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Do patrol sergeants' supervisory styles influence patrol officer behavior? This question is addressed by examining data collected for the Project on Policing Neighborhoods, a systematic observational study of patrol officers and first-line supervisors in two metropolitan police departments in 1996 and 1997. Using four distinct supervisory styles created through factor analysis of attitudinal constructs identified in the management and policing literatures, the influence of different supervisory styles over patrol officer behaviors—arrest, use of force, and issuing citations—is assessed. Findings show that at least one supervisory style has a significant influence over the likelihood that officers will use force against suspects. Furthermore, the presence of a supervisor (regardless of supervisory style) significantly increases the likelihood that officers will arrest. Implications for policy and future research are explored.

To a large extent, the work of the patrol officer is unsupervised and, to a lesser extent, it is unsupervisable.

—Lundman (1979, p. 160)

Previous research has slighted the potential influence of supervisors on police officers' arrest decisions. . . . On the basis of some ethnographic evidence and in light of current findings, this appears to be a serious omission.

—Smith (1984, p. 31)

Do supervisory styles of first-line patrol supervisors influence subordinate behavior? Although most scholars and practitioners agree that one role of police field supervisors is to control the behavior of their officers, the degree of control that supervisors actually have continues to be a matter of debate. Several researchers have hypothesized about this relationship, and others have tested it empirically. The majority of research exploring police behavior has focused on the frequency and duration of encounters with citizens, patrol officer discretionary decision making toward citizens (e.g., decisions to arrest or issue tickets), and officer misbehavior (e.g., work shirking or departmental violations). Collectively, these studies have produced a somewhat inconsistent collection of findings regarding the effects of supervision on patrol officer behavior.

It is troubling that the policing community knows so little about the influence that supervisors have over their subordinates' behavior or what influences supervisors could reasonably be expected to have. The following research seeks to address some of the remaining questions surrounding the issue of police supervision. Using four supervisory styles identified in earlier research (Engel, in press-a), the varying influences of supervisory styles on subordinate behaviors are examined. The findings show that at least one supervisory style does have an important influence over officers' use of force toward suspects, and the mere presence of a supervisor (regardless of his or her supervisory style) at a police-suspect encounter increases the likelihood of arrest. The implications of these and other findings for policy and future research are discussed.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH
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caught between their responsibility to superior officers and their responsibility for subordinate officers. Faced with this conflict, individual sergeants adapt and define their roles differently (Trojanowicz, 1980; Van Maanen, 1983, 1984).

Several classic ethnographic works in policing have addressed the role of the police supervisor. In Muir's (1977) discussion of patrol officers' understanding and perspective toward humankind and morality regarding the use of coercion, he suggested that patrol sergeants could have a fundamental influence on subordinates' development and outlooks. Specifically, Muir hypothesized that patrol officers differed from one another based on differences in their development of understanding and morality, which influenced their behavior. If Muir's proposition is correct—that police officers' behavior is driven by their attitudes—then his suggestion that patrol supervisors could greatly influence the attitudes of their subordinates has implications for the potential effect that patrol supervisors have on the behavior of these officers. His work suggests that frontline supervisors are responsible not only for directing and supervising subordinate officers but also for the development of their attitudes and outlooks. Given the proper conditions, a supervisor's influence on subordinates' attitudes and outlooks could affect their discretionary behavior.

Early work by Wilson (1968) came to a similar conclusion; however, Wilson's work was based on descriptions of administrators (particularly chiefs) and not field supervisors. He proposed that an administrator's preference had a varying influence on patrol officers' use of discretion in different types of citizen encounters. Wilson suggested that administrators had greater control over police behavior in both police-invoked and citizen-invoked law enforcement situations compared to police-invoked or citizen-invoked order maintenance situations. Although Muir (1977) and Wilson (1968) clearly differed in their conceptual and theoretical perspectives, both scholars concluded that officers' attitudes—and as a result, their behavior—could be influenced by their superiors. As stated by Wilson, "Controlling subordinates depends only partly on sanctions and inducements; it also requires instilling in them a shared outlook or ethos that provides for them a common definition of the situations they are likely to encounter" (pp. 138-139).

Focusing strictly on the role of first-line patrol sergeants, Van Maanen (1983, 1984) described the potential influence that supervisors have over subordinate officers. Although Van Maanen noted that the nature of patrol work somewhat limits supervisory control, he argued that supervisors use the tasks they must perform as a way to control subordinate behavior. Specifically, through the use of "personnel brokering," "institutional display and documentation," and "mobilization of effort," sergeants use their control over procedural matters to influence substantive police practices. Van Maanen concluded that the power potential within the supervisory role is often overlooked in policing research.

In contrast to Muir (1977), Wilson (1968), and Van Maanen (1983, 1984), Brown (1988) hypothesized that field supervisors and administrators have relatively little influence over patrol officers' behavior. Brown suggested that a supervisor's ability to control an officer's discretionary behavior is severely limited due to the nature of policing, group solidarity of police officers, and a supervisor's dependence on the actions of their subordinates. As a result, they often focus on matters they can control, such as enforcement of departmental rules and regulations. The patrol officers in Brown's study reinforced this notion by reporting that they believed their supervisors were more concerned with enforcing departmental rules and regulations than controlling their discretionary decisions.

Several researchers have empirically tested the effects of supervision on patrol officer behavior (Allen, 1980, 1982; Allen & Maxfield, 1983; Brehm & Gates, 1993; Gates & Worden, 1989; Mastrosik, Ritti, & Snipes, 1994; Reiss, 1971; Smith, 1984; Tiff, 1971), but no firm conclusions have been reached. This body of research suggests that the effects of supervision are generally small in magnitude and vary across types of behaviors or tasks performed by subordinates.

Tiff (1971) directly observed sergeants in one metropolitan police department who were self-classified as one of three supervisory styles. He reported that differences in supervisory styles within or between districts had little to no effect on patrol officer effectiveness. He suggested that patrol sergeants were unable to have a significant influence on subordinates due to the complex interaction among the following elements:

1) the nature of the work supervised, 2) the impermanence of sergeant-patrolman relations, 3) the environmental "high crime" task demands, 4) the nature of manpower deployment decisions, 5) the lack of executive policy guidelines for handling non-crime incidents, 6) the pressures of subordinates, and 7) the nature of his superiors' task expectations. (Tiff, 1975, p. 72)

Tiff suggested that the highly differentiated tasks that patrol officers must handle, in addition to the lack of departmental or professional guidelines to direct their behavior, further limited supervisory influence.
In contrast, Allen (1980, 1982) reported that the presence of supervisors at citizen encounters had at least a minimal effect on the behavior of subordinate patrol officers. Using data collected from systematic observation of 24 police departments in three metropolitan areas (Police Services Study data), Allen operationalized the concept of supervision as the number of face-to-face and radio contacts a field supervisor had with subordinate officers during a shift. He found that supervisor presence had a moderate effect on the time spent by subordinates at police–citizen encounters. As Allen reports, however, supervisors were present at only 7% of the total number of encounters observed, and of those, supervisors only took control by issuing commands or directives to subordinates 18% of the time.

Using the same data, Smith (1984) classified police departments based on their level of professionalism and bureaucratization. Employing a multivariate probit analysis, he found that the presence of a supervisor at police–citizen encounters significantly increased the probability that a subordinate officer would make an arrest. This effect, however, was contingent on the type of department. In an extension of this analysis, Smith and Klein (1983) included organizational properties in their model. They reported that an organizational level variable—proportion of encounters involving a supervisor—was not a significant predictor of arrest, although the presence of a supervisor at the encounter was a significant predictor. Smith (1984) concluded that "previous research has slighted the potential influence of supervisors on police officers' arrest decisions. . . . On the basis of some ethnographic evidence and in light of current findings, this appears to be a serious omission" (p. 31).

In contrast to the findings of some supervisory influence over patrol officer behavior derived from observation data, researchers examining survey data have reported little or no supervisory influence over patrol officer behavior. Analyses of survey responses from patrol officers and supervisors in the Louisville Police Department found that subordinates' reported behavior was not influenced by supervisors' reported preferences, nor patrol officers' perceptions of supervisors' preferences (Allen & Maxfield, 1983). Likewise, Brown (1988) reported that of patrol officers and supervisors a majority surveyed agreed that "the routine actions of field supervisors have but a marginal impact on the way they [patrol officers] use their discretion" (p. 121). Finally, Mastrofski et al. (1994) found that neither an officer's perception of the immediate supervisor's priority for driving under the influence (DUI) enforcement nor an officer's perception of higher administrators' priorities for DUI enforcement had a statistically significant effect on an officer's DUI enforcement activities.

Collectively, research linking police supervision to subordinate behavior has produced inconsistent findings. Much of the early qualitative work suggested that supervisory styles could have a significant influence over patrol officer behavior. Research examining responses to survey questions only measures perceived influence and does not adequately test the actual influence that supervisors have over patrol officers. Research using observational data has also relied on somewhat limited measures of supervision, counting the number of contacts between supervisors and officers or the time supervisors spend with subordinates rather than measuring the quality or style of supervision (cf. Tiff, 1971). Although several scholars have identified different types of supervisors (Cohen, 1980; Pursley, 1974; Tiff, 1971; Van Maanen, 1983), and strong similarities among these classifications has been identified (Engel, in press-a), no research has attempted to analyze the varying influence that different supervisory styles have over patrol officer behavior. Using supervisory styles created in previous research (Engel, in press-a), the following research examines the influence of sergeants' supervisory styles over patrol officer behavior toward citizens. Specifically, police officer actions taken toward suspects—including arrest, use of force, and issuing citations—are examined.

**METHOD**

**DATA**

This empirical examination of supervision uses data collected for the Project on Policing Neighborhoods, a large-scale study of police behavior funded by the National Institute of Justice. Systematic observation of patrol officers and field supervisors (sergeants and lieutenants) was conducted during the summer of 1996 in the Indianapolis, Indiana, Police Department (IPD) and during the summer of 1997 in the St. Petersburg, Florida, Police Department (SPPD).

Systematic observation was conducted in IPD with 58 patrol supervisors (sergeants and lieutenants) during 87 rides, totaling more than 600 hours; 78% of IPD patrol sergeants and lieutenants were observed at least once. In SPPD, systematic observation was conducted with 26 patrol sergeants, 4 patrol lieutenants, and 8 patrol officers working as the acting sergeant.
during 72 shifts; 96% of patrol sergeants in SPPD were observed at least once. In addition, field observation of patrol officers was conducted for more than 5,700 hours in 24 neighborhoods across the two sites. The selection of these neighborhoods was “biased intentionally toward patrol areas where we expected to observe higher levels of police activity than the average in the city: areas marked by higher levels of social and economic distress than was characteristic of the city overall” (Parks, Mastrofski, DeJong, & Gray, 1999, p. 492). In IPD, 194 patrol officers were observed during 336 shifts, whereas in SPPD, 128 officers were observed during 360 shifts. Combined, observers recorded information regarding encounters between officers and approximately 12,000 citizens on standardized coding forms (Mastrofski, Snipes, Parks, & Maxwell, 2000; Parks et al., 1999).

Data were also obtained through structured interviews with 69 of 74 patrol supervisors in IPD and all 27 patrol sergeants in SPPD. The interview captured demographic and background information along with supervisors’ views regarding a number of topics, including management priorities and innovative policies such as problem solving and community-oriented policing. More than 95% of patrol officers in IPD (398 officers) and 97% of patrol officers in SPPD (240 officers) also completed a structured interview of similar design.

**Research Sites**

The IPD serves the city of Indianapolis, which had an estimated population of 377,723 in 1995, including 39% minorities, 8% unemployed, 9% below the poverty level, and 17% female-headed households with children. The violent crime rate in this city as reported in 1995 was 1,178 per 100,000 residents, above the national average of 716.0 per 100,000 residents (Mastrofski et al., 2000; Parks et al., 1999). In 1996, the department employed 1,013 sworn officers: 17% female, 21% minority, and 36% with a 4-year college degree (Parks et al., 1999). The patrol division was divided geographically into four districts, all of which were studied. Each district was unique in character, mission, and emphasis placed on community policing (for details, see Mastrofski et al., 2000; Parks et al., 1999).

Supervisory structure and form differed across IPD districts and shifts. It was unclear if a direct supervisor-subordinate relationship actually existed because this department did not have a formal evaluation process in place. Each patrol officer in IPD was assigned one of three work schedules with rotating days off. On each shift in every district, a sergeant was assigned to a particular schedule. Therefore, each shift had three different squads supervised by different sergeants. This supervisory structure provided that sergeants worked the same schedule as the group of officers (their squad) that they were responsible for. Officers working in specialized community policing units were directly supervised by one sergeant whose sole responsibility was to monitor and direct the activities of the officers in that unit. Three of the four observed districts had a community-policing unit, although the structure and emphases of these units differed (DeJong, Mastrofski, & Parks, in press).

St. Petersburg, Florida, is located at the southern tip of Pinellas County, with a population of 240,318 in 1995, including 24% minorities, 5% unemployed, 6% below the poverty level, and 10% female-headed households with children (Parks et al., 1999). The violent crime rate (per 100,000 population) as reported in 1994 was 2,254.5, well above the national average of 716.0 and the state of Florida’s average of 1,146.8 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1996). In 1996, the SPPD had 505 sworn officers, of whom 13% were women, 22% were minorities, and 26% had a 4-year college degree (Parks et al., 1999). The jurisdiction of this department was divided into three districts and 48 Community Policing Areas (CPA), with a community policing officer assigned to each area.

The SPPD supervision structure has undergone tremendous change in recent years. During the period of observation, it reflected a compromise between geographic deployment and a squad system. Sergeants were directly responsible for a team of officers on a particular shift working in a specific sector or geographic area (three sectors in each district) along with a handful of community policing officers assigned to a CPA. Each sergeant had responsibility for one or more CPAs (and the community policing officers working in those areas) within his or her sector. Sergeants were scheduled to work three temporal shifts (24 hours) and then flex their schedule for the remaining 16 hours each week. During a temporal shift, sergeants were responsible for the direct supervision of all patrol officers working that shift for the entire district, not just their sector. During flex shifts, sergeants were expected to work on problem solving in their specific CPA, supervise their community policing officers, and complete administrative paperwork.

**Measures of Supervision**

Using systematic observational data, supervision has been operationalized in past research as a measure of the number of field contacts between
a supervisor and a subordinate (Allen, 1980, 1982; Gates & Worden, 1989) or as the presence of a supervisor at the scene of a police-citizen encounter (Brehm & Gates, 1993; Smith, 1984; Smith & Klein, 1983). Only one study using observational data has attempted to measure styles of supervision. Tiff (1971) systematically observed patrol officers based on a sampling of particular types of supervisors who were self-identified as having a particular style. Note, however, that the validity of these self-categorizations was not reported.

In the following analyses, the substantive nature of supervision rather than the quantity of supervision is measured. In previous analyses, this substantive nature of supervision was measured using the underlying attitudinal dimensions of supervisory styles identified from the management and policing literatures (Engel, in press-a). The measures of supervision were based on a sample of the supervisors who were both interviewed and observed. Combining both sites, 81 supervisors were included in the analyses: 17 lieutenants and 39 sergeants from IPD and 25 sergeants from SPPD. Individual items that were intended to represent the supervisors' beliefs and attitudes were extracted from the supervisor survey (for a complete list of these items, see the appendix). Nine additive scales were created to represent the attitudinal dimensions identified from the management and policing literatures: power distribution, decision making, activity level, relations orientation, task orientation, inspirational motivation, supervisors' expectations for community policing by subordinates, supervisors' expectations for aggressive enforcement by subordinates, and supervisors' general views of subordinates. These scales are further described in Table 1.

These nine constructs were analyzed using exploratory factor analysis to identify underlying latent styles of supervision. Based on the sample of 81 supervisors, factor analysis revealed four significant factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, which collectively explained 63% of the variance. The factor loadings for each attitudinal construct are reported in Table 2. Each of the four factors was considered a different style of supervision. The factor scores indicate the strength of each underlying attitudinal construct for each style. The four styles of supervision that emerge were labeled traditional, innovative, supportive, and active, respectively. Supervisors were classified with a particular style based on their highest factor score. For a detailed description of the selection of underlying attitudinal constructs and creation of supervisory styles, see Engel (in press-a). A brief description of each supervisory style is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level Scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making Scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations Orientation Scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation Scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation Scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect Community Policing Scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect Aggressive Enforcement Scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Subordinates Scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 81 supervisors; IPD = Indianapolis Police Department; SPPD = St. Petersburg Police Department. Larger values represent higher levels of activity, more direct decision making, more or less equal power, more potential of relative orientation, task orientation, inspirational motivation, expectations for community policing, and more positive views of subordinates.
being an advocate. Unlike innovative supervisors, supportive supervisors view management as something officers need protection against.

Active supervisors are characterized by their high levels of activity in the field. This activity includes both patrol work and supervisory functions. These supervisors tend to be decision makers, taking over and handling situations themselves. Unlike traditional supervisors, active supervisors believe they have power within the organization and have positive views of subordinates. Active supervisors also have lower levels of inspirational motivation. The ultimate goal for active supervisors is to be active field supervisors, performing the dual function of street officer and supervisor.

The distribution of supervisory styles for this sample of sergeants and lieutenants is reported in Table 3. There is a roughly equal distribution of each style. When the styles are examined for each department separately, however, significant differences emerge. Traditional supervisors are significantly overrepresented in SPPD, whereas active supervisors are underrepresented. IPD sergeants are evenly distributed across all styles; however, IPD lieutenants are slightly more likely to be classified as innovative and less likely to be classified as traditional (Engel, in press-a).

Differences between male and female supervisors are also reported in Table 1. Female supervisors are disproportionately represented as traditional supervisors (a full 50% of female supervisors are classified as traditional supervisors). Few other differences in classification are apparent. There are no statistically significant differences in classification with regard to the supervisors' race, rank, age, years of experience, or education. The four types of supervisors also do not differ from one another in their reported views of the importance of promotion or moving to a specialized unit or their amount of training and general knowledge of the principles of community policing. Innovative supervisors, however, report receiving significantly more training in supervision, management, and leadership, whereas the other three supervisor styles do not differ in their reported amount of training (Engel, in press-a).

**HYPOTHESES**

Using the above supervisory styles, two general hypotheses are tested in the following analyses. First, it is speculated that the influence of supervisory styles will be dependent on the type of subordinate behavior examined. Prior research suggests that supervisors and administrators are more likely to influence police officer actions that are concrete or easily
measured by supervisors (Bittner, 1983; Brown, 1988; Jermier & Berkes, 1979; Van Maanen, 1983; Wilson, 1968). For example, issuing traffic tickets or arresting offenders in what Wilson (1968) has termed “law-enforcement situations” could easily be detected by a supervisor. These situations create statistics that allow supervisors to measure their subordinates’ work output. As suggested by Van Maanen (1983), supervisors use these stats to influence the actions of their subordinates because they are concrete measures that are interpretable by both the supervisor and the subordinate. Therefore, one would expect supervisors in the following analyses to have a stronger influence on officer actions, including arrest and issuing citations, compared to their influence over officers’ use of force, which is less likely to be detected or observed by a supervisor.

It is also hypothesized that different styles of supervision influence patrol officer behavior with varying magnitudes. In general, it is speculated that supervisors with stronger styles would have more influence over subordinates in paramilitary organizations. Therefore, traditional and active supervisors may be more likely to influence subordinates through fear of discipline (more likely used by traditional supervisors) or simply by being more likely to detect misbehavior (active supervisors spend more time in the field). One would expect that officers with traditional or active supervisors would be more likely to arrest offenders, issue traffic citations, and use force due in part to their supervisors’ expectations for aggressive enforcement. In contrast, officers with innovative or supportive supervisors are hypothesized to produce fewer arrests, citations, and uses of force due in part to their supervisors’ expectations for community policing and problem solving rather than aggressive enforcement. Likewise, officers with supportive supervisors are hypothesized to have lower rates of productivity because they are more insulated from criticism and punishment.

ANALYSES

SAMPLE

Analyses of the effects of supervision on patrol officer behavior are contingent upon linking officers with their individual supervisors. Officers were not asked for the name of their direct supervisor to encourage forthright responses on the officer survey, which included sensitive questions about the quality of supervision. Therefore, officers are matched with their direct sergeants through other information collected from the officer and
supervisor surveys. In IPD, both officers and supervisors are assigned to districts, shifts, and work schedules. Of the 194 officers observed, 82.9% are matched with an individual sergeant from their shift and work schedule. In SPPD, officers and supervisors are assigned to districts, shifts, and CPAs. Of the 128 officers observed in this department, 92.5% are matched to their individual sergeant. Only observations of the 239 officers that were matched with a sergeant are included in the following analyses.

To explore the influence of supervisory styles, officer behaviors (arrests, uses of force, and issuing citations) are examined for two different groups of suspects: nontraffic suspects and traffic suspects encountered by patrol officers. Officers matched with a sergeant encountered 1,506 nontraffic suspects and 581 traffic suspects. A citizen was considered a suspect if, at the end of the encounter, they were coded as a "peace disturber, wrongdoer, or person complained about." Analyses are conducted at the suspect level, and logistic regression is used to estimate the parameters of these models.

NONTRAFFIC SUSPECTS

Two multivariate models estimate the likelihood of arrest and use of force at the suspect level. Of the 5,179 citizens encountered, 29% (1,506) were considered suspects at the end of the encounter. As shown in Table 4, the dependent variables, arrest and use of force, are measured as dichotomous variables: 22% of the suspects were arrested, and 9% had some type of force used against them by police.

Officer and suspect characteristics (reported in Table 2) are all measured as dichotomous variables, with the exception of officers' years of experience (continuous) and age of the suspect (eight-category ordinal scale). Officer and suspect race are collapsed into White/non-White categories. Suspects' demeanor is a dichotomous measure of observers' characterizations occurring before an arrest. Finally, a suspect is considered under the influence of drugs or alcohol if there is any observed physical or behavioral evidence of drug or alcohol use.

Situational variables are measured as continuous and include both the number of bystanders and the number of other police officers present. Two measures describe the area where the encounter took place. Location is a dichotomous measure describing whether the encounter took place in a public or private setting. To further control for community context, "concentrated disadvantage" (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997) is measured as a four-item weighted factor score (eigenvalue = 2.75, factor loadings > .75), including percentage poor, percentage of labor force unemployed, percentage female-headed families, and percentage Black (Parks et al., 1999; Reisig & Parks, 2000). Victim preference is a dichotomous variable representing victim preference for arrest compared to either no victim present or no preference for arrest. In addition, the percentage of time during the encounter when a supervisor was present is included in the model to control for the quantity of supervision officers receive during the encounter.

Legal variables, including the seriousness of the offense, evidence of illegal behavior, the existence of an arrest warrant, and evidence of any interaction phase crime, are also displayed in Table 4. Taking into account critiques of past research posed by Klinger (1994), seriousness of the offense is measured as a four-category ordinal-level scale: 0 = no crime; 1 = public disorder or victimless crime; 2 = misdemeanor or minor property crime; 3 = major property, minor violent crime; 4 = major violent crime. Evidence of illegal behavior includes police observation of the suspect engaging in an illegal act, physical evidence implicating the suspect, claims from other citizens implicating the suspect, or a suspect confession. A dichotomous variable measures if the suspect was wanted on a previous arrest warrant. Another dichotomous variable measures interaction-phase crime, including threats or assaults toward an officer, threats or assault toward another citizen, and a suspect attempt, to address Klinger’s critique of the policing literature.

Finally, three organizational-level measures are included as independent variables: department, shift, and different supervisory styles of officers' direct sergeants. Department is measured as a dichotomous variable, whereas shift is measured with two separate dichotomous variables (day shift and evening shift; night shift is the excluded category). The individual supervisory styles of sergeants are measured as four separate dichotomous variables. In the logistic regression models that follow, the traditional supervisory style is the excluded category.

The unstandardized regression coefficients, standard errors, and significance levels for the models examining arrest are displayed in Table 5. This table illustrates regression models for two dependent variables; Model A examines the predictors of arrest of nontraffic suspects, whereas Model B examines the predictors of the use of force.

As shown in Model A, there are several significant predictors of arrest, including suspect attributes and situational variables such as evidence of drugs or alcohol use, displays of disrespect toward police, fewer bystanders at the scene, more police present, and presence of a supervisor for a larger percentage of the encounter. All of the legal variables (seriousness, evidence,
TABLE 4. Descriptives for Nontraffic Suspects (n = 1,506)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (1 = White)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (1 = Male)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community policing assignment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (1 = White)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (1 = Male)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (ordinal scale)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/alcohol use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demeanor (1 = disrespect)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim requests arrest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim and suspect acquainted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrated disadvantage</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private location</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police initiated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bystanders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of officers present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of encounter supervisor present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>21.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest warrant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction phase crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department (1 = St. Petersburg, Florida Police Department)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day shift</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening shift</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

arrest warrant, and interaction phase crime) are significant predictors of arrest. Also, officers from IPD are significantly more likely to arrest nontraffic suspects. No officer characteristics significantly predict arrest. The results also show that the variables of interest, supervisory styles, also do not significantly predict arrest. Note, however, that the mere presence of a supervisor at the encounter did significantly influence officer behavior; controlling for other factors, the longer a supervisor was present, the more likely officers were to arrest suspects.

The unstandardized regression coefficients, standard errors, and significance levels of the logistic regression models for the use of force are also
displayed in Table 5. Model B displays several significant predictors of the use of force: disrespectful suspects, suspects not well acquainted with their victims, more police present, evidence of criminal behavior, an arrest warrant, interaction phase criminal behavior, and encounters during the evening shift. In addition, officers with an active sergeant are significantly more likely to use force than officers with any other type of supervisory style. Controlling for other factors, the odds of using force on a citizen increase by 2.06 times when the officer has an active sergeant. The mere presence of supervisor at the encounter, however, does not have a significant influence on police use of force.

TRAFFIC SUSPECTS

Models also estimate the effects of officer and suspect characteristics, along with the effects of organizational, situational, and legal variables, on the likelihood of issuing a citation and/or arresting traffic offenders. In this sample, 581 of the original 773 traffic offenders were encountered by patrol officers who were linked to a particular sergeant. Similar measures of officer, suspect, situational, legal, organizational, and supervisory style variables were also examined for traffic suspects (see Table 6). Several differences between the analyses for nontraffic offenders and those for traffic offenders must be noted. First, several situational variables (victim request, victim-suspect relationship, location, concentrated disadvantage, and police-initiated encounter) were not included in the analyses of traffic suspects. Second, suspects’ use of drugs or alcohol is not identified as an individual measure but rather incorporated in the seriousness variable. Third, the seriousness variable is measured slightly different. Again, it is a 4-point scale measure, but the categories represent traffic offenses: 1 = general violation, routine stop, or equipment violation; 2 = moving violation; 3 = speeding; and 4 = DUI or accident. Finally, as a supplement to the offense seriousness variable, an additional dichotomous variable is included that measures whether suspects had engaged in a drug or gun offense.

The results of the logistic regression analyses are displayed in Table 7. Model A reports the significant predictors of being issued a traffic citation. This is a relatively weak model, with only three significant variables (suspect demeanor, evidence, and arrest warrant). None of the supervisory styles are significant predictors of traffic suspects being issued a citation.

Model B reports the unstandardized coefficients and standard errors of variables predicting to citation and/or arrest. This is a slightly stronger model with older suspects, disrespectful suspects, suspects with evidence of criminal behavior, suspects wanted by police, and suspects involved in a drug or gun offense all significantly more likely to be issued a citation and/or arrested. The inclusion of individual supervisory styles, however, does not add any explanatory power to the models. Officers are neither more nor less likely to issue citations and/or arrest traffic suspects based on the supervisory style of their sergeants.
supervisors to measure (e.g., arrests and citations). This hypothesis was not supported by these findings. Analyses show that supervisory styles are not significant predictors of arrest (for nontraffic suspects) or citations and/or arrest (for traffic suspects). However, the mere presence of supervisors at police-citizen encounters—regardless of their supervisory styles—does increase the likelihood of arrest.

The finding that officers with active supervisors are more likely to use force is consistent with the hypothesis that officers with supervisors who have stronger supervisory styles would be more likely to influence subordinate behavior. Active supervisors are characterized by their expectations for aggressive enforcement, high levels of decision making, and presence in the field. In fact, active supervisors personally use force against citizens at a rate of 0.14 times per 8-hour shift, compared to 0.009 times per 8-hour shift for all other supervisors (Engel, in press-a). It appears that these supervisors create an atmosphere where aggressive tactics by their subordinates are tolerated (and perhaps expected). If supervisors actively use force, it is likely that subordinate officers will as well, in part because of the expectations placed on them by supervisors to produce arrests but also because of a general acceptance of this behavior. An active supervisor may be considered by officers as more like a peer than a supervisor—or as Reuss-Ianni and Ianni (1983) described, active supervisors may be viewed by subordinates as part of the “street-cop” rather than the “management-cop” culture.

Analyses of other types of officer behavior also show that the officers with active supervisors significantly differ from their peers. Officers with active supervisors spend significantly more time per shift engaging in police-initiated activities and problem-solving/community-policing activities (Engel, in press-b). Combined, these findings suggest that active supervisors have the most influence over patrol officer behavior. It has been suggested that this influence is due (at least in part) to the presence of active supervisors in the field, working alongside their subordinates and setting an example for the work they expect (Engel, in press-b). As described by one active supervisor observed in the field,

**TABLE 7. Logistic Regression Analyses of Traffic Suspects (n = 568)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model A: Citation</th>
<th>Model B: Citation or Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.25 (2.25)</td>
<td>4.27 (2.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.69 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.56 (0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.27 (0.36)</td>
<td>0.40 (0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>0.01 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community policing assignment</td>
<td>0.02 (0.48)</td>
<td>0.28 (0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.19 (0.23)</td>
<td>-0.21 (0.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.17 (0.24)</td>
<td>0.17 (0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.03 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.09)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demeanor</td>
<td>0.80 (0.30)**</td>
<td>1.06 (0.30)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrated disadvantage</td>
<td>0.20 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.18 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bystanders</td>
<td>0.05 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other officers present</td>
<td>0.14 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.30 (0.11)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent supervisor present</td>
<td>0.01 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness</td>
<td>0.09 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.09 (0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>0.26 (0.30)**</td>
<td>1.56 (0.30)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest warrant</td>
<td>0.94 (0.48)*</td>
<td>2.52 (0.61)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction phase crime</td>
<td>0.12 (0.96)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/gun offense</td>
<td>0.86 (0.63)</td>
<td>1.93 (0.76)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department (1 = St. Petersburg, Florida, Office Department)</td>
<td>0.18 (0.24)</td>
<td>0.14 (0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day shift</td>
<td>0.48 (0.45)</td>
<td>0.33 (0.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening shift</td>
<td>0.22 (0.28)</td>
<td>0.22 (0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>0.20 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.10 (0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>0.04 (0.31)</td>
<td>0.27 (0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>0.10 (0.30)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Entries are unstandardized coefficients and, in parentheses, standard errors.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

**DISCUSSION**

The primary question for researchers studying police supervision is whether different styles of supervision influence officer decision making. These analyses suggest that one of the four supervisory styles (active) has a small but important influence on officers' use of force against nontraffic suspects. It was hypothesized that the style of an individual supervisor would have the greatest effect on patrol officer behaviors that are easier for
In an innovative department, gaining compliance was a totally different proposition and that is why supervisors needed to lead by example. (Project on Policing Neighborhoods [POPNI])

Collectively, evidence from the POPN study suggests that supervisors do have an influence over subordinates' behaviors and that this influence can be positive or negative depending on the example supervisors set.

The active supervisory style identified in this research is similar to the street sergeant identified by Van Maanen (1983, 1984). Street sergeants were described as "literally on the street listening to the radio, moving from locale to locale, and constantly communicating with members of the squad" (Van Maanen, 1983, p. 298). Street sergeants also led by example and were described by Van Maanen as being "both admired and feared by their men" (p. 298) and therefore more likely to influence their subordinates' behavior. It is interesting to note, however, that in this study, supervisory styles only influence officer behaviors that are the most difficult for supervisors to monitor and measure (e.g., use of force, problem-solving activities, and proactivity). In contrast, supervisory styles do not have a significant influence over officer behaviors that are easier to monitor and measure (e.g., arrests, citations).

There are several plausible explanations for the apparent contradiction in the findings. First, it may be that supervisors with strong supervisory styles are more likely to have an influence on situations where officers have the most discretion. Both Van Maanen (1983) and Jermier and Berkes (1979) have proposed that control over subordinate behavior may be affected by task differentiation. Van Maanen (1983) hypothesized that "the less certain the task, the less visible its performance, the less direction provided from above, and the lower the official work load, the more [italics added] opportunity a sergeant has to provide his men with a definition for their duties" (pp. 297-298). Likewise, Jermier and Berkes (1979) reported "when subordinates perceived their tasks as unpredictable, they preferred their leader to clarify their roles" (p. 17). This suggests that in a highly ambiguous work environment such as patrol work, not only might supervisors influence officers' discretion, but officers may also appreciate this clarification of their roles.

Another possibility is that higher ranking officials in police organizations have an influence over officer behaviors that are easier to measure (e.g., arrests and citations), and this influence is relatively uniform across officers within a single department. Wilson (1968) suggested that administrators could control officer discretionary decisions in law enforcement situations because administrators could easily observe "substantive outcomes or by measuring the output of individual officers" (p. 88). Furthermore, discretionary decision making could be better controlled by administrators in citizen-invoked law enforcement situations (where officers have the least discretion) by establishing specific policies and setting guidelines. Therefore, the influence of administrators over concrete, measurable patrol officer actions should be relatively consistent. This would account for the finding that the likelihood of arrest increases according to the amount of time supervisors are present at the encounter but not by their individual supervisory styles. If this explanation is accurate, the place to look for supervisory influences over measurable outcomes is at the district or department level rather than at the field supervisory level.

Although identifying supervisory styles and examining their influence on subordinate behavior has provided interesting findings, caution should be exercised when interpreting them. The data used in this study of police supervision is limited in several ways. The POPN used a data-collection design created for systematic observation of encounters between patrol officers and citizens. The study of patrol supervision does not fit neatly into this scheme. Although systematic observation and surveys provide a descriptive slice of police work, they often do not provide detailed information about long-term patterns of police behavior or the effectiveness of long-term policies and strategies. The study of patrol supervision may be better captured by some type of modified ethnographic research design where detailed information about the actual patterns (especially the underlying rationales, objectives, etc.) of supervisory practices could be collected. Although this research design did have a partial ethnographic component containing detailed information collected during each ride, examinations of long-term patterns of supervision and the structural, environmental and political factors affecting these patterns is nonetheless limited. Future research on police supervision should address these issues.

In addition, the influence of supervisory styles implies that officers can readily identify one and only one sergeant as their direct supervisor and that this supervisor has an influence over their behavior. Patrol officers, however, are often supervised by two or more field supervisors (Tiff, 1971). The supervision that subordinate officers experience is likely to be based on a collection of supervisory styles that are contingent upon individual supervisory styles and the relationship between field supervisors and management. Police squads (groups of officers working the same district and shift) often develop distinct patterns of behavior, which might be linked to the type of
general supervision they receive from multiple field supervisors. Therefore, future research should examine the relationship between individual supervisory styles and collective forms of supervision.

Despite these limitations, the identification of different supervisory styles and the finding that at least one style has an influence over some forms of subordinate behavior has important implications for policy. Police administrators who wish to establish particular policies and procedures within their departments need to examine the differences among first-line supervisors. Experience has shown that field supervisors may be an impediment to the implementation and eventual success of innovative policies (Mark, 1976; Sherman, Milton, & Kelley, 1973; Walker, 1993). Indeed, it has been generally recognized that field supervisors play an important role in communicating administrators’ philosophies and policies (Bayley, 1994; Goldstein, 1990; Sparrow, Moore, & Kennedy, 1990). The present research confirms that supervisors do have some “power potential” (Van Maanen, 1984). Police administrators may want to channel this potential and encourage leadership by example. For administrators to support this power potential, however, first-line supervisors must be encouraged to be actively engaged with subordinates in the field but also to set a proper example through their actions.

As police organizations have evolved and greater emphasis has been placed on the goals of community-oriented policing and problem solving, scholars have speculated about the changing role for patrol supervisors (Goldstein, 1990; Weisburd, McElroy, & Hardymann, 1988; Wite, Travis, & Langworthy, 1990; Wycoff & Skogan, 1994; Van Maanen, 1983). Scholars now stress the role of the field supervisor as a coach and mentor for subordinate officers (Goldstein, 1990). Under the principles of community-oriented policing, patrol officers are afforded more discretion and are encouraged to develop creative problem-solving approaches. Supervisors can facilitate this transition in objectives by encouraging team building, raising morale, emphasizing their role as a coach and mentor, and leading by example. Police administrators must recognize, however, that more aggressive forms of patrol officer behavior may be the result of leadership by example if supervisors use more aggressive enforcement tactics. The present findings suggest that an active supervisory style does have an impact on the aggressive behavior of patrol officers vis-à-vis citizens. If the ultimate goal in the community-policing era is to develop subordinates by emphasizing problem-solving skills and sound judgment, then practitioners and researchers need to further examine the attitudes and behavior of first-line supervisors.

### Decision Making (two items)
1. When you are on the scene of an incident with your officers, how frequently do you tell them how to handle the incident?
2. When you are on the scene, how frequently do you take it over and handle the incident yourself?

Never [1], rarely [2], sometimes [3], or often [4]

### Power Distribution (11 items)

How much influence do you usually have over each decision:

1. Which officers are assigned to your unit.
2. The specific CPA or job assignments your officers receive.
3. Whether one of your officers is permitted to go out of service to do problem solving or other special tasks.
4. Whether your officers are disciplined for minor rule infractions.
5. Whether your officers receive assignments to specialist units when they ask for them.
6. Whether one of your officers is authorized to work overtime.
7. Whether one of your officers is approved for off-duty work.
8. Your officers’ prospects for promotion to higher rank.
9. Department policies about patrol operations.
Hardly any or none [1], some [2], a lot [3].

10. When you have asked for resources needed to do a job, how often have you been given what you requested?
11. When you have made decisions about how to do patrol operations, how often have your decisions been supported by higher-ups?

Never [1], seldom [2], sometimes [3], usually [4], always [5]

### Relations Orientation 1 (one item)

1. How many officers in your unit would you consider to be your friends?
None [1], a few [2], about half [3], all or most [4].

### Relations Orientation 2 (one item)

Here is a list of functions [list includes 10 items] that first-line police supervisors might be expected to perform. Indicate the 3 that you think are the most important for you to perform as a first-line supervisor [5] and 3 that are the least important [1].

Protecting subordinates from unfair criticism or punishment.
Task Orientation (four items)

Here is a list of functions [list includes 10 items] that first-line police supervisors might be expected to perform. Indicate the 3 that you think are the most important for you to perform as a first-line supervisor [5] and 3 that are the least important [1].

1. Making sure that reports are properly completed.
2. Enforcing department rules and regulations.

Here is a list of goals [list includes seven items] that police are sometimes expected to accomplish. Indicate the two you believe are the most important for patrol officers with 911 assignments [5] and two that you think are the least important [1].

3. Handling calls for service to their assigned area.

Level of Activity/Relative Distance of Supervision (two items)

Answer the following questions never [1], rarely [2], sometimes [3], always [4]:

1. How frequently do your officers ask you to come to the incidents that they are handling?
2. Other than when it is required by department policy, how frequently do you go on your own initiative to incidents that your officers are handling?

Inspirational Motivation (one item)

Here is a list of functions [list includes 10 items] that first-line police supervisors might be expected to perform. Indicate the 3 that you think are the most important for you to perform as a first-line supervisor [5] and 3 that are the least important [1].

Helping officers to work on problems in their assigned areas.

Expectations for Community Policing (nine items)

Indicate your level of agreement with the following:

1. Police officers have reason to be distrustful of most citizens [values reversed].
2. Assisting citizens is just as important as enforcing the law.
3. A good patrol officer will try to find out what residents think the neighborhood problems are.

Disagree strongly [1], disagree somewhat [2], agree somewhat [3], agree strongly [4]

How often should patrol officers with 911 assignments be expected to do something about each of the following situations:

4. Public nuisances (loud parties, barking dogs)
5. Neighbor disputes
6. Family disputes
7. Litter and trash

8. Parents who don’t control their kids
9. Nuisance businesses that cause lots of problems for neighbors
   Never [1], sometimes [2], much of the time [3], always [4]

Expectations for Aggressive Enforcement (three items)

Indicate your level of agreement with the following:

1. Enforcing the law is by far the patrol officer’s most important responsibility.
2. A good patrol officer is one who patrols aggressively by stopping cars, checking out people, running license checks, and so forth.

Disagree strongly [1], disagree somewhat [2], agree somewhat [3], agree strongly [4]

Here is a list of goals [list includes seven items] that police are sometimes expected to accomplish. Indicate the two you believe are the most important for patrol officers with 911 assignments [5] and two that you think are the least important [1].

3. Making arrests and issuing citations.

NOTES

1. Officer effectiveness was operationalized as the number of incidents handled per tour, response to radio calls, time spent handling encounters, downtime after an encounter was handled, and the manner of handling crimes, complaints, offenses, and disturbances.
2. Smith’s (1984) findings are suspect because he did not adequately control for the seriousness of the offense involved in the encounter. Offense seriousness is correlated with both supervisor presence and arrest, suggesting that the relationship between supervisor presence and arrest may be confounded.
3. Previously, supervision was organized as a “squad system,” in which one sergeant was directly responsible for a fixed group of officers who worked the same schedule. After a change in administrative personnel, St. Petersburg, Florida, Police Department (SPPD) implemented a supervisory structure that focused on geographic deployment. Each sergeant in the department was assigned to a particular geographic area (i.e., Community Policing Areas [CPA]) for which he or she was directly responsible. As a result, sergeants were responsible for supervising patrol officers and community policing officers who were assigned to their particular area across every shift. After about a year, this structure of supervision was reorganized because of the unrealistic demands it placed on sergeants.
4. Supervisors were excluded from the analyses if they were not both interviewed and observed (16 sergeants and lieutenants from Indianapolis, Indiana, Police Department [IPD] and 3 sergeants from SPPD). Also, eight patrol officers acting as temporal sergeants in SPPD were excluded, as were all the lieutenants from this department. For details, see Engel (in press-a).
5. Specific items with questions regarding their reliability or validity were eliminated from the composite scale measures. Where appropriate, a single item was used to represent an attitudinal dimension rather than an additive scale.

6. The two relations-orientation items do not strongly correlate (Pearson's r = 0.11), and reliability analysis suggests that they do not belong in an additive scale (alpha coefficient = 0.19). At face value, the items tap different issues. The number of officers that supervisors consider their friends is not related to their reported importance of protecting officers from unfair criticism or punishment. As a result, these two items are entered separately in analyses, with both representing different aspects of the relations-orientation construct.

7. There was not a 100% match between officers and sergeants because not all sergeants from IPD were both observed and interviewed (thus, they were not categorized with a particular supervisory style). Also, in a handful of cases, a positive match could not be made between the officer and sergeant because the officer changed shifts partway through the observation period. Although a high percentage of patrol officers from IPD were matched to supervisors with the same work schedule, caution should be used in interpreting any results based on this pairing of supervisors and subordinates. Supervision in this department appeared to be more collective in nature and concentrated at the shift level.

8. In SPPD, 17 officers were not matched to a specific sergeant because they reported working CPAs that were not identified by supervisors as being their particular areas of responsibility. These particular CPAs were not "study beats" for the Project on Policing Neighborhoods; therefore, systematic observation of these officers is likely to be limited anyway.

9. Due to the hierarchical nature of the data, hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) estimates are also derived. HLM results indicate that there is not significant dependence between groups of observations; therefore, multilevel modeling is not necessary. Furthermore, the estimates generated through HLM are similar to the logistic regression results and therefore are not reported in the text.

10. The use of force measure includes firm grip or nonpain restraint, pain compliance (hammerlock, wristlock, finger grip, carotid control, arm lock), impact or incapacitation methods (striking with body or weapon, mace, taser), or drawing or discharging a firearm.

11. Temporal ordering is established in cases of arrest. Observers were instructed to code the citizen as disrespectful if the citizen was verbally argumentative, impolite, did something or failed to do something that was requested of them by the officer, or displayed disrespectful gestures.

12. This measure is only available for beats that were designated as study beats. Although each of the officers in this sample has been observed, their primary assignment may not have been a study beat. Exclusion of these officers does not make a significant difference in the findings reported.
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