SHEDDING LIGHT ON POLICE CULTURE: AN EXAMINATION OF OFFICERS' OCCUPATIONAL ATTITUDES

EUGENE A. PAOLINE III
University of Central Florida

Research on police culture has generally fallen within one of two competing camps—one that depicts culture as an occupational phenomenon that encompasses all police officers and one that focuses on officer differences. The latter conceptualization of police culture suggests subcultures (or at least segmentation) that bound or delimit the occupational culture. Using survey data collected as part of the Project on Policing Neighborhoods (POPN) in two municipal police departments, the research reported here examines the similarities and differences among contemporary police officer attitudes in an effort to locate some of the boundaries of the occupational culture of police. Seven analytically distinct groups of officers are identified, suggesting that officers are responding to and coping with aspects of their occupational world in different ways. The findings call into question some of the assumptions associated with a monolithic police culture.

Keywords: *police; police culture; police subcultures; officer attitudes; cluster analysis*

Police culture has been a topic of study for well more than 40 years. Since the seminal work of William Westley (1970), traditional characterizations of a monolithic police culture have focused on describing the widely shared attitudes, values, and norms that serve to manage the strains created within

---

This article is based on data from the Project on Policing Neighborhoods, directed by Stephen D. Mastrofski, Roger B. Parks, Albert J. Reiss, Jr., and Robert E. Worden. The project was supported by Grant No. 95-IJ-CX-0071 by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent

POLICE QUARTERLY Vol. 7 No. 2, June 2004 205–236
DOI: 10.1177/1098611103257074
© 2004 Sage Publications

the occupational and organizational environments of policing. Other police research diverges from the traditional characterization, asserting that officers might cope with the strains of their occupation differently in the form of officer types or styles (see, e.g., Broderick, 1977; Brown, 1988; Muir, 1977; White, 1972). Although monolithic police culture research stresses the central tendencies among officers, typology studies highlight the variance.

Some recent research has begun to even further question many of the assumptions of a single police culture (e.g., Chan, 1996; Haarr, 1997; Herbert, 1998; Manning, 1994a, 1994b; Paoline, Myers, & Worden, 2000), and this study follows that lead. Using survey data collected as part of the Project on Policing Neighborhoods (POPN) in two municipal police departments, the research reported here examines the similarities and differences in police officer attitudes in order to locate some of the boundaries of occupational culture as well as identify possible subgroups. This study is geared toward developing a clearer understanding of cultural phenomena among police officers who may be differentially perceiving and coping with aspects of their working environments in contemporary police departments. It is my contention that we could expect to find variation in attitudes associated with the police culture, even in the early to mid 1970s, when most typology studies were conducted. Now, with the changes that have occurred in the composition of police forces (i.e., more racial minorities, females, and college-educated officers) and in the philosophies of policing (i.e., community policing) over the past two decades, we might expect even more fragmentation, the nature of which should be examined for a more sophisticated understanding of police culture.

This article begins by considering traditional accounts of police culture, along with competing conceptualizations of culture that suggest variation among officers. This section is followed by a discussion of the occupational outlooks that are generally considered to be the most prominent features of police culture. Next, based on Worden's (1995) synthesis of typology studies, expectations for how groups of officers might attitudinally vary from one another are presented. Although most typology studies relied on only a few attitudinal dimensions (i.e., two or, at most, three), the research reported here examines multiple occupational outlooks simultaneously, all

---

the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. The author would like to thank Rob Worden, Ray Surette, and the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions that improved this article. An earlier version of this manuscript was presented at the American Society of Criminology Meeting in Chicago, Illinois in November 2002.

of which are part of what culture is thought to cover (i.e., attitudes toward citizens, supervisors, the police role, procedural guidelines, and policing tactics). Based on the proposed expectations for group formation, a cluster analysis technique is performed, and the findings are discussed. Finally, the implications for future research and practice are outlined.

COMPETING CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF POLICE CULTURE

Since William Westley's seminal study in the 1950s, descriptions of a "single" police culture have focused on the widely shared attitudes, values, and norms that serve to manage strains created by the nature of police work (i.e., the occupational street environment) and the punitive practices of police management and supervision (i.e., in the organizational environment) (Brown, 1988; Crank, 1998; Drummond, 1976; Fielding, 1988; Kappeler, Sluder, & Alpert, 1998; Manning, 1995; McNamara, 1967; Reiner, 1985; Reuss-Ianni, 1983; Rubinstein, 1973; Skolnick, 1994; Sparrow, Moore, & Kennedy, 1990; Van Maanen, 1974; Westley, 1970). These attitudes, values, and norms include a distrust and suspiciousness of citizens and a prescription to assess people and situations in terms of their potential threat (i.e., maintaining the edge), a lay-low or cover-your-ass orientation to police work that would discourage the initiation of contacts with citizens and supervisors, a strong emphasis on the law enforcement elements of the police role, a we-versus-they attitude toward citizens, and the norm of loyalty to the peer group (for a more detailed account of traditional police culture research, see Paoline, 2003).

Although research on the police culture has stressed the central tendencies among officers, other research (i.e., typologies) notes variation. Interestingly, all typology studies identify a group of officers that carry many of the outlooks of the traditional conceptualization of police culture: for example, Broderick's (1977) Enforcer, Brown's (1988) Old-Style Crime-Fighter, Muir's (1977) Enforcer, Reiner's (1978) New Centurion, Walsh's (1977) Action-Seeker, and White's (1972) Tough-Cop. However, these studies also identify contrasting groups that do not equally share many of the attitudes, values, and norms commonly associated with the police culture. Typology studies of police contrast the notion that all officers see the world through the same lens and suggest that officers might cope with the strains of their occupation differently. Moreover, the research that has identified these stylistic differences among officers have concluded with very similar types or styles of officers, despite independent research sites and

samples, and over different points in time—all of which speaks to both the reliability and validity of this research (see Reiner, 1985; Worden, 1995).

The research on styles of police officers was heavily influenced by the professional reform of police (see White, 1972). Based on that research, we might speculate that as changes in the police profession occur, differing attitudes (e.g., toward role, citizens, tactics, supervision, rules and regulations, and procedural guidelines, etc.) may emerge among police. Changes in the demographics of police personnel (i.e., more females, racial minorities, and college-educated officers) as well as changes in policing philosophies (i.e., community policing) over the past two decades may have eroded the monolithic police culture, thus contributing to a more fragmented occupational group (Haarr, 1997; Paoline et al., 2000). As such, the potential now exists for officers to exhibit more attitudinal variation toward aspects of their occupational and organizational environments than past literature has documented. The key research questions are: (a) How attitudinally similar are officers to one another? and (b) To the extent that subgroup differences emerge, what attitudes comprise such groups? This is precisely what this study will examine.

ATTITUDINAL DIMENSIONS OF POLICE CULTURE

Previous research holds that particular valences on a number of attitudinal dimensions are a part of the police culture. What follows are the outlooks that are generally considered prominent features of culture as well as how these outlooks might vary.

CITIZENS

Research on police officers has noted the negative attitudes that police hold toward citizens (Reuss-Ianni, 1983; Rubinstein, 1973; Skolnick, 1994; Westley, 1970). As part of a we-versus-they outlook, officers have generally not trusted, and have been suspicious of, the citizens they police. In addition, officers have historically not believed that those outside the policing profession would assist them in performing their duties, and even if "outsiders" did try to assist, they would not be of any real help (Sparrow et al., 1990). Conversely, research on police types/styles suggests that officers vary in their negative attitudes toward citizens. Using Muir's (1977, p. 226) research as an example, the Professional holds more favorable attitudes toward citizens than the cynic Enforcer, who would be more apt to

separate citizens into the unfavorable "they" category within a we-versus-they distinction.

SUPERVISION

Just as research on police culture has noted the negative attitudes that police officers hold toward citizens, so too have patrol officers' attitudes been characterized with regard to their primary supervisors and upper-level managers (see Crank, 1997; Crank & Caldero, 1991; Drummond, 1976). Feelings of uncertainty with regard to supervisory expectations and scrutiny have marked these negative attitudes. A different line of argument is proposed by typology researchers who have noted variation in attitudes that officers hold toward their supervisors. For instance, Reiner's (1978) work in the early 1970s noted that Professionals held more positive supervisory attitudes than the conflictual New Centurions.

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

The occupational culture literature notes that a major source of tension between officers and supervisors has centered on supervisors' focus on procedural rules and regulations (Brown, 1988; McNamara, 1967; Skolnick, 1994). Traditional accounts of culture have noted that officers' attitudes toward these restrictions have been unfavorable. The cultural reaction has been a lay-low/cover-your-ass attitude, whereby officers choose to avoid ambiguous situations in which negative evaluation might follow from supervisors (Van Maanen, 1974). Conversely, typology studies have noted variation in the extent to which officers hold negative attitudes toward procedural guidelines (Worden, 1995).

ROLE ORIENTATION

Traditional police culture research suggests that officers cope with the ambiguities of their role in society by focusing exclusively on crime-fighting activities, as service, order maintenance, and community policing efforts have historically not been regarded as real police work (Kelling & Kliesmet, 1996; Sparrow et al., 1990; Van Maanen, 1974). Reuss-Ianni (1983) asserted, in her explanation of the street cop culture, that sole identification with the crime-fighter image is a central tenet. By contrast, typologies of police reveal differences among officers in their conception of

the police role. Using Brown's (1988) research as an example, the Professional officer would be characterized as having a broader role conception than that of the rigid Old-Style Crime-Fighter.

POLICING TACTICS

Related to the ways in which officers identify with their role is their general beliefs about tactics of law enforcement or how the role should be performed—aggressiveness and selectivity. Police culture research posits that officers collectively hold positive attitudes toward aggressive stops of cars and checking out people as well as favorable attitudes toward selective enforcement of laws (i.e., assigning felonies a higher priority) (Skolnick, 1994; Van Maanen, 1974; Westley, 1970). A different line of argument is proposed by Brown (1988), who asserted that officers vary in their orientations toward these two forms of discretionary behavior.

EXPECTATIONS FOR GROUP FORMATION

The previous discussion focused on the ways in which cultural attitudes could be expected to vary among officers, and those bivariate expectations serve as the foundation of the current analysis. In analyzing sets of cultural attitudes simultaneously (i.e., more than a single attitude at a time), the task of explaining expected relationships is more complicated. More specifically, the question becomes: What can and should we expect in terms of the number and nature of different attitudinal groups? In doing so, because no one study has analyzed the entire set of attitudes proposed in the current research, some inferences might have to be drawn based on descriptive information provided by previous authors. For instance, because much of the work on typologies predates community policing, orientations toward this role will be extrapolated based on aspects of composite types (e.g., broad as opposed to narrow role orientation). Table 1 displays the five groups that could be expected to form, based on Worden's (1995) synthesis of American typology research (i.e., Broderick, 1977; Brown, 1988; Muir, 1977; White, 1972). Each column represents an expected officer group, and each row depicts each group's attitudinal orientations. In using this table to highlight group differentiation, it is more useful to examine the table vertically, as some of the time the expectation is that multiple groups will hold similar attitudes (e.g., congruent negative views of citizens held by Tough-Cops, Clean-Beat Crime-Fighters, and Avoiders).

TABLE 1. Attitudinal Expectations for Group Formation

	Group 1: Tough-Cops	*Group 2: Clean-Beat Crime-Fighters*	*Group 3: Avoiders*	*Group 4: Problem-Solvers*	*Group 5: Professionals*
Citizens	(-) citizens are hostile and uncooperative	(-) citizens are unappreciative	(-) citizens do not understand the police	(+) help citizens get to the root of problems	(+) maintain positive rapport with citizens
Supervisors	(-) supervisors are unsupportive	(-) supervisors are unsupportive	(-) or (+/-) pacify supervisors to keep out of trouble	(+) especially in more community policing departments	(+) value supervisory approval
Procedural guidelines	(-) they do more harm than anything	(+) value these due process safeguards	(-) viewed as obstacles	(-) too restrictive, impede efforts to solve problems	(+) accept the limitations placed on them
Law enforcement	(+) narrow role orientation that only includes law enforcement	(+) very rigid law enforcement orientation	(-) or (+/-) believe in only handling unavoidable (i.e., serious) crimes	(-) or (+/-) not the most important/defining function for an officer	(+) accept this role, though not rigid or inflexible
Order maintenance	(-) if handle, do so informally (not regarded as real police work)	(+) as long as they can handle them formally (i.e., ticket or arrest) part of role	(-) would only create more work	(+) expansive role orientation in handling citizen problems	(+) value roles beyond crime fighting
Community policing	(-) not real policing	(-) may impede their efforts to fight street crime	(-) would only create more work	(+) expansive role orientation	(+) expansive role orientation
Aggressiveness	(+) believe in aggressive style of patrol, part of image	(+) believe in aggressive style of patrol in controlling all illegality	(-) only increases chances to get into trouble	(-) usually only results in negative consequences for citizens	(-) or (+/-) exception rather than the norm
Selectivity	(+) believe in handling only real (i.e., serious) violations formally	(-) believe in pursuing and handling all forms (i.e., minor and serious) of illegal behavior	(+) believe in handling only unavoidable serious offenses that, if not handled, would bring undue negative attention to them	(+) discretionary informal judgment (over strict law enforcement) valued in handling problems	(-) handle full range of offenses, though do not feel the need to handle all formally (i.e., ticket or arrest)

Note: (+/-) indicates neutral attitudes.

GROUP 1: TOUGH-COPS

Tough-Cops epitomize many of the values depicted in monolithic characterizations of police culture. If officers hold the same beliefs as their predecessors, then one group should be comprised of these Tough-Cops. These individuals are cynical, believing that citizens are hostile toward the police and supervisors are unsupportive. Tough-Cops also have a narrow conception of the police role and believe that they should perform their law enforcement role aggressively and selectively (Worden, 1995).

Whereas traditional studies of police culture would posit that the majority of (or nearly all) officers would be Tough-Cops, the assumption here is that smaller numbers of officers will be found in this group (when compared to others), as police demographics and philosophies have changed to possibly fragment the traditional values held by Tough-Cops. Further speculation might suggest that many of the Tough-Cops have aged out of policing, thus affecting socialization patterns within contemporary police departments.

GROUP 2: CLEAN-BEAT CRIME-FIGHTERS

In many ways, the Clean-Beat Crime-Fighter resembles the Tough-Cop. Like the Tough-Cop, Clean-Beat Crime-Fighters are cynical, oriented strongly toward the crime-fighter role, and often upset with unsupportive supervisors. What separates Clean-Beat Crime-Fighters from Tough-Cops are their never-dying pursuit of fighting all crime (i.e., not just felonies) and the premium they place on individual rights of citizens.

GROUP 3: AVOIDERS

As the label implies, Avoiders are just doing their time, avoiding as much police work as possible. Their attitudes toward the elements of the work environments are neutral at best and negative at worst. Whereas Tough-Cops and Clean-Beat Crime-Fighters have a mission (i.e., law enforcement), the Avoiders' mission is to do just enough to wear the uniform (Reiner, 1978). Even though Avoiders are posited to hold negative attitudes toward most aspects of policing, the expectation is that few of their attitudes (both positive and negative) will be extreme (i.e., overly positive or negative), as Avoiders simply do not care enough to hold such attitudes.

Avoiders are cynical, burnt-out officers (Worden, 1995) who have either incrementally built up to this style over time or may be in some transitory state.

GROUP 4: PROBLEM-SOLVERS

Like Avoiders, Problem-Solvers are not aggressive in their patrolling tactics but are selective in their enforcement (Brown, 1988). Unlike Avoiders, these officers care very much about their job, especially with regard to helping citizens, which distinguishes them from all previous officer clusters. Problem-Solvers value their discretion, which they believe enables them to solve the problems that plague the community. Finally, Problem-Solvers will perform law enforcement functions, just not in strict legalistic ways (e.g., arrest) (Brown, 1988); thus, these officers should hold more favorable attitudes toward order maintenance and community policing/disorder objectives over crime-fighting responsibilities.

GROUP 5: PROFESSIONALS

Professional officers, as the name implies, embody the ideals of the professionalization reform movement (Brown, 1988; White, 1972). Professionals are willing to accept the changes/innovations that occur in policing; hold favorable opinions toward citizens, supervisors, procedural guidelines, and police work in general; and have one of the broadest role orientations of all types of officers (Worden, 1995). With respect to performing their multiple roles, Professionals do not endorse aggressive patrolling, as such tactics are regarded as the exception rather than the norm (unlike Clean-Beat Crime-Fighters). Finally, Professionals hold less favorable attitudes toward selective enforcement than groups like Clean-Beat Crime-Fighters and Problem-Solvers.

Although the expectations for attitudinal alignment within groups are based on explanations provided by research on police typologies, it should be noted that this author allows for the possibility that exact replicas of officer types might not emerge or that fewer or more groups form. The primary purpose of this section has been to provide a priori expectations for group formation based on extant research.

DATA

The data for this study were collected as part of the POPN, a large-scale, multimethod study of police in the Indianapolis Police Department (IPD) and St. Petersburg Police Department (SPPD). Data collection included patrol officer and supervisor observations, upper management extended interviews, citizen surveys, and patrol officer and supervisor surveys. This study relies exclusively on surveys of patrol officers. The data from these surveys are rich in information about many aspects of policing in general (e.g., officers' knowledge of beat(s), training and knowledge, goals, views of work unit, background characteristics and occupational attributes) and especially with regard to important cultural dimensions such as attitudes toward citizens, supervision, procedural guidelines, role, and tactics. Moreover, both departments reflect the changes that have occurred among contemporary police agencies across America over the past two decades, which might lead to a more fragmented occupational group than noted for past police culture studies. Because the two sites' work environments were similar in many respects (e.g., officer composition, civilianization, city crime rates, city diversity, etc.) (Terrill & Mastrofski, 2002), they were combined for analytical purposes.

Interviews of patrol officers were conducted by trained project employees at the IPD in Indianapolis, Indiana and the SPPD in St. Petersburg, Florida during the summers of 1996 and 1997, respectively. The interviews were conducted at each district station in Indianapolis (i.e., north, south, east, west) and at central headquarters in St. Petersburg. Identification numbers were assigned for each respondent to ensure confidentiality. The interview consisted of a mix of questions posed by interviewers and checklists completed by respondents in the interviewers' presence, the latter to minimize interviewer effects.

Of the 426 patrol officers assigned to one of IPD's four patrol districts during the study period, a total of 398 police officers were surveyed, producing a completion rate of 93%.[1] In the SPPD, 240 out of a possible 246 patrol officers were interviewed, for a completion rate of 98%.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The research presented here consists of three separate sets of analyses. The first set of analyses classifies groups of patrol officers based on their occupational attitudes. The second set of analyses examines the attitudinal

composition of the group(s), and the third set of analyses assesses the attitudes across the groups of officers.

MEASURES

In examining officers' attitudes toward central components of culture (i.e., citizens, supervisors, procedural guidelines, role, and policing tactics), a total of 10 measures were constructed and are displayed in the appendix.

Two measures of officers' attitudes toward citizens are examined. The first measure, an additive index, examines officers' perception of the likelihood that citizens in his or her primary work assignment would cooperate with the police. The second citizen measure is a single Likert-type item that reflects the degree to which officers are distrustful of citizens. Officers' attitudes toward supervisors are measured with two separate additive indices. The first measure reflects the degree to which officers hold favorable opinions of their most immediate or front-line supervisors—sergeants—and the second measure focuses on more senior personnel (i.e., district management).

Patrol officers' attitudes toward procedural guidelines are measured in terms of a single Likert-type questionnaire item. Role orientation is measured with three separate items. The first measure examines officers' orientation toward law enforcement and is measured in terms of a single Likert-type questionnaire item. The second measure is an additive index and is concerned with the degree to which order maintenance situations are included in officers' role definitions. The last item is a community policing additive index that measures the degree to which officers consider disorderly conditions to be police matters.

Finally, patrol officers' attitudes toward policing tactics are measured in terms of two separate Likert-type items. The first measure examines officers' views of aggressive patrol tactics (identical to one that Brown, 1988, used). A second measure reflects the degree to which patrol officers believe in selective enforcement of the law.

Before cluster analyzing the 10 attitudinal measures, as previously noted, there needs to be variation among the attitudes. More specifically, if officers' attitudes are all the same, then analyzing variation through cluster analysis becomes a moot point. Traditional characterizations of culture would posit that we should find little, if any, differences among officers. This was not the case here, as patrol officers varied in their attitudes toward citizens, supervisors, procedural guidelines, role, and the performance of

the role. Table 2 provides summary statistics for each of the patrol officer attitudes.

Although variation is noted, the pattern of some patrol officer attitudes exhibits a few similarities to traditional research. Like monolithic characterizations of police culture, many officers are still positively oriented toward their role as law enforcers (53% of the officers agree *somewhat* that law enforcement was their most important responsibility), favor aggressive patrolling tactics (46% of the officers agreed *somewhat* in these tactics), and believe that there are instances in which selective enforcement of the law is appropriate (63% responded that they should be selective *sometimes*), although the levels of intensity are not nearly as strong as that noted by previous research. Other patterns do not conform to traditional cultural expectations. Officers do not uniformly view citizens and supervisors in unfavorable terms (29% expressed some distrust in citizens, whereas the modal response for views of sergeants was *agree strongly* for all items), strictly oppose due process safeguards (59% *disagreed strongly* in overlooking procedural guidelines), or reject roles other than law enforcement (no officer responded *never* to all of the order maintenance items, whereas only 9 officers did for more contemporary community policing questions). This in its own right is significant in understanding police culture, although it does not tell us how variation is dispersed among different groups of officers (see Paoline, 2001, chapter 4 for more detail on this variation).

CLUSTER ANALYSIS[2]

The analytical technique used for the first set of analyses is K-means cluster analysis, which is the most ideal clustering method for large data sets (i.e., more than 200 cases) (Nourusis, 1990). In his text on cluster analysis, Everitt (1980) defined a cluster as follows: "Given a sample of N objects or individuals, each of which is measured on each of p variables, devise a classification scheme for grouping the objects into g classes. The number of classes and the characteristics of the classes to be determined" (p. 1). For the current analysis, N would equal patrol officers and p would consist of their measured attitudes and orientations. The K-means procedure, based on the nearest centroid sorting method, makes a preliminary pass through the data to determine the initial cluster centers. Once the centers are determined, the procedure assigns cases to each cluster based on an estimation of the smallest or closest distance between that case and the center of a given cluster—the cluster's centroid (Nourusis, 1990). A group's

TABLE 2. Descriptive Statistics of Patrol Officer Attitudes (n = 585)

	Mean	*Item Range*	*Minimum*	*Maximum*	*Standard Deviation*
Citizen cooperation	9.47	3-12	4	12	1.81
Citizen distrust	2.01	1-4	1	4	.79
Sergeants	16.95	5-20	5	20	3.64
District management	7.59	3-12	3	12	2.13
Procedural guidelines	1.64	1-4	1	4	.88
Law enforcement	3.13	1-4	1	4	.75
Order maintenance	9.08	3-12	5	12	1.95
Community policing	7.05	3-12	3	12	1.88
Aggressive patrol	2.92	1-4	1	4	.85
Selective enforcement	3.00	1-4	1	4	.59

centroid is a compilation of a combined mean score across all variables clustered. Cases are then compared to one another based on their cluster membership or how much alike they are to one another, as determined by their nearness to their cluster centroid. For this study, each officer's combined responses to 10 attitudinal dimensions are compared to every other officer, and those officers who are most similar are placed in the same cluster or group. Officers in each cluster do not have to be totally identical to one another, but they are more like the officers in their cluster compared to the other clusters.

Two of the most important decisions in using cluster analysis are the choice of variables and determining the proper number of clusters (Aldenderfer & Blashfield, 1984; Anderberg, 1973; Everitt, 1980). Both of these decisions received much attention. As previously noted, 10 attitudinal dimensions, all of which are part of police culture, are being used to establish group membership among patrol officers. Because no attitude in this analysis should be weighted more heavily than another, the variables were standardized into z scores (Everitt, 1980). Using a LISTWISE selection criteria, which excludes cases in which a response to a given attitude is missing, the working data set includes 585 of the total 638 patrol officers, or 92% of the sample population.

In determining the number of clusters, an iterative selection process was used, which established a range of clusters to assess the best fit to the data (i.e., the ratio of the collective distance between officers and their cluster centroid to the number of clusters). In examining the mean of officers' distance from their cluster centers at different cluster solutions (i.e., a range of clusters), one is able to identify the most efficient solution, as mean scores

flatten out or fail to exhibit differences from one cluster specification to another. Higher mean scores suggest that officers are more dispersed or further away from the cluster centroids. Table 3 displays the range of specified clusters, the squared distances (to accentuate differences) from the cluster centers of officers for each number of clusters specified, and the difference in mean scores as one moves iteratively from solution to solution.

Results of the K-means cluster analysis reveal that seven distinguishable groups of officers emerge, as the last substantial decrease in means occurs from a six-cluster model to a seven-cluster model, with few fluctuations through further cluster enumerations.

The next set of analyses examines the intra- and intercluster relationships. This involves describing the groups of officers that are formed. In determining what differentiates the groups of officers, descriptive statistics for each group's attitudes are analyzed.

PATROL OFFICER GROUPS

Previously, it was mentioned (see Table 1) that one could reasonably expect at least five groups of officers. Interestingly, some of these expectations are supported, whereas others are not. The following represents a description of the seven groups of officers, which were formed based on their attitudinal similarities and differences. The bulk of this discussion will be focused on explaining (central) attitudinal tendencies of each group. Table 4 provides a summary of each cluster's attitudinal means and standard deviations, allowing intra- and intergroup examination. Table 4 also presents the results of one-sample *t* tests between individual cluster means and population means (see Table 2), and although means across clusters in some instances may not appear drastically different from one another, 58/70 (83%) of the *t*-test comparisons are significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Cluster 3—Traditionalists. The Traditionalists embody many of the orientations found in the classic descriptions of police culture, which supports one of the expected cluster formations previously described—Tough-Cops. Of all the groups, Traditionalists hold the least positive views that citizens would cooperate with the police (mean = 7.84). Although Traditionalists scored the lowest in the belief in citizen cooperation, they do not appear to be overly distrustful of citizens (mean = 2.24). As such, it appears that the hostility perceived from and toward citizens may not be as prominent among contemporary officers in this group, although feelings of

TABLE 3. K-Means Centroid Cluster Formations

Number of Clusters	*Squared Means*	*Mean Difference*
2	8.93	
3	8.30	.63
4	7.75	.55
5	7.29	.46
6	6.97	.32
7	6.61	.36
8	6.46	.15
9	6.39	.07
10	6.16	.23
11	6.01	.15
12	5.95	.06
13	5.84	.11
14	5.67	.17
15	5.56	.11

uncooperativeness are still very much alive. It is also apparent that Traditionalists, like their Tough-Cop predecessors, hold unfavorable views of their supervisors, many of whom might be regarded as unsupportive and out of touch.

As expected, officers in Cluster 3 also hold unfavorable views of procedural guidelines (mean = 2.69), representing one of only two groups (see also Dirty Harry Enforcers) that generally believed that search-and-seizure laws should sometimes be overlooked. In terms of role, Traditionalists endorse the crime-fighting aspects of the occupation (though not with the intensity expected), and they reject order maintenance (mean = 7.94) and community policing functions (mean = 5.8).

Traditionalists also hold somewhat favorable outlooks toward aggressive patrol tactics (mean = 3.02) and selective enforcement of the law (mean = 3.27). A narrow crime-fighting role that endorses an aggressive but selective approach, possibly allowing Traditionalists to concentrate exclusively on more serious criminal offenses, conforms to expectations based on extant research on the occupational police culture.

Overall, one group of officers does resemble, in many ways, traditional characterizations of police culture. Contrary to traditional writing on police culture, but not contrary to expectations formed in this research, Traditionalists are the minority rather than majority, as only 51 officers (or 9% of all officers) are found within this group. So, although smaller in numbers, it

TABLE 4. Patrol Officer Groups: Descriptive Statistics of Attitudes and Mean Comparisons to Population

	Cluster 1: Lay-Lows (n = *83*)		*Cluster 2: Old-Pros* (n = *136*)		*Cluster 3: Traditionalists* (n = *51*)		*Cluster 4: Anti-Organizational Street-Cops* (n = *53*)		*Cluster 5: Dirty Harry Enforcers* (n = *75*)		*Cluster 6: Peacekeepers* (n = *58*)		*Cluster 7: Law Enforcers* (n = *129*)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Citizen cooperation (3-12)	10.16*	1.53	10.24*	1.51	7.84*	1.30	10.43*	1.53	9.72	1.64	9.38	1.85	8.35*	1.64
Citizen distrust (1-4)	1.72*	.67	1.64*	.64	2.24*	.74	1.92	.73	2.35*	.76	1.72*	.79	2.47*	.73
Sergeants (5-15)	18.07*	2.01	18.37*	2.06	12.41*	3.83	9.78*	2.69	18.60*	2.12	17.48	2.46	18.25*	1.94
District management (3-12)	7.78	2.07	8.80*	2.03	6.48*	1.60	5.76*	1.47	8.72*	1.73	6.93*	1.94	7.03*	1.89
Procedural guidelines (1-4)	1.30*	.56	1.19*	.41	2.69*	.71	1.26*	.52	3.04*	.56	1.72	.87	1.24*	.45
Law enforcement (1-4)	2.89*	.62	3.40*	.56	3.00	.57	3.00	.68	3.32*	.52	1.95*	.76	3.54*	.55
Order maintenance (3-12)	7.17*	1.23	10.63*	1.31	7.94*	1.79	8.74	1.95	9.49*	1.61	10.46*	1.37	8.42*	1.57
Community policing (3-12)	5.71*	1.07	8.52*	1.52	5.80*	1.41	6.70	1.48	7.61*	1.75	8.47*	1.83	6.05*	1.34
Aggressive patrol (1-4)	2.35*	.77	3.16*	.69	3.02	.76	2.57*	.93	3.27*	.74	2.17*	.78	3.26*	.70
Selective enforcement (1-4)	2.81*	.63	2.87*	.57	3.27*	.49	3.17*	.47	2.99	.56	3.41*	.56	2.90*	.56

*One-sample *t* test comparison between individual cluster mean and population mean ($p < .05$).

appears as though the "old guard" has not totally broken down, as there is some evidence of traditional cops even within contemporary departments.

Cluster 7—Law Enforcers. The orientations of officers in Cluster 7 conform in many ways to expectations based on a set of typology studies which identified a Clean-Beat Crime-Fighter style (see Worden, 1995). As expected, like Traditionalists, officers in this group believe that citizens are somewhat uncooperative with the police, as the mean value was 8.35 (among the lowest of all groups). In addition, of all the clusters, Law Enforcers are the most distrustful of citizens (mean = 2.47). It is evident that Law Enforcers' views of citizens in their occupational environment is more unfavorable than favorable, which is consistent with expectations. Partial support is found here for the expectation that officers in this group would have negative attitudes toward supervisors in their organizational environment. It appears that Law Enforcers relate more favorably to sergeants (mean = 18.25), who could reasonably be expected to be more supportive of their crime-fighting mentality, as opposed to potentially more "out of touch" senior personnel (mean = 7.03).

As expected, Law Enforcers strongly favor a law enforcement role orientation, as officers in this group hold the strongest crime-fighting attitudes (mean = 3.54). Law Enforcers also moderately accept order maintenance functions (as expected), which allow for the possibility of acting in more formal ways (i.e., arrests or citations), yet they show displeasure with more contemporary community policing functions (mean = 6.05). A speculative interpretation of the relationship between positive views of supervisors and role orientation could be that the community policing movement in these departments, like other American law enforcement agencies, is interpreted by Law Enforcers as a mandate from higher-ups, whereas at the street level, sergeants are viewed as more supportive of their emphasis on crime fighting and the maintenance of order. Furthermore, when we examine views of procedural guidelines, we find that Law Enforcers, like Clean-Beat Crime-Fighters of the 1970s, place a premium on these due process safeguards (mean = 1.24). Law Enforcers are also positively oriented toward aggressive patrol tactics (mean = 3.26), which conforms with expectations. Finally, although Law Enforcers should hold negative views of selective enforcement of the law, strong evidence is lacking here, though levels of agreement are among the lowest of all groups (mean = 2.90). So, although this is contrary to expectations, we do not find that Law Enforcers strongly favor selective enforcement over full enforcement of all infractions regardless of seriousness.

Cluster 2—Old-Pros. The label of Old-Pros is used to describe a group of officers who align with expectations put forth by typology studies in the 1970s (i.e., Professionals), many of which were interested in the professionalization reform movement and its impact on street-level officers' attitudes and behavior. At that time, Professionals might have been regarded as the new breed exception rather than the norm, although we find here that they are more of the norm (23% of the population), especially when compared to Traditionalists (8% of the population).

Old-Pros, like Professionals before them, might be thought of as embodying model attitudes of professional police officers. Old-Pros hold favorable attitudes of citizens in their occupational environment, as they believe that citizens are both cooperative (mean = 10.24) and should not be distrusted (mean = 1.64). Old-Pros hold equally favorable attitudes toward supervisors in their organizational environment as they do for citizens. Officers in this group have a high regard for both their sergeants (mean = 18.37) and district managers (mean = 8.80). In fact, although other groups generally hold favorable attitudes toward sergeants, few share the positive attitudes toward upper-level district managers that Old-Pros possess. The attitudes of these officers, in many ways, might serve as blueprints that management would want of their police officers.

Further evidence for the blueprint notion can be found in attitudes toward procedural guidelines. Old-Pros uniformly disagreed (99%) that "patrol officers should sometimes overlook search-and-seizure laws and other legal guidelines" (mean = 1.19). Unlike the narrow law enforcement focus of others (e.g., Traditionalists), Old-Pros believe in performing multiple roles beyond crime fighting. Officers in this cluster accept law enforcement (mean = 3.40), order maintenance (mean = 10.63), and community policing functions (mean = 8.52), as their orientations toward all are among the highest of all groups.

Old-Pros do diverge from expectations, as they hold positive attitudes toward aggressive patrolling tactics (mean = 3.16). This could be directly related to their expansive role orientations because the performance of multiple roles might be interpreted by these officers as one that would benefit from frequent stops of cars, checking out people, and running license checks. Many academicians and practitioners alike might regard such attitudes as part of order maintenance and disorder policing, which are valued components of Old-Pros' role orientation. So for Professionals, who predated community policing, aggressive patrol orientations were not a part of their orientations, whereas for Old-Pros in contemporary police

departments, positive orientations for aggressive patrol are found. Also, somewhat unexpectedly, Old-Pros favor some degree of selective enforcement of the law (mean = 2.87). Like the divergence found for Law Enforcers, the modal response is that they should be selective in enforcement only *sometimes*. Again, this could be related to role, as the more functions that officers feel they should perform, the greater the opportunity to believe that not all dispositions should or could be handled formally (i.e., arrest or citation). So, selectivity for Old-Pros may be more about how to handle situations (i.e., disposition) rather than what to handle and not handle (i.e., prioritizing). In this sense, Old-Pros might not totally diverge from expectations for selectivity.

Cluster 6—Peacekeepers. Officers found within Cluster 6 resemble past descriptions of Problem-Solvers. In terms of views of citizens, Peacekeepers are not distrustful of their clientele (mean = 1.72), and although their attitudes of citizen cooperation are somewhat mixed, they are more favorable than unfavorable. In terms of supervisors, Peacekeepers' attitudes are very positive toward direct supervisors (i.e., sergeants) (mean = 17.48), whereas views of district managers are much less favorable (mean = 6.93). This divergent pattern might be better explained by examining the role orientations of officers in this group. Peacekeepers are heavily oriented toward the order maintenance role (mean = 10.46), although they place a much lower value on crime fighting (the lowest of all groups). Although Peacekeepers' community policing attitudes are not as favorable as that found for order maintenance, their mean values (8.47) are exceeded only by Old-Pros.

The connection between supervisors and role could be linked with Peacekeepers' beliefs about how the role should be performed. Officers in Cluster 6 hold negative orientations toward aggressive patrolling tactics, and they have positive orientations toward selective enforcement. So Peacekeepers value their discretion in performing their order maintenance role (and community policing to a lesser extent), yet they do not believe in performing their role in an aggressive manner. Such values might not only work to minimize the chance of procedural errors and subsequent negative sanctions for Peacekeepers, but it might also work to minimize the potentially adverse interactions between their immediate supervisors and higher-ups. As such, supervisors might grant Peacekeepers more autonomy than others (e.g., more aggressive Traditionalists), who might continuously place them at odds with their superiors.

Finally, unlike Problem-Solvers who viewed procedural guidelines as an impediment to performing their role, Peacekeepers fail to share such feelings, instead choosing to embrace safeguards of due process (mean = 1.72). This is not too surprising given the fact that such safeguards are not a recent change or reform as they were when researchers noted the resistance that Problem-Solvers exhibited.[3] It also suggests that, for Peacekeepers, the focus on maintaining order is not an at-all-costs endeavor, which could neutralize the violation of due process rights of citizens (see Dirty Harry Enforcers). As such, Peacekeepers (like Old-Pros) might be good fits within contemporary departments that stress community building, problem solving, or nonaggressive order maintenance approaches to community policing.

Cluster 1—Lay-Lows. The attitudes of officers in Cluster 1 conform loosely to expectations based on descriptions of Avoiders. Contrary to expectations, Lay-Lows do not distrust citizens (mean = 1.72) and see them as cooperative (mean = 10.16). Although officers in this group are not overly positive toward district management (mean = 7.78), orientations toward sergeants are much more favorable (mean = 18.07). Though unexpected, these findings might not be a total surprise, as the ability of officers in this group to lay low may rest on holding positive attitudes toward the key players in their working environment (i.e., citizens and immediate supervisors). We notice that once these officers are asked about their views of more distant supervisors, more light is shed on potential levels of resentment and negativity.

As expected, Lay-Lows have a narrow role orientation that focuses on traditional unavoidable law enforcement functions, rejecting other roles that usually entail more ambiguous and time-consuming functions (i.e., order maintenance and community policing). Eighty percent of the officers in this group agreed that law enforcement was by far their most important responsibility (though the majority was only *agree somewhat*), whereas scores on the order maintenance (mean = 7.17) and community policing (mean = 5.71) indices were the lowest of all clusters. In contrast to Avoiders, who resent procedural guidelines, Lay-Lows nearly unanimously disagreed that they should overlook them (mean = 1.30). Officers in this group, as expected, responded unfavorably toward aggressive patrolling tactics. In fact, of all groups, only Peacekeepers are less aggressive than Lay-Lows. Finally, as expected, Lay-Lows favor the use of selective enforcement (mean = 2.81) in performing their law enforcement duties.

Cluster 4—Anti-Organizational Street-Cops. Unlike the previous five groups of officers that attitudinally aligned with previous studies of officer subgroups (i.e., typologies), the next two clusters represent additional distinct groups. This first group of officers shares some of the attitudes of both Lay-Lows and Traditionalists. There appear to be two distinguishable attributes of Cluster 4 members—their extremely negative attitudes toward supervisors in their organizational environment and their very strong positive attitudes toward citizens in their occupational environment. As such, the label Anti-Organizational Street-Cops most appropriately describes officers in this cluster.

Anti-Organizational Street-Cops hold the most optimistic beliefs of all clusters, that citizens will cooperate with the police (mean = 10.43), and they are among the least distrustful of citizens (mean = 1.92). Moreover, no group was more negative toward sergeants and district managers than Anti-Organizational Street-Cops. For most groups, we find a general congruence between views of citizens and views of supervisors (i.e., either positive or negative for both), whereas for Cluster 4 we find the most incongruence. A speculative interpretation of this divergence could be that Anti-Organizational Street-Cops enjoy being on the street working with citizens and resent supervisors, who might not have the same attitudes. When role orientations of Anti-Organizational Street-Cops are examined, we find that this group of officers does have a positive orientation toward law enforcement (mean = 3.00), but they do not have overly favorable orientations toward order maintenance (mean = 8.74) and community policing (mean = 6.70) objectives. Anti-Organizational Street-Cops' views of citizens and role might seem contradictory to advocates of community policing, and it might also be a reflection of the respect for citizens these officers hold. Anti-Organizational Street-Cops might view order maintenance and community policing functions (many of which are for noncrime situations) as overly intrusive and incompatible with their positive views of citizens and thus not endorsed. On the other hand, the law enforcement orientation of these officers may be their way of looking out for the best interests of citizens in preventing and responding to crime.

In performing their law enforcement role, these officers do not strongly endorse aggressive patrolling tactics (mean = 2.57). Further evidence of positive orientations toward citizens can be found in Anti-Organizational Street-Cops' resistance to violating citizens' due process rights, as the modal response was that they *disagreed strongly* that officers should sometimes overlook search-and-seizure laws (mean = 1.26). Finally, officers in this

group favored the use of selective enforcement (mean = 3.17), valuing the use of discretion in the performance of their law enforcement duties. This is not surprising given their positive attitudes toward citizens and their less-than-extreme orientations toward law enforcement and aggressiveness.

Cluster 5—Dirty Harry Enforcers. A seventh distinct cluster of officers emerges with orientations that appear to be closest to those of Law Enforcers and Traditionalists. Because officers in Cluster 5 believe strongly in aggressive patrol tactics in performing multiple police functions (i.e., crime and noncrime), while endorsing, at times, the violation of citizen rights, they are labeled Dirty Harry Enforcers.

To the extent that Anti-Organizational Street-Cops enjoy working with citizens on the street and despise supervisors in the organization, the opposite would be true of Dirty Harry Enforcers. Like Law Enforcers, officers in Cluster 5 display some feelings of distrust toward citizens (mean = 2.35), as these officers' modal response was that they *agree somewhat* that officers have reasons to distrust citizens. Attitudes toward the potential for citizen cooperation with the police are more favorable (mean = 9.72), suggesting that although Dirty Harry Enforcers might distrust some citizens, they do believe that citizens would cooperate with the police. Officers in this group scored high in their views of supervisors (mean = 18.60), matched only by the Old-Pros cluster. So, although views of citizens are mixed and more negative than positive, attitudes toward superiors are clearly more positive than negative.

Role orientations for this group are broad, as these officers accept the multiple functions that police are expected to perform. Dirty Harry Enforcers, like Law Enforcers, believe in performing law enforcement (mean = 3.32) and order maintenance functions (mean = 9.49), although unlike Law Enforcers, these officers are more willing to include in their role orientations more contemporary community policing objectives (mean = 7.61). Also, like Law Enforcers, Dirty Harry Enforcers believe in an aggressive approach to policing, which includes stopping cars, checking out people, and running license checks (mean = 3.27). This group of officers, like most others, believes in the use of their discretionary judgment in enforcing the law. One of the more distinguishing attitudinal characteristics of officers in this group is their agreement (mean = 3.04) that officers should sometimes overlook search-and-seizure laws in doing their jobs. The only officers to come close to Dirty Harry Enforcers' disdain for procedural guidelines are Traditionalists.

CULTURAL AND SUBCULTURAL ATTITUDES

Although the cluster analysis reveals statistical differences among officers based on the collectivity of attitudes, it does not tell us which attitudes are the most and least distinguishing across the seven groups. As such, the previous section was most concerned with explaining each analytically distinct group vertically, whereas this section focuses on the horizontal assessment of attitudes. If we consider the theoretical framework of this study, the prior section is more consistent with research that highlights cultural variation, as more than a single cluster was found. This section will tell us the extent to which certain occupational attitudes are more collectively shared among the groups (i.e., less distinguishing) as well as those to which cultural fragmentation is built. In doing so, it is important to recall Table 1 (expectations for group formation) and the notion that for no attitude were all groups hypothesized to be totally opposite from the other groups. To assess statistical differences in attitudinal means across the seven groups of officers, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted, using the most conservative statistical criteria (i.e., Bonferroni) to minimize Type I errors with multiple comparisons (i.e., overestimating statistical significance) (Nourusis, 1990).[4]

There are some interesting similarities noted across the groups. More specifically, the fewest statistically significant ($p < .05$) contrast among means are found for orientations toward selective enforcement (clusters: 1, 3; 1, 4; 1, 6; 2, 3; 2, 4; 2, 6; 3, 7; 5, 6; 6, 7), aggressive patrolling tactics (clusters: 1, 2; 1, 3; 1, 5; 1, 7; 2, 4; 2, 6; 3, 4; 3, 6; 4, 5; 4, 7; 5, 6; 6, 7), sergeants (clusters: 1, 3; 1, 4; 2, 3; 2, 4; 3, 4; 3, 5; 3, 6; 3, 7; 4, 5; 4, 6; 4, 7), and citizen distrust (clusters: 1, 3; 1, 5; 1, 7; 2, 3; 2, 5; 2, 7; 3, 6; 4, 5; 4, 7; 5, 6; 6, 7). These findings suggest that there are higher levels of consensus among officer groups in the way in which they perform the role, views of sergeants, and citizen distrust, which may be representative of cultural similarity. More specifically, most groups favored some degree of selective enforcement, moderate levels of aggressive patrolling tactics, positive views of sergeants, and low levels of citizen distrust. In contrast, higher amounts of statistical contrasts among clusters are found for orientations toward: community policing (clusters: 1, 2; 1, 4; 1, 5; 1, 6; 2, 3; 2, 4; 2, 5; 2, 7; 3, 4; 3, 5; 3, 6; 4, 5; 4, 6; 5, 6; 5, 7; 6, 7), order maintenance (clusters: 1, 2; 1, 4; 1, 5; 1, 6; 1, 7; 2, 3; 2, 4; 2, 5; 2, 7; 3, 5; 3, 6; 4, 6; 5, 6; 5, 7; 6, 7), procedural guidelines (clusters: 1, 3; 1, 5; 1, 6; 2, 3; 2, 5; 2, 6; 3, 4; 3, 5; 3, 6; 3, 7; 4, 5; 4, 6; 5, 6; 5, 7; 6, 7), district management (clusters: 1, 2; 1, 3; 1, 4; 1, 5; 2, 3; 2, 4; 2, 6; 2, 7;

3, 5; 4, 5; 4, 6; 4, 7; 5, 6; 5, 7), and citizen cooperation (clusters: 1, 3; 1, 7; 2, 3; 2, 6; 2, 7; 3, 4; 3, 5; 3, 6; 4, 6; 4, 7; 5, 7; 6, 7). As such, it appears that cultural fragmentation among groups of officers may be built around expansive role orientations, views of citizen cooperation and upper-level managers, and orientations toward the occasional violation of procedural guidelines.

CLUSTERS AS SUBCULTURES

One might wonder whether these attitudinal groups of officers represent separate subcultures. It is certainly tempting to assume that each of these groups is a subculture, but at this time such an assessment is much more speculative. Based on the current research, officers' occupational attitudes appear to be less representative of a single culture and more fragmented in nature, as subgroup differences are found that would not exist if officers' attitudes were part of a monolithic culture. Although there are group differences that exist across the seven clusters, the degree of differentiation does vary. In some cases, differences among the clusters are rather small, whereas for others, differentiation is much more pronounced. For example, Traditionalists, who represent many of the values associated with the monolithic police culture, appear to be polar opposites of Peacekeepers. An examination of the comparison of mean scores (ANOVA) from the previous section reveals that these two groups significantly differed from one another in 8 out of the 10 attitudinal dimensions.[5] The same is true when Dirty Harry Enforcers are compared to Lay-Lows, who also significantly differed from one another in 8 out of 10 attitudes.

There are also groups that are analytically distinct from one another but exhibit fewer differences than noted for groups like Traditionalists and Peacekeepers (or Dirty Harry Enforcers and Lay-Lows). For example, Dirty Harry Enforcers share some of the same attitudes of Traditionalists (with the exception of views of supervisors and parts of role orientation), whereas Lay-Lows and Peacekeepers are more alike than other groups (with the exception of role and selectivity). For these two sets of groups, each differed statistically in approximately half of the attitudes, though in some instances the difference was in terms of intensity and not direction. For example, Lay-Lows and Peacekeepers both rejected overlooking procedural guidelines, though the disdain was higher for Peacekeepers. Although some groups are similar to others, this is not a fatal flaw, as many of the same findings were highlighted in the work of typologies that formed the basis for

this study. For example, Tough-Cops and Clean-Beat Crime-Fighters were somewhat similar and would not be confused with groups like Professionals and Problem-Solvers (who shared attitudes). In determining if these clusters should be regarded as subcultures, one point should be clearly made—it is not as important to note the number of subcultures as much as noting the possible existence of subcultures. This is something that has eluded some police culture researchers. Because so little is known about the nature and existence of police subcultures, these findings could serve as a starting point for additional studies of police culture(s).

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In commenting about the future direction of police culture research, Fielding (1988) stated,

> If occupational culture is to serve as an empirically satisfactory concept as well as a theoretically necessary one, the sense of its internal variations and textures must be brought out in the same fashion as have conceptions of culture in relation to delinquency. (p. 185)

The aim of this study was to do just that, by examining the complexities of officers' occupational attitudes in assessing whether they are representative of the traditional police culture or more fragmented in nature. An analysis of survey data from two contemporary departments reveals that officers are responding to and coping with aspects of their occupational world in ways that resemble those noted in typology research done more than 25 years ago. Although most of the previous studies concentrate on only a few orientations, this research combined multiple dimensions simultaneously. Five of the groups (i.e., Traditionalists, Old-Pros, Law Enforcers, Peacekeepers, and Lay-Lows) conform rather closely to expectations based on this prior research. There is also evidence of two additional distinct groups (i.e., Anti-Organizational Street-Cops and Dirty Harry Enforcers). We also find that some of the groups that mirror typology research have adapted to changes that have taken place in the environment of policing (e.g., Old-Pros and Lay-Lows). These findings contrast with the notion that officers are all from the same attitudinal mold.

Although evidence is presented here that finds that officers' occupational attitudes are less representative of the single traditional characterization of police culture, there are some limitations of this research. The generalizability of these findings across other U.S. police departments is

limited in some respects. Both IPD and SPPD are reflective of community policing philosophy advancements, and both serve rather diverse populations and neighborhoods in terms of social class and crime. Police officers in these two departments also reflect general trends in educational attainment as well as racial and gender diversification efforts. In this regard, these departments are representative of most municipal police agencies in the United States, and thus we could expect these findings to generalize to many departments but would make poor comparisons to smaller rural, suburban, or unincorporated area departments in which both the occupational and organizational environments in which officers cope would be different.

A second limitation of this research pertains to the cross-sectional nature of the data collection. The findings here are but a snapshot of officers' occupational attitudes and fail to tell us whether these attitudes, and subgroup membership, are permanent or whether they might change over time. For example, are Lay-Lows' attitudes stable over one's tenure or is this some transitory burnt-out stage? If officers' attitudes continually change, then these subgroups might be accurate over the short term but would fail to capture group membership at a later date.

A third limitation of this research centers on the scope of cultural attitudes that are examined. Although the attitudes analyzed here are central components of what police culture is said to cover, there were some attitudes that could not be captured. For example, according to the traditional model of police culture, loyalty to fellow occupational members is what binds police officers together. Loyalty to other officers could not be analyzed with these data. It would be interesting to measure the degree to which officers are still loyal to one another as well as potential differences in intra- and intergroup loyalty. Although this research is a start for examining cultural differences among police officers, the exploration of attitudes that cover additional aspects of the occupational and organizational environments of policing (e.g., views of human nature, danger, uncertainty, social isolation, loyalty, etc.) would only add to our understanding of police culture. As we add to and complicate our lines of inquiry, we might find that groups are even more fragmented than what we found here.

There are some important practical implications of this research. Just as police researchers should not overestimate the level of cultural agreement among officers, the same is true for police administrators. The police culture has been used by both in explanations of legitimizing the misuse of police authority, including the use of force, and has also been noted as a major barrier to reform efforts. The implications of the current research for

police practice center on the acknowledgment of different attitudinal subgroups of officers, not all of which carry the undesirable attributes often associated with *the* police culture. For example, although some groups of officers represent many of the negative attitudes of the traditional culture (e.g., Dirty Harry Enforcers and Traditionalists), others hold attitudes that would be considered polar opposites (e.g., Peacekeepers and Old-Pros). Police administrators concerned with the misuse of police authority and the negative repercussions in terms of police-citizen relations would benefit from understanding the differences that exist among groups of officers. As administrators structure and implement policies in ensuring police accountability, acknowledgment of group differences could be used to intensify training for those officers that might need it the most, instead of retraining officers after a problem occurs. Police administrators might also want to use members from other subgroups (e.g., Old-Pros) as exemplary officers in their training.

This research also has implications for community policing. With regard to such efforts, there is both good and bad news. The bad news is that some patrol officers fail to embrace order maintenance and disorder objectives, which are commonly associated with community policing initiatives. This is not too surprising given that many police reform efforts have been met with similar resistance. The good news is that not all officers resist such policing. In fact, the most differentiating attitude across the groups, in terms of statistically significant mean differences (i.e., ANOVA), was community policing orientation (followed by order maintenance). In winning the hearts and minds (Skogan & Hartnett, 1997) of police officers, administrators could work with the resistors and possibly use the more pro-community-policing groups to help win the hearts and minds of others. Knowledge of varying orientations toward community policing could be especially crucial during the introductory stages of a department's implementation of community policing.

Future research should continue to explore variation among officers' cultural outlooks. Such research should work toward identifying and examining additional attitudinal dimensions from the ones examined here, in finding out more about police officers' (at all levels) views of their occupational and organizational environments. Researchers of police culture should also employ different methodological approaches. In-depth, open-ended interviews could potentially detect differences in the ways officers cope with the strains of their work environments that cannot be captured by structured interviews. Interviews should also be conducted and compared in different

research settings (e.g., in the field and station) that might affect officers' willingness to divulge details about potentially sensitive subject matters (e.g., views of supervisors, loyalty to peers, etc.).

In expanding and deepening our understanding of officers' cultural attitudes, future research should explore factors (e.g., officer characteristics) that might affect group differences and employ longitudinal data designs. Examinations of officers over time will enable us to identify potential changes in attitudes (and subgroup alignment) as well as the factors that might shape such differences among officers.

Finally, research should analyze the extent to which the attitudinal groups, as possible proxies for subcultures, translate into actual behavior. If one's attitudes are precursors for behavior, then we should expect a positive relationship. Although the social scientific community has failed to find much concordance between attitudes and behavior (see Worden, 1989), researchers should not abandon these endeavors, as the connection between officers' cultural attitudes and their behavior hinges on the proper specification of both (i.e., attitudinal dimensions should be closely related to the target behavior) (Frank & Brandl, 1991). This research has worked largely on the front half, whereas the back half needs more attention.

APPENDIX
Attitudinal Measures

Five of the measures used in this study are multiple-item, additive indices. The results of preliminary and confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the indices tap a single underlying dimension. Each of the indices correlates with the corresponding factor scale at or higher than .95. The reliabilities of the indices are acceptable, as the alpha coefficients are .75, .89, .71, .73, and .64, respectively, for the citizen cooperation, sergeants, district management, order maintenance, and community policing indices.

Citizens

Cooperation	1. How many citizens in [the respondent's beat/CPA] would call the police if they saw something suspicious? 2. How many citizens in [the respondent's beat/CPA] would provide information about a crime if they knew something and were asked about it by the police? 3. How many citizens in [the respondent's beat/CPA] are willing to work with the police to try to solve neighborhood problems? (response for all items: 1 = *none*, 2 = *few*, 3 = *some*, 4 = *most*)

Distrust	1. Police officers have reason to be distrustful of most citizens. (response: 1 = *disagree strongly*, 2 = *disagree somewhat*, 3 = *agree somewhat*, 4 = *agree strongly*)

Supervisors

Sergeants	1. My supervisor's approach tends to discourage me from giving extra effort. (reverse coded) 2. My supervisor is not the type of person I enjoy working with. (reverse coded) 3. My supervisor lets officers know what is expected of them. 4. My supervisor looks out for the personal welfare of his/her subordinates. 5. My supervisor will support me when I am right even if it makes things difficult for him or her. (response for all items: 1 = *disagree strongly*, 2 = *disagree somewhat*, 3 = *agree somewhat*, 4 = *agree strongly*)
Management	1. When an officer does a particularly good job, how likely is it that top management will publicly recognize his or her performance? 2. When an officer gets written up for a minor violation of the rules, how likely is it that he or she will be treated fairly? 3. When an officer contributes to a team effort rather than look good individually, how likely is it that top management here will recognize it? (response for all items: 1 = *very unlikely*, 2 = *somewhat unlikely*, 3 = *somewhat likely*, 4 = *very likely*)

Procedural Guidelines

1. In order to do their jobs, patrol officers must sometimes overlook search-and-seizure laws and other legal guidelines. (response: 1 = *disagree strongly*, 2 = *disagree somewhat*, 3 = *agree somewhat*, 4 = *agree strongly*)

Role Orientation

Law enforcement	1. Enforcing the law is by far a patrol officer's most important responsibility. (response: 1 = *disagree strongly*, 2 = *disagree somewhat*, 3 = *agree somewhat*, 4 = *agree strongly*)
Order maintenance	1. How often do they think that patrol officers should be expected to do something about neighbor disputes? 2. How often do they think that patrol officers should be expected to do something about family disputes? 3. How often do they think that patrol officers should be expected to do something about public nuisances? (response for all items: 1 = *never*, 2 = *sometimes*, 3 = *much of the time*, 4 = *always*)
Community policing	1. How often do they think that patrol officers should be expected to do something about nuisance businesses? 2. How often do they think that patrol officers should be expected to do something about parents who don't control their kids? 3. How often do they think that patrol officers should be expected to do something about litter and trash? (response for all items: 1 = *never*, 2 = *sometimes*, 3 = *much of the time*, 4 = *always*)

(continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Policing Tactics	
Aggressive patrol	1. A good patrol officer is one who patrols aggressively, stopping cars, checking out people, running license checks, and so forth. (response: 1 = *disagree strongly*, 2 = *disagree somewhat*, 3 = *agree somewhat*, 4 = *agree strongly*)
Selective enforcement	1. How frequently would you say there are good reasons for not arresting someone who has committed a minor criminal offense? (response: 1 = *never*, 2 = *sometimes*, 3 = *much of the time*, 4 = *always*)

NOTES

1. Out of the 28 nonresponding officers, 18 declined to participate in the survey (3 were reserve officers who did not work very often), and interviewers were unable to track down the 10 remaining officers.

2. A similar technique, factor analysis, is sometimes mistakenly equated with cluster analysis. Factor analysis, also known as R-mode analysis (Aldenderfer & Blashfield, 1984), is most appropriately used as a *variable* reduction technique in which the user works to reduce multiple items into fewer (or single) dimensions (used here to construct the additive indices). By comparison, cluster analysis, also known as Q-mode analysis, is most appropriately used as an *object* reduction technique in which the user classifies things (e.g., persons, cases, or entities) into a smaller set of categories.

3. This is an example of how changes over the past 25 to 30 years in policing affect both culture and subcultural groupings. Officers studied in the 1970s, as Walker (1992) explained, might have either experienced (or been socialized during) the changes brought on by the due process revolution. It could be that as time has gone on, such guidelines are not viewed as restrictions at all but merely part of the normal routine of the occupation itself. Evidence of this is found within this analysis, as only two clusters of officers (i.e., 3 and 5) hold negative feelings toward procedural guidelines.

4. To reject the null hypothesis that the means for each of the attitudes were equal across the seven groups, an F ratio of 2.12 was needed to be significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was rejected for all of the attitudes, as F ratios exceeded this value: citizen cooperation ($F = 31.39$), citizen distrust ($F = 22.75$), sergeants ($F = 139.69$), district management ($F = 28.60$), procedural guidelines (143.72), law enforcement ($F = 57.04$), order maintenance ($F = 64.14$), community policing ($F = 60.52$), aggressive patrol ($F = 29.25$), and selective enforcement ($F = 11.76$).

5. In summing the ANOVAs for each cluster vertically, of the possible 60 statistical differences for each cluster (i.e., 6 possible differences multiplied by 10 attitudes), Peacekeepers (41) and Traditionalists (39) had the highest number of statistically significant mean differences of all groups, followed by Dirty Harry Enforcers (37), Anti-Organizational Street-Cops (36), Old-Pros (36), Lay-Lows (34), and Law Enforcers (33). Such findings

suggest that there are significant differences among the clusters, though for some, the differences are fewer when compared to others.

REFERENCES

Anderberg, M. R. (1973). *Cluster analysis for applications*. New York: Academic Press.

Aldenderfer, M. S., & Blashfield, R. K. (1984). *Cluster analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Broderick, J. J. (1977). *Police in a time of change*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Brown, M. K. (1988). *Working the street: Police discretion and the dilemmas of reform* (2nd ed.). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Chan, J. (1996). Changing police culture. *British Journal of Criminology*, *36*, 109-134.

Crank, J. P. (1997). Celebrating agency culture: Engaging a traditional cop's heart in organizational change. In Q. C. Thurman & E. McGarrell (Eds.), *Community policing in a rural setting* (pp. 49-57). Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson.

Crank, J. P. (1998). *Understanding police culture*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Crank, J. P., & Caldero, M. (1991). The production of occupational stress in medium-sized police agencies: A survey of line officers in eight municipal departments. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *19*, 339-349.

Drummond, D. S. (1976). *Police culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Everitt, B. (1980). *Cluster analysis*. New York: John Wiley.

Fielding, N. G. (1988). *Joining forces: Police training, socialization and occupation competence*. London: Routledge.

Frank, J., & Brandl, S. (1991). The police attitude-behavior relationship: Methodological and conceptual considerations. *American Journal of Police*, *5*, 83-103.

Haarr, R. H. (1997). Patterns of integration in a police patrol bureau: Race and gender barriers to integration. *Justice Quarterly*, *14*, 53-85.

Herbert, S. (1998). Police subculture reconsidered. *Criminology*, *36*, 343-369.

Kappeler, V. E., Sluder, R. D., & Alpert, G. P. (1998). *Forces of deviance: Understanding the dark side of policing* (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Kelling, G. L., & Kliesmet, R. B. (1996). Police unions, police culture, and police abuse of force. In W. A. Geller & H. H. Toch (Eds.), *Police violence* (pp. 191-212). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Manning, P. K. (1994a). *Police occupational culture: Segmentation, politics, and sentiments*. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Manning, P. K. (1994b). *Dynamics and tensions in police occupational culture*. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Manning, P. K. (1995). The police occupational culture in Anglo-American societies. In W. Bailey (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of police science* (pp. 472-475). New York: Garland.

McNamara, J. H. (1967). Uncertainties in police work: The relevance of police recruits' background and training. In D. Bordua (Ed.), *The police: Six sociological essays* (pp. 163-252). New York: John Wiley.

Muir, W. K., Jr. (1977). *Police: Streetcorner politicians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nourusis, M. J. (1990). *SPSS base system user's guide*. Chicago: SPSS, Inc.

Paoline, E. A., III. (2001). *Rethinking police culture: Officers' occupational attitudes*. New York: LFB Publishing.

Paoline, E. A., III. (2003). Taking stock: Toward a richer understanding of police culture. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *31*, 199-214.

Paoline, E. A., III, Myers, S. M., & Worden, R. E. (2000). Police culture, individualism, and community policing: Evidence from two police departments. *Justice Quarterly*, *17*, 575-605.

Reiner, R. (1978). *The blue-coated worker.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Reiner, R. (1985). *The politics of the police*. New York: St. Martin's.

Reuss-Ianni, E. (1983). *Two cultures of policing*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Rubinstein, J. (1973). *City police*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Skogan, W. G., & Hartnett, S. M. (1997). *Community policing, Chicago style*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Skolnick, J. H. (1994). *Justice without trial: Law enforcement in democratic society* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley.

Sparrow, M. K., Moore, M. H., & Kennedy, D. M. (1990). *Beyond 911: A new era for policing*. New York: Basic Books.

Terrill, W., & Mastrofski, S. D. (2000). Situational and officer-based determinants of police coercion. *Justice Quarterly*, *19*, 215-248.

Van Maanen, J. (1974). Working the street: A developmental view of police behavior. In H. Jacob (Ed.), *The potential for reform of criminal justice* (pp. 83-130). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Walker, S. (1992). *The police in America: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Walsh, J. L. (1977). Career styles and police behavior. In D. H. Bayley (Ed.), *Police and society* (pp. 149-175). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Westley, W. A. (1970). *Violence and the police: A sociological study of law, custom, and morality.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

White, S. O. (1972). A perspective on police professionalization. *Law & Society Review*, *7*, 61-85.

Worden, R. E. (1989). Situational and attitudinal explanations of police behavior: A theoretical reappraisal and empirical assessment. *Law and Society Review*, *23*, 667-711.

Worden, R. E. (1995). Police officers' belief systems: A framework for analysis. *American Journal of Police*, *14*, 49-81.

Eugene A. Paoline III is an assistant professor in the Department of Criminal Justice and Legal Studies at the University of Central Florida. His research interests include police socialization and culture, occupational stressors among criminal justice practitioners, and theoretical development in criminal justice. He is the author of Rethinking Police Culture: Officers' Occupational Attitudes *(LFB Publishing, 2001) and holds a Ph.D. in criminal justice from the University at Albany, State University of New York.*