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FOREWORD

The Major Cities Chiefs (MCC) and the Major County Sheriffs (MCS) are organizations whose members are the Chief Executive Officers of the largest law enforcement agencies in United States. Membership in the MCCA includes departments from the United States and Canada. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) established the National Executive Institute (NEI) as the education and training program for the executives in the MCC, MCS, international law enforcement, and other federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies. Graduates of the NEI also formed the FBI NEI Associates (FBI NEIA).

The Human Resources Committee of the MCCA with members from the MCS and in association with the FBI and NEIA meets three times a year to address contemporary personnel incidences and issues through research, discussion and the formulation of strategies and policy. The Committee is comprised of both sworn and civilian professionals, who have distinguished themselves during their careers in personnel administration and development. The leadership of the MCCA has charged the Committee with addressing law enforcement’s human resource challenges and providing strategic alternatives for implementing, resolving, and mitigating the current issues.

Readers of this work will realize how difficult it is for writers to state opinions or make suggestions that apply equally to local, state, urban, rural, suburban, and federal law enforcement agencies. However, the Human Resources Committee’s experienced and wise practitioners are not just espousing theory, but are actually transforming these ideas into performance on a daily basis. These human resource professionals created this written document from their research and experience, and it was edited through many discussions within the Committee.

While the MCCA, MCS, and FBI NEIA do not specifically endorse every conclusion or recommendation of this report, they use its information to generate discussion and reasonable debate during roundtable and training sessions. The result is better informed Chief Executive Officers who will continue to lead policy changes that will improve law enforcement services.

The MCCA, MCS, and FBI NEIA do not endorse companies or individuals identified or cited in this project, and references to them are provided for information purposes only.
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Executive Summary

In this year’s project on community engagement, the MCCA HRC presents a report on a research program, Tact, Tactics, and Trust (T3) within our practitioner’s study. These are offered for your consideration in “Building The Foundations For Engagement-Based Policing” in your agency.

The first section is an Introduction (p.7) with some definitions of community engagement and trust along with some considerations from an excellent community engager from Virginia Beach Police Department.

The next section (p.16) is based on a DARPA funded research project that led to the development of a program named “Good Stranger.” This DARPA project was commissioned because the “military has struggled in recent years with how to create order and peace in unstable social environments weakened by violence, conflict, and mistrust.”

The following 6 sections (pp.30-76) include studies done and the perspectives of representatives from our MCCA members (Fairfax County, Philadelphia, Montgomery County, Toronto, Las Vegas, and Virginia Beach). These sections also provide information on some of their departments’ programs to address engagement in Community-Based Policing.

The next section on “Measurement of Engagement and Trust” (p.61) gives rationale on methods of measuring engagement and trust, and some coming attractions on other processes that are in the research phase now. This is an important section because agencies should determine if their programs have the intended outcomes.

The appendix section (pp.68-122) includes a number of additional resources. Our view is that many of these documents may be very useful in your agencies’ work on policies, procedures, training and education to formulate your strategy to “build a foundation for engagement-based policing.”

Please give us your feedback on this project.
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Beginnings

Everyone who has worked on projects where the goal is to enhance the capabilities of law enforcement knows that there is much research and writing that is involved in producing a publication like this. However, concerning community engagement, it would be extremely beneficial if the readers of this project could have heard the conversations that led to its composition, and so we included some of those conversations below. This publication is evidence that the men and women who represent the agencies of the Major Cities Chiefs Association (MCCA) and its Human Resources Committee (HRC) continue to lead with their chiefs in the mission of serving and protecting their communities. The discussions that informed our treatment of this tough issue were what students of adult learning call critical reflective thinking (Mezirow). The subject is not necessarily complex or even difficult to understand. However, the struggle in communicating with the many constituents and cultures that come into play in analyzing, synthesizing, implementing, and ultimately successfully addressing the culture change needed, is daunting. We started our work at Orlando, continued in research at the FBI Academy and with editing efforts at Las Vegas came up against obstacles. In tackling the issue it was suggested that perhaps we have four hurdles in our way from the start. The first is the concept of changing the police culture from a mentality of warriors to one of guardians (*21st Century Policing*). The second is a perceived reluctance in giving our officers more discretion in implementing community oriented policing, problem solving policing, and intelligence led policing into a policy, practice, and culture of engagement-based policing with our communities. The third is how to get the training to our entire police department without major disruptions and high costs. The fourth perceived obstacle is changing the trust factor within our police departments both top-down and bottom-up that would allow and provide the needed discretion for solutions.
**Definition**

To establish a baseline understanding of community engagement, we looked up various definitions of the concept. These are a few:

[Community engagement]…refers to the process by which …organizations and individuals build ongoing, permanent relationships for the purpose of applying a collective vision for the benefit of a community. …[C]ommunity engagement primarily deals with the practice of moving…communities towards change, usually from a stalled or otherwise similarly suspended position. (Gottlieb)

Another definition is to “build ongoing, permanent relationships for the purpose of applying a collective vision for the benefit of a community.” (Wikipedia)

In Australia, the Victorian Government website provides:

- Community engagement can mean communication, education, public participation, participative democracy or working in partnership.
- It can include a variety of approaches, such as one-way communication or information delivery, consultation, involvement and collaboration in decision-making, and empowered action in informal groups or formal partnerships.

Tony Veneziano, one of our MCCA HRC members gave us the Toronto Police Service’s definition of community engagement:

- At its lowest level, it refers to in-person communications and interactions between a police officer and a member of the public…
- Encompasses both community inquiries wherein a police officer makes an inquiry for the purpose of preserving the peace and or preventing crimes or other offences; and informal interactions….a simple “meet and greet” between an officer and a community member(s)
- A professional, bias-free interaction with the community and other key stakeholders to assist in the achievement of enhanced and sustained public safety, both in the long and short term.

There are many others that would add value, but with these and the influence of the others, we then discussed why community engagement was essential.

**Virginia Beach Police Department**

We asked one of Virginia Beach Police Department’s (VBPD) best community engagers, Lt. Kenny Miller for his opinion on “Engagement-based Policing” and he provided the following:

**Developing relationships** – This is an enormous step in community engagement and community repair. When the police and the community are fragmented by events, it is the reaching out and extending the hand of alliance. Community engagement is the foundation of police and community relationship repair, and that can segue into trust. VBPD does it by candid talk, empathy, attending civic functions, stopping by at neighborhood sporting events, going to places outside the norm, (barbershops, hair
salons, restaurants) or just getting out of the car and using the T3 (TACT, TACTICS AND TRUST) method helps develop friends. The importance of this method is showing respect and that it is the process of developing a friend. While developing relationships as your driving force, there will always be an unusual negative occurrence, and the friends developed beforehand are already in place should they be needed. Having this respectful support formed during earlier engagement can be critical to agency success. The concept of establishing a friend in good times may prevent seeking a friend in challenging times. Of course you can not be friends with everyone, so the question is who are these friends we need? In VBPD we look for local members of the community, and we include the Mayor, City, County Leaders, the business leaders, other public safety members, high school students, and even the homeless person. It can be anyone. We believe developing friends with every one we can, including the homeless, like when the officer gets them into a shelter or provides service or assistance where there is a medical need. Officers who are active and engaged, especially those who are resourceful, create good community engagement. Obviously some officers are more gifted and creative, but all can be better.

We emphasize on the critical importance of building trust and relationships with community members who are already beyond the "tipping point." Even in the roughest neighborhoods citizens love seeing guys on foot patrol. And they want the officers to actually stop and talk. We need to get cops to have the confidence to get out of the "wallflower" mode.

In VBPD we see the benefits of developing the relations, including:

**Trust** – Trust is the ultimate goal in the engagement between the community, which consists of the businesses, faith-based members, city leaders, students, and the police.

*Note: Dr. Lande added here that trust is fundamentally about relationships, not the characters of individuals. This means that trust describes the quality of a relationship between two or more people. Often, trust is a type of cooperative relationship in which the members of the relationship act in ways that produce positive outcomes both for themselves and for others. We might think of trust as a kind of relationship where the size of the pie grows as a result of how individuals treat one another (Gottman 2011). When scientists characterize trusting individuals they speak of behavior propensities that are benevolent (behavior that benefits others and not just the individual), competent within their domain (for police this might mean satisfactorily solving community defined problems), and predictable (officers respond reliably and treat people in a consistent manner) (Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman 1995; Klein, Klein, Lande, et al 2015).

Distrust is a different type of relationship wherein individuals work for their own gains without really taking into account the needs, values, goals, and identities of others. We might think of distrusting relationships as defined by a lack of sensitivity of the individuals to others, such that they act independently of one another, or are "unhooked" from one another. When we talk about distrust we are talking about not being able to count on someone to have our backs because we aren’t even on their minds. We can think of people who contribute to distrustful relationships as being unpredictable, incompetent, and often self-serving.
Betrayal is yet another trust-related relationship, and one that is most clearly the opposite of trust and also the most serious when it comes to relationships between police and the community. When community members say that they distrust the police, usually they mean something like what scientists define as betrayal. Here, individuals behave in ways that foster their own needs and projects in ways that actively harm others. For example, when officers write lots of citations, with no discretion and at the expense of activities that could engage them with the community, just to keep their supervisors at bay, they are acting in ways that benefit their own organizational relationships and hurting community members with stiff fines. We might think of betrayal as zero-sum game, where police and community members think the only way they can gain or win is at the expense of the other, making them lose. In relationships defined by betrayal we can think of people behaving in ways that are more than just self-serving, but contemptuous, humiliating, and maleficent.

When people are in trusting relationships they are able to be vulnerable, i.e. take the risk of relying on someone else in order to get something done. So in addition to taking a risk, trust is also about how police and community members cooperate and become interdependent on one another to be successful.

The four dimensions of trust that we use in T3 are “IBCoP:”

- Integrity: honor, sincerity, authenticity
- Benevolence: disposition to do good
- Competence: expertise, proficiency
- Predictability: reliability, certainty

Another Note: In our deliberative sessions it was apparent the writers believe that an important aspect of building trust with the community has the prerequisite that there must be a strong basis of trust within the law enforcement agency. Studies show that:

Trust is both a cause and an effect of company culture. The trust we have in each other informs how we operate, and the way we operate encourages trust. [Yammer CTO and co-founder Adam Pisoni says] that bureaucracy exists where trust doesn’t…

Whether consciously or unconsciously, we make personal and business decisions based on trust daily. (Yammer)

Business organizations are not substantially different from police organizations, regarding trust. Where the chief or the executive staff does not trust any combination of, the mid-level, first line supervisors, or officers, more than likely the feeling is mutual and those emotions transfer into interactions with the community served. Before we can adequately address our community engagement, we certainly need to make sure we are continuously improving our internal trust. In the last section of this study regarding measurement and trust we explore trust a bit more.

Back to Lt. Miller: Trust is a very important factor, because it is sometimes seemingly impossible to gain, and yet very easy to lose. The efforts for trust must reach a cross section of the police and community. It is the continual development of day-to-day relationships that are extremely beneficial during challenging times.
Removing barriers – In building trust it removes physical, language or social barriers. For the community it’s getting access to information, or voicing needs or opinions that directly affects them. It affords community leaders or community members the opportunity to come forward with confidence in order to aid in tackling community issues. This may later translate into these members having an impact on city/county government. It can develop into a partnership between the community, police and all local government. It provides the opportunity to address issues and impact decisions that will affect them.

Confidence/trust (transparency) – Transparency is the practice where VBPD demonstrates qualities that make laws and ordinance compliance more obvious or easy to understand with respect to day-to-day operations. This is extremely important on the heels of an unusual negative occurrence that takes place in the community. Being helpful, truthful, and up front has to be the practice of the agency in both crisis and non-crisis situations. If the agency has a practice of being up front and honest, the community is more tolerant and understanding. Agencies must take the time to explain its mission, especially any changes, or things that impact the community. This can also be facilitated by taking advantage of social media and other modes of communication to develop proper messaging. The by-product of transparency is trust.

Methods of engagements – Attend city/town hall meetings:
As we mentioned before, agency leaders, all officers and supervisors should attend civic leagues meetings, community fairs, city/town hall meetings in order to communicate information about issues in the community. This is an opportunity for people to raise concerns, ask questions, and be given answers on things that affect others in the community. Public meetings are a good way to float ideas and explore possible proposals before they are formalized. A good experience at a meeting can encourage people to become more involved in the engagement process with police officers. It is always an excellent way to communicate with large numbers of the public. This too is a way to develop friendship, create partnership, remove barriers, and build trust.

Roadshows and public exhibitions – We believe VBPD should operate on the concept that ‘a picture is worth a thousand words’ to convey information. Public exhibitions of police equipment or educating the community about the department can be combined with other events and taken directly to them. School events or summer fairs are great locations to develop friends through communication and interactive processes. This may reduce the need to attract people to other police-related events. Impromptu visits to these locations can appeal to younger people, who may not respond to flyers or be interested meeting-based approaches. When you stage an exhibition, officers can gather immediate reactions from those who attend. This is also an excellent way to recruit while in casual engagement with your target audience.

Surveys and questionnaires – These are the single most widely used engagement method for the VBPD. Surveys are done door to door by officers up to and including the chief (Appendix V). They are used to gather quantitative answers, and if the participants are representative of the community, wider public opinion can be deduced. Questionnaires can also be very useful for gauging public reactions to changes, ideas, and proposals, or understanding what people think about facilities or services. This
method allows gathering information from a large number of people. The best practice for officers to embrace surveys is to enlist the services of senior command staff members to be an important part of conducting the surveys. During these surveys the Neighborhood Planning team will also be able to give feedback on your potential proposals and plans.

Note: Based on reading Lt. Miller’s explanation of community engagement, Dr. Wender offered that non-enforcement related community contacts with our "regular offenders" are essential. Even if it's awkward at first, it pays dividends when it is time to take official action. Breaching the normal cop-citizen dynamic is important in getting the most mistrustful members of the community used to having cops just talk with them. This is how we start chipping away at the "no snitch" culture and similar self-destructive behavior.

Dr. Wender also presented some food for thought. He suggested that every time you drop off a rental car, the attendant is always friendly and chatty. He’ll tell you his name, and say "hey, if you evaluate today's service, you'll get 10% off your next rental." They know how to build rapport and get you to take action that gives feedback. Suppose officers actually gave people their names and badge numbers and said, "hey, if you do an online survey, the PD will give you a gift card, meal voucher, whatever. . . " Then appeal to cops' competitive nature: the first squad/platoon/precinct w/ X number of positive contacts gets extra comp time or vacation…

Dr. Wender continued: Trust and legitimacy are ultimately built on social interactions. The social interactions that compose the street-level “stuff” of community engagement are face-to-face, highly dynamic (behavior changes over time of the encounter), complex (there are many components to be sensed and explained), unpredictable (there are many possible and even probable outcomes), and often risky (the stakes are high). In our view, the main purpose of policing is to engage safely and fairly with the public to “get things done” in often volatile settings where officers, victims, suspects, witnesses, and bystanders have vastly different understandings of what is occurring, divergent or conflicting goals. They are already engaged in different courses of action (e.g. trying to get to work on time versus trying to conduct a safe traffic stop), and are mutually trying to influence one another. Officers need strong, effective, moment-by-moment skills to succeed in these tense, complex social environments. On a larger scale, when officers have a high level of social competence, they can leverage every public interaction as an opportunity to engage with the community and create positive outcomes conducive to peace, order, and stability. A range of promising efforts such as Blue Courage™, Fair and Impartial Policing™, T3 – Tact, Tactics, and Trust™, and VALOR for Blue™ represent various crucial elements of what we think must be a systematic, sustained, evidence-based approach to building and implementing an engagement-based model of 21st century policing.

As we see it, engagement-based policing represents the evolution of community-oriented policing along several lines of effort responsive to the ethical, legal, political, and operational demands of collaboratively creating safety in a dynamic and diverse society. Community-oriented policing as it existed in the 1990s was a major step in the right direction. Even so, its primary emphasis on relationships with “stable” elements of the community and abstract problem-solving models separated from basic human
engagement is clearly insufficient to the current urgent challenges of community trust and relationship building that we face today across the country. Plainly stated, traditional community policing programs often do not go far enough in engaging the most vulnerable and troubled segments of the population. Yet these are the people with whom the police most frequently interact, and whose relative trust or mistrust has a disproportionate strategic influence on the legitimacy of entire agencies, and indeed on the entire policing profession. While it remains crucial to engage with “law-abiding” citizens in the conventional sense of the word, the real imperative in creating stability, trust, and peace in our most challenged and troubled communities and neighborhoods is to engage networks of disaffected teens and young adults who are both the victims and perpetrators of a disproportionate amount of violent crime. The reality of policing is that we have not devoted enough time and resources to building relationships with the people with whom we interact the most: disenfranchised, marginalized communities where jobs, hope, and stability are in short supply and violence, guns, drugs, and despair are all too common. And plainly stated, none of this will happen unless police leaders and supervisors constantly embody the traits they expect of their subordinates, and unless effective engagement is a required, critical, and measured area of job performance.

The policing profession urgently needs to rethink its sense of mission so that it better aligns with the complex values and interests of a diverse, democratic society. This is true particularly at a time when critics from the left and right alike are questioning the overwhelmingly punitive orientation of criminal justice policy since the 1980s. Policing must position itself as the unshakably trustworthy source of community peace and security. Peace and security are public goods, and are the most basic requirement of public life without which nothing else is possible -- commerce, education, family life, culture, and so forth. As criminologists such as Ian Loader and Neil Walker (2001) have been arguing for years, the police ultimately deliver a public good that no other private or public entity can deliver. Sadly, just as other public goods such as healthcare and education are mal-distributed, so are safety and security. Just as the healthiest people often have the best medical insurance, it is often the safest communities that enjoy the best-staff, best-equipped police departments. As part of its move to strengthen the political legitimacy of the police in a diverse, democratic society, the member agencies of MCCA must move to highlight their unique ability to ensure equal and universal protection of the inalienable human right to peace and security, especially in the communities where it is needed most.

See Appendix VIII for other resources to use on improving community engagement policy and procedure, as well as training in your agency.

In the next section the two Ph.D. authors present to readers a program named Tact, Tactics, and Trust (T3), referred to above and later in other sections. They take much of this discussion in our introductory portion and add value to our study with a research-based program. To our knowledge it is the only police-training program that simultaneously addresses the perceptual, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions of social interaction. It integrates the latest scientific research on managing social encounters with validated training techniques.
The training focuses on four tasks:

**Task 1:** Enhance officers’ perceptual, cognitive, and behavioral capacities to create positive outcomes in their police interactions.

**Task 2:** Improve officers’ ability to build rapport and trust with citizens in diverse social and cultural contexts under stressful and dangerous conditions.

**Task 3:** Increase officers’ ability to anticipate and rapidly address sources of conflict, danger, mistrust and error in social encounters.

**Task 4:** Increase officers’ skills at each stage of the social engagement cycle

---

**Works Cited**


Introduction: Putting “Procedures” into Procedural Justice

Police have wrestled for decades with a set of seemingly intractable challenges centered on improving engagement and trust with the communities we serve. Every so often, these challenges rise to crisis level in the aftermath of high profile, failed encounters between the police and the community. It happened in the 1960s in Watts, Detroit, Newark, and other cities; it happened again in Los Angeles in 1992, and more recently it occurred in Ferguson and New York. There is a troublingly common pattern to all of these crises and to the failures that sparked them, and a frustrating repetitiveness to the calls for police reform that followed in their wake. Plainly stated, we have known for at least fifty years what needs to be done in order to build greater trust between police and the communities they serve. Consider the following statements:

Improving police-community relations will require “modification of police procedures on the street, stronger internal discipline over officers, greatly enlarged and strengthened police-community relations units, improved procedures for handling citizen complaints, better screening to eliminate candidates for the police force who are biased, and many other measures. . . .”

Minority communities “are becoming increasingly sensitive to being frequently stopped and questioned or arrested for minor crimes.”

“In each phase of training additional emphasis is needed on the use of verbal skills rather than physical force to control potentially volatile situations and on the development of human relationship skills”

“The training program for FTOs (field training officers) should be modified to place greater emphasis on communication skills and the appropriate use of force.”

The first two quotes above come from the 1967 President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice Task Force Report on the Police. The second two quotes come from the 1991 Christopher Commission Report on the LAPD. Needless to say, all of these quotes could been have plucked from recent headlines about police-community relations in 2015.
The bottom line is that the description and diagnosis of strained police-community relations, mutual mistrust, and catastrophic failures in face-to-face encounters has remained largely constant since the 1960s. While violent crime rates have plummeted over the past generation, mistrust and friction between police and the public remain far too high, especially in minority and other marginalized communities. The time has long passed for police to translate the “peace dividend” of falling crime rates into better relations with the communities they serve, and to rethink best practices for serving communities where reductions in crime have proven more recalcitrant.

With this assessment in mind, what follows here is an ambitious call for a paradigm shift to a model of engagement-based policing, and a specific recommendation to lay the foundation of this model in core, organization-wide capacities to interact effectively with other people in situations where safety, trust, and peace are paramount considerations. Taking stock of recent tragic events that have led to both community member and officer deaths, and considering their relation to a common set of dynamics that have changed little over the past half-century, it is clear to us that the time has long passed for serious, deeper reform in how we prepare and lead our officers to positively engage the public they serve. However large or small the agency, strategic success and failure begin and end with individual, street-level interactions. As every executive leader who reads this report will all too painfully recognize, the dreaded 2:00 AM phone call is inevitably born of a failed or controversial individual encounter. To the extent that we can effectively prevent and better handle these encounters and their political aftermath, community trust will grow, to say nothing of both officer and public safety.

As the quotes above on police reform illustrate, there is no shortage of general recommendations on how to improve police-community relations. Yet, as evidenced by the recurring pattern of mistrust and the violence it can engender, it is starkly apparent that even the most well-researched and noble ideas amount to nothing more than catchy slogans if they do not meaningfully change officers’ street-level perceptions, decisions, and actions in the moments that matter most. Despite the unimpeachable value of much of the existing training on police-community relations, community-oriented policing, procedural justice, legitimacy, and so forth, none of it fills the critical need for basic skills in social interaction.

Officers are vaguely told that they must ask questions, listen actively, be fair and respectful, de-escalate crisis, ask questions, and so forth. But how can cops safely and effectively translate such directions into street-level performance? We know from research in other institutional settings such as medicine that generic advice fails to produce the desired results because it does not equip people with specific skills usable under dynamic, complex conditions (Stivers, 2007, Heritage et. al., 2007; Heritage et al., 2010). The psychological theory behind procedural justice is clear: police legitimacy hinges on the quality of treatment, the apparent fairness of decision-making, citizens’
opportunity to tell their side and be heard, and the perceived benevolence of officers’ actions. Yet even the best-intentioned officers who can recite these four principles from training are often still at a loss as to what they should actually do during their next contact. To put it another way, calls for procedural justice beg the question, “what procedures and how to perform them on a street corner in the middle of the night?”

Trust and legitimacy are ultimately built on social interactions. The social interactions that compose the street-level “stuff” of community engagement are face-to-face, highly dynamic (behavior changes over time of the encounter), complex (there are many components to be sensed and explained), unpredictable (there are many possible and even probable outcomes), and often risky (the stakes are high). In our view, the main purpose of policing is to engage with the public to “get things done” in often volatile settings where officers, victims, suspects, witnesses, and bystanders have vastly different understandings of what is occurring, divergent or conflicting goals, are already engaged in different courses of action (e.g. trying to get to work on time versus trying to conduct a safe traffic stop), and are mutually trying to influence one another. Officers need strong, effective, moment-by-moment skills to succeed in these tense and fraught social environments. On a larger scale, when officers have a high level of social competence, they can leverage every public interaction as an opportunity to engage with the community and create positive outcomes conducive to peace, order, and stability.

The DARPA SSIM Program

In a different but related context, the military has struggled in recent years with how to create order and peace in unstable social environments weakened by violence, conflict, and mistrust. In 2010, the Marine Corps Training and Education Command (TECOM) approached the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA, www.darpa.mil) for help rethinking how to train Marines to successfully manage high-risk, high consequence social interactions of the kind that were constantly occurring in Iraq and Afghanistan. As the premier research and development organization of the Department of Defense, DARPA is the “go-to” source for meeting the military’s most urgent and complicated technical needs. TECOM asked DARPA to create a program that would develop an integrated system of new methods and technologies for training social interaction skills. Unlike large-scale role player exercises, the training would have to be cost-effective, and would also have to enable the high repetitions and high throughput necessary for thousands of Marines to develop, practice, and improve skills proficiency. Equally important, the training would have to be delivered interactively, not just as passive lecture material. Finally, the training would have to be evidence-based and grounded in a rigorous scientific understanding of the dynamics of social interactions.
In seeking a program manager for this new effort, DARPA looked for a combination of scientific and operational background, and in 2010 hired one of the authors of this report, Dr. Brian Lande, a sociologist (University of California at Santa Cruz) and deputy sheriff with research expertise in the dynamics of face-to-face human interaction. In turn, Dr. Lande reached out to this report’s other author, Dr. Jonathan Wender, and asked him to join the DARPA program as its senior advisor. Dr. Wender is a twenty-year police veteran and criminologist at the University of Washington (Seattle) with expertise in social encounters and police-citizen interactions. In treating civilian policing as the starting point for developing the new program, DARPA recognized that the police already had a deep practical understanding of the essential role of face-to-face interactions in creating strategic success.

As a first step toward developing the new program, called Strategic Social Interaction Modules (SSIM) or “Good Stranger,” Lande and Wender searched across the entire United States and internationally to identify the state of the art in social interaction training both in and beyond policing. They met with police executives and trainers from across the country at the IACP conference in Orlando in 2010, and held a panel on the SSIM Program at the PERF conference in Seattle in early 2011. Lande and Wender found some promising work in areas ranging from procedural justice and crisis intervention training (CIT) to healthcare and psychotherapy. Still, to their dismay and the dismay of many of the police leaders with whom they met, it was starkly apparent that social interaction training for police officers had progressed very little since the late 1980s, even though training in many other areas – firearms, defensive tactics, investigations, forensics, and so on – had advanced by leaps and bounds. It quickly became clear that the SSIM program would have to begin from the ground up.

Armed with a budget of nearly $40 million and a 3½-year timeline, the SSIM program solicited, rigorously selected, and funded some of the nation’s best social scientists, police and military trainers, and technology developers to redefine the state of the art in social interaction training. SSIM researchers did much of their crucial groundwork under formal memoranda of agreement with Seattle PD, San Francisco PD, the Washington State Patrol, the King County (WA) Sheriff’s Office, and the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission. SSIM’s social science research team uncovered crucial insights into the nature of police-citizen and military-civilian interactions, and into how people make social decisions and judgments under tense, complex, dynamic conditions. This knowledge contributed to the development of new evidence-based training methods, and to the formulating of performance objectives and outcome measures that enable the data-driven evaluation of social success. SSIM also generated several technological innovations for cost-effective, web-based training systems that integrate artificial intelligence and social science. These new tools have been pilot-tested with the military, and are immediately usable by police agencies given sufficient funding.
As SSIM grew, it rapidly generated wider interest beyond the Marine Corps. With its far larger resources and expanding focus on the human dimension of military operations, the Army became SSIM’s leading armed services champion. Interest in SSIM also grew in the Department of Homeland Security, intelligence community, and among a wide range of federal law enforcement agencies. As of early March 2015, with SSIM funding almost totally expended, some of SSIM’s groundbreaking technological innovations in socially realistic simulation training are being considered for follow-on development by the Army Research Lab (ARL) and the Army’s Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC). Several SSIM-developed training methods are being used at the Army Maneuver Center of Excellence at Fort Benning and the USMC Center for Advanced Operational Culture Learning (CAOCL), and other elements of SSIM are being piloted at the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School (Army Special Operations Command).

**T3 – Tact, Tactics, and Trust™**

With SSIM effectively complete, the authors have integrated the most promising and immediately usable research findings, training methods, and technologies from the SSIM program, and have refined and expanded them specifically for civilian police use. The result is an integrated system called T3–Tact, Tactics, and Trust™, abbreviated “T3.” T3 takes the best of SSIM in order to address the urgent need for effective, evidence-based social interaction training for police officers. As illustrated in the diagram below in Figure 1, T3 comprises a spectrum of components which police agencies can use either separately or in any of wide range of combinations.

The heart of T3 training is a curriculum called “Tactical Human Dynamics™” (THD), which is delivered in a live, interactive setting using a range of hands-on techniques and exercises designed to teach social interaction in all of its dimensions: physical, mental, and emotional. Many of the skills taught in the hands-on version of THD can also be delivered virtually using a web-based scenario training tool called APACTS, which enables officers to practice critical skills at low cost to their agency. Developed as it was for the Army and Marine Corps, APACTS is specifically designed to enable agencies to deliver cost-effective, measurable, documented training to large, geographically dispersed work forces, such as a major-city police department with numerous precincts and sub-stations.

The T3 system also includes several other components, including an experiential leadership training program (ELT) built on the premise that key organizational values should be interwoven into every training context; evaluation/assessment programs that measure officer performance and community trust; custom reform and community engagement programs, and research support for next-generation technology such as smart body cams and smart CCTV.
The entire T3 system and all of its training, evaluation, and research and development components are built on four core premises:

1. Tact, tactics, and trust are the cornerstones of fair and effective policing.
2. Tact, tactics, and trust are inseparable on the street, so they must be trained as a unified whole.
3. For better or worse, every police-community interaction has strategic effects.
4. These effects can either be proactively influenced by skilled personnel or left to chance.

**Tactical Human Dynamics Training™**

Tactical human dynamics is the art of positively influencing the social environment in order to create desired near-term and long-term outcomes. THD starts from the principle that unlike the physical environment, which is effectively unchangeable, the social environment is inherently “plastic” and “malleable.” The social environment constantly changes in response to human influence, both positive and negative. THD provides officers with specific skills that empower them to have a far greater positive influence on the social environment than they ever thought possible. The THD curriculum is evidence-based, and draws on research results from the SSIM program along with other major scientific findings on the essential foundations of successful social interaction.
These foundations include a set of core perceptual, cognitive and behavioral skills, along with measurable performance outcomes that together make up a model for social competence in police officers. Some key elements of police officer social competence are as follows: situational awareness of critical social cues (goals, roles, identities, key relationships, social emotions, signs of trouble, etc.), gaining voluntary compliance, social influence, error-recovery, de-escalation, and self-control. These and other elements of social competence form the bedrock on which THD training is built.

THD training focuses on enhancing officers’ competence in four areas of performance known together as “PDAT skills:”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Domain</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Sample Training Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>detecting important cues, situational awareness, anomaly detection, etc.</td>
<td>APACTS, Video analysis, situational judgment tasks, role play scenarios, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>pattern recognition, accurate diagnosis, making appropriate judgments, determining appropriate courses of action</td>
<td>APACTS, situational judgment tasks, role play scenarios, interactive drills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>skillful execution of verbal and non-verbal tactics for influencing social situations, de-escalation techniques, voluntary compliance techniques</td>
<td>Interactive Drills, role play scenarios, mat room exercises (defensive tactics/de-escalation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>empathy, perspective-taking, effects awareness, influence skills</td>
<td>Breaching exercises, tactical games, live and video scenarios, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PDAT Skills and Instructional Methods**

In THD training, officers interactively learn how to apply PDAT skills at every stage of a seven-step Social Engagement Cycle. The seven steps of the cycle are: anticipate, assess, contact, engage, adapt, influence/create, and assess/exit. Every step of the way, THD teaches the specific practical skills that officers need to enact abstract, general concepts as procedural justice, fairness, community policing, and legitimacy.

THD training conditions and strengthens the core social skills essential for successful human interaction just as core training in the physical sense provides the functional
skills at the heart of athletic excellence. And just as physical excellence cannot be learned, practiced, and improved from reading books or listening passively to lectures, social interaction is no different. This is why THD relies on interactive, experiential training methods such as role play scenarios, interactive drills that break down tasks into specific, focused skill exercises, social breaching exercises, video situational judgment tasks, and hands-on de-escalation drills. By integrating tact, tactics, and trust in a single hands-on training program, THD directly and practically addresses the holistic outcomes that chiefs and community leaders alike need most in their officers.

**APACTS Technology to Improve Skills and Save Costs**

Even when classroom training provides initial effective delivery of knowledge and skills, longer-term training is necessary to ensure continuous retention, proficiency, and improvement. Ongoing, documented practice and performance evaluation are particularly important when the training in question is mission-critical. Needless to say, this reality is enormously challenging for large organizations such as the member agencies of MCCA, for whom direct training costs can be prohibitive.

How can large organizations deliver realistic, effective, high-repetition training to thousands of personnel? This is one of the key questions that the authors were tasked with addressing in DARPA SSIM. Role player training is realistic, but it is inefficient and very expensive. Simulators such as those used for firearms and driver training can be effective, but they are also very expensive to acquire and maintain. The best option is to use web-based training that does not require departments to buy costly technology and delivers low-fidelity but validated decision making simulations.

One of the most promising technologies to emerge from SSIM is the Adaptive Perceptual and Cognitive Training System (APACTS) that provides affordable and scalable approaches to improving social performance in law enforcement. APACTS already largely address the following draft recommendation from the 21st Century Policing Task Force:

> 5.8 The federal government should support research into the development of technology that enhances scenario based training, social interaction skills, and enables the dissemination of interactive distance learning.

APACTS is an interactive, web-based tool that trains critical law enforcement skills by using realistic scenarios, with the right amount of fidelity, that combine both social and tactical cues. APACTS integrates factors related to tact, tactics, and trust in a single training experience, just as they are integrated on the street. APACTS uses artificial intelligence and an automated pedagogy system. It runs on any computer, tablet, or mobile device that has a web browser. APACTS does not require additional hardware of any kind, nor does it require a live human trainer. APACTS improves perception and decision-making skills at the same time. APACTS integrates technology, social science,
and operational police expertise. Scenarios, learning objectives, and feedback are built on the same set of PDAT skills taught in the classroom version of Tactical Human Dynamics. Scenario content and learning objectives can be fully customized to meet user needs.

A New Paradigm: Engagement-Based Policing

The DARPA SSIM program was born out of a growing military interest in the critical role of trust and engagement. Consider the following: the US Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) report “Special Operations Forces 2020” is marked on every page and both covers with the phrase, “You Can’t Surge Trust.” If the cutting edge of the US military demands that “operations will move at the speed of trust,” what is our excuse in policing? As the preceding example illustrates, the public debate about the “militarization of policing” is marked by a great irony. While police leaders, elected officials, and communities argue the relative merits of transferring surplus military equipment to police departments, and consider the corrosive effects on public trust of a militarized “us-versus-them” attitude among some street cops, the military itself is deeply involved in an ambitious top-to-bottom process of developing highly refined policies, procedures, and technologies to address the social and political complexities of warfare. Indeed, on the matter of considering how to win hearts and minds and transform conflict into consensus and trust, the military is in many respects far ahead of civilian policing. The Army is creating an entire Engagement Warfighting Function intended to address the human aspect of military operations. In the Army’s own words, “[u]nderstanding the power residing in human interaction, social constructs, language, culture, behavior, and other human variables will provide the construct for future Army forces to influence the operational environment” (Army TRADOC Pamphlet 525-8-5, p. 17). If the military can change the way it thinks about engaging with American’s actual and potential adversaries on battlefields half a world away, what is our excuse for failing to consider how to improve the quality of our public interactions with the communities we are sworn to serve and protect?

Community-oriented policing as it existed in the 1990s was a major step in the right direction. Even so, its emphasis on relationships with “stable” elements of the community and abstract problem-solving model separated from basic human engagement is clearly insufficient to the current challenges of community trust and relationship building that we face today across the country. Traditional community policing programs often do not go far enough in engaging the most vulnerable and troubled segments of the population. Yet these are the people with whom the police most frequently interact, and whose relative trust or mistrust has a disproportionate strategic influence on the legitimacy of entire agencies, if not the entire policing profession. It is well and good to engage with “respectable” citizens in the conventional sense of the word; however, the real challenge in creating peace, stability, and trust in
our most challenged and troubled communities and neighborhoods is to engage networks of disaffected teens and young adults who are both the victims and perpetrators of a disproportionate amount of violent crime. The reality of policing is that we have not devoted enough time to building relationships with the people with whom we spend the most time: disenfranchised, marginalized communities where jobs, hope, and stability are in short supply and violence, guns, drugs, and despair are all too common.

The policing profession urgently needs to rethink its sense of mission so that it better aligns with the complex values and interests of a diverse, democratic society. Particularly at a time when critics from the left and right alike are questioning the overwhelmingly punitive orientation of criminal justice policy since the 1980s, policing must position itself as the unshakably trustworthy source of community peace and security. Peace and security are public goods, and are the most basic requirement of public life without which nothing else is possible -- commerce, education, family life, culture, and so forth. As criminologists such as Ian Loader and Neil Walker (2001) have been arguing for years, the police ultimately deliver a public good that no other private or public entity can deliver. Sadly, just as other public goods such as healthcare and education are maldistributed, so are safety and security. Just as the healthiest people often have the best medical insurance, it is often the safest communities that enjoy the best-staff, best-equipped police departments. As part of its move to strengthening the political legitimacy of the policing in a diverse, democratic society, the member agencies of MCCA must move to highlight their role in bringing the most basic right to peace and security where it is needed most.

**Engagement-Based Policing: Key Recommendations for MCCA**

If any meaningful degree of reform is going to take root and be effective, it will need to have the support of mistrustful communities and skeptical cops alike, both of whom have long grown weary of "old wine in new bottles." Recent events and the political realities created by modern technology have raised the bar for police reform, accountability, and transparency. It will not suffice to implement half-hearted measures that are long on style and short on substance.

Under an engagement-based paradigm, law enforcement is a means to an end, not an end in itself. Law enforcement is a precision tool that police officers should use with care, caution, and compassion, not the primary method of choice. This is particularly imperative in resolving non-violent, chronic quality of life issues where custodial arrests are expensive, ineffective, and corrode community trust. As a starting point and to foster serious dialogue, we offer the following recommendations as a basis for crafting an engagement-based policing paradigm:
1.) Tact, tactics, and trust must be trained in an integrated fashion. Defensive tactics or firearms training should not be trained separately from the very social interaction skills that shape the likelihood that force may need to be used.

2.) Develop expertise in social performance at all levels of the organization and in all aspects of operations. Social skills are like driving skills. Too much training is focused on learning policy and law or trying to change attitudes. Such approaches forget that there is a wide range of performance within an organization and that performance for an individual can vary across time (e.g. due to fatigue). Emphasizing expertise forces the agency to treat attaining legitimacy, building trust, gaining compliance, de-escalation, as outcomes that are more or less successfully achieved.

3.) Implement decision training for social skills. Decision training emphasizes training exercises that require trainees to practice making judgments in simulated tasks. Decision training requires not only teaching the desired behaviors, but the cognitive abilities that influence decisions about how and when to execute a skillful behavior. The emphasis is less on learning abstract principles than on practicing judgments—recognizing when and how to implement policies and procedures. This means understanding the decision requirements for a number of routine types of social encounters that police may have, whether traffic stops, mental health contacts, etc. (Klein 2004; Wiggins 2006) and specifying what cognitive abilities and competencies are critical to expert performance.

4.) Focusing on legitimacy is too vague. Procedural justice delineates important areas of improvement for law enforcement. But it misses the larger problem: law enforcement needs to approach training in social skills as a general competency. Learning how to regulate the emotions of others (e.g. as de-escalation requires), size up social encounters, and so forth are general competencies that affect police performance well beyond whether or not they impact the legitimacy of the police. As such, social skills must be taught as a core set of proficiencies just like physical training. Social skill should not be taught as a “topic,” but rather as the foundation of all other policing skills.

5.) Use scenario technology to multiply effects of classroom training.

6.) Train for desired outcomes, not to protect from liability.

7.) Consider the following as a template for how you train your officers and supervisors: “We must place students into situations of uncertainty and complexity where creativity, adaptability, critical thinking and independent, rapid decision-making are essential elements. The moral courage or nerve to make
decisions in these types of situations is to be actively rewarded” (Army Mission Command White Paper, 2012:6).

8.) Identify the core, non-negotiable traits and skills that you demand of your officers and consistently foster them in all training, regardless of the particular topic.

9.) Hold supervisors and trainers accountable for modeling and exemplifying your agency’s non-negotiable traits and skills. Implicit leadership transmits influence: show your personnel what you want, don’t tell. Experience beats explanation!
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Community Engagement:
Is Our Department Impeding or Promoting It?

Director Dwight Bower
Fairfax County Police Department

Note: This is an example of FCPD proactively reaching out to their community and throughout their organization, in order to expand community engagement. We admire their efforts to prepare and build community engagement before any regional critical incident with the additional national implications of overwhelming rioting. However, there are no guarantees on any of theirs or your apparent local incidents not becoming a crisis overnight.

Appendix I of this project report is the March, 2015 document titled Factors Affecting Commitment to Community Policing: A Study of Sergeants and Patrol Officers at the Fairfax County Police Department. A Fulbright Postdoctoral Scholar, Hina Jawaid Kalyal, completed this study under the academic supervision of George Mason University Professor Stephen D. Mastrofski. Fairfax County Police Department benefits in numerous ways from an established partnership with George Mason University’s Center for Justice Leadership & Management. The public partnership initiating Dr. Kalyal’s study ensures survey data collection from police supervisors and officers, as well as from community leaders and residents in other ongoing studies, enjoys the level of perceived objectivity essential for law enforcement management and political leadership to obtain valid and actionable information from survey methodology.

Dr. Kalyal’s research is an attempt to highlight the factors that are expected to impede or promote commitment among police supervisors and officers to a community policing strategy. Building capacity for the implementation of more effective community oriented policing programs is essential to engaging communities and building trust between law enforcement officers and residents. A paper and pencil survey was conducted in the Fairfax County Police Department from June – August 2013; the internal population of interest included the sergeants and officers of the 48 patrol squads serving at the eight district stations. The total number of usable survey responses was 476. From the perspective of performance metrics, it is important to emphasize that the focus of the research is on the affective commitment of police supervisors and officers to the department’s community oriented policing strategy. Dr. Kalyal grouped the study variables into three categories: organizational job resources (i.e., organizational support, job autonomy, and field training), personal job resources (i.e., community oriented policing related self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, and internal locus of control), and job demands (i.e., role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload). All variables are fully defined in Appendix I.

The quotation inserted below is quite revealing and demonstrates the operational relevance of the research methodology.

During informal conversations with the officers we discovered that some officers believed the department did not have a COP program in place and others were not satisfied with the way the program was run. The officers
had reservations about the work environment rather than the idea of community policing. There was some uncertainty regarding the definition of community policing and while some believed the program had been shelved years ago, others felt that their entire job revolved around the philosophy.

All three job demand variables (role overload, role ambiguity, and role conflict) showed a negative relationship with affective commitment to community oriented policing in the Fairfax County Police Department survey data analyses. Dr. Kalyal writes: “Excessive job demands lead to a feeling of helplessness and loss of control over work situations leading to lack of support for any new strategy. Stressed employees fail to see the benefit of new programs to the organization and to them.”

Dr. Kalyal’s study lists six implications from her research. Of these, three have clear relevance to our examination of community engagement.

• First, there is a need to formally communicate the department’s support for community policing and the benefits of partnering with the public. Regular meetings, workshops and organization-wide training sessions on problem solving, empowerment and the benefits of community oriented policing can help reestablish command support for the philosophy.

• Second, the training for community policing officers should include content on developing psychological resilience and the ability to cope with change related stress. Related to this is the hiring of individuals with higher levels of self-confidence who should demonstrate resilience and hardiness during change.

• Third, efforts must be made to reduce job demands and the provision of adequate resources must be ensured to maintain a balance at work.
Community Engagement

Lieutenant D. F. Pace
Philadelphia Police Department

Note: This section is a more reflective look at some of the academic and educational views on the leadership needed to guide an organization through the culture change of community engagement.

Why It Is Needed

Policing cannot be understood if examined alone, as though the institution was an island in a lake. The more persuasive analogy is that policing is a sandbar in a river, subject to being continuously shaped and reshaped by the powerful social currents in which it is immersed. As a profoundly significant social institution, policing is shaped and reformed repeatedly by a multitude of forces in American society. (Swanson, 2012) Reciprocally, police influence society. Shaping society too are historical events, both great and small, at all levels. Engagement serves as a vital bridge between the police and the communities it serves particularly when controversial or high profile events occur.

At times an incident of international implications, such as the events of September 11, 2001, imposes a shift on the role of policing that is demanded and welcomed by society in general. At others, a singular incident involving an interaction between police and the community can be perceived in such a way as to become a touchstone for grievance and scrutiny of the way police do business.

Police cannot take for granted or assume that their role in society will always be viewed with gratitude and admiration. Indeed, the very communities where effective police services are most urgently needed are the same ones where there are all too many powerful reasons for people to mistrust the officers sworn to protect them. Whether the basis for this reasoning is correct does not change the immutable fact that the attitudes persons may have toward the police are fluid, and much like the river that shapes the sandbar, police must be malleable enough to weather and adapt to the currents of change in societal thinking. However, the police themselves are not without a voice to effect change and it is for this reason that we consider how police at all levels can ensure the most favorable climate for effective policing of the community it serves. As a hard, immovable riverbank of stone causes oncoming waters of a river to overflow its reservoir, so too the institution of policing, if rigidly resistant to changes in the society it serves, will realize a cascade of discontentment and mistrust overflowing it.

In short, the community needs well-trained, well-supervised, well-disciplined morally unimpeachable police, and the police need a community that is willing to support and collaborate with them in accomplishing their mission to society. In order to accomplish this, community engagement is key.

How It Is Implemented

Fulfilling the role of a police officer involves leadership. Even non-ranking officers are expected to assume the role of a leader when intervening or assisting and protecting those who summon them for aid.
A key component of effective leadership calls upon the leader to apply the law of sacrifice. (Maxwell J., 2007) There is a common misperception among people who aren’t leaders that leadership is all about the position as well as the perks and power that come with it. (Maxwell J., 2007) In turn, some in positions of authority mistakenly believe that authority permits them to bully. The very opposite is true. The heart of leadership is putting others ahead of yourself. (Maxwell J., 2007) Some officers may harbor a perception that “the bad guys have all the rights, cops have none.” There is a measure of truth to this statement. In some sense, an officer, by virtue of his leadership position and authority in the community gives up certain rights. When people have no responsibilities, they can do pretty much anything they want. Once people take on responsibility, they start to experience limitations in what they can do. There is a cost associated with being granted authority. Persons in positions of authority must be willing to give up more than the people who they have authority over. (Maxwell J., 2007)

In a police–community relationship, this equation is manifested in recognition that authority equals responsibility and accountability. Police cannot, in the discharge of their duties, permit their services and interaction with the public to be tainted by bullying or abuse. It is incumbent upon the police officer to take the initiative to employ de-escalation techniques when a verbal confrontation occurs. A good way to de-escalate an inflamed situation is through an appeal to the other person’s self interest. This requires strong empathic skills.

**Understanding Self-Interest In Community Engagement**

Humans are intrinsically motivated by self-interest. This is neither good nor bad. All rational, and even many irrational humans are motivated to act in a way that returns some benefit or reward. It can be argued that even those who are best known for their selfless humanitarian service, like Gandhi or Mother Theresa: persons whose lives were marked by giving and self sacrifice, were motivated by self interest in the sense that their decisions to do good and help others fulfilled a desire to achieve the goal of service above self, leading to contentment and satisfaction in their own lives. In other words, adding value to others added value to their own existence.

How does this apply to the police-community relationship? Members of the community, law abiding or not, are no less motivated by self-interest. An approach of “Do as I say because I am the police” is, in a free society, unpersuasive and lacks any modicum of value to the subject of such an order if unaccompanied by some benefit, particularly in an environment where avenues for redress of grievances and advocates for those who feel unjustly treated abound. An effective police-community encounter takes into account the self-worth of the individual and appeals to the person to consider how the interaction with police benefits them. This benefit might be immediate or delayed, direct or remote. In any case, a member of the public is more likely to engage positively with an officer when that officer recognizes and validates a person’s sense of worth and self-respect. Decades of research and practice support the premise that people are more likely to obey the law when they believe that those who are enforcing it have the legitimate authority to tell them what to do. But the public confers legitimacy only on
those who they believe are acting in procedurally just ways. (The President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015, p. 7)

Philadelphia Police Commissioner Charles Ramsey, past president of the MCCA, spoke of a police officer and mentor he knew early in his career with the Chicago Police Department. The mentor had an extraordinary ability to defuse nearly any tense situation and resolve almost any conflict peacefully. When the young Officer Ramsey asked him how he was able to do this so effectively, his mentor explained it this way: “Each of us, in a perfect world, are born a ten,” the mentor explained illustratively. However, upon birth and because of the challenges that face even the youngest of us, three can be deducted from that number “off the bat”. If by chance one is born into poverty, deduct another three. Should one also be born a minority, deduct yet another three. This leaves some with only a “one” remaining from the original ten assigned. That “one” represents a person’s own human dignity and sense of personal worth, however modest. And should a figure cloaked with authority, such as a police officer, through a less than dignified approach or abusive manner, threaten that remaining sense of self esteem, it should be no surprise that the subject of such an encounter will fight with all the spirit they can muster, right or wrong, in an attempt to preserve and protect that “one”. (Ramsey, 2013) Plainly stated, never humiliate another person.

It behooves police officers, who spend a lion’s share of their time dealing with those who are, or those who feel less privileged, to be mindful of the protective posture one will assume when an interaction feels less like help or a respectful appeal, and more like an attack on personal dignity. Law enforcement cannot build trust if it is seen as an occupying force coming in from the outside to rule and control the community. (The President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015, p. 9) Micro-level tactical interactions have macro-level strategic consequences.

Community Engagement Through Adding Value

Adding value is really the essence of enlarging others. It’s finding ways to help others improve their abilities and, more importantly, their attitudes. (Maxwell J. C., The Complete 101 Collection: What Every Leader Needs to Know., 2012) If community engagement is the goal, finding ways to add value should be among the primary objectives of each police-citizen encounter. At times that value is added to the individual with whom the interaction occurs. At others, it is to people who are affected by the actions of the person with whom police are dealing. When the community senses an addition of value stemming from the police action, their willingness to assist, support, and cooperate with police increases. This can be understood best through a simple cost-benefit analysis. The benefit derived from cooperating with the police must be greater than the perceived “cost” of it.

Communities want their police departments to deliver value. A department’s value is only as good as the collective contribution of the officers who staff it. Police have the unique capacity to add value in the form of safety, security, order, and peace. In his book, The True Writer’s Life, author William Lee Ballard outlines three crucial guidelines for adding value that can apply to community engagement:

1. You add value to others when you truly value others.
2. You add value to others when you make yourself more valuable to others.
3. You add value to others when you know and relate to what others value. (Ballard, 2014)

It might be difficult to make a connection between the work of police officers as both crime fighters and life-coaches. In reality, officers as a whole spend a relatively small amount of time actually fighting crime and a greater portion simply interacting with the community as verbal communicators and providing other services. (Swanson, 2012) When those verbal communications are viewed by recipients as valuable, it will attract persons to the officers, not repel them. In many inner city minority communities, it is fashionable to manifest a disdain for the police and to boast about being obstructionists toward them. This is fatal to community engagement in the same way as verbal abuse from the police. Police are often discouraged by the lack of involvement by the community in working toward solutions to problems that plague inner city neighborhoods. Members of the public are equally put off by a perception, real or imagined, that police are simply unresponsive or dismissive of their needs. Solutions must be the product of a combined effort between the police and the community, as well as other constituents. However, as previously stated, the community wants leaders. The community needs leaders. It is in the community’s self interest to have leaders and someone will fill that leadership void. In inner city communities these voids are filled all too often by poor role models who are likely to take rather than give. Often, police do not see themselves as ideal candidates to fulfill these rolls or may feel it isn’t their job to do so. But what if the community saw their police as leaders more than they saw them as enforcers? Could community engagement be more attainable? Leaders propose realistic solutions which communities find valuable and can visualize succeeding. The most effective means to this end is to appeal to community members’ sense of self-worth, self-interest and demonstrate a cost-benefit analysis favoring engagement.

In accomplishing the goal of giving citizens an opportunity to be heard (The President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015, p. 7) police must assign legitimacy to the concerns of those they serve. In turn, police will be more motivated to assign that legitimacy when the community returns the sentiment in kind.

Motivating Officers To Engage

“People will work harder for praise than they will for a raise,” says professional speaker Rita Davenport. (Davenport, 2015) What moves officers to action can be placed into two categories: intrinsic and extrinsic motivators. (Mutizwa, 2014) Extrinsic rewards remain significant for workers, of course. Pay is an example of an extrinsic reward. It motivates from the outside. Pay is an important consideration for most workers in accepting a job, and unfair pay can be a strong de-motivator. However, after people have taken a job and issues of unfairness have been settled, extrinsic rewards diminish in importance in most instances. Intrinsic rewards then take on greater importance and tend to drive day-to-day motivation. One way that intrinsic rewards can assume a greater role in promoting a strong work ethic is through the establishment of a national community engagement award measured by quantifiable metrics upon which to evaluate agencies and officers. A recognition program at the national level that includes a high level of legitimacy and prestige may motivate agencies and their officers to
pursue community engagement with a view toward personal fulfillment coupled with bragging rights. This is not unlike national recognition for any other professional endeavor. Giving the community a voice in who receives such an award further attaches legitimacy to such an initiative.

Practical community engagement is an active method of implementing change. Community engagement involves actively implementing a specific process towards activism such as the 8-step guideline listed below developed by Hildy Gottlieb, founder of the organization, Create The Future. The emphasis in community engagement must be that of honest relationship building for the sake of community in contradistinction to external motivators, such as pay. The steps are:

1. Determine the goals of the plan.
2. Plan out whom to engage.
3. Develop engagement strategies for those individuals you already know.
4. Develop engagement strategies of those individuals you do not already know.
5. Prioritize those activities.
6. Create an implementation plan.
7. Monitor your progress.
8. Maintain those relationships. (Gottlieb, Creating the Future, 2015)

Community Engagement is the process of building relationships with community members who will work side-by-side with you as an ongoing partner, to make the community a better place to live. Considered from the perspective of a two-way relationship, Community Engagement is the organizational equivalent of friendship. (Gottlieb, Community Engagement Planning in Three Steps, 2015)

A closer examination of each step in the context of police-community engagement follows.

**Determine The Goals Of The Plan**

Determining the goal of a plan of community engagement begins with defining what community engagement is in the context of the agency / community relationship. Additionally, questions must be answered. Which needs are most pressing? Which gaps must be bridged? While no two police agencies are identical, overall issues and challenges facing them may be similar. Likewise, while communities differ demographically and geographically, there may be common needs. What preemptive measures can an agency take to cool tensions before they become costly crises?

**Plan Out Who To Engage**

If community engagement can be likened to a friendship, then those engaged in such a relationship must have common goals. If the goal of a police agency is to forge a bond with the community that will lead to more productive collaboration, then the other half of
that relationship must be willing to collaborate as well. Engagement is productive, not destructive. A one-sided effort to community engagement is akin to a rowboat with a column of oarsmen on both sides with rowers on only one side of the boat rowing. The boat will simply go around in circles, stagnate, and never advancing.

**Develop Engagement Strategies For Those Individuals You Already Know**

Police have enjoyed longstanding support of many constituents in their communities. From civic associations to faith-based groups, from business organizations to philanthropists, each can make a major contribution toward the betterment of the community. Building trust through these associations can stave off the level of disenfranchisement that leads to riotous behavior that usually follows an action that is perceived as inequitable police treatment. Identify the people that live or work in the area that will be most impacted by a strong relationship with their local police department or key people or groups (e.g., for-profit or non-profit organizations or voluntary groups) that are influential to achieving the goal of community engagement. (MAPC, 2013)

**Develop Engagement Strategies Of Those Individuals You Do Not Already Know**

While working on a program that developed medical evaluation questions, The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation identified five key steps in uncovering potential partners who would help the company succeed in its mission of understanding what might be important to its stakeholders. (Preskill & Jones, 2009) Without taking a great leap, these five steps, slightly modified, can assist police agencies in identifying stakeholders in the community engagement process who might not otherwise be a part:

Step 1: *Prepare for stakeholder engagement*: In the context of police-community relations. This step includes collecting information and learning about who makes up the community - its history, why or how they came into being, and what does success look like if there was indeed a partnership between the constituent group and the police.

Step 2: *Identify potential stakeholders*: This step involves identifying all of the potential stakeholders whom you might engage. It includes understanding the demographics of the community as well as their values. What is important to them and what, if anything, the police can do to help achieve what is valued.

Step 3: *Prioritize the list of stakeholders*: This step helps determine which stakeholders are most vital to the community engagement process.

Step 4: *Consider potential stakeholders’ motivations for participating*: This step has you consider stakeholders’ motivations for participating in community engagement. Knowing this will help you select an engagement strategy.

Step 5: *Select a stakeholder engagement strategy*: Based on stakeholders’ motivations, your reasons for including them and various other considerations. This step helps you choose one or more engagement strategies to facilitate the identification and development of the police-community relationship.
Prioritize Those Activities

Spend the most time cultivating relationships with the most influential groups that will serve as the pillars of the community engagement relationship and will be most instrumental in quelling a crisis should one arise.

Create An Implementation Plan

An implementation plan is a management tool designed to illustrate, in detail, the critical steps in developing and starting an engagement initiative. It is a guide or map that helps each member of the agency be proactive rather than reactive in developing a program and identifying any challenges along the way. It allows any person working on the program, regardless of his or her level of involvement, to fully understand the goal of the program and how it is to be accomplished. It ensures that everyone working on the project is on the same page and any discrepancies are resolved before they become costly to the population served. (Department of Health and Human Services, 2015) In terms of community engagement, success is not possible unless management and line staff work together, share the same vision, and feel a sense of ownership in the engagement initiative as they work toward realizing a return on their efforts.

Monitor Your Progress

Relentless follow-up and measurement of the success of the community engagement relationship is essential. One cannot know whether a community engagement initiative is working unless it is measured and monitored.

Maintain Those Relationships

As community perceptions change and positive achievements fade into the past, it is important that police make an effort to sustain any good work accomplished by maintaining relationships with community stakeholders. Regular involvement in the decision-making impacting the community allows stakeholders to feel like they are a part of the process. Through such regular involvement, community stakeholders derive the energy to stay engaged and connected to the overall mission of effective police-community engagement.
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Hiring for More Successful and Diverse Community Engagement

Captain Dave Anderson
Montgomery County Police Department

Note: Since 1993, the MCCA HRC has done no less than 6 studies that included hiring the right people. However, in none of our studies do we want to give that subject matter short shrift. MCPD agrees that our greatest resource is our people.

The successful development of any law enforcement agency program on community engagement begins with hiring the right people. It is not uncommon for a personnel director to be given exclusive direction to hire “diversity.” But will that alone promote success for an agency to engage with their community? We believe there is value in a diverse workforce, but that focus must be achieved through legal methods of hiring. While we believe that our police departments should mirror those communities served, employers are not permitted by law to discriminate in their hiring process to have a better appearance. Rather, law enforcement agencies need to understand what they want in a candidate, like being able to engage with people, and where to recruit people possessing those attributes. The Major Cities Chiefs Association Human Resources Committee (MCCA HRC) has addressed hiring in a number of other studies including last year’s titled, Serve Better by Reflecting the Community: Recruiting, Hiring, and Developing Targeted Demographics. Policy and procedures, as well as strategies are presented in these previous studies if further research on the topic of recruiting and hiring is desired.

The purpose of this section is to give a short summary that reminds us that recruiting is an eyes wide-open job. We should know where we are going and why we are going there. Experience has demonstrated that diversity, in hiring, is a challenge. Some would say it is the most difficult “non-operational” issue facing law enforcement agencies. While diverse recruiting and hiring present some challenges, we suggest that it is helpful to look at some separate issues in the process. An agency may have a tremendously successful recruiting effort that generates a diverse pool of applicants. Many times, however, as the process continues the pool becomes less diverse. We suggest that some agencies need to analyze where they are losing their diversity in their process and then scrutinize that part of the process. One way to inspect the process is to always ask the question, “Is this a relevant and necessary part of what we need for the initial hiring phase?” because in the long run it is good to remember that training continues the hiring process.

Most senior law enforcement personnel understand that the ability to communicate with people will likely be the one thing defining their success in this line of work, especially in community engagement. So do we test for those qualities in our initial hiring process? The answer is different for each agency, but most personnel directors have limited ability to test the communication skills of candidates. At best, there might be a panel interview with scenarios that do not include role players. There is a strong argument to collect some other more detailed analysis of a candidate’s ability to communicate and then relate those results to the training that will be provided during the “entry-level” period.
So, if we can determine the “who, what, when, and where” of recruiting why do we have problems in hiring a diverse workforce and/or good communicators? Simply put, we operate as though we believe that the same strategies that worked 30 years ago will work today. If we believe that cops must be good communicators then we must ensure that those attributes exist in the population we recruit. If we further believe that a diverse workforce will lend credibility to our law enforcement efforts in community engagement, then we suggest there is a need to be recruiting in areas that are both non-traditional and have those demographics and communication capabilities in mind. Some argue that our focus tends to be on skill sets in criminology, legal studies, homeland security, etc. A strategy that is innovative may include looking towards other professions such as social work and sales to find those candidates with communication skills.

The bottom line is that we have to be intentional in hiring the people needed to be able to interact, communicate, and establish a trust relationship with the community served. In short, we need to recruit, hire, train, supervise, develop, and promote our officers to be community engagers.
Building an Organizational Structure of Community Engagement
At the Toronto Police Service

Tony Veneziano, Chief Administrative Officer
Toronto Police Service

Note: TPS gives us Community Engagement the Canadian way, defining it and telling why it is important for our Northern partners. This section includes some of their initiatives, a look at their method of changing culture while monitoring its effectiveness, and anticipating barriers.

Givens:

• We (police officers) serve communities which are comprised of different races, social status, cultures, religious faiths, ethnic groups, genders, including people with mental health and other issues

• We are given the discretion and authority to make decisions in simple, complex and high stress situations, that will impact public safety, as well as the trust and confidence the public, has in the police … those decisions can take away the freedom of an individual (through incarceration) and can involve use of force up to and including deadly force, where absolutely necessary

• Because of the discretion and authority we are given, we must also be held accountable for the decisions we make, which could include criminal charges where the use of force is not deemed necessary or justified

• We cannot provide cost-effective and value-added public safety services without working with different stakeholders in our various communities …. We need the community as much as they need us

• We provide a “service” which implies and requires building strong relationships with the people we provide the public safety services to, regardless of colour, race, religion, sexual preference, social status, etc. ….. they all pay us to keep them safe!

What is Community Engagement?

From the Toronto Police Service (TPS) Police and Community Engagement Review (PACER) report:

• At its lowest level, it refers to in-person communications/interactions between a police officer and a member of the public

• Encompasses both community inquiries wherein a police officer makes an inquiry for the purpose of preserving the peace and or preventing crimes or other offences; and informal interactions …. a simple “meet and greet” between an officer and a community member(s)

• A professional, bias-free interaction with the community and other key stakeholders to assist in the achievement of enhanced and sustained public safety, both in the long and short term
Why is Community Engagement Important? .... What are the Benefits?

- Helps create a feeling of partnership with the community as opposed to an “us versus them” mentality, and enhances police legitimacy and credibility
- Promotes trust and confidence in our abilities to keep the community safe
- Recognizes that we cannot effectively serve the public and keep them safe without the assistance of the community
- Breaks down barriers between the police and members/factions of the community
- Allows us to leverage the knowledge and experience of community members to make better use of and get greater value from our public safety human assets (our officers and civilians) ..... we don’t have to do it alone ..... It becomes a shared responsibility
- Our “business” is “public” safety .... So community engagement promotes the need to develop and maintain relationships with different stakeholders in the community, from community leaders, to the guy on the street at 2 a.m., to the local store owner, to local politicians, to the parents whose son is getting involved in drugs and gangs .... This need to develop relationships extends from the Chief of Police right down to front line officers on patrol or investigating a crime
- To serve effectively, there is a need to understand, empathize and adjust to the needs of the community, including differences in cultures and beliefs
- Community engagement improves our image with the public in terms of how they view us ... trust us
- It allows us to increase education, awareness and understanding of what we do and how we do it ..... So that when a critical incident occurs, people will have a better understanding of why we conducted ourselves the way we did
- Young people are changing how they view and respect authority, so we have to adjust how we deal with and relate to the young people in the community and develop relationships with them as well
- Makes the “job” of policing more interesting and satisfying for our officers .... Less robotic and more personable ... you talk to people, you joke around with them, you show your human side, you show you care about them and their safety, you show them your understand some of the challenges they have to deal with, whether its poverty, high crime in their neighbourhood, “persons in crisis” (e.g., mental health issues)
- Makes our officers feel and be what they really are and what we want them to be “public safety professionals”
- This enables us to attract a wider range and better quality candidates to policing by demonstrating that policing enables a “career” in public safety, and that we value and need the interpersonal, communication and relationship building skills that are critical to effective public safety service delivery
• Allows us to justifiably share accountability for social, crime and other problems impacting public safety so that root-based, sustainable solutions can be implemented

• Improves overall service delivery and allows officers to leverage knowledge and experiences of the respective community and or the community as a whole

• Enables police agencies to better balance the protection of the public with the need to protect and promote human rights

• Enables and promotes qualitative intelligence led/based public safety strategies and activities and measurement of same, through the information gathered from engaging with members of the community or particular area/group

• Promotes understanding of different cultures, races, genders, faiths, that will help achieve bias-free interactions and activities

How do we infuse effective community engagement into police organizations?

• Change/update the image of a police officer to better reflect the type of person we need and what we need them to do

• Develop a profile for the “ideal” police officer …. Qualifications, experience, expertise, “soft” skills, expectations

• Teach/promote professional, unbiased, empathetic customer service approach and why it’s a must in policing and to achieving public safety objectives

• Build ability to perform quality community engagement activities into police officers profile/job descriptions as “must haves” and “be able to demonstrate”, and build these expectations into screening process for new recruits

• Make community engagement and the skill sets required to carry it out effectively, a mandatory and regular part of the training curriculum at both the local and corporate levels

• Select field training/coach officers who exemplify community engagement and its importance so that new recruits see the value and actual “walk of the talk”

• Promote/demand “quality” diversity and inclusiveness in the recruitment and promotional processes

• Make effective/quality community engagement objectives part of the performance evaluation/development process and a key factor in assignments and promotions

• Ensure hiring competencies reflect and enable community engagement approach

• Continually reinforce that we are a “service” in the business of providing public safety with the help of our customers – the public

• Constantly reinforce the importance of community engagement and professional, respectful interactions with members of the public, at pre-shift parades

• Acknowledge and communicate real life examples of community engagement and how it benefited the community and the police agency
• Encourage the media to help promote/market community engagement approach with real life examples ….. market ourselves as a public safety “service” provider who understands and cares for our customers, and who needs them in order to be effective

• Use social media strategically to get info out to and from the different members of the community to enhance public safety and help solve crimes and deal with other issues and victimization

**Barriers to Achieving Effective Community Engagement:**

• Lack of buy-in from the executive management team and supervisors (Sergeants, Staff Sergeants)

• Inability to clearly demonstrate to officers, the value (outcomes) and benefits of community engagement to the organization and the public

• We make it a one-time initiative …. Lack of regular and on-going promotion and reinforcement of community engagement and its value to achieving public safety objectives

• Not involving the community in developing new community engagement activities, initiatives, events or processes/procedures to get their input and buy in before we implement

• CULTURE …. Unwillingness to change- the we’re the only ones that can keep the community safe, we don’t need anyone else’s help, mindset

**Some TPS Community Engagement Initiatives:**

• Neighborhood Officer Program – a 2 year commitment where police officers are assigned to a defined city neighborhood and provided with social media training and tools with the objective of engaging with community members to support short and long term problem solving

• Auxiliary officers – last year our Auxiliary officers engaged in numerous events including parades and special events all with the objective of engaging with community members.

• Community and Police Liaison Committees (CPLCs), - all 17 police divisions and Traffic Services have at least one CPLC (some have more than one) that meet and then face the greater community as representatives of the police to engage other community members.

• CCCs – the Chief’s Consultative Committees –represent different communities within the City of Toronto and provide a high level contact with the Service as a liaison to their respective communities.

• Youth in Policing Initiative Program – hiring high school students from distinct at-risk neighborhoods in the City, for summer employment - designed to engage youth and their respective communities and make them ambassadors with their friends, schoolmates, families
• SRO (School Resource Officer) Program – School Resource Officers are placed in schools within the City, to engage the youth community, through the schools, and to help build relationships with the Toronto Police Service.

• CSLO – Community School Liaison Officer – works with the junior schools to engage this age group about public safety.

Other TPS References:

• Police And Community Engagement Report (PACER) – see report at http://www.torontopolice.on.ca/pacer/

• Toronto Police Services Community Engagement Policy
  o Procedures to operationalize this policy are in the process of being finalized
Community Engagement
The LVMPD Experience
Deputy Chief Al Salinas
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

Note: Below is an extensive cataloguing of many of the LVMPD programs that are related to community engagement, and are conducted by them. LVMPD is a large organization staffing many initiatives. We provide this section because it may be used to craft some community engagement efforts in your department. The programs included may provide ideas for training and oversight for your organization.

Introduction

Recent controversial deadly force events by police across the nation have highlighted the vulnerabilities to peace and safety of communities and the devastating repercussions that are often the result of such events. These events are exacerbated when they involve citizens from the minority community, and can quickly develop into a firestorm of civil unrest. According to an article in Time.com, “A grand jury decision not to indict police officer Darren Wilson for the shooting of unarmed black teen Michael Brown has stoked anger in Ferguson, Mo. where peaceful protests have given way to looting and violence, virtually shutting down the city.” The impact to the community can have lasting effects far beyond the violence and the destruction to property. According to research conducted by Victor Matheson of College of the Holy Cross and Robert Baade of Lake Forest College,

In the ten years after the 1992 Los Angeles riots, for example, the city lost nearly $4 billion in taxable sales. Social unrest can have a lasting negative impact on a local economy in a way that’s much more persistent than even a natural disaster; though Hurricane Andrew caused more damage upfront, businesses were able to bounce back as soon as cleanup began. We didn’t see that in Los Angeles. (Matheson)

It also highlights the importance of a robust community engagement strategy and the need for a durable relationship between the police and the communities they serve. According to the Time article, “Various experts and commentators have suggested policy changes that could help rebuild trust in the police department…” (Time)

To this end, Tom Tyler, Law Professor at Yale University, outlined four principals supporting procedurally just behavior in community engagement. They are:

1) Treating people with dignity and respect
2) Giving individuals ‘voice’ during encounters
3) Being neutral and transparent in decision making
4) Conveying trustworthy motives (Tyler)

The following internal and external department programs of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department illustrate each of these principals in engaging its constituents.
Internal and External Department Programs

Community Engagement for any Law Enforcement agency should be a major focus and a priority. Building resilient relationships with their respective communities can result in great dividends when a controversial police use-of-force incident occurs. Police agencies should focus on community engagement from two perspectives, internal and external as they relate to planning, operations and resource allocation and distribution. With regard to the internal perspective, department strategic plans, training, department policies, community committees and department protocols should focus on how best to engage the communities they serve.

The Interim Report of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing lists a number of recommendations to better improve the relationship between a community and its police department. According to the report, recommendation 2.1 states, “Law Enforcement agencies should collaborate with community members to develop policies and strategies in communities and neighborhoods disproportionately affected by crime for deploying resources that aim to reduce crime by improving relationships, greater community engagement and cooperation.” (President’s Task Force)

The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department recently created a sub-working group of Metro’s Multi-Cultural Advisory Council (MMAC) comprised of Department commanders, African-American and Hispanic community stakeholders, the Clark County District Attorney’s Office and representatives of the ACLU. Its purpose was to look at and revamp the LVMPD’s Department policy on conducting and documenting field interviews on suspected gang members and associates of gang members. According to the ACLU, the existing policy did not contain within it “due process” or a formal appeal process for a juvenile or adult to refute a police officer’s assertion the juvenile or adult was a gang member or an associate of a criminal gang. The working group developed a model policy that was lauded by the ACLU as a very acceptable change to the previous department policy on field interviews. The reality is every police agency and every community is vulnerable if an event similar to what took place in Ferguson, New York, Los Angeles, and others should occur. Police Agencies should implement and build upon community programs that have proven to be effective since the inception of community oriented policing. Programs such as Citizens Academies and Neighborhood Watch are just two that have proven successful, not only in reducing certain crimes but more importantly in building a strong bond between the community and their respective police departments.”

MMAC was formed in April of 2003, and the council is comprised of a diverse group of Hispanics, African-American, Asian-Americans, Arab-Americans, Jewish-American, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, and the ACLU representatives. The primary goal of the council is to listen to all concerns brought forward for discussion and to work together with the LVMPD to develop solutions to resolve issues. The 18 member council board meets monthly to discuss community issues with the Sheriff and the Undersheriff. This is a clear example of one of Tyler’s fundamental components of establishing police legitimacy and procedural justice, namely “providing for citizen’s to tell their side and be heard.” (Presidential Task Force) Since its inception the MMAC continues to be the eyes and ears of the community and continues to provide valuable feedback to the LVMPD. At the same time the members are being educated about
policing. Its mission is to serve as a resource for the LVMPD in developing and understanding diversity awareness and cultural competence among its staff and to assist the department in providing a respectful, safe, reliable, trustworthy and responsive service with integrity to a diverse population.

Strategic Plan
Regarding internal perspective, police agencies should develop strategic plans focusing a portion of the plan on community engagement. Viable strategic planning contributes directly to police legitimacy in that it emphasizes quality of treatment toward the community. According to Balanced Scorecard Institute, a strategy management group, strategic planning is an organizational management activity that is used to set priorities, focus energy and resources, strengthen operations, ensure that employees and other stakeholders are working toward common goals, establish agreement around intended outcomes/results, and assess and adjust the organization’s direction in response to a changing environment. It is a disciplined effort that produces fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization is, who it serves, what it does, and why it does it, with a focus on the future. Effective strategic planning articulates not only where an organization is going and the actions needed to make progress, but also how it will know if it is successful. (LVMPD Strategic Plan)

The LVMPD’s current Strategic Plan was implemented in 2012 and will be in effect until 2016. The Mission statement of the LVMPD is to “Partner with the community to provide outstanding service and protection through prevention, innovation and leadership”. The fourth procedural justice pillar from the Task Force is “the perceived benevolence of officers’ actions as they carry out their mission.” (President’s Task Force) To that end, goals of the LVMPD are presented as an acronym SERVE. Strengthen and Improve Homeland Security, Ensure the safety of our community, Retain and develop leaders throughout the department, Value and sustain excellent service, and Excel in communications, innovation and operations. Internal programs concentrating on the needs of the community are paramount in addressing victimization, assisting in providing relief to an overburdened criminal justice system and collaborating with social services providers to identify long-term solutions to criminal and non-criminal issues. One major example of a department internal program is the Crisis Intervention Program.

Crisis Intervention
Within every community there are mentally ill citizens that come into contact with police officers on a regular basis. These mentally ill or emotionally disturbed citizens can present the most danger to first responders and also draw an inordinate amount of resources from the entire criminal justice system. The mentally ill have historically been disconnected from society, yet many are incarcerated in county jails and state prisons, overburdening an already strained corrections system. According to the National Institute for Corrections, “In a 2006 Special Report, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) estimated that 705,600 mentally ill adults were incarcerated in state prisons, 78,800 in federal prisons and 479,900 in local jails.” (BJS) In addition, research
suggests “people with mental illnesses are overrepresented in probation and parole populations at estimated rates ranging from two to four times the general population.” (National Institute of Corrections) Growing numbers of mentally ill offenders have strained correctional systems.

Identifying the need to develop a more effective response to the issue of the mentally ill and how police officers respond to calls involving the mentally ill, the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) was implemented in the LVMPD. The CIT program is a group effort bringing the police and the community together for the common goals of safety, understanding and service to mentally ill persons in emotional crisis situations including their families. The CIT sets a standard of excellence for LVMPD officers with respect to treatment of individuals with mental illness and how to respond to a crisis and work with the community to resolve each situation in a manner that shows concern for the citizen’s well-being.

The objective of the program is to teach law enforcement personnel how to respond to any request to provide assistance to persons who have a diagnosed mental illness or who are in a volatile emotional crisis; provide referrals to the proper social agencies; diversion of certain persona away from the criminal justice system and toward treatment, whenever available and appropriate. (LVMPD Crisis Intervention)

Initially, a certain number of LVMPD officers were trained in crisis intervention. Many more have completed the training and today every police recruit in the police academy is CIT certified by graduation day. Building on the CIT program the LVMPD has instituted the Mobile Crisis Intervention Team (MCIT) concept. It includes a psychiatric nurse, case managers licensed drug and alcohol counselors, qualified mental health professionals and outreach workers. Currently there are two MCIT teams working covering 7 days a week and approximately 20 hours of any given day. In addition the team will respond to any request in the valley regardless of jurisdictional boundaries.

Police agencies efforts should always strive to increase transparency with the community they serve. According to the IACP Social Media Beat in an article written by then Police Chief Billy Grogan of the Dunwoody Police Department in Georgia,

In years past, many police departments operated in almost complete secrecy. The community knew very little about what the department was doing except in the most extreme cases involving terrible tragedies. The culture of law enforcement perpetuated this belief that citizens were better off, and so were police departments, if citizens were kept in the dark. As times changed and the thought process of law enforcement leaders evolved, we began to see the value of community involvement and partnership. The birth of community oriented policing and all of the offshoots of that opened up communication with citizens like never before. Law enforcement held community meetings to talk about crime, disseminated information via e-mail lists, and was more open to sharing information than ever before. Today, thanks to social media, information sharing and transparency have become synonymous. This transparency is truly law enforcement's best friend. (IACP Magazine)
The third pillar contributing to procedural justice, “citizen’s opportunity to tell their side and be heard,” (President’s Task Force) is immediately evident in this paradigm shift. The LVMPD effort towards transparency and information sharing is facilitated by the 1st Tuesday Program. It is an opportunity for the citizens of Las Vegas to get involved with the police department. The first Tuesday of every month LVMPD opens its doors to its substations from 7 p.m. to 8 p.m. when the community has an open forum of communication with the police officers who patrol their neighborhoods. Each month the LVMPD highlights a different area of the department so the community can get a better idea of what goes on behind the scenes throughout the different sections of the department.

As previously stated the LVMPD’s policies are reviewed and edited with the community in mind and with the understanding that its policies can assist in building a stronger relationship with the community, hence conveying “trustworthy motives,” the forth pillar of Tyler’s procedural justice principals. (President’s Task Force)

H.A.R.T.

In response to an enormous rise in our community’s Spanish speaking population, LVMPD established H.A.R.T. (Hispanic American Resource Team) in an effort to build trust with this sizable constituent group in the Las Vegas Metropolitan Area. Hispanic citizens are not the largest minority group in Clark County but exact numbers are unknown because it is believed a large portion of the Hispanic population is undocumented. Nevertheless this culturally diverse segment of the community requires police services from the LVMPD. The U.S. Census Bureau puts the Las Vegas Metropolitan area Hispanic population at approximately 30 percent of the entire population of Clark County.

Trustworthy motives are manifested in the way the LVMPD addresses the needs of this large segment of the community which does not speak English. We determine how to best protect and serve this segment who are so fearful of police that many crimes committed against them go unreported.

H.A.R.T.’s mission is to encourage interaction between Department members and the people of different cultures with the Hispanic Community leading to mutual understanding and respect. H.A.R.T. consists of a team of Spanish speaking officers who are fluent in both Spanish and English. They conduct preliminary field investigations of criminal activities that impact the undocumented Spanish speaking community. The team members also conduct follow up investigations when appropriate and coordinate with other investigative units as events dictate. H.A.R.T. develops and implements educational and training programs designed to foster working partnerships with this community segment. It also assesses and recognizes crime trends, and develops methods to combat these issues as they relate to this portion of the Hispanic community.

Homeless Liaison Program

If the goal, according to Tyler is to give individuals voice during encounters, any procedural justice initiative would be incomplete if it does not afford every member of the community a voice. This includes even those voices that are considered trifling by
many: those of the homeless. Homelessness in America continues to be a growing social and criminal issue for many municipalities. The limited resources aimed at the issue do little to stem the tide of the ever-growing homelessness population. According to a July, 2009 National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty report,

The housing and homelessness crisis in the United States has worsened over the past two years, particularly due to the current economic and foreclosure crises. On March 27, 2008, CBS News reported that 38 percent of foreclosures involved rental properties, affecting at least 168,000 households. The Sarasota, Florida, Herald Tribune noted that, by some estimates, more than 311,000 tenants nationwide have been evicted from homes this year after lenders took over the properties. People being evicted from foreclosed properties and the economic crisis in general have contributed to the growing homeless population. As more people fall into homelessness, local service providers are seeing an increase in the demand for services. In Denver, nearly 30% of the homeless population is newly homeless. The Denver Rescue Mission has reported a 10% increase in its services. The State of Massachusetts reports that the number of families living in shelters has risen by 33% in the past year. In Atlanta, Georgia, the Metro Atlanta Task Force for the Homeless reports that 30% of all people coming into the Day Services Center daily are newly homeless. In Concord, New Hampshire, the food pantry at First Congregational Church serves about 4,000 meals to over 800 people each month, around double the rate from 2007.

Of the 25 cities surveyed by the US Conference of Mayors for its annual Hunger and Homelessness Report, 19 reported an increase in homelessness in 2008. On average, cities reported a 12 percent increase. (Homes not Handcuffs)

The efforts to address the homeless issue from a problem oriented solution focus appear to be a better alternative than incarcerating the homeless and over burdening an already exhausted corrections system. It was also noted in the report,

While many cities engage in practices that exacerbate the problem of homelessness by criminalizing it, some cities around the country have pursued more constructive approaches. The following examples illustrate more constructive approaches to homelessness:

• Daytona Beach, FL. In order to reduce the need for panhandling, a coalition of service providers, business groups, and the City of Daytona Beach began a program that provides homeless participants with jobs and housing. While in the Downtown Street Team program, participants are hired to clean up downtown Daytona Beach and are provided initially with shelter and subsequently with transitional housing. A number of participants have moved on from the program to other full-time jobs and housing.
• Cleveland, OH. Instead of passing a law to restrict groups that share food with homeless persons, the City of Cleveland has contracted
with the Northeast Ohio Coalition for the Homeless to coordinate outreach agencies and food sharing groups to prevent duplication of food provision, to create a more orderly food sharing system, and to provide an indoor food sharing site to groups who wish to use it.

- Portland, OR. As part of its 10-year plan, Portland began “A Key Not a Card,” where outreach workers from five different service providers are able to immediately offer people living on the street permanent housing rather than just a business card. From the program's inception in 2005 through spring 2009, 936 individuals in 451 households have been housed through the program, including 216 households placed directly from the street.

**Recommendations**

Instead of criminalizing homelessness, local governments, business groups, and law enforcement officials should work with homeless people, providers, and advocates for solutions to prevent and end homelessness. Cities should dedicate more resources to creating more affordable housing, permanent supportive housing, emergency shelters, and homeless services in general. To address street homelessness, cities should adopt or dedicate more resources to outreach programs, emergency shelter, and permanent supportive housing. Business groups can play a positive role in helping to address the issue of homelessness. Instead of advocating for criminalization measures, business groups can put resources into solutions to homelessness. When cities work with homeless persons and advocate for solutions to homelessness, instead of punishing those who are homeless or poor, everyone benefits. (Homes not Handcuffs)

Exacerbating the homelessness issue is the fact that the mentally ill make up a portion of the homeless population today in the United States. Police Officers find themselves confronting the mentally ill who are often without medication and have at times become violent. The most recent officer involved shooting in Los Angeles, California illustrates this very scenario. According to an article in the LA Times dated March 7, 2015,

Chanting "You can't kill Africa," dozens of people on Saturday marched from Los Angeles Police Department headquarters to skid row to protest the fatal police shooting of an unarmed homeless man during a struggle with officers. Some 200 people protested Saturday a recent police shooting that resulted in the death of a homeless man in downtown L.A. Cue Jn'Marie, a skid row preacher, said police should have sent a mental health team to handle Charly "Africa" Leundeu Keunang, whose March 1 shooting was caught on video and viewed by millions of people. Keunang, who was convicted of armed bank robbery in 2000, was committed to a psychiatric prison hospital three years into his 15-year federal prison term. Police said Keunang had robbed and assaulted another skid row man, began fighting officers when they arrived and grabbed a rookie officer's holstered pistol, prompting three others to fire. (LA Times)
As a response to the homeless issue in the Vegas Valley, a new effort was initiated leveraging a multi-disciplinary approach. The LVMPD homeless liaison program conducts weekly outreach interventions with the Community Oriented Program teams from the various commands. When conducting outreach the team consists of mental health professionals, outreach workers, WestCare, Salvation Army, Veterans Administration and Rapid Rehousing, Transparent Mental Health to Home program and other agencies to ensure all services are available. The Homeless Liaison works in tandem with all service providers. The goal when conducting outreach is to eliminate all barriers for homeless persons. Education, training, programs and services on homelessness are provided when requested to organizations and the Las Vegas Community.

LVMPD Office of Internal Oversight

Building trust and legitimacy also means being neutral and transparent in decision-making, and the function of the Office of Internal Oversight (OIO) is key to this end. The OIO is comprised of the Critical Incident Review Team (CIRT), the Oversight Section, and the Office of Quality Assurance, consisting of Accreditation, the Force Analysis Compliance Team, and the Policy and Research Unit. The OIO is responsible for providing an on-going review of all issues surrounding our officers’ use of deadly force, as well as accreditation, staff inspections, audits and policy reviews.

The CIRT is tasked with conducting thorough and timely administrative reviews of all uses of deadly force and other high-risk critical incidents. These reviews are ultimately presented to the department’s Critical Incident Review Process, which is comprised of the Use of Force Board and the Tactical Review Board, for review and accountability. The purpose of the administrative review is to improve both individual and agency performance by examining what was planned prior to the incident, what happened, why it happened and what can be done differently to improve performance. CIRT evaluates decision-making, tactics, supervision, and the actual use of force. CIRT identifies any training needs for the individual, squad, unit, section or department and/or any necessary changes to policies, practices and/or training. The overall mission of CIRT is to minimize risks and maximize safety in future police operations, through sharing lessons learned from the Department’s past experiences.

The Oversight Section was created to work as a liaison with the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) to ensure LVMPD policies, training and internal accountability systems are current, relevant, and meet the criteria of constitutional policing. One of the many ways this is accomplished is with an annual review of the Use of Force policy, which includes components from post use of force assessments, annual assessments, and assessments resulting from major court decisions.

Reality Based Training (RBT)

Treating people with dignity with respect is an art that can be developed. Indeed, like any social skill, development and practice translates into improvement. All LVMPD police personnel in the rank of Sergeant and below will attend RBT. Lieutenants are required to attend RBT with any squad that they choose to observe and understand the tactics being employed by teams. Exceptions to attending will require being
documented and approved through their chain up to Deputy Chief, along with the approval of the Deputy Chief of the Professional Standards Division. This training is based on local and national trends identified by members of RBT and CIRT. Training will include classroom instruction consisting of patrol tactics and team dynamics for responding to potentially critical calls. Classroom instruction will then be applied to a reality based training scenario. Most blocks of instruction will be four hours in length but can vary depending on the nature of the training.

Sergeants are required to attend RBT training with their squad. Squads will be scheduled on a training day by RBT staff. Notice will be sent in the same fashion as AOST notification to the Sergeant and the entire chain of command for the squad scheduled. This training is mandatory and officers not attending will be rescheduled on a make-up day with no guarantee of that day being a training day. Note: A minimum of four (4) hours of de-escalation training annually, will be incorporated into Advanced Officer Survival Training, RBT, Defensive Tactics, ECD or other mandatory training throughout the year.

**Advanced Officer Skills Training**

The LVMPD Advanced Officer Skills Training (AOST) provides classroom discussions and practical applications to further enhance training in the area of use of force through classroom and reality-based decision making scenarios. Training will involve a one-day (9 hours) training program consisting of:

- Use of Force Training
- Defensive Tactics Training
- Reality-based use of force decision-making scenarios (Simunitions & MILO Simulator)
- ECD annual re-certification

**Requirement To Participate**

The AOST Program is mandatory annual training for police officers. All police personnel in the rank of lieutenant and below authorized to carry a firearm on duty will be required to attend. In lieu of mandatory AOST Training, lieutenants will attend annual Incident Command System (ICS) Refresher Training. Units that do not require normal police action (PEAP, Human Resources, SWAT, ARMOR, etc.) can request an exemption from this training with approval of their chain of command and the Organizational Development Bureau Commander.

**Technology: LVMPD Body cameras**

If the community can see what the police see, transparency and trust can be developed. The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines for the proper use, management, storage and retrieval of video and audio data recorded by body worn cameras (BWC). BWCs are an effective law enforcement tool that reinforces the public’s perception of police professionalism and transparency, and preserves factual representations of officer-citizen interactions. BWCs have the potential to improve community relations, strengthen public trust in law enforcement, lower the number of citizen complaints, defend officers against false accusations, increase agency accountability, and improve
officer training and evaluation. The LVMPD respects the legitimate privacy interests of the citizens and visitors of Clark County when utilizing BWCs. BWCs are effective in capturing video and audio evidence for use in criminal and internal investigations. BWCs also serve to enhance the accuracy of officer reports and testimony in court. Audio and video recordings enhance this department’s ability to review probable cause for arrest, officer and suspect interaction, and evidence for investigative and prosecutor purposes. BWCs may also be useful in documenting crime and accident scenes or other events that include the confiscation and documentation of evidence or contraband. This policy does not govern the use of surreptitious recording devices used in specialized operations. All officers hired on or after July 1, 2013 are required to wear a BWC (based on BWC availability and specific assignments designated by the department). Officers hired prior to July 1, 2013, may voluntarily wear a BWC. The Body Camera Detail, assigned to Patrol Operations Support Section, is responsible for the management, planning, operations, and evaluation of LVMPD’s BWC program.

Las Vegas Strip Cameras

In order to ensure the safety of tourists and the gaming corridor on the Las Vegas strip and downtown Las Vegas, LVMPD installed 37 permanent cameras along the Strip. LVMPD took this project on as a unit, in an attempt to save agency money, manage the installation, and control the quality of the system. Through a partnership with the Nevada Department of Transportation, LVMPD personnel were able to put cameras on the NDOT’s fiber network on the Strip. After selecting the most critical sites for camera installations, cameras were installed. Wireless aggregate points were installed as a backup, and as a location where future cameras could be put on the network from casino rooftops. In coordination with our Real Time Crime Center we had a video wall installed for monitoring.

Real Time Crime Center

An important section of the Southern Nevada Counter-Terrorism Center (SNCTC) is the Real Time Crime Center. The RTCC is staffed by LVMPD Police Officers. These Officers have the ability to monitor and operate over 40 live public safety cameras on Las Vegas Boulevard from Russell Road to Sahara Avenue, several cameras on the Tropicana West corridor, and the Fremont East live cameras. The RTCC also has access to the headquarters cameras, as well as the RTC fast cameras. We are in the process of getting access to the school district cameras, as well as moving into the private sector.

The mission of the RTCC is to proactively monitor the Public Safety Cameras to detect and prevent criminal activity. RTCC officers will then direct the appropriate resources to the activity, and give close to real time intelligence. Through the constant staffing and monitoring of these cameras the RTCC aims to proactively reduce crimes, and prevent terrorist acts in these sectors.

The RTCC is currently staffed 7 days a week from 1600-0200, with the goal of having the RTCC staffed 24/7 year round.

The RTCC position is a critical operational position within the Fusion Center. It is responsible for recognizing significant public safety events and providing pertinent
safety updates to officers in the field. It is one of the centerpieces to help achieve the SNCTC’s goal to prevent, reduce, and disrupt crime and terrorism through real time crime intelligence. The RTCC also assists in the support of critical incidents, emergency responses, major events, and investigations.

The cameras have operated near flawlessly since their installation, and we put them through their first large scale test during the New Year’s Eve celebration, which was attended by over 300,000 people from around the world.

**External Efforts**

**Community Programs**

A collaborative effort initiated by the LVMPD and the faith based community proved to be a very successful approach to combating gang violence in a predominantly African-American community. According to the submission for the IACP Webber Seavey Award application,

Since its inception in February of 2006, *Safe Village* has successfully broadened the joint efforts of the LVMPD and community to effect a reduction in gang related violence and youth crime by providing quick responses to violent crime; a core of outreach workers, mentors and volunteers to work with youth; and a platform for the formation of continued collaborative efforts to identify and provide extensive preventive resources to meet a wide variety of needs in West Las Vegas, a volatile neighborhood with Southern Nevada. The multifaceted partnership between law enforcement, government, community based, business and faith based organizations, has been led by LVMPD’s Bolden Area Command. It was created out of a discernable need to disrupt the culture of violence that affects youth caught up in dangerous street life and gang related behaviors in selected high crime neighborhoods. This strategy incorporates well established federal delinquency prevention strategies to combat violent and gang related crime and increase the safety and quality of life for the residents in the target areas. (Submission to IACP)

**Recap**

In response to deaths from gang violence and the belief faith-based organizations such as the church should respond, Rebuilding Every City Around Peace (RECAP) was formed. RECAP is a new national initiative that will mobilize cities across the United States to end the era of gang-violence and restore neighborhoods to peace. RECAP provides capacity-building activities such as conferences, e-learning and on-line communities to support gang violence reduction efforts. RECAP is a partnership that leverages the expertise developed by Rev. Jeffrey Brown of the Boston Ten Point Coalition’s twenty years of experience in the US and around the world. RECAP has developed an expertise in helping faith-based organizations and law enforcement among other key stakeholders increase their capacity for solving gang violence in their area. Community policing is and can be a very effective tool in law
enforcement. But community policing often depends upon having good relations with the community and in many urban areas, the relations between the urban, often minority community and law enforcement is poor which inhibits effective policing and prevents the community from getting the quality of law enforcement it deserves. RECAP uses the approach developed from the Boston Ten Point Coalition experience to help bring communities and law enforcement together. RECAP will help faith-based communities:

• Build coalitions among entities such as police, community organizations, and other faith-based organizations specifically around critical public safety concerns;
• Create cultures of trust, with the goal of sharing information and resources within these coalitions; and
• Use proven principles and methods to combat and strive to neutralize the current culture of violence with a culture of peace, and provide alternatives to promote healthy communities. It will also repair the relationships between inner-city communities and public safety stakeholders.

The LVMPD has adopted and implemented the framework of the RECAP initiative in the Las Vegas Valley. The LVMPD developed and standardized a Violence Response Activation protocol developed by and implemented in each Area Command with the assistance of the Gang Crimes Bureau Prevention Section, and members of the RECAP Board, to directly address the prevention of retaliatory violence and community reaction, which may occur as a result of Gang related violent incidents. Towards the expansion of RECAP (Rebuilding Every City around Peace), and following the longstanding agency tradition established by the Safe Village initiative, a mobilization of faith based and community citizen is referred to as an “Activation.” It is a multistep process. Step 1 requires the immediate response of Community /Faith Based liaisons to the crime scene/vicinity and hospital; Step 2 is a collaborative event in the community where the violent incident occurred. At that event, Law Enforcement, community residents, faith based partners, area businesses, and leaders come together publicly to promote peace, denounce violence, and encourage community cooperation. This event, can take on different formats, but ideally takes place within 48 to 72 hour time frame after the initial incident.

Finally, beyond the actual Activation and Response protocols is an ongoing commitment of the Department to be a creative partner and lead agency in the development of local community and police coalitions in each of its area Commands that can effectively identify and meet the prevention, intervention, and reentry needs of youth and families in communities most affected by violence. Those ongoing efforts are demonstrated in the substantial community outreach efforts of all of the LVMPD Area Commands.

Private Sector Community Engagement

Conveying trustworthy motives can be accomplished through education. Educating the private sector (restaurants, hotels/motels, or insurance companies) can significantly
aide law enforcement in deterring criminal behavior and further expand the breadth of any community policing effort. Members of the private sector, also, share the benefits of community preservation with residents and local law enforcement. To this end the LVMPD has strong partnerships with the Las Vegas Convention Visitors Association, the Las Vegas Security Chiefs Association and the gaming properties along the Las Vegas Strip and the downtown Fremont Experience. The Southern Nevada Counter Terrorism Center that is sponsored by and staffed by the LVPMD places an Intelligence Analyst funded by the private sector in the SNCTC.
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Cyber Community Outreach
Social Media and Law Enforcement

Lieutenant Harry McBrien
Virginia Beach Police Department

Note: Studying their history VBPD learns to communicate better, improve their strategy and execution, and succeed through community engagement.

Social media has exploded over the past decade and changed the way the entire world communicates. While most of social media has a positive effect on society by allowing friends and family to stay connected, it can also have adverse effects as with flash mobs, hate crimes, and bullying. A global population is constantly utilizing twitter, My Space, Facebook, Snap Chat, Instagram, and many other domains. Because the population we protect and serve are so focused on social media, it is imperative that local law enforcement agencies learn to utilize this technology to prevent crime and maintain positive public relations through outreach.

The city of Virginia Beach's positive reputation was profoundly tarnished by an event solicited through social media. In an effort to avoid negative affects similar to the 1989 Greek fest riots, action was swift and proactive. The city learned valuable lessons that can be a used as learning tools for other police departments.

In 2013, the resort area of the city of Virginia Beach unexpectedly welcomed 40,000 college age students and individuals for a weekend. In a matter of just a few hours, Virginia Beach experienced 3 robberies, 3 stabbings and 3 shootings. Negative media reports were seen throughout the country. This event was assembled almost exclusively through social media. Virginia Beach Police Department was immediately thrust into a negative limelight, even though the city has had the distinction of being one of the safest cities of its size for well over a decade.

In an effort to be proactive, the city of Virginia Beach partnered with the Convention and Visitor Bureaus and Media Communications Divisions. Millions of advertising dollars are spent annually in an attempt to bring in business and tourism. Strategically aligning tourism and marketing combined with safe behavior practices is a win/win for the city. Highlighting our city as safe and friendly benefits us all in the long run. Ensuring the police department has a savory reputation could prove beneficial as well.

After 2013, in an effort to reverse some of the negative perceptions, The Virginia Beach Police Department partnered with Regent University to develop a Public Service Announcement designed to reach out to the millennial generation with the message: Come to Virginia Beach, have fun, but act responsibly during college beach week 2014. The goal was to develop a message that could be shared through social media, the same medium that created college beach week 2013. College students who understand social media and how information is shared developed the PSA content and message. Furthermore, the student assignment was the catalyst for a much more comprehensive communication plan. The 2014 communications plan was put together between The
Police Department PIO’s, department leadership and the city’s Media Communications Group. The plan included local outreach to citizens of Virginia Beach, local universities and tourists. A web application and Internet site known as the Virginia Beach Insider was developed and shared with local colleges explaining what kind of behavior is acceptable in Virginia Beach. The result of the outreach combined with a comprehensive plan by the police department resulted in a safe and relatively quiet college beach week 2014 with no major incidents. Out of the 350 plus arrests that were made that weekend, only one arrest could be attributed to a local college student. In conclusion, the PSA and cyber messaging was effective.

In 2015, the college beach week communications plan and the overall Virginia Beach communications plan (Appendix VI) is just as important as past efforts. The addition of the Virginia Beach Convention and Visitors Bureau that oversees all of the city’s advertising was essential because of the negative sentiment towards law enforcement throughout the country and the negative effects it has had on communities and relationships. Attached you will find the most up to date college beach weekend communications plan (Appendix VI). There is also a social media friendly reminder of what is needed and expected while staying at a beach hotel.

At the VBPD, we want to maintain a positive image for our city and the police department, and while our plan is designed around college beach weekend, it is actually flexible and scalable to reach out to the 18-25 demographic group. For purposes of this study and for VBPD, this is the group that law enforcement across the country are dealing with on a daily basis, and especially when there has been a police action with negative consequences. Social media may be a tool that you will use to more peacefully resolve some situations and an excellent means of communicating with the leaders or members of various community groups.

The below link brings you to the Internet application of the Virginia Beach Insider.

http://moblalbum.com/6CjG7XJuum/gallery/183702

- Recommendations

1. Follow social media to avoid unexpected surprises
2. Partner with tourism department to save on advertising positive city message
3. Reach out to local colleges with PSA that has a comprehensive plan about socially responsible behavior
Measurement of Engagement and Trust

Brian Lande, PhD
Polis Solutions, LLC

Note: The following excerpts come from email communications seeking information from Dr. Lande on how the DARPA and other studies measured their effectiveness of engagement. The intent of including this material is to get a sense of what is possible in measurement and what are the future instruments and methodology of measuring the effectiveness of initiatives and whether programs are obtaining the desired outcomes. Dr. Lande suggests and provides some studies on to how to obtain a measurement for trust.

You asked me to send you a summary of how to measure engagement that includes how we measured trust. Appendix III is a paper where we looked at the “stealth” or Experiential Leadership Training delivery of T3 related skills. Trust was measured using a post-interaction survey as well as wearable sensors (measuring body movement, proximity, and speech volume) that capture social signals. Social signals are the cues made up of the often subtle but very observable things people do and say. Social signals are the basic building blocks that humans use to coordinate with one another.

We are still in the process of analyzing and modeling much of the data, but Appendix III, using just very basic statistics, already tells an important story about trust, that I will get to later. Nonetheless, we think rapport is an important antecedent of trust, even though it is not the same social process. Several of our papers are still being written, and likely won’t be submitted for publication until the fall.

In the forthcoming study, we primarily looked at rapport as our measure. Trust can also be measured, but it requires more work and I will describe why in a bit. For now, it is important to know that rapport is much easier to measure than trust because it is a visible quality of a social encounter. You can see it and measure it without having to guess about people’s private thoughts and feelings. Trust often requires asking people about their feelings about who is “trustworthy,” and that adds additional work, valuable work, but it comes at a cost. But don’t let this diminish the importance of rapport for community engagement. Rapport matters for discussions of trust because it is a kind of cooperative social cement that can be the foundation of trust. When we stand face to face with a community member, as a police officer, we build rapport in the short term and try to turn it into trust. In other words, rapport is what allows an officer to get a relationship off the ground.

What do social psychologists mean by rapport? Rapport tells us about how well people are engaged with one another, how well they are syncing up with one another (much like two instruments being in tune), and how affable they find one another, i.e. how much their emotions mirror each other in a positive manner. We measured rapport by using a standardized set of behavioral codes that evaluators used (engagement, demeanor, positive/negative affect, repair activity, and situational framing). We used
tablets to record video of behavior and to code the behavior in real time. Trained judges operated the tablets to make sure that codes were applied in a consistent manner.

We also used a post-interaction survey based on the work of Frank Bernieri (http://www.researchgate.net/publication/247746617_Interactional_Synchrony_and_Rapport_Measuring_Synchrony_in_Displays_Devoid_of_Sound_and_Facial_Affect). The point of the survey was to capture something about how the interaction felt — smooth, boring, engaging, awkward, etc.— the personal experience. Finally, we used wearable sensors to measure rapport by looking at the level of activity, mirroring behaviors, taking turns while talking and acting, number of interruptions, and certain emotional qualities of speech. We are able to very reliably, automatically, and objectively measure rapport. When individuals on our post-interaction survey described an interaction as smooth we looked at whether the sensors also detected smooth movements during the interaction.

Whether as part of the DARPA effort or ongoing research by Polis Solutions and its research partners, there are, broadly speaking, four ways to measure trust, all that have advantages and weaknesses:

1.) Observation of police-citizen encounters and/or training using our behavioral evaluation system PCIS.
2.) Post-Interaction surveys and questionnaires
3.) Scenario based tests, like ShadowBox, that look at trust-earning sense making and courses of action
4.) Wearable sensors and computer-vision (standoff camera) sensing.

**Observation of Police-Citizen Encounters:** At Polis we follow John Gottman’s work on marital conflict to rigorously measure trust. Our methodology to objectively measure trust is not only to ask people whether or not they trusted an officer at the end of an encounter using a questionnaire, but we use trained researchers or evaluators from LE (e.g. tac officers at academies, Field Training Officers, supervisors) to look at behavior using a paper or tablet based rubric. Specifically, we look at whether or not an officer acts in a way that takes into account the best interests of the persons they are dealing with, in addition to taking care of their own interests. In other words, to measure “trust” we actually have to measure three different things: trust, distrust, and betrayal. We measure this a couple of ways. We use observers who rate behavior using our Police-Citizen Interaction Coding System (PICS) and we use questionnaires and surveys at the end of training for role players. The same questionnaire can be used with community members to follow up on observed interactions. Gottman measured trust in controlled lab environments and we have a system to measure trust in scenario based training environments and in “the wild” of the streets.

For example, when an officer is interacting with a citizen we look at whether or not the officer acknowledges the needs, projects, and actions of the citizen or whether or not they suppress, ignore, gloss over, and interrupt, those behaviors. Examples of distrust would be officers who only focus on completing their course of action such as getting
information on a domestic violence (DV) investigation (i.e. their own interests) at the cost of not letting a witness/offender speak or complete their activity (e.g. getting to work in a timely manner, maintaining their sense of self as good citizen versus as an offender). A betrayal could be as simple as officers who not only put their mission or task needs ahead of the citizen, but are actively harming the citizen, (e.g. by shaming, contempt, excessive force, punishment for contempt of cop, etc.). An officer that builds “trust” is able to juggle competing courses of action, but this requires sophisticated cognition and decision making to achieve. Officers who can do this are able to gain cooperation and avoid or de-escalate conflict. Below is the address for an article by Taylor (http://lab.pauljtaylor.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/2014-Book-Taylor.pdf) who has looked at similar problems in the world of interview and interrogation.

Measuring trust using structure social observation provides very detailed data, but it comes at a cost, quite literally, it is very expensive. It takes a several people a great deal of time to collect data and then ardously try to code it and analyze it.

**Post Interaction Surveys and Questionnaires:** But there are other ways to measure trust as well that directly tap into the experience of citizens and/or police. Dennis Rosenbaum has led a NIJ effort called the National Police Research Platform (http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11292-015-9228-9 and Appendix II) that has a nice methodology for using surveys to track individual communities members trust in individual officers and in the agency as a whole. Dennis takes samples of police citations and reports and contacts the individuals that were contacted by the officer. He then has researchers telephone those contacts or reach out to them via survey to get a report on the conduct of the officer and the reported beliefs of the citizens in the home they contacted. The NIJ team asks about everything from how trustworthy an officer was, to how empathetic, to how much force was used. This is a rich and large-scale way to measure trust in a community that provides big picture data on individual officer performance as well as the “optics” of the agency. Data can be collected over many years, as well, to look at long-term changes and track efficacy of different policy, training, and tactical interventions. I have attached a reference to one of the Platform’s papers. ?

On the cutting edge is a joint effort, proposed by Polis Solutions and Aptima, called PolMap (POLice Media Analytics Program). This is an effort to use social media analytics to try and replicate something akin to what the NIJ Platform does but at low cost, on a much larger scale than the Platform is able to do, and on a continuous basis. PolMap works by scraping publicly available data from the Internet to map out the sentiment that media users have about police. The tool can identify areas of low trust, the topics causing low trust, people who are critical to shaping public perceptions, as well as identify problems of concern to a community. A summary of PolMap is included. PolMap is a concept at this point. The technology for the PolMap exists but has not been funded to implement the goals of PolMap.

Dr. Zack Horn, a psychologist at Aptima is the co-author on the paper on rapport and trust that we are currently writing. He emphasizes a finding from the Ft. Benning “Stealth” study, that is important for LE.
Zack’s point was that the training provided to the Infantry Basic Officer Leaders Course (IBOLC) cadres (mostly Captains), by Scott Flanagan (Appendix III), focused on modeling and engaging in trust building behaviors centered on the kinds of traits I defined at the beginning of the MCAA paper as critical to trust: benevolence (looking out for other’s interests and payoffs), competence, integrity (a value laden self-consistency), predictability (a more value neutral conception of statistical reliability of behavior). Scott and his training team modeled trust in addition to modeling rapport-building behavior. The goal was not only to demonstrate what trust building behaviors look like but to give IBOLC lieutenants a tangible sense of what it feels like to be in an organizational setting where trust is a goal. What we found is that we not only were able to train the cadre to model trust for their trainees, but that trainees then enacted rapport and trust building in their role play evaluations, especially in trust ratings from role-players.

Here is the other scary finding: existing training in the control group was actually degrading trust and social performance. This caught us off guard and demonstrates the importance of doing research because our initial impression was that IBOLC was already doing a good job when it came to developing social skills. Instead, we learned that the curricula needed to be refined and we also learned what we needed to change in our own training development.

We have every reason to believe that existing training in academies and the experience of field training is also unintentionally degrading social performance. That is, our existing efforts are not maintaining status quo competencies and they aren’t likely improving performance. This should get everyone’s attention. The U.S. Army is willing to take the risk to experiment with new training in order to become a more effective force. Law enforcement executives need to start asking themselves if they are equally committed to trying new training interventions, assessing their performance, and trying again.

But there is another implication of this DARPA study that Dr. Horn identifies. The “stealth” study suggests that the public will likely experience greater trust in their police, and the police greater cooperation and legitimacy from the public, if they can embody trust within their own interactions and relationships within their own agencies. There is little research on this within the law enforcement community. But we really need to know how changing trust patterns within an agency causes changes in the community environment. This would require two concurrent longitudinal studies, one of relationships within the agency and another study of (using telephone interviews or paper surveys) of the community. If Dr. Horn and I had our way, the LE study would use a combination of wearable sensors to model cohesion, social networks, and interaction patterns along with a survey instrument asking officers and their leaders about their levels of trust in one another. We would then do a survey/phone interview only study of the community where we looked at community members who had contact with officers and also community members who did not (but perhaps had vicarious experience). More food for thought.
Another area of survey-based research on trust is called Social Norms Campaigns. Most successfully executed out of Montana State University for public health, the Montana Social Norms Project worked with law enforcement agencies to identify gaps in beliefs held by police and the public about each other and then implemented media campaigns to bring disjointed and distorted beliefs into alignment with the actual “norms” or reality of the population. (See Tooley, M., Linkenbach, J., Lande, B. J., & Lande, G. M. (2009). Media, the Public, and the Law Environment Community: Correcting Misperceptions. The Police Chief, 76(6), 62-67).

A final thought on surveys. Surveys can provide a great “big picture” and they are less expensive than structure observational studies, but again, there is a cost. This time the cost is the quality and richness of the data. Surveys can be great for describing trust related outcomes but they can’t provide the detailed kind of evidence we need to know about the behavior of officers in complicated social encounters. We often lose sight of the “process” that leads to outcomes. This matters because when we know someone is missing the target we want to provide process feedback on how and why they are off target.

**Scenario based testing:** Gary Klein, Helen Klein, and I published a paper on “Good Stranger” sense making and decision-making. “Good Strangers” as we put it, were police officers and soldiers that excelled at being put into strange situations where they did not know the people, language, or culture of the people they encountered. These were masters of social encounters. We studied how these “good strangers” sized up situations and resolved crises and conflicts. We were able to code, in pen and paper tests, how inclined a soldier or officer was to see contacts with citizens as opportunities to build trust. This does not tell us too much about actual behavior but we are able to track cognitive changes in how officers think about trust building opportunities and how competent their decisions are about trust building courses of action (COA). Our objective benchmark for performance is a panel of subject measure experts. We measure the “distance” between a trainee’s judgments and COAs and that of experts. This method of scenario based training and evaluation, which we call “ShadowBox,” gave us unexpected insight into what motivates police officers to seek out opportunities to build trust and also why only some officers seem able to “see” those opportunities.

ShadowBox and other scenario/simulation based assessments are quick and inexpensive. But they often can’t give us data on behavior. They tell us about how police officers think, maybe even what their preferred courses of action might be, but we don’t get to see how they actually perform.

**Automated Sensors:** This is the most cutting edge way to assess trust and it is still the most experimental. Wearable sensors, called sociometers, measure the qualities of interactions between members of an organization. One of our partners, Sociometric Solutions, has used its sociometers to measure trust. We used the same technology to measure rapport in soldier-citizen encounter training scenarios. Sociometric badges can be deployed in an agency to measure everything from organizational performance to the level of trust within the agency. We can also look at the types of social networks that make the agency work or not work effectively. We know from many studies using
sociometric badges that the quality of social networks help to explain the level of trust reported in surveys. Sociometric badges can be unobtrusively deployed within a law enforcement agency to confidentially gather data and analyze trust, creativity, rapport, and social network properties of the agency.

Even more experimental but very promising is the work of Peter Tu at General Electric and Ajay Divakaran at SRI-International’s Sarnoff Vision and Multi-Sensor Lab. Both groups are able to use standoff video and wearable cameras (as well as other sensors) to analyze important features of trust, such as engagement, affect, proxemics, etc. The biggest challenge with sensors is that these are experimental and emerging technologies. These efforts require more basic research before they can be fully deployed with already existing technologies like dash-cams, body-cams, and interview room camera systems. But stand by, these are likely to be the most reliable and effective measurement tools available for trust in the future.

In an ideal world, to measure trust you would use a combination of methods. Right now, state of the art would be to use a system like the NIJ’s Platform along with behavioral measures. The behavioral measures provide immediate feedback to officers on how to improve performance. The NIJ Platform then allows you to look at organizational and community level outcomes over time. Together you have an ability to measure performance and outcomes with enough fidelity to make data driven and scientifically informed changes to training, policy, and street level behavior.

There was an article in The Crime Report (Appendix IV) on the failure of community policing:

Much of what currently ails many community policing programs can be attributed to an over-emphasis on the latter of these elements – which is given equal footing with trust-building initiatives despite making up just ten percent of Trojanowicz’s original community policing platform. Almost universally police departments gauge the success of their COP efforts on how well they solve the problem of crime as evidenced in quarterly crime statistics. It’s hard to blame them. “Trust” and “transformation” are considerably hard to measure quantitatively, whereas crime figures are a simple matter of math.” (http://www.thecrimereport.org/news/inside-criminal-justice/2015-05-community-policing- promise-and-failure)

Measuring trust does require effort because we don’t have any infrastructure in place to do so. Measuring trust is not “hard” for scientific reasons, but because there has been a lack of commitment and investment in building the infrastructure we need to assess this critical feature of individual and organizational performance. Measuring trust does not need to be any harder than what it took to put in place a system to generate internal statistics like arrest rates, crime rates, etc. Many if not most criminologists would tell you that “arrest” statistics, just like activity statistics, are meaningless for telling us how well a department is doing (no matter how much law enforcement likes sharing these numbers with mayors, city/county managers, governors, politicians and government). They are good political numbers to show an agency is doing “something,” but they are
not a measure of outcome (crime rates, citizen safety, citizen satisfaction, community social capital, etc.) and therefore, not the needed measurement.

Note: Dr. Lande provided research included in the appendix section, a 2009 study titled “Exploring the dimensions of trust in the police among Chicago juveniles, by Flexon, Lurigio, and Greenleaf (Appendix VII).
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Introduction

Community Oriented Policing (COP) strategies emphasize fundamental changes in police organization focusing on three dimensions: greater community involvement, problem solving approaches, and organizational decentralization. Changes of such magnitude can be challenging for the employees due to a number of stress inducing factors such as the requirement of new skill sets, perceived or real threat to economic security and lowering of social status.

When employees face programs and initiatives for which they are ill prepared, this leads to stress and resistance towards adoption of such changes. A strong commitment and willingness to deal with change is necessary for institutionalizing COP which will help build a sustainable police-community relationship.

Aim of the study

The present research is an attempt to highlight the factors that are expected to impede or promote commitment to a community policing strategy. The focus of this research is patrol officers, who play an important role at the street level in the implementation of the decisions of the top management. The study is important as it identifies factors that can assist in building capacity for the implementation of more effective COP programs. For the present research, survey data were collected from the sergeants and patrol officers of the Fairfax County Police Department.

The study investigates how job demands relate to commitment to change and resulting behavior and the role of job resources in mitigating the negative effects of these demands for the success of change initiatives. Job demands refer to those physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical or mental effort. Job resources refer to those physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that (a) are functional in achieving work goals, (b) reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs, or (c) stimulate personal growth and development.

This research is significant for the successful implementation of COP as it taps into the perceptions and emotions of the employees towards the change initiative. Because the success of change efforts lies in the abilities and motivation of individuals within the organization, an individual-level approach to managing change seems appropriate.

The report addresses the following questions:

- Which resources have a stronger positive impact on commitment to COP?
- Which job demands have a stronger negative impact on commitment to COP?
- Do job resources mitigate the negative effects of job demands on commitment to COP?

The meaning of these terms will be described in the following section.
Definition of Study Variables

Focus of the Study

Affective commitment to COP. It is the desire to provide support for a strategy like COP (community oriented policing) based on its inherent benefits that leads to its successful implementation. For example, officers displaying high levels of affective commitment are likely to go above and beyond expectations to ensure the success of a community policing program.

Organizational Job Resources

Organizational Support. It is the support provided to patrol officers by the management in terms of objective performance evaluation and a reward system which encourages commitment to strategies such as COP.

Job Autonomy. It is the degree to which a person’s job allows discretion and independence. This means that the first line officers are allowed the discretion to implement community policing as they see fit. This would lead to a desire to whole heartedly support the COP program.

Field Training. It is the COP related training an officer receives on the job to communicate effectively with the citizens and engage in a variety of problem solving activities leading to the realization of the benefits of and support for the strategy.

Personal Job Resources

COP-related Self Efficacy. It refers to the judgments employees make concerning their ability to do what is required to successfully deal with the demands of COP. The more confident they feel about their abilities, higher will be the commitment to COP.

Emotional intelligence. It is the ability to monitor one's personal feelings and those of others by making use of verbal and non-verbal cues. Such information can be used to guide one’s actions more effectively while dealing with issues relating to community policing.

Internal locus of control. The extent to which officers believes that the rewards, reinforcements or outcomes at work are due to their own efforts (internality). Officers with a high internal locus of control tend to be more satisfied with their jobs than those with an external locus of control (those who blame external factors for work outcomes). They report less job stress, perceive more autonomy and control, and enjoy challenges such as COP.

Job Demands

Role ambiguity. It has been described as the situation where an individual does not have clear direction about the expectations of his or her role in the job or organization. Here it
refers to being unclear about one’s goals and objectives as a community policing officer, which reduces commitment towards the strategy.

*Role conflict.* It is viewed as incompatibility in communicated expectations that interfere with performance. This could mean an officer may be receiving incompatible requests from superiors or fellow officers which creates confusion while carrying out COP related assignments and negatively impacts the willingness to support the program.

*Role overload.* It can be defined as the extent to which performance required in a job is excessive. In the present case it means having to deal with excessive workload or job demands relating to COP which are perceived as unreasonable by the officers. This leads to a lack of commitment towards the strategy.

The research model posits two easily grasped propositions:

- As job demands increase, the police officer’s commitment to organizational change decreases.
- As job resources increase, the police officer’s commitment to organizational change increases.

However, there is a third proposition that under demanding work conditions, employees who are provided with sufficient job resources will be more capable of dealing with these job-related demands. This in turn leads to employee acceptance and commitment to a certain course of action. In other words, we expect that the demoralizing effects of job demands on commitment to change will be weaker for police officers who enjoy higher levels of job resources than those officers who experience lower levels of job resources.

**Survey Methodology**

A paper and pencil survey was conducted at the Fairfax County Police Department from June-August, 2013. The population of interest included all the sergeants and officers of the 48 patrol squads at the eight stations of Fairfax County Police.

The survey was administered to 636 sergeants and officers of the Fairfax County Police. 409 surveys were administered directly while 227 were left to be returned through mail. 79 mail surveys were received with a response rate of 35% for mail surveys only. A total of 488 surveys were received with an approximate response rate of 77%. 11 surveys were discarded on account of being left blank or partially filled. The total number of usable responses was 476 (approximately 75% usable surveys).

**Interpretation of results**

FCPD has always supported community policing as a philosophy and was one of the first departments in the country to implement the program formally. But due to a change in priorities, the program was put on a backburner. Although the department still claims to adhere strongly to
the philosophy, there seems to be some confusion among the officers regarding program implementation.

During informal conversations with the officers we discovered that some officers believed the department did not have a COP program in place and others were not satisfied with the way the program was run. The officers had reservations about the work environment rather than the idea of community policing. There was some uncertainty regarding the definition of community policing and while some believed the program had been shelved years ago, others felt that their entire job revolved around the philosophy. The Co-PI observed FCPD’s definition of community policing mounted on the wall of the roll call room at only two of the eight stations.

The mean value of affective commitment to COP (3.81)\(^1\) in the present study shows that generally there is a support for community policing within the organization. However an important question included in the survey relating to the portion of an officer’s job which included community policing related activities showed a negative relationship with affective commitment to COP. This indicates that the more community policing becomes a part of an officer’s job, lesser will be the commitment towards COP which is contrary to the hypothesized relationship expected to yield a positive relationship.

This indicates that officers support the idea of COP and hold a positive view about it but do not support its method of implementation in their organization. This was shared during our informal conversations and some of the comments provided in the feedback section of the survey questionnaire.

**Which resources have a stronger positive impact on commitment to COP?**

The relationship between affective commitment to COP and job resources shows that personal resources are stronger than organizational resources because they are more in an individual’s control than organizational resources. COP related self-efficacy (ability to deal with COP demands) emerged as the strongest resource which is instrumental in helping deal with the uncertainty of change.

Of all the external resources, field training (related to communication and problem solving effectiveness) had a significant but negative relationship with affective commitment to COP. This unexpected negative relationship suggests that higher the level of field training, lower the level of commitment to community policing. This does not in any way indicate the dissatisfaction with training but rather implicates the implementation of the COP program. Training creates certain expectations which when not met, reduce commitment towards an initiative. This is in line with previous research which states that the lack or absence of resources

---

\(^1\) Affective commitment to COP variable was created by taking the sum of average scores of six questions on a five point scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree, the mean for which was 3.81. On the affective commitment scale the following values thus apply: 1 Strongly disagree, 2 Disagree, 3 Not Sure, 4 Agree, 5 Strongly agree. Thus, a 3.81 means that the sample of respondents averaged a level that fell just short of the “agree” level when asked about their commitment to COP.
results in cynicism and lack of motivation which prevents individuals from exerting extra effort towards their jobs.

Officers who feel that they are adequately trained for community policing activities and subsequent problem solving are more positive about community policing and its effectiveness and develop an expectation of continued support from the organization. Lack of such resources in dealing with unfamiliar situations leads to greater stress for those with higher expectation of support. Officers who initially support the program at times become disillusioned when they do not see visible departmental support for the COP philosophy.

**Which job demands have a stronger negative impact on commitment to COP?**

All three job demands; role overload (excessive job demands), role ambiguity (confusion regarding job objectives) and role conflict (confusion regarding performance of tasks) have a negative relationship with affective commitment to COP in the present study. This indicates that the presence of such stressors is detrimental to the implementation of a strategy. Excessive job demands lead to a feeling of helplessness and loss of control over work situation leading to lack of support for any new strategy. Stressed employees fail to see the benefit of new programs to the organization and to them.

**Do job resources mitigate the negative effects of job demands on commitment to COP?**

Contrary to expectation the results show that officers who perceived they were better trained were more adversely affected by role overload (excessive job demands) than the ones with low perceived level of training. This is perhaps due to lack of subsequent training to deal with work pressures and real life situations. Role overload creates an imbalance between job demands and resources leading to the fear of being unable to deal with work demands. When faced with a situation not dealt with in the training program (such as role overload), officers feel more stressed and less committed to the community policing strategy. Therefore, continuous training and feedback are important to promote a more positive view of community policing and reduce resistance.

Job autonomy (discretion) was seen to reduce the intensity of the negative relationship between role conflict (confusion regarding performance of tasks) and affective commitment to COP. Role conflict arises due to differing expectations from various reporting relationships. Job autonomy provides an employee the freedom to deal with stressful situations in the manner they deem fit thereby reducing their negative impact. Having the decision latitude to deal with such conflicting demands maintains employee commitment towards a particular course of action.

Internal locus of control (belief that outcomes depend upon one’s own efforts) was found to mitigate the negative impact of role ambiguity on commitment to community policing. A strong internal locus of control leads to resilience which helps in coping more effectively with change related stress. Such employees view change and related processes more optimistically as they are confident about their abilities to control their environment and deal with challenges. When employees feel empowered and in control of their work situations they are likely to come
up with more creative solutions to support a change initiative during uncertain times thereby dealing more effectively with role ambiguity.

**Implications**

- First of all there is a need to formally communicate the department’s support for community policing and the benefits of partnering with the public. If the department wishes to elevate employee commitment to community policing, the module on community policing taught at the Fairfax Criminal Justice Academy needs to be restored to its original detail to instill the importance of the philosophy among the trainee officers. Regular meetings, workshops and organization-wide training sessions on problem solving, empowerment and benefits of COP can help reestablish the management’s support for the philosophy.

- As community policing is based on the premise of empowering the first line officer, they should be given greater latitude to make decisions they deem fit. Job autonomy (discretion) along with timely feedback is instrumental in dealing with stressors like role conflict as it provides a reassurance for the usefulness of a change program or strategy. Employees will be more supportive when they have control of dealing with demanding work situations.

  It may however be noted that very high levels of job autonomy have been noted to lead to more stress as it implies more uncertainty and higher levels of responsibility. Therefore care must be exercised in determining the level of job autonomy for the officers with decision making latitude coupled with adequate supervision.

- Coaching by a peer or a supervisor can help the officers recognize their role and functions as a community policing officer and develop clear expectations. Follow up training sessions are necessary for the officers to feel well prepared and committed to the COP program.

- Efforts must be made to reduce job demands and the provision of adequate resources must be ensured to maintain a balance at work. Manageable work demands and job autonomy gives employees a chance to recover from stress and even create their own coping mechanisms. Targeted interventions are required for reducing role overload ambiguity and conflict by focusing on individuals who display higher levels of these stressors. Involvement of first line officers in COP related planning and decision making can help reduce ambiguities and increase commitment. Workload must be managed in conjunction with support from the organization to ensure more support for organizational change.

- The present study suggests the positive relationship of internal locus of control (belief that outcomes depend upon one’s own efforts) in reducing the impact of role ambiguity on affective commitment to COP. This highlights the importance of hiring individuals with higher levels of self-confidence which would lead to resilience and hardiness during change. Internals are more suited to work independently which is the basic requirement
of COP. Research suggests that resilience is positively related to work performance. The training for community policing officers should include content on developing psychological resilience and the ability to cope with change related stress.

- An important factor to consider in terms of inculcating positive attitudes towards change is to maintain a continuous provision of inducements such as training. Inducements provided on a regular basis will lead to resilience towards uncertainty. Employee perception of having received adequate organizational resources before and during the implementation of a strategy helps develop a high quality social exchange relationship with the organization leading to strong commitment for the change initiative. Continued organizational support is imperative during change. This goes to show that provision of resources by the organization will help maintain positive emotions during strategy implementation, leading to commitment and support by the employees.
APPENDIX II

**Police-Community Interaction Survey (PCIS) Items**

All items have a “Prefer to skip this question” response option. The following survey items and do not reflect the actual structure of the survey instruments, which are available in Spanish and English and both web and interactive voice modalities.

**Officer Demographics as perceived by respondent**
The following questions are about your police encounter, that is, the period when you interacted with one or more police officers.

- **Was the officer you interacted with the most a male or female?**
  1. Male
  2. Female

- **What was the age of the officer you interacted with the most?**
  1. Under 30 years old
  2. Thirty to forty years old
  3. Over 40 years old

- **To the best of your knowledge, what was this officer’s race or ethnicity?**
  1. White
  2. Black or African American
  3. Hispanic or Latino/Latina
  4. Asian
  5. Native American
  6. Some other racial or ethnic group

**Encounter Type**

- **How did your face-to-face contact with a police officer occur?**
  1. It was a traffic stop
  2. It was a traffic crash
  3. It was a crime report
  4. I was stopped while walking, riding a bike, or waiting in a public area
  5. Do not remember

**Encounter Outcome**

(Traffic Stops, Pedestrian Stops, and Traffic Crashes only)

- **What happened as a result of this police contact?**
  1. I was given a ticket or fine
  2. I was given a warning only
  3. Nothing happened
  4. Something else

**Encounter Location**

(Traffic Crashes and Crime Reports only)

- **Where did your police contact occur?**
  1. On the street
  2. In your home
  3. At a district police station
  4. Other

**Type of Crime**  
(Crime Reports only)  
• What type of crime incident was it?  
  1. It was a personal crime, where someone was threatened or attacked by another person or had something taken from them by force or threat  
  2. It was a property crime, where someone broke into a home, building or car, and stole property or damaged property  
  3. It was some other type of crime

**Police Responsiveness**  
(Traffic Crashes and Crime Reports only)  
• How long did it take for the police to arrive?  
  1. They arrived very slowly  
  2. They arrived somewhat slowly  
  3. They arrived somewhat quickly  
  4. They arrived very quickly

**Overall Satisfaction of the Encounter**  
• Taking the whole experience into account, how satisfied are you with the way you were treated by the officer in this case?  
  1. Very Dissatisfied  
  2. Dissatisfied  
  3. Satisfied  
  4. Very Satisfied

**Officer Trustworthy**  
During the encounter, the officer...  
• considered my views.  
• seemed trustworthy.  
• tried to be helpful.  
• took the matter seriously.  
  1. Strongly Disagree  
  2. Disagree  
  3. Agree  
  4. Strongly Agree

**Officer Neutral or Unbiased**  
During the encounter, the officer...  
• made decisions based on the facts.  
• was fair and evenhanded.  
• discriminated against me because of my race, gender, age, religion, or sexual orientation. (reversed)  
  1. Strongly Disagree  
  2. Disagree  
  3. Agree  
  4. Strongly Agree
Officer Respectful
During the encounter, the officer...
  • treated me with dignity and respect.  1. Strongly Disagree
  • treated me politely.  2. Disagree
  • talked down to me. (reversed)  3. Agree
  4. Strongly Agree

Officer Communication and Emotional Control
During the encounter, the officer...
  • remained calm.  1. Strongly Disagree
  • displayed a sense of humor.  2. Disagree
  • interrupted me (reversed)  3. Agree
  4. Strongly Agree

During your encounter with the police...
  • At the start, did the officer greet you by saying hello and stating his or her name?  1. Yes
  2. No
  • Did the officer raise his or her voice to you?
  • Did the officer thank you for cooperating?

Citizen non-compliance:
During your encounter with the police...
  • Did you raise your voice to the officer?  1. Yes
  2. No

Officer Use of Force
(Traffic Stops and Pedestrian Stops Only)
During the encounter,
  • Did the officer threaten to use physical force against you?  1. Yes
  2. No
  • Did the police officer actually use force against you, such as pushing, grabbing, hitting or kicking you?
  • Did the officer search you by touching your body in different places?
  • Did the officer point a weapon at you, such as pepper spray, stun gun or actual gun?

Officer Blaming
During the encounter, the officer...
  • Seemed to blame me for what happened.  1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Disagree
  3. Agree
  4. Strongly Agree
Officer Task Competence
During the encounter, the officer...

• appeared to know what he or she was doing.
• clearly explained the reasons for his or her actions
• explained what would happen next in the process.
• answered my questions well.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Agree
4. Strongly Agree

Officer Empathy and Emotional Support
During the encounter, the officer...

• listened to what I had to say.
• seemed concerned about my feelings.
• seemed to believe what I was saying.
• comforted and reassured me.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Agree
4. Strongly Agree

Officer Informational Support
(Crime Reports only)
During the encounter, the officer...

• referred me to people or agencies that might be helpful.
• provided me with useful tips to avoid this situation in the future.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Agree
4. Strongly Agree

Citizen Cooperation and Compliance (legal cynicism)
Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

• I sometimes question the laws we are asked to obey.
• When a police officer makes a request, you should do what they say even if you disagree with it.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Agree
4. Strongly Agree

How likely would you be to...

• Work with the police to identify a person who has committed a crime in your neighborhood?

1. Very Unlikely
2. Unlikely
3. Likely
4. Very Likely

Organizational Performance Overall
Now, we want you to think about the police who work in the neighborhood where you live. Please rate how good a job you feel the police are doing in your neighborhood.

How well are they doing at...

• Fighting crime?
• Dealing with problems that concern our neighborhood?
• Being visible on the streets?
• Being available when you need them?
• Treating people fairly regardless of who they are?

1. Very Poor Job
2. Poor Job
3. Good Job
4. Very Good Job
Organizational Legitimacy (trust and confidence)
Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

- I trust my police department to make decisions that are good for everyone in my city.
  1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Disagree
  3. Agree
  4. Strongly Agree
- I have confidence that my police department can do its job well.

Community Crime Prevention
How likely would you be to...

- Attend a meeting of residents in your neighborhood to discuss crime prevention?
  5. Very Unlikely
  6. Unlikely
  7. Likely
  8. Very Likely

Fear of crime
How safe do you feel, or would you feel, being alone outside in your neighborhood at night?

  1. Very Safe
  2. Somewhat Safe
  3. Somewhat Unsafe
  4. Very Unsafe

Respondent Demographics
Finally, we would like some personal and household information so that we can better understand how different groups feel about the police. Your personal information is confidential. Only group information will be reported.

- What is your gender?
  1. Male
  2. Female

- Please enter your age.
  Open Response

- What race do you consider yourself to be?
  1. White
  2. Black or African American
  3. Hispanic or Latino/Latina
  4. Asian
  5. Native American
  6. Some other racial or ethnic group
  7. Mixed (e.g. White-African American, Hispanic-African American)

- **What is the last grade you completed in school?**
  1. Some grade school
  2. Some high school
  3. Graduated high school
  4. Technical/Vocational
  5. Some College
  6. Graduated College/Bachelors/BA
  7. Graduate/Professional/PhD/JD/MA, etc

- **Are you a resident of the city where you had the police encounter?**
  1. Yes
  2. No

- **What was the total combined income for all the people in your household, before taxes, for the past year? (Your specific response will be kept completely confidential.)**
  1. Less than $25,000
  2. $25,001 to less than $50,000
  3. $50,001 to less than $75,000
  4. $75,001 to less than $100,000
  5. Over $100,000

- **Finally, the last question - Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the way the officer handled the situation, either good or bad?**
  Open Response
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Abstract

Military personnel operate in foreign countries where they must interact with strangers from dissimilar cultures. Adversaries can blend in among locals to hide in the social landscape, using complex tactics that exploit their advantages in asymmetric warfare. Soldiers’ ability to navigate this social terrain and effectively interact with civilians can have consequences at all levels of warfare. Good social interaction skills can effectively enhance mission success and lead to friendly relations and local support; conversely, poor social skills can generate negative perceptions or worse, incite adversarial actions that put the mission and Soldiers at risk. Stealth Training leverages principles from the U.S. Army’s Adaptive Soldier/Leader Training and Education (ASLTE), in which Soldiers learn to interact with others in an asymmetric power situation through experiencing authentic social interactions with their instructors. Stealth trainers aim to modify existing instructor training by demonstrating key behaviors that shape the exercise of leadership and authority. The essential issue is whether the instructor develops leader attributes in their own students by modeling these positive social interaction skills. Such instructor training is expected to improve social skills in students. This investigation tests the effectiveness of Stealth Training in (1) teaching instructors to implement the approach themselves and (2) improving social skills in soldiers. Results showed that Stealth-trained instructors were more likely to exhibit key social skills when teaching their own students. Similarly, students of Stealth-trained instructors were, overall, more likely than students of traditional instructors to exhibit the desired social skills in mock Key Leader Engagements.
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1. Introduction

The mission of the Defense Advanced Research Projects (DARPA), Strategic Social Interactions Module (SSIM) program is to maximize the warfighter’s ability to successfully manage high-risk, high-consequence social interactions on unfamiliar human terrain. The vision of SSIM is to develop novel ways to teach warfighters the core human dynamics proficiencies (HDPs) that are necessary for successful completion of a full spectrum of military tasks in which social interaction is a critical element, both in kinetic and non-kinetic environments. Positive outcomes of applying these proficiencies include de-escalation of conflict, reduction of unnecessary use of force, reduced mutual perceptions of humiliation/disrespect, increased flow of actionable information/intelligence, correction of errors/misperceptions, increased mutual perceptions of trust and respect, and enhanced cooperation with host nation allied forces and civilian populations [1]. Core HDPs involved during social interactions include: (re)initiate encounter, make sense of the situation, repair or recover, appraise outcome, pursue objectives, and (re)plan. Cross-cutting skills such as attending to non-verbal cues, perspective taking, mutual attention, rapport and trust building, self-control, self-awareness, and recognizing social affordances support these categories [2,3]).

1.1. Training Approach

As one solution to the challenge of developing core HDPs in warfighters, we explore “Stealth Training.” In general, Stealth Training is a process in which an unrelated curriculum is taught by an instructor who focuses on fostering an atmosphere that edifies the learner as a (a) full participant in repeated authentic social interactions (ASI) [4], and (b) direct observer and benefactor of appropriate use of authority. Stealth Training leverages principles of the U.S. Army’s Adaptive Soldier/Leader Training and Education (ASLTE) [5]. ASLTE has been advanced successfully to implement various aspects of the Army Learning Model (ALM) [6], deliberately developing leader attributes in the context of training tactical and technical skills [7,8]. Similarly, Stealth Training leverages already scheduled training of technical military skills to surreptitiously train HDPs by role modeling key behaviors that shape the exercise of leadership and authority during training.

The essential realization behind ASLTE is that a Soldier’s entire experience during training, not just the domain content, matters and that this broader experience must be actively managed. In the case of desired HDPs, we propose that learning experiences in terms of instructor-student (and Soldier-leader) interactions, beyond the specific learning content, can be systematically shaped to grow HDPs. Specifically, ASLTE principles are designed to develop leader attributes such as problem solving, initiative, and confidence through techniques including, but not limited to, aspects of problem-based learning and related constructivist approaches [9,10]. At its core, however, the approach builds on the concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which is the gap between what a student can do independently and with assistance, or the zone in which learning occurs [11]. In practice, this means that instructors must challenge students while promoting success that builds confidence and initiative. Through scaffolding strategies and formative feedback, the student learns that while he or she might face formidable challenges, the instructor is someone who can be trusted to promote success and tolerate measured failure. The growth of trust and rapport in the context of an ASI with an asymmetric authority relationship (i.e., differences in positional power) is perhaps the most important learning outcome that can be leveraged to provide a model, to be experienced, analyzed, and discussed, in developing desired HDPs. This observation, modeling, and eventual habitual execution of positive instructor-student interaction capitalizes on the dynamics of the ZPD and the power of social learning [11,12,13].

Likewise, the approach builds on elements of attachment theory which posits that a firm base of emotional support engenders willingness to explore and the development of self-reliance [14,15,16]. To address HDP training challenges for the SSIM program, we applied a variant of ASLTE to develop HDPs by leveraging ASI in the form of instructor-student interactions that deliberately grow underlying 21st Century Soldier Competencies and leader attributes such as critical thinking and problem solving, confidence and initiative, and character and accountability [6]. The approach is considered “stealth” in that the curriculum and other surface characteristics of the course remain unchanged; rather, the approach sets a positive environment while offering continuous behavior modeling and repeated opportunities for ASI. A key assumption is that in executing ASLTE, the leader or instructor is required to display desired HDPs to achieve ASLTE principles. It is this demonstration and modeling of desired HDPs by the instructor that the student should witness, experience, and ultimately apply in
subsequent social interactions. As a result, such desired learning opportunities for the student are created through both observation and first-hand experience.

This study was designed to determine first whether Stealth Training has a significant influence on instructors’ social interactions with Soldiers, and subsequently whether Soldiers taught by Stealth-trained instructors are more likely than students of traditional instructors to exhibit HDPs and facilitate key outcomes of authentic social interactions during mock Key Leader Engagements (KLEs).

- **Hypothesis 1**: Instructors who are exposed to the Stealth Training intervention are more likely to exhibit positive instructor-student interactions than instructors who are not exposed to the Stealth invention.

- **Hypothesis 2**: In relation to Soldiers taught by traditional course instructors, Soldiers with Stealth-trained instructors will show improvements in outcomes, such as (a) developing greater rapport with the Citizen; (b) earning greater levels of trust, as rated by the Citizen.

- **Hypothesis 3**: In relation to Soldiers taught by traditional course instructors, Soldiers with Stealth-trained instructors will exhibit more appropriate HDP behaviors, such as (a) exhibiting more respectful demeanor toward the Citizen; (b) exhibiting increased engagement during the interaction. Collectively, confirmation of these hypotheses would indicate that by emphasizing positive social interactions during training, Stealth Training can have a positive and meaningful effect on Soldier HDPs.

2. Method

2.1. Participants and Design

The participants in this experiment included 80 commissioned Army junior officers enrolled in an initial officer training course involving a variety of mental, physical, technical, and tactical instruction. Students were previously assigned to one of two training Companies upon joining their Brigade. Subsequently, 40 students were selected to form the control group (taught by traditional Army instructors assigned to their Company), and 40 students were selected to form the treatment group (taught by Stealth-trained Army instructors assigned to their Company) based on their pre-existing unit assignment. While all 80 participants engaged in the pre-training session, 19 students did not return to participate in the post-training session, resulting in a final sample size of 61 participants (i.e., 31 from the control group and 30 for the treatment group). The average age group of this all-male student sample is 21-24 years, most with no prior military experience. The current study was conducted using a quasi-experimental mixed research design, with two conditions (treatment versus control; between subjects) tested at two time periods (before versus after an initial officer training course; within subjects). To test for non-equivalence in HDPs between these pre-assigned groups, a survey battery of dispositional measures (listed below) was administered to all participants. Comparative analyses indicated no significant differences between the control and treatment groups in their HDP-related dispositions. The treatment consisted of exposure to instructors who had received Stealth Training. This manipulation required the research team to provide Stealth Training to the Army instructors assigned to the “treatment” group. The Army instructors assigned to the “control” group received the standard Army training offered to all instructors. The treatment (i.e., “Stealth-trained”) instructors took part in one of two iterations of an Instructor Stealth Training Course (ISTC) taught by retired Army instructors who are experienced in ASLTE instructional methods. 2.2. Procedure Instructor training. Prior to evaluating effects of Stealth Training on Soldiers, the Instructor Stealth Training Course (ISTC; the train-the-trainer intervention) was conducted to create the conditions for the primary manipulation. The course aimed to develop the necessary attitudes and behaviors in instructors so that they could later apply the approach when training their own students. Trained observers used behaviorally-anchored rating scales to rate the quality with which instructors exhibited the right behaviors, i.e., whether Stealth Trained...
instructors were in fact implementing the approach in their own instruction. Due to staggered scheduling of Army courses, instructors were observed either 1, 10, or 14 weeks following their ISTC.

**Student training.** The lessons and content of the initial officer (i.e., student) training courses in this study was consistent across instructor type (traditional or Stealth-trained); each course included classroom and field instruction over five days. In the training courses with Stealth-trained instructors, students were exposed to interactions with instructors who engaged in active listening, rapport building, and trust building activities similar to what they learned in their train-the-trainer course. Through each of these events, the opportunities for positive instructor-student interactions formed the basis of coaching, modeling, and discussion on how to promote positive interactions.

**Student evaluation.** To assess the effects of Stealth Training at the student level, Army students participated in scenario-based role playing events before and after participation in the officer training course. During these sessions, Soldiers were challenged with negotiating a difficult situation that could escalate (mock KLE). Outcome measures assessed how well Soldiers executed the KLE. Two comparable role play scenarios were used for evaluating social interaction skills before and after training, and were constructed based on discussions with experienced Army instructors. Based on real-world Soldier experiences, the scenarios presented participants with challenging dilemmas in which accomplishing their mission could potentially harm community relationships. The pretest scenario involved an Army platoon interacting with a key leader from friendly local militia group, in which the student’s mission was to get the key leader to relinquish heavy weapons and comply with national law. The posttest scenario reflects a similar dilemma, in which a local farmer, forced by enemy insurgents to grow poppy illegally, must be convinced by the student to stop growing poppies. In both scenarios, the relationship deteriorates as the Soldier attempts to accomplish the specific mission goals, requiring social interaction skills to manage the conflict. Due to restrictions in participant availability, each scenario was designed to last approximately 5-7 minutes.

Role players in the scenarios were volunteers recently graduated from other local military training programs awaiting their next military assignment. Role players were directed to arrive with civilian clothes and dummy weapons to use as props. They were given a copy of the relevant scenario and told to read through it entirely. One researcher described how the scenario would be acted out in the room. The role players were assigned to positions based on the researchers’ assessment of their personality during initial discussions. Those assigned to key leader roles were generally confident, outgoing, and comfortable in a role play position. Once all roles were assigned, the role play team rehearsed the scenario for approximately 90 minutes. A total of eight role play teams were trained, two teams for each of four data collections (pre- and post-training for both control and treatment groups).

Participants first completed the pre-training dispositional survey battery and then were taken to the role play one-by-one and briefed on the scenario details. During the social interactions, two researchers observed the Soldier’s performance throughout the social interaction and used a tablet-based evaluation tool to capture real-time changes in engagement and demeanor. This technology enabled observers to quickly assess performance during and after each interaction. After completing the role play, each subject was directed to an adjacent room and asked to complete a post hoc survey regarding their experiences from the scenario-based session.

**2.3. Measures**

To assess changes in instructor behavior, members of the research team observed and rated instructors on 12 key attributes (e.g., adapting coaching to individual students, modeling proper wielding of authority) using behaviorally anchored Likert scales ranging from 1 to 5, with 5 representing desired instructor behavior. Research team observers were not blind to conditions as they assessed instructor-student interactions with the primary purpose of providing feedback to guide further instructor coaching. Regardless, these ratings provide a glimpse into the nature of observed instructor-student behaviors. The ratings measures were adapted from those used previously to assess instructor behavior in initial entry training [7], and were modified to enable assessment of attributes specific to Stealth Training and developing HDPs (e.g., proper wielding of authority, developing mutual trust, and enabling positive interactions). Complete measurement details are found in the Instructor Evaluation Technical Report [17].

The pre-training dispositional survey battery used in the student evaluation included the Big 5 personality traits [18], concern for appropriateness [19], persistence [20], self-monitoring [19], and trust [21]. During the mock KLEs, two observers rated the respectful demeanor of the Soldier (i.e., situational orientation and civility [22]) and Soldier
engagement (i.e., listening, observing, and body positioning) respectively. Following the interactions, Soldiers, observers, and role players completed summative survey-based measures of dyad rapport [23], trust [21], engagement, and demeanor [24]. Engagement and demeanor assessments were highly consistent between observers (Cronbach’s alpha, ranged from 0.72 to 0.84).

2.4. Analysis

For instructor evaluations, an omnibus ANOVA investigated mean observer ratings among Instructor Groups (traditional instructors, Stealth-trained instructors at 1, 10, or 14 weeks post-training) and key behaviors (12 key attributes were assessed). Pairwise comparisons were computed to follow-up significant omnibus effects and to examine differences in more detail.

For student evaluations, repeated measures ANOVAs were selected to investigate differences between control and treatment groups on performance in scenario-based role play sessions before and after training. Specifically, six Group (control, treatment) by Test Time (pre, post) interaction analyses examined changes in HDP outcomes and behaviors as demonstrated during the mock KLEs: (1) rapport built between the Soldier and the citizen, (2) the citizen’s perception of trust in the Soldier, (3) real-time observer tags of respectful demeanor displayed by the Soldier, (4) observer survey ratings of respectful demeanor displayed by the Soldier, (5) real-time observer tags of engagement displayed by the Soldier, and (6) observer survey ratings of engagement displayed by the Soldier. Significant interactions were examined in more detail with paired t-tests.

3. Results

Data from instructor and student evaluations were analyzed to test whether Stealth-trained instructors and their students exhibited improvement in HDPs following their respective training courses. In support of Hypothesis 1, results indicate that Stealth Training produced desired effects on instructor–student interactions. Observations indicated that Stealth-trained instructors more readily and repeatedly exhibited the behaviors required to apply Stealth Training to teach HDPs than instructors in the control group. Furthermore, these changes in behavior were better implemented by instructors who were given more time between the ISTC and its application with their own students, suggesting that successful application of Stealth Training during instruction requires time for instructors to synthesize the new approach and integrate it into their instructional strategy. Specifically, results showed a significant effect of Instructor Group ($F[1,3]=15.980, p<.001$), where ratings were highest for the 14-week Stealth-trained instructor group (mean = 4.1; SD = 0.5) and lowest for the control group (mean = 2.4; SD = 0.7). The analysis also revealed a Key Behavior effect ($F[11,176]=6.248, p<.001$). Most importantly, there was a significant interaction between Instructor Group and Key Behavior factors ($F[33,176]=2.275, p=.009$). Follow-up tests revealed higher ratings of instructor behavior following Stealth Training compared to traditional training for the following key attributes: fostering inter-trainee communications and discussion, enabling positive interactions between students and instructors, facilitating turn taking in asking and answering questions, fostering discussion of mistakes/consequences, and assuming the role of helper in ensuring Soldier success (all $ps<.05$).
Stealth Training to teach HDPs than instructors in the control group revealed a significant effect of training comparisons between Control and Treatment conditions in ratings of (a) Trust; (b) Demeanor, and (c) Engagement. In support of Hypothesis 1, trained instructors more readily and repeatedly exhibited mistakes/consequences, key attributes: higher ratings of Respectful Demeanor (Hypothesis 3a), and remain engaged during social interactions (Hypothesis 3b).

For instructor evaluation, an omnibus ANOVA revealed significant differences between groups at 1, 10, or 14 weeks post training comparisons between Control and Treatment conditions in ratings of (a) Trust; (b) Demeanor, and (c) Engagement. In support of Hypothesis 1, trained instructors more readily and repeatedly exhibited mistakes/consequences, key attributes: higher ratings of Respectful Demeanor (Hypothesis 3a), and remain engaged during social interactions (Hypothesis 3b).

Subsequently, students participated in role playing exercises before and after receiving Army training with either Stealth-trained or traditional instructors. It was hypothesized that positive social interactions experienced with Stealth-trained instructors in the treatment group would transfer to improvements in HDP behaviors and outcomes following Army training, and improve HDP behaviors and outcomes beyond those demonstrated by the control group. As shown in Table 1, while there were no significant differences between groups regarding a Soldier’s ability to establish rapport with the citizen, there exist significant interactions between groups that support the impact of Stealth-trained instructors on a Soldier’s ability to earn trust with the citizen (Hypotheses 2b), demonstrate respectful demeanor (Hypothesis 3a), and remain engaged during social interactions (Hypothesis 3b).

**Trust in Soldier.** Figure 1a illustrates the Group by Test Time interaction for the HDP outcome of Trust. Paired t-tests revealed that citizen ratings of Trust in control group Soldiers significantly decreased from pre- to post-training ($t[20]=2.36$, $p=.028$), but not in the treatment group. In support of Hypothesis 2b, this finding suggests that following traditional Army training, Soldiers may appear to their citizen counterparts as less trustworthy during these KLE social interactions. In contrast, while not significant, participants in the treatment group averaged higher ratings of Trust after receiving Army training from Stealth-trained instructors.

**Respectful Demeanor.** Figure 1b illustrates the Group by Test Time interaction for the HDP behavior of Respectful Demeanor. Paired t-tests revealed that observer ratings of Demeanor exhibited by Soldiers in the control group significantly decreased from pre- to post-training ($t[30]=2.36, p=.025$) but not in the treatment group. Aligned with Hypothesis 3a, this suggests that following traditional Army training, Soldiers demonstrated less respect to the key leader during these social interactions. In contrast, a trend showed that participants in the treatment group averaged higher ratings of Respectful Demeanor after receiving training from Stealth-trained instructors.

**Engagement.** Figure 1c shows the Group x Test Time interaction for Engagement. In contrast to the Trust and

![Table 1. Summary of results.](image-url)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HDP Outcomes &amp; Behaviors of Interest</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Group by Test Time Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>f    df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Rapport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Soldier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demeanor (observed real-time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demeanor (observer post hoc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement (observed real-time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement (observer post hoc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Significant at $p < 0.05$.  
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Fig. 1. Pre- vs. Post-training comparisons between Control and Treatment conditions in ratings of (a) Trust; (b) Demeanor, and (c) Engagement.
Demeanor results, paired t-tests showed that observer ratings of Engagement exhibited by Soldiers in the treatment group significantly increased from pre- to post-training ($t(29)=-2.15, p=.040$) but not in the control group. In support of Hypothesis 3b, this suggests that Soldiers taught by Stealth-trained instructors were more engaged with their citizen counterparts during the KLE (i.e., facing the citizen directly, making more direct eye contact, active listening). In contrast, trends indicate that participants in the control group averaged lower ratings of Engagement.

4. Discussion

The central idea behind Stealth Training is that technical and tactical content is only one aspect of what a Soldier learns during a program of instruction. We posited that Soldiers will learn key leader attributes for use in navigating asymmetric power situations by interacting with instructors who model such positive social interaction skills. If instructors appropriately wield authority in ASIs with students, such an approach may encourage Soldier HDPs.

In the current effort, we focused on a train-the-trainer approach in which Army instructors participated in a week long course followed by a coaching workshop to reinforce concepts learned during the course. Throughout each of these events, the instructor-student interactions that naturally occur (i.e., ASIs) formed the basis of coaching.

Author name / Procedia Manufacturing 00 (2015) 000-000 ?

modeling, and discussion. Hypothesis 1 was that relative to control group instructors, Stealth trained instructors would show more positive social interactions with students during their own instruction. Consistent with this hypothesis, results showed that Stealth trained instructors were more likely to exhibit key HDP behaviors when teaching their own students, e.g., fostering inter-trainee communication, enabling positive interactions, and facilitating turn taking in asking and answering questions. That is, Stealth-trained instructors exhibited a higher frequency of HDP behaviors than traditional instructors. Such patterns of HDPs largely transferred from those instructors to their students. Congruent with Hypothesis 2 and 3, students of Stealth-trained instructors were, overall, more likely to exhibit desired HDPs in mock KLEs than students of traditional instructors. More specifically, participants taught by traditional instructors showed significant decreases from pre- to post-training in their ability to build trust and show respectful demeanor to their key leader counterpart. Participants with Stealth-trained instructors showed no such decrement. In contrast, participants with Stealth-trained instructors showed improvements in their engagement levels from pre- to post-training. Participants with traditional Army instructors showed no such improvement. It should be noted that observed effects may have been enhanced by Battalion-level organization of instructors into training teams designed to help cadre focus on specific skills (e.g., land navigation). However, such effects should have been uniform across both control and treatment groups. Similarly, while observers were trained to rate students objectively and consistently throughout student evaluations, these observers were not blind to condition; thus, future experiments may reduce potential rater bias by ensuring observers are blind to condition.

Overall, these data suggest that Stealth Training positively impacted HDPs, as Soldiers modeled the positive social interactions that they experienced with their own instructors. However, rather than improving these skills overall, these data suggest that Stealth Training had the effect of ameliorating decrements that may be typical in traditional Army training settings. Indeed, this finding is not particularly surprising, for early military training can be characterized by authoritative instructor behavior by which the development of Soldier obedience and discipline is sometimes prioritized over other competing training objectives. Likewise, issues including rigid adherence to training schedules or a narrow focus on standards alone can work against the aims of ASLTE as achievement or schedules overwhelm the learning process [7,8]. That is not to say, however, that ASLTE argues against high standards, nor does it argue against the Army’s task, conditions, standards framework. Instead, ASLTE training principles positively shape the narrative of defining the Army standard towards the development and assessment of technical and tactical skills simultaneously, and by design, with other leader attributes (i.e. Character and Accountability; Adaptability and Initiative; and Problem Solving and Critical Thinking). The data presented here suggest that ASLTE, implemented as a foundation for Stealth Training, can affect a wider range of objectives, in this case preserving social interaction skills that might otherwise suffer as Soldiers experience negative instructor-student interaction models.

5. Conclusions
These data suggest that Stealth Training and ASLTE in general can positively impact key training goals of current many Army initiatives. Discussions with senior leadership and staff at the U.S. Army Maneuver Center of Excellence (MCoE) and the Directorate of Training and Doctrine (DOTD) to discuss future directions and seek command guidance to better understand the Stealth Training potential within the MCoE and the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) will be critical. Potential areas of transition interest within TRADOC include the U.S. Army Functional Concept for Engagement (TRADOC PAM 525-8-5) which seeks to institutionalize HDP capabilities into Army doctrine, training, education, and leader development. These capabilities include the skills needed to work with host nations, regional partners, and indigenous populations in a culturally attuned manner that allows bridging language barriers, opening lines of communication, and connections with key political and military leaders in a way that is both immediate and lasting. Similarly, The U.S. Army Human Dimension Concept (TRADOC PAM 525-3-7) redefines the parameters of the human dimension to encompass cognitive, physical, and social components. How Soldiers and Army civilians interact with and are influenced by others’ beliefs, behaviors, feelings, and interpersonal interactions comprises the social component of the Human Dimension Concept and may benefit from ASLTE. Social fitness consists of individual well-being through self-discipline, developing and maintaining trusted, valued relationships, and fostering good communication with others. Finally, The U.S. Army
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Learning Concept for 2015 (TRADOC Pam 525-8-2) describes a continuous adaptive learning model that instills 21st century Soldier competencies through a learner-centric 2015 learning environment, supported by an adaptive development and delivery infrastructure that enables career-long learning and sustained adaptation.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (Contract #W911NF-11-C-0266). The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this article are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the official views or policies, either expressed or implied, of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency or the Department of Defense. We thank Adele Luta, COL Matthew Hepburn, Bill Casebeer, Jonathan Wender, and Brian Lande for their support of various phases of this effort along with the Soldiers who participated at the Maneuver Center of Excellence, Ft. Benning, GA.

References


APPENDIX IV
Inside Criminal Justice Community Policing: Promise and Failure

May 15, 2015 03:38:00 am By Christopher Moraff

Since 1994, the Department of Justice’s Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) has doled out more than $14 billion in funding to thousands of police agencies around the country in an effort to improve the way law enforcement officers interact with the constituents they are sworn to protect.

Yet 20 years after then-President Bill Clinton instructed his Justice Department to create a special program dedicated to advancing the principles of community policing, stories of citizens (most of them minority men) dying in police custody are rarely far from the headlines.

Baltimore riot policemen form a line to push back protesters and media members on April 28. (Photo via Wikipedia)

While statistics on police misconduct are notoriously hard to pin down, the available data suggests federal efforts to make police more responsive to community interests have had only limited impact on the street. And they’ve done nothing to increase the average American’s trust in police – which, according to a Gallup poll, was at the same level last year even before Ferguson that it was the year COPS was launched.

Despite measurable reductions in violent crime, citizen complaints of police misconduct rose by double digits between 2002 and 2006, according to data gathered by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), and more of these complaints were substantiated than in previous years. Over the same period COPS hiring grants put thousands of new officers on the street.

Assuming the problem with police behavior is limited to “a few bad apples,” it’s safe to say COPS programs haven’t done a terribly good job cleaning out the orchard.

Indeed, four of the cities where the most controversial police killings have occurred since November – Cleveland, Tulsa, Charlestown, S.C., and Baltimore – have benefitted from millions in COPS grants over the years. Between 2011 and 2013, the police department in Cleveland alone received more than $7 million to put more officers on the street. Unfortunately one of them happened to be Timothy Loehmann – who shot and killed 12-year old Tamir Rice last November for sitting on a park bench holding a BB gun (it’s worth mentioning here that Ohio is an open-carry state).

Loehmann had been fired from his previous job as a police officer in a neighboring city for poor performance and had
reportedly failed to secure employment at four other law enforcement agencies before Cleveland PD picked him up in early 2014.

In December, the Department of Justice (DOJ) issued a scathing report on its grantee, calling out the Cleveland police force for engaging in “a pattern or practice of the use of excessive force” that it tied to “a failure to embrace and incorporate the concepts of community policing at all levels.”

Like most large U.S. municipalities, Cleveland has had a community policing program in place in one form or another since the 1990s. One could be forgiven for questioning whether the money spent propping up those efforts hasn’t amounted to a big waste of taxpayer dollars (and indeed Republican lawmakers have been doing just that in recent years).

But Cleveland’s failure shouldn’t be viewed as an indictment of community policing, or even the COPS office itself – which has hosted a succession of leaders who seem genuinely interested in reforming police practice. Rather it underscores the difficulty of turning principle into practice, and the extent to which the theories that gave rise to the COPS office have been tainted by the war on drugs, police militarization and a culture of mass incarceration.

It should also serve as a cautionary tale for the many prominent federal, state and local officials who have hitched their carts to community policing as the best solution to the current crisis in law enforcement without a complete understanding of what the term means.

Conversations with police leaders, community activists and academics – many of whom helped formalize modern American community policing in the 1970s and 1980s – reveal an approach to community policing that is all too often fundamentally at odds with the philosophy as it was envisioned. All remain true believers in the model’s ability to revolutionize policing in America, but they say before that can happen we need to have a conscientious public discussion on what community policing is, and what it isn’t.

**Lost in Translation**

While progressive police chiefs were experimenting with community-based policing since at least the 1960s, the theory flourished in the 1980s under the guidance of Michigan State University criminologist Robert Trojanowicz.

Trojanowicz conducted studies of early foot patrol experiments in the nearby cities of Flint and East Lansing and found increased levels of satisfaction among both community members and officers. In 1983 he established the National Center for Community Policing (NCCP) and began exploring the concept of policing as an immersion profession in which the enforcement of law is only one component.

“Community Officers are part of the community, generalists who do whatever it takes to help people help themselves,” he wrote.

Between 1985 and 1990, Trojanowicz and his colleague Bonnie Bucqueroux (who served as the Associate Director of the NCCP) published a number of foundational texts on community policing, which they distilled into ten essential principles:

*Philosophy and organizational strategy* Commitment to community empowerment Decentralized and personalized policing Immediate and long-term proactive problem solving Ethics, legality, responsibility, and trust

*Expanding the police mandate* Helping those with special needs Grassroots creativity and support Internal change

*Building for the future*

By the early 1990s, Trojanowicz’s belief that police should be “social workers with a gun” ran headlong into a competing concept of policing known as “broken windows” theory – which came to prominence during the same period and – in its most recognizable form – posits that enforcement of minor quality-of-life violations helps reduce serious crime and leads to positive community outcomes.
Trojanowicz died suddenly in 1994 at the age of 52 before he could see how that clash played out. But Bucqueroux—who now teaches journalism at MSU—blames broken windows theory and its influence on the “arrest first” approach championed by Clinton-era COPS officials for “destroying” community policing. (Her 2014 article titled “11 Reasons Community Policing Died” is a must read for anyone interested in wrapping their heads around how things got so bad).

Bucqueroux says that since its inception the COPS program has been unable to shake the influence of the zero-tolerance “tough on crime” ethos that influenced criminal justice policy in the 1990s.

“We saw police as a catalyst for change and that arrest was only one tool and that was something that the federal government was not happy with,” she said. “I became aware of this fact that there were two approaches to broken windows.”

A new proposal aimed at meeting state concerns over the Prison Rape Elimination Act is circulating—even as reports of prison sexual...

* * * * * * *

David Couper, who spent two decades as the Chief of Police of Madison, Wisconsin, and now runs the blog *Improving Police*, articulated this dichotomy in an interview in March following the release of the DOJ report on the Ferguson Police Department (which stretched broken windows to its ignoble conclusion).

“When the theory of broken windows started it was literally about improving infrastructure,” he said, “but then it evolved into policing broken people.”

Couper was an early pioneer of what he calls “neighborhood policing,” and by the time he retired from leading the MPD in 1993 he had established a legacy of effective community policing that exists to this day. A vocal critic of the way community policing has been misapplied, he calls the COPS program, “a multi-year charade” that has failed to change the dominant style of policing despite the appearance of widespread buy-in.

He doesn’t blame the DOJ for failing at its mission, but rather implies the mission was doomed from the start without thousands of forward-thinking chiefs across America with the political will to serve as its foot-soldiers.

“The success or failure of community policing hinges entirely on police leadership,” he said. “A leader’s job is to push the status quo and to try new things, but to do that is risky business, so what [a lot] of chiefs did under pressure is they established a community policing unit, but they didn’t change what else they were doing.”

Minus that will to change, Trojanowicz’s pioneering theories of community empowerment and decentralization became supplanted by a repackaged version of the very ethos he had set out to change. His ten principles still turn up in COPS instructional documents on community policing: but in practice they are now bundled into the three-pronged approach to community oriented policing advanced by the DOJ: Organizational Transformation, Community Partnerships and Problem Solving.

Much of what currently ails many community policing programs can be attributed to an over-emphasis on the latter of these elements—which is given equal footing with trust-building initiatives despite making up just ten percent of Trojanowicz’s original community policing platform. Almost universally police departments gauge the success of their COP efforts on how well they solve the problem of crime as evidenced in quarterly crime statistics. It’s hard to blame them. “Trust” and “transformation” are considerably hard to measure quantitatively, whereas crime figures are a simple matter of math.

A Crisis of Leadership

The idea that successful community policing is more about political will than it is about money is a theme that comes up regularly when talking to the theory’s early architects. Many say a lack of the former and an abundance of the latter has led to a considerable amount of waste and abuse over the years.

“Local agencies wanted to call themselves community policing without having to implement the changes, and if they could pick up a few grant dollars even better,” said Bucqueroux. “The chiefs that already wanted to do it used the
money well but the definitions were so broad that I saw programs that were reactionary that were still funded."

Discussions with police officials and researchers have revealed a host of strategic initiatives – some active, others defunct – that have been erroneously lumped under the umbrella of community policing. These range from giving out free hot dogs at monthly community picnics to flooding a high-crime area with patrol officers who are instructed to enforce every code violation they encounter. Other departments assign officers to a localized foot patrol only to rotate them out after six months, negating the ownership factor that unpins so much of true community policing.

More often, departments dance between “Officer Friendly” style engagement practices and militaristic enforcement campaigns while missing the point that the sweet spot of community policing falls in between. If you religiously cite every person drinking a beer in the park on a hot summer night for public drinking, they’re probably not going to tell you who did the shooting you’re investigating no matter how many hot dogs you feed them.

Perhaps the most well-known version of bastardized community policing – stop-and-frisk – has not only alienated entire communities but has proven completely ineffective as a blunt-force crime-fighting strategy as well.

In contrast to these approaches, experts say true community policing efforts incorporate strategies that are designed to improve public safety by eliciting the input of stakeholders and responding to a neighborhood’s unique cultural and socio-economic dynamics. Academics call this “passive engagement,” and it is most effectively practiced without a summons book.

In Madison under Couper that meant decriminalizing possession of small amounts marijuana long before that was a thing; in New York it would have meant asking Eric Garner to please take his loose cigarette business down the street and away from stores instead of choking him out on the street. For Bucqueroux it means considering giving drug dealers the leeway to ply their trade inside if it means keeping them off the street where kids are playing.

The notion that discretionary policing, long-term beats that give officers ownership over their patrol areas, cultural competence, and genuine responsiveness to community concerns leads to stronger citizen-police ties is hardly a new idea. Unfortunately any enduring progress toward that goal over the past two decades has been blocked by a decades long law enforcement paradigm (intricately tied to the war on drugs) that has literally divided police and many of the communities they serve into separate enemy camps.

Andrea Schneider – a former COPS office researcher who spent years studying the program’s effectiveness – says reversing that level of damage will be a formidable undertaking. It’s not enough for a chief to create silos of community policing while the remainder of their department conducts business as usual, she explains. But she says facilitating the kind of cultural transformation needed to affect authentic community policing will mean turning decades of law enforcement practice on its head.

“We’re talking about community centered, human-centered programming in a culture that is very linear,” said Schneider. “Police departments are paramilitary and their culture is not known for being innovative so the challenge is how do you turn that around.

“It’s a way of thinking, it’s very hard to change that.”

Christopher Moraff writes on criminal justice policy, policing, and civil liberties for Al Jazeera America and NextCity.org. He was a 2014 John Jay/Harry Frank Guggenheim Reporting Fellow. This is an abridged version of a story published this month in the Philly Declaration. For the full version of his story please click HERE. (http://phillydeclaration.org/2015/05/06/the-promise-and-failure-of-community-policing/)
Cervera: Ask a cop for a cup of coffee and some conversation

By Jim Cervera

© August 20, 2014

For more than a week, our nation's newspapers and television outlets have been fixated on the events in Missouri. There are now calls for federal investigations into how police use their authority and the use of excessive force.

At the core of the issue is this fact: Police departments can police more safely and effectively if they maintain the trust and cooperation of the communities they serve. This is the cornerstone of what is known as police legitimacy.

Today, the Virginia Beach Police Department will begin its fourth year of door-to-door citizen surveys. Last year officers engaged in frank, one-on-one, eyeball-to-eyeball discussions with members of 3,000 households in an effort to gauge how we are upholding our commitment to our citizens.

There are two main purposes for this outdated, inefficient, labor-intensive way for us to survey our citizens. First, we need to know how you perceive crime in your individual neighborhoods. Maybe more importantly, we need to know your perceptions of how we are exercising our authority.

We already know the crime numbers. We know that violent crime and certain property crimes have been tracking downward for the past five years. We also know that our case clearance rates (how many crimes we solve) have been steadily increasing during this time frame.

However, perceptions frame reality, so most important is your view of crime and how it affects your family and your neighborhood. Crime numbers tell only part of the story. So, don't hold back. Tell us exactly how you feel when walking your streets at night or how secure you feel your children are while playing in the neighborhood park or going to school.

We will also ask you how we are meeting our mission in our 21st century democratic society. We know that legitimacy goes beyond what is lawful for police to do in society; it relies on what is morally justified and appropriate. We will ask you how we gain your trust and confidence. We want to know if you, and your neighbors, are being treated with dignity and respect, and we need to know your perception of our trustworthiness.
On a large scale, there is no greater example than how our officers police the Oceanfront. There are many legal actions they can take, but the key to large-scale crowd management is to employ strategies that are, in the eyes of the citizens in the crowd, not just legal but legitimate.

Our officers are adept at knowing when to slow dance with the crowd and how to arrest an individual in the middle of the crowd without other citizens noticing that a police action is taking place.

Finally, we want the surveys to prompt real conversations. There is nothing better than two people from different social, racial or ethnic backgrounds having a heart-to-heart discussion about a common goal. Both the Virginia Beach Police and our citizens have the goal of a safer community.

I often ask citizens to tell me the last time they called for a police officer to come by their home for a cup of coffee and a chat. It never happens. The average citizen/cop interaction is over a tense situation.

Sometimes negative perceptions - of the police and of citizens - are born as a result of these stressful interactions. With these surveys, we intend to break down barriers of communication, acknowledge that we have a common priority, prove that we are all in this as one, and mutually agree that we can, and will, build better communities together.

Starting this evening, and for the next six weeks, we will be knocking on thousands of doors in Western Bayside, Green Run, the Holland Road corridor and Washington Square.

We need to talk, we need your input, and we need your trust and confidence.

One more thing: The entire command staff will be assisting in the surveys. So, let me know if the coffee is brewing.

*Jim Cervera is chief of the Virginia Beach Police Department.*

*Posted to: Guest Columns Opinion*
APPENDIX VI
College Beach Week 2015 Visitors Communications Plan UPDATED 3/9/15

Summary
College Beach Week is scheduled for two weekends in 2015: April 17-19 and April 24-26. In 2014, Virginia Beach Police report only a few minor incidents at the Oceanfront — a huge contrast to unruly crowds in 2013. 40,000 visitors were estimated to be at the resort area in 2014 but reports indicated a fairly peaceful environment. Virginia Beach police are aware and are staffing accordingly.

Major events during this time indicate a need for a strengthened communications strategy that is consistent across all channels:

- Virginia Arts Festival: Virginia International Tattoo
- Virginia Beach Convention & Visitors Bureau Familiarization tour
- April 13-18 VA FCCLA (Family, Career and Community Leaders of America) Student Conference. Multiple hotels. 1300 attendees (mostly middle school & high school students)
- April 15-18 VA Psychological Association, Sheraton VB Oceanfront, 125 attendees
- April 16-24 Al-Anon World Service Conference, Wyndham, 200 attendees
- April 19-24 CASA Annual Education & Training Seminar, Hilton VB Oceanfront, 125 attendees
- April 23-26 Eastern Diocese Youth Conference, Holiday Inn VB Norfolk (Express), 600 attendees
- April 26-29 VA, Maryland & Delaware Assn of Electric Cooperatives Quarterly Board Meeting & Education Day, 150 attendees

Sports Marketing Events:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 Senior Softball Tidewater Classic</td>
<td>Apr 14-19, 2015</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 American Cornhole Majors</td>
<td>Apr 17-18, 2015</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 VB Field Hockey Turf &amp; Surf Hockey Blast</td>
<td>Apr 18 – 19, 2015</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 URugby Sevens Virginia Beach</td>
<td>Apr 25-26, 2015</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Oceantumblers Spring Fling</td>
<td>Apr 25 - 26, 2015</td>
<td>2122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Spring Fling Fast Pitch Softball</td>
<td>Apr 25-26, 2015</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a collaborative effort with the Virginia Beach Convention & Visitors Bureau, event organizers and the Virginia Beach Hotel Association, police and oceanfront business owners hope to increase positive and educational messaging with visitors on how to best deal with the increased crowds and traffic.

Target Audiences:
- Event attendees
- Visitors: 18-25
- Visitors: Families, Seniors
- Industry Partners (Hotel, Restaurant, Attractions)

Objectives:
1. Raise awareness of alternate routes to the resort area.
2. Create a welcoming atmosphere to spring break visitors by police and business owners.
3. Create an educational, consistent message to visitors across all industry partners.

Campaign Evaluation:

The following will be measured by the CVB to determine benchmark numbers for future occurrences:
1. Website traffic increase to Beach Tips web page on visitvirginiabeach.com
2. Increased number of vacation guide downloads
3. Visits to Shorelines blog post
4. Police video views on YouTube
5. Use of hashtag #bestweekever

**Execution At A Glance:**

1. Raise awareness of alternate routes to the resort area.
   a. Better Ways to Resort Beach Tips web page***
   b. Better Ways to Resort Beach print ad in International Tattoo event program.
   c. Custom email blast to ticket holders 2 weeks prior to event.
   d. Use of 311
   e. Blog post on Shorelines blog describing “Better Ways to Resort Beach”
2. Create a welcoming atmosphere to spring break visitors by police and business owners.
   a. Create social media campaign with consistent message for all partners to use****
   b. You Tube video PSA using police
   c. Right Now in Virginia Beach home page update at visitvirginiabeach.com***
   d. “Love Your Hotel” to Beach Tips app at visitvirginiabeach.com***
3. Create an educational, consistent message to visitors across all industry partners.
   a. “Things to Do” script**
   b. Script for hotels to contact guests in advance (from Russell Lyons)

*Social Media Monitoring*
BCF will monitor conversations related to College Beach Weekend on Twitter. Beginning on Monday, March 9, they will provide the CVB with a report of notable online conversations on a weekly manner. These will be used to identify any particular areas of concern (e.g. mentions of specific events, places, times and activities), as well as any general visitor inquiries that might be pertinent to that time period. Moving forward, weekly social media monitoring reports will focus on identifying particular areas of concern (e.g. safety, cleanliness, appeal, etc.) or general visitor inquiries, as well as help identify potential VB ambassadors who might not already be engaging with @VisitVaBch.

**Front-Line Communications**
The CVB will equip front-line staff at the Visitor Information Center and Resort Area hotels with a branded document that can be used to complement visitors’/guests’ welcome packets, making them aware of the options available for exploring Virginia Beach beyond the oceanfront. In addition to a Virginia Beach “Spring Bucket List,” the document will include information to encourage them to take less-traveled routes to/from the beach in an effort to avoid traffic congestion. Additionally, visitors will be encouraged to stay in the know with the “Beach Rules & Tips” to ensure an enjoyable and hassle-free vacation in Virginia Beach.

***VisitVirginiaBeach.com***
The “Beach Rules & Tips” will be placed more prominently on the CVB’s homepage and include a newly added hotel icon linking to important lodging information (i.e. what’s required at check-in, facility use and rules, etc.). The page will also include the aforementioned information on finding “A Better Way to the Beach” through the use of less-traveled – and more scenic – routes to/from the beach to avoid traffic congestion.

****Social Media Messaging***
Current social media messaging focuses on promoting Virginia Beach’s spring and summer offerings and events, highlighting its value of providing three distinct beach experiences in one vacation, in line with paid media efforts. Last year, the designated #bestweekever hashtag was used to encourage families to share their Virginia Beach vacation with us through social media.
Through the strategic use of hashtags, we can help maximize the reach of Virginia Beach’s online conversations, particularly through the real-time channels of Twitter and Instagram, and help distill any message not in line with the destination’s positioning as a spring-time destination. The intent is to make Virginia Beach’s visitor-friendly messaging more visible among the college set and within the existing social media chatter, drawing to attention to the fact that spring break in Virginia Beach is about having a laidback, hassle-free and safe experience for all visitors, keeping in mind that @VisitVaBch’s following is primarily made up of out-of-market visitors, members of the media and industry partners, not those people currently discussing College Beach Weekend.

Hashtags to Consider
Below are existing spring break hashtags to leverage, in addition to #bestweekever, based on how they’re trending and being used, as well as remaining consistent with previous destination messaging.

- #beachweekend
- #beachweek
- #familiyspringbreak

We don’t recommend the inclusion of “college” in those hashtags, so as not to lose the destination’s focus. A search for #beachweek will yield any related mentions (e.g. #collegebeachweek or #collegebeachweekend). We also don’t want to oversaturate our feed with hashtags.

Messaging
The following are suggested topics to be tweeted about, maximizing our spring break messaging, all of it reflecting messaging used in our out-of-market media relations efforts: kid-friendly, the outdoors, beaches, culinary experiences, adventure and something for every age. Messages will be maximized through social media leading up to April 17-19 and 24-26.

- Virginia Beach offers three beach experiences, each with their own distinct personality, which are perfect for everyone in the family. Enjoy tranquility along the scenic, calm and shallow waters of the Chesapeake Bay, or take in the breathtaking views of Virginia Beach’s southern shore at Sandbridge.
- There is plenty for families to enjoy along Virginia Beach – from a world-renowned boardwalk to an energetic downtown! Families can enjoy the great outdoors, a flourishing local culture and delicious seafood and coastal cuisine.
- Virginia Beach is the ideal family spring break destination!
- Visitor-friendly activities for all ages:
  - Highlight activities for different age groups (elementary, middle and high school) through existing Pinterest boards (pinterest.com/visitvabeach)
  - Cruise the three-mile oceanfront boardwalk on a beach cruiser or surrey
  - Perfect your sandcastle-building skills at Grommet Island – a playground situated right on the beach and accessible to everyone (ADA-compliant)
  - Paddleboard or kayak – you might even see a pod of dolphins frolicking in the waves!
  - Enjoy shopping, dining and entertainment in Virginia Beach’s downtown area, Town Center
  - Explore marine life at the Virginia Aquarium or dive into art at MOCA
  - Climb to the top – at Mt. Trashmore or the Cape Henry Lighthouse
  - Hike First Landing State Park or take a tram tour of False Cape

Examples
Hashtags and messaging might be incorporated in the following manner on Twitter:
- Ready for the #bestweekever? #visitvabeach is ready for #familiyspringbreak! We have something for all the kids in your family [link to Pinterest boards]
- Welcome, visitors! We love seeing you enjoying your #beachweekend #familiyspringbreak [photo] #bestweekever
- Spending a #beachweek with the family in #visitvabeach? Take advantage of these kid-friendly attractions [link] #bestweekever
• The #bestweekever means perfecting your sand-castle-building skills at Grommet Island! [link] #familyspringbreak

• Kid-friendly is always a safe bet. The @VAAquarium is a must-see! #familyspringbreak #beachweek #bestweekever

• April is a great time to spend a #beachweekend in #visitvabeach! Be sure to share your #familyspringbreak photos with us. #bestweekever

• A #beachweek in #visitvabeach really is the #bestweekever! Enjoy these kid-friendly activities. #familyspringbreak [link]
Spring is a busy time for travel in Virginia Beach, with beachcombers from around the world visiting us during these warmer months. Because beach time is of the essence, we want you to get to the beach quickly. For a better way to the beach, try these routes suggested by locals.

- **17th Street**
The original gateway to the beach.
- **19th Street**
Soak up some of the area’s most iconic architecture, including the convention center and our emerging arts district.
- **Laskin Road**
Drive by one of Virginia Beach’s most treasured works of art, the iconic Wave, a 35-foot stainless steel sculpture.
- **Shore Drive**
Refresh your senses with this scenic ride through First Landing State Park.
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ABSTRACT

Youths’ opinions about the police matter and can affect officers’ ability to perform their duties. The relationship between police officers and youths, however, is often highly strained. Despite the importance of trust in effective police programming, little is known about youngsters’ trust in the police and the association between trust and other views and experiences of adolescents. In a quantitative multivariate model, the current study assessed several correlates of Stoutland’s (2001) dimensions of police trust in a large sample of Chicago youths. The study examined the relationship between youths’ trust in the police and their attitudes, beliefs, experiences, behaviors, and background characteristics. Supportive of Stoutland’s (2001) results, the investigation found that trust in the police was a multidimensional construct. The current study also found a relationship between vicarious experiences and trust and evidence for the negativity or asymmetrical bias that has appeared in previous studies of police-citizen contacts.

Introduction

The importance of citizen involvement in the implementation of effective crime prevention initiatives has been thoroughly researched and firmly established (Rosenbaum, 1994). Citizen participation in anti-crime activities is the foundation on which community policing programs were created and are perpetuated (Rosenbaum, 1986, 1994). As the prevailing organizational strategy of police departments in the United States, community policing focuses on neighborhood challenges while relying on a joint, formal problem-solving process. Therefore, community policing demands that citizens and police authorities work together closely in the coproduction and maintenance of public safety and order. Nonetheless, without trust between police officers and community residents, such partnerships can never be fully formed or sustained (Skogan, 2006).

The continued cooperation of residents and police officers is critical to the success of crime reduction efforts in local communities (Stoutland, 2001). Long-term cooperation between these groups, however, is quite difficult to achieve—especially in minority communities—and can thrive only in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect (Skogan, 2006). Citizens who distrust the police are fearful or reluctant to report crimes, to assist law enforcement officers in criminal investigations, to volunteer for police-sponsored neighborhood programs, or to call the police for assistance (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997; Tyler, 2004). Even more seriously, in communities in which the police are distrusted, officers are less successful in preventing and solving crime and also might be at greater risk for verbal or physical assaults (Harris, 2005).

Historically, research has shown that younger members of the community are less likely to trust and cooperate with police officers than older members of the community (Horst & Frank, 2000). Numerous studies had demonstrated that the relationship between police officers and youths is highly strained and antagonistic (Friedman, Lurigio, Greenleaf, & Albertson, 2004). Police-youth relationships appear to be quite volatile in urban areas with large minority populations (Browning, Cullen, Cao, Kopache, & Stevenson, 1994; Friedman et al., 2004; Janeksela, 1999; Jones-Brown, 2000; Taylor, Turner, Esbensen, & Winfree, 2001; Weitzer & Tuch, 2005). Juveniles’ negative attitudes toward the police increase the tension between the two groups, leading inexorably to confrontational encounters (Bittner, 1990; Herz, 2002), Sykes and Clark (1980) asserted that juveniles, particularly members of minority groups, strenuously avoid contact with the police; when interactions do occur, they are generally governed by a wide power differential. Police officers expect deferential behavior from juveniles and regard them as mostly troublesome and problematic residents (Sykes & Clark, 1980). Thus, public exchanges between the police and juveniles are ripe for overt conflict because the police perceive minority youths as low-status residents (Lanza-Kaduce & Greenleaf, 2000). Such negative encounters between adolescents and police officers can foment
deep-seated and longstanding enmity between the two groups (Tuch & Weitzer, 1997).

Attitudes toward the police begin crystallizing during adolescence when youths have greater opportunities for direct and indirect contact with officers and other agents of the juvenile justice system (Skogan, 2006; Snyder & Sickmund, 1996; Walker, 1992). By early adulthood, most people’s views of the police are fairly well developed, including their perceptions of officers’ trustworthiness (Friedman et al., 2004).

Despite the early formulation of attitudes toward the police and the centrality of trust in effective police programming, many questions are unanswered about youths’ trust in the police and the association between trust and other views and experiences of adolescents. For example, are pro-social beliefs related to police trust? Are gang members more distrustful of the police than youths with no gang affiliations? Do witnessing negative interactions between police and youths undermine trust in the police? To address these and other questions, the current study investigated the correlates of trust overall as well as the relationship between a variety of predictor variables and Stoutland’s (2001) dimensions of trust in the police.

Stoutland’s trust construct

Stoutland’s (2001) ethnographic study of trust in the police involved fifty interviews conducted with citizens in high-crime areas in Boston. She found that residents in these neighborhoods felt that the police ignored their needs and disrespected them as well as other members of the community. Nevertheless, citizens generally regarded police officers as competent and dependable professionals. Stoutland (2001) viewed respect as a key component of trust in the police; she indicated that when officers fail to respect citizens, citizens are unlikely to trust and work with the police in law enforcement programs that attempt to reduce neighborhood crime and disorder.

Stoutland (2001) relied on a set of four questions that she believed represented a more comprehensive view of trust in the police. The questions were examined separately and together in the current research in order to explore trust in the police. The questions and the dimensions that they assessed were: “Do the police care about the community or care about [its] concerns as they plan and implement policies to control crime in the neighborhood?” (priorities); “Can we rely on the police to be courteous and fair?” (respectfulness); “Can we rely on the police to have sufficient resources to maintain low levels of crime and high levels of safety?” (dependability); and “Do the police understand the issues and possess the knowledge and skills to effectively enforce the law?” (competence).

Current study

Stoutland (2001) urged future researchers to use her “trust” framework to quantitatively examine the factors that can affect citizens’ trust of the police. The present study responded to Stoutland’s call by building on her framework to examine juveniles’ trust in the police in Chicago. In light of scant knowledge about juveniles’ attitudes toward the police (Leiber, Nalla, & Farnworth, 1998), this research was designed to describe the correlates of trust in the police for the purpose of understanding both the broader and more precise nature of the construct.

The current study was undertaken as an extension of Stoutland’s (2001) research on police trust. She argued that parsing trust in the police into the four elements outlined earlier could illuminate the multifaceted, dynamic, and frequently complicated and conflictive nature of police-citizen relationships. In a quantitative multivariate model that explored the robustness of Stoutland’s qualitative measure framework, the authors investigated several correlates of her dimensions of police trust in a large sample of adolescents, asking closed-ended and more youth-appropriate variants of her questions while including a wide range of measures to explore attitudes, beliefs, experiences, behaviors, and background characteristics.

Correlates of trust

Commitment to school

Although considerable research has found that adolescents’ commitment to school lowers the risk for delinquency (Gottfredson, 2001), few studies have investigated the relationship between commitment to school and attitudes toward the police. Weak attachment to school and poor relationships with teachers could generalize to more global anti-social values and behaviors, creating hostile sentiments toward the police and other authority figures (Agniew, 2005; Levy, 2001). Are juveniles with negative attitudes toward their teachers more likely to distrust the police than students with positive attitudes toward their teachers?

In one of the few studies that touched on this issue, Hurst and Frank (2000) surveyed middle school students in the Cincinnati metropolitan area. Overall, they found that juveniles, who attended public schools in the inner city, where dropout rates are relatively higher, harbored more negative views toward the police than students who attended public schools in the suburbs, where dropout rates are relatively lower. In the entire sample, approximately 50 percent of the youths reported that they trusted the police, 27 percent reported that they did not trust the police, and 33 percent reported that they were neutral toward the police. Minority students generally were less trusting of the police than White students. Hurst and Frank’s research, however, did not investigate whether attitudes toward school or teachers were related to attitudes toward the police.

Parental relationships and pro-social beliefs

Numerous researchers have found that juveniles who are strongly attached to their parents are less likely to engage in delinquent activities (Sampson & Laub, 1993; Wright & Cullen, 2001). Indeed, as Agnew (2005) argued, youths who are more attached to their parents should be more likely to agree with their parents’ conventional beliefs and model their parents’ law-abiding behaviors. As such, does parental attachment affect trust in the police? Using self-report data from middle and high school students, Nihart, Lersch, Sellers, and Mieczkowski (2005) examined attitudes toward the police in the southeastern United States, indicating that “youths who reported more positive feelings about their parents and teachers also reported positive feeling toward the police” (p. 85). Nihart et al. (2005) further reported that periodic contacts between officers and youngsters in their study resulted in neither a strong positive nor a strong negative response toward the police.

As several studies had demonstrated, adolescents with antisocial values and beliefs (tolerant of rule-breaking) are more likely than those with pro-social values and beliefs to engage in aggressive acts, delinquent behavior, and substance use. They are also more likely than pro-social youths to be arrested (Guerra & Slaby, 1990; Huesmann & Guerra, 1997; Kee, Sim, Troch, Tian, & Ng, 2003). Piquero, Fagan, Mulvey, Steinberg, and Odgers (2005) suggested that adolescents’ attitudes and beliefs about the law are shaped by their views of their families and other adults in the community, which could extend to youths’ trust in the police.

Gang membership

Gang members are among the most police-targeted groups of individuals, and therefore, would be expected to harbor negative views of the police, including high levels of police distrust. Friedman et al. (2004) found that Chicago high school students who reported being gang members were more likely to be stopped and disrespected by the police than students who reported that they were not gang members. Approximately 75 percent of the students who claimed to be a gang member stated that they felt disrespected by the police, compared to 58
percent of those who claimed that they were not a gang member. Gang members were also more likely than non-gang members to be stopped by the police and to be stopped more frequently by the police throughout the year preceding the study. How is gang membership related to trust in the police as measured by Stoutland’s framework? That question was a major focus of the present investigation.

Sanchez-Jankowski (1991) found that, in many communities, citizens fail to cooperate with the police to combat gang problems. This failure resulted in officer frustration and community member resentment—feelings imatical to trust that can disrupt police-citizen initiatives aimed at reducing crime. The researcher also noted that citizen apathy toward the gang problem increases the intensity of aggressive police enforcement tactics against gang members, undermining the relationship between gang members and officers even further.

Gang members and police officers are wedded in a continuously intense and hostile relationship. Considerable evidence suggests that gang members are highly distrustful of police officers (Jackson & McBride, 2000). Chicago is no exception. With a long history of gang activity and vigorous programs to combat gangs, gang members and law enforcement officers have been locked in a bitter power struggle for several decades (Lemmer, Bensinger, & Lurigio, 2008).

The Chicago Police Department’s efforts to combat gangs have consisted largely of vigorous suppression and enforcement activities, which can increase gang cohesion and solidarity while increasingly alienating youths from police officers (Greene & Pranis, 2007). The words of one Chicago gang member epitomize the profound depth of distrust between these two groups “the police (themselves) are a gang...they beat on us and abuse us for no reason...their behavior is (unpredictable)” (Lurigio, 1988). In light of the apparent effects of gang membership on youth’s trusting of the police, this variable was included in the current analysis.

Calling the police

Citizens’ contacts with the police fall within two basic categories: public-initiated or police-initiated, or as Clancy, Hough, Aust, and Kernshaw (2001) called them, sought and unsought encounters, respectively. In general, the public experiences police-initiated contacts as negative experiences (e.g., arrests, vehicular stops, field interrogations) that lead to dissatisfaction with law enforcement and other unfavorable opinions of police officers (Seed, 2004). The urban poor are more likely to call the police than middle-class suburbanites or the wealthy. Inner-city crime victims, however, are less likely to be involved in cases in which their assailants are arrested than are victims in higher-status and less-populated communities (Avakame, Fye, & McCoy, 1999). Thus, inner-city minorities are less likely to be trustful of the police than their White, suburban counterparts.

As the literature suggests, civilian-initiated contacts with the police are more likely to result in favorable views of officers than police-initiated contacts. For example, Fitzgerald, Hough, Joseph, and Qureshi (2002) found that two-thirds of the citizens who had voluntarily contacted the police were satisfied with the encounter, compared to fewer than half of those who were the subject of unwanted police attention. Similarly, Seed (2004) reported that seeking out the police was associated with higher levels of satisfaction with officers than being stopped by the police on the street for various reasons. Hence, the current study explored whether juveniles’ calling of the police was related to trust.

Vicarious experiences

An abundance of research shows that direct contact with the police can affect adults’ attitudes toward law enforcement (Skogan, 2006). Comparatively few studies, however, have explored the effects of indirect citizen experiences on attitudes toward the police. Such experiences are fairly common among youths and can have an impact on their perceptions about law enforcement (Brunson, 2007). How is indirect contact with the police related to youths’ views of officers? Is trust in the police affected by watching police officers interact with others? In line with Piquero et al.’s (2005) notions about the legal socialization process, which “occurs through individuals’ interactions, both personal and vicarious, with police, courts, and other legal actors” (p. 267), the present research explored the relationship between trust in the police and youths’ indirect contact with officers.

Rosenbaum, Schuck, Costello, Hawkins, and Ring (2005) indicated that vicarious experiences with the police in Chicago were significantly related to attitudes toward the police. Their findings suggested differences in how various racial and ethnic groups process their personal histories or past experiences with the police. For example, according to their results, African Americans were more likely to be affected by their indirect experiences with the police than members of other racial groups. Similarly, Weitzer and Tuch (2005) found that vicarious experiences with officers were correlated with lower approval ratings of the police among African Americans and their White counterparts, but not among Latinos. The researchers also observed that the mass media can affect attitudes toward the police—particularly among African Americans, who are prominently featured in news stories about police officers’ abuse of citizens.

Based on surveys and interviews with St. Louis teenagers, Brunson (2007) reported that police officers’ abuse of youths (e.g., “pushing, shoving, rifling through pockets and forcibly undressing suspects”) was a common occurrence in youths’ vicarious encounters with the police. Brunson’s findings indicate that vicarious interactions with the police can leave a lasting impression on youths, as illustrated in the following two excerpts from interview subjects’ responses: “...Ronald explained how he felt after watching police beat his best friend with clubs. He noted, ‘That made me not trust the police. Seein’ what they did to him you know. How [do] I know that something like that wouldn’t happen to me?’ Likewise, Curtis remarked, ‘When I see [the police] mistreating people it makes me mad’” (pp. 90–91). Brunson recommended that researchers continue to investigate the relationship between trust and the different types of interactions that youths have with the police.

Race and ethnicity

Race is perhaps the most studied of all personal background variables in terms of attitudes toward the police (Hurst, 2007). As Skogan (2006) aptly noted, “All research on American’s views of the police begins with race” (p. 101). Only a small sampling of more recent studies in this vast literature is cited here. African Americans are more likely than other racial groups to be victims of crime, to have negative contacts with the police, to be stopped disproportionately by the police, and to report incidents of police harassment and mistreatment (Anderson, 1990; Erez, 1984; Schafer, Huebner, & Bynum, 2003; Tuch & Weitzer, 1997). For example, Skogan (2006) found that 70 percent of young African American men in Chicago reported being stopped by the police, compared to an average of 20 percent of the total number of residents in the city.

Hagan, Shedd, and Payne (2005) also found that African American students in Chicago were more likely than Latino or White students to have encounters with the police, while Latinos were more likely to react negatively to these encounters than other youths. Hagan et al. suggested that adolescent minorities’ perceptions of “criminal justice” and Whites’ negative attitude toward the police were fueled by their unfavorable perceptions of school and their being subjected to frequent and unprompted police stops. The authors decried the paucity of research on Latinos’ responses to police contacts (see also Brown, 2004; Martinez, 2007).

In New York City, Tyler (2005) investigated two forms of trust in the police: institutional (confidence based on abstract, global views of police leadership) and motive-based (confidence based on practical
views of police on the street) trust. In further support of the effect of race on perceptions of the police, Tyler found that African Americans expressed less trust in the police than Latinos or Whites. All respondents rated the police slightly higher on motive-based trust than on institutional trust. Tyler concluded that a police officer’s display of fairness in the exercise of duty was the most important factor in determining citizens’ trust in the police.

In a national survey of the determinants of satisfaction with the police, Weitzer and Tuch (1999) reported that African American men were significantly less satisfied with the police than African American women. Perceived personal safety in the neighborhood affected satisfaction with the police. Those who resided in communities in which crime was a minor problem were more satisfied with the police than those who resided in communities in which crime was a major problem.

He and McLean (2004) studied the relationship between residents and the police in North Carolina, concluding that race was the most important predictor of confidence in the police. Lower-class residents and African Americans were less likely to report confidence in the police than Whites or middle-class residents. In addition, the risk of being a victim of a crime or previous victimization lowered citizen confidence in the police. Finally, Hurst, Frank, and Browning (2000) reported that African American teenagers were more negative than White teenagers in their assessments of the police following street encounters, even though their ratings of police treatment during those encounters were similar to those of White teenagers.

Present research
Data collection and sample
The data used in this research were part of a larger study of police–youth relations (see Friedman et al., 2004). Questionnaire data for this study were obtained from a purposive sample of Chicago public school students who were enrolled in May 2000 in eighteen high schools throughout the city. With the guidance of Chicago public school system administrators, the schools were selected to yield a comprehensive sample of students enrolled in public high schools at that time. The data were collected during regular school hours in accordance with each high school principal’s directions.

The questionnaire consisted of 131 items in open- and closed-end response formats. The survey employed a number of rating scales and explored several content domains—namely, demographic characteristics, students’ perceptions of the police, personal experiences with the police, and attitudes toward other social institutions. School officials reviewed the survey and were assured that the questionnaires were anonymous. (For a more detailed description of the survey, see Friedman et al., 2004.)

A total of 943 students were asked to complete the questionnaire. The average completion time was twenty-five minutes. The completion rate for the survey was 94 percent (n = 891). A total of forty-seven surveys were incomplete or unusable, and five students refused to participate in the study. Nearly half of the students were freshmen and 41 percent were juniors. The mean and median age of the students was sixteen years. Approximately 55 percent of the respondents were African American, 28 percent were Latino, 7 percent were White, and 3 percent were Asian. The study sample slightly overrepresented Asian students compared with the student population of the city’s public schools. The sample consisted of more young women (55 percent) than young men (46 percent). Table 1 presents the variable descriptions for measures used in the study.

Variables and hypotheses
School
The variable “school” was based on two questions answered using a Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The two questions measured youths’ commitment to school and attachment to teachers. The first asked youths about their affinity for school; the second asked if they cared about their teachers’ opinions of them. The survey questions were highly correlated (p ≤ .000, two-tailed) and combined into an additive index. Higher values on the measure indicated more positive attitudes toward school, whereas lower values indicated less positive attitudes. Youths with a stronger commitment to school were hypothesized to have more trust in the police than youths with a weaker commitment to school.

Teachers can be critically important authority figures and role models in students’ lives. The relationships that youths forge with their teachers could help create a basis for more positive and trusting relationships with police officers. The relationships between youths and teachers, however, are usually more limited and transient than relationships between youths and parents. Indeed, as discussed earlier, parental involvement (or lack thereof) with their children can affect delinquency and criminality and influence youths’ attitudes toward police officers. Hence, a measure of parental identification was included in the current research.

Parental identification
Identification with parents was measured by two variables. The first measure, “identify with mom,” was measured by asking students to be like the kind of person their mothers are. The second variable, “identify with dad,” asked students if they wanted to be like the kind of person their fathers are. Both questions asked participants to respond using a Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Attitudes toward each parent were measured separately because a large percentage of students reported that they resided in a single-parent household (see Friedman et al., 2004). Higher values on either variable indicated that the student identified more strongly with the respective parent, whereas lower values indicated that the student identified less strongly.

Youths with a stronger attachment to either or both parents were hypothesized to have more trust in the police than youths with a weaker attachment to either or both parents.

Pro-social beliefs
“Pro-social beliefs” consisted of two questions that were measured using a Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The first question asked students to respond to the statement, “Most acts that people call ‘delinquent’ don’t really hurt anyone.” The second question asked students to respond to the statement, “People who leave their keys in their car are as much to blame as the thief if their car is stolen.” The survey questions were highly correlated (p ≤ .000, two-tailed) and combined into an additive index. Higher values on the index indicated more conventional beliefs, whereas lower values indicated less conventional beliefs. Youths with stronger pro-social beliefs were hypothesized to have more trust in the police than youths with weaker pro-social beliefs.

Gang membership
The variable “gang membership” was a simple dichotomous measure of a youth’s affiliation with a gang. The question used to measure this variable asked students if they had ever been a gang member. Students who answered “yes” to this question were counted as gang members. Students who answered “no” were not. Youths with no gang affiliation were hypothesized to have more trust in the police than youths with a gang affiliation.

Called police
“Called police” measured whether students had contacted the police in the previous year. The variable was a dichotomous measure. Calling the police in the last year was coded as “1,” not calling the police was coded as “0.” A willingness to call the police was an indicator of whether youths recognized police officers as a legitimate authority for resolving conflicts or as a source of community services
and support. Youths who called the police were hypothesized to have more trust in officers than youths who did not call the police.

Vicarious experiences

Youths’ “vicarious experiences” with the police was measured with a set of dummy variables created to account for a skip pattern in the survey. The first question, “Have you ever seen a youth stopped by the police?” was a screening question in the survey. The next question asked students who had seen other youths stopped by the police if the officer had treated the stopped youth with respect or disrespect. The dummy variables identified students who had not seen other youths stopped by the police, students who had seen other youths stopped and respected by the police, and students who had seen other youths stopped and disrespected by the police. Students who had seen other youths stopped and respected by the police were used as the comparison group in the analyses. Youths with positive vicarious experiences with the police were hypothesized to have more trust in officers than those with negative vicarious experiences with the police.

Subject variables

Separate analytic models for African Americans and Latinos were estimated because of the significance of race in the police literature. Specifically, race/ethnicity was used as selection criterion to determine if the models were consistent for African American and Latino youths. African American and Latino youths were hypothesized to have less trust in officers than White youths. Gender also was used to determine if the models were consistent for male and female youths.

In light of previous studies regarding the link between gender and trust in the police, which have produced highly mixed results, no specific relationship between gender and trust in the police was hypothesized (Brown & Benedict, 2002; Hurst, 2007). Dependent variables

The dependent variables were based on Stoutland’s (2001) four elements of trust in the police: priorities, respectfulness, dependability, and competence. In the first stage of the analysis, four separate equations were generated using each of the quantitative measures of Stoutland’s elements as dependent variables. All questions used for the trust variables were measured using Likert scales ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

The first question measured Stoutland’s priorities dimension and asked students if they believed that the police really cared about what is good for their neighborhood. The second question measured Stoutland’s respectfulness dimension and asked students if they believed that the police treated most individuals fairly. The third question measured Stoutland’s dependability dimension and asked students if they can rely

Table 1

Descriptive statistics of variables used in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Index variable measuring students’ commitment to pro-social institutions</td>
<td>Whole N*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low measures indicate low commitment (low social bonds)</td>
<td>African-Americans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High measures indicate high pro-social commitment (social bonding)</td>
<td>Latino*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-social</td>
<td>Index variable measuring students’ pro-social beliefs</td>
<td>Whole N*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low measures indicate delinquent beliefs (low social bonds)</td>
<td>African-Americans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High measures indicate pro-social beliefs (social bonding)</td>
<td>Latino*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called police</td>
<td>Called dichotomous variable measuring if the police were police called</td>
<td>Whole N*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the last year (yes = 1, no = 0)</td>
<td>African-Americans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latino*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be like mom</td>
<td>Variable measuring if youth want to be like the kind of person their mother is</td>
<td>Whole N*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low measures indicate wanting to be like their mother</td>
<td>African-Americans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High measures indicate wanting to be like their mother</td>
<td>Latino*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be like dad</td>
<td>Variable measuring if youth want to be like the kind of person their father is</td>
<td>Whole N*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low measures indicate wanting to be like their father</td>
<td>African-Americans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High measures indicate wanting to be like their father</td>
<td>Latino*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang</td>
<td>Dichotomous variable used to measure self-reported gang membership among Chicago high school students (gang member = 1, non-gang member = 0)</td>
<td>Whole N*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low measures indicate delinquent beliefs</td>
<td>African-Americans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High measures indicate pro-social beliefs</td>
<td>Latino*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarious experience</td>
<td>Dummy variables:</td>
<td>Whole N*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i = not seen others stopped</td>
<td>African-Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii = seen others stopped and respected (comparison group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii = seen others stopped and not respected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low measures indicate delinquent beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High measures indicate pro-social beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low measures indicate low trust in the police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variable</td>
<td>Dichotomous variable measuring respondent sex (male = 1, female = 0)</td>
<td>Whole N*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low measures indicate pro-social beliefs</td>
<td>African-Americans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High measures indicate low trust in the police</td>
<td>Latino*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variable</td>
<td>Index variable measuring “trust in the police” using Stoutland concepts</td>
<td>Whole N*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low measures indicate high levels of trust in the police</td>
<td>African-Americans</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low measures indicate low trust in the police</td>
<td>Latino*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures are rounded.

* Full sample
* Selected for African-Americans
* Selected for Latino.
The police do the best they can. I can rely on the police. The police treat most individuals fairly. The police really care about what is good for my neighborhood. These are the dimensions of trust in the police that were measured in the study.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>Variable measuring priorities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectfulness</td>
<td>Variable measuring respectfulness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>Variable measuring dependability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Variable measuring competence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures are rounded.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The police really care about what is good for my neighborhood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police treat most individuals fairly</td>
<td>482**</td>
<td>408**</td>
<td>535**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can rely on the police</td>
<td>424**</td>
<td>407**</td>
<td>448**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police do the best they can</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>Respectfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectfulness</td>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Likewise deletion. ** p < 0.01 level (two-tailed).

Results

Approximately 40 percent of the students agreed or strongly agreed that they liked school and cared about what their teachers thought of them. Nearly one-third (31 percent) of the youths agreed or strongly agreed with each of the two questions that measured pro-social beliefs (people who leave their keys in car are as much to blame as the thief and delinquent acts do not hurt anyone). Similarly, 30 percent of the students reported that they had called the police in the past year. Half of the respondents indicated that they wanted to be like their mothers; however, only 27 percent of the students agreed or strongly agreed that they wanted to be like their fathers.

A small percentage (30 percent) of the students responded that they were a current or a former gang member. Nearly 60 percent reported having been stopped by the police in the last year, and 40 percent reported that they observed others stopped and treated with disrespect by the police. Only 11 percent reported that they witnessed others stopped and treated with respect by the police.

The seemingly low percentage of reported gang membership is attributable to two factors. First, active gang members are unlikely to attend or stay in school. Overall, the four-year graduation rate of students in the Chicago public school system is only 55 percent (Chicago Public Schools, 2007). Gang members are among the least likely groups of students to complete their education. Indeed, poor school performance is a cause and consequence of gang membership (Hill, Lui, & Hawkins, 2001). Second, gang members might have underreported their affiliation despite numerous assurances about, and safeguards to protect, respondent’s anonymity.

The dependent variable consisted of four questions. Approximately 17 percent of the youths agreed or strongly agreed that, “The police care about what is good for my neighborhood.” Less than one-fifth (18 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that, “The police treat most individuals fairly.” Only 20 percent of the students agreed or strongly agreed that, “The police really care about what is good for my neighborhood.” “The police do the best they can.” The scores on the trust index ranged from 4 to 20 (with lower numbers representing lower levels of trust and vice versa). The mean for the full sample on the trust index was 10.5; for African Americans and Latinos, it was 10.2 and 10.9, respectively.

Priorities and respectfulness

The models for the priorities and respectfulness dimensions were highly comparable. The analyses showed that youths who were pro-school and pro-teacher were more likely to believe that the police really cared about what is good for their neighborhood (i.e., priorities) and treat most people fairly (i.e., respectfulness). Students who observed other youths stopped and treated with disrespect were less likely to...
believe that the police cared about their neighborhood (i.e., priorities) or treated people fairly (i.e., respectfulness), compared to students who observed other youths stopped and treated with respect.

Dependability and competence

In the dependability and competence models, similar associations were found between school and seeing other youths stopped and treated disrespectfully by the police. Specifically, youths who were pro-school and pro-teacher were more likely to believe that they can rely on the police (dependability) and the police do the best that they can (competence). Students, who observed other youths stopped and treated with disrespect, compared to those who observed other youths stopped and treated with respect, were less likely to believe that the police are dependable and competent. In addition, the dependability model indicated that students who aspired to be like their fathers were more likely to trust the police than those who did not. The competence model also showed that youths who called the police in the last year were less likely to believe that the police do the best that they can.

In summary, the regression models for the four dimensions were mostly consistent; however, the dependability and competence models were somewhat distinguishable from each other and the priorities and respectfulness models. The correlational findings in Table 3 and the regression results in Table 4 support Stoutland’s (2001) observation that trust can be conceptualized as a larger construct with different dimensions. To test the singular predictive power of the construct, the four elements were combined into an additive index, which provided a more parsimonious and stable outcome measure.

Trust in the police index

Ordinary least squares regression analysis was used to estimate three models using the trust in the police index as the dependent variable. The first model examined all students in the sample. The second model included only African American students, who constituted the largest proportion of students in the sample. The third model included only Latino students, who constituted the second largest group of students in the sample.

As shown in Table 5, Model 3, representing Latino students, explained 15 percent more of the variance in the dependent variable than did Model 1, which included all the students in the sample. Also, the model for Latino students explained 21 percent more of the variance in the dependent variable than the model for African American students. The variable description table helps explain these differences (see Table 1). Latino students were more equally distributed among the set of dummy variables that measured students’ vicarious experiences with the police; this increased variation led to better estimations in the model.

Table 5 shows distinctions among the models. The model for all students in the sample (Model 1) demonstrated that students’ feelings about teachers and school were important predictors of trust in the police. Whether a student observed other students stopped and treated with disrespect by the police was also important in predicting trust in the police and was the strongest predictor of trust in the police (Beta = - .326). Specifically, students who observed other youths stopped and treated disrespectfully, compared to those who observed other youths stopped and treated respectfully, were less likely to trust the police.

In Model 2, for African American students, the results were similar to those found in the overall model (Model 1). For African American students, however, wishing to be like their mothers, predicted lower trust in the police, a finding that did not appear in Model 1. As with the full model for all students, observing others being treated with disrespect was the strongest predictor of trust in the police (Beta = -.280) followed by commitment to school (Beta = .212).

The model for Latino students (Model 3) produced findings that were comparable to those found in the model for African American students (Model 2), with the exception of the variable “not seen other youths stopped by the police,” which was significant in the former but not in the latter. This distinction was also found when comparing the model for Latinos with the full model. For Latinos, not observing others stopped by the police, compared to seeing other youths stopped and treated with respect, predicted trust in the police (Beta = .200). School was the most important predictor in the model for Latino students (Beta = .220), a finding that differed from the other two models.

Cross-coefficient analysis

A cross-coefficient t-test found no differences between the overall model and the model for African American students. Differences were found, however, between the models for African American and Latino students. The regression analysis showed that school predicted trust in the police in both models. The cross-coefficient analysis found that school had a different slope in the models for Latino and African American students.
Table 5
Regression equations: explaining trust in the police.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>Trust the police</th>
<th>Trust the police</th>
<th>Trust the police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall (Model 1)</td>
<td>African-Americans (Model 2)</td>
<td>Latino (Model 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>.40E+00</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.34E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-social beliefs</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called police</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be like mom</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be like dad</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang member</td>
<td>-.738</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not seen other stopped</td>
<td>1.704</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen other stopped disrespectfully</td>
<td>-2.23E+00</td>
<td>-.326</td>
<td>-1.87E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>8.63E+00</td>
<td>9.31E+01</td>
<td>6.26E+04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>17.47E+00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>110.38E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>677</td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $b$ is the unstandardized coefficient; Beta is the standardized coefficient. Figures are rounded.

* Coated as 1=yes, 0=no.
* Comparison group
* $p \leq .05$.
** $p \leq .01$.
*** $p \leq .001$.

students ($z = -1.76$, $p \leq .05$). The difference was one of magnitude not direction, because the regression analysis indicated that school was significant for both models. The cross-coefficient $t$-test, therefore, supported the regression results showing that school was a stronger predictor of trust in the police for Latino students than for African American students.

The cross-coefficient analysis also found a difference between the African American and Latino student models in both the magnitude and direction for the vicarious experiences variable. Students who had not seen other students stopped by the police, compared to students who had seen others stopped and respected, had no effect on African American students’ trust in the police but did have an effect on Latino students’ trust in the police. The cross-coefficient $t$-test demonstrated that this was a significant difference between the models, suggesting that no contact with the police was a predictor of trust for Latinos, but not for African Americans ($z = -2.96$, $p \leq .002$).

The regression analyses indicated that “school” predicted trust in the police for both the overall model and the model for Latino students. The cross-coefficient $t$-test showed a difference in magnitude between the models for the school variable. In the Latino model, “school” had a stronger association with trust in the police than in the overall model ($z = -1.40$, $p \leq .08$). In addition, the regression analyses revealed a difference in magnitude in which the variable “be like mom” was stronger in the model for Latino students than in the overall model. The cross-coefficient $t$-test also showed a difference between the models with regard to the predictive power of students wanting to be like their mothers and trust in police ($z = 1.52$, $p \leq .06$).

The final difference between the model for Latino students and the overall model was found for the variable “not seen other youths stopped by the police.” The regression analysis suggested that the models had different slopes for this variable. The findings of the cross-coefficient $t$-test supported the distinctions in the regression equations and showed that no vicarious experiences with the police was a stronger predictor in the Latino model than in the overall model ($z = -2.56$, $p \leq .005$).

Summary and conclusions

As Stoutland (2001) suggested, the four dimensions in her trust in the police framework were distinguishable from one another. Nonetheless, all the regression models had similar predictive power as indicated by explained variances, as well as similar predictive specificity as indicated by the variables that were significantly related to trust in the police. The model for Latino students explained the most variance in the outcome measure. Supportive of Stoutland’s results, the trust in the police was found to be a multidimensional construct. Measured with quantitative variables, her four basic elements were highly correlated with one another, but were also slightly different in terms of their relationships with other variables.

On all four separate dimensions (priorities, respectfulness, dependability, and competence), commitment to school and seeing other youths stopped and treated disrespectfully by the police were highly significant predictors of trust. As hypothesized, adolescents with greater commitment to school and teachers expressed more trust in the police on the four dimensions. Also as hypothesized, students who observed other youths being stopped and treated with disrespect by the police expressed significantly less trust in the police on the four dimensions than students who had not seen other youths stopped and treated with disrespect by the police.

Other variables were significantly related to youths’ trust in the police. Specifically, as hypothesized, youths who aspired to be like their fathers rated the police higher on dependability than youths who did not aspire to be like their fathers. Contrary to the study’s hypothesis, however, youths who called the police, rated officers significantly lower on the competence dimension. Based on other studies, this finding suggests that youths were dissatisfied with their interactions with the police (the process) and not necessarily with the outcome of the call (Tyler, 2001a, 2001b).

Unrelated to any of the four separate dimensions of trust were pro-social beliefs, gang membership, and not seeing others stopped by the police. Unlike other studies, no gender effect was found on police perceptions (e.g., Engel, Sobol, & Worden, 2000). Young men and women showed no differences on the predictors of trust. The treatment of youths during vicarious and direct contacts with police appear more important that gender per se, which is a predictor of the frequency of contact (Jones-Brown, 2000). Using the additive index of trust in the police with the full sample of students, commitment to school and vicarious experiences were highly significant predictors of trust in the police in the hypothesized directions. For example, liking school and caring about teachers’ opinions were related to higher trust in the police.
and seeing other youths stopped and treated disrespectfully by the police was related to lower trust in the police.

Among Latino youths, no contact with the police was related to higher ratings of trust in officers than was positive vicarious experiences with the police. This result is somewhat expected given the comparatively lower rates of Latino participation in Chicago’s Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) and comparatively higher rates of Latino dissatisfaction with and distrust in the police in Chicago, especially among Spanish-speaking Latinos who generally are less favorable in their views of police and less involved in CAPS than their English-speaking counterparts. These findings might reflect a pervasive unwillingness among Latinos to contact police and to report crimes—a finding that has been suggested in evaluations of CAPS, which also show that Latinos rate the police lower than Whites on measures such as police helpfulness and fairness (Skogan, Steiner, DuBois, Gudell, & Fagan, 2002).

Among Latino and African American youths, “being like mom” was related to lower ratings of trust in police, which is consistent with previous research showing that women rate the police more negatively than men and that women of color are more likely to report seeing and hearing about instances of police abuse (Hurst & Frank, 2000; Hurst, McDermott, & Thomas, 2005). A closer relationship with mom could increase the likelihood that negative attitudes toward the police will be transmitted to adolescents of color. As noted earlier, however, Weitzer and Tuch (1999) found that women expressed more positive views of the police than men in the African American community. More studies should explore the interaction between race and vicarious experiences with the police.

Driven by theoretical considerations (e.g., social bonding) in the construction of the questionnaire, it was presumed that a desire to emulate parents is indicative of pro-social inclinations and interests. It was also presumed that, in most cases, parents are role models for conformity and conventionalism. A small (albeit unknown) percentage of parents, however, are inadequate role models of responsibility, maturity, and constraint. In the worst case, criminally involved parents can perpetuate intergenerational gang membership, drug selling, and other criminal pursuits. Thus, the findings regarding “wanting to be like mom/dad” must be viewed with a degree of caution.

The two most important findings of the current study was its support for the substantial influence of vicarious experiences on trust and the negativity or asymmetrical bias that has appeared in previous studies of police-citizen contacts. Indirect encounters with the police are obviously a critical variable in shaping young people’s views of police officers (Hurst & Frank, 2000). Police officers should be mindful of how secondhand reports of their undesirable interactions with youths can diffuse through the community and imbue young residents with a sense of entitlement and distrust toward the police. Along the same lines, this study suggests that negative encounters probably trump positive ones with respect to their relative effects on attitudes toward the police. According to the asymmetry hypothesis, youths attach more weight to negative encounters with the police than positive ones when formulating their views of officers. Thus, witnessing other youths being treated disrespectfully by the police is quite likely to culminate in negative attitudes toward the police, whereas witnessing other youths being treated respectfully by the police is not as likely to culminate in positive attitudes toward the police (Skogan, 2006).

Why should the police care about juvenile trust? For several reasons, they should. Police officers are often the first and only contact that young people have with the juvenile justice system (Bittner, 1990). They embody the law and legal system, leaving lasting impressions on youths that can affect their attitudes toward the law and legal authorities. In the short-term, unfavorable impressions of the police can weaken youths’ ties to school and strengthen their ties to gangs. In the long-term, they can make youths less likely to cooperate with and trust the police in adulthood, undermining community policing and other programs that depend on close ties between police officers and community members (Bittner, 1990). Public opinion about the police matters and can affect officers’ ability to perform their duties (Hurst et al., 2000) because widespread confidence in the police makes their work easier and more effective (italics author’s) (Skogan, 2006, p. 138).

Police officers should be aware that their behavior with the public can affect not only a particular individual in an encounter but also the bystanders to those encounters. Disrespectful treatment by the police can make a deep impression on more persons than the individual who is the subject of a particular stop. In the community policing era, it is especially critical for the police to communicate positive messages to youths. Although researchers and policymakers might be hesitant to ascribe blame in such cases, officers are the professionals and need to be held to a higher standard than high school students or teenagers. As Friedman et al. (2004, p. 22) concluded, “Police rudeness undermines the public’s appreciation for the genuine wealth of courtesies and life-saving services rendered by so many honest and hard-working police officers.”

Officers-youth interactions are a two-way street; youths probably have preconceived notions about law enforcement authorities. Similarly, officers’ attitudes toward youngsters are based on previous experiences and stereotypes about adolescents. Thus, the negativity that juveniles harbor toward the police might elicit police officer disrespect. The police view disrespect for their authority as a transgression that should be punished, even if a citizen has engaged in no rule breaking (Sherman, 1982). In short, the behavior or demeanor of both police officers and youths can affect the definition of an encounter and its eventual outcome. A major limitation of this study was the absence of contextual variables. The current findings would have been greatly informed by an analysis of neighborhood effects on police trust. Chicago is a heterogeneous city in terms of many factors that predict crime and the nature and extent of police engagement with community residents in their efforts to enforce the law and deliver services. For example, Skogan’s (2006) research on community policing provides a high informative analysis of differences in the translation and implementation of CAPS in neighborhoods defined by widely divergent social, political, and economic climates. In addition, seminal research on the environmental (ecological) correlates of crime in Chicago demonstrates the power of contextual variables (e.g., social cohesion and collective efficacy) in determining and explaining levels of crime and disorder in communities (Sampson et al., 1997). Future research should examine both individual- and contextual-level variables in attempts to fully understand residents’ trust in the police.
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APPENDIX VIII
City leaders call on black men to mentor youths and stop the violence

By Justin George The Baltimore Sun

March 25, 2015, 11:16 AM

African-American community leaders implored a sea of mostly black men at a Northwest Baltimore church Tuesday to mentor black youth and help stop a "genocide" of black males being lost to homicide.

The speakers included a pastor, a city councilman, a community activist, a public safety official, a school administrator and nonprofit directors — all African-American — who led a discussion before a crowd of about 1,000 on how black men should stop violence, read to young people and employ teens.

The meeting was convened by Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake, who issued a "call to action" urging black men to do more to curtail the killing of African-Americans, who made up nearly 90 percent of all homicide victims last year. Many of the community leaders at the Empowerment Temple event have been working for years on that mission.

The forum provided a place the disparate group could unify and find constructive solutions, such as calling on men to become mentors for 900 youths on a waiting list at the Big Brothers Big Sisters of the Greater Chesapeake.

"To see someone being hurt, to see someone being killed, to see the violence to see the madness going on — there's something instinctual that's supposed to be happening as a man," said Munir Bahir, a leader of the 300 Men March, who organizes "street engagement" teams to reach disassociated youth. "When you see harm, when you see people being victimized, you stand up and you want to do something."

The meeting was broadcast over the Internet and publicized on social media with the hashtag #WeCanEndIt.

When mentorship came up, the Rev. Jamal H. Bryant called on 20 men to stand and immediately sign up for a volunteer program. When a single mother asked the mayor what the city could do to help employ her son and keep
him out of trouble in the summer, City Councilman Brandon M. Scott said the city's YouthWorks program is hiring record numbers and a city staffer took down her name.

In the hallway, groups such as the Recovery Network, a mental health and drug treatment group, Roberta’s House, a victim counseling center, and Safe Kids, a parent help program, stood ready to sign up people.

Rawlings-Blake acknowledged criticism from residents who said the ”call to action” deflected the failures of the city to lower unemployment, create jobs and make neighborhoods safer. She responded by saying it’s everyone’s job to speak out against homicide and the status quo.

"Some people have said the work we're doing here is blaming black men," she told the crowd. "I refuse to ignore the crisis."

This year, all but three of the city’s 44 homicide victims were black. Last year, 189 of the city’s 211 murder victims were black. And most were young. The largest group of victims — 54 — were age 25 to 29, while the second largest group, age 18 to 24, included 50 victims, according to Baltimore police.

More forums are planned to build momentum and organize volunteers to reach city youth. The effort was inspired by President Barack Obama’s "My Brother’s Keeper" initiative, which also aims to help African-American boys.

The mayor has also been urging city employees to be part of the movement.

Last year, in an effort to improve Baltimore's youth literacy rate, Rawlings-Blake signed an order granting every city employee two hours of paid leave per week to volunteer as a literacy tutor through Third Grade Reads, a program that uses city employees to tutor elementary students who are reading below grade level.

Baltimore Police Commissioner Anthony W. Batts, who is African-American, has urged police officers to volunteer in the program. On Tuesday, he said, he mentored a child at Arundel Elementary School in Cherry Hill before attending a police homicide meeting that was cut short when he went to the scene of a shooting in Southwest Baltimore that seriously wounded a man.

"I live this. I go out to those streets, I go out to the corners, and I see this every single day and it touches my spirit," he said.

Theodore Thompson, deputy chief academic officer of Baltimore City Public Schools, said African-American families need more support to help stop the daily truancy of 4,800 children in Baltimore, 78 percent of whom are black boys. He said new "reengagement centers," which are underway, are a start.

Rawlings-Blake called on businesses to hire one youth for the summer, and if it's too expensive, she urged them to come to the city to seek help.

Scott, the councilman, challenged African-Americans to destroy the stereotypes that continue to plague black men, such as perceptions that they are "dangerous," which he said the black community sometimes feeds into with rap lyrics. He said young people's self-esteem needs to be strengthened so that they see they are "Kings" with a history that dates back to the start of civilization.

"We ourselves self-inflict that stuff because I know we don't live like that," he said.

*Baltimore Sun* reporter Andrea K. McDaniels contributed to this article.

*jgeorge@baltsun.com*

twitter.com/justingeorge

An earlier version of this story included the wrong organization that was seeking 900 mentors for children. The story has been changed to reflect the correct organization.
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