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Brett, J. M. , Stroh, L. K., & Reilly, A. H. (1990). Impact of societal shifts and corporate changes on employee relocation. Washington, D.C.: Employee Relocation Council.

Burke, R. J. (1988). Some antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 3, 287-302.

Burke, R. J. (1989). career stages, satisfaction, and well-being among police officers. Psychological Reports, 65, 3-12.

Burke, R. J. (1993). Work-family stress, conflict, coping, and burnout in police officers. Stress Medicine, 9, 171-180.

Buzawa, E. S. (1984). Determining patrol officer job satisfaction: The role of selected demographic and job specific attitudes. Criminology, 22, pp.61-81.

Cain, Maureen E. (1973). Interdependence With Family - Marital Integration and Domestic Life. Police Human Relations, pp. 180-208.

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences, 2nd edition. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Delprino, R. P., & Bahn, C. (1988). A national survey of the extent and nature of psychological services in police departments. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 19(4), 241-245.

Delprino. R. P., Kennedy, C. L. (1994). Work and family issues in law enforcement: A preliminary study. Buffalo: State University of New York at Buffalo.

Depue, R. L. (1981). High-risk lifestyles: The police family. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 50, 8-13.

Durner, J. A., Kroeker, M. A., Miller, C. R., & Reynolds, W. R. (1975, November). Divorce: Another occupational hazard. The Police Chief, 48-53.

Elliott, M. L., Bingham, R. D., Nielsen, S. C., Warner, P. D. (1986). Marital intimacy and satisfaction as a support system for coping with police officer stress. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 14, 40-44.

Ellison, K. W., & Genz, J.L. (1983). Stress and the police officer. Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, IL.

Evans, P., & Bartolome, F. (1984). The changing pictures of the relationship between career and family. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 5, 9-21.

Friedman, D. E., & Galinsky, E. (1992). Work and family issues: a legitimate business concern. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), Work, families, and organizations, pp. 168-207. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Galinsky, E., Friedman, D. E., & Hernandez, C. A. (1991). The corporate reference guide to work-family programs. New York: Families and Work Institute.

Greenhaus, J. H., Bedeian, A. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1987). Work experiences, job performance, and feelings of personal and family well-being. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 31, 200-215.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. Academy of Management Review, 10, 76-88.

Goldstein, I. L., (1991). Training in work organizations pp 507-619 in Marvin D. Dunnette and Leatta M. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol 2, Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. Palo Alto, CA.

Hageman, M. J. C. (1978). Occupational stress and marital relationships. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 6, 402-412.

Heiman, G. A. (1995). Research methods in psychology. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Howell, D. C. (1982). Statistical methods for psychology. Boston: PWS-Kent.

Hurrell, J. J. Jr., McLaney, A., & Murphy, L. R. (1990). The middle years: Career stage differences. Prevention in Human Services, 8, 179-203.

Jacques, Jeffrey M. & Mutchnick, Robert J. (1979). Familism, Reference Groups, and Family Satisfaction among Police Officers. Journal of Police Science and Administration, pp.179-185.

Janik, J. (1995). Who needs peer support? The Police Chief, 62 (9), 38-41.

Kando, T. & Summers, W. (1971). The impact of work on leisure: Toward a paradigm and research strategy. Pacific Sociological Review, 14. 310-327

Kanter, R. M. (1977). Work and family in the United States: A critical review and agenda for research and policy. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Kincaid, B. L. (1994). The chaplain's role in the law enforcement family. In J. T. Reese & E. Scrivner (Eds.) Law enforcement families: Issues and answers. Washington D. C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Kirkcaldy, B. (1993). Job stress and satisfaction: International police officers. Psychological Reports, 72, 386.

Kirshman, E. (1997). I love a cop. New York: The Guilford Press.

Kraut, A. I. (1990). Strategic responses of human resource management to changing work and family issues [Special issue]. Human Resource Planning, 13 (2).

Leary, M. R. (1995). Introduction to behavioral research methods, 2nd edition. New York: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

MacLennan, B. W. (1992). Stressor reduction: An organizational alternative to individual stress management. In J. C. Quick, L. R. Murphy, & J. J. Hurrell, Jr. (Eds.) Stress & well-being at work. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Maslach, C. & Jackson, S. E. (1979, May). Burned-out cops and their families. Psychology Today, 59-62.

Maynard, P. & Maynard N. E. (1982). Stress in Police Families: Some Policy Implications. Journal of Police Science and Administration, pp. 302-314.

Maynard, P., Maynard, N., McCubbin, H. & Shao, D. (1980). Family life and the police profession: Coping patterns wives employ in managing job stress and the family environment. Family Relations, 29, 495-501.

Megerson, J. S. (1976, January). The officer's lady: A follow-up. The Police Chief, 50-52.

Mortimer, J. T., Lorence, J., & Kumka, D. S. (1986). Work, family and personality: Transition to adulthood. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

National Education Association. (1965). Sampling and statistics handbook for surveys in education. Washington, D.C.: Research Division of the National Education Association.

National Institute of Justice: Issues and Practices. (1997). Developing a law enforcement stress program for officers and their families. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Niederhoffer, A. & Niederhoffer, E. (1978). The police family: From the station house to the ranch house. Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Osipow, S. & Doty, 1. (1985). Job stress across career stage. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16, 26-32.

Police stress and family well being: Hearings before the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, House of Representatives, (1991, May 20) (testimony of Ellen Scrivner, Ph.D.).

Preiss, J. J., & Ehrlich, H. J. (1966). An examination of

role theory: The case of the state police. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Ready, Timothy F. (1979). So Your Husband Is A Police Officer. The Police Chief, pp.40-41.

Reese, J. T., & Scrivner, E. (Eds.) (1994). Law enforcement families: Issues and answers. Washington D.C., F.B.I.

Reichman, R. & Beidel, B. E. (1989). Implementation of a state police EAP. Journal of Drug Issues, 19, 369-383.

Reiser, M. (1978) The Problems of Police Officers' Wives. The Police Chief, pp 38-42.

Rogers, K. (1977). Marriage and the police officer. Police College Magazine, 14, 40-42.

Saper, Marshall B. (1980). Police Wives: The Hidden Resource. The Police Chief, pp. 28-29.

Schneer, J. A., & Reitman, F. A. (1993). Effects of alternate family structures on managerial career paths. Academy of Management Journal, 36, 830-843.

Scrivner, E. (1994). In J. T. Reese & E. Scrivner (Eds.) Law enforcement families: Issues and Answers. Washington D. C.: U. S. Department of Justice.

Scrivner, E. & Reese, J. T. (1994). Family issues with no easy answers. In J. T. Reese & E. Scrivner (Eds.) Law enforcement families: Issues and Answers. Washington D. C.: U. S. Department of Justice.

Simpson, D. (1978, August). A policeman's wife never knows. South Carolina: The News and Courier.

Sleek, S. (1993, December). Stress of critical events affects offices, families. APA Monitor, 29-30.

Staines, G. (1980). Spillover versus compensation: A review of the literature on the relationship between work and non-work. Human Relations, 33. 111-129.

Stenmark, D. E., DePiano, L. C., Wackwitz, J. H., Cannon, C. D., Walfish, S. (1982). Wives of police officers: Issues related to family-job satisfaction and job longevity. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 10, 229-234.

Stratton, J. G. (1975). The law enforcement family: Programs for spouses. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 16-22.

Stratton, J. G., Tracy-Stratton, B., & Alldredge, G. (1982). The Effects of a Spouse's Training Program: A Longitudinal Study. Journal of Police Science and Administration, pp. 297-301.

Territo, L. & Vedder, H. J. (1981). Stress and police personnel. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Thomas, L. T. & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. Journal of Applied Psychology, 80, 6-15.

U. S. Department of Justice. (1992). Preventing law enforcement stress: The organization's role. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Violanti, J. M. & Marshall, J. R. (1983). The police stress process. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 11, 389-394.

Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, H.R. 3355-9, 103d Cong., 1st Sess. (1994).

Weber, R. P. (1985). Basic content analysis. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

White, E.K., & Honig, A. L. (1995). Law enforcement families. In M. Kurke & E. Scrivner (Eds.), Police psychology into the twenty-first century. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wrightsman, L., Nietzel, M. & Fortune, W. (1994). Psychology and the legal system, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Zedeck, S. (1992). Introduction: Exploring the domain of work and family concerns. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), Work, families, and organizations, pp. 1-32. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Appendix A-1

Work and Family Issues in Law Enforcement Questionnaire (WFILE)

WORK & FAMILY ISSUES IN LAW ENFORCEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

R.P. Delprino & C.L. Kennedy, SUNY College at Buffalo

Do not duplicate or use any portion of this questionnaire without the permission of the authors.

1. Agency: _____

2. Job title: _____

3. Gender: ___ male ___ female

4. Age: _____

5. Ethnicity: ___ African American ___ American Indian/Alaskan Native
   ___ Asian or Pacific Islander ___ Hispanic
   ___ White, not of Hispanic origin

6. Highest level of education: ___ High School ___ Some College ___ Associates degree ___ Bachelors Graduate ___ Some Graduate Degree ___ Graduate Degree

7. Marital status: ___ Single ___ Divorced ___ Married ___ Widowed

8. Are you a military combat veteran? ___ Yes ___ No

9. Number of years in law enforcement. _____

10. Number of years on current job. _____

11. How many children do you have? If you do not have any children please check None.

		Number	Ages	Number Currently Living With You
example:	**Sons**	**2**	**10, 15**	**1**
	Sons	_____	_____	_____
	Daughters	_____	_____	_____
	Step-sons	_____	_____	_____
	Step-daughters	_____	_____	_____
	None	_____		

12. Do you have other family members who have or are currently work in law enforcement?

    Yes ___ No ___

13. Please list other family members who have or are currently working in law enforcement:

	Relationship	Years in Law Enforcement
example:	**father**	**20**
	_____	_____
	_____	_____

14. What shift do you typically work? ___ 8 am - 4 pm ___ 4 pm - 12 pm ___ 12 pm - 8 am
    other (please specify) _____

15. How often does your shift change?

0	1	2	3	4	5
Does not change	**Less than monthly**	**Monthly**	**Every 3 months**	**Every 6 months**	**More than 6 months**

16. Do you work with a partner? ___ Yes ___ No

17. What is the gender of your current partner? ___ Female ___ Male

18. For this next section, read each statement. Using the following scale, indicate, to what degree each statement describes you.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

___ My work experiences and my family experiences directly influence each other.

___ The family environment can make up for difficulty in the job.

___ My work experiences and family experiences **do not** influence each other.

___ My attitudes, experiences, and conflicts at work carry over into my home life.

___ Desirable behaviors and feelings that are lacking in my work are pursued in family activities.

___ My work and family roles remain separate from each other.

___ Interactions with friends or family members carry over to my job.

___ Involvement in non-work social activities allows me to release negative feelings that may result from the job.

___ My attitudes and behaviors at work are very different from my attitudes and behaviors at home.

___ The feelings I have from incidents at work often come home with me.

___ I view my family as a haven from the job.

___ My success on the job is not influenced by my family life.

___ My job influences my parenting style.

___ The camaraderie I feel among my fellow officers, compensates for any lack of sharing/closeness I have with family members.

___ My job experiences do not effect interactions with family members and friends.

___ I often discuss my work experiences with members of my family.

___ Leisure activities after work help to energize/revitalize me from work.

___ I am able to avoid thinking about my family concerns when I go to work.

___ The things I see on the job make me more protective of my family.

___ My job gives me prestige and status that I do not experience in other areas of my life.

___ I do not discuss my work experiences with family members nor family experiences with co-workers.

19. Use the scale below to indicate to what degree each of the following are issues that you or your family members must deal with as a result of your job.

1	2	3	4	5
Not an issue	Somewhat not an issue	Somewhat of an issue	An issue	Very much an issue

___ The job becomes a priority over the family.

___ Physiological demands of the job including changing shifts, and changes in eating, exercising and sleeping patterns.

___ Stress, burnout, withdrawal.

___ Danger associated with the job.

___ Closed society of policing.

___ Anger, frustration and mistrust from the job carries over into the family.

___ Organizational hierarchy of the department.

___ Relationship with partner.

___ Officer and family are expected to behave by a higher set of standards.

___ Marital conflict.

___ Conflict between your role as an officer and your role as a parent.

___ Job requires you to be away from family and miss important family events.

___ Public criticism that officers may experience influences family members.

___ Family members lack understanding of the job.

___ Tendency to be more protective of family members due to the potential dangers you see other members of the public encounter while on the job.

20. Are there any other work and family issues related to being a law enforcement officer that you would like to make us aware of?

21. The next set of items deals with how your career as a law enforcement officer influences your relationship with your spouse/significant other. Please use the following scale to respond to each item.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Usually/Always

___ What occurs on the job influences my relationship with my spouse/significant other.

___ We spend time together.

___ My relationship with my spouse/significant other is secondary compared to my relationship with other officers.

___ I try to protect my spouse/significant other from what occurs on the job.

___ I am protective of my spouse/significant other from potential threats in the community.

___ The stress from the job leads me to withdraw from my spouse/ significant other.

___ What I learn from the job improves my communication with my spouse/significant other.

___ I discuss my work problems.

___ I discuss my feelings.

___ The mood I am in as a result of my job influences the mood of my spouse/significant other.

___ We argue about my job.

___ We make long range plans.

___ My spouse/significant other has to make personal sacrifices because of the job.

___ The job interferes with my spouse's/significant other's job opportunities/personal plans.

___ We socialize with others not involved in law enforcement.

___ We plan special activities.

___ My spouse/significant other assumes responsibilities at home.

___ After a significant incident on the job, my spouse/significant other is the first person I contact for support.

22. How does your spouse/significant other feel about your career in law enforcement?

1	2	3	4	5
Very supportive	Somewhat supportive	Neutral	Somewhat not supportive	Not supportive

23. Please rate the following statements in reference to the ways your spouse/significant other provides support for you.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost never	Sometimes	Often	Usually/Always

___ Tries to better understanding the job.

___ Understands the amount of stress you experience.

___ Good listener.

___ Communicates well.

___ Recognizes when you are withdrawing.

___ Identifies problems when they occur.

___ Joins support group.

___ Facilitates access to counseling for you or family members.

___ Flexible in scheduling family events.

___ Maintains positive attitude.

___ Maintains good sense of humor.

___ Participates in educational seminars on issues related to a family member's career in law enforcement.

___ Gets you involved in social activities with civilians outside of work.

24. Are there any other issues related to how your job influences your relationship with your spouse/significant other that you would like to discuss?

IF YOU DO NOT HAVE CHILDREN, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 30.

25. Would you encourage your children to enter law enforcement?

1	2	3	4	5
To a very slight extent				To a very large extent

26. How do your children feel about your job?

1	2	3	4	5
Very supportive	Somewhat supportive	Unsure	Somewhat not supportive	Not supportive

27. Please use the following scale to identify how being a parent influences you as a police officer.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Neither agree or agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

___ Being a parent enables me to be more understanding in situations that involve children and families.

___ Since I have become a parent, I have a greater awareness of the issues that effect children and teenagers.

___ As a parent, I can work better with children and teenagers.

___ Because I am a parent, calls that involve children have a greater effect on me.

___ When I respond to calls that involve children, I often think of my own children.

28. Please use the following scale to identify how your job as a police officer may influence your relationship with your child/children?

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Neither agree or agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

___ I am a disciplinarian.

___ I am protective of my child/children.

___ My job demands limit the quality time I have to spend with my child/children.

___ The job transfers to my parenting skills, for example I sometimes interrogate my children as to their activities.

___ I am tolerant of my child's/children's behavior, attitude.

___ Being an officer enhances my communication with my child/children.

___ I have high standards for my child/children.

___ My child/children can question my authority.

29. Are there any other issues related to how your job influences your relationship with your child/children that you would like to discuss.

30. How supportive are your parents of your career in law enforcement.

1	2	3	4	5
Very supportive	Somewhat supportive	Unsure	Somewhat not supportive	Not supportive

31. How supportive are your siblings or other family members of your career in law enforcement.

1	2	3	4	5
Very supportive	Somewhat supportive	Unsure	Somewhat not supportive	Not supportive

32. The following items deal with relationships and friendships. Please use the following scale to respond to each item.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Neither agree or agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

___ The majority of my friends are other police officers.

___ I spend time outside of work with other police officers.

___ I have many friends outside of the department.

___ It is difficult to develop relationships/friendships with individuals who are not officers.

___ It is difficult to develop relationships/friendships with other officers.

___ It is difficult to maintain long lasting relationships/friendships with individuals who are not officers.

___ It is difficult to maintain long lasting relationships/friendships with other officers.

___ I participate in activities that are non-department related.

___ My family members interact with other police families.

___ It is easy to meet other people socially.

___ The majority of my conversations with friends are police related.

___ Others identify me primarily as a police officer.

___ Others treat me differently when they find out that I am a police officer.

___ I am cautious in developing friendships with individuals who are not officers.

___ I am cautious in developing friendships with other officers.

___ Others treat me with respect because I am a police officer.

___ Others expect me to adhere to a higher set of standards because I am a police officer.

33. Are there any other issues related to how your job influences your relationship with others that you would like to discuss.

34. The following are programs/services that may be offered by your department to assist officers with work and family issues. For each program/service:

*** First, circle either YES, or NO to identify if you believe that your department offers this program/service. Circle the question mark if you are not sure that your department offers this program/service.**

*** Next, circle either YES or NO in the second column to identify if you have used this program/service.**

PROGRAM/SERVICE	Does your department offer this program/service?			Have you ever used this program/service?	
Employee Assistance Program.	YES	?	NO	YES	NO
Training at the academy level on work and family issues.	YES	?	NO	YES	NO
Family day at the academy/department.	YES	?	NO	YES	NO
Family orientation program.	YES	?	NO	YES	NO
Peer support group.	YES	?	NO	YES	NO
Training or workshops on work and family provided to officers through the course of their career.	YES	?	NO	YES	NO
Spouse awareness programs.	YES	?	NO	YES	NO
Spouse support group.	YES	?	NO	YES	NO
Programs for the children of officers.	YES	?	NO	YES	NO
Family support group.	YES	?	NO	YES	NO
Training on health and wellness issues related to your job.	YES	?	NO	YES	NO
Hotline number officers can call for assistance.	YES	?	NO	YES	NO

35. **If confronted with a difficult situation at home or work please use the following scale to indicate how willing would you be to make use of the services listed.**

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely would use service	Probably would use service	Unsure	Probably would not use service	Definitely would not use service

___ Employee Assistance Program.

___ Training at the academy level on work and family issues.

___ Family day at the academy/department.

___ Family orientation program.

___ Peer support group.

___ Training or workshops on work and family provided to officers through the course of their career.

___ Spouse awareness programs.

___ Spouse support group.

___ Programs for the children of officers.

___ Family support group.

___ Training on health and wellness issues related to your job.

___ Hotline number officers can call for assistance.

36. **To what degree would the following enhance the department's ability to assist officers with work and family issues?**

1	2	3	4	5
To a very slight extent				To a very large extent

___ Offer a greater number and variety of programs.

___ Develop programs designed specifically for officers.

___ Provide a greater number of programs at the academy level and early in the officer's career to address problems that may occur.

___ Develop a policy statement that indicates support of programs.

___ Have the upper echelon of the organization acknowledge support of programs.

___ Involve family members to a greater degree.

___ Deliver programs at the local/field level.

___ Provide off-site services.

___ Reduce stigma associated with seeking assistance.

___ Publicize available programs to officers and family members.

IF YOU DO NOT WORK WITH A PARTNER, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 39.

37. The following items deal with your relationship with your partner. Please use the following scale to respond to each item.

1	2	3	4	5
Very False		Neutral		Very True

___ You and your partner socialize outside of work.

___ My partner knows my family.

___ My partner is my confidante.

___ My spouse/significant other knows my partner.

___ My partner's family and my family engage in activities together.

___ I can trust my partner.

___ My partner knows more about me than my family.

___ It is easier to talk about my concerns with my partner than members of my family.

38. Are there any other issues related to how your job influences your relationship with your partner that you would like to discuss?

39. Is there anything else that you would like to make us aware of in reference to work and family issues in law enforcement?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Please place your completed questionnaire in the enclosed self addressed stamped envelope to be return to:

Ms. Cynthia Goss, Director
Employee Assistance Program
Erie County Health Department
95 Franklin Street, Room 1276
Buffalo, NY 14202

Appendix A-2

WFILE Descriptive Tables

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Erie County Data

Item	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
1. Agency:			
Buffalo	221	37.0	597
Village of Angola	2	.3	
Depew	5	.8	
Town of Evans	6	1.0	
Village of Hamburg	3	.5	
Town of Lancaster	12	2.0	
City of Tonawanda	13	2.2	
Erie County Sheriff's	69	11.6	
Town of Brant	2	.3	
East Aurora	6	1.0	
Gowanda	0	0	
Village of Kenmore	9	1.5	
Village of Lancaster	5	.8	
Town of Tonawanda	86	14.4	
Amherst	12	2.0	
City of Lackawanna	8	1.3	
West Seneca	38	6.4	
Lockport	21	3.5	
Cheektowaga	28	4.7	
Town of Hamburg	22	3.7	
Orchard Park	0	0	
Town of Eden	2	.3	
Niagara County Sheriff's	14	2.3	
Department Not Identified	13	2.2	
2. Job Title:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Chief	5	.8	597
Captain	25	4.2	
Lieutenant	86	14.4	
Sergeant	15	2.5	
Detective	90	15.1	
Administration	5	.8	
Commander	1	.2	
Deputy Sheriff	51	8.5	
Deputy Commissioner	1	.2	
Supervisor	3	.5	
Investigator	2	.3	
Inspector	3	.5	
Police Officer	296	49.6	
Range Officer	2	.3	
Radio Dispatcher (asst.)	2	.3	
Job Title Not identified	10	1.7	

3. Gender:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Male	541	90.8	596
Female	55	9.2	
Gender Not Identified	1		

4. Age:

Ages ranged from the age of 21 to the age of 60.

Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
40.10	8.20	589

5. Ethnicity:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
African American	23	3.9	586
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	.2	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	6	1.0	
Hispanic	16	2.7	
White/Not of Hispanic Origin	540	92.2	
Ethnicity Not Identified	11		

6. Highest level of education:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
High School	76	12.8	593
Some College	179	30.2	
Associates Degree	141	23.8	
Bachelors Degree	149	25.1	
Some Graduate Degree	34	5.7	
Graduate Degree	14	2.4	
Education Not Identified	4		

7. Marital status:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Single	81	13.6	595
Divorced	61	10.3	
Married	446	75.0	
Widowed	7	1.2	
Marital Status Not Identified	2		

8. Are you a military combat veteran?

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Yes	123	20.7	595
No	472	79.3	
Not Identified	2		

9. Number of years in law enforcement:

The number of years spent serving in law enforcement ranged from 1 year to 46 years.

Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
15.75	8.23	597

10. Number of years on current job:

The number of years spent on the current job ranged from 1 year to 38 years.

Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
11.07	7.59	595

11. Do you have children:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Yes	489	80.7	597
No	115	19.3	

12. Do you have other family members who have or are currently work in law enforcement?

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Yes	213	35.7	597
No	384	64.3	

14. What shift do you typically work?

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8am - 4 pm	185	31.0	596
4 pm - 12 pm	105	17.6	
12 pm - 8 am	66	11.1	
Other	240	40.3	

15. How often does your shift change?

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Does not change	359	62.8	572
Less than monthly	153	26.7	
Monthly	12	2.1	
Every 3 months	12	2.1	
Every 6 months	19	3.3	
More than 6 months	17	3.0	
Shift Change Not Identified	25		

16. Do you work with a partner?	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Yes	197	33.0	597
No	379	63.5	
Sometimes	21	3.5	

17. What is the gender of your current partner?	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
			213
Male	168	78.9	
Female	19	8.9	
Alternate partners	26	12.2	

18. Using the following scale, indicate, to what degree each statement describes you.

1. Strongly disagree 2. Moderately disagree 3. Neither agree or disagree 4. Moderately agree 5. Strongly agree

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
My work experiences and family experiences directly influence each other.	3.39	1.24	594
The family environment can make up for difficulty in the job.	3.83	1.14	593
My work experiences and family do not influence each other.	2.49	1.29	592
My attitudes, experiences, and conflicts at work carry into home life.	3.15	1.28	591
Desirable behaviors and feelings that are lacking in my work are pursued in family activities.	3.28	1.16	590
My work and family roles remain separate from each other.	3.62	1.26	593
Interactions with friends and family members carry over to my job.	3.02	1.22	591
Involvement in non- work activities allows release of negative feelings.	3.47	1.23	592
My attitudes and behaviors at work are different from at home.	3.13	1.30	591

Continuation of question 18.

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
The feelings I have from incidents at work often come home with me.	3.14	1.29	592
I view my family as a haven from the job.	3.58	1.23	591
My success on the job is not influenced by my family life.	2.75	1.25	589
My job influences my parenting style.	3.37	1.20	560
Comraderie among fellow officers compensates for lack of closeness with family.	1.93	1.13	589
My job experiences do not effect interactions with family members.	2.82	1.26	589
I often discuss my work experiences with family.	3.21	1.36	591
Leisure activities after work help to revitalize me from work.	3.95	1.06	591
I am unable to avoid thinking of family concerns when I go to work.	2.57	1.15	591
The things I see on the job make me more protective of my family.	4.48	.82	592
My job gives me prestige that I do not experience in other areas of life.	2.57	1.19	592
I do not discuss work experiences with family nor family experiences at work.	2.40	1.15	591

19. **Use the scale to indicate to what degree each of the following are issues that you and your family members must deal with as a result of your job.**

1. Not an issue	2. Somewhat not an issue	3. Somewhat of an issue	4. An issue	5. Very much an issue

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
The job becomes a priority over family.	2.08	1.21	596
Physiological demands of job including changing shifts, changes in eating and sleeping patterns.	3.19	1.41	592
Stress, burnout, withdrawal.	2.98	1.34	595
Danger associated with the job.	2.90	1.23	596
Closed society of policing.	2.27	1.22	587
Anger, frustration and mistrust from job carries over into family.	2.09	1.22	595
Organizational hierarchy of department	2.91	1.45	594
Relationship with partner.	1.64	1.13	536
Officer and family are expected to behave by a higher set of standards.	2.65	1.36	594
Marital conflict.	2.03	1.30	582
Conflict between role as officer and parent.	1.81	1.10	567
Job requires to be away from family and miss important events.	3.00	1.32	595
Public criticism officers experience influences family members.	2.55	1.21	593
Family members lack understanding of job.	2.34	1.27	595
Tendency to be more protective of family due to potential dangers you see members of public encounter.	3.55	1.13	595

21. **This set of items deals with how your career in law enforcement influences your relationship with spouse/significant other. Use the following scale to respond to each item.**

1. Never 2. Almost Never 3. Sometimes 4. Often 5. Usually/Always

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
What occurs on job influences Relationship with spouse/significant other.	2.58	.89	579
We spend time together.	3.84	.88	576
My relationship with spouse/ significant other is secondary compared to my relationship with other officers.	1.67	.89	579
I try to protect spouse/significant from what occurs on job.	3.43	1.08	576
I am protective of spouse/significant from potential threats from community.	3.97	1.06	578
The stress from the job leads me to withdrawal from spouse/significant other.	2.29	1.00	579
What I learn from job improves communication with spouse/significant other.	2.76	.95	576
I discuss my work problems.	3.03	1.08	578
I discuss my feelings.	3.08	1.04	580
The mood I am in as a result of my job influences the mood of my spouse/ significant other.	2.84	.90	578
We argue about my job.	1.93	.89	579
We make long range plans.	3.32	1.05	577
My spouse/significant other makes personal sacrifices because of job.	2.92	1.01	578
The job interferes with spouse's/ significant other's job opportunities/ career plans.	2.29	1.06	577

Continuation of question 21.

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
We socialize with others not in law enforcement.	3.82	.85	580
We plan special activities.	3.47	.87	576
My spouse/significant other assumes responsibilities at home.	3.72	.94	570
After a significant incident on job, my spouse/significant other is the first person I contact for support.	3.51	1.18	577

22. How does your spouse/significant other feel about your career in law enforcement?

1. Very Supportive 2. Somewhat Supportive 3. Neutral 4. Somewhat Not Supportive 5. Not Supportive

Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
1.61	.89	548

23. Please rate the following statements in reference to the ways your spouse/significant other provides support for you.

1. Never 2. Almost Never 3. Sometimes 4. Often 5. Usually/Always

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
Tries to better understand the job.	3.63	.98	573
Understands the amount of stress you experience.	3.39	1.02	573
Good listener.	3.90	.93	578
Communicates well.	3.84	.93	579
Recognizes when you are withdrawing.	3.54	1.04	562
Identifies problems when they occur.	3.36	.90	571
Joins support group.	1.35	.74	552

Facilitates access to counseling for you or family members.	1.54	.97	543
Flexible in scheduling family events.	3.93	.88	577
Maintains positive attitude.	3.92	.86	578
Maintains good sense of humor.	3.87	.93	580
Participates in educational seminars on issues related to family in law enforcement.	1.42	.86	560
Gets you involved in social activities with civilians out of work.	3.28	1.17	575

25. Would you encourage your children to enter law enforcement?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
To a very slight extent				To a very large extent

Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
2.56	1.30	499

26. How do your children feel about your job?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Very Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Unsure	Somewhat Not Supportive	Not Supportive

Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
1.86	.92	458

27. Use the following scale to identify how being a parent influences you as a police officer.

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Strongly Disagree	Moderately disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
Being a parent enables me to be more understanding in situations with kids.	4.22	.84	468
Since becoming a parent, I have a greater awareness of issues that effect teens and children.	4.21	.81	467

As a parent, I can work better with children and teenagers.	3.86	.92	468
Because I am a parent, calls with children effect me greater.	4.14	.95	467
When responding to calls that involve children, I think of my own kids.	4.09	1.04	465

28. Use the following scale to identify how your job as a police officer may influence your relationship with your child/children.

1. Strongly Disagree	2. Moderately Disagree	3. Neither Agree or disagree	4. Moderately Agree	5. Strongly Agree

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
I am a disciplinarian.	3.79	1.01	468
I am protective of my children.	4.46	.75	469
My job demands limit quality time with child/children.	3.60	1.27	468
Job transfers to parenting skills, for example: Interrogate children.	3.21	1.19	464
I am tolerant of kids behavior.	3.26	1.05	466
Being an officer enhances communication with kids.	3.13	.94	466
I have high standards for my kids.	4.19	.87	468
My child/children can question my authority.	2.58	1.19	466

30. How supportive are you parents of your career in law enforcement?

1. Very Supportive	2. Somewhat Supportive	3. Unsure	4. Somewhat Not Supportive	5. Not Supportive

Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
1.51	.83	552

31. **How supportive are your siblings or other family members of your career in law enforcement?**

1. Very Supportive	2. Somewhat Supportive	3. Unsure	4. Somewhat Not Supportive	5. Not Supportive

Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
1.62	.78	589

32. **The following items deal with friendships and relationships. Use the following scale to respond.**

1. Strongly Disagree	2. Moderately Disagree	3. Neither agree or disagree	4. Moderately Agree	5. Strongly Agree

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
The majority of my friends are police.	2.76	1.30	597
I spend time out of work with other police officers.	3.23	1.23	595
I have many friends out of the department.	4.02	1.08	597
It is difficult to develop friendships/ relationships with non-officers.	2.08	1.20	596
It is difficult to develop friendships/ relationships with other officers.	2.07	1.06	596
It is difficult to maintain long friendships/relationships with non-police officers.	1.95	1.14	596
It is difficult to maintain long friendships/relationships with officers.	1.99	1.03	596
I participate in non-department events.	4.24	1.01	597
My family interacts with other police families.	2.92	1.22	595
It is easy to meet people socially.	3.81	1.15	595
The majority of conversations with friends are police related.	2.60	1.14	594
Identified primarily as police officer.	3.48	1.14	594

Continuation of Question 32.

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
I'm treated differently when people Find out I am a police officer.	3.76	1.02	594
I'm cautious in developing friendships with non-officers.	2.71	1.29	594
I am cautious in developing friendships with other officers.	.59	1.13	594
Treated with respect because I am a police officer.	3.24	.90	594
Expected to adhere to higher set of standards.	4.01	.92	595

34. **The following are programs that may or may not be offered by your department to assist officers with work and family issues.**

a. Does your department offer this program?

Service		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Employee Assistance Program	Yes	342	58.3	587
	No	114	19.4	
	Unsure	131	22.3	
Training at academy level on work and family issues.	Yes	233	39.6	588
	No	195	33.2	
	Unsure	160	27.2	
Family day at academy/department.	Yes	96	16.3	589
	No	389	66.0	
	Unsure	104	17.7	
Family orientation program.	Yes	38	6.5	588
	No	420	71.4	
	Unsure	130	22.1	
Peer support group.	Yes	44	7.5	584
	No	390	66.8	
	Unsure	150	25.7	
Training/workshops on work and family issues throughout career.	Yes	68	11.6	585
	No	375	64.1	
	Unsure	142	24.3	
Spouse awareness program.	Yes	40	6.8	587
	No	398	67.8	
	Unsure	149	25.4	
Spouse support group.	Yes	28	4.8	587
	No	404	68.8	
	Unsure	155	26.4	
Programs for children of officers.	Yes	28	4.8	586
	No	425	72.5	
	Unsure	133	22.7	
Family support group.	Yes	28	4.8	588
	No	407	69.2	
	Unsure	153	26.0	
Training on health and wellness.	Yes	238	40.5	588
	No	243	41.3	
	Unsure	107	18.2	

Continuation of Question 34.

Service		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Hotline number officers can call for assistance.	Yes	165	28.0	589
	No	276	46.9	
	Unsure	148	25.1	

34b. If you responded yes to the above question, please indicate if you have used this program/service. Frequencies and percentages represent those participants who indicated the programs exist in their organizations.

Service		Frequency	Percentage
Employee Assistance Program	Yes	40	11.7
	No	302	88.3
Training at academy level on work and family issues.	Yes	123	54.7
	No	102	45.3
Family day at academy/department.	Yes	57	61.3
	No	36	38.7
Family orientation program.	Yes	18	51.4
	No	17	48.6
Peer support group.	Yes	3	6.8
	No	41	93.2
Training/workshops on work and family issues throughout career.	Yes	35	50.7
	No	34	49.3
Spouse awareness program.	Yes	6	15.0
	No	34	85.0
Spouse support group.	Yes	3	11.1
	No	24	88.9
Programs for children of officers.	Yes	8	26.7
	No	22	73.3
Family support group.	Yes	1	3.6
	No	27	94.4
Training on health and wellness.	Yes	142	60.9
	No	91	39.1
Hotline number officers can call for assistance.	Yes	8	5.0
	No	153	95.0

35. **If confronted with a difficult situation at home or work please use the following scale to indicate how willing would you be to make use of the services listed.**

1. Definitely Would Use Service	2. Probably Would Use Service	3. Unsure	4. Probably Would Not Use Service	5. Definitely Would Not Use Service

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
Employee Assistance Program	2.66	1.07	589
Training at academy level on work and family issues.	2.74	1.10	584
Family day at academy/department.	2.67	1.20	585
Family orientation program.	2.78	1.14	584
Peer support group.	2.97	1.01	585
Training/workshops on work and family provided throughout career.	2.66	1.02	584
Spouse awareness program.	2.83	1.07	579
Spouse support group.	2.99	1.02	578
Programs for children of officers.	2.66	1.10	579
Family support group.	2.93	1.02	582
Training on health and wellness.	2.32	1.07	586
Hotline number officers can call for assistance.	2.60	1.07	585

36. To what degree would the following enhance the department's ability to assist officers with work and family issues?

1. To a very slight extent 2. 3. 4. 5. To a very large extent

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
Offer a greater number and variety of programs.	3.24	1.14	578
Develop programs designed specifically for officers.	3.52	1.12	578
Provide more services at academy level.	3.65	1.23	578
Develop policy statement indicating support of programs.	3.35	1.20	580
Upper echelon acknowledge support of programs.	3.50	1.30	579
Involve family to a greater degree.	3.18	1.16	579
Deliver programs at local/field level.	3.39	1.11	578
Provide off-site services.	3.49	1.16	579
Reduce stigma of seeking assistance.	3.92	1.21	581
Publicize available programs to officers and family members.	3.83	1.16	581

37. **The following items deal with your relationship with your partner. Use the following scale to respond to each item.**

1. Very False 2. 3. Neutral 4. 5. Very True

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
You and your partner socialize outside of work together.	3.28	1.36	222
My partner knows my family.	3.85	1.23	223
My partner is my confidante.	3.28	1.36	222
My spouse/significant other knows my partner.	4.00	1.22	217
My partner's family and mine engage in activities together.	2.60	1.43	223
I can trust my partner.	4.27	.95	223
My partner knows more about me than my family.	2.45	1.37	223
It is easier to talk about my concerns with my partner than with family.	2.55	1.35	222

---

[a] Represents the percentage of responses.

[b] Indicates the number of participants who responded to that item.

Items 20, 24, 29, 33, 38, and 39 were open-ended items.

Appendix A-3

WFILE Cover Letters

POLICE RESEARCH EDUCATION PROJECT

750 FIRST STREET, N.E., SUITE 1020 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002-4241 • (202) 842-4420 • FAX: (202) 842-4396

ROBERT T. SCULLY
Executive Director

July 1996

Dear Law Enforcement Colleague:

About three weeks ago, you should have received a copy of this questionnaire on law enforcement stress factors. If you have not already completed the survey, please take the time to do so now. Your response is very important.

As you know, law enforcement is undoubtedly the most stressful occupation in America, requiring officers to make split-second, life and death decisions all in a day's work. Officers serve to protect the peace, but all too often there is no one to support them when they need assistance.

That is why the Dallas Police Association has joined with the Police Research and Education Project (PREP), sister organization of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), to identify from the ***officer's perspective*** the greatest work and family stress factors. Your response is very important. The information you provide will assist in the development of guidelines and model programs that best reflect the needs and concerns of law enforcement officers.

The enclosed survey is completely **confidential** and has been **anonymously** mailed to a random sample of officers with the cooperation of the Dallas Police Department. This important stress survey has also been endorsed by the Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Texas.

The questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope within the next two weeks. All information will be sent to the law enforcement stress team at Buffalo State College which will summarize the results.

Thank you for your assistance in participating in this project. If you have any questions, please call Beth Weaver at (202) 842-4420.

Sincerely,

Robert T. Scully, Executive Director
Police Research and Education Project

Glenn White, President
Dallas Police Association

POLICE RESEARCH EDUCATION PROJECT

750 FIRST STREET, N.E., SUITE 1020 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002-4241 • (202) 842-4420 • FAX: (202) 842-4396

ROBERT T. SCULLY
Executive Director

July 1996

Dear Law Enforcement Colleague:

About three weeks ago, you should have received a copy of this questionnaire on law enforcement stress factors. If you have not already completed the survey, please take the time to do so now. Your response is very important.

As you know, law enforcement is undoubtedly the most stressful occupation in America, requiring officers to make split-second, life and death decisions all in a day's work. Officers serve to protect the peace, but all too often there is no one to support them when they need assistance.

That is why the Police Conference of New York has joined with the Police Research and Education Project (PREP), sister organization of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), to identify from the ***officer's perspective*** the greatest work and family stress factors. Your response is very important. The information you provide will assist in the development of guidelines and model programs that best reflect the needs and concerns of law enforcement officers.

The enclosed survey is completely **confidential** and has been **anonymously** mailed to a random sample of officers with the cooperation of the PCNY.

The questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope within the next two weeks. All information will be sent to the law enforcement stress team at Buffalo State College which will summarize the results.

Thank you for your assistance in participating in this project. If you have any questions, please call Beth Weaver at (202) 842-4420.

Sincerely,

Robert T. Scully, Executive Director
Police Research and Education Project

Edward W. Guzdek, President
Police Conference of New York

POLICE RESEARCH EDUCATION PROJECT

750 FIRST STREET, N.E., SUITE 1020 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002-4241 • (202) 842-4420 • FAX: (202) 842-4396

ROBERT T. SCULLY
Executive Director

July 1996

Dear Law Enforcement Colleague:

About three weeks ago, you should have received a copy of this questionnaire on law enforcement stress factors. If you have not already completed the survey, please take the time to do so now. Your response is very important.

As you know, law enforcement is undoubtedly the most stressful occupation in America, requiring officers to make split-second, life and death decisions all in a day's work. Officers serve to protect the peace, but all too often there is no one to support them when they need assistance.

That is why the Minnesota Police and Peace Officers Association has joined with the Police Research and Education Project (PREP), sister organization of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), to identify from the ***officer's perspective*** the greatest work and family stress factors. Your response is very important. The information you provide will assist in the development of guidelines and model programs that best reflect the needs and concerns of law enforcement officers.

The enclosed survey is completely **confidential** and has been **anonymously** mailed to a random sample of officers with the cooperation of the MPPOA. This important police stress survey has also been endorsed by the Police Officers Federation of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Police Department. The questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope and return within the next two weeks. All information will be sent to the law enforcement stress team at Buffalo State College which will summarize the results.

Thank you for your assistance in participating in this project. If you have any questions, please call Beth Weaver at (202) 842-4420.

Sincerely,

Robert T. Scully, Executive Director
Police Research and Education Project

Dennis J. Flaherty, Executive Director
Minnesota Police and Peace
Officers Association

POLICE
RESEARCH
EDUCATION
PROJECT

750 FIRST STREET, N.E., SUITE 1020 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002-4241 • (202) 842-4420 • FAX: (202) 842-4396

ROBERT T. SCULLY
Executive Director

July 1996

Dear Law Enforcement Colleague:

About three weeks ago, you should have received a copy of this questionnaire on law enforcement stress factors. If you have not already completed the survey, please take the time to do so now. Your response is very important.

As you know, law enforcement is undoubtedly the most stressful occupation in America, requiring officers to make split-second, life and death decisions all in a day's work. Officers serve to protect the peace, but all too often there is no one to support them when they need assistance.

That is why the Texas Municipal Police Association has joined with the Police Research and Education Project (PREP), sister organization of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), to identify from the ***officer's perspective*** the greatest work and family stress factors. Your response is very important. The information you provide will assist in the development of guidelines and model programs that best reflect the needs and concerns of law enforcement officers.

The enclosed survey is completely **confidential** and has been **anonymously** mailed to a random sample of officers with the cooperation of the TMPA.

The questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope within the next two weeks. All information will be sent to the law enforcement stress team at Buffalo State College which will summarize the results.

Thank you for your assistance in participating in this project. If you have any questions, please call Beth Weaver at (202) 842-4420.

Sincerely,

Robert T. Scully, Executive Director
Police Research and Education Project

Jim Lyde, Executive Director
Texas Municipal Police
Association

POLICE
RESEARCH
EDUCATION
PROJECT

750 FIRST STREET, N.E., SUITE 1020 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002-4241 • (202) 842-4420 • FAX: (202) 842-4396

ROBERT T. SCULLY
Executive Director

August, 1996

Dear Colleague:

About three weeks ago, you should have received a copy of this questionnaire on law enforcement stress factors. If you have not already completed the survey, please take the time to do so now. Your response is very important.

The enclosed survey is completely confidential and has been mailed to a random number of fellow members with the cooperation of the New York City Police Department. This anonymous survey has been reviewed and endorsed by leaders of the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, the Detectives' Endowment Association, the Sergeants Benevolent Association , the Lieutenants Benevolent Association and the Captains Endowment Association.

The New York City Police Department is cooperating with the Police Research and Education Project (PREP), a sister organization of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), to identify the underlying factors of work and family related stress. Your candid response is important to the success of this worthwhile project.

The questionnaire takes approximately 15 minutes to complete and should be placed in the enclosed postage-paid envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation and participation in this survey. If you have any questions, please call Beth Weaver at (202) 842-4420.

Sincerely,

Robert T. Scully, Executive Director
Police Research and Education Project

Howard Safir, Police Commissioner
New York City Police Department

County of Erie

DENNIS T. GORSKI
COUNTY EXECUTIVE

DEPARTMENT OF CENTRAL POLICE SERVICES
JOHN N. CARDARELLI, COMMISSIONER

September 6, 1994

Dear Fellow Officer:

For the last two years, The Erie County Department of Central Police Services and the Employee Assistance Program have put forth great effort into developing an exclusive Law Enforcement Employee Assistance Program designed to meet the individual needs associated with your job. In November of last year, we conducted a stress survey to 10% of our local federal, state, county, and city police agencies with a 63% return rate. Based on the cooperation of the officers surveyed, the Training Academy was able to develop and implement several training programs addressing the needs expressed by that survey to hundreds of officers in the Law Enforcement Community.

Dr. Robert Delprino, Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychology, Buffalo State College has taken a very strong interest in this field and has requested that we help him to HELP US in identifying the needs of officers in this complex issue.

To that end, we are asking for your cooperation in completing the enclosed "Work and Family Issues in Law Enforcement Questionnaire". As in the past, we will use the responses to develop additional programs available to you and your family addressing specific needs.

Thank you for your time and effort in participating in this project. If you have any questions, please contact Cindy Goss at 858-7714.

Sincerely,

John N. Cardarelli
Commissioner

Cynthia Goss, Director E.A.P.

JNC/fh
Enc.

BUFFALO STATE COLLEGE

1300 Elmwood Avenue Buffalo, New York 14222-1095

Work and Family Issues in Law Enforcement

Dear Officer:

I am asking for your cooperation in completing the attached Work and Family Issues in Law Enforcement Questionnaire. This project is being conducted with the cooperation of Commissioner John Cardarelli of Central Police Services and Ms. Cynthia Goss, Director of the Erie County Employee Assistance Program.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gain an understanding of the relationship between work and family for law enforcement personnel. The information you provide will be beneficial to the police community by assisting in identifying and developing services for officers and their family members. Your response is very important because it will ensure that the services developed will adequately reflect law enforcement officers' views on this topic.

The questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. All information you provide will remain confidential and your participation will be anonymous. Please place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed self addressed stamped envelope. All information will be returned to:

Ms. Cynthia Goss, Director
Employee Assistance Program
Erie County Health Department
95 Franklin Street, Room 1276
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Robert P. Delprino

Robert P. Delprino, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology

Appendix A-4

Factor Analysis and Reliability Analysis For Erie County Study

Table 2

Factor Analyses and Reliability Analyses for Erie County Study

Factors For Work-Family Orientation

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Total Variance	Reliability	Mean	S.D.
WFILE (n=597)					
Work-family spillover	4.65	22.1	.84	3.11	.90
Compensation	1.85	8.8	.63	3.63	.73
Communication of work experiences	1.44	6.8	.63	3.40	1.08

Factors For Work and Family Issues

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Total Variance	Reliability	Mean	S.D.
WFILE (n=597)					
Occupational Effects on the Family	5.62	36.0	.75	2.61	.80
Negative Effects on the Family	1.25	8.3	.77	2.09	.88
Personal Stress	1.05	7.0	.71	3.06	1.07

Factors For Spousal Relationship and Support Issues

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Total Variance	Reliability	Mean	S.D.
WFILE (n=597) Factor Analysis 1 (18 items)					
Job Influences Spouse	4.43	24.6	.78	2.26	.67
Spouse Communication	2.55	14.2	.76	3.09	.81
Spouse Social Support	1.73	9.6	.74[1]	3.61	.69
Spouse Sacrifice	1.16	6.5	.77	2.60	.93
Protection of Spouse	1.13	6.3	.62	3.70	.91
WFILE (n=597) Factor Analysis 2 (13 items)					
General Spouse Support	5.40	41.5	.86[1]	3.72	.74
Spouse Willing to Participate in Activities	1.78	13.7	.67	1.42	.64

Note. [1] After deletion of items which decreased coefficient alpha.

Factors Related to Relationship with Other Officers

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Total Variance	Reliability	Mean	S.D.
WFILE (n=597)					
Non-officer friendships	4.50	25.0	.82	2.25	.78
Officer Friendships	2.50	13.9	.68	2.50	.75
Identified as Police Officer	1.87	10.4	.68	3.62	.70

Factors Related to Children

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Total Variance	Reliability	Mean	S.D.
WFILE (n=597) Factor Analysis 1 (5 items)					
Parenthood Influences Job	2.82	56.5	.80	4.11	.68
WFILE (n=597) Factor Analysis 2 (13 items)					
Behavior with Own Children	2.04	25.5	.57	4.15	.65
Tolerant of Children	1.51	18.8	.47	2.99	.74
Job Affects Children	1.06	13.2	.53	3.41	1.02

Items Included in the Spillover/Segmentation Factor for Work-Family Orientati

Subscale Items
WFILE
Work-family spillover
My work experiences and my family experiences directly influence each other.
My attitudes, experiences, and conflicts at work carry over into my home life.
My work experiences and family experiences do not influence each other.
My work and family roles remain separate from each other.
The feelings that I have from incidents at work often come home with me.
My job experiences do not affect interactions with family members and friends.
Interactions with friends or family members carry over to my job.

Items Included in the Compensation Factor for Work-Family Orientation

Subscale Items
WFILE
Compensation
I view my family as a haven from the job.
Leisure activities after work help to energize/revitalize me from work.
Desirable behaviors and feelings that are lacking in my work are pursued in family activities.
Involvement in non-work social activities allows me to release negative feelings that may result from the job.
The family environment can make up for difficulty in the job.

Items Included in the Communication Factor for Work-Family Orientation

Subscale Items
WFILE
Communication of work experiences
I often discuss my work experiences with members of my family.
I do not discuss my work experiences with family members nor family experiences with co-workers.

Items Included in the Occupational Effects on Family Factor for Work and Family Issues

---

Subscale Items

WFILE

Occupational Effects on Family

Danger associated with the job.

Closed society of policing.

Organizational hierarchy of department.

Relationship with partner.

Officer and family are expected to behave by a higher set of standards.

Public criticism that officers may experience influences family members.

Tendency to be more protective of family members due to the potential dangers you see other members of the public encounter while on the job.

Items Included in the Negative Effects on Family Factor for Work and Family Issues

Subscale Items
WFILE
Negative Effects on Family
The job becomes a priority over the family.
Anger, frustration and mistrust from the job carries over into the family.
Marital conflict.
Conflict between your role as an officer and your role as a parent.
Family members lack understanding of the job.

Items Included in the Personal Stress Factor for Work and Family Issues

Subscale Items
WFILE
Personal Stress
Physiological demands of the job including changing shifts, and changes in eating, exercising and sleeping patterns.
Stress, burnout, withdrawal
Job requires you to be away from family and miss important family events.

Items Included in the Spousal Relationship and Support Issues Subscales

Subscale Items
WFILE
Job Influences Spouse
What occurs on job influences relationship with spouse/significant other
The mood I am in as a result of my job influences the mood of my spouse/significant other.
The stress from the job leads me to withdrawal from spouse/significant other.
We argue about my job.
My relationship with spouse/significant other is secondary compared to my relationship with other officers.
Spouse Communication
What I learn from job improves communication with spouse/significant other.
I discuss my work problems.
I discuss my feelings.
After a significant incident on job, my spouse/significant other is the first person I contact for support.
Spouse Social Support
We spend time together.
We make long range plans.
We socialize with others not in law enforcement.
We plan special activities.
Spouse Sacrifice
My spouse/significant other makes personal sacrifices because of my job.
The job interferes with spouse's/significant other's job opportunities/career plans.
Protection of Spouse
I try to protect my spouse/significant other from what occurs on the job.
I am protective of spouse/significant other from potential threats in community.
General Spouse Support
Tries to better understand the job.
Communicates well.
Identifies problems when they occur.
Maintains positive attitude.
Maintains good sense of humor.
Spouse Willing to Participate in Activities
Joins support group.
Facilitates access to counseling for you or family members.
Participates in educational seminars on issues related to family in law enforcement.

Items Included in the Officer Friendship Subscales

Subscale Items
WFILE
Non-officer Friendships
It is difficult to maintain long friendships/relationships with non-police officers.
It is difficult to develop friendships/relationships with non-officers.
I have many friends out of the department.
The majority of my friends are police.
It is easy to meet people socially.
The majority of conversations with friends are police related.
I participate in non-department events.
I'm cautious in developing friendships with non-officers.
Officer Friendships
It is difficult to develop friendships/relationships with other officers.
It is difficult to maintain long friendships/relationships with officers.
My family interacts with other police families.
I spend time out of work with other police officers.
I am cautious in developing friendships with other officers.
Identified as police officer
Others identify me primarily as a police officer.
I'm treated differently when people find out I am a police officer.
I am treated with respect because I am a police officer.
I am expected to adhere to a higher set of standards because I am an officer.

Items Included in the Children Subscales

Subscale Items
WFILE
Parenthood Influences Job
Being a parent enables me to be more understanding in situations with children.
Since becoming a parent, I have a greater awareness of issues that affect teens and children.
As a parent, I can work better with children and teenagers.
Because I am a parent, calls with children affect me greater.
When responding to calls that involve children, I think of my own children.
Behavior with Own Children
I am a disciplinarian.
I am protective of my children.
I have high standards for my children.
Tolerant of Children
I am tolerant of children's behavior and attitudes.
Being an officer enhances my commmunication with children.
My child/children can question my authority.
Job Affects Children
My job demands limit quality time with my child/children.
Job transfers to parenting, for example, interrogate kids on activities.

Appendix B-1

Police Officer Questionnaire (POQ)

Police Officer Questionnaire

For office use only

Instructions: Answer each question, making sure to shade the corresponding circle area *completely*. Use ballpoint pen or pencil (no felt tip).

1. State in which you work: ○ New York ○ Minnesota ○ Texas

2. Name of agency: _____

_____

Type of agency: ○ Suburban ○ Rural ○ City ○ County

3. Please indicate the approximate number of sworn officers in your agency:

○ 1-20 ○ 21-50 ○ 51-100 ○ 101-200 ○ 201-500 ○ 501-1000 ○ Over 1000

4. Job title: ○ Captain ○ Deputy Sheriff ○ Dispatcher ○ Police Officer ○ Sheriff
○ Chief ○ Detective ○ Lieutenant ○ Sergeant ○ Other

5. Your current assignment: ○ Administrative ○ Patrol

6. Gender: ○ Male ○ Female

7. Your age: ☐☐

8. Ethnicity: ○ African American ○ Hispanic ○ American Indian / Alaskan Native ○ Asian or Pacific Islander
○ White, not of Hispanic origin ○ Other _____

9. Highest level of education: ○ High School ○ Some College ○ Associate's Degree ○ Bachelor's Degree
○ Some Graduate School ○ Graduate Degree

10. Military veteran? ○ Yes ○ No

11. Years in law enforcement: ☐☐

12. Have other family members worked in law enforcement? ○ Yes ○ No

13. Marital status: ○ Single, never married ○ Currently married ○ Divorced, not remarried ○ Widowed, not remarried

If currently or previously married, is/was this your first marriage? ○ Yes ○ No

14. Do you have children? ○ Yes ○ No

15. Do any preschool-aged children live with you? ○ Yes ○ No

16. Do you or your spouse/partner care for an elderly parent or relative? ○ Yes ○ No

17. How often does your shift change?

○ More often than monthly ○ Each month ○ Every 3 months ○ Every 6 months ○ A period longer than 6 months ○ Does not change

18. Do you work with a partner? ○ Yes ○ No

Continue to next page

57150

©1996 Delprino, Kennedy, O'Quin. For information, contact Robert Delprino, Buffalo State College. (716) 878-6669.

Police Officer Questionnaire - p. 2

For office use only

The questions below refer to your health and wellness:

19. During the past month, would you say your health has been:

① Poor ② Fair ③ Good ④ Very good ⑤ Excellent

20. Within the **past month**, how many **days per week** did you participate in vigorous activities (e.g., bicycling, brisk walking, jogging, aerobics, etc.) for 20 minutes or more:

⓪ 0 days/wk ① 1 day/wk ② 2 days/wk ③ 3 days/wk ④ 4 days/wk ⑤ 5 days/wk ⑥ 6 days/wk ⑦ 7 days/wk

21. During the **past week**, how many alcoholic drinks (i.e., a glass of wine, beer, a shot of liquor) have you had?

⓪ 0 drinks ① 1 drink ② 2-3 drinks ③ 4-7 drinks ④ 8-14 drinks ⑤ 15-21 drinks ⑥ 22-28 drinks ⑦ 29+ drinks

22. How many cigarettes do you smoke **per day**?

⓪ 0 cigarettes ① 10 or less cigarettes ② 11-20 cigarettes ③ 21-30 cigarettes ④ 31-40 cigarettes ⑤ 41+ cigarettes

23. Please indicate whether you have had any of these health-related problems in the **past month**. Mark *all* that apply.

○ Allergies ○ Back problems ○ Diarrhea ○ Emphysema ○ Heart trouble ○ Loss of appetite ○ Trembling hands
○ Asthma ○ Diabetes ○ Dizziness ○ Headaches ○ High blood pressure ○ Sleeplessness ○ Ulcers

24. Overall, how much stress are you experiencing on the job?

① None at all ② A little ③ Some ④ Quite a bit ⑤ A lot

Please indicate to what extent you agree with each statement below:	Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree
25. My work and family experiences directly influence each other.	①	②	③	④	⑤
26. My family makes up for difficulty on the job.	①	②	③	④	⑤
27. My work and family experiences **do not** influence each other.	①	②	③	④	⑤
28. My experiences and conflicts at work carry over into my home life.	①	②	③	④	⑤
29. I talk about my work experiences with family members.	①	②	③	④	⑤
30. Behaviors & feelings that are lacking in my work are pursued in family activites.	①	②	③	④	⑤
31. My work and family roles remain separate from each other.	①	②	③	④	⑤
32. I discuss my family experiences with co-workers.	①	②	③	④	⑤
33. Family activities allow me to release negative feelings from the job.	①	②	③	④	⑤
34. The feelings I have from incidents at work often come home with me.	①	②	③	④	⑤
35. I discuss my family with co-workers.	①	②	③	④	⑤
36. I view my family as a haven from the job.	①	②	③	④	⑤
37. My job experiences **do not** affect my interactions with family members.	①	②	③	④	⑤
38. Leisure activities after work help to revitalize me.	①	②	③	④	⑤
39. I **do not** discuss my job with family members.	①	②	③	④	⑤
40. I spend time outside of work with other police officers.	①	②	③	④	⑤
41. It is difficult to develop friendships with other officers.	①	②	③	④	⑤
42. It is difficult to maintain long-lasting friendships with other officers.	①	②	③	④	⑤
43. My family interacts with other police families.	①	②	③	④	⑤
44. I am cautious in developing friendships with other officers.	①	②	③	④	⑤

Continue to next page

64167

©1996 Delprino, Kennedy, O'Quin. For information, contact Robert Delprino, Buffalo State College. (716) 878-6669.

Police Officer Questionnaire - p. 3

For office use only

Using the scale below, indicate how each issue impacts you or your family:

① Not at all	② A little	③ Some	④ Quite a bit	⑤ A lot

45. The job becomes a priority over the family.
46. Physiological demands.
47. Changing shifts.
48. Job stress.
49. Burnout.
50. Danger associated with the job.
51. Closed society of policing.
52. Organizational hierarchy of the department.
53. Officer & family are expected to behave by a higher set of standards.
54. Marital/relationship conflict.
55. Conflict between your work and family roles.
56. Job requires you to be away from family.
57. Public criticism of officers influences family members.
58. Family members lack understanding of the job.
59. Tendency to be protective of family members.

How does your career as a law enforcement officer influence your relationship with your spouse/partner?

⓪ Does not apply	① Never	② Rarely	③ Sometimes	④ Often	⑤ Always

60. What occurs on the job influences my relationship with my spouse/partner.
61. Job stress leads me to withdraw from my spouse/partner.
62. The mood I am in as a result of my job influences the mood of my spouse/partner.
63. We argue about my job.

How does your spouse/partner provide support for you?

⓪ Does not apply	① Never	② Rarely	③ Sometimes	④ Often	⑤ Always

64. Tries to understand my job.
65. Communicates well.
66. Willing to join spouse support group.
67. Willing to facilitate access to counseling for me or family members.
68. Maintains positive attitude.
69. Maintains good sense of humor.
70. Would participate in educational activities related to law enforcement.
71. Willing to attend activities sponsored by the agency.

Continue to next page

57162

©1996 Delprino. Kennedy. O'Quin. For information, contact Robert Delprino. Buffalo State College. (716) 878-6669.

Police Officer Questionnaire - p. 4

For office use only

Use the scale below to answer each question:

⓪ Does not apply	① Never	② Rarely	③ Sometimes	④ Often	⑤ Always

72. ⓪ ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ My spouse/partner is supportive of my career in law enforcement.

73. ⓪ ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ My children are supportive of my career in law enforcement.

74. ⓪ ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ My parents are supportive of my career in law enforcement.

Please indicate to what extent you agree with each statement below:	Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree
75. I'm understanding in situations that involve children & families.	①	②	③	④	⑤
76. I have a great awareness of the issues that affect children & teenagers.	①	②	③	④	⑤
77. I can work well with children and teenagers.	①	②	③	④	⑤
78. Calls that involve children have a great effect on me.	①	②	③	④	⑤
79. When I respond to calls that involve children, I think of my own children.	①	②	③	④	⑤
80. I would encourage my children to enter law enforcement.	①	②	③	④	⑤
81. My job limits the amount of time I have to spend with my children.	①	②	③	④	⑤

The following are programs/services that may be offered by your agency to assist officers with work and family issues. For each:

- First, indicate whether you believe that your agency offers the program/service. Select the question mark (?) if you are not sure.
- Second, indicate whether you have ever used the program/service.

	Does your department offer this program/service?			Have you ever used this program/service?		
82.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Employee Assistance Program
83.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Counseling for law enforcement family members
84.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Child care on a 24-hour basis
85.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Marital and child support groups
86.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Stress reduction programs
87.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Stress education for law enforcement recruits and families
88.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Post-shooting debriefing for officers and their spouses
89.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Group therapy
90.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Hypertension clinics
91.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis
92.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Law enforcement family crisis telephone services on a 24-hour basis
93.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Counseling for law enforcement personnel exposed to the HIV virus
94.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Peer counseling
95.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Counseling for families of personnel killed in the line of duty
96.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating
97.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Family orientation programs (e.g., spouse awareness, precinct visit, etc.)
98.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Programs geared toward work & family issues for recruits
99.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Programs geared toward work & family issues throughout an officer's career
100.	① No	② ?	③ Yes	① No	② Yes	Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance

Continue to next page

57168

©1996 Delprino, Kennedy, O'Quin. For information, contact Robert Delprino, Buffalo State College, (716) 878-6669.

Police Officer Questionnaire - p. 5

For office use only

If confronted with a difficult situation at home or work, how willing would you be to make use of the services listed? Indicate your willingness using the scale below.

① Definitely would not use service	② Probably would not use service	③ Unsure	④ Probably would use service	⑤ Definitely would use service

101.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Employee Assistance Program
102.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Counseling for law enforcement family members
103.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Child care on a 24-hour basis
104.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Marital and child support groups
105.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Stress reduction programs
106.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Stress education for law enforcement recruits and families
107.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Post-shooting debriefing for officers and their spouses
108.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Group therapy
109.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Hypertension clinics
110.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis
111.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Law enforcement family crisis telephone services on a 24-hour basis
112.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Counseling for law enforcement personnel exposed to the HIV virus
113.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Peer counseling
114.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Counseling for families of personnel killed in the line of duty
115.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating
116.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Family orientation programs (e.g., spouse awareness, precinct visit, etc.)
117.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Programs geared toward work & family issues for recruits
118.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Programs geared toward work & family issues throughout an officer's career
119.	①	②	③	④	⑤	Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance

Please indicate to what extent you agree/disagree with each statement:	Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree
120. My supervisor is supportive of officers who seek counseling.	①	②	③	④	⑤
121. Top management supports officers seeking counseling.	①	②	③	④	⑤
122. There is a stigma associated with counseling in my organization.	①	②	③	④	⑤
123. My fellow officers back up officers seeking counseling.	①	②	③	④	⑤
124. My union supports officers who seek counseling.	①	②	③	④	⑤
125. Confidentiality of services is a problem in my organization.	①	②	③	④	⑤

Please answer each question:

126. Is it a policy in your organization to require officers involved in a critical incident to go to counseling? ○ Yes ○ No

127. Does your agency have a collective bargaining agreement?

○ No ○ Yes, local union negotiated ○ Yes, state union negotiated ○ Yes, national union negotiated
○ Yes, local police association negotiated ○ Yes, state police association negotiated

Continue to next page

57177

©1996 Delprino. Kennedy. O'Quin. For information, contact Robert Delprino. Buffalo State College. (716) 878-6669.

Police Officer Questionnaire - p. 6

For office use only

128. Does your agency provide health insurance?

○ No ○ Yes, for current employees only ○ Yes, for retirees as well as current employees

129. Do you have a "police officer's bill of rights?"

○ Yes → If yes, mark *all* options that apply:
○ No
○ Contractual provision ○ Statute
○ Department policy ○ Local ordinance

130. Does your agency have a residency requirement? ○ No ○ Yes, for new hires ○ Yes, for all officers

131. Does your agency offer a tax deferred pension plan? ○ No ○ Yes

132. In which of the following types of investigations does an officer in your agency have the right to legal representation? (Mark *all* that apply.)

○ Internal Affairs investigation ○ Criminal investigation ○ Civilian review board

○ Other (please specify) _____

133. In which of the following types of investigations do you have the right to remain silent? (Mark *all* that apply.)

○ Internal Affairs investigation ○ Criminal investigation ○ Civilian review board

○ Other (please specify) _____

134. Does your agency have a formal policy regarding the "high speed pursuit" of people suspected of a violent crime? ○ No ○ Yes

135. Are you allowed to engage in "high speed pursuit" of people suspected of a violent crime? ○ No ○ Yes ○ Sometimes

Would the following enhance your agency's ability to help officers?	Not at all				Very much
136. Mandate confidentiality.	①	②	③	④	⑤
137. Offer more programs for police families.	①	②	③	④	⑤
138. Develop programs designed specifically for officers.	①	②	③	④	⑤
139. Provide programs early in the officer's career.	①	②	③	④	⑤
140. Develop a policy statement that indicates support of programs.	①	②	③	④	⑤
141. Top management acknowledges support of programs.	①	②	③	④	⑤
142. Deliver programs at the local/field level.	①	②	③	④	⑤
143. Provide off-site services.	①	②	③	④	⑤
144. Reduce stigma associated with seeking assistance.	①	②	③	④	⑤
145. Publicize available programs to officers and family members.	①	②	③	④	⑤
146. Adopt an "Officer's Bill of Rights."	①	②	③	④	⑤
147. Allow for the formation of a police association/union.	①	②	③	④	⑤
148. Allow police association to engage in collective bargaining for officers.	①	②	③	④	⑤

Thank you!

4135

©1996 Delprino. Kennedy. O'Quin. For information, contact Robert Delprino, Buffalo State College. (716) 878-6669.

Appendix B-2

POQ Cover Letter: 1st Mailing

Appendix B-3

POQ Cover Letter: 2nd Mailing

POLICE RESEARCH EDUCATION PROJECT

750 FIRST STREET, N.E., SUITE 1020 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002-4241 • (202) 842-4420 • FAX: (202) 842-4396

ROBERT T. SCULLY
Executive Director

July 1996

Dear Law Enforcement Colleague:

As you know, law enforcement is undoubtedly the most stressful occupation in America, requiring officers to make split-second, life and death decisions all in a day's work. Officers serve to protect the peace, but all too often there is no one to support them when they need assistance.

That is why the Minnesota Police and Peace Officers Association has joined with the Police Research and Education Project (PREP), sister organization of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), to identify from the ***officer's perspective*** the greatest work and family stress factors. Your response is very important. The information you provide will assist in the development of guidelines and model programs that best reflect the needs and concerns of law enforcement officers.

The enclosed survey is completely **confidential** and has been **anonymously** mailed to a random sample of officers with the cooperation of the MPPOA. This important police stress survey has also been endorsed by the Police Officers Federation of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Police Department. The questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope and return within the next two weeks. All information will be sent to the law enforcement stress team at Buffalo State College which will summarize the results.

Thank you for your assistance in participating in this project. If you have any questions, please call Beth Weaver at (202) 842-4420.

Sincerely,

Robert T. Scully, Executive Director
Police Research and Education Project

Dennis J. Flaherty, Executive Director
Minnesota Police and Peace
Officers Association

POLICE
RESEARCH
EDUCATION
PROJECT

750 FIRST STREET, N.E., SUITE 1020 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002-4241 • (202) 842-4420 • FAX: (202) 842-4396

ROBERT T. SCULLY
Executive Director

July 1996

Dear Law Enforcement Colleague:

As you know, law enforcement is undoubtedly the most stressful occupation in America, requiring officers to make split-second, life and death decisions all in a day's work. Officers serve to protect the peace, but all too often there is no one to support them when they need assistance.

That is why the Texas Municipal Police Association has joined with the Police Research and Education Project (PREP), sister organization of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), to identify from the ***officer's perspective*** the greatest work and family stress factors. Your response is very important. The information you provide will assist in the development of guidelines and model programs that best reflect the needs and concerns of law enforcement officers.

The enclosed survey is completely **confidential** and has been **anonymously** mailed to a random sample of officers with the cooperation of the TMPA.

The questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope within the next two weeks. All information will be sent to the law enforcement stress team at Buffalo State College which will summarize the results.

Thank you for your assistance in participating in this project. If you have any questions, please call Beth Weaver at (202) 842-4420.

Sincerely,

Robert T. Scully, Executive Director
Police Research and Education Project

Jim Lyde, Executive Director
Texas Municipal Police Association

POLICE RESEARCH EDUCATION PROJECT

750 FIRST STREET, N.E., SUITE 1020 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002-4241 • (202) 842-4420 • FAX: (202) 842-4396

ROBERT T. SCULLY
Executive Director

July 1996

Dear Law Enforcement Colleague:

As you know, law enforcement is undoubtedly the most stressful occupation in America, requiring officers to make split-second, life and death decisions all in a day's work. Officers serve to protect the peace, but all too often there is no one to support them when they need assistance.

That is why the Dallas Police Association has joined with the Police Research and Education Project (PREP), sister organization of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), to identify from the ***officer's perspective*** the greatest work and family stress factors. Your response is very important. The information you provide will assist in the development of guidelines and model programs that best reflect the needs and concerns of law enforcement officers.

The enclosed survey is completely **confidential** and has been **anonymously** mailed to a random sample of officers with the cooperation of the Dallas Police Department. This important stress survey has also been endorsed by the Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Texas.

The questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope within the next two weeks. All information will be sent to the law enforcement stress team at Buffalo State College which will summarize the results.

Thank you for your assistance in participating in this project. If you have any questions, please call Beth Weaver at (202) 842-4420.

Sincerely,

Robert T. Scully, Executive Director
Police Research and Education Project

Glenn White, President
Dallas Police Association

POLICE RESEARCH EDUCATION PROJECT

750 FIRST STREET, N.E., SUITE 1020 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002-4241 • (202) 842-4420 • FAX: (202) 842-4396

ROBERT T. SCULLY
Executive Director

July 1996

Dear Law Enforcement Colleague:

As you know, law enforcement is undoubtedly the most stressful occupation in America, requiring officers to make split-second, life and death decisions all in a day's work. Officers serve to protect the peace, but all too often there is no one to support them when they need assistance.

That is why the Police Conference of New York has joined with the Police Research and Education Project (PREP), sister organization of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), to identify from the ***officer's perspective*** the greatest work and family stress factors. Your response is very important. The information you provide will assist in the development of guidelines and model programs that best reflect the needs and concerns of law enforcement officers.

The enclosed survey is completely **confidential** and has been **anonymously** mailed to a random sample of officers with the cooperation of the PCNY.

The questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope within the next two weeks. All information will be sent to the law enforcement stress team at Buffalo State College which will summarize the results.

Thank you for your assistance in participating in this project. If you have any questions, please call Beth Weaver at (202) 842-4420.

Sincerely,

Robert T. Scully, Executive Director
Police Research and Education Project

Edward W. Guzdek, President
Police Conference of New York

POLICE RESEARCH EDUCATION PROJECT

750 FIRST STREET, N.E., SUITE 1020 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002-4241 • (202) 842-4420 • FAX: (202) 842-4396

ROBERT T. SCULLY
Executive Director

Dear Colleague:

August, 1996

The enclosed survey is completely confidential and has been mailed to a random number of fellow members with the cooperation of the New York City Police Department. This anonymous survey has been reviewed and endorsed by leaders of the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, the Detectives' Endowment Association, the Sergeants Benevolent Association , the Lieutenants Benevolent Association and the Captains Endowment Association.

The New York City Police Department is cooperating with the Police Research and Education Project (PREP), a sister organization of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), to identify the underlying factors of work and family related stress. Your candid response is important to the success of this worthwhile project.

The questionnaire takes approximately 15 minutes to complete and should be placed in the enclosed postage-paid envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation and participation in this survey. If you have any questions, please call Beth Weaver at (202) 842-4420.

Sincerely,

Robert T. Scully, Executive Director
Police Research and Education Project

Howard Safir, Police Commissioner
New York City Police Department

Appendix B-4

POQ Total Descriptive Tables

POLICE OFFICER QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Item				
1.	State:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
	New York P.D.	490	71.5	1631
	New York (surrounding)	195	28.5	
	Minnesota P.D.	235	44.8	
	Minnesota (surrounding)	289	55.2	
	Dallas Texas P.D.	210	49.8	
	Dallas (surrounding)	212	50.2	
	State not identified	1		
2b.	Type of Agency:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
	Suburban	279	17.2	1630
	Rural	14	.9	
	City	1319	81.4	
	County	8	.5	
	Agency not identified	2		
3.	Number of sworn officers:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
	1 - 20	20	1.2	1630
	21 - 50	131	8.0	
	51 - 100	210	12.9	
	101 - 200	215	13.2	
	201 - 500	106	6.5	
	501 - 1000	248	15.2	
	over 1000	700	42.9	
	Number not identified	2		
4.	Job Title:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
	Captain	26	1.6	1630
	Chief	9	.6	
	Deputy Sheriff	1	.1	
	Detective	222	13.6	
	Dispatcher	5	.3	
	Lieutenant	90	5.5	
	Police Officer	964	59.1	
	Sergeant	282	17.3	
	Other	31	1.9	
	Job title not identified	2		
5.	Current Assignment:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
	Administrative	357	22.5	1584
	Patrol	1227	77.5	
	Assignment not identified	48		

6. Gender:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Male	1421	87.2	1629
Female	208	12.8	
Gender not identified	3		

7. Age:

Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
37.21	8.42	1628

The respondents age ranged from 22 to 64 with an average age of respondents of 37.

8. Ethnicity:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
African American	87	5.4	1626
Hispanic	108	6.7	
American Indian/Alaskan	17	1.0	
Asian/Pacific Islander	15	.9	
White/Non-Hispanic	1382	85.1	
Other	15	.9	
Ethnicity not identified	3		

9. Education:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
High School	118	7.2	1629
Some College	487	29.9	
Associate's Degree	375	23.0	
Bachelor's Degree	477	29.3	
Some Graduate School	105	6.4	
Graduate Degree	67	4.1	
Education not identified	3		

10. Military Veteran:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Yes	414	25.5	1625
No	1211	74.5	
Not identified	7		

11. Years in Law Enforcement:

Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
12.99	8.30	1621

The number of years served in law enforcement ranged from less than 1 year to 55 years. As a group the respondents served an average of 13 years in law enforcement.

12. Family Members in Law Enforcement:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Yes	657	41.4	1588
No	931	58.6	
Not identified	44		

13. Marital Status:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Single	287	17.7	1625
Married	1180	72.6	
Divorced	149	9.2	
Widowed	9	.6	
Marital status not identified	7		

13b. Is this your first marriage:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Yes	975	77.6	1256
No	281	22.5	
Not identified	376		

14. Do you have children:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Yes	1118	68.9	1623
No	505	31.1	

15. Pre-school children living with you:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Yes	502	30.9	1625
No	1123	69.1	

16. Elder care for parent/relative:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Yes	147	9.0	1629
No	1482	91.0	

17. Shift Change:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
More often than monthly	370	22.7	1630
Each month	65	4.0	
Every 3 months	71	4.4	
Every 6 months	112	6.9	
Longer than 6 months	141	8.7	
Does not change	871	53.4	
Shift change not identified	2		

18. Do you work with a partner:	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Yes	603	37.1	1626
No	1023	65.9	

19. During the past month would you say your health has been:

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Poor	24	1.5	1632
Fair	141	8.6	
Good	542	33.2	
Very Good	609	37.3	
Excellent	316	19.4	

20. Within the past month, how many days per week did you participate in vigorous activities (e.g. bicycling, brisk walking, aerobics, etc.) for 20 minutes or more:

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
0 days/wk	312	19.1	1630
1 days/wk	227	13.9	
2 days/wk	298	18.3	
3 days/wk	333	20.4	
4 days/wk	196	12.0	
5 days/wk	169	10.4	
6 days/wk	48	2.9	
7 days/wk	47	2.9	

21. During the past week how many alcoholic drinks (i.e. a glass of wine, beer, a shot of liquor) have you had:

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
0 drinks	594	36.4	1631
1 drink	177	10.9	
2 - 3 drinks	287	17.6	
4 - 7 drinks	280	17.2	
8 - 14 drinks	161	9.9	
15 - 21 drinks	71	4.4	
22 - 28 drinks	30	1.8	
29 + drinks	31	1.9	

22. How many cigarettes do you smoke per day:

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
0 cigarettes	1336	82.0	1630
10 or less cigarettes	68	4.2	
11 - 20 cigarettes	104	6.4	
21 - 30 cigarettes	67	4.1	
31 - 40 cigarettes	38	2.3	
41 + cigarettes	17	1.0	

23. Health related problems (Allergies, Asthma, Back Problems, Diabetes, Diarrhea, Dizziness, Emphysema, Headaches, Heart Trouble, High Blood Pressure, Loss of Appetite, Sleeplessness, Trembling Hands, Ulcers) that are often associated with prolonged exposure to stress were listed. Officers were asked to indicate whether or not they had experienced any of these problems within the last month.

Of the health related problems listed the four highest rated issues identified by officers that they had experienced included:

Headaches	475	(29.1%)
Back Problems	446	(27.3%)
Allergies	405	(24.8%)
Sleeplessness	401	(24.6%)

Other ratings:

Diarrhea	220	(13.5%)
High Blood Pressure	144	(8.8%)
Loss of appetite	63	(3.9%)
Trembling Hands	49	(3.0%)
Asthma	46	(2.8%)
Dizziness	45	(2.8%)
Ulcers	30	(1.8%)
Diabetes	19	(1.2%)
Heart Trouble	13	(.8%)
Emphysema	2	(.1%)

Number of Health Related Problems	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
0	527	32.3	1632
1	476	29.2	
2	295	18.1	
3	169	10.4	
4	92	5.6	
5	38	2.3	
6	21	1.3	
7	11	.7	
8	3	.2	

24. Officers were asked to indicate on a 5 point scale how much stress they felt they were experiencing on the job.

1	2	3	4	5
None at all	A little	Some	Quite a bit	A lot

Of the 1613 officers that responded to this question, 1233 (76.4%) indicated that they experienced at least some stress on the job. 453 (28.1%) indicated that they experienced quite a bit to a great deal of stress.

25. - 44. Please indicate to what extent you agree with each statement:

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Moderately Disagree	3 Neither Agree nor Disagree	4 Moderately Agree	5 Strongly Agree

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
Leisure activities after work help to revitalize me.	4.06	.90	1628
I view my family as a haven from the job.	3.59	1.14	1622
My work and family roles remain separate from each other.	3.54	1.19	1630
I talk about my work experiences with family members.	3.46	1.22	1628
I discuss my family with co-workers.	3.45	1.12	1626
My family makes up for difficulty on the job.	3.43	1.22	1625
Family activities allow me to release negative feelings from the job.	3.43	1.11	1626
I discuss my family experiences with co-workers.	3.42	1.13	1621
My work and family experiences directly influence each other.	3.42	1.22	1629
Behaviors & feelings that are lacking in my work are pursued in family activities.	3.11	1.09	1624
I spend time out of work with other police officers.	3.10	1.26	1628
The feelings I have from incidents at work often come home with me.	3.03	1.26	1626
My experiences and conflicts at work carry over into my home life.	2.96	1.27	1628
My job experiences do not affect my interactions with family members.	2.93	1.25	1627
My family interacts with other police families.	2.85	1.27	1630
I am cautious in developing friendships with other officers.	2.60	1.24	1629

Continuation of section 25 - 44.

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
My work and family experiences do not influence each other.	2.50	1.29	1624
I do not discuss my job with family members.	2.42	1.21	1622
It is difficult to maintain long-lasting friendships with other officers.	2.26	1.17	1629
It is difficult to develop friendships with other officers.	2.50	1.29	1623

45. - 59. Using the scale below, indicate how each issue impacts you or your family:

1 Not at all	2 A little	3 Some	4 Quite a bit	5 A lot

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
Tendency to be protective of family members.	3.49	1.21	1612
Job stress.	3.14	1.09	1612
Officer and family are expected to behave to a higher set of standards.	3.07	1.40	1610
Organizational hierarchy of department.	2.87	1.35	1602
Burnout.	2.82	1.28	1614
Physiological demands.	2.79	1.07	1601
Job requires you to be away from family.	2.76	1.20	1613
Danger associated with the job.	2.70	1.12	1613
Changing shifts.	2.56	1.49	1608
Public criticism of officers influences family members.	2.54	1.24	1613
Marital/relationship conflict.	2.36	1.22	1612
Family members lack understanding of the job.	2.36	1.19	1614
Closed society of policing.	2.34	1.13	1596
Conflict between your work and family roles.	2.21	1.10	1611
Job becomes priority over family.	2.79	1.07	1601

60. - 63. How does your career as a law enforcement officer influence your relationship with your spouse/partner?

0	1	2	3	4	5
Does not apply	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
The mood I am in as a result of my job influences the mood of my spouse/partner.	2.575	1.00	1476
What occurs on the job influences my relationship with my spouse/partner.	2.55	.90	1462
Job stress leads me to withdrawal from my spouse/partner.	2.31	.99	1471
We argue about my job.	1.88	.90	1443

64. - 71. How does your spouse/partner provide support for you:

0	1	2	3	4	5
Does not apply	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
Maintains positive attitude.	3.88	.90	1508
Maintains good sense of humor.	3.85	.93	1514
Tries to understand my job.	3.82	.98	1500
Communicates well.	3.67	1.00	1511
Willing to attend activities sponsored by the agency.	3.22	1.17	1405
Would participate in educational activities related to law enforcement.	2.97	1.26	1234
Willing to facilitate access to counseling for me or family members.	2.63	1.38	811
Willing to join spouse support group.	2.26	1.30	783

72. My spouse/partner is supportive of my career in law enforcement.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Does not apply	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
4.34	.86	1510

73. My children are supportive of my career in law enforcement.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Does not apply	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
4.45	.76	940

74. My parents are supportive of my career in law enforcement.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Does not apply	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
4.33	.87	1436

75. - 81. Please indicate to what extent you agree with each statement below.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither agree or Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
I'm understanding in situations that involve children and families.	4.41	.71	1610
I have a great awareness of the issues that affect children and families.	4.20	.74	1609
I can work well with children and teenagers.	4.06	.86	1610
Calls that involve children have a great effect on me.	3.90	1.01	1607
When I respond to calls that involve children, I think of my own children.	3.75	1.10	1566
My job limits the amount of time I have to spend with my children.	3.47	1.14	1555
I would encourage my children to enter law enforcement.	2.55	1.23	1600

82. - 100. The following are programs/services that may or may not be offered by your department to assist officers with work and family issues.

a. Does your department offer this service?

Item		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Employee Assistance Program.	Yes	1204	74.8	1609
	No	127	7.9	
	Unsure	278	17.3	
Counseling for law enforcement family members.	Yes	1031	64.1	1608
	No	267	16.6	
	Unsure	310	19.3	
Child care on a 24-hour basis.	Yes	39	2.4	1611
	No	1321	82.0	
	Unsure	251	15.6	
Marital and child support.	Yes	406	25.4	1601
	No	659	41.2	
	Unsure	536	33.5	
Stress reduction programs.	Yes	705	43.8	1609
	No	493	30.6	
	Unsure	411	25.5	
Stress education for law enforcement recruits and families.	Yes	514	32.1	1599
	No	550	34.4	
	Unsure	535	33.5	
Post-shooting debriefing for officers and their spouses.	Yes	1017	63.2	1608
	No	276	17.2	
	Unsure	315	19.6	
Group therapy.	Yes	341	21.2	1605
	No	646	40.2	
	Unsure	618	38.5	
Hypertension clinics.	Yes	273	17.0	1605
	No	720	44.9	
	Unsure	612	38.1	
Critical Incident response on a 24- hour basis.	Yes	800	49.9	1604
	No	320	20.0	
	Unsure	484	30.2	
Law enforcement family crisis telephone services on 24 hour basis.	Yes	362	22.5	1606
	No	711	44.3	
	Unsure	533	33.2	

Continuation of 82. - 100.a.

Item		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Counseling for law enforcement personnel exposed to the HIV virus.	Yes	339	21.1	1608
	No	555	34.5	
	Unsure	714	44.4	
Peer counseling.	Yes	681	42.3	1609
	No	473	29.4	
	Unsure	455	28.3	
Counseling for families of personnel killed in the line of duty.	Yes	857	53.3	1609
	No	277	17.2	
	Unsure	475	29.5	
Seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating.	Yes	474	29.5	1605
	No	630	39.3	
	Unsure	501	31.2	
Family orientation programs (e.g.spouse awareness, precinct visit. etc.)	Yes	363	22.6	1604
	No	770	48.0	
	Unsure	471	29.4	
Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits.	Yes	243	15.2	1600
	No	714	44.6	
	Unsure	643	40.2	
Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout officer's career.	Yes	180	11.2	1601
	No	843	52.7	
	Unsure	578	36.1	
Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance.	Yes	891	55.4	1608
	No	233	14.5	
	Unsure	484	30.1	

82. - 100.
b. If you responded yes to the above, please indicate if you have used this program/service. Frequencies and percentages represent those respondents who indicated the program/service exists in their organization.

Item		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Employee Assistance Program.	Yes	198	12.3	1608
	No	1410	87.7	
Counseling for law enforcement family members.	Yes	125	7.8	1605
	No	1480	92.2	
Child care on a 24-hour basis.	Yes			1613
	No	1613	100.0	
Marital and child support.	Yes	22	1.4	1606
	No	1584	98.6	
Stress reduction programs.	Yes	117	7.3	1608
	No	1491	91.4	
Stress education for law enforcement recruits and families.	Yes	157	9.6	1601
	No	1444	90.2	
Post-shooting debriefing for officers and their spouses.	Yes	129	8.1	1595
	No	1466	91.9	
Group therapy.	Yes	27	1.7	1603
	No	1576	98.3	
Hypertension clinics.	Yes	26	1.6	1608
	No	1582	98.4	
Critical Incident response on a 24- hour basis.	Yes	94	5.9	1600
	No	1506	94.1	
Law enforcement family crisis telephone services on 24 hour basis.	Yes	13	.8	1603
	No	1590	9.2	
Counseling for law enforcement personnel exposed to the HIV virus.	Yes	29	1.8	1602
	No	1573	98.2	
Peer counseling.	Yes	38	2.4	1606
	No	1568	97.6	
Counseling for families of personnel killed in the line of duty.	Yes	12	.8	1594
	No	1582	99.2	

Continuation of 82. - 100.b.

Item		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating.	Yes	48	3.0	1604
	No	1556	97.0	
Family orientation programs (e.g.spouse awareness, precinct visit. etc.)	Yes	105	6.6	1600
	No	1495	93.4	
Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits.	Yes	68	4.2	1604
	No	1536	95.8	
Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout officer's career.	Yes	34	2.1	1606
	No	1572	9739	
Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance.	Yes	115	7.2	1593
	No	1478	92.8	

101. - 119. If confronted with a difficult situation at home or work, how willing would you be to make use of the services listed? Indicate your willingness using the scale below.

1 Definitely would not use service	2 Probably would not use service	3 Unsure	4 Probably would use service	5 Definitely would use service

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
Employee Assistance Program.	3.26	1.13	1619
Counseling for law enforcement family members.	3.29	1.11	1618
Child care on a 24-hour basis.	3.11	1.45	1603
Marital and child support.	3.06	1.14	1613
Stress reduction programs.	3.52	1.07	1619
Stress education for law enforcement recruits and families.	3.40	1.15	1606
Post-shooting debriefing for officers and their spouses.	4.20	1.00	1619
Group therapy.	2.68	1.14	1620
Hypertension clinics.	3.17	1.09	1619
Critical Incident response on a 24- hour basis.	3.71	1.09	1622
Law enforcement family crisis telephone services on 24 hour basis.	3.20	1.15	1619
Counseling for law enforcement personnel exposed to the HIV virus.	3.61	1.12	1620
Peer counseling.	3.04	1.12	1623
Counseling for families of personnel killed in the line of duty.	4.09	1.05	1616
Seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating.	3.11	1.18	1619
Family orientation programs (e.g.spouse awareness, precinct visit. etc.)	3.36	1.15	1620
Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruit.	3.14	1.16	1614
Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout officer's career.	3.40	1.08	1621
Mental health treatment provide independently by health insurance.	3.41	1.12	1618

120. - 125. Please indicate to what extent you agree/disagree with each statement:

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Moderately Disagree	3 Neither Agree nor disagree	4 Moderately Agree	5 Strongly Agree

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
My union supports officers who seek counseling.	3.71	.98	1602
There is a stigma associated with counseling in my organization.	3.58	1.15	1622
Confidentiality of services is a problem in my organization.	3.54	1.21	1621
My supervisor is supportive of officers who seek counseling.	3.29	1.15	1623
My fellow offices back up officers seeking counseling.	3.09	.98	1624
Top management supports officers seeking assistance.	2.93	1.24	1622

126. Is it a policy in your organization to require officers involved in a critical incident to go to counseling:

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Yes	885	56.3	1571
No	686	43.7	

127. Does your agency have a collective bargaining agreement?

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
No	417	26.5	1572
Yes, local union negotiated	616	39.2	
Yes, Local police association	455	28.9	
Yes, State union negotiated	51	3.2	
Yes, State police association	27	1.7	
Yes, National union negotiated	6	.4	

128. Does your agency provide health insurance?

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
No.	13	.8	1554
Yes, for current employees only.	690	44.4	
Yes, for retirees and current employees.	851	54.8	

129a. Do you have a "police officer's bill of rights?"

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Yes	867	63.1	1414
No	547	38.7	

129b. If you marked yes, mark all options that apply:

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Contractual provision	458	29.6	1547
Department policy	532	34.4	
Statute	392	25.4	
Local ordinance	117	7.6	

130. Does your agency have a residency requirement?

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
No	770	49.8	1546
Yes, for new hires	346	22.4	
Yes, for all officers	430	27.8	

131. Does your agency offer a tax deferred pension plan?

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
No	100	6.5	1538
Yes	1438	93.5	

132. In which of the following types of investigations does an officer in your agency have the right to legal representation?

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Internal Affairs investigation	1215	78.1	1555
Criminal investigation	1465	94.2	
Civilian review board	876	56.3	
Other	67	4.3	

133. In which of the following types of investigations do you have the right to remain silent?

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
Internal Affairs investigation	299	19.2	1555
Criminal investigation	1319	84.8	
Civilian review board	312	20.1	
Other	39	2.5	

134. Does your agency have a formal policy regarding "high speed pursuit" of people suspected of a violent crime?

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
No	135	8.8	1541
Yes	1406	91.2	

135. Are you allowed to engage in "high speed pursuit' of people suspected of a violent crime?

	Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
No	107	7.0	1535
Yes	769	50.1	
Sometimes	659	42.9	

136. - 148. Would the following enhance your agency's ability to help officers?

1 2 3 4 5
Not at all Very Much

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
Mandate confidentiality.	4.16	1.05	1540
Reduce stigma associated with seeking assistance.	4.15	.96	1528
Adopt an "Officer's Bill of Rights."	4.07	1.07	1498
Allow police association to engage in collective bargaining for officers.	3.81	1.33	1421
Publicize available programs to officers and family members.	4.03	.97	1532
Provide off-site services.	4.03	.98	1532
Provide programs early in the officer's career.	4.02	.95	1533
Top management acknowledges support of programs.	3.95	1.08	1529
Develop programs designed specifically for officers.	3.89	.96	1531
Deliver programs at the local/field level.	3.85	1.01	1527

Continuation of 136. - 148.

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	n[b]
Develop a policy statement that indicates support of programs.	3.82	1.04	1531
Allow for the formation of a police association/union.	3.81	1.33	1421
Offer more programs for police families.	3.69	1.04	1533

[a] Represents the percentage of responses.

[b] Indicates the number of participants who responded to that item.

Appendix B-5

POQ Descriptive Tables By Six Areas

Table 4

Comparing the Six Areas on Variables From Page 1 of the Officer Questionnaire

State	City or Area	Average Age	Years in law enforcement
New York	New York City	34.76_{a}	11.18_{a}
	N of cases	488	481
	NYC Area	38.92_{b}	14.59_{c}
	N of cases	185	186
State mean		35.90	12.13
N of cases		673	667
Minnesota	Minneapolis	38.12_{b}	13.57_{bc}
	N of cases	235	234
	MN Area	38.56_{b}	14.59_{c}
	N of cases	268	268
State mean		38.36	14.11
N of cases		503	502
Texas	Dallas	38.42_{b}	14.06_{bc}
	N of cases	207	207
	Dallas Area	37.22_{b}	12.00_{ab}
	N of cases	204	204
State mean		37.82	13.04
N of cases		411	411
TOTAL		37.18	13.00
N of cases		1587	1580
F Statistics		13.17***	9.78***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey).

Table 4 (continued)

State	City or Area	Job Title	
New York	New York City		
		Police Officer	59.9%
		All other titles	40.1%
	N of cases		489
	NYC Area		
		Police Officer	56.5%
		All other titles	43.5%
	N of cases		186
Minnesota	Minneapolis		
		Police Officer	63.8%
		All other titles	36.2%
	N of cases		235
	MN Area		
		Police Officer	61.6%
		All other titles	38.4%
	N of cases		268
Texas	Dallas		
		Police Officer	51.0%
		All other titles	49.0%
	N of cases		206
	Dallas Area		
		Police Officer	58.0%
		All other titles	42.0%
	N of cases		205

Note. There were no significant differences among areas, $\chi^2(5) = 9.22$, $p > .10$.

Table 4 (continued)

State	City or Area	Current Assignment	
New York	New York City		
		Administrative	23.0%
		Patrol	77.0%
	N of cases		478
	NYC Area		
		Administrative	20.7%
		Patrol	79.3%
	N of cases		184
Minnesota	Minneapolis		
		Administrative	21.9%
		Patrol	78.1%
	N of cases		228
	MN Area		
		Administrative	16.9%
		Patrol	83.1%
	N of cases		260
Texas	Dallas		
		Administrative	25.8%
		Patrol	74.2%
	N of cases		194
	Dallas Area		
		Administrative	28.5%
		Patrol	71.5%
	N of cases		200

Note. There were no significant differences among areas, $\chi^2(5) = 10.39$, $p > .06$.

Table 4 (continued)

State	City or Area	Gender	
New York	New York City		
		Male	82.9%
		Female	17.1%
	N of cases		490
	NYC Area		
		Male	93.0%
		Female	7.0%
	N of cases		186
Minnesota	Minneapolis		
		Male	83.4%
		Female	16.6%
	N of cases		235
	MN Area		
		Male	89.6%
		Female	10.4%
	N of cases		268
Texas	Dallas		
		Male	86.4%
		Female	13.6%
	N of cases		206
	Dallas Area		
		Male	94.1%
		Female	5.9%
	N of cases		203

Note. Differences among areas were significant, $\chi^2(5) = 26.93$, $p < .00007$.

Table 4 (continued)

State	City or Area	Ethnicity	
New York	New York City		
		Minority	24.6%
		Majority	75.4%
	N of cases		487
	NYC Area		
		Minority	9.2%
		Majority	90.8%
	N of cases		185
Minnesota	Minneapolis		
		Minority	8.2%
		Majority	91.8%
	N of cases		233
	MN Area		
		Minority	3.4%
		Majority	96.6%
	N of cases		268
Texas	Dallas		
		Minority	22.8%
		Majority	77.2%
	N of cases		206
	Dallas Area		
		Minority	11.7%
		Majority	88.3%
	N of cases		205

Note. Differences among areas were significant, $\chi^2(5) = 89.55$, $p < .00001$.

Table 4 (continued)

State	City or Area	Education	
New York	New York City		
		High School	13.3%
		Some college	40.0%
		Associates degree	17.0%
		Bachelors degree	22.0%
		Graduate work or degree	7.6%
	N of cases		487
	NYC Area		
		High School	13.4%
		Some college	37.6%
		Associates degree	14.0%
		Bachelors degree	22.0%
		Graduate work or degree	12.9%
	N of cases		186
Minnesota	Minneapolis		
		High School	3.0%
		Some college	17.0%
		Associates degree	45.5%
		Bachelors degree	26.4%
		Graduate work or degree	8.1%
	N of cases		235
	MN Area		
		High School	.7%
		Some college	16.4%
		Associates degree	34.3%
		Bachelors degree	35.8%
		Graduate work or degree	12.7%
	N of cases		268
Texas	Dallas		
		High School	.0%
		Some college	19.8%
		Associates degree	14.0%
		Bachelors degree	48.8%
		Graduate work or degree	17.4%
	N of cases		207
	Dallas Area		
		High School	8.8%
		Some college	42.4%
		Associates degree	14.1%
		Bachelors degree	27.8%
		Graduate work or degree	6.8%
	N of cases		205

Note. Differences among areas were significant, $\chi^2(20) = 296.82$, $p < .00001$.

Table 4 (continued)

State	City or Area		Q10	Q12	Q14	Q15
New York	New York City					
		Yes	13.9%	50.2%	57.9%	33.9%
		No	86.1%	49.8%	42.1%	66.1%
	N of cases		488	472	487	487
	NYC Area					
		Yes	22.7%	52.5%	72.4%	31.4%
		No	77.3%	47.5%	27.6%	68.6%
	N of cases		185	181	185	185
Minnesota	Minneapolis					
		Yes	38.5%	34.5%	68.2%	28.2%
		No	61.5%	65.5%	31.8%	71.8%
	N of cases		234	226	233	234
	MN Area					
		Yes	25.4%	28.1%	78.7%	30.3%
		No	74.6%	71.9%	21.3%	69.7%
	N of cases		268	263	267	267
Texas	Dallas					
		Yes	29.5%	41.2%	75.7%	29.1%
		No	70.5%	58.8%	24.3%	70.9%
	N of cases		207	204	206	206
	Dallas Area					
		Yes	34.7%	37.3%	73.0%	30.7%
		No	65.3%	62.7%	27.0%	69.3%
	N of cases		202	201	204	205
Chi Square statistics			66.90***	49.08***	46.56***	3.14

Note. ***$p < .0001$.

Table 4 (continued)

State	City or Area		Q16	Q18
New York	New York City			
		Yes	11.5%	62.0%
		No	88.5%	38.0%
	N of cases		488	489
	NYC Area			
		Yes	14.1%	14.1%
		No	85.9%	85.9%
	N of cases		185	185
Minnesota	Minneapolis			
		Yes	9.8%	55.4%
		No	90.2%	44.6%
	N of cases		235	233
	MN Area			
		Yes	4.9%	9.3%
		No	95.1%	90.7%
	N of cases		268	268
Texas	Dallas			
		Yes	4.3%	37.4%
		No	95.7%	62.6%
	N of cases		207	206
	Dallas Area			
		Yes	7.3%	16.1%
		No	92.7%	83.9%
	N of cases		205	205
Chi Square statistics			21.53**	331.18***

Note. *** $p < .0001$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 4 (continued)

State	City or Area	Marital Status	
New York	New York City		
		Single	27.9%
		Currently married	63.9%
		Previously married	8.2%
	N of cases		488
	NYC Area		
		Single	19.0%
		Currently married	74.5%
		Previously married	6.5%
	N of cases		184
Minnesota	Minneapolis		
		Single	21.4%
		Currently married	66.7%
		Previously married	12.0%
	N of cases		234
	MN Area		
		Single	10.4%
		Currently married	81.7%
		Previously married	7.8%
	N of cases		268
Texas	Dallas		
		Single	8.3%
		Currently married	79.1%
		Previously married	12.6%
	N of cases		206
	Dallas Area		
		Single	7.3%
		Currently married	78.5%
		Previously married	14.1%
	N of cases		205

Note. Differences among areas were significant, $\chi^2(10) = 83.82$, $p < .00001$.

Table 4 (continued)

State	City or Area	Shift change	
New York	New York City		
		More than monthly	35.0%
		Each month	2.5%
		Less than monthly	4.5%
		Does not change	58.1%
	N of cases		489
	NYC Area		
		More than monthly	51.1%
		Each month	3.8%
		Less than monthly	9.4%
		Does not change	25.8%
	N of cases		186
Minnesota	Minneapolis		
		More than monthly	6.0%
		Each month	4.3%
		Less than monthly	29.8%
		Does not change	60.0%
	N of cases		235
	MN Area		
		More than monthly	26.5%
		Each month	3.0%
		Less than monthly	34.7%
		Does not change	35.8%
	N of cases		268
Texas	Dallas		
		More than monthly	2.4%
		Each month	12.1%
		Less than monthly	4.8%
		Does not change	80.7%
	N of cases		207
	Dallas Area		
		More than monthly	2.5%
		Each month	1.0%
		Less than monthly	39.7%
		Does not change	56.9%
	N of cases		204

Note. Differences among areas were significant, $\chi^2(15) = 485.39$, $p < .00001$.

Table 5

Comparing the Six Areas on Variables From Page 2 of the Officer Questionnaire

State	City or Area	Q19	Q20	Q21	Q22
New York	New York City	3.66	2.61	1.74_{ab}	$.54_{c}$
	N of cases	490	489	490	489
	NYC Area	3.52	2.44	2.09_{b}	$.56_{c}$
	N of cases	186	186	186	186
State mean		3.62	2.56	1.84	.54
N of cases		676	675	676	675
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.58	2.34	2.34_{c}	$.59_{c}$
	N of cases	235	235	235	235
	MN Area	3.69	2.58	2.19_{c}	$.26_{ab}$
	N of cases	268	268	268	268
State mean		3.64	2.47	2.26	.42
N of cases		503	503	503	503
Texas	Dallas	3.76	2.52	1.34_{a}	$.14_{a}$
	N of cases	207	206	206	206
	Dallas Area	3.61	2.35	1.39_{a}	$.47_{bc}$
	N of cases	205	205	205	205
State mean		3.68	2.44	1.36	.31
N of cases		412	411	411	411
TOTAL		3.64	2.50	1.85	.44
N of cases		1591	1589	1590	1589
F Statistics		1.68	1.08	12.63***	7.16***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$.

Table 5 (continued)

State	City or Area	Health problems	Q24
New York	New York City	1.18_{a}	2.94_{a}
	N of cases	490	482
	NYC Area	1.70_{c}	3.18_{bc}
	N of cases	186	182
State mean		1.32	3.00
N of cases		676	664
Minnesota	Minneapolis	1.67_{c}	3.29_{c}
	N of cases	235	232
	MN Area	1.55_{bc}	3.15_{bc}
	N of cases	268	268
State mean		1.61	3.22
N of cases		503	500
Texas	Dallas	1.24_{ab}	2.93_{ab}
	N of cases	207	206
	Dallas Area	1.65_{bc}	3.08_{abc}
	N of cases	205	204
State mean		1.44	3.00
N of cases		412	410
TOTAL		1.44	3.07
N of cases		1591	1574
F Statistics		7.18***	7.01***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$.

Table 5 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q25	Q26	Q27	Q28
New York	New York City	3.13_{a}	3.28	2.81_{a}	2.62_{a}
	N of cases	489	488	489	489
	NYC Area	3.33_{ab}	3.45	2.57_{ab}	2.98_{bc}
	N of cases	185	184	184	185
State mean		3.18	3.32	2.74	2.72
N of cases		674	672	673	674
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.69_{c}	3.47	2.27_{b}	3.30_{c}
	N of cases	235	234	233	235
	MN Area	3.71_{c}	3.57	2.23_{b}	3.26_{bc}
	N of cases	268	267	266	268
State mean		3.70	3.53	2.25	3.28
N of cases		503	501	499	503
Texas	Dallas	3.44_{bc}	3.52	2.39_{b}	2.96_{bc}
	N of cases	207	207	207	207
	Dallas Area	3.52_{bc}	3.45	2.40_{b}	2.95_{b}
	N of cases	204	204	204	203
State mean		3.48	3.48	2.39	2.95
N of cases		411	411	411	410
TOTAL		3.42	3.43	2.50	2.96
N of cases		1588	1584	1583	1587
F Statistics		11.76***	2.59	10.23***	13.71***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$.

Table 5 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q29	Q30	Q31	Q32
New York	New York City	3.30_{a}	2.87_{a}	3.69_{a}	3.46
	N of cases	490	488	490	483
	NYC Area	3.33_{ab}	3.12_{ab}	3.56_{ab}	3.30
	N of cases	184	184	186	186
State mean		3.31	2.94	3.66	3.41
N of cases		674	672	676	669
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.39_{abc}	3.16_{b}	3.40_{b}	3.36
	N of cases	235	232	235	234
	MN Area	3.67_{c}	3.31_{b}	3.37_{b}	3.56
	N of cases	267	268	267	268
State mean		3.54	3.24	3.39	3.47
N of cases		502	500	502	502
Texas	Dallas	3.61_{bc}	3.14_{b}	3.62_{ab}	3.37
	N of cases	207	207	207	206
	Dallas Area	3.54_{abc}	3.25_{b}	3.42_{ab}	3.31
	N of cases	204	204	204	203
State mean		3.58	3.19	3.52	3.34
N of cases		411	411	411	409
TOTAL		3.45	3.10	3.54	3.41
N of cases		1587	1583	1589	1580
F Statistics		4.65**	7.57***	3.92*	1.96

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). ** $p < .001$. *** $p < .0001$.

Table 5 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q33	Q34	Q35	Q36
New York	New York City	3.20_{a}	2.76_{a}	3.49	3.48
	N of cases	489	487	487	485
	NYC Area	3.27_{ab}	3.08_{bc}	3.32	3.52
	N of cases	184	185	186	185
State mean		3.22	2.84	3.44	3.49
N of cases		673	672	673	670
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.44_{ab}	3.35_{c}	3.43	3.66
	N of cases	233	234	234	235
	MN Area	3.51_{b}	3.24_{bc}	3.55	3.56
	N of cases	268	268	268	268
State mean		3.48	3.29	3.49	3.61
N of cases		501	502	502	503
Texas	Dallas	3.44_{ab}	2.94_{ab}	3.44	3.76
	N of cases	207	207	206	205
	Dallas Area	3.31_{ab}	3.03_{abc}	3.34	3.69
	N of cases	204	204	204	203
State mean		3.38	2.98	3.39	3.73
N of cases		411	411	410	408
TOTAL		3.34	3.02	3.44	3.59
N of cases		1585	1585	1585	1581
F Statistics		3.71*	9.63***	1.46	2.49

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. * $p < .01$.

Table 5 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q37	Q38	Q39	Q40
New York	New York City	3.25_{a}	4.03	2.54_{ab}	3.00_{b}
	N of cases	489	488	487	488
	NYC Area	3.12_{ab}	4.02	2.73_{a}	3.13_{ab}
	N of cases	185	185	183	186
State mean		3.22	4.03	2.59	3.04
N of cases		674	673	670	674
Minnesota	Minneapolis	2.62_{c}	4.05	2.45_{ab}	3.19_{ab}
	N of cases	235	235	234	235
	MN Area	2.54_{c}	4.09	2.14_{c}	3.31_{a}
	N of cases	268	268	268	268
State mean		2.58	4.07	2.28	3.25
N of cases		503	503	502	503
Texas	Dallas	2.98_{ab}	4.12	2.32_{bc}	2.93_{b}
	N of cases	206	207	206	206
	Dallas Area	2.80_{bc}	4.02	2.33_{bc}	3.11_{ab}
	N of cases	204	204	203	204
State mean		2.89	4.07	2.33	3.02
N of cases		410	411	409	410
TOTAL		2.93	4.05	2.43	3.10
N of cases		1587	1587	1581	1587
F Statistics		16.50***	.47	6.87***	3.07*

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. * $p < .01$.

Table 5 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q41	Q42	Q43	Q44
New York	New York City	1.95	2.18	2.73_{b}	2.55_{ab}
	N of cases	486	490	490	489
	NYC Area	2.20	2.34	3.03_{ab}	2.77_{b}
	N of cases	186	185	186	185
State mean		2.02	2.22	2.82	2.61
N of cases		672	675	676	674
Minnesota	Minneapolis	2.09	2.30	2.77_{ab}	2.63_{ab}
	N of cases	234	235	235	235
	MN Area	2.12	2.24	3.10_{a}	2.40_{a}
	N of cases	268	267	268	268
State mean		2.11	2.27	2.95	2.51
N of cases		502	502	503	503
Texas	Dallas	1.98	2.28	2.76_{b}	2.70_{ab}
	N of cases	206	207	207	207
	Dallas Area	2.13	2.38	2.85_{ab}	2.76_{b}
	N of cases	202	204	203	204
State mean		2.05	2.33	2.80	2.73
N of cases		408	411	410	411
TOTAL		2.06	2.26	2.85	2.61
N of cases		1582	1588	1589	1588
F Statistics		2.26	1.17	4.01*	3.29*

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). * $p < .01$.

Table 6

Comparing the Six Areas on Variables From Page 3 of the Officer Questionnaire

State	City or Area	Q45	Q46	Q47	Q48
New York	New York City	1.87_{a}	2.61_{a}	2.64_{bc}	2.98_{a}
	N of cases	482	479	483	482
	NYC Area	2.00_{ab}	2.80_{ab}	2.98_{c}	3.18_{ab}
	N of cases	186	184	186	185
State mean		1.91	2.66	2.74	3.04
N of cases		668	663	669	667
Minnesota	Minneapolis	2.37_{c}	3.13_{c}	2.39_{ab}	3.43_{b}
	N of cases	231	228	228	231
	MN Area	2.37_{c}	2.89_{bc}	2.74_{b}	3.25_{b}
	N of cases	265	265	265	265
State mean		2.37	3.00	2.58	3.33
N of cases		496	493	493	496
Texas	Dallas	1.99_{ab}	2.63_{ab}	2.00_{a}	2.92_{a}
	N of cases	206	205	205	206
	Dallas Area	2.25_{bc}	2.86_{abc}	2.48_{b}	3.26_{b}
	N of cases	202	201	201	202
State mean		2.12	2.74	2.24	3.09
N of cases		408	406	406	408
TOTAL		2.11	2.79	2.56	3.14
N of cases		1572	1562	1568	1571
F Statistics		11.03***	9.19***	11.08***	8.20***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$.

Table 6 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q49	Q50	Q51	Q52
New York	New York City	2.63_{a}	2.84_{b}	2.19_{a}	2.73_{b}
	N of cases	482	482	473	477
	NYC Area	2.89_{abc}	2.75_{ab}	2.43_{ab}	2.80_{b}
	N of cases	186	186	185	184
State mean		2.70	2.81	2.26	2.75
N of cases		668	668	658	661
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.14_{c}	2.88_{b}	2.62_{b}	3.23_{a}
	N of cases	232	232	227	230
	MN Area	2.81_{ab}	2.55_{a}	2.40_{ab}	2.73_{b}
	N of cases	265	265	265	265
State mean		2.96	2.70	2.50	2.97
N of cases		497	497	492	495
Texas	Dallas	2.81_{abc}	2.58_{ab}	2.20_{a}	2.91_{ab}
	N of cases	206	205	205	206
	Dallas Area	2.97_{bc}	2.56_{a}	2.38_{ab}	2.95_{ab}
	N of cases	202	202	200	200
State mean		2.89	2.57	2.29	2.93
N of cases		408	407	405	406
TOTAL		2.83	2.71	2.34	2.86
N of cases		1573	1572	1555	1562
F Statistics		5.73***	4.75**	5.42**	5.26**

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 6 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q53	Q54	Q55	Q56
New York	New York City	3.23_{b}	2.37	2.13_{a}	2.62_{a}
	N of cases	481	482	480	482
	NYC Area	2.96_{ab}	2.38	2.12_{ab}	2.81_{ab}
	N of cases	186	186	186	186
State mean		3.15	2.37	2.13	2.67
N of cases		667	668	666	668
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.26_{b}	2.60	2.42_{b}	3.07_{b}
	N of cases	229	230	231	231
	MN Area	2.70_{a}	2.28	2.28_{ab}	2.82_{ab}
	N of cases	265	265	265	265
State mean		2.96	2.43	2.35	2.94
N of cases		494	495	496	496
Texas	Dallas	3.07_{ab}	2.33	2.15_{ab}	2.80_{ab}
	N of cases	206	206	206	206
	Dallas Area	3.09_{b}	2.31	2.29_{ab}	2.62_{a}
	N of cases	202	202	202	202
State mean		3.08	2.32	2.22	2.71
N of cases		408	408	408	408
TOTAL		3.07	2.38	2.22	2.76
N of cases		1569	1571	1570	1572
F Statistics		6.09***	2.04	3.07*	5.39**

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. * $p < .01$.

Table 6 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q57	Q58	Q59
New York	New York City	2.35_{b}	2.43_{ab}	3.50_{ab}
	N of cases	482	483	482
	NYC Area	2.40_{b}	2.45_{ab}	3.62_{b}
	N of cases	186	185	186
State mean		2.37	2.44	3.53
N of cases		668	668	668
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.18_{a}	2.56_{a}	3.51_{ab}
	N of cases	232	232	232
	MN Area	2.42_{b}	2.18_{b}	3.25_{a}
	N of cases	265	265	265
State mean		2.77	2.36	3.37
N of cases		497	497	497
Texas	Dallas	2.59_{b}	2.27_{ab}	3.46_{ab}
	N of cases	206	206	205
	Dallas Area	2.50_{b}	2.24_{ab}	3.69_{b}
	N of cases	202	202	201
State mean		2.55	2.25	3.58
N of cases		408	408	406
TOTAL		2.54	2.36	3.49
N of cases		1573	1573	1571
F Statistics		16.07***	3.65*	3.81*

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. * $p < .01$.

Table 6 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q60	Q61	Q62	Q63
New York	New York City	2.38_{a}	2.14_{c}	2.36_{a}	1.88_{ab}
	N of cases	420	429	422	421
	NYC Area	2.55_{ab}	2.36_{abc}	2.54_{abc}	1.92_{ab}
	N of cases	168	171	174	173
State mean		2.43	2.20	2.41	1.90
N of cases		588	600	596	594
Minnesota	Minneapolis	2.74_{b}	2.62_{ab}	2.80_{c}	2.07_{a}
	N of cases	215	213	216	208
	MN Area	2.67_{b}	2.41_{bc}	2.62_{bc}	1.77_{b}
	N of cases	252	251	253	244
State mean		2.70	2.51	2.71	1.90
N of cases		467	464	469	452
Texas	Dallas	2.53_{ab}	2.20_{c}	2.51_{ab}	1.79_{b}
	N of cases	186	184	186	181
	Dallas Area	2.60_{ab}	2.33_{c}	2.79_{bc}	1.87_{ab}
	N of cases	183	185	186	180
State mean		2.56	2.27	2.65	1.83
N of cases		369	369	372	361
TOTAL		2.55	2.32	2.57	1.88
N of cases		1424	1433	1437	1407
F Statistics		6.09***	7.98***	8.20***	3.08*

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. * $p < .01$.

Table 6 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q64	Q65	Q66	Q67
New York	New York City	3.72	3.71	2.20	2.50
	N of cases	436	444	194	214
	NYC Area	3.76	3.71	2.14	2.42
	N of cases	176	178	85	90
State mean		3.74	3.71	2.18	2.48
N of cases		612	622	279	304
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.76	3.53	2.23	2.57
	N of cases	215	216	127	129
	MN Area	3.83	3.60	2.35	2.85
	N of cases	255	255	132	127
State mean		3.80	3.57	2.29	2.71
N of cases		470	471	259	256
Texas	Dallas	3.91	3.70	2.28	2.60
	N of cases	191	191	126	121
	Dallas Area	4.01	3.72	2.41	2.86
	N of cases	189	188	98	113
State mean		3.96	3.71	2.33	2.73
N of cases		380	379	224	234
TOTAL		3.81	3.67	2.26	2.62
N of cases		1462	1472	762	794
F Statistics		2.80	1.38	.63	2.13

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. No means were significantly different.

Table 6 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q68	Q69	Q70	Q71
New York	New York City	3.87	3.88	2.77_{a}	3.03_{ab}
	N of cases	441	446	336	390
	NYC Area	3.94	3.85	2.93_{ab}	3.36_{c}
	N of cases	179	179	136	169
State mean		3.89	3.87	2.82	3.13
N of cases		620	625	472	559
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.76	3.75	2.92_{ab}	2.90_{a}
	N of cases	214	215	179	197
	MN Area	3.87	3.78	3.11_{b}	3.40_{c}
	N of cases	254	254	216	244
State mean		3.82	3.77	3.02	3.17
N of cases		468	469	395	441
Texas	Dallas	3.90	3.85	3.12_{b}	3.29_{bc}
	N of cases	191	191	166	182
	Dallas Area	3.98	3.96	3.12_{b}	3.51_{c}
	N of cases	190	190	168	185
State mean		3.94	3.91	3.12	3.40
N of cases		381	381	334	367
TOTAL		3.88	3.85	2.97	3.22
N of cases		1469	1475	1201	1367
F Statistics		1.39	1.37	3.28*	9.27***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. * $p < .01$.

Table 7

Comparing the Six Areas on Variables From Page 4 of the Officer Questionnaire

State	City or Area	Q72	Q73	Q74
New York	New York City	4.23_{b}	4.37	4.32
	N of cases	442	209	427
	NYC Area	4.26_{b}	4.45	4.48
	N of cases	176	115	153
State mean		4.24	4.40	4.36
N of cases		618	324	580
Minnesota	Minneapolis	4.33_{ab}	4.43	4.27
	N of cases	218	139	211
	MN Area	4.37_{ab}	4.47	4.39
	N of cases	256	190	244
State mean		4.35	4.46	4.34
N of cases		474	329	455
Texas	Dallas	4.42_{a}	4.53	4.27
	N of cases	191	138	185
	Dallas Area	4.53_{ab}	4.43	4.30
	N of cases	188	125	178
State mean		4.47	4.48	4.29
N of cases		379	263	363
TOTAL		4.34	4.44	4.33
N of cases		1471	916	1398
F Statistics		4.14*	.83	1.64

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). * $p < .01$.

Table 7 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q75	Q76	Q77	Q78
New York	New York City	4.52_{a}	4.27_{bc}	4.23_{a}	4.03_{c}
	N of cases	480	478	481	480
	NYC Area	4.55_{a}	4.34_{c}	4.13_{ab}	4.13_{c}
	N of cases	182	182	182	180
State mean		4.53	4.29	4.20	4.06
N of cases		662	660	663	660
Minnesota	Minneapolis	4.23_{b}	4.07_{a}	3.91_{b}	3.76_{ab}
	N of cases	234	233	234	233
	MN Area	4.40_{ab}	4.16_{abc}	4.05_{ab}	3.61_{a}
	N of cases	264	266	265	266
State mean		4.32	4.12	3.98	3.68
N of cases		498	499	499	499
Texas	Dallas	4.33_{b}	4.12_{b}	3.89_{b}	3.92_{bc}
	N of cases	207	207	206	205
	Dallas Area	4.33_{b}	4.17_{abc}	3.98_{b}	3.93_{bc}
	N of cases	202	202	201	202
State mean		4.33	4.14	3.93	3.93
N of cases		409	409	407	407
TOTAL		4.41	4.20	4.06	3.90
N of cases		1569	1568	1569	1566
F Statistics		7.64***	4.13*	7.67***	8.99***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. * $p < .01$.

Table 7 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q79	Q80	Q81
New York	New York City	3.67_{b}	2.56_{ab}	3.38
	N of cases	465	478	463
	NYC Area	4.03_{a}	2.62_{ab}	3.49
	N of cases	178	180	175
State mean		3.77	2.57	3.41
N of cases		643	658	638
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.59_{b}	2.32_{b}	3.55
	N of cases	223	229	221
	MN Area	3.74_{ab}	2.79_{a}	3.53
	N of cases	262	266	260
State mean		3.67	2.58	3.54
N of cases		485	495	481
Texas	Dallas	3.84_{ab}	2.42_{b}	3.58
	N of cases	200	206	200
	Dallas Area	3.78_{ab}	2.45_{b}	3.43
	N of cases	198	201	197
State mean		3.81	2.43	3.50
N of cases		398	407	397
TOTAL		3.75	2.54	3.48
N of cases		1526	1560	1516
F Statistics		4.21**	4.48**	1.37

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). ** $p < .001$.

Table 7 (continued)

State	City or Area		QA82 EAP	QA83	QA84	QA8
New York	New York City					
		No	1.2%	4.6%	62.3%	15.5%
		?	10.8%	16.0%	31.1%	42.7%
		Yes	87.9%	79.5%	6.6%	41.8%
	N of cases		481	482	483	478
	NYC Area					
		No	29.5%	51.9%	91.8%	74.6%
		?	10.9%	21.3%	7.7%	16.0%
		Yes	59.6%	26.8%	.5%	9.4%
	N of cases		183	183	183	181
Minnesota	Minneapolis					
		No	.9%	2.6%	83.3%	24.6%
		?	8.5%	20.1%	15.5%	39.2%
		Yes	90.6%	77.4%	1.3%	36.2%
	N of cases		234	234	233	232
	MN Area					
		No	4.2%	24.8%	95.8%	60.3%
		?	13.2%	23.7%	3.4%	29.0%
		Yes	82.6%	51.5%	.8%	10.7%
	N of cases		265	262	263	262
Texas	Dallas					
		No	11.3%	11.7%	90.3%	40.8%
		?	43.6%	10.2%	9.2%	36.9%
		Yes	45.1%	78.0%	.5%	22.3%
	N of cases		204	205	206	206
	Dallas Area					
		No	14.4%	23.8%	92.1%	65.2%
		?	26.2%	25.2%	7.9%	23.4%
		Yes	59.4%	51.0%	.0%	11.4%
	N of cases		202	202	202	201
Chi Square statistics			344.92	327.35	204.13	350.61

Note. For all χ^2 statistics on this page, df = 10, $p < .00001$.

Table 7 (continued)

State	City or Area		QA86	QA87	QA88	QA89
New York	New York City					
		No	10.6%	14.6%	9.8%	12.9%
		?	30.5%	46.1%	26.8%	47.7%
		Yes	58.9%	39.2%	63.4%	39.4%
	N of cases		482	479	481	480
	NYC Area					
		No	70.3%	73.5%	51.4%	76.9%
		?	16.5%	16.0%	19.1%	18.1%
		Yes	13.2%	10.5%	29.5%	4.9%
	N of cases		182	181	183	182
Minnesota	Minneapolis					
		No	20.2%	17.3%	5.6%	19.9%
		?	36.5%	39.8%	12.0%	53.7%
		Yes	43.3%	42.9%	82.5%	26.4%
	N of cases		233	231	234	231
	MN Area					
		No	42.0%	54.0%	7.6%	60.8%
		?	24.6%	26.2%	12.9%	27.2%
		Yes	33.3%	19.8%	79.5%	12.1%
	N of cases		264	263	264	265
Texas	Dallas					
		No	19.9%	17.2%	21.8%	42.7%
		?	17.5%	30.4%	18.4%	45.1%
		Yes	62.6%	52.5%	59.7%	12.1%
	N of cases		206	204	206	206
	Dallas Area					
		No	50.2%	56.7%	24.0%	63.7%
		?	19.4%	25.4%	21.0%	26.9%
		Yes	30.3%	17.9%	55.0%	9.5%
	N of cases		201	201	200	201
Chi Square statistics			335.24	375.70	268.41	423.43

Note. For all χ^2 statistics on this page, df = 10, $p < .00001$.

Table 7 (continued)

State	City or Area		OA90	OA91	OA92	OA93
New York	New York City					
		No	11.9%	6.7%	12.1%	11.4%
		?	43.5%	43.6%	40.4%	53.4%
		Yes	44.6%	49.7%	47.5%	35.1%
	N of cases		480	479	480	481
	NYC Area					
		No	81.3%	54.4%	78.1%	62.3%
		?	15.9%	18.1%	13.7%	19.7%
		Yes	2.7%	27.5%	8.2%	18.0%
	N of cases		182	182	183	183
Minnesota	Minneapolis					
		No	37.5%	6.4%	24.9%	29.2%
		?	59.1%	21.9%	47.2%	55.8%
		Yes	3.4%	71.7%	27.9%	15.0%
	N of cases		232	233	233	233
	MN Area					
		No	65.3%	20.1%	67.4%	44.9%
		?	27.2%	15.2%	23.9%	35.1%
		Yes	7.5%	64.8%	8.7%	20.0%
	N of cases		265	264	264	265
Texas	Dallas					
		No	52.4%	22.4%	56.8%	39.5%
		?	42.7%	36.1%	36.4%	48.3%
		Yes	4.9%	41.5%	6.8%	12.2%
	N of cases		206	205	206	205
	Dallas Area					
		No	62.0%	32.8%	68.5%	53.7%
		?	32.5%	32.8%	26.5%	38.3%
		Yes	5.5%	34.3%	5.0%	8.0%
	N of cases		200	201	200	201
Chi Square statistics			586.37	319.99	522.12	270.02

Note. For all χ^2 statistics on this page, df = 10, $p < .00001$.

Table 7 (continued)

State	City or Area		OA94	OA95	OA96	OA97
New York	New York City					
		No	8.5%	3.9%	15.0%	29.9%
		?	39.7%	21.4%	33.5%	43.5%
		Yes	51.8%	74.7%	51.6%	26.6%
	N of cases		481	482	481	478
	NYC Area					
		No	74.9%	53.8%	67.8%	75.4%
		?	17.5%	29.1%	18.9%	13.7%
		Yes	7.7%	17.0%	13.3%	10.9%
	N of cases		183	182	180	183
Minnesota	Minneapolis					
		No	7.3%	8.2%	28.6%	31.0%
		?	27.8%	40.8%	50.0%	34.1%
		Yes	65.0%	51.1%	21.4%	34.9%
	N of cases		234	233	234	232
	MN Area					
		No	45.5%	20.8%	56.1%	64.8%
		?	20.8%	34.0%	23.9%	17.0%
		Yes	33.7%	45.3%	20.1%	18.2%
	N of cases		264	265	264	264
Texas	Dallas					
		No	9.8%	11.7%	39.8%	41.7%
		?	22.9%	24.8%	34.5%	27.7%
		Yes	67.3%	63.6%	25.7%	30.6%
	N of cases		205	206	206	206
	Dallas Area					
		No	60.2%	26.9%	60.0%	69.0%
		?	27.4%	34.3%	22.5%	22.0%
		Yes	12.4%	38.8%	17.5%	9.0%
	N of cases		201	201	200	200
Chi Square statistics			561.51	346.97	322.86	232.12

Note. For all χ^2 statistics on this page, df = 10, $p < .00001$.

Table 7 (continued)

State	City or Area		QA98	QA99	QA100
New York	New York City				
		No	25.5%	30.3%	8.7%
		?	57.3%	53.3%	37.4%
		Yes	17.2%	16.3%	53.8%
	N of cases		478	478	481
	NYC Area				
		No	74.7%	78.7%	30.2%
		?	18.7%	18.6%	19.2%
		Yes	6.6%	2.7%	50.5%
	N of cases		182	183	182
Minnesota	Minneapolis				
		No	20.3%	40.3%	6.9%
		?	49.1%	46.3%	29.6%
		Yes	30.6%	13.4%	63.5%
	N of cases		232	231	233
	MN Area				
		No	70.9%	72.6%	11.0%
		?	23.4%	19.4%	20.1%
		Yes	5.7%	8.0%	68.9%
	N of cases		261	263	264
Texas	Dallas				
		No	31.6%	46.1%	22.8%
		?	43.7%	38.3%	42.7%
		Yes	24.8%	15.5%	34.5%
	N of cases		206	206	206
	Dallas Area				
		No	69.7%	76.5%	20.4%
		?	26.9%	20.0%	25.9%
		Yes	3.5%	3.5%	53.7%
	N of cases		201	200	201
Chi Square statistics			363.80	255.60	132.70

Note. For all χ^2 statistics on this page, df = 10, $p < .00001$.

Table 7 (continued)

State	City or Area		QB82 EAP	QB83	QB84	QB85
New York	New York City					
		No	91.0%	96.0%	100.0%	99.4%
		Yes	9.0%	4.0%	.0%	.6%
		N of cases	479	480	483	479
	NYC Area					
		No	90.2%	96.7%	100.0%	100.0%
		Yes	9.8%	3.3%	.0%	.0%
		N of cases	183	183	183	182
Minnesota	Minneapolis					
		No	71.2%	87.4%	100.0%	94.8%
		Yes	28.8%	12.6%	.0%	5.2%
		N of cases	233	231	233	232
	MN Area					
		No	85.7%	93.9%	100.0%	100.0%
		Yes	14.3%	6.1%	.0%	.0%
		N of cases	265	263	265	264
Texas	Dallas					
		No	97.6%	83.4%	100.0%	98.5%
		Yes	2.4%	16.6%	.0%	1.5%
		N of cases	205	205	206	206
	Dallas Area					
		No	87.1%	90.1%	100.0%	98.0%
		Yes	12.9%	9.9%	.0%	2.0%
		N of cases	202	202	202	202
Chi Square statistics			82.32***	45.90***	---	32.69***

Note. For all χ^2 statistics on this page, df = 5. *** $p < .00001$. For QB84, statistics could not be computed.

Table 7 (continued)

State	City or Area		QB86	QB87	QB88	QB89
New York	New York City					
		No	96.3%	96.4%	92.9%	98.7%
		Yes	3.8%	3.6%	7.1%	1.3%
	N of cases		480	478	479	476
	NYC Area					
		No	97.8%	95.6%	99.5%	98.9%
		Yes	2.2%	4.4%	.5%	1.1%
	N of cases		183	180	182	182
Minnesota	Minneapolis					
		No	94.0%	83.1%	88.3%	96.6%
		Yes	6.0%	16.9%	11.7%	3.4%
	N of cases		232	231	230	232
	MN Area					
		No	89.8%	89.0%	89.2%	98.9%
		Yes	10.2%	11.0%	10.8%	1.1%
	N of cases		265	264	260	265
Texas	Dallas					
		No	80.0%	77.6%	94.1%	99.5%
		Yes	20.0%	22.4%	5.9%	.5%
	N of cases		205	205	204	206
	Dallas Area					
		No	94.6%	92.6%	89.0%	96.5%
		Yes	5.4%	7.4%	11.0%	3.5%
	N of cases		202	202	200	202
Chi Square statistics			69.37***	78.27***	25.10**	11.10

Note. For all χ^2 statistics on this page, df = 5. *** $p < .00001$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 7 (continued)

State	City or Area		OB90	OB91	OB92	OB93
New York	New York City					
		No	95.4%	97.1%	99.2%	99.6%
		Yes	4.6%	2.9%	.8%	.4%
	N of cases		478	479	478	479
	NYC Area					
		No	100.0%	97.2%	99.4%	97.2%
		Yes	.0%	2.8%	.6%	2.8%
	N of cases		183	181	181	180
Minnesota	Minneapolis					
		No	99.6%	95.3%	97.8%	96.6%
		Yes	.4%	4.7%	2.2%	3.4%
	N of cases		233	232	232	234
	MN Area					
		No	99.2%	83.6%	99.6%	96.9%
		Yes	.8%	16.4%	.4%	3.1%
	N of cases		265	262	263	262
Texas	Dallas					
		No	100.0%	95.6%	99.5%	98.5%
		Yes	.0%	4.4%	.5%	1.5%
	N of cases		206	203	206	204
	Dallas Area					
		No	100.0%	95.5%	99.5%	99.0%
		Yes	.0%	4.5%	.5%	1.0%
	N of cases		202	202	202	202
Chi Square statistics			40.33***	65.76***	6.32	12.87

Note. For all χ^2 statistics on this page, df = 5. *** $p < .00001$.

Table 7 (continued)

State	City or Area		QB94	QB95	QB96	QB97
New York	New York City					
		No	98.3%	99.0%	96.2%	96.0%
		Yes	1.7%	1.0%	3.8%	4.0%
	N of cases		479	477	479	478
	NYC Area					
		No	99.5%	99.5%	96.7%	95.6%
		Yes	.5%	.5%	3.3%	4.4%
	N of cases		182	182	181	181
Minnesota	Minneapolis					
		No	93.1%	99.6%	98.7%	89.2%
		Yes	6.9%	.4%	1.3%	10.8%
	N of cases		233	231	233	232
	MN Area					
		No	97.3%	99.2%	95.4%	90.8%
		Yes	2.7%	.8%	4.6%	9.2%
	N of cases		264	262	263	262
Texas	Dallas					
		No	98.0%	99.0%	98.1%	91.2%
		Yes	2.0%	1.0%	1.9%	8.8%
	N of cases		205	202	206	205
	Dallas Area					
		No	99.5%	99.5%	97.5%	95.5%
		Yes	.5%	.5%	2.5%	4.5%
	N of cases		202	200	201	201
Chi Square statistics			27.36**	1.26	6.36	19.11*

Note. For all χ^2 statistics on this page, df = 5. ** $p < .0001$. * $p < .001$.

Table 7 (continued)

State	City or Area		QB98	QB99	QB100
New York	New York City				
		No	97.9%	99.0%	93.7%
		Yes	2.1%	1.0%	6.3%
	N of cases		478	478	478
	NYC Area				
		No	97.3%	100.0%	89.9%
		Yes	2.7%	.0%	10.1%
	N of cases		182	183	178
Minnesota	Minneapolis				
		No	85.3%	97.4%	91.3%
		Yes	14.7%	2.6%	8.7%
	N of cases		232	233	229
	MN Area				
		No	98.1%	95.8%	91.6%
		Yes	1.9%	4.2%	8.4%
	N of cases		263	264	262
Texas	Dallas				
		No	95.6%	96.1%	92.7%
		Yes	4.4%	3.9%	7.3%
	N of cases		206	206	206
	Dallas Area				
		No	99.0%	98.5%	96.0%
		Yes	1.0%	1.5%	4.0%
	N of cases		202	201	200
Chi Square statistics			78.64***	15.73*	7.22

Note. For all χ^2 statistics on this page, df = 5. *** $p < .00001$. * $p < .001$.

Table 8

Comparing the Six Areas on Variables From Page 5 of the Officer Questionnaire

State	City or Area	Q101	Q102	Q103	Q104
New York	New York City	3.26	3.06_{a}	3.07	2.89_{a}
	N of cases	485	485	480	484
	NYC Area	3.21	3.22_{ab}	2.98	2.96_{ab}
	N of cases	185	185	181	182
State mean		3.25	3.11	3.05	2.91
N of cases		670	670	661	666
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.26	3.33_{b}	2.99	3.10_{ab}
	N of cases	234	232	228	233
	MN Area	3.29	3.45_{b}	3.12	3.21_{b}
	N of cases	268	268	268	267
State mean		3.28	3.39	3.06	3.16
N of cases		502	500	496	500
Texas	Dallas	3.17	3.39_{b}	3.33	3.16_{ab}
	N of cases	204	204	203	203
	Dallas Area	3.38	3.54_{b}	3.24	3.24_{b}
	N of cases	202	203	202	203
State mean		3.27	3.46	3.28	3.20
N of cases		406	407	405	406
TOTAL		3.26	3.29	3.11	3.06
N of cases		1578	1577	1562	1572
F Statistics		.83	7.84***	1.94	4.77**

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 8 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q105	Q106	Q107	Q108
New York	New York City	3.34_{a}	3.22_{a}	3.94_{a}	2.65
	N of cases	485	481	485	486
	NYC Area	3.73_{b}	3.63_{c}	4.24_{b}	2.70
	N of cases	184	183	184	185
State mean		3.45	3.33	4.02	2.67
N of cases		669	664	669	671
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.36_{a}	3.25_{ab}	4.22_{b}	2.58
	N of cases	233	229	232	232
	MN Area	3.72_{b}	3.52_{bc}	4.54_{c}	2.69
	N of cases	267	266	268	268
State mean		3.55	3.39	4.40	2.64
N of cases		500	495	500	500
Texas	Dallas	3.54_{ab}	3.49_{bc}	4.12_{ab}	2.65
	N of cases	205	203	205	204
	Dallas Area	3.71_{b}	3.61_{c}	4.34_{bc}	2.87
	N of cases	204	203	204	204
State mean		3.63	3.55	4.23	2.76
N of cases		409	406	409	408
TOTAL		3.53	3.41	4.19	2.68
N of cases		1578	1565	1578	1579
F Statistics		8.59***	6.88***	14.64***	1.54

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$.

Table 8 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q109	Q110	Q111	Q112
New York	New York City	3.26_{b}	3.49_{a}	3.22	3.39_{a}
	N of cases	486	486	486	485
	NYC Area	3.36_{b}	3.71_{ab}	3.28	3.84_{c}
	N of cases	185	185	185	185
State mean		3.29	3.55	3.23	3.52
N of cases		671	671	671	670
Minnesota	Minneapolis	2.88_{a}	3.76_{b}	3.14	3.51_{ab}
	N of cases	233	234	232	233
	MN Area	3.13_{ab}	4.10_{c}	3.21	3.80_{c}
	N of cases	267	268	268	268
State mean		3.01	3.94	3.18	3.66
N of cases		500	502	500	501
Texas	Dallas	3.12_{ab}	3.61_{ab}	3.12	3.59_{abc}
	N of cases	204	205	204	205
	Dallas Area	3.26_{b}	3.77_{b}	3.27	3.74_{bc}
	N of cases	203	203	203	203
State mean		3.19	3.69	3.19	3.66
N of cases		407	408	407	408
TOTAL		3.18	3.71	3.21	3.60
N of cases		1578	1581	1578	1579
F Statistics		5.59***	11.77***	.61	7.77***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$.

Table 8 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q113	Q114	Q115	Q116
New York	New York City	3.00	3.99_{b}	3.15	3.20_{a}
	N of cases	487	486	487	487
	NYC Area	3.09	4.03_{b}	3.25	3.27_{ab}
	N of cases	184	184	182	185
State mean		3.03	4.00	3.18	3.22
N of cases		671	670	669	672
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.02	4.01_{b}	2.99	3.29_{ab}
	N of cases	234	231	233	232
	MN Area	3.02	4.38_{a}	3.03	3.56_{b}
	N of cases	268	268	268	267
State mean		3.02	4.21	3.01	3.43
N of cases		502	499	501	499
Texas	Dallas	3.03	4.05_{b}	3.10	3.43_{ab}
	N of cases	205	204	205	204
	Dallas Area	3.14	4.14_{ab}	3.17	3.58_{b}
	N of cases	204	202	203	204
State mean		3.09	4.10	3.13	3.50
N of cases		409	406	408	408
TOTAL		3.04	4.09	3.11	3.36
N of cases		1582	1575	1578	1579
F Statistics		.50	5.76***	1.46	5.73***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$.

Table 8 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q117	Q118	Q119
New York	New York City	3.03	3.22_{a}	3.30
	N of cases	483	487	486
	NYC Area	3.19	3.40_{ab}	3.37
	N of cases	184	185	185
State mean		3.07	3.27	3.32
N of cases		667	672	671
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.15	3.34_{ab}	3.47
	N of cases	232	233	232
	MN Area	3.17	3.57_{b}	3.57
	N of cases	267	267	268
State mean		3.16	3.47	3.52
N of cases		499	500	500
Texas	Dallas	3.17	3.45_{ab}	3.36
	N of cases	204	204	203
	Dallas Area	3.27	3.64_{b}	3.49
	N of cases	203	204	204
State mean		3.22	3.54	3.43
N of cases		407	408	407
TOTAL		3.14	3.40	3.41
N of cases		1573	1580	1578
F Statistics		1.50	6.25***	2.43

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$.

Table 8 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q120	Q121	Q122
New York	New York City	3.30_{ab}	2.90_{b}	3.87_{a}
	N of cases	487	487	487
	NYC Area	3.03_{a}	2.86_{b}	3.54_{b}
	N of cases	185	185	183
State mean		3.23	2.89	3.78
N of cases		672	672	670
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.38_{b}	2.80_{b}	3.51_{b}
	N of cases	234	233	234
	MN Area	3.45_{b}	3.39_{a}	3.28_{b}
	N of cases	268	268	268
State mean		3.42	3.12	3.39
N of cases		502	501	502
Texas	Dallas	3.25_{ab}	2.66_{b}	3.50_{b}
	N of cases	205	205	205
	Dallas Area	3.20_{ab}	2.86_{b}	3.55_{b}
	N of cases	203	203	204
State mean		3.22	2.76	3.53
N of cases		408	408	409
TOTAL		3.29	2.93	3.59
N of cases		1582	1581	1581
F Statistics		3.55*	10.34***	10.44***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. * $p < .01$.

Table 8 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q123	Q124	Q125
New York	New York City	3.03_{ab}	3.81_{c}	3.76_{d}
	N of cases	487	486	487
	NYC Area	2.92_{a}	3.87_{c}	3.97_{cd}
	N of cases	184	184	184
State mean		3.00	3.83	3.82
N of cases		671	670	671
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.18_{ab}	3.82_{c}	3.27_{ab}
	N of cases	234	232	234
	MN Area	3.22_{b}	3.67_{bc}	3.15_{a}
	N of cases	268	267	268
State mean		3.20	3.74	3.20
N of cases		502	499	502
Texas	Dallas	3.05_{ab}	3.55_{ab}	3.47_{b}
	N of cases	206	202	205
	Dallas Area	3.20_{ab}	3.39_{a}	3.51_{bc}
	N of cases	204	190	202
State mean		3.12	3.47	3.49
N of cases		410	392	407
TOTAL		3.10	3.71	3.54
N of cases		1583	1561	1580
F Statistics		3.43*	8.47***	16.61***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. * $p < .01$.

Table 8 (continued)

State	City or Area		Q126	Q127
New York	New York City			
		Yes	72.4%	88.5%
		No	27.6%	11.5%
	N of cases		475	462
	NYC Area			
		Yes	31.1%	96.7%
		No	68.9%	3.3%
	N of cases		177	181
Minnesota	Minneapolis			
		Yes	52.7%	99.6%
		No	47.3%	.4%
	N of cases		220	228
	MN Area			
		Yes	47.9%	100.0%
		No	52.1%	.0%
	N of cases		263	267
Texas	Dallas			
		Yes	53.1%	5.1%
		No	46.9%	94.9%
	N of cases		196	198
	Dallas Area			
		Yes	59.0%	18.8%
		No	41.0%	81.2%
	N of cases		200	197
Chi Square statistics			106.09	1055.50

Note. For χ^2 statistics on this page, df = 5, $p < .00001$.

Table 9

Comparing the Six Areas on Variables From Page 6 of the Officer Questionnaire

State	City or Area		Q128
New York	New York City		
		No	1.1%
		Yes, current employees	12.3%
		Yes, retirees also	86.6%
	N of cases		455
	NYC Area		
		No	1.1%
		Yes, current employees	19.7%
		Yes, retirees also	79.2%
	N of cases		178
Minnesota	Minneapolis		
		No	1.8%
		Yes, current employees	79.2%
		Yes, retirees also	19.0%
	N of cases		226
	MN Area		
		No	.0%
		Yes, current employees	50.0%
		Yes, retirees also	50.0%
	N of cases		262
Texas	Dallas		
		No	.5%
		Yes, current employees	56.8%
		Yes, retirees also	42.7%
	N of cases		199
	Dallas Area		
		No	.5%
		Yes, current employees	79.5%
		Yes, retirees also	20.0%
	N of cases		195

Note. Differences among areas were significant, $\chi^2(10) = 466.22$, $p < .00001$.

Table 9 (continued)

State	City or Area		Q129
New York	New York City		
		Yes	70.6%
		No	29.4%
	N of cases		402
	NYC Area		
		Yes	63.4%
		No	36.6%
	N of cases		172
Minnesota	Minneapolis		
		Yes	79.4%
		No	20.6%
	N of cases		194
	MN Area		
		Yes	85.2%
		No	14.8%
	N of cases		244
Texas	Dallas		
		Yes	27.8%
		No	72.2%
	N of cases		187
	Dallas Area		
		Yes	26.7%
		No	73.3%
	N of cases		187

Note. Differences among areas were significant, $\chi^2(5) = 284.73$, $p < .00001$.

Table 9 (continued)

State	City or Area		Q129con	Q129dept	Q129stat	Q129loc
New York	New York City					
		No	56.1%	51.7%	87.3%	90.4%
		Yes	43.9%	48.3%	12.7%	9.6%
	N of cases		458	458	458	458
	NYC Area					
		No	49.4%	60.1%	87.1%	88.8%
		Yes	50.6%	39.9%	12.9%	11.2%
	N of cases		178	178	178	178
Minnesota	Minneapolis					
		No	67.7%	70.8%	58.4%	89.8%
		Yes	32.3%	29.2%	41.6%	10.2%
	N of cases		226	226	226	226
	MN Area					
		No	71.3%	67.8%	35.6%	94.6%
		Yes	28.7%	32.2%	64.4%	5.4%
	N of cases		261	261	261	261
Texas	Dallas					
		No	96.9%	77.3%	91.8%	96.4%
		Yes	3.1%	22.7%	8.2%	3.6%
	N of cases		195	194	194	194
	Dallas Area					
		No	99.5%	80.1%	89.5%	95.8%
		Yes	.5%	19.9%	10.5%	4.2%
	N of cases		191	191	191	191
Chi Square statistics			226.79***	73.78***	349.24***	17.32*

Note. For χ^2 statistics on this page, df = 5. *** $p < .00001$. * $p < .01$.

Table 9 (continued)

State	City or Area		Q130
New York	New York City		
		No	16.3%
		Yes, new hires	9.0%
		Yes, all officers	74.7%
	N of cases		455
	NYC Area		
		No	43.8%
		Yes, new hires	34.7%
		Yes, all officers	21.6%
	N of cases		176
Minnesota	Minneapolis		
		No	.0%
		Yes, new hires	99.1%
		Yes, all officers	.9%
	N of cases		226
	MN Area		
		No	90.0%
		Yes, new hires	3.8%
		Yes, all officers	6.1%
	N of cases		261
Texas	Dallas		
		No	97.0%
		Yes, new hires	2.0%
		Yes, all officers	1.0%
	N of cases		197
	Dallas Area		
		No	86.0%
		Yes, new hires	1.0%
		Yes, all officers	13.0%
	N of cases		193

Note. Differences among areas were significant, $\chi^2(10) = 1720.66$, $p < .00001$.

Table 9 (continued)

State	City or Area		Q131
New York	New York City		
		No	4.7%
		Yes	95.3%
	N of cases		449
	NYC Area		
		No	14.1%
		Yes	85.9%
	N of cases		177
Minnesota	Minneapolis		
		No	1.8%
		Yes	98.2%
	N of cases		224
	MN Area		
		No	3.1%
		Yes	96.9%
	N of cases		260
Texas	Dallas		
		No	12.2%
		Yes	87.8%
	N of cases		197
	Dallas Area		
		No	8.3%
		Yes	91.7%
	N of cases		192

Note. Differences among areas were significant, $\chi^2(10) = 43.88$, $p < .00001$.

Table 9 (continued)

State	City or Area		Q132ia	Q132crim	Q132civ	Q132oth
New York	New York City					
		No	9.4%	6.6%	22.9%	93.0%
		Yes	90.6%	93.4%	77.1%	7.0%
	N of cases		458	458	458	458
	NYC Area					
		No	13.5%	5.6%	53.4%	97.8%
		Yes	86.5%	94.4%	46.6%	2.2%
	N of cases		178	178	178	178
Minnesota	Minneapolis					
		No	28.3%	6.2%	25.7%	96.0%
		Yes	71.7%	93.8%	74.3%	4.0%
	N of cases		226	226	226	226
	MN Area					
		No	17.6%	5.4%	65.9%	98.1%
		Yes	82.4%	94.6%	34.1%	1.9%
	N of cases		261	261	261	261
Texas	Dallas					
		No	33.8%	6.1%	40.9%	96.5%
		Yes	66.2%	93.9%	59.1%	3.5%
	N of cases		198	198	198	198
	Dallas Area					
		No	46.2%	4.1%	75.9%	95.4%
		Yes	53.8%	95.9%	24.1%	4.6%
	N of cases		195	195	195	195
Chi Square statistics			140.47***	1.69	252.33***	13.67

Note. For χ^2 statistics on this page, df = 5. *** $p < .0001$.

Table 9 (continued)

State	City or Area		Q133ia	Q133crim	Q133civ	Q133oth
New York	New York City					
		No	77.5%	26.4%	81.7%	95.9%
		Yes	22.5%	73.6%	18.3%	4.1%
	N of cases		458	458	458	458
	NYC Area					
		No	61.2%	13.5%	75.3%	97.8%
		Yes	38.8%	86.5%	24.7%	2.2%
	N of cases		178	178	178	178
Minnesota	Minneapolis					
		No	90.3%	10.6%	89.8%	97.8%
		Yes	9.7%	89.4%	10.2%	2.2%
	N of cases		226	226	226	226
	MN Area					
		No	77.0%	10.3%	87.0%	98.5%
		Yes	23.0%	89.7%	13.0%	1.5%
	N of cases		261	261	261	261
Texas	Dallas					
		No	92.9%	11.1%	52.5%	99.0%
		Yes	7.1%	88.9%	47.5%	1.0%
	N of cases		198	198	198	198
	Dallas Area					
		No	90.8%	6.2%	88.2%	97.9%
		Yes	9.2%	93.8%	11.8%	2.1%
	N of cases		195	195	195	195
Chi Square statistics			95.01***	68.64***	126.82***	8.18

Note. For χ^2 statistics on this page, df = 5. *** $p < .0001$.

Table 9 (continued)

State	City or Area		Q134
New York	New York City		
		No	3.8%
		Yes	96.2%
	N of cases		452
	NYC Area		
		No	10.7%
		Yes	89.3%
	N of cases		177
Minnesota	Minneapolis		
		No	27.4%
		Yes	72.6%
	N of cases		223
	MN Area		
		No	5.7%
		Yes	94.3%
	N of cases		261
Texas	Dallas		
		No	2.5%
		Yes	97.5%
	N of cases		197
	Dallas Area		
		No	8.3%
		Yes	91.7%
	N of cases		193

Note. Differences among areas were significant, $\chi^2(5) = 122.88$, $p < .00001$.

Table 9 (continued)

State	City or Area		Q135
New York	New York City		
		No	17.6%
		Yes	11.2%
		Sometimes	71.2%
	N of cases		448
	NYC Area		
		No	8.5%
		Yes	29.5%
		Sometimes	61.9%
	N of cases		176
Minnesota	Minneapolis		
		No	.0%
		Yes	89.7%
		Sometimes	10.3%
	N of cases		223
	MN Area		
		No	.4%
		Yes	80.8%
		Sometimes	18.8%
	N of cases		260
Texas	Dallas		
		No	2.0%
		Yes	59.2%
		Sometimes	38.8%
	N of cases		196
	Dallas Area		
		No	2.6%
		Yes	60.8%
		Sometimes	36.6%
	N of cases		194

Note. Differences among areas were significant, $\chi^2(10) = 586.06$, $p < .00001$.

Table 9 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q136	Q137	Q138	Q139
New York	New York City	4.30_{b}	3.71_{ab}	3.88	4.03
	N of cases	452	449	447	448
	NYC Area	4.30_{b}	3.80_{ab}	3.97	4.12
	N of cases	176	174	175	174
State mean		4.30	3.74	3.91	4.05
N of cases		628	623	622	622
Minnesota	Minneapolis	4.14_{ab}	3.54_{b}	3.80	3.95
	N of cases	223	221	221	221
	MN Area	3.88_{a}	3.56_{b}	3.80	3.97
	N of cases	259	259	258	260
State mean		4.00	3.55	3.80	3.96
N of cases		482	480	479	481
Texas	Dallas	4.07_{ab}	3.80_{ab}	3.97	4.06
	N of cases	197	197	198	198
	Dallas Area	4.21_{b}	3.86_{a}	4.04	4.12
	N of cases	194	194	193	194
State mean		4.14	3.83	4.01	4.09
N of cases		391	391	391	392
TOTAL		4.16	3.70	3.90	4.03
N of cases		1501	1494	1492	1495
F Statistics		6.38***	3.67*	2.36	1.33

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. * $p < .01$.

Table 9 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q140	Q141	Q142	Q143
New York	New York City	3.81	3.97	3.88	4.11_{b}
	N of cases	448	446	446	449
	NYC Area	3.98	4.06	3.86	4.15_{b}
	N of cases	173	173	173	174
State mean		3.86	3.99	3.88	4.12
N of cases		621	619	619	623
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.76	3.84	3.86	4.01_{ab}
	N of cases	221	222	222	222
	MN Area	3.69	3.85	3.70	3.83_{a}
	N of cases	260	260	259	258
State mean		3.72	3.84	3.77	3.91
N of cases		481	482	481	480
Texas	Dallas	3.89	3.92	3.96	4.05_{ab}
	N of cases	197	197	196	196
	Dallas Area	3.96	4.11	3.94	4.07_{ab}
	N of cases	194	193	193	194
State mean		3.93	4.02	3.95	4.06
N of cases		391	390	389	390
TOTAL		3.83	3.95	3.86	4.04
N of cases		1493	1491	1489	1493
F Statistics		2.79	2.17	1.99	3.47*

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). * $p < .01$.

Table 9 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q144	Q145	Q146
New York	New York City	4.36_{c}	4.02	4.07_{b}
	N of cases	445	449	438
	NYC Area	4.28_{bc}	4.04	4.07_{ab}
	N of cases	173	172	168
State mean		4.33	4.02	4.07
N of cases		618	621	606
Minnesota	Minneapolis	4.01_{ab}	4.03	4.08_{ab}
	N of cases	221	222	216
	MN Area	3.90_{a}	3.88	3.83_{a}
	N of cases	259	259	252
State mean		3.95	3.95	3.94
N of cases		480	481	468
Texas	Dallas	4.12_{ab}	4.12	4.21_{b}
	N of cases	197	197	195
	Dallas Area	4.16_{bc}	4.19	4.32_{b}
	N of cases	194	194	193
State mean		4.14	4.16	4.26
N of cases		391	391	388
TOTAL		4.16	4.03	4.08
N of cases		1489	1493	1462
F Statistics		9.46***	2.60	5.45**

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 9 (continued)

State	City or Area	Q147	Q148
New York	New York City	3.82_{b}	4.05_{bc}
	N of cases	415	419
	NYC Area	3.79_{ab}	3.90_{b}
	N of cases	155	155
State mean		3.81	4.01
N of cases		570	574
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.97_{b}	4.11_{bc}
	N of cases	202	203
	MN Area	3.44_{a}	3.47_{a}
	N of cases	243	243
State mean		3.68	3.76
N of cases		445	446
Texas	Dallas	3.86_{b}	4.48_{d}
	N of cases	188	196
	Dallas Area	4.05_{b}	4.30_{cd}
	N of cases	183	193
State mean		3.95	4.39
N of cases		371	389
TOTAL		3.81	4.03
N of cases		1386	1409
F Statistics		5.72***	17.05***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$.

Appendix B-6

Factor Analysis and Reliability Analysis For Officer Questionnaire Compared to Erie County Study

Table 10

Factor Analyses and Reliability Analyses for Officer Questionnaire Compared to Erie County Study

Factors For Work and Family Issues

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Total Variance	Reliability	Mean	S.D.
WFILE (n=597)					
Occupational Effects on the Family	5.62	36.0	.75	2.61	.80
Negative Effects on the Family	1.25	8.3	.77	2.09	.88
Personal Stress	1.05	7.0	.71	3.06	1.07
Police Officer Questionnaire (n=1632)					
Negative Effects on the Family	5.62	37.4	.76	2.36	.83
Occupational Effects on the Family	1.23	8.2	.71	2.86	.87
Personal Stress	1.04	6.9	.75	2.86	.89

Factors For Work-Family Orientation

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Total Variance	Reliability	Mean	S.D.
WFILE (n=597)					
Work-family spillover	4.65	22.1	.84	3.11	.90
Compensation	1.85	8.8	.63	3.63	.73
Communication of work experiences	1.44	6.8	.63	3.40	1.08
Police Officer Questionnaire (n=1632)					
Spillover/Segmentation	3.90	19.5	.85	3.07	.94
Compensation	1.94	9.7	.64	3.51	.70
Discuss Family with Co-workers	1.51	7.6	.91	3.43	1.07
Discuss Job with Family	1.33	6.7	.79	3.52	1.10

Factors For Spousal Relationship and Support Issues

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Total Variance	Reliability	Mean	S.D.
WFILE (n=597) Factor Analysis 1 (18 items)					
Job Influences Spouse	4.43	24.6	.78	2.26	.67
Spouse Communication	2.55	14.2	.76	3.09	.81
Spouse Social Support	1.73	9.6	.74[1]	3.61	.69
Spouse Sacrifice	1.16	6.5	.77	2.60	.93
Protection of Spouse	1.13	6.3	.62	3.70	.91
WFILE (n=597) Factor Analysis 2 (13 items)					
General Spouse Support	5.40	41.5	.86[1]	3.72	.74
Spouse Willing to Participate in Activities	1.78	13.7	.67	1.42	.64
Police Officer Questionnaire (n=1632)[2]					
Relationship with Spouse	-	-	.82	2.33	.76
Positive Attitude of Spouse	-	-	.84	3.80	.82
Spouse Willing to Help (n=661)	-	-	.85	2.74	1.08
Family Support of Career (n=810)	-	-	.71	4.40	.65

Note. [1] After deletion of items which decreased coefficient alpha. [2] Factor analyses were not carried out on these items because of the small number of items per subscale and, in the case of the latter two subscales, large amounts of missing data.

Factors Related to Relationship with Other Officers

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Total Variance	Reliability	Mean	S.D.
WFILE (n=597)					
Non-officer friendships	4.50	25.0	.82	2.25	.78
Officer Friendships	2.50	13.9	.68	2.50	.75
Identified as Police Officer	1.87	10.4	.68	3.62	.70
Police Officer Questionnaire (n=1632)					
Difficulty in Friendships with Other Officers	2.63	52.6	.79	2.31	.97
Interact With Other Officers Outside of Work	1.01	20.2	.68	2.98	1.10

Factors Related to Children

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Total Variance	Reliability	Mean	S.D.
WFILE (n=597) Factor Analysis 1 (5 items)					
Parenthood Influences Job	2.82	56.5	.80	4.11	.68
WFILE (n=597) Factor Analysis 2 (13 items)					
Behavior with Own Children	2.04	25.5	.57	4.15	.65
Tolerant of Children	1.51	18.8	.47	2.99	.74
Job Affects Children	1.06	13.2	.53	3.41	1.02
Police Officer Questionnaire (n=1632)					
Children Affect Me	2.57	36.7	.80	4.22	.65
Think of My Children [1]	1.44	20.6	.63	3.71	.82

Note. [1] After deletion of item which decreased coefficient alpha.

Items Included in the Spillover/Segmentation Factor for Work-Family Orientation

---

Subscale Items

WFILE

Work-family spillover

My work experiences and my family experiences directly influence each other.

My attitudes, experiences, and conflicts at work carry over into my home life.

My work experiences and family experiences do not influence each other.

My work and family roles remain separate from each other.

The feelings that I have from incidents at work often come home with me.

My job experiences do not affect interactions with family members and friends.

Interactions with friends or family members carry over to my job.

Police Officer Questionnaire

Spillover/Segmentation

My experiences and conflicts at work carry over in to my home life

My work and family experiences directly influence each other.

My job experiences do not affect interactions with family members.

My work and family experiences do not influence each other.

The feelings that I have from incidents at work often come home with me.

My work and family roles remain separate from each other.

Items Included in the Compensation Factor for Work-Family Orientation

---

Subscale Items

WFILE

Compensation

I view my family as a haven from the job.

Leisure activities after work help to energize/revitalize me from work.

Desirable behaviors and feelings that are lacking in my work are pursued in family activities.

Involvement in non-work social activities allows me to release negative feelings that may result from the job.

The family environment can make up for difficulty in the job.

Police Officer Questionnaire

Compensation

Family activities allow me to release negative feelings from the job.

I view my family as a haven from the job.

My family makes up for difficulty on the job.

Behaviors and feelings that are lacking in my work are pursued in family activities.

Leisure activities after work help to revitalize me.

Items Included in the Communication Factor for Work-Family Orientation

---

Subscale Items

WFILE

Communication of work experiences

I often discuss my work experiences with members of my family.

I do not discuss my work experiences with family members nor family experiences with co-workers.

Police Officer Questionnaire

Discuss Family with Co-workers

I discuss my family with co-workers.

I discuss my family experiences with co-workers.

Discuss Job with Family

I do not discuss my job with family members.

I talk about work experiences with family members.

Items Included in the Occupational Effects on Family Factor for Work and Family Issues

---

Subscale Items

WFILE

Occupational Effects on Family

Danger associated with the job.

Closed society of policing.

Organizational hierarchy of department.

Relationship with partner.

Officer and family are expected to behave by a higher set of standards.

Public criticism that officers may experience influences family members.

Tendency to be more protective of family members due to the potential dangers you see other members of the public encounter while on the job.

Police Officer Questionnaire

Occupational Effects on Family

Officer and family are expected to behave by a higher set of standards.

Tendency to be protective of family members.

Closed society of policing.

Danger associated with the job.

Organizational hierarchy of department.

Relationship with partner.

Public criticism of officers influences family members.

Items Included in the Negative Effects on Family Factor for Work and Family Issues

Subscale Items
WFILE
Negative Effects on Family
The job becomes a priority over the family.
Anger, frustration and mistrust from the job carries over into the family.
Marital conflict.
Conflict between your role as an officer and your role as a parent.
Family members lack understanding of the job.
Police Officer Questionnaire
Negative Effects on Family
Conflict between your work and family roles.
The job becomes a priority over the family.
Marital/relationship conflict.
Job requires you to be away from your family.
Family members lack understanding of the job.

Items Included in the Personal Stress Factor for Work and Family Issues

Subscale Items
WFILE
Personal Stress
Physiological demands of the job including changing shifts, and changes in eating, exercising and sleeping patterns.
Stress, burnout, withdrawal
Job requires you to be away from family and miss important family events.
Police Officer Questionnaire
Personal Stress
Changing shifts.
Job Stress.
Burnout.
Danger associated with the job.
Physiological demands.

Items Included in the Spousal Relationship and Support Issues Subscales

Subscale Items
WFILE
Job Influences Spouse
What occurs on job influences relationship with spouse/significant other
The mood I am in as a result of my job influences the mood of my spouse/significant other.
The stress from the job leads me to withdrawal from spouse/significant other.
We argue about my job.
My relationship with spouse/significant other is secondary compared to my relationship with other officers.
Spouse Communication
What I learn from job improves communication with spouse/significant other.
I discuss my work problems.
I discuss my feelings.
After a significant incident on job, my spouse/significant other is the first person I contact for support.
Spouse Social Support
We spend time together.
We make long range plans.
We socialize with others not in law enforcement.
We plan special activities.
Spouse Sacrifice
My spouse/significant other makes personal sacrifices because of my job.
The job interferes with spouse's/significant other's job opportunities/career plans.
Protection of Spouse
I try to protect my spouse/significant other from what occurs on the job.
I am protective of spouse/significant other from potential threats in community.
General Spouse Support
Tries to better understand the job.
Communicates well.
Identifies problems when they occur.
Maintains positive attitude.
Maintains good sense of humor.
Spouse Willing to Participate in Activities
Joins support group.
Facilitates access to counseling for you or family members.
Participates in educational seminars on issues related to family in law enforcement.

Items Included in the Spousal Relationship and Support Issues Subscales (continued)

Subscale Items
Police Officer Questionnaire
Relationship with Spouse
What occurs on the job influences my relationship with my spouse/partner.
Job stress leads me to withdraw from my spouse/partner.
The mood I am in as a result of my job influences the mood of my spouse/partner.
We argue about my job.
Positive Attitude of Spouse
Tries to understand my job.
Communicates well
Maintains positive attitude
Maintains good sense of humor
Spouse Willing to Help
Willing to join spouse support group.
Willing to facilitate access to counseling for me or family members.
Would participate in educational activities related to law enforcement.
Willing to attend activities sponsored by the agency.
Family Support of Career
Spouse/partner is supportive of career
Children are supportive of career
Parents are supportive of career

Items Included in the Officer Friendship Subscales

Subscale Items
WFILE
Non-officer Friendships
It is difficult to maintain long friendships/relationships with non-police officers.
It is difficult to develop friendships/relationships with non-officers.
I have many friends out of the department.
The majority of my friends are police.
It is easy to meet people socially.
The majority of conversations with friends are police related.
I participate in non-department events.
I'm cautious in developing friendships with non-officers.
Officer Friendships
It is difficult to develop friendships/relationships with other officers.
It is difficult to maintain long friendships/relationships with officers.
My family interacts with other police families.
I spend time out of work with other police officers.
I am cautious in developing friendships with other officers.
Identified as police officer
Others identify me primarily as a police officer.
I'm treated differently when people find out I am a police officer.
I am treated with respect because I am a police officer.
I am expected to adhere to a higher set of standards because I am an officer.

Police Officer Questionnaire
Difficulty in Friendships with Other Officers
It is difficult to develop friendships with other officers.
It is difficult to maintain long-lasting friendships with other officers.
I am cautious in developing friendships with other officers.
Interact With Other Officers Outside of Work
I spend time outside of work with other police officers.
My family interacts with other police families.

Items Included in the Children Subscales

Subscale Items
WFILE
Parenthood Influences Job
Being a parent enables me to be more understanding in situations with children.
Since becoming a parent, I have a greater awareness of issues that affect teens and children.
As a parent, I can work better with children and teenagers.
Because I am a parent, calls with children affect me greater.
When responding to calls that involve children, I think of my own children.
Behavior with Own Children
I am a disciplinarian.
I am protective of my children.
I have high standards for my children.
Tolerant of Children
I am tolerant of children's behavior and attitudes.
Being an officer enhances my commmunication with children.
My child/children can question my authority.
Job Affects Children
My job demands limit quality time with my child/children.
Job transfers to parenting, for example, interrogate kids on activities.

Police Officer Questionnaire
Children Affect Me
I'm understanding in situations that involve children and families.
I have a great awareness of issues that affect children and teenagers.
I can work well with children and teenagers.
Think of My Children
Calls that involve children have a great effect on me.
When I respond to calls that involve children, I think of my own children.
My job limits the amount of time I have to spend with my children.

Appendix B-7

Comparing the Six Areas on Scale Score Variables From the Officer Questionnaire

Table 11

Comparing the Six Areas on Scale Score Variables From the Officer Questionnaire

State	City or Area	Spillover-Segmentation	Compensation
New York	New York City	2.79_a	3.37_a
	N of cases	484	480
	NYC Area	3.02_b	3.47_{ab}
	N of cases	181	180
State mean		2.85	3.40
N of cases		665	660
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.34_c	3.57_b
	N of cases	232	229
	MN Area	3.34_c	3.61_b
	N of cases	265	267
State mean		3.34	3.59
N of cases		497	496
Texas	Dallas	3.06_b	3.59_b
	N of cases	206	205
	Dallas Area	3.14_{bc}	3.54_b
	N of cases	203	203
State mean		3.10	3.57
N of cases		409	408
TOTAL		3.07	3.50
N of cases		1571	1564
F Statistics		18.17***	6.10***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$.

Table 11 (continued)

State	City or Area	Discuss Family with Coworkers	Discuss Job with Family
New York	New York City	3.48	3.39_{a}
	N of cases	480	487
	NYC Area	3.31	3.31_{a}
	N of cases	186	181
State mean		3.43	3.37
N of cases		666	668
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.40	3.47_{ab}
	N of cases	233	234
	MN Area	3.56	3.76_{c}
	N of cases	268	267
State mean		3.48	3.62
N of cases		501	501
Texas	Dallas	3.41	3.65_{bc}
	N of cases	205	206
	Dallas Area	3.32	3.60_{abc}
	N of cases	203	203
State mean		3.37	3.62
N of cases		408	409
TOTAL		3.43	3.51
N of cases		1575	1578
F Statistics		1.89	6.27***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$.

Table 11 (continued)

State	City or Area	Negative Effects on Family	Occupational Effects on Family	Personal Stress
New York	New York City	2.29_b	2.79_b	2.76_b
	N of cases	477	467	476
	NYC Area	2.36_b	2.83_b	2.90_{ab}
	N of cases	185	183	183
State mean		2.31	2.80	2.80
N of cases		662	650	659
Minnesota	Minneapolis	2.61_a	3.17_a	3.14_a
	N of cases	230	226	228
	MN Area	2.39_b	2.70_b	2.87_b
	N of cases	265	265	265
State mean		2.49	2.92	3.00
N of cases		495	491	493
Texas	Dallas	2.31_b	2.85_b	2.73_b
	N of cases	206	204	204
	Dallas Area	2.34_b	2.93_b	2.92_{ab}
	N of cases	202	200	201
State mean		2.32	2.89	2.82
N of cases		408	404	405
TOTAL		2.37	2.86	2.87
N of cases		1565	1545	1557
F Statistics		5.00**	8.79***	6.98***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 11 (continued)

State	City or Area	Difficulty in Friendships	Interact Outside Work	Relationship With Spouse
New York	New York City	2.22	2.87_{b}	2.20_{b}
	N of cases	485	488	392
	NYC Area	2.44	3.08_{ab}	2.34_{ab}
	N of cases	184	186	162
State mean		2.28	2.93	2.24
N of cases		669	674	554
Minnesota	Minneapolis	2.34	2.98_{ab}	2.56_{a}
	N of cases	234	235	205
	MN Area	2.26	3.20_{a}	2.37_{ab}
	N of cases	267	268	239
State mean		2.30	3.10	2.45
N of cases		501	503	444
Texas	Dallas	2.31	2.85_{b}	2.26_{b}
	N of cases	206	206	174
	Dallas Area	2.43	2.98_{ab}	2.40_{ab}
	N of cases	202	203	172
State mean		2.37	2.91	2.33
N of cases		408	409	346
TOTAL		2.31	2.98	2.34
N of cases		1578	1586	1344
F Statistics		2.33	4.09*	6.71***

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$. * $p < .01$.

Table 11 (continued)

State	City or Area	Positive Attitude of Spouse	Spouse Willing to Help	Family Support of Career
New York	New York City	3.79	2.61	4.35
	N of cases	425	166	178
	NYC Area	3.82	2.64	4.43
	N of cases	174	71	93
State mean		3.80	2.61	4.38
N of cases		599	237	271
Minnesota	Minneapolis	3.70	2.64	4.36
	N of cases	213	112	118
	MN Area	3.77	2.91	4.44
	N of cases	254	102	172
State mean		3.74	2.77	4.41
N of cases		467	214	290
Texas	Dallas	3.85	2.81	4.38
	N of cases	190	104	120
	Dallas Area	3.91	2.91	4.46
	N of cases	185	92	108
State mean		3.88	2.85	4.42
N of cases		375	196	228
TOTAL		3.80	2.74	4.40
N of cases		1441	647	789
F Statistics		1.49	1.84	.64

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. There were no differences in means across the six areas for any of the three variables.

Table 11 (continued)

State	City or Area	Children Affect Me	Think of My Children
New York	New York City	4.34_{c}	3.70
	N of cases	477	459
	NYC Area	4.34_{bc}	3.88
	N of cases	182	173
State mean		4.34	3.75
N of cases		659	632
Minnesota	Minneapolis	4.07_{a}	3.64
	N of cases	233	219
	MN Area	4.21_{abc}	3.63
	N of cases	263	260
State mean		4.15	3.63
N of cases		496	479
Texas	Dallas	4.11_{a}	3.79
	N of cases	206	198
	Dallas Area	4.16_{ab}	3.72
	N of cases	201	197
State mean		4.13	3.75
N of cases		407	395
TOTAL		4.22	3.71
N of cases		1562	1506
F Statistics		8.44***	2.67

Note. F statistics compare the six area means. Means with the same subscripts do not differ at the .01 level (Tukey). *** $p < .0001$.

Appendix C-1

Agency Questionnaire (AQ):
(Work and Family Support Services For Law Enforcement)

WORK AND FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

POLICE RESEARCH AND EDUCATION PROJECT

The purpose of this survey is to better understand how law enforcement agencies are addressing work and family issues for officers and their family members. This work is supported by a grant from the National Institute of Justice. **All information provided will remain confidential.** The goal is not to identify specific agencies but instead to identify overall trends. For each item below, **please circle your response. Some sections ask that you write in information or contain a bit more detailed instructions.** Please read them before proceeding with that section. After completing this four page questionnaire, you may include your mailing address at the end of the survey to receive a copy of the results of this study.

1. Identify the type of agency you work in:

1 City · 2 County 3 State

2. Please indicate the approximate number of sworn officers in your agency:

1 1-20 2 21-50 3 51-100 4 101-200 5 201- 500 6 501-1000 7 over 1000

3. Please *write* in the number of male and female police officers in your agency:

1 Number of Male Officers _____ 2 Number of Female Officers _____

4. Does your agency have a mission statement?

1 Yes 2 No

If YES, does the mission statement include a reference to work and family issues?

1 Yes 2 No

5. Does your agency provide any type of mental health service?

1 Yes 2 No

6. Does your agency have a formalized psychological services unit?

1 Yes 2 No

7. Write in the number of individuals with the titles listed below who provide services to police officers or family members within your agency:

	Title	Number of Providers	Are Any Providers also Sworn Law Enforcement Officers?		
7.1	Certified Drug/Alcohol Counselor	_____	1 Yes	2 No	3 Not sure
7.2	Chaplain	_____	1 Yes	2 No	3 Not Sure
7.3	Employee Assistance Program Coordinator	_____	1 Yes	2 No	3 Not Sure
7.4	Peer Supporters	_____	1 Yes	2 No	3 Not Sure
7.5	Psychologist / Psychiatrist	_____	1 Yes	2 No	3 Not Sure
7.6	Social Worker	_____	1 Yes	2 No	3 Not Sure
7.7	Civilian Volunteers	_____	1 Yes	2 No	3 Not Sure
7.8	Other _____	_____	1 Yes	2 No	3 Not Sure
7.9	Other _____	_____	1 Yes	2 No	3 Not Sure

©1997 Delprino, Kennedy. For more information, contact Robert Delprino, Buffalo State College, (716) 878-6669.

8. The following is a list of services that may be offered by your agency.

A. For each service, please indicate if the service is offered.
If it is offered tell us how it is offered using the descriptions below (In-House, External, Both).

1. Not Provided
2. Not Sure ?
3. In-House - The service exists as a separate unit within the agency or as a special operation of an existing unit.
4. External - Services are provided by an individual or group under contract with the agency.
5. Both in-house and external - A combination of in-house and external programs, for instance a program that is overseen by a department employee that also uses some contracted external sources for services.

B. Next, indicate if the service is also offered for officers' family members

Service	A. Not Provided	Not Sure ?	Program is provided In-House	External	Both	B. Also provided to family members
8.1 Employee Assistance Program (EAP).	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.2 EAP specifically designed for law enforcement.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.3 Counseling.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.4 Child care on a 24-hour basis.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.5 Marital and child support groups.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.6 Stress reduction programs.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.7 Hypertension clinics.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.8 Health and wellness programs.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.9 Group therapy.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.10 Post-shooting debriefing.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.11 Training/seminars on domestic violence	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.12.Stress education for law enforcement recruits	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.13 Stress education for officers on the job.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.14 Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.15 Law enforcement crisis telephone services on a 24-hour basis.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.16 Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.17 Peer support.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.18 Short-term counseling (under 6 months) related to personnel killed in the line of duty.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.19 Long-term (6 months or more) counseling related to personnel killed in the line of duty.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.20 Family issues related to firearm safety.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.21 Seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.22 Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.23 Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout an officer's career.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.24 Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.25 Work-out facilities.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.26 Time off during work to use facilities.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.27 Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/ treatment of organizational stress.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.28 Family orientation programs (spouse awareness; visiting precinct).	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No
8.29 Flexible work scheduling (e.g. modify officer's shifts to meet family demands.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes 2 No

9. Using the scale below, indicate to what extent the following are obstacles or problems related to the use of services in your agency:

		Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
9.1	**Budgetary.**	1	2	3	4	5
9.2	Lack of personnel who can provide the service.	1	2	3	4	5
9.3	**Viewpoint of policy making body.**	1	2	3	4	5
9.4	Viewpoint of police officers.	1	2	3	4	5
9.5	**Legal concerns of any type.**	1	2	3	4	5
9.6	Stigma associated with seeking assistance.	1	2	3	4	5
9.7	**Confidentiality issues.**	1	2	3	4	5
9.8	Lack of union support.	1	2	3	4	5
9.9	**Lack of input from officers in regards to police and program development.**	1	2	3	4	5
9.10	Accessibility and privacy of service location.	1	2	3	4	5
9.11	**Managers may use program to target some officers for disciplinary action.**	1	2	3	4	5
9.12	Family members do not support or are suspicious of services.	1	2	3	4	5

Please add any additional comments:

10. Indicate if your agency takes any of the following steps to facilitate the development, awareness or acceptance of services.

		YES	NO	UNSURE
10.1	**Training at the academy level.**	1	2	3
10.2	Provide funding for services/programs.	1	2	3
10.3	**Provide office space.**	1	2	3
10.4	Allow officers to use job time to train as peer supporters.	1	2	3
10.5	**Allow officers to do peer support work while on the job.**	1	2	3
10.6	Newsletters that advertise services/programs.	1	2	3
10.7	**Provide information on benefits of services to department.**	1	2	3
10.8	Collaborate with local union in developing and increasing awareness of programs.	1	2	3
10.9	**Public policy statements of support from administration.**	1	2	3
10.10	Mandate confidentiality.	1	2	3
10.11	**Allow officers to attend counseling appointments while on duty.**	1	2	3
10.12	Train supervisors on access, use and referral of agency services.	1	2	3
10.13	**Increase number of family programs offered.**	1	2	3

Please add any additional comments:

Please complete questions on next page.

11. **Are there plans to enlarge or implement the use of programs that address work and family issues within the next two years?**

1 Yes 2 No

12. **Does your agency specify qualifications for those who provide services?**

1 Yes 2 No

If YES what are the qualifications, circle all that apply.

1 Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D, ect..) 3. State license 5. Specialized training

2 Masters (MA, MSW, ect..) 4. Certification 6. Other (please specify)

13. **Does your agency supply services to other police agencies?**

1 Yes 2 No

If YES please explain why (cost savings, combine expertise, ect..)

14. **Does your program keep utilization statistics?**

1 Yes 2 No

15. **Has your agency conducted an impact study of programs effectiveness?**

1 Yes 2 No

If NO, do you plan to do so within the next year?

1 Yes 2 No

16. **To what degree does work and family stress issues impact your agency?**

To a Very Slight Extent				To a Very Large Extent
1	2	3	4	5

Please provide us with information about the person responding to this questionnaire.

17. **Job Title** _____

18. **Number of years in current job.** _____

19. **Number of years working with law enforcement.** _____

20. **Gender**

1. Male 2. Female

21. **Highest level of education.**

1 High School 2 Some College 3 Associates Degree

4 Bachelor's Degree 5 Some Graduate Work 6 Graduate Degree

Any additional comments:

Thank you for responding. Please return to Dr. Robert Delprino, Buffalo State College 1300 Elmwood Ave. Buffalo, NY 14222.

Appendix C-2

AQ Cover Letters

POLICE
RESEARCH
EDUCATION
PROJECT

750 FIRST STREET, N.E., SUITE 920 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002-4241 • (202) 842-4420 • FAX: (202) 842-4396

February 28, 1997

ROBERT T. SCULLY
Executive Director

Dear Chief Law Enforcement Officer:

The Police Research and Education Project, under the auspices of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), is conducting a study, Identification of Work and Family Services for LAw Enforcement Personnel, to identify the extent of law enforcement work and family issues and the existence of work and family programs.

The enclosed survey is completely confidential. This has been mailed to a random sample of law enforcement agencies throughout the country to identify the existence and success of programs that may be offered to police officers and their families.

Your response is very important. The goal of this study is not to identify specific agencies but to identify overall trends. This survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Please return the survey by March 21, 1997 in the enclosed postage-paid envelope.

A final report of this study will be published in conjunction with NIJ later this spring. If you would like a copy, please include your name and address with your completed survey or submit your request separately to the return address on the questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation and participation in this important survey. Please contact Dr. Robert Delprino of Buffalo State College at (716) 878-6669 for additional information. He will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Sincerely,

Robert T. Scully
Executive Director

POLICE
RESEARCH
EDUCATION
PROJECT

750 FIRST STREET, N.E., SUITE 920 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002-4241 • (202) 842-4420 • FAX: (202) 842-4396

ROBERT T. SCULLY
Executive Director

March 25, 1997

Dear Chief Law Enforcement Officer:

During the week of February 28 we asked for your cooperation in completing a national survey on work and family support services for law enforcement. This survey is being supported by a grant awarded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ). To date we believe that we have not yet received your response. Over 200 law enforcement agencies have responded to the survey. We hope to increase the number of respondents to ensure the accuracy in our discussions of the findings.

Regardless of how much or how little you are involved in this area, your response is still very important to us. The enclosed survey is completely confidential and only group results will be disclosed. This survey has been mailed to a random sample of law enforcement agencies throughout the country to identify the existence and success of programs that may be offered to police officers and their family members.

Please join with other departments in providing this information which will allow for the preparation of a comprehensive report on this very important topic. An additional survey and return envelope have been included for your convenience. This survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Please return the survey by April 14, 1997 in the enclosed postage-paid envelope.

A final report of this study will be published in conjunction with NIJ later this spring. If you would like a copy of this report please include your name and address with your completed survey or submit your request separately to Dr. Robert Delprino at Buffalo State College.

Thank you for your cooperation and participation in this very important survey. Please contact Dr. Robert Delprino of Buffalo State College at (716) 878-6669 for additional information. He will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Sincerely,

Robert T. Scully

Robert T. Scully
Executive Director

Appendix C-3

AQ Tables 1-8

Table 1

Police Agency Participation

	Type of Agency				
	State	25,000-49,999	50,000-99,999	100,000 or more	Total
Agencies Contacted	49	286	154	98	587
Responses	48	166	84	82	380
Percent of Responses	98.0	58.0	54.5	83.7	65.0

Table 2

Number of Male and Female Police Officers

	State	25,000-49,999	50,000-99,999	100,000 or more
Male:				
Mean	1062.05	67.63	131.76	1676.59
Standard Deviation	1189.11	36.41	45.60	4023.53
n[a]	44	157	78	70
Female:				
Mean	86.82	5.40	11.08	301.23
Standard Deviation	126.05	5.76	7.38	756.66
n[a]	44	151	78	70

[a] Indicates the number of agencies that responded to that item.

Table 3

Service Providers Within Agencies

Item	State	25,000-49,999	50,000-99,999	100,000 or more	Total
7.1 Certified Drug/Alcohol Counselor					
Mean	2.67	1.32	2.80	3.07	2.27
Standard Deviation	3.23	.96	3.91	3.10	2.81
n[a]	12	44	25	30	111
7.2 Chaplain					
Mean	11.72	3.02	3.95	6.96	5.38
Standard Deviation	16.70	4.16	4.68	7.72	8.24
n[a]	29	90	57	69	245
7.3 EAP Coordinator					
Mean	1.87	1.16	1.34	1.42	1.36
Standard Deviation	2.54	.61	1.33	1.71	1.45
n[a]	31	94	53	52	230
7.4 Peer Supporters					
Mean	24.55	3.88	8.68	32.50	17.03
Standard Deviation	20.47	3.26	18.93	45.82	30.82
n[a]	22	43	41	48	154
7.5 Psychologist/Psychiatrist					
Mean	3.20	1.48	1.67	3.17	2.17
Standard Deviation	6.04	1.09	1.15	5.24	3.56
n[a]	20	87	36	58	201
7.6 Social Worker					
Mean	1.50	1.35	2.33	6.31	2.98
Standard Deviation	.71	.67	2.50	7.16	4.42
n[a]	2	20	12	13	47
7.7 Civilian Volunteers					
Mean	121.40	14.79	15.38	77.50	42.62
Standard Deviation	199.80	19.67	15.22	185.49	119.14
n[a]	5	24	13	18	60

[a] Indicates the number of agencies that have a provider with that title who provides services to officers and family members.

Table 4

Agencies Whose Service Providers Are Sworn Officers

Item		State	25,000-49,999	50,000-99,999	100,000 or more	Total
7.1b Certified Drug/Alcohol Counselor:						
	Frequency[a]	5	3	1	10	19
	Percentage[b]	15.2	4.5	2.7	25.0	12.0
	n[c]	33	66	37	40	158
7.2b Chaplain:						
	Frequency[a]	9	9	6	19	43
	Percentage[b]	31.0	9.1	10.0	30.6	17.2
	n[c]	29	99	60	62	250
7.3b EAP Coordinator:						
	Frequency[a]	12	8	7	17	44
	Percentage[b]	40.0	7.5	12.1	30.4	17.5
	n[c]	30	107	58	56	251
7.4b Peer Supporters:						
	Frequency[a]	20	34	37	47	138
	Percentage[b]	80.0	50.0	72.5	81.0	68.3
	n[c]	25	68	51	58	202
7.5b Psychologist/Psychiatrist:						
	Frequency[a]	3	3	1	6	13
	Percentage[b]	13.6	3.1	2.4	10.3	6.0
	n[c]	22	96	42	58	218
7.6b Social Worker:						
	Frequency[a]	1	0	0	2	3
	Percentage[b]	16.7			7.1	2.8
	n[c]	6	48	25	28	107
7.7b Civilian Volunteers:						
	Frequency[a]	2	0	0	1	3
	Percentage[b]	25.0			3.4	2.7
	n[c]	8	49	27	29	113

[a] Indicates the number of agencies that responded YES to that item.

[b] Represents the percentage of YES responses within that agency.

[c] Indicates the total number of agencies that responded to that item.

Table 5.1

Availability of Programs For Officers and Family Members

Item			Total Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.1	Employee Assistance Program (EAP).				
	Provided:	In-House	39	10.5	372
		External	218	58.6	
		Both	70	18.8	
		Total:	327	87.9	
	Provided:	To Family	246	79.9	308
8.2	EAP specific to law enforcement.				
	Provided:	In-House	38	10.7	356
		External	85	23.9	
		Both	41	11.5	
		Total:	164	46.1	
	Provided:	To Family	114	60.3	189
8.3	Counseling.				
	Provided:	In-House	30	8.2	365
		External	198	54.2	
		Both	97	26.6	
		Total:	325	89.0	
	Provided:	To Family	223	78.0	286
8.4	Child care on a 24 hour basis.				
	Provided:	In-House	2	.6	352
		External	4	1.1	
		Both	1	.3	
		Total:	7	2.0	
	Provided:	To Family	6	6.7	89
8.5	Marital and child support groups.				
	Provided:	In-House	21	5.8	364
		External	80	22.0	
		Both	13	3.6	
		Total:	114	21.4	
	Provided:	To Family	92	62.2	148
8.6	Stress Reduction Programs.				
	Provided:	In-House	61	16.6	367
		External	100	27.2	
		Both	58	15.8	
		Total:	219	59.6	
	Provided:	To Family	102	50.0	204

Table 5.1 (Continued)

			Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.7	Hypertension clinics.				
	Provided:	In-House	12	3.3	361
		External	48	13.3	
		Both	14	3.9	
		Total:	74	20.5	
	Provided:	To Family	35	31.5	111
8.8	Health and wellness programs.				
	Provided:	In-House	85	23.2	366
		External	84	23.0	
		Both	62	16.9	
		Total:	231	63.1	
	Provided:	To Family	78	38.0	205
8.9	Group therapy.				
	Provided:	In-House	12	3.3	360
		External	74	20.6	
		Both	23	6.4	
		Total:	109	30.3	
	Provided:	To Family	83	58.5	142
8.10	Post-shooting debriefing.				
	Provided:	In-House	109	29.8	366
		External	83	22.7	
		Both	152	41.5	
		Total:	344	94.0	
	Provided:	To Family	147	53.1	277
8.11	Training/seminars on domestic violence.				
	Provided:	In-House	125	33.9	369
		External	37	10.0	
		Both	127	39.8	
		Total:	289	83.7	
	Provided:	To Family	42	17.4	242
8.12	Stress education for law enforcement recruits.				
	Provided:	In-House	115	31.8	362
		External	78	21.5	
		Both	39	10.8	
		Total:	232	64.1	
	Provided:	To Family	51	25.1	203
8.13	Stress education for officers on the job.				
	Provided:	In-House	110	30.3	363
		External	69	19.0	
		Both	62	17.1	
		Total:	241	66.4	
	Provided:	To Family	50	24.0	208

Table 5.1 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.14 Critical Incident Response on a 24 hour basis.				
Provided:	In-House	133	36.3	366
	External	70	19.1	
	Both	88	24.0	
	Total:	291	79.4	
Provided:	To Family	121	51.7	234
8.15 Law enforcement crisis telephone services on a 24-hour basis.				
Provided:	In-House	43	11.9	362
	External	43	11.9	
	Both	22	6.1	
	Total:	108	29.9	
Provided:	To Family	75	55.1	136
8.16 Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.				
Provided:	In-House	47	12.9	364
	External	143	39.3	
	Both	44	12.1	
	Total:	234	64.3	
Provided:	To Family	91	46.0	198
8.17 Peer support.				
Provided:	In-House	137	37.5	365
	External	28	7.7	
	Both	40	11.0	
	Total:	205	56.2	
Provided:	To Family	96	50.8	189
8.18 Short term counseling (under 6 months) related to personnel killed in the line of duty.				
Provided:	In-House	36	9.8	369
	External	150	40.7	
	Both	79	21.4	
	Total:	265	71.9	
Provided:	To Family	165	73.3	225
8.19 Long-term (6 months or more) counseling related to personnel killed in the line of duty.				
Provided:	In-House	27	7.4	365
	External	125	34.2	
	Both	52	14.2	
	Total:	204	55.8	
Provided:	To Family	122	66.3	184

Table 5.1 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.20 Family issues related to firearm safety.				
Provided:	In-House	98	27.0	363
	External	10	2.8	
	Both	7	1.9	
	Total:	115	31.7	
Provided:	To Family	43	33.1	130
8.21 Seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling or overeating.				
Provided:	In-House	55	14.9	370
	External	67	18.1	
	Both	28	7.6	
	Total:	150	40.6	
Provided:	To Family	49	32.7	150
8.22 Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits.				
Provided:	In-House	83	22.7	365
	External	32	8.8	
	Both	19	5.2	
	Total:	134	36.7	
Provided:	To Family	79	53.4	148
8.23 Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout officer's career.				
Provided:	In-House	48	13.2	364
	External	26	7.1	
	Both	27	7.4	
	Total:	101	27.7	
Provided:	To Family	53	40.8	130
8.24 Mental health treatment provided independently by insurance company.				
Provided:	In-House	24	6.5	371
	External	241	65.0	
	Both	42	11.3	
	Total:	307	82.8	
Provided:	To Family	219	85.5	256
8.25 Work-out facilities.				
Provided:	In-House	230	63.4	363
	External	33	9.1	
	Both	42	11.6	
	Total:	305	84.1	
Provided:	To Family	71	29.8	238

Table 5.1 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.26 Time off during work to use facilities.				
Provided:	In-House	52	14.2	366
	External	3	.8	
	Both	6	1.6	
	Total:	61	16.6	
Provided:	To Family	7	7.6	92
8.27 Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/treatment of organizational stress.				
Provided:	In-House	30	8.2	366
	External	45	12.3	
	Both	19	5.2	
	Total:	94	25.7	
Provided:	To Family	27	23.9	113
8.28 Family orientation programs (spousal awareness; visiting precinct).				
Provided:	In-House	134	36.4	368
	External	10	2.7	
	Both	13	3.5	
	Total:	157	42.6	
Provided:	To Family	123	75.9	162
8.29 Flexible work scheduling (e.g. modify officer's shift to meet family needs).				
Provided:	In-House	106	28.6	371
	External	2	.5	
	Both	0		
	Total:	108	29.1	
Provided:	To Family	15	19.0	79

[a] Represents the percentage of responses.

[b] Indicates the number of agencies that responded to that item.

Table 5.2

Availability of Programs For Officers and Family Members

		25,000 - 49,999		
Item		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.1 Employee Assistance Program (EAP).				
Provided:	In-House	7	4.3	162
	External	104	64.2	
	Both	24	14.8	
	Total:	135	83.3	
Provided:	To Family	101	78.3	129
8.2 EAP specific to law enforcement.				
Provided:	In-House	4	2.6	155
	External	53	34.2	
	Both	12	7.7	
	Total:	69	44.5	
Provided:	To Family	42	56.8	74
8.3 Counseling.				
Provided:	In-House	6	3.8	157
	External	99	63.1	
	Both	28	17.8	
	Total:	133	84.7	
Provided:	To Family	78	69.6	112
8.4 Child care on a 24 hour basis.				
Provided:	In-House	0		151
	External	1	.7	
	Both	0		
	Total:	1	.7	
Provided:	To Family	2	5.7	35
8.5 Marital and child support groups.				
Provided:	In-House	1	.6	155
	External	37	23.9	
	Both	1	.6	
	Total:	39	25.1	
Provided:	To Family	30	53.6	56
8.6 Stress Reduction Programs.				
Provided:	In-House	21	13.3	158
	External	49	31.0	
	Both	16	10.1	
	Total:	86	54.4	
Provided:	To Family	37	48.1	77

Table 5.2 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.7 Hypertension clinics.				
Provided:	In-House	2	1.3	156
	External	20	12.8	
	Both	5	3.2	
	Total:	27	17.3	
Provided:	To Family	11	27.5	40
8.8 Health and wellness programs.				
Provided:	In-House	28	17.7	158
	External	43	27.2	
	Both	26	16.5	
	Total:	97	61.4	
Provided:	To Family	32	38.1	84
8.9 Group therapy.				
Provided:	In-House	0		155
	External	38	24.5	
	Both	3	1.9	
	Total:	41	26.4	
Provided:	To Family	27	49.1	55
8.10 Post-shooting debriefing.				
Provided:	In-House	33	20.9	158
	External	45	28.5	
	Both	67	42.4	
	Total:	145	91.8	
Provided:	To Family	51	45.5	112
8.11 Training/seminars on domestic violence.				
Provided:	In-House	34	21.3	160
	External	27	16.9	
	Both	79	49.4	
	Total:	140	87.6	
Provided:	To Family	10	10.0	100
8.12 Stress education for law enforcement recruits.				
Provided:	In-House	15	9.6	156
	External	46	29.5	
	Both	15	9.6	
	Total:	76	48.7	
Provided:	To Family	6	8.8	68
8.13 Stress education for officers on the job.				
Provided:	In-House	34	21.8	156
	External	41	26.3	
	Both	24	15.4	
	Total:	99	63.5	
Provided:	To Family	12 8	14.5	83

Table 5.2 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.14 Critical Incident Response on a 24 hour basis.				
Provided:	In-House	46	29.3	157
	External	40	25.5	
	Both	37	23.6	
	Total:	123	78.4	
Provided:	To Family	34	38.2	89
8.15 Law enforcement crisis telephone services on a 24-hour basis.				
Provided:	In-House	6	3.9	155
	External	21	13.5	
	Both	6	3.9	
	Total:	33	21.3	
Provided:	To Family	18	39.1	120
8.16 Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.				
Provided:	In-House	12	7.7	156
	External	72	46.2	
	Both	14	9.0	
	Total:	98	62.9	
Provided:	To Family	25	35.2	71
8.17 Peer support.				
Provided:	In-House	40	25.5	157
	External	19	12.1	
	Both	9	5.7	
	Total:	68	43.3	
Provided:	To Family	28	43.8	64
8.18 Short term counseling (under 6 months) related to personnel killed in the line of duty.				
Provided:	In-House	3	1.9	160
	External	77	48.1	
	Both	24	15.0	
	Total:	104	65.0	
Provided:	To Family	57	69.5	82
8.19 Long-term (6 months or more) counseling related to personnel killed in the line of duty.				
Provided:	In-House	1	.6	158
	External	60	38.0	
	Both	12	7.6	
	Total:	73	46.2	
Provided:	To Family	36	56.3	64

Table 5.2 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.20 Family issues related to firearm safety.				
Provided:	In-House	39	24.8	157
	External	7	4.5	
	Both	2	1.3	
	Total:	48	30.6	
Provided:	To Family	14	29.2	48
8.21 Seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling or overeating.				
Provided:	In-House	19	11.9	159
	External	34	21.4	
	Both	6	3.8	
	Total:	59	37.1	
Provided:	To Family	14	26.4	53
8.22 Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits.				
Provided:	In-House	12	7.6	157
	External	18	11.5	
	Both	5	3.2	
	Total:	35	22.3	
Provided:	To Family	12	27.3	44
8.23 Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout officer's career.				
Provided:	In-House	9	5.7	157
	External	15	9.6	
	Both	9	5.7	
	Total:	33	21.0	
Provided:	To Family	13	28.9	45
8.24 Mental health treatment provided independently by insurance company.				
Provided:	In-House	6	3.8	159
	External	103	64.8	
	Both	14	8.8	
	Total:	123	77.4	
Provided:	To Family	71	76.3	93
8.25 Work-out facilities.				
Provided:	In-House	85	53.8	158
	External	19	12.0	
	Both	24	15.2	
	Total:	128	81.0	
Provided:	To Family	33	34.4	96

Table 5.2 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.26 Time off during work to use facilities.				
Provided:	In-House	18	11.4	158
	External	2	1.3	
	Both	4	2.5	
	Total:	24	15.2	
Provided:	To Family	3	8.1	37
8.27 Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/treatment of organizational stress.				
Provided:	In-House	5	3.2	157
	External	25	15.9	
	Both	7	4.5	
	Total:	37	23.6	
Provided:	To Family	10	23.3	43
8.28 Family orientation programs (spousal awareness; visiting precinct).				
Provided:	In-House	45	28.5	158
	External	7	4.4	
	Both	4	2.5	
	Total:	56	35.4	
Provided:	To Family	40	72.7	55
8.29 Flexible work scheduling (e.g. modify officer's shift to meet family needs).				
Provided:	In-House	46	28.6	161
	External	1	.6	
	Both	0		
	Total:	47	29.2	
Provided:	To Family	9	25.0	36

[a] Represents the percentage of responses.

[b] Indicates the number of agencies that responded to that item.

Table 5.3

Availability of Programs For Officers and Family Members

		50,000 - 99,999		
Item		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.1	Employee Assistance Program (EAP).			
	Provided: In-House	6	7.3	82
	External	54	65.9	
	Both	14	17.1	
	Total:	74	90.3	
	Provided: To Family	52	76.5	68
8.2	EAP specific to law enforcement.			
	Provided: In-House	4	5.2	77
	External	19	24.7	
	Both	10	13.0	
	Total:	33	42.9	
	Provided: To Family	20	50.0	40
8.3	Counseling.			
	Provided: In-House	3	3.8	80
	External	49	61.3	
	Both	21	26.3	
	Total:	73	91.4	
	Provided: To Family	51	81.0	63
8.4	Child care on a 24 hour basis.			
	Provided: In-House	1	1.3	80
	External	2	2.5	
	Both	0		
	Total:	3	3.8	
	Provided: To Family	3	13.6	22
8.5	Marital and child support groups.			
	Provided: In-House	4	4.9	82
	External	18	22.0	
	Both	4	4.9	
	Total:	26	31.8	
	Provided: To Family	20	57.1	35
8.6	Stress Reduction Programs.			
	Provided: In-House	4	4.9	82
	External	27	32.9	
	Both	13	15.9	
	Total:	44	53.7	
	Provided: To Family	25	56.8	44

Table 5.3 (Continued)

			Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.7	Hypertension clinics.				
	Provided:	In-House	2	2.5	81
		External	13	16.0	
		Both	2	2.5	
		Total:	17	21.0	
	Provided:	To Family	7	26.9	26
8.8	Health and wellness programs.				
	Provided:	In-House	12	14.8	81
		External	22	27.2	
		Both	11	13.6	
		Total:	45	55.6	
	Provided:	To Family	18	42.9	42
8.9	Group therapy.				
	Provided:	In-House	2	2.5	81
		External	18	22.2	
		Both	6	7.4	
		Total:	26	32.1	
	Provided:	To Family	20	60.6	33
8.10	Post-shooting debriefing.				
	Provided:	In-House	22	26.8	82
		External	21	25.6	
		Both	33	40.2	
		Total:	76	92.6	
	Provided:	To Family	25	44.6	56
8.11	Training/seminars on domestic violence.				
	Provided:	In-House	34	41.0	83
		External	6	7.2	
		Both	33	39.8	
		Total:	73	88.0	
	Provided:	To Family	7	11.9	59
8.12	Stress education for law enforcement recruits.				
	Provided:	In-House	14	17.3	81
		External	26	32.1	
		Both	9	11.1	
		Total:	49	60.5	
	Provided:	To Family	9	20.9	43
8.13	Stress education for officers on the job.				
	Provided:	In-House	16	20.0	80
		External	17	21.3	
		Both	16	20.0	
		Total:	49	61.3	
	Provided:	To Family	10	22.7	44

Table 5.3 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.14 Critical Incident Response on a 24 hour basis.				
Provided:	In-House	24	29.3	82
	External	13	15.9	
	Both	21	25.6	
	Total:	58	70.8	
Provided:	To Family	19	40.4	47
8.15 Law enforcement crisis telephone services on a 24-hour basis.				
Provided:	In-House	2	2.5	79
	External	11	13.9	
	Both	4	5.1	
	Total:	17	21.5	
Provided:	To Family	12	41.4	29
8.16 Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.				
Provided:	In-House	5	6.2	81
	External	31	38.3	
	Both	13	16.0	
	Total:	49	60.5	
Provided:	To Family	20	45.5	44
8.17 Peer support.				
Provided:	In-House	29	36.3	80
	External	5	6.3	
	Both	13	16.3	
	Total:	76	58.9	
Provided:	To Family	19	41.3	46
8.18 Short term counseling (under 6 months) related to personnel killed in the line of duty.				
Provided:	In-House	4	4.9	82
	External	35	42.7	
	Both	17	20.7	
	Total:	54	68.3	
Provided:	To Family	36	75.0	48
8.19 Long-term (6 months or more) counseling related to personnel killed in the line of duty.				
Provided:	In-House	3	3.7	81
	External	28	34.6	
	Both	12	14.8	
	Total:	43	53.1	
Provided:	To Family	23	59.0	39

Table 5.3 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.20 Family issues related to firearm safety.				
Provided:	In-House	19	23.8	80
	External	0		
	Both	2	2.5	
	Total:	21	26.3	
Provided:	To Family	6	21.4	28
8.21 Seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling or overeating.				
Provided:	In-House	7	8.6	81
	External	16	19.8	
	Both	8	9.9	
	Total:	31	38.3	
Provided:	To Family	10	28.6	35
8.22 Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits.				
Provided:	In-House	11	13.8	80
	External	10	12.5	
	Both	3	3.8	
	Total:	24	30.1	
Provided:	To Family	13	44.8	29
8.23 Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout officer's career.				
Provided:	In-House	7	8.6	81
	External	7	8.6	
	Both	9	11.1	
	Total:	23	28.3	
Provided:	To Family	11	36.7	30
8.24 Mental health treatment provided independently by insurance company.				
Provided:	In-House	6	7.2	83
	External	53	63.9	
	Both	9	10.8	
	Total:	68	81.9	
Provided:	To Family	52	86.7	60
8.25 Work-out facilities.				
Provided:	In-House	54	67.5	80
	External	9	11.3	
	Both	9	11.3	
	Total:	72	90.1	
Provided:	To Family	9	17.0	53

Table 5.3 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.26 Time off during work to use facilities.				
Provided:	In-House	15	18.8	80
	External	1	1.3	
	Both	1	1.3	
	Total:	17	21.4	
Provided:	To Family	2	8.3	24
8.27 Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/treatment of organizational stress.				
Provided:	In-House	2	2.5	81
	External	10	12.3	
	Both	6	7.4	
	Total:	18	22.2	
Provided:	To Family	5	18.5	27
8.28 Family orientation programs (spousal awareness; visiting precinct).				
Provided:	In-House	28	33.7	83
	External	2	2.4	
	Both	2	2.4	
	Total:	32	38.5	
Provided:	To Family	25	71.4	35
8.29 Flexible work scheduling (e.g. modify officer's shift to meet family needs).				
Provided:	In-House	26	32.1	81
	External	1	1.2	
	Both	0		
	Total:	27	33.3	
Provided:	To Family	4	22.2	18

[a] Represents the percentage of responses.

[b] Indicates the number of agencies that responded to that item.

Table 5.4

Availability of Programs For Officers and Family Members

Item			100,000 or more Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.1	Employee Assistance Program (EAP).				
	Provided:	In-House	16	20.0	80
		External	39	48.8	
		Both	21	26.3	
		Total:	76	95.1	
	Provided:	To Family	60	84.5	71
8.2	EAP specific to law enforcement.				
	Provided:	In-House	23	30.3	76
		External	9	11.8	
		Both	9	11.8	
		Total:	41	53.9	
	Provided:	To Family	35	74.5	47
8.3	Counseling.				
	Provided:	In-House	15	18.5	81
		External	29	35.8	
		Both	32	39.5	
		Total:	76	93.8	
	Provided:	To Family	61	84.7	72
8.4	Child care on a 24 hour basis.				
	Provided:	In-House	1	1.3	77
		External	1	1.3	
		Both	1	1.3	
		Total:	3	3.9	
	Provided:	To Family	1	4.3	23
8.5	Marital and child support groups.				
	Provided:	In-House	13	16.5	79
		External	19	24.1	
		Both	6	7.6	
		Total:	38	48.2	
	Provided:	To Family	31	79.5	39
8.6	Stress Reduction Programs.				
	Provided:	In-House	25	31.6	79
		External	18	22.8	
		Both	14	17.7	
		Total:	57	72.1	
	Provided:	To Family	26	49.1	53

Table 5.4 (Continued)

			Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.7	Hypertension clinics.				
	Provided:	In-House	4	5.2	77
		External	11	14.3	
		Both	4	5.2	
		Total:	19	24.7	
	Provided:	To Family	9	29.0	31
8.8	Health and wellness programs.				
	Provided:	In-House	25	31.6	79
		External	15	19.0	
		Both	12	15.2	
		Total:	52	65.8	
	Provided:	To Family	16	38.1	42
8.9	Group therapy.				
	Provided:	In-House	8	10.4	77
		External	13	16.9	
		Both	9	11.7	
		Total:	30	39.0	
	Provided:	To Family	26	68.4	38
8.10	Post-shooting debriefing.				
	Provided:	In-House	37	46.8	79
		External	10	12.7	
		Both	29	36.7	
		Total:	76	96.2	
	Provided:	To Family	45	64.3	70
8.11	Training/seminars on domestic violence.				
	Provided:	In-House	39	49.4	79
		External	1	1.3	
		Both	24	30.4	
		Total:	64	81.1	
	Provided:	To Family	16	29.6	54
8.12	Stress education for law enforcement recruits.				
	Provided:	In-House	55	68.8	80
		External	5	6.3	
		Both	8	10.0	
		Total:	68	85.1	
	Provided:	To Family	24	40.7	59
8.13	Stress education for officers on the job.				
	Provided:	In-House	39	49.4	82
		External	8	10.1	
		Both	13	16.5	
		Total:	60	76.0	
	Provided:	To Family	20	39.2	51

Table 5.4 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.14 Critical Incident Response on a 24 hour basis.				
Provided:	In-House	47	59.5	82
	External	9	11.4	
	Both	15	19.0	
	Total:	71	89.9	
Provided:	To Family	41	64.1	64
8.15 Law enforcement crisis telephone services on a 24-hour basis.				
Provided:	In-House	26	32.1	81
	External	6	7.4	
	Both	7	8.6	
	Total:	39	48.1	
Provided:	To Family	31	77.5	40
8.16 Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.				
Provided:	In-House	18	22.5	80
	External	22	27.5	
	Both	13	16.3	
	Total:	53	66.3	
Provided:	To Family	29	56.9	51
8.17 Peer support.				
Provided:	In-House	48	60.0	80
	External	1	1.3	
	Both	12	15.0	
	Total:	61	76.3	
Provided:	To Family	34	64.2	53
8.18 Short term counseling (under 6 months) related to personnel killed in the line of duty.				
Provided:	In-House	22	27.8	79
	External	19	24.1	
	Both	23	29.1	
	Total:	64	81.0	
Provided:	To Family	47	82.5	57
8.19 Long-term (6 months or more) counseling related to personnel killed in the line of duty.				
Provided:	In-House	17	21.8	78
	External	21	26.9	
	Both	19	24.4	
	Total:	57	73.1	
Provided:	To Family	41	80.4	51

Table 5.4 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.20 Family issues related to firearm safety.				
Provided:	In-House	23	29.1	79
	External	2	2.5	
	Both	2	2.5	
	Total:	27	34.1	
Provided:	To Family	16	45.7	35
8.21 Seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling or overeating.				
Provided:	In-House	20	24.4	82
	External	10	12.2	
	Both	7	8.5	
	Total:	37	45.1	
Provided:	To Family	15	40.5	37
8.22 Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits.				
Provided:	In-House	40	50.0	80
	External	3	3.8	
	Both	5	6.3	
	Total:	48	60.1	
Provided:	To Family	36	76.6	47
8.23 Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout officer's career.				
Provided:	In-House	24	30.8	78
	External	1	1.3	
	Both	4	5.1	
	Total:	29	37.2	
Provided:	To Family	19	51.4	37
8.24 Mental health treatment provided independently by insurance company.				
Provided:	In-House	9	11.1	81
	External	54	66.7	
	Both	11	13.6	
	Total:	74	91.4	
Provided:	To Family	62	93.9	66
8.25 Work-out facilities.				
Provided:	In-House	66	83.5	79
	External	2	2.5	
	Both	7	8.9	
	Total:	75	94.9	
Provided:	To Family	18	29.5	61

Table 5.4 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.26 Time off during work to use facilities.				
Provided:	In-House	13	15.9	82
	External	0		
	Both	0		
	Total:	13	15.9	
Provided:	To Family	0		21
8.27 Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/treatment of organizational stress.				
Provided:	In-House	15	18.5	81
	External	7	8.6	
	Both	3	3.7	
	Total:	25	30.8	
Provided:	To Family	9	30.0	30
8.28 Family orientation programs (spousal awareness; visiting precinct).				
Provided:	In-House	41	51.3	80
	External	1	1.3	
	Both	5	6.3	
	Total:	47	58.9	
Provided:	To Family	38	82.6	46
8.29 Flexible work scheduling (e.g. modify officer's shift to meet family needs).				
Provided:	In-House	17	20.7	82
	External	0		
	Both	0		
	Total:	17	20.7	
Provided:	To Family	2	11.8	17

[a] Represents the percentage of responses.

[b] Indicates the number of agencies that responded to that item.

Table 5.5
Availability of Programs For Officers and Family Members

Item			State Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.1	Employee Assistance Program (EAP).				
	Provided:	In-House	10	20.8	48
		External	21	43.8	
		Both	11	22.9	
		Total:	42	87.5	
	Provided:	To Family	33	82.5	40
8.2	EAP specific to law enforcement.				
	Provided:	In-House	7	14.6	48
		External	4	8.3	
		Both	10	20.8	
		Total:	21	43.7	
	Provided:	To Family	17	60.7	28
8.3	Counseling.				
	Provided:	In-House	6	12.8	47
		External	21	44.7	
		Both	16	34.0	
		Total:	43	91.5	
	Provided:	To Family	33	84.6	39
8.4	Child care on a 24 hour basis.				
	Provided:	In-House	0		44
		External	0		
		Both	0		
		Total:	0	100.00	
	Provided:	To Family	0	100.00	39
8.5	Marital and child support groups.				
	Provided:	In-House	3	6.3	48
		External	6	12.5	
		Both	2	4.2	
		Total:	11	23.0	
	Provided:	To Family	11	61.1	18
8.6	Stress Reduction Programs.				
	Provided:	In-House	11	22.9	48
		External	6	12.5	
		Both	15	31.3	
		Total:	32	66.7	
	Provided:	To Family	14	46.7	30

Table 5.5 (Continued)

			Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.7	Hypertension clinics.				
	Provided:	In-House	4	8.5	47
		External	4	8.5	
		Both	3	6.4	
		Total:	11	23.4	
	Provided:	To Family	8	57.1	14
8.8	Health and wellness programs.				
	Provided:	In-House	20	41.7	48
		External	4	8.3	
		Both	13	27.1	
		Total:	37	77.1	
	Provided:	To Family	12	32.4	37
8.9	Group therapy.				
	Provided:	In-House	2	4.3	47
		External	5	10.6	
		Both	5	10.6	
		Total:	12	25.5	
	Provided:	To Family	10	62.5	16
8.10	Post-shooting debriefing.				
	Provided:	In-House	17	36.2	47
		External	7	14.9	
		Both	23	48.9	
		Total:	47	100.00	
	Provided:	To Family	26	66.7	39
8.11	Training/seminars on domestic violence.				
	Provided:	In-House	18	38.3	47
		External	3	6.4	
		Both	11	23.4	
		Total:	32	68.1	
	Provided:	To Family	9	31.0	29
8.12	Stress education for law enforcement recruits.				
	Provided:	In-House	31	68.9	45
		External	1	2.2	
		Both	7	15.6	
		Total:	39	86.7	
	Provided:	To Family	12	36.4	33
8.13	Stress education for officers on the job.				
	Provided:	In-House	21	43.8	48
		External	3	6.3	
		Both	9	18.8	
		Total:	33	68.9	
	Provided:	To Family	8	26.7	30

Table 5.5 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.14 Critical Incident Response on a 24 hour basis.				
Provided:	In-House	16	33.3	48
	External	8	16.7	
	Both	15	31.3	
	Total:	29	81.3	
Provided:	To Family	27	79.4	34
8.15 Law enforcement crisis telephone services on a 24-hour basis.				
Provided:	In-House	9	19.1	47
	External	5	10.6	
	Both	5	10.6	
	Total:	19	40.3	
Provided:	To Family	14	66.7	21
8.16 Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.				
Provided:	In-House	12	25.5	47
	External	18	38.3	
	Both	4	8.5	
	Total:	34	72.3	
Provided:	To Family	17	53.1	32
8.17 Peer support.				
Provided:	In-House	20	41.7	48
	External	3	6.3	
	Both	6	12.5	
	Total:	29	60.5	
Provided:	To Family	15	57.7	26
8.18 Short term counseling (under 6 months) related to personnel killed in the line of duty.				
Provided:	In-House	7	14.6	48
	External	19	39.6	
	Both	15	31.3	
	Total:	41	85.5	
Provided:	To Family	25	65.8	38
8.19 Long-term (6 months or more) counseling related to personnel killed in the line of duty.				
Provided:	In-House	6	12.5	48
	External	16	33.3	
	Both	9	18.8	
	Total:	21	64.6	
Provided:	To Family	22	73.3	30

Table 5.5 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.20 Family issues related to firearm safety.				
Provided:	In-House	17	36.2	47
	External	1	2.1	
	Both	1	2.1	
	Total:	19	40.4	
Provided:	To Family	7	36.8	19
8.21 Seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling or overeating.				
Provided:	In-House	9	18.8	48
	External	7	14.6	
	Both	7	14.6	
	Total:	23	48.0	
Provided:	To Family	10	40.0	25
8.22 Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits.				
Provided:	In-House	20	41.7	48
	External	1	2.1	
	Both	6	12.5	
	Total:	27	56.3	
Provided:	To Family	18	64.3	28
8.23 Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout officer's career.				
Provided:	In-House	8	16.7	48
	External	3	6.3	
	Both	5	6.3	
	Total:	16	29.3	
Provided:	To Family	10	55.6	18
8.24 Mental health treatment provided independently by insurance company.				
Provided:	In-House	3	6.3	48
	External	31	64.6	
	Both	8	16.7	
	Total:	42	87.6	
Provided:	To Family	34	91.9	37
8.25 Work-out facilities.				
Provided:	In-House	25	54.3	46
	External	3	6.5	
	Both	2	4.3	
	Total:	30	65.1	
Provided:	To Family	11	39.3	28

Table 5.5 (Continued)

		Frequency	Percent[a]	n[b]
8.26 Time off during work to use facilities.				
Provided:	In-House	6	13.0	46
	External	0		
	Both	1	2.2	
	Total:	7	15.2	
Provided:	To Family	2	20.0	10
8.27 Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/treatment of organizational stress.				
Provided:	In-House	8	17.0	47
	External	3	6.4	
	Both	3	6.4	
	Total:	14	29.8	
Provided:	To Family	3	23.1	13
8.28 Family orientation programs (spousal awareness; visiting precinct).				
Provided:	In-House	20	42.6	47
	External	0		
	Both	2	4.3	
	Total:	22	46.9	
Provided:	To Family	20	76.9	26
8.29 Flexible work scheduling (e.g. modify officer's shift to meet family needs).				
Provided:	In-House	17	36.2	47
	External	0		
	Both	0		
	Total:	17	36.2	
Provided:	To Family	0		8

[a] Represents the percentage of responses.

[b] Indicates the number of agencies that responded to that item.

Table 6

Agencies' Obstacles or Problems Related to the Use of Psychological Services

Item		State	25,000-49,999	50,000-99,999	100,000 or more	Total
9.1	Budgetary.					
	Mean	3.29	3.79	3.43	3.20	3.52
	Standard Deviation	1.40	1.24	1.29	1.38	1.32
	n[a]	48	164	83	80	375
9.2	Lack of personnel who can provide the services.					
	Mean	3.11	3.39	3.30	2.78	3.20
	Standard Deviation	1.34	1.27	1.20	1.37	1.30
	n[a]	47	163	83	80	373
9.3	Viewpoint of policy making body.					
	Mean	2.50	2.77	2.72	2.40	2.64
	Standard Deviation	1.17	1.25	1.23	1.23	1.23
	n[a]	48	163	82	80	373
9.4	Viewpoint of police officers.					
	Mean	3.04	2.91	2.96	2.95	2.95
	Standard Deviation	1.02	1.02	.98	1.13	1.03
	n[a]	47	161	81	79	368
9.5	Legal concerns of any type.					
	Mean	2.98	2.79	2.82	2.79	2.81
	Standard Deviation	1.15	1.02	.96	1.19	1.06
	n[a]	47	163	82	80	372
9.6	Stigma associated with seeking assistance.					
	Mean	3.27	3.25	3.38	3.30	3.29
	Standard Deviation	1.25	1.16	1.06	1.12	1.14
	n[a]	48	162	82	79	371
9.7	Confidentiality issues.					
	Mean	2.65	2.88	2.60	2.72	2.76
	Standard Deviation	1.39	1.21	1.12	1.72	1.23
	n[a]	48	162	82	80	372
9.8	Lack of union support.					
	Mean	2.12	2.42	2.42	2.14	2.32
	Standard Deviation	1.03	1.10	1.02	1.07	1.11
	n[a]	43	153	79	78	373

Table 6 (Continued)

Item		State	25,000-49,999	50,000-99,999	100,000 or more	Total
9.9	Lack of input from officers in regards to police and program development.					
	Mean	2.73	2.95	2.82	2.54	2.80
	Standard Deviation	.98	1.12	1.13	1.10	1.11
	n[a]	48	162	83	80	373
9.10	Accessibility and privacy of service location.					
	Mean	2.79	2.70	2.49	2.33	2.58
	Standard Deviation	1.25	1.06	.98	1.37	1.15
	n[a]	47	160	82	80	369
9.11	Managers may use program to target some officers for disciplinary action.					
	Mean	2.17	1.87	1.95	2.29	2.01
	Standard Deviation	1.14	1.12	1.15	1.40	1.20
	n[a]	48	163	83	80	374
9.12	Family members do not support or are suspicious of services.					
	Mean	2.15	2.51	2.49	2.25	2.40
	Standard Deviation	1.01	1.04	.97	1.10	1.04
	n[a]	48	162	83	80	373

[a] Indicates the number of agencies that responded to that item.

Note: These items were answered on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree. Copyright 1997 Delprino & Kennedy. Use only with pernission.

Table 7

Agencies' Actions in Facilitating the Development, Awareness or Acceptance of Services.

Item		State	25,000-49,999	50,000-99,999	100,000 or more	Total
10.1	Training at the academy level.					
	Frequency[a]	44	99	50	70	263
	Percentage[b]	91.7	60.7	59.5	85.4	69.8
	n[c]	48	163	84	82	377
10.2	Provide funding for services/programs.					
	Frequency[a]	38	98	52	62	250
	Percentage[b]	80.9	59.8	61.9	76.5	66.5
	n[c]	47	164	84	81	376
10.3	Provide office space.					
	Frequency[a]	27	47	27	57	158
	Percentage[b]	58.7	28.7	32.1	69.5	42.0
	n[c]	46	164	84	82	376
10.4	Allow officers to use job time to train as peer officers.					
	Frequency[a]	24	56	40	51	171
	Percentage[b]	50.0	34.1	48.2	62.2	45.4
	n[c]	48	164	83	82	377
10.5	Allow officers to do peer support work while on the job.					
	Frequency[a]	27	78	47	60	212
	Percentage[b]	57.4	47.9	57.3	73.2	56.7
	n[c]	47	163	82	82	374
10.6	Newsletters that advertise services/programs.					
	Frequency[a]	24	70	37	54	185
	Percentage[b]	51.1	42.9	44.0	65.9	49.2
	n[c]	47	163	84	82	376
10.7	Provide information on benefits of services to department.					
	Frequency[a]	41	114	65	68	288
	Percentage[b]	85.4	70.4	77.4	84.0	76.8
	n[c]	48	162	84	82	375

Table 7 (Continued).

Item		State	25,000-49,999	50,000-99,999	100,000 or more	Total
10.8	Colloborate with local union in developing and increasing awareness of programs.					
	Frequency[a]	21	38	30	41	130
	Percentage[b]	52.5	25.0	39.0	53.2	37.6
	n[c]	40	152	77	77	346
10.9	Public policy statements of support from administration.					
	Frequency[a]	34	69	38	52	193
	Percentage[b]	72.3	42.6	45.2	63.4	51.5
	n[c]	47	162	84	82	375
10.10	Mandate confidentiality.					
	Frequency[a]	44	128	74	75	321
	Percentage[b]	93.6	78.0	88.1	91.5	85.1
	n[c]	47	164	84	82	377
10.11	Allow officers to attend counsleing appointments while on duty.					
	Frequency[a]	39	102	59	54	254
	Percentage[b]	81.3	61.8	70.2	65.9	67.0
	n[c]	48	165	84	82	379
10.12	Train supervisors on access, use referral of agency services.					
	Frequency[a]	35	99	58	67	259
	Percentage[b]	72.9	60.4	69.0	81.7	68.5
	n[c]	48	164	84	82	378
10.13	Increase number of family programs offered.					
	Frequency[a]	20	34	17	27	98
	Percentage[b]	41.7	20.9	20.5	33.3	26.1
	n[c]	48	163	83	81	375

[a] Indicates the number of agencies that responded YES to that item.

[b] Represents the percentage of YES responses within that agency.

[c] Indicates the number of agencies that responded to that item.

Table 8

Organizational Impact

Item		State	25,000-49,999	50,000-99,999	100,000 or more	Total
4. Agency mission statement:						
	Frequency[a]	45	141	74	78	338
	Percentage[b]	95.7	86.5	89.2	97.5	90.6
	n[c]	47	163	83	80	373
4b. Mission statement includes reference to work and family:						
	Frequency[a]	9	33	20	11	73
	Percentage[b]	21.4	24.4	27.0	15.5	22.7
	n[c]	42	135	74	71	322
5. Agency provides mental health services:						
	Frequency[a]	44	143	73	74	334
	Percentage[b]	95.7	86.7	90.1	91.4	89.5
	n[c]	46	165	81	81	373
6. Agency has formalized psychological services:						
	Frequency[a]	16	33	15	45	109
	Percentage[b]	34.8	20.0	17.9	54.9	28.9
	n[c]	46	165	84	82	377
11. Plans to enlarge/implement programs that address work and family in next 2 years:						
	Frequency[a]	26	42	19	33	120
	Percentage[b]	55.3	25.9	22.9	41.8	32.3
	n[c]	47	162	83	79	371
12. Specify qualifications for those who provide services:						
	Frequency[a]	33	99	51	61	244
	Percentage[b]	70.2	62.7	65.4	78.2	67.6
	n[c]	47	158	78	78	361

Table 8 (continued)

Item		State	25,000-49,999	50,000-99,999	100,000 or more	Total
13. Supply services to other police agencies:						
	Frequency[a]	17	21	17	27	82
	Percentage[b]	37.0	13.0	21.0	33.8	22.3
	n[c]	46	161	81	80	368
14. Program keeps utilization statistics:						
	Frequency[a]	22	37	22	50	131
	Percentage[b]	48.9	23.6	27.8	62.5	36.3
	n[c]	45	157	79	80	361
15. Has conducted an impact study on program effectiveness:						
	Frequency[a]	5	7	3	13	28
	Percentage[b]	10.6	4.4	3.6	16.3	7.6
	n[c]	47	159	83	80	369
15b. Plan to conduct impact study within next year:						
	Frequency[a]	6	13	4	6	29
	Percentage[b]	15.4	9.0	5.5	9.4	9.1
	n[c]	39	144	73	64	320

[a] Indicates the number of agencies that responded YES to that item.

[b] Represents the percentage of YES responses within agency.

[c] Indicates the number of agencies that responded to that item.