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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Awareness opens many doors; such is the case with family violence. Prior to the 1970s, home was considered a man's castle. What took place behind closed doors was of no interest to the public. The police, however, were not exempt from this societal lack of interest. In fact, domestic disturbances accounted for a large percentage of calls handled by the police. For example, in Atlanta, 60 percent of all police calls on the night shift are domestic dispute calls (Hyde and Rosenberg, 1980:262). Domestic disputes also accounted for a high percentage of police deaths and injuries. For example, 22 percent of police deaths and 40 percent of police injuries are a result of family violence calls (Bard and Zacker, 1971:678). The door was finally opened to the rest of the public in the 1970s via social science research (e.g., Steinmetz, 1977; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Straus. Gelles and Steinmetz, 1980; Gelles, 1980) and law enforcement was severely criticized for the traditional role utilized responding to family fight calls (Roy, 1977; Martin, 1983).

The police organization viewed these calls as potentially dangerous; thus, police officers were trained to handle the situation with caution. Besides police safety, an additional goal was minimal intrusion into private family lives. This second goal derives from societal norms regarding privatization of the family. Later, researchers generally agreed that these traditional police responses to domestic violence had to be modified. With new guidelines, greater attention would be given to the plight of victims of spouse abuse.
Two uniquely different solutions have evolved in the literature. The first perspective argues for adequate police training (Bard, 1969, 1980; Bard and Zacker, 1971). Trained law enforcement officers would act as practitioners mediating violent family situations. Furthermore, officers would be trained to work with, and refer to, agencies such as social services and shelters for abused wives. In essence, police officers would be prepared to implement a treatment plan that would fit the particular needs of the situation. The second perspective involves police discretion. Researchers advocating this perspective insist the police have too much discretion and do not make arrests at domestic disturbances when an arrest should be made (Oppenlander, 1982; Martin, 1983; Brown, 1984). They contend discretion should be taken out of the hands of the individual officer with guidelines implemented for mandatory arrest when violence occurs.

Statement of the Problem

This research investigates the police response to domestic disturbances. This is an important and timely subject because many states, localities and law enforcement agencies are in the process of reevaluating the laws, statutes, and procedures that guide police officers in their response to domestic disputes (Reed et al. 1983; Buzawa, 1982; Banks, 1984; Quarm and Schwartz, 1985; Berk et al. 1980; O'Reilly, 1983).

Recommendations for improving the effectiveness of police interventions at family fights have their foundations in the two perspectives cited above. (For example, see Battered Women: Issues of Public Policy. This book is based on a consultation sponsored by the
The recommendations from both of these perspectives, however, suffer from two major problems. First, the studies, and consequently the recommendations, are not based on a sound theoretical structure. For the most part, these studies fail to incorporate theoretical guidelines for understanding police behavior. Second, very few studies have examined the police response from the police perspective. In fact, this has been a major shortcoming of prior studies on police response that researchers have indicated as essential for further investigation (Berk and Loseke, 1981; Smith and Klein, 1984; Homant and Kennedy, 1985). This research attempts to rectify these shortcomings by developing theoretical models to explain the police response which are then tested using police officers as respondents.

The police literature is replete with studies examining all facets of police behavior, however, few have focused on the police response to family disturbances. This study extrapolates from the theoretical and empirical knowledge on police behavior two models to explain police response. The first, the organizational model, examines the influences the police organization has on the officer’s response to a domestic disturbance. The second, the psychological predispositional model, looks at those characteristics of officers that influences their response to family fights.

The development of theoretical models to explain police response to domestic disputes enables recommendations by advocates of police training and mandatory arrest to be reexamined in light of their
ability to effect change within the police organization. Furthermore, by analyzing these issues from the police perspective, recommendations for change takes into consideration factors that influence officer's response. For example, if officers do not perceive police intervention at family fights as "real" police work (Brown, 1984) and therefore handle the matter as quickly as possible, then recommendations for increased training may not serve to enhance the effectiveness of the police response. However, mandatory arrest may act as a mechanism for legitimizing police involvement in family disturbances by shifting the focus of the response from a maintenance order call to a law enforcement problem.

Research Objectives

The purpose of this research is the development of a theoretical model to explain the police response to domestic disturbances. A derivation of this is the examination of the two perspectives, police training and mandatory arrest, in light of the findings generated by this analysis. In turn, the implications each perspective holds for restructuring current police policy can be reexamined to determine which is consistent with the findings on police response.

Goals of the Study

The major goals of this research are the development and testing of theoretical models that explain and predict those factors that influence police response to domestic disturbances. In Chapter III, two models are developed from the sociological literature on the police; the organizational model and the psychological predispositional
model. These models are then tested using a sample of police officers.

Prior to developing and testing these models, a thorough review of the literature on police response to domestic disturbances is examined. This review is important to this study because it legitimizes the need for developing causal models that extend the parameters of current knowledge on police response in the area of family violence. Furthermore, the research reviewed supports the need for a change in current practices relating to police response.

The two opposing perspectives found in the literature (training and mandatory arrest) strongly assert the need for change, however, their solutions are diametrically opposed to each other. Thus, these two perspectives provide a context for looking at the studies on police response by categorizing their recommendations by type of change.

Clarification of Terms

Throughout this monograph, the terms family violence, family fights, domestic disturbances, and domestic disputes are used interchangeably. Police officers use these terms to refer to conflict, be it verbal or physical, that occurs between husbands and wives, or cohabitating adults of the opposite sex. In essence, this conflict can include anything from a threat to do harm to murder, with pushing, shoving, hitting, and using a weapon falling somewhere in between.

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is composed of six chapters. Following the introductory chapter, Chapter II reviews the literature on police response to family violence from the police training and mandatory
arrest perspectives. Chapter III develops the theoretical models that guide the research in this study. The hypotheses are presented in this chapter. Chapter IV outlines the methods used to conduct the research. Chapter V presents the data analysis with the test of the two models. Chapter VI provides an analysis and summary of the study and highlights the implications of this research project.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction
Historically, women have been victimized by males under the guise of patriarchy (Dobash and Dobash, 1979). For example, English common law asserted the right of the male to chastise his wife for correctional purposes (Pagelow, 1985). In fact, the rule of thumb which evolved out of English common law referred to the husband's right to beat his wife with a stick no thicker than his thumb (Klein, 1981). In the United States, it wasn't until 1871 that attention was focused on the "ancient privilege" of wife beating when two states, Alabama and Massachusetts, rescinded statutes protecting males who beat their wives (Pagelow, 1985:284).

Laws prohibiting wife beating have been implemented in the United States. However, attitudes about a male's right to dominate his wife have changed very slowly. In fact, until the 1970s, research on family violence suffered from "selective inattention" (Gelles, 1980:144). It was not considered a problem, and thus was not seen as worthy of study.

The battered women's movement, founded in London in 1971, focused attention on the plight of battered women. Since then, family violence has emerged as a "high priority social issue" (Gelles, 1980:144). Along with this rise in awareness of family violence as a major social problem, the police response to such situations was also evaluated and found to be deficient (Bard, 1969; Field and Field, 1973; Martin, 1977). Early researchers found police officers were inadequately trained to handle family violence situations and were given little
guidance in the way of policy guidelines other than: "arrest should be exercised as a last resort" (Field and Field, 1973:228). Furthermore, police officers, being predominantly male, considered home a man's castle and thus were unwilling to interfere with what went on behind closed doors (Martin, 1977).

Since the early 1970s, researchers exploring police response to family violence have become more critical of law enforcement's role and more demanding of change (McShane, 1979; Oppenlander, 1982; Brown, 1984). Although there is general consensus among researchers that police response to domestic disputes needs to be altered, the degree of change advocated has varied from increased police training in family crisis intervention (Bard, 1969) to mandatory arrest when violence occurs (Oppenlander, 1982). While this analysis focuses on these two perspectives, many of the studies actually fall on a continuum somewhere between these two poles.

Police Training

The police training model was designed by Morton Bard (1969) to offer police officers intensive training in not only practical techniques for handling domestic disturbances, but also in theoretical understanding of the interpersonal dynamics involved in violent relationships. Bard indicated the content of the program revolved around five topics: crisis intervention; interpersonal conflict management; theory on the structure and dynamics of the family, including an understanding of conflict and violence in the family; intervention methods; and referral networks (Bard and Connolly, 1978:311). The project involved 18 policemen who were specially
trained at the Psychological Center of the City College in New York. After being trained, these policemen were paired up and instructed to handle all the family disturbance calls on their tour of duty. In a 22 month period, these 18 officers engaged in 1388 interventions with 962 families.

Bard notes some rather interesting findings from this project. First, with the high degree of danger involved in family disturbance calls, Bard was happy to report that not one of the 18 policemen sustained an injury throughout the 22 months (Bard and Zacker, 1971). In comparison with a similar inner city district of New York where there were fewer domestic disturbance calls, there were five reports of injuries to policemen incurred handling family fight calls (Bard, 1969).

A second finding is even more interesting. The community learned through the social network that a family dispute "brings men who are able and willing to spend time and effort in rendering assistance." Furthermore, these officers attempted "to resolve the conflict . . . but failing that they are trained to make referrals to agencies" (Bard, 1969:249). Bard notes the majority of referrals made by the officers in the project were to a wide range of social and mental health agencies, whereas in the comparison precinct, 90 percent of the referrals were to the courts (Bard and Zacker, 1971; Bard, 1980).

Other findings resulting from this experiment were a reduction in the number of family assaults in the precinct and no homicides in any family the officers worked with during the study (Bard, 1980).

Finally, the policemen were amazed by the favorable response of
the community. Families started referring other families, they would come to the police station to talk to these officers. The policemen said a common expression by the public was "I never have had a cop talk to me like this." Bard concludes:

"Attitudes toward police will change when the police are seen as performing in ways consistent with principles of human psychology and when they are given realistic training to render professional police services with dignity (Bard, 1969:249)."

In the 1970s, Bard conducted a follow up study to test the results of the first project and to add a control group for comparisons. He found "officers trained in conflict management were measurably superior in all police performance than were officers who were not specially trained" (Bard, 1980:107). Bard argues for the retention of police discretion. He contends arrest does not solve the problem, often it intensifies it. Bard suggests domestic violence is such a complex problem that single alternatives (such as mandatory arrest) are simplistic and do not take into account the wide range of situations police encounter when dealing with individuals in family situations. For instance, battered women need more than their right to legal access, they also need to become aware of the resources the community can provide for them. Therefore, police trained in skilled interventions who are aware of the resources available to battered women (such as shelter houses) not only have the power of arrest to utilize if necessary, they also can employ any number of interventions that would best meet the needs of the family involved.

Bard's results are impressive but the project was conducted on a small scale in one very large city with many resources to help troubled families. Whether these results could be achieved in a rural area or
in a city with fewer resources is open to debate. Nevertheless, Bard's research offers strong support for the police training perspective. Also, Bard's logic on discretion is compelling. With discretion, police are not limited to one course of action, rather, they can tailor an outcome that may involved mediation, referral, arrest or a combination of methods. In other words, the police can match an outcome with their own judgment of what is necessary.

Walter (1981) contends small city police departments do not have access to the specialized training Bard utilized in his study of New York City police officers. However, Walter demonstrates in his study of small city policemen, that the need for training is just as essential in the small town as in the large metropolitan area. In his study, Walter found the predominant attitudes held by small city police officers towards family disturbance calls were those of "dislike, frustration and anger." Further, he contends these feelings can be traced back to their belief "that nothing could successfully be done within the calls". In other words, "officers are impotent in the face of disturbances requiring capabilities and training not available to them" (Walter, 1981:260). It is, therefore, not too surprising to learn 50 percent of Walter's sample utilized minimal contact as their predominant response to family disturbances. According to Walter, these officers "perceived no legitimate role for themselves" within the disturbance and thus were likely "to leave the premises as quickly as possible" (Walter, 1981:256).

In as much as Bard's solutions are not feasible for rural and small city police officers, Walter contends police academies must begin
placing greater emphasis on teaching officers effective intervention tactics for handling family disturbances. Historically, this topic has received little attention in training academies. For example, Parnas examined one training program that offered police recruits 490 hours of training, of which less than one hour was devoted to handling domestic disturbance calls (Parnas, 1967:915). Walter asserts training academies must increase police officers understanding of the nature of domestic disturbance calls or "officers will continue to use ineffective tactics, and potential warnings of future disasters will continue to be ignored" (Walter, 1981:260).

A second model that falls within the police training perspective evolved out of a three year project conducted by Treger (1975). Professional and graduate social workers were placed with two police departments in middle class communities in Illinois. The purpose of the project was to demonstrate "that by speedy social assessment and early intervention, continued overloading of the criminal justice system could be alleviated and rehabilitation initiated immediately" (Treger, 1975:2).

Treger points out that a large percentage of police work deals with social problems that require social or psychological remedies: "by having social workers as members of the law enforcement team an alternative is provided to the police officer for those cases which could be better helped by referral to social workers" (Treger, 1975:69). The problem in the past has been that police officers have not trusted or recognized the authority of social workers and social workers have not trusted the police. Therefore, they have been
reluctant to work with and understand how the other operates to serve the public.

This project demonstrated that social workers and police officers can work together. In a survey conducted before the project started, 80 percent of the police officers were skeptical and apprehensive about the idea of working with social workers. After the project was completed, the police were surveyed again and 97 percent reported very positive attitudes toward the concept of police and social workers working together.

This model is viewed as a step towards developing interprofessional relationships. According to Treger, when police and social workers cooperate "services are provided at a time when they are most needed and when they may be most effective" (Treger, 1975:134). An outcome of this increased cooperation would be a decrease in the recycling rates of certain calls to law enforcement. For instance, this model provides an opportunity for early detection and prevention of family troubles through services offered by the social workers after it has come to the attention of the police. Thus, early intervention services provided at the initial contact will start a trend away from the criminal justice system.

This study is useful because it demonstrates that cooperation between social service agencies and the police enhances the chances of successful outcomes for clients both agencies come into contact with. Furthermore, exposure of the two agencies to one another builds rapport and a working relationship which, in the long run, is a benefit to the community.
The major criticism of this study is that it was conducted in two middle class communities. A more meaningful design might have contrasted a police department from a middle class community with a police department working in an inner city. This contrast would illustrate the effects of social class and the resulting differences in types of calls handled by the two agencies.

The police-social worker team approach has been successful in other communities using varying forms of cooperation. For example, in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, social workers are teamed with police officers to provide on the scene crisis intervention (Higgins, 1978), while in Erie, Pennsylvania, social workers train police officers in how to intervene skillfully in domestic disturbances (Hanewicz et al., 1982:494). To empirically test this approach, the Washtenau County Sheriff's Department in Ann Arbor, Michigan, participated in a program designed to improve linkages with community social services agencies. Results from the six month experimental program showed a 600 percent increase in social service agency contact by disputants referred by the police following an intervention at a domestic disturbance (Hanewicz et al., 1982:497).

The next argument I will analyze for police training comes from Stanley Vanagunas (1982). This viewpoint is different from the others presented in that Vanagunas looks at the police in the context of planning for the delivery of urban services. The police function, according to Vanagunas, is basically reactive, in other words the police primarily respond to calls (Reiss found that 90 percent of all police arrests were reactive - Vanagunas, 1982:39). Furthermore, only
20 percent of all calls to law enforcement agencies deal with crime related events. For these reasons, Vanagunas believes the police should be viewed as a social service thereby placing them in the domain of social planning. In other words, the police would be considered a "human service organization . . . whose primary function is to enhance the well-being of individuals and groups rather than the public as a whole" (Vanagunas, 1982:45).

By invoking this approach, the police become accountable for the quantity and quality of its direct services to the citizenry. Therefore, planning revolves around the delivery of police services to individuals and groups within the community and not the overall crime rate which the police have limited ability to do much about anyway. In as much as the police are mandated to respond to family fight calls, the process of accountability to the groups the police serve necessitates that the police receive training so as to become a resource to victims of abuse. Training should revolve around effective interventions, referrals to community services and provision to support services such as transportation to emergency shelters or crisis centers.

To facilitate the delivery of services to battered women, Pahl (1982) contends police officers "cannot act appropriately without listening to the woman's own analysis of what should be done" (Pahl, 1982:343). She contends there is often a vast disparity between the way a battered women perceives an assault and how the police perceive it, which leads to the women not being taken seriously by the police. In Pahl's study of battered women, 63 percent stated the police
response had not been helpful. Respondents indicated the police "seemed reluctant to become involved and unwilling to intervene in more than the most minimal way" (Pahl, 1982:340). Pahl contends those officers seen as most helpful did not necessarily take a law enforcement role, rather "they were those who responded most appropriately" (Pahl, 1982:343). In other words, an arrest was not always viewed as the most appropriate response by the battered women; counseling, referral or just calming the husband down were seen as helpful interventions.

Pahl's study lends support to Vanagunas' assertion that training enables the police to become more responsive to battered women. By understanding their perspective, police are able to select interventions from a variety of techniques that would meet the needs of the parties involved.

In their own way, the authors reviewed under this perspective all contribute to the police training hypothesis. Through improved training, the police will offer skilled interventions to families in crisis. Furthermore, this training will enable the barriers between the police and social service agencies to crumble allowing for increased effectiveness between agencies in delivering early and effective treatments to cliental. Finally, by revising the priorities of the police organization from a strictly law enforcement function to a human service orientation, trained officers will be more responsive to the needs of the citizens they serve.
Mandatory Arrest

The mandatory arrest model was developed as a reaction to police not doing their jobs in domestic disturbance situations. Researchers espousing this perspective are very critical of police practices of underenforcement in domestic disputes. According to Oppenlander (1982), the police ignore flagrant law violations that occur in the home, thus endorsing patriarchy and the male's right to dominate his wife. "If there is a cop out of police in domestic investigations, it lies in their failure to enforce the law in justifiable cases of assault" (Oppenlander, 1982:463).

Wermuth's (1982) examination of programs addressing the problem of family violence instituted by the Criminal Justice system over the last fifteen years comes to the same conclusion as Oppenlander: the system is reluctant to treat wife beating as a crime. According to Wermuth, programs based on Bard's model of crisis intervention assumes violence within the family is not a criminal matter, but rather an interpersonal problem. Thus, police interventions were based on the precept both participants were equal partners in the dispute, and therefore, both were responsible for the violence. As a result of this philosophy, criminal sanctions, though warranted, were seldom considered as intervention techniques.

In 1978, the Family Violence Program was established by LEAA policy makers to provide "direct and indirect services to the victims and perpetrators of family violence" (Wermuth, 1982:34). Diversion and counseling programs were developed for offenders while shelter homes and information and referral services were provided to victims. On the
surface, these services and treatment programs appeared beneficial to the reduction of family violence. According to Wermuth, this model simply extended the therapeutic approach which assumed wife beating was a complex interpersonal problem which required services, record keeping, and official attention. Again, arrests of violent offenders were not encouraged. Rather, "emphasis was put on the potential for rehabilitation and reconciliation rather than on the victims need for protection" (Wermuth, 1982:37). Instead of focusing on the causes of violence against women, the Criminal Justice system mystified the problem: "Violence becomes a symptom of weakness and illness, rather than of power and force" (Wermuth, 1982:43).

Wermuth contends the Criminal Justice system needs to take responsibility for protecting the victims of violent domestic abuse. "Instead of defining wife-beating as different and routinely side-stepping punitive measures, it should be defined and treated as are other violent crimes" (Wermuth, 1982:45).

According to Bae (1981), domestic disturbances are generally viewed by the police as "non-crimes" while spousal violence is considered normal as long as it is within limits. For example, Field and Field (1973) indicate an arrest at a domestic dispute often depends on the seriousness of the injury to the victim. In the past, some police departments had an informal "stitch" rule, "Whereby a certain (high) number of stitches was required before the officer could make an arrest" (Field and Field, 1973:229).

Bae (1981) contends the police are not concerned with the physical safety of the wife when they respond to domestic disturbances. In his
analysis of police training manuals, arrest as an intervention was seen as the "last resort". According to Bae, the wife's safety is not considered important because "the intra-family problem is not a police matter and that both parties are . . . capable of solving their own problems" (Bae, 1981:66).

Bae insists the arrest of a violent husband is often the only means available to protect a battered wife, but in reality it is very rare for the police to make such an arrest. He contends situational conditions take precedence over a wife's physical safety. For instance; the officer's own safety, the time required to fill out the arrest reports, the officer's belief the wife will drop the charges in the morning, and empathy for the husband; these conditions make the chances for an arrest improbable.

Burris and Jaffe (1983) agree with Bae's assertion arrests of violent husbands are rare. In a study they conducted in 1979, they found police made arrests in three percent of all family violence cases "despite the fact that they advised 20 percent of the victims to seek medical treatment" (Burris and Jaffe, 1983:309). They offer the following reasons why police officers are reluctant to arrest:

1. Most police departments have not developed clearly defined policies regarding arrest, except to require that such action should be avoided whenever possible in cases of family violence.

2. Wife assault cases are given low priority in law enforcement departments, there is no reward or attention given to officers who rigorously pursue arrest in these cases.

3. Police recruits and veteran officers receive very little training on this issue.

4. Traditionally, violence has been condoned as a normal male
response to stress and it is implied wife abuse should remain in the private domain of the family (Burris and Jaffe, 1983:310).

Burris and Jaffe contend the police policy of minimal intervention has far reaching implications:

1. The female who calls the police for protection is disillusioned by the response she gets and begins to feel there are no alternatives to her situation.

2. Many women who are being abused will not call the police because they are aware that very little will be done to deter their assailant.

3. Police officers often get frustrated with repeat calls to the same residence.

4. By not arresting the male, police are giving the batterer the message that he has a right to hit his partner and that he will not be held responsible for his behavior (Burris and Jaffe, 1983:310).

Davis (1981) conducted in-depth interviews with policemen and found officers are reluctant to arrest in family dispute situations. According to Davis, these officers did not view family disputes as "real" police work. The officers believed the disputes arose out of marital intimacy, and therefore were not due to a "criminal element". Thus, the officers tended to "normalize family conflict" (Davis, 1981:11). This leads to the preconception by officers that non-legal remedies are the preferred mode of intervention at family disturbances.

The officers interviewed by Davis viewed the family dispute call as a "no win situation" where the officer often gets "caught in the middle". Thus, generalizations based on these beliefs, lead the officer to view disputants in domestic disturbances as unstable and unreliable. Davis states: "Since the call is seen as involving unreliable and unstable citizens, officers tend to develop the
preconception that arrests are best avoided in family disturbances" (Davis, 1981:13). Thus, the officers subscribed to the policy "get in and get out" avoiding getting hurt (Davis, 1981:13).

A study by Berk and Loseke (1981) found a police officer's decision to arrest at a domestic disturbance call largely depended on situation specific interpretations by the officer. For example, the results of their statistical analysis indicated the strongest variable effecting a police officer's decision to arrest was the female's willingness to sign a citizen's arrest warrant. If a woman was unwilling to sign the warrant, arrest was highly unlikely on any grounds. Three other variables proved to be highly significant. First, alcohol use by the male was strongly correlated with the decision to arrest. The authors speculate intoxication by the male indicates a volatile situation that is not likely to be solved quickly, furthermore, police can then arrest on a more convenient charge such as resisting arrest or assaulting a police officer. Second, they found police arrests increased by 30 percent when the female made an allegation of violence against the male. Finally, when the female makes the call for help to the police, the probability of arrest decreases by 21 percent. Berk and Loseke suggest that when the woman calls, the police may feel the situation has not reached the critical point in terms of severity of conflict. In other words, if she can call, then she is not hurt badly enough. However, when the conflict has escalatated beyond the household and an outsider calls, the police response may be more severe so as to avoid future complaints from neighbors.
These results suggest a police officer's decision to arrest depends in part on how the victim and suspect set the stage for police management of the situation. When the police officer arrives at the scene, the officer constructs a picture of what has happened based on the situational determinants mentioned above. From this picture, the police officer interprets the situation based on prior experience and determines what response to utilize. As the authors point out, the decision to arrest does not "necessarily center on the collection of evidence for proof that laws have been violated" (Berk and Loseke, 1981:342). The authors contend the decision to arrest is much more complicated than this.

"An officer's interpretations of events, and the ways in which these interpretations are assessed and ultimately acted upon, constitute a far more complex process than prior research and speculation on police response to domestic violence would suggest" (Berk and Loseke, 1981:342).

Berk and Loseke indicate part of the problem may lie with the "problematic nature of the routine exercise of police discretion" (Berk and Loseke, 1981:343). Discretion becomes a normal way of handling the situation. Rather than basing the decision to arrest on whether or not a law has been violated, officers interpret the situation based on prior experience and situational determinants. Thus, handling of the situation becomes routine when it fits the pattern based on previously encountered situational determinants.

This study offers a different way of looking at police discretion. If police routinely avoid arrest at domestic disturbances, it may not strictly be an abuse of the power to arrest as much as it is a learned response based on prior experiences and situations that fit those
One criticism leveled against the research of Berk and Loseke deals with their methodology. The study consisted of 405 police reports of interventions in domestic disturbances. The data analyzed consisted entirely of police reports, neither victims or suspects were interviewed. Furthermore, over 300 cases were dropped from the original sample (n=730) due to insufficient information on the police report. In other words, the study deals mainly with the more serious disputes police handle, while the less serious were dropped due to lack of data.

Smith and Klein (1984) also looked at situational determinants that influence police arrest decisions. In replicating Berk and Loseke, they corrected for the methodological problems that limited that study. Smith and Klein included both domestic and non-domestic disputes while collecting their data through direct observation of police citizen encounters. They found decisions to arrest were influenced by situational variables.

As in the Berk and Loseke study, Smith and Klein found the most significant determinant of arrest was the victims preference for arrest. However, the socioeconomic status of the neighborhood modified this variable, in that the higher the status of the neighborhood, the more likely the police were to comply with a complainant's request for an arrest. In lower-status neighborhoods, the police appeared indifferent toward victims, enacting a policy of non-enforcement. Smith and Klein contend this selective nonenforcement "represents a systematic denial of legal protection toward a specific segment of the
population" (Smith and Klein, 1984:478).

In comparing both domestic and non-domestic disputes, Smith and Klein found police were less likely to arrest when the complainant was a female, and more likely to arrest when disputes involved a male complainant. This finding corresponds with Berk and Loseke’s contention the probability of police arrest decreases when the female calls for police help.

Other factors Smith and Klein found to influence arrest were: previous contact with disputing parties; antagonistic offenders who challenged a police officer’s legitimacy or authority; and offenders who had been drinking. These findings support the Berk and Loseke findings indicating the importance of extra legal factors in determining a police officer’s decision to arrest.

Smith and Klein point out a major limitation to their study and other studies that attempt to explain police decision making. They contend: "little attention has been given to how predispositions of police affect their behavior". In other words, how does "attitudes, values and beliefs of individual officers structure their discretionary choices?" (Smith and Klein, 1984:480).

Sherman and Berk (1984) found police officers face three conflicting options when they confront a domestic assault case:

1. Forced separation to achieve short term peace.
2. Mediation as a means of getting to the underlying cause of the dispute.
3. Arrest the assailant to protect the victim.

In an experiment set up by the authors, officers from the Minneapolis
Police Department responded to simple domestic violence calls (misdemeanors) randomly using one of the three options stated above. Outcomes for the experiment were measured in two ways:

1. Police recorded failure: the offender failed to complete a six month follow up period without a report of another domestic violence.

2. Interviews with the victims: during the six months following police involvement, when the offender perpetrated further acts of domestic violence, the intervention was recorded as a failure.

From police reports, the overall failure rate was 18.2 percent. However, the rate for those arrested was 13 percent, while those who had been separated had a 26 percent failure rate. From interviews with the victims, there was a 28.9 percent failure rate. For those arrested, the rate was 19 percent, however, the rate for those advised was 37 percent.

There were some methodological problems with this study: police refusal to cooperate and the inability of the researchers to follow up on some of the victims. Nevertheless, the study does offer support for deterrence, in that swift imposition of a sanction may deter male offenders in domestic disturbance cases.

In a multiyear study of domestic disturbances in Ohio, Bell (1985) found the police responded to 128,171 domestic dispute incidents, with injuries or death to the victim reported in 41 percent of the cases. Bell notes that in only 14 percent of the reported disputes were arrests made by the police. The data indicate the police are not providing full legal coverage to victims of domestic violence by failing to make justifiable arrests.
Bell contends the results from his study indicate "the police are contributing to the continuation of family violence by not taking decisive intervention action" (Bell, 1985:62). According to Bell, the police not only fail to protect victims, but they also avoid arresting violent offenders, resulting in a perpetuation of the cycle of violence within the family.

Bell strongly urges police organizations to adopt procedures and policies that would protect members within the family. "The police must develop processes whereby violent domestic offenders are identified and dealt with in a manner consistent with the severity of their offense" (Bell, 1985:62). Bell suggests arrests should be mandatory in cases of serious domestic violence with in custody counseling required for domestic offenders prior to their release.

Oppenlander (1982) agrees with Bell's claim the police are not doing their job of enforcing the law in domestic violence situations. She presents support for this thesis from the Police Services Study, 1977, in which trained observers rode with police in 24 communities and recorded the officer's responses to complaints. Oppenlander analyzed 596 (out of 5688 observations) of the recorder observations in which the police investigated disputes and assaults.

Six main findings emerged from this study. First, officers were slower to arrive at family fights (4.65 minutes) than to other types of disputes involving non related participants (3.86 minutes). Oppenlander speculates officers are reluctant to get involved in family matters, and by taking their time to get to the scene, the officers hoped the argument would be worked out by the time they arrived.
Second, police are more concerned with the suspect (in most cases, male) and less concerned with the needs of the victim. Oppenlander states the police are not effective in dealing with the victim, furthermore, "police do not readily adapt to the needs or preferences of domestic victims" (Oppenlander, 1982:455). Third, the most common strategy by police at domestic disturbances is non-intervention. Fourth, mediation or counseling is one alternative police officers use at domestic disturbances, however, the data indicate very few officers have been trained in mediation or crisis intervention. Furthermore, those who do counsel rely on their own personal beliefs and experiences in prescribing solutions. Fifth, even though 90 percent of the officers stated they were aware of groups to refer battered women to, in only four percent of the calls did the officer refer a participant to an agency for help. Finally, the police arrive at domestic disturbances in the heat of the argument between the participants. Oppenlander contends the disputants see the police as authority figures and not as facilitators. Because of this, few are interested in on-the-scene counseling, furthermore, victims want officers to enforce the law.

According to Oppenlander, these findings support the major criticism leveled against police in that they are failing to enforce the law in cases of assault within the family. She is also very critical of the police training approach: "Arrest at least offers greater potential than makeshift psychological palliatives for reducing family violence" (Oppenlander, 1982:463). In essence, the author argues the police are mandated to enforce the law in domestic
disturbances and not to act as counselors.

Oppenlander presents a strong argument for the mandatory arrest perspective. Her findings indicate many areas in which the police have failed to adequately respond to domestic disturbance calls. However, one could take her arguments and use them to substantiate the development of the police training perspective. By being aware of the problems she has pointed out, police could be trained to overcome these deficits.

Brown's (1984) study of 84 battered women admitted to a shelter home for victims of conjugal violence found the police response to domestic disputes inadequate. Brown's findings support Oppenlander's (1982) contention the police are not doing their job of enforcing the law. According to the victims Brown interviewed, arrests by police were rarely made, and referrals to outside agencies were not provided by the police. Brown contends this traditional police response may contribute to "self derogation among battered women and discourage them from seeking remedy through application of the criminal law" (Brown, 1984:285).

According to Brown, the police do not perceive domestic violence as a legitimate police function, rather, law enforcement officers view wife abuse as a non-crime and a matter for civil law. In developing a remedy for this, Brown suggests a "fundamental shift in police philosophy" that would legitimize "domestic violence as a law enforcement problem" (Brown, 1984:285).

The studies reviewed in this perspective point out the problems inherent in police discretion and the need for mandatory arrest at
domestic disturbances. Berk and Loseke, and Smith and Klein point to the use of discretion to routinely handle calls based on situational determinants rather than basing their decisions on whether or not laws have been violated. Bell, Bae, Oppenlander and Brown found many shortcomings in the police response to domestic violence which leads to their contention police are not enforcing the law in cases of domestic violence. Finally, the study by Sherman and Berk illustrates deterrence does have an effect on reducing the number of violent episodes in the home.

Summary

These two perspectives offer different solutions for solving a complex problem. Both agree it is imperative the traditional police response be modified, but they disagree rather dramatically on the degree of discretion police officers should have when intervening at domestic disturbance calls, and therefore, their solutions are diametrically opposed to one another.

The mandatory arrest perspective contends police officers employ too much discretion and do not make arrests when an arrest should be made. Researchers within this orientation assert the need for more stringent guidelines to guide police in doing their job when responding to domestic calls where violence has occurred and an arrest should be made. According to this perspective, discretion should be eliminated in family violence situations. The prime objective of the police response under this model would be to determine if a law had been violated, and if so, arrest the suspect.

The training perspective contends police officers should retain
discretion, however, this orientation maintains it is essential police be trained in effective methods for handling family disputes. As a result of training, Bard visualized the police role as being one of "managers of human crisis and conflict" (Bard, 1978:49). Bard assumes family problems are unique and require an array of techniques and resources to match the intervention to the problem. Police training provides the officer with the skills and knowledge to perform these interventions. Furthermore, interventions in family fights cannot be delegated to any other system because of the inherent dangerousness of the call. By providing adequate and appropriate training to the police, society can utilize an available resource waiting to be developed.

The next chapter will develop models that will be used to examine these two perspectives.
CHAPTER III
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

Research reviewed in the last chapter clearly demonstrates the need for reform in police handling of domestic violence calls. Two opposing perspectives dispute the direction this reform should take. The first, the training model, argues for increased training of officers while maintaining police discretion. The second approach, the mandatory arrest model, contends police discretion should be limited or eliminated for officers responding to family disturbances where violence has occurred. In order to understand the effect these models may have on police responsiveness to domestic violence, factors that contribute to police response will be examined.

Sociological research has traditionally focused on how organizational factors influence the police role, and what effect this has had on police response. Recent studies (Smith and Klein, 1984; Berk and Loseke, 1981), however, have questioned the effect psychological predispositions have on officers discretionary decision making when responding to family violence calls.

This chapter will develop two theoretical frameworks to describe, explain and predict police response to domestic violence. The first is based on the organizational approach and will develop factors causally related to police response. The second framework will analyze those factors associated with psychological predispositions that influence police response. After presenting each approach, relevant hypotheses consistent with each model will be developed.
Organization Factors

There are over 40,000 law enforcement agencies in this country; each agency is organized roughly in the same manner, performing similar functions while being responsible to different levels of governmental jurisdictions (Wilson, 1969:3). In essence, these agencies hold in common organizational structures that are based on bureaucratic standards. Moreover, these bureaucratic standards, or organizational factors, influence the way police officers perform their duties.

According to Weber (1984), bureaucracy in public agencies is based on the following characteristics:

1. A fixed division of labor.
2. A hierarchy of officers.
3. A set of general rules which govern performance.
4. A separation of personal from official property and rights.
5. Selection of personnel on the basis of technical qualifications.
6. Employment viewed as a career by participants.

Weber contends the first three characteristics form the basis for "bureaucratic authority". Furthermore, this authority is what makes bureaucracy superior to other forms of organizations (Weber, 1984:24).

Weber's conception of authority in bureaucracy is based on the rational-legal model which rests on "a belief in the legality of patterns of normative rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands" (Scott, 1981: 32). According to Weber, the rational legal form of authority provides bureaucracy with a stable and predictable structure for both superiors
and subordinates. Furthermore, it permits subordinates to exercise "relatively greater independence and discretion than is possible in other types of administrative systems" (Scott, 1981:70). Thus, subordinates in a bureaucratic structure are guided by impersonal principles which require interpretation. This interpretations is the basis for independent action, or discretion.

Weber's thesis is relevant to contemporary police organizations. Although bureaucratic standards (organizational factors) greatly influence officers perceptions of their role within the organization, principles that guide officer response are open to interpretation. Thus, discretion becomes a normal way of handling police duties (Berk and Loseke, 1981).

Wilson (1969) found the bureaucratic structure of a police organization was mediated by size of community and the political nature of city government. In his analysis of eight communities, Wilson identified three types of police agencies predominant in the United States: watchmen, service, and legalistic. The watchmen style of police department was a non-professional agency concerned with maintaining order. Police within this style of organization tended to handle police matters informally, while non-intervention was the preferred response to disturbing situations. Generally, the watchmen style of police departments were found in smaller communities where city governments were dominated by one party.

The service style of police department was generally found in fairly homogeneous, middle class communities, where government officials perceived their role as a civic duty and the police role as a
public service. In these communities, police were most likely to provide services in disturbing situations in the form of counseling or rendering help rather than enforcing laws.

The legalistic police organization stressed enforcement of the law. Thus, in disturbing situations, rule enforcement was the primary solution to the problem. Wilson found the legalistic style of police departments in fairly large cities where reform governments were in power.

Wilson's typology illustrates the influence size of community has on the police mission. Small communities expect public servants to provide personal services to its members. Police officers generally share these common community values and adopt a service orientation. As communities increase in size, communication between police and citizens decreases. As a result, in larger cities, police departments are more bureaucratic and more specialized than police agencies in smaller communities.

Brown (1981) agrees with Wilson's assertion community size affects the relationship between police and the community. In a study of three California police departments of various sizes, Brown found the smaller law enforcement agencies less autonomous than the large police force. In the small communities, demands to provide a full range of police services while maintaining a low-key style of law enforcement constrained officers autonomy. According to Brown, the chief difference between the large and small police departments was their proximity to community pressures. In small communities, police have "neither the flexibility nor the autonomy to enforce the law as they
please" (Brown, 1981:65). In contrast, police in large departments are characterized by their relative autonomy from community pressures. This autonomy is based on two characteristics; first, external controls on the police are limited, and second, the large departments are bureaucratized and centralized.

Smith (1984) advanced Wilson and Brown's work by classifying police departments into four types based on the organizational context the agency operated within. Based on these contexts, police organizations varied in degrees of professionalization and bureaucratization (Figure 1). Fraternal agencies were non-professional and low in bureaucratization, militaristic were also non-professional but were high in bureaucracy. Legalistic agencies were professional organizations high in bureaucratization while service was a professional agency low in bureaucracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUREAUCRATIZATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Legalistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Militaristic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Classification of Police Agencies
Service and fraternal agencies, being low in bureaucratization were more involved in their communities, and therefore, more dependent on them. Whereas militaristic and legalistic are highly bureaucratic, they were able to operate with more autonomy in the community. Thus, social control was viewed differently based on the agencies degree of bureaucratization. The less bureaucratic agencies were more likely to be conciliatory when handling disturbing situations, in contrast to the bureaucratic agencies use of aggressive law enforcement. However, Smith points out professionalism is also an important factor in an officers response to disturbing situations. Officers within service agencies are more likely to get involved in helping solve difficult interpersonal problems, while legalistic agencies are more likely to make arrests based on non-discriminatory, dispassionate law enforcement. However, the departments low in professionalism; militaristic and fraternal, are more likely to be discriminatory when they do arrest or use a strategy of non-intervention. Smith contends: "Police behavior reflects dominant values and beliefs about legal control that are specific to the type of police agency to which the officer belongs" (Smith, 1984:35).

Wilson, Brown and Smith's analysis of organizational influences on police response suggest two opposing models; the legalistic and service models, with the other types falling somewhere on a continuum in between. For example, Wilson's watchmen style of policing would fall somewhere between his typology of legalistic and service, whereas Smith's militaristic and fraternal would be on a continuum between legalistic and service.
These two models, the legalistic and service, have clearly distinctive opposing characteristics, that are determined by the organizational context in which it operates. The characteristics of these models are:

**Legalistic model**

1. Highly specialized with great division of labor and a centralized style of command.
2. Stresses rules, policies, and procedures and obedience.
3. Primary operational thrust is reactive, suppression and apprehension.
4. Impersonal attitude toward the public and its problems.
5. Stresses influence of authority to accomplish tasks.
6. Exemplary conduct of employees based on threat, external control, and enforcement of rules (Banovetz, 1984:104).

**Service model**

1. Generalized approach with less division of labor and a decentralized style of command.
2. Stresses individual discretion and trust of individual decision making.
3. Primary operational thrust is proactive, prevention and deterrence.
4. Personally involved with the public and its problems.
5. Stresses influence of persuasion with subtle use of authority to accomplish tasks.
6. Exemplary conduct of employees based on training, self-control, and individual responsibility (Banovetz, 1984:104).

These six characteristics dictate an officer's response to police duties. For instance, a police officer working in a legalistic organization is likely to have little autonomy, trusting to rules and
procedures as guidelines for performing duties. These police officers are more likely to respond to the public in an impersonal, manner utilizing arrest as their main intervention. Further, a police officer’s recognition within the department is likely to be a result of the number of arrests made. In contrast, police officers in organizations with a service approach are more likely to enjoy more autonomy in performing their duties, while utilizing discretion and individual decision making to guide their response. Service oriented police officers are more likely to be involved with the public, relying on friendly persuasion to accomplish tasks and viewing prevention as a major goal of police work. Within a service organization, education and training become important determinants for adequately performing duties.

Psychological Predispositions

Police officers perceptions of their role are influenced not only by organizational factors, but also by psychological predispositions. Research (White, 1974; Walsh, 1977; Muir, 1977; Brown, 1981) has consistently shown these roles to be "empirically specifiable by the perceptions and by the behaviors of the role occupants, and these two sets of specifications are measurable independently" (White, 1974:43). In other words, officers conform to role types based on their perceptions of appropriate behavior for that particular role. These differing perceptions are largely the result of psychological predispositions.

Brown's (1981) typology of operational styles is illustrative of research focusing on why officers respond differently to similar
situations. According to Brown, a particular operational style structures an officer's approach to police work. Brown identified four types of operational styles from his field observations: old style crime fighter, clean beat crime fighter, service style and professional style.

Old style crime fighters are aggressive but selective, in other words, they view police work in terms of investigation and apprehending serious criminals. Old style crime fighters do not perceive minor violations or order maintenance incidents as "real" police work, and avoid these situations when possible. Disputes, such as domestic disturbances, are seen as trivial matters and are usually handled in an informal way, relying on a warning rather than formal intervention. According to Brown, the old style crime fighter is a throwback to an era when police departments had few constraints on police action. The crime fighter relied on his skills acquired over the years to survive on the street; "Despite their skill, they were (and are) brutal and often given to the worst abuses of police power" (Brown, 1981:229).

The clean beat crime fighters are also very aggressive in their preoccupation with controlling serious crime, however, they differ in that they rigidly enforce all the laws, regardless of seriousness. The clean beat crime fighter believes crime is controlled "by keeping a clean beat, by establishing a reputation for consistent, hard nosed enforcement" (Brown, 1981:229). Clean beat crime fighters find order maintenance calls as distasteful as the old style crime fighter, however, they do not avoid these calls. Rather, they tend to handle them as quickly as possible giving little attention to the plight of
the victim. Arrest is the most likely response in serious dispute situations. Brown contends these officers display "an undue sense of obedience and deference toward supervision" while having trouble reconciling "the dilemma between the instrumental and substantive goals of police work and the numerous moral choices patrolmen routinely confront" (Brown, 1981:232). As a result, these officers display a very rigid approach to law enforcement which often leads to frustration when supervisors fail to reward them for their aggressive style of police work. As a result, after three to five years on the streets, many clean beat crime fighters (and to a lesser extent old style crime fighters) become less aggressive, adopting either service or professional styles. According to Brown, as the frustrations mounted, officers lost their zeal to fight crime and retreated to a more subdued operational style.

Brown describes the professional style in terms of flexibility. The professional views law enforcement as important, but also contends other aspects of the job, such as order maintenance, are also important. Professionals view prevention as an important element of the police response. For instance, professionals are more apt to enforce traffic laws with the goal of preventing accidents. Professionals differ from the crime fighters in their handling of disturbance calls. Whereas crime fighters view these calls as trivial, the professional treats each call as being unique, requiring patience and understanding in order to resolve the dispute. The professional believes in police professionalism and adheres to departmental regulations as much as possible. However, they remain flexible enough
to maintain rapport with the community and balance the needs of the organization with the needs of the community.

The final style identified by Brown was the service style. Police officers who exhibit this style deemphasize arrest and enforcement of laws and focus on helping people solve problems. Consequently, service officers are viewed as sensitive to community values and needs. Techniques other than arrest are most often employed by service style officers in helping people with interpersonal problems.

Brown contends the development of an operational style is greatly influenced by peers. Rookie patrolmen usually model their style after an older officer while interpreting their experiences through their immediate peers. Officers go through an "intensive rite of passage" where they develop a distinctive set of beliefs and values that conform to "the norms that govern the police subculture" (Brown, 1981:243).

Models developed by Brown and others suggest a dualistic typology for explaining police response to domestic disturbances. Schonborn (1975) offers a typology classifying police as either humanitarian or authoritarian by the way they handle violent conflict. Humanitarian officers are innovators and closely resemble the conception of police as "philosophers, guides and friends" (Schonborn, 1975:163). Authoritarian officers are traditionalists. In contrast to humanitarian officers "authoritarian peacekeepers are often formal and inflexible during their conflict interventions" (Schonborn, 1975:164).

The authoritarian style closely resembles Brown's old style crime fighter and clean beat crime fighter whereas the humanitarian type corresponds to the professional and service style. Synthesizing
Brown's typology with Schonborns' suggests two distinct styles: the law enforcement and the service style.

Officers espousing the law enforcement style are more likely to be over conforming and dependent on authority. Furthermore, they tend to divide the world up into "good guys" and "bad guys", thus stereotyping populations to fit their conception of reality. Moreover, this orientation generally does not place much value on the beneficial effects of higher education, rather, traditional ways of solving problems are considered more useful. Thus, police officers who place little value on education tend to deal with problems in a rigid manner using rote solutions.

The law enforcement style of officer sees the world as a threatening place which requires the use of power and force when dealing with "bad guys". These officers tend to see themselves as guardians of middle class values and norms, thus reacting strongly to those who violate said norms. Furthermore, these officers tend to become secretive and clannish about their activities, often taking a defensive stance towards the rest of society. A "machismo orientation" develops which leads to male chauvinism. "Women involved in police incidents are generally considered to be unreasonable, quick to take offense, even dangerous" (Niederhoffer, 1967:120). Thus, these officers develop a distrust for females and are likely during family fight interventions to side with the male (Schonborn, 1975).

Service style officers view themselves as public servants accountable to the community for their actions. Thus, they emphasize education and training as a basis for providing appropriate services to
the community. The service style also stresses good public relations, impartiality and non-punitiveness. Service style officers tend to be more open and flexible, utilizing persuasion over coercion in handling violent situations. Furthermore, this style officer relies on a variety of techniques to help those involved in dispute situations with the goal being the prevention of future problems.

Levens and Dutton (1980) examined officers' attitudes on police training comparing recently trained recruits with veteran officers. They found the newer officers more likely to be satisfied with training in crisis intervention, more willing to get involved in domestic disputes, and more likely to make referrals to outside agencies than were veteran officers. Furthermore, these findings remained consistent through the officers first seven months on the job. The authors point out, however, that officers "attitudes change drastically during the first three years on the job" (Levens and Dutton, 1980: 63) and thus, a crucial variable in understanding police response is years experience as a police officer.

Various researchers in the family violence field have speculated that the sex of the officer affects police response to domestic disputes. Some researchers (Sherman, 1973; Kennedy and Homant, 1983) contend policewomen are more sensitive to women's issues, and therefore, more effective in handling domestic violence calls than policemen. However, other researchers (Price, 1974; Martin, 1979) suggest female police officers may emphasize more masculine characteristics while downplaying those behaviors considered feminine, thus utilizing similar responses to family violence calls as male
officers.

In a survey designed to address the issue of police response by gender to family violence situations, Homant and Kennedy (1985) compared police perceptions of spouse abuse by gender of officer. Based on a sample of 61 policewomen and 89 policemen, the authors found female officers "have a different set of values and goals for dealing with family fights" (Homant and Kennedy, 1985:42) than male officers. The policewomen were more likely to refer battered women to shelter homes and to show understanding and sympathy than were policemen. Further, female officers scored higher on an "involvement" scale developed by Homant and Kennedy to measure an officer's professional concern about family fights.

Implications from this study would seem to indicate female police officers are more helpful and concerned for the needs of battered women. However, Homant and Kennedy do not think it is practical to advocate female officers respond to the majority of domestic dispute calls. Rather, they find it more logical for police agencies to develop discussion groups that would facilitate communication between male and female officers on the issue of police response to family violence. The authors believe this would bring about an exchange of ideas that in the long run may sensitize males to issues pertinent to battered women.

Theoretical Hypotheses

In this section, theoretical hypotheses will be developed for the two models discussed earlier in this chapter (see Figures 2 and 3). The hypotheses specify the causal relationships for these two models;
Figure 2. Relationship between the organizational variables
Figure 3. Relationship between the psychological predispositional variables
the first examines organizational variables, while the second tests psychological predispositional variables.

Organizational context (Model 1)

1. The larger the community the less likely community pressure will influence the administrative orientation of the department; conversely, the smaller the community the more likely community pressure will influence the administrative orientation of the department.

2. The larger the community, the more likely the department will have a law enforcement orientation; conversely, smaller communities are more likely to have police departments with service orientations.

3. The larger the community, the more likely officers will have a law enforcement orientation; conversely, the smaller the community, the more likely officers will have a service orientation.

These first three hypotheses test the effect community size has on the orientation of the department as well as the officer's perceived role within the department. Wilson (1969) and Brown (1981) have demonstrated the larger the city or county, the more likely the government will be highly centralized, thus the more likely the police agency will be bureaucratic. Furthermore, in large departments officers and administrators have more autonomy from local politics and community pressures to pursue their own style of operation. In contrast, police departments in smaller towns and rural areas are oriented to community expectations. Departmental administrators and officers are sensitive to the needs of the community and more likely to adopt a service orientation to meet the needs of the community.

4. The more oriented police administrators are toward law enforcement, the more likely the department will adopt a law enforcement orientation; conversely, the more oriented police administrators are towards service to the community, the more likely the department will adopt a service orientation.
5. The more oriented police administrators are toward law enforcement, the more likely an officer will utilize non-intervention/arrest procedures when responding to domestic disturbances; conversely, the more oriented police administrators are toward service to the community, the more likely officers will utilize mediation/referral techniques when responding to domestic disturbances.

Wilson (1969) argues the orientation of the department is shaped by the administrative style of the chief of police over and above the influence exerted by community size or politics. The chief of police affects the orientation of a department by instituting policies and procedures that reflect his orientation. As a result, these policies and procedures have a direct effect on officer response to domestic disturbance calls.

6. Agencies with law enforcement orientations are more likely to stress non-intervention/arrest as their primary response to domestic disputes; conversely, agencies with service orientations are more likely to stress mediation/referral as their primary response to domestic disputes.

Agencies with law enforcement orientations are more likely to be reactive in their primary operational thrust, thus stressing apprehension and suppression. Agencies with service orientations are more likely to be proactive, stressing prevention and deterrence (Wilson, 1969; Smith, 1984). By emphasizing either the proactive or reactive operational style, the department influences an officer to utilize that response which coincides with departmental guidelines when responding to domestic disputes.

7. The more law enforcement oriented the department, the more likely officers will adopt a law enforcement oriented police role; conversely, the more service oriented the department the more likely officers will adopt a service oriented police role.

8. The more law enforcement oriented the police role, the more likely the officer will utilize non-intervention/arrest strategies when responding to domestic disturbances;
conversely, the more service oriented the police role, the more likely the officer will utilize mediation/referral techniques when responding to domestic disturbances.

Rules, policies, and procedures reflect the orientation of the department and influence officers in the development of their roles within the organization. Those officers oriented toward law enforcement are more likely to handle domestic disturbance calls as quickly as possible, whereas officers oriented toward service to the community attempt to solve problems utilizing preventative techniques (Brown, 1981).

9. Agencies with law enforcement orientations are less likely to provide training for handling domestic disputes; conversely, agencies with service orientations are more likely to provide training for handling domestic disputes.

10. Agencies that provide little training are more likely to stress non-intervention/arrest techniques for handling domestic disputes; conversely, agencies that provide more training are likely to stress mediation/referral strategies for handling domestic disputes.

Agencies with law enforcement orientations stress non-intervention/arrest as appropriate responses to domestic disputes. Rules, policies, and procedures guide officer response. Agencies with service orientations stress meeting community needs when handling domestic disputes. Officers are provided with training that enables them to choose from among a number of intervention techniques for handling the situation (Bard, 1969).

11. Agencies with law enforcement orientations are more likely to provide training that stresses non-intervention, officer safety and arrest procedures for handling domestic disputes, conversely, agencies with service orientations are more likely to provide training that stresses mediation techniques and referral alternatives for resolving domestic disputes.

12. Training that emphasizes the law enforcement orientation is more likely to stress non-intervention/arrest as appropriate
responses when handling domestic disturbances; conversely, training that emphasizes the service orientation is more likely to stress mediation/referral as appropriate responses for handling domestic disturbances.

13. The more training stresses non-intervention/arrest the more likely the officer will perceive the police role in terms of law enforcement; conversely, the more service oriented the training, the more likely the officer will perceive the police role in terms of service to the community.

The type of training offered police officer will vary by the orientation of the department. Those departments with law enforcement orientations stress techniques that result in officer safety, arrest, and handling the situation as quickly as possible. Agencies with service orientations provide training that emphasizes a variety of techniques. The goal of this training is to provide officers with the skills and knowledge necessary to perform interventions utilizing mediation and referral. This training in turn affects officer's perceptions of their role (Bard, 1969).

**Psychological predispositional context (Model 2)**

1. Female police officers are more likely to value training emphasizing intervention techniques for handling domestic disturbances than are male officers.

2. Female police officers are more likely to perceive police interventions at family disturbance calls as an important element of the police role, whereas male officers are more likely to perceive police interventions at family disturbance calls as not "real" police work.

Research by Homant and Kennedy (1985) found female police officers more helpful and concerned about the welfare of battered women and more willing to refer them to shelter homes. Furthermore, female officers were more likely to advocate a professional attitude for police officer involvement in family fights than were male officers.
3. The lower the educational attainment the more likely the officer will devalue training emphasizing intervention techniques at family disturbances; conversely, the higher the educational attainment the more likely the officer will value training emphasizing intervention techniques at family disturbances.

4. The lower the educational attainment the more likely the officer will perceive police intervention at family fights as not "real" police work; conversely, the higher the educational attainment, the more likely the officer is to perceive police interventions at family fights as an important element of the police role.

Schonborn (1975) contends police officers with low educational attainment devalue the effects of higher education and training and rely on traditional ways for solving problems. These officers view family fights as trivial matters to be avoided if possible. Officers with higher levels of education advocate training as a means for learning new techniques. Educated officers are more likely to view police intervention at domestic disputes as an important and necessary function for the police. Educated officers often view themselves as public servants responding to the needs of the community.

5. The more years experience an officer has the more likely the officer will devalue training emphasizing intervention techniques for handling family fights; conversely, the less years experience an officer has the more likely the officer will value training emphasizing intervention techniques for handling family fights.

6. The more years experience an officer has the more likely the officer will perceive police intervention at family fights as not "real" police work; conversely, the less years experience an officer has the more likely the officer is to perceive police intervention at family fights as an important element of the police role.

These two hypotheses call for an inverse relationship between years experience as a police officer and the officer's values on training and intervention. Levens and Dutton (1980) found such a
relationship in their study of recently trained recruits and veteran officers.

7. The less value an officer places on training, the more likely the officer will perceive the police role at family fights in terms of law enforcement; conversely, the more value an officer places on training the more likely the officer will perceive the police role at family fights in terms of service to the community.

8. The less value an officer places in police intervention at domestic disturbances, the more likely the officer will perceive the police role at family fights in terms of law enforcement; conversely, the more value an officer places in police intervention at domestic disturbances the more likely the officer will perceive the police role at family fights in terms of a service orientation.

Police officers who do not perceive family fights as "real" police work value non-intervention techniques when responding to these types of calls. Furthermore, officers who place little value in training are more likely to base their role at family fights on attitudes and values learned from other officers or from personal experience. Police officers who value training and perceive intervention in family disputes as important elements of the police role are more likely to perceive their role at family fights as a service that meets the needs of the community (Brown, 1981; Schonborn, 1975).

9. The more law enforcement oriented the officer's peers the more likely the officer will perceive the police role at family fights in terms of law enforcement; conversely, the more service oriented the officer's peers, the more likely the officer will perceive the police role at family fights in terms of a service orientation.

10. The more an officer's peers respond to family fights utilizing non-intervention/arrest the more likely the officer will respond to family fights utilizing non-intervention/arrest; conversely, the more an officer's peers respond to family fights utilizing mediation/referral, the more likely the officer will respond to family fights utilizing mediation/referral.
Peers not only influence officers in the development of their role, but also in the adoption of techniques used responding to calls. Officers belong to a police subculture that governs the norms of police work. Therefore, experiences are interpreted through this subculture influencing the officer's role development as well as choice of methods (Brown, 1981).

11. Police officers who perceive their role at family fights in terms of law enforcement are more likely to utilize non-intervention/arrest strategies when responding to domestic disturbances; conversely, police officers who perceive their role at family fights in terms a service orientation are more likely to utilize mediation/referral techniques when responding -to domestic disturbances.

Officers who perceive their role at family fights in terms of law enforcement do not view domestic disturbances as "real" police work and therefore are to be handled as quickly as possible with a minimum of involvement. These officers utilize non-intervention/arrest strategies when responding to family disturbances. Officers who perceive their role at family fights in terms of service to the community focus on helping people solve problems through mediation and referral (Schonborn, 1975).
CHAPTER IV

METHODS

Introduction

This chapter reviews the methods used to collect and measure the theoretical concepts outlined in Chapter III. A discussion of the sample, the questionnaire, the questionnaire pretest, the operationalization of the variables, and the statistical procedures used in the empirical analysis are presented.

Sample

The sample was drawn from four law enforcement agencies; Ames (Iowa) Police Department, Columbia (South Carolina) Police Department, Lexington County (South Carolina) Sheriff’s Department, and the Sioux Falls (South Dakota) Police Department. These departments were selected for pragmatic reasons; proximity (Ames), former working relationship (Sioux Falls), and ties with the Law Enforcement Community (My father was a police instructor in South Carolina).

The data for this study were collected from two sources. First, the administrative head (Police Chief or Sheriff) of each department was personally interviewed to ascertain the administrative orientation of the department. Second, questionnaires were distributed to 323 line officers responsible for handling domestic disturbance calls. As Table 1 illustrates, 242 usable questionnaires (75 percent) were returned. A descriptive analysis of the sample will be included in the next chapter.
The Questionnaire

The questionnaire (see Appendix) was a composite of original questions developed to measure police attitudes about law enforcement intervention in domestic disputes. The questionnaire is divided into four sections. The first section contains thirteen questions designed to assess the demographic characteristics of the sample. Part two contains fifteen questions that focus on the respondent's attitudes about police intervention in family fights. This section also asks officers to categorize their response to family disturbance calls. Section three consists of two questions designed to measure, from the officer's perspective, the role of the department and the role of the officer. Finally, part four is divided into six categories designed to assess the amount and type of training officers have had for handling family fights.

Table 1. Response Rate for Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Delivered</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Usable</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After gaining permission from each of the departments to conduct this study, the questionnaire, along with authorizations from each of the department heads, was submitted to the Iowa State University Human Subjects in Research Committee. This committee approved the research instrument on November 21, 1985 (see Appendix B).

The questionnaire was administered and collected by the author to all three shifts (at line up) of the Sioux Falls Police Department in December, 1985. For those officers not working the day the questionnaire was administered, the instrument was placed in their mailbox at the police department with an envelope and a cover letter (see Appendix C) attached instructing them where to deliver the questionnaire. For the other three departments in this study, the research questionnaire was delivered to the Chief of Police or Sheriff, who distributed it (via the training officer) to the officers in the department. To each survey was attached an envelope. On the cover letter to the questionnaire, the following sentence was added near the bottom of the sheet: After filling out this form, please place in the attached envelope and return to the training officer or the Chief. The questionnaires were delivered to the Ames department in December, 1985, while the Columbia and Lexington County departments received the questionnaires in January, 1986. Each department was recontacted approximately two weeks later, at which time the questionnaires were collected from the Chief of Police or Sheriff.

Questionnaire Pretest

The questionnaire was pretested at the Brookings (South Dakota) Police Department. All the officers working the day the pretest was
administered filled out the questionnaire (21 officers). The questionnaire was administered by the author at each line up for the three shifts. After filling out the questionnaire, officers from each shift were individually interviewed to ascertain their evaluation of the questions on five issues: 1) availability of alternative answers, 2) the general structure of the questions, were they meaningful to the officers, 3) were the instructions to each section clear and unambiguous, 4) was the terminology clear to the officers, and finally, were the questions fair indicators of police attitudes on family violence interventions?

As a result of the analysis of the completed questionnaires and the personal interviews with the officers, the research instrument was revised to alleviate the problems inherent within the first questionnaire (see Appendix C). The major change occurred in part four of the questionnaire. The officers found this section too vague and time consuming. They were not sure what training qualified for inclusion in this section. As a result, many left this part blank. To overcome these problems, part four was revised to make it easier for the officer to categorize training they had received. Further, an additional question was added in section one (question 13) which was designed to measure the amount of training officers received. Minor changes involving wording, order and format were also adopted as a result of the critique of the first questionnaire.

**Operationalization of Variables**

This section will describe the variables used in the two models discussed in Chapter III.
Community size

Community size measures the population of the city or county the particular department has jurisdiction over. Data to measure this variable were gathered from 1980 census statistics. Populations ranged from 45,775 (Ames) to 140,353 (Lexington County). This variable was coded in thousands, for example, Ames was coded as 45 while Lexington County was coded 140.

Administrative orientation

Administrative orientation was measured through responses gathered in a personal interview with the Chief of Police or Sheriff from each department. These administrative heads were asked to characterize their department's style of operation on a continuum from 1 (Law Enforcement) to 6 (Service to the Community). Responses ranged from 2 (Ames) to 5 (Columbia) with Sioux Falls and Lexington County indicating a 4. The mean for this variable was 4.2.

Department role

This variable reflects the police officer's perception of the role of the department within the community. On the questionnaire (part 3, question 1), officers were asked to select the number closest to the choice that best expresses their answer to the question: What role does your department expect of you?. Choices ranged from 1 (Law Enforcement) to 6 (Service to the community), and coded in the same manner.
The amount of training an officer receives for handling family fights was measured by officer's responses to two questions. The first question (part 1, question 13): How much training have you had for handling family fights? Officers had four responses to choose from ranging from 1 (none) to 4 (very much). The second question (part 2, question 3): The training you have received has adequately prepared you to handle family fights. This question also had four responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The zero order correlation between these two indicators was .54 which allows them to be used as multiple indicators in the LISREL computer program. The alpha for these two variables was .70.

A series of questions were also included (part 4) designed to measure the actual amount of training officers had received. The respondents were instructed to put the number of hours of training they had received from the following types of training: presentations, training sessions, seminars and workshops, recruit training, college courses and other. A large number of the officers failed to fill out this section of the questionnaire. Only seven percent of the officers indicated they had received no training in question 13 (part 1), however, only 46 percent of the officers admitted to any form of recruit training, while 84 percent of the respondents failed to cite any training under seminars and workshops. To illustrate, frequencies were computed measuring the responses (with 0 for blanks) and then recomputed controlling for missing data. As table 2 clearly portrays, the mean of 21.2 for the sample is almost five times less than the 99.1
for those who filled out this portion of the survey. One possible explanation for this divergence is that those officers with a great deal of training were more likely to fill out this section than those with little training. Whatever the reasons, the disparity between the two means invalidates this section of the questionnaire from further analysis.

Table 2. Amount of Training Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Training</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean controlling for missing data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Sessions</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit Training</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of training

Type of training was measured by officers' response to the following question: For handling family fights, how much stress does your department place on the following forms of training? Officers were provided with a list of six types of training, and asked to rank order these alternatives from 1 (most stressed) to 6 (least stressed). The first four forms of training were coded from most (1) to least (6), while the order was reversed (6-1) for the last two types of training. The first four types of training are hypothesized to predict the law
enforcement model whereas the last two fit the service model. The first four variables were added together and divided by four to form a law enforcement variable, while the last two were added together and divided by two to form a service variable. These two variables were then added together and divided by two to form the new variable to measure type of training.

Officer role
This variable measures officers' perceptions of their role within the community. In part three of the questionnaire, officers were asked to select the number closest to the choice that best expressed their answer to the question: What do you think the role of the officer should be? Responses ranged from 1 (law enforcement) to 6 (service to the community) and were coded in the same manner.

Sex
Respondents were asked to specify their sex. The responses were coded (1) male and (2) female.

Education
The officer's level of education was measured by the question: How many years of school have you completed? Responses ranged from 7 to 17.

Police experience
Two indicators were used to measure this variable. The first indicator asked the officer's response to the question: How many years have you been a police officer or deputy sheriff? Responses ranged
from less than one year (coded as 1) to 38 years. The second indicator asked officers to specify their ages. Ages ranged from 21 to 61. The zero order correlation between these two indicators was .81.

Peer influence

This variable was designed to measure the influence an officer’s peers had on the officer’s response to family fight calls. The question, which had five component parts, asked the respondents to specify how other officers handle family fight calls. The responses were coded 1 (never) to 5 (most always). The majority of officers indicated their peers regularly utilized the intervention technique of having one party leave till the situation "cools down". It was hypothesized that leave would be correlated with arrest and warn, however, this was not the case. Therefore, to examine the effect of peer influence on officer response, arrest and warn (zero-order correlation = .242) were combined to form one variable predicting a law enforcement orientation, while help and refer (zero-order correlation = .243) were combined to predict a service orientation.

Value of training

Value of training is measured by the officer’s response to the following question: Seminars, training sessions and workshops on family violence? Officers were given four choices ranging from very helpful (coded 4) to not helpful at all (coded 1). This variable was designed to measure officers’ perceptions of how valuable training sessions are in providing techniques for intervening in family violence calls. Question ten in part two was also intended to measure this
variable, but the zero order correlation of .32 was too low to be considered for inclusion as a multiple indicator in the LISREL program.

**Value of intervention**

This variable is designed to measure how valuable officers' perceive police intervention to be in family disturbances. The question: Intervening in family fights is not "real" police work, has four responses, ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (4). A second measure of this variable states: Responding to family fights is an important part of the police role. For this variable, responses ranged from strongly agree (4) to strongly disagree (1). The zero order correlation of .415 was not strong enough for this variable to be included into the analysis as a multiple indicator.

**Role at family fight**

This variable is measured by two questions. The first asks the officer: When you respond to a family fight, what should your major concern be? The first response (coded 1) states: Determine whether or not a law has been broken, and if so, make an arrest. The second response (coded 2) states: Determine the problem between the parties and help them to resolve their differences. The second indicator states: What is your role at family fight calls? Officers are given two choices, the first is enforce the law (coded 1) while the second is mediate/referral (coded 2). The zero order correlation between these two indicators was .557, while the Alpha was .71. The high correlation between these two questions allows them to be used as multiple indicators for this variable.
Officer response

Officer response is the dependent variable for this study. In part two, question fourteen, officers were asked: When you are called to a family fight, how often do you use the following responses. The officers were given five intervention strategies. Responses were coded 1 (never) to 5 (most always).

Statistical Analysis

Path analysis, a statistical technique for assessing causal inferences, is used in this study to test the relationships posited by the hypotheses for the two models discussed in Chapter III. The application of path analysis is based upon several assumptions. First, the relations among the variables in the causal model are linear, additive and asymmetrical. Consequently, the model contains no reciprocal causation or curvilinear relationships. Second, the residuals (error terms) are not correlated with each other or with the independent variables that precede them in the model. This assumption implies all the variables relevant to the model are included and being tested. Third, the variables are measured on an interval scale and are measured without error (Pedhazur, 1982:582). Finally, variables that are measured cross-sectionally are in a state of equilibrium; that is, variables measured contemporaneously do not change despite a lag time (Kenny, 1979:51).

Path models consist of exogenous and endogenous variables. Exogenous variables are those whose variability is assumed to be determined by factors outside the causal model. In other words, there is no attempt to explain the variability of exogenous variables, or to
explain its relationships with other exogenous variables. In this study, there are five exogenous variables in the two models: community size, sex, education, police experience, and peer influence. Endogenous variables are those whose variation is attributable to exogenous or other endogenous variables in the model. These are nine endogenous variables split between the two models: administrative orientation, department role, amount of training, type of training, officer role, value of training, value of intervention, family fight role, and officer response.

Path diagrams depict the hypothesized causal relationships in the form of unidirectional arrows, which are drawn from the cause (independent variable) to the effect (dependent variable). A curved line with arrowheads at both ends depict the interrelationships between two exogenous variables. Finally, residual variables are indicated by unidirectional arrows from the residual variable to its respective dependent variable. Residual variables are analogous to the error terms, or residuals, found in regression analysis (Pedhazur, 1982:582).

The path models tested in this study used the LISREL computer program to analyze the structural equations (see Figures 4 and 5). LISREL is an extremely versatile, yet very complex computer program. The LISREL program is capable of analyzing causal models with multiple indicators of latent variables, measurement errors, reciprocal causation, correlated errors, and correlated residuals to name a few. The virtue of LISREL is that "it is well suited for the analysis of complex models that are characteristic of much of social and behavioral research" (Pedhazur, 1982:677).
Model 1a

See Figure 2 for variable labels.

Figure 4. Structural and measurement model for organizational variables
Model 2

See Figure 3 for variable labels.

Figure 5. Structural and measurement model for psychological predispositional variables
The LISREL model consists of two parts, the measurement model and the structural equation model. The measurement model specifies how the latent variables are measured in terms of the observed variables. The structural equation model specifies the causal relationships among the latent variables (Pedhazur, 1982: 639).

The structural equation model defined for the general LISREL model (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1983) is:

$$\eta = \Gamma \xi + \beta \eta + \zeta$$

where \( \eta \) (eta) is a vector of endogenous variables; \( \xi \) (xi) is a vector of exogenous variables; \( \beta \) (beta) and \( \Gamma \) (gamma) are coefficient matrices; and \( \zeta \) (zeta) is a vector of residuals or errors. It is assumed the means for all the variables are equal to zero (Pedhazur, 1982:639). The structural equations for the two models analyzed in this study are:

**Model 1**

\[
\begin{align*}
\eta_2 &= \Omega_{21} \xi_1 + \zeta_1 \\
\eta_3 &= \Omega_{31} \xi_1 + \beta_{32} \eta_2 + \zeta_2 \\
\eta_4 &= \beta_{43} \eta_3 + \zeta_3 \\
\eta_5 &= \beta_{53} \eta_3 + \zeta_4 \\
\eta_6 &= \Omega_{61} \xi_1 + \beta_{63} \eta_3 + \beta_{65} \eta_5 + \zeta_5 \\
\eta_7 &= \beta_{72} \eta_2 + \beta_{73} \eta_3 + \beta_{74} \eta_4 + \beta_{75} \eta_5 + \beta_{76} \eta_6 + \zeta_6 \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Model 2**

\[
\begin{align*}
\eta_5 &= \Omega_{51} \xi_1 + \Omega_{52} \xi_2 + \Omega_{53} \zeta_3 + \zeta_1 \\
\eta_6 &= \Omega_{61} \xi_1 + \Omega_{62} \xi_2 + \Omega_{63} \zeta_3 + \zeta_2 \\
\eta_7 &= \Omega_{74} \xi_4 + \beta_{75} \eta_5 + \beta_{76} \eta_6 + \zeta_3 \\
\eta_8 &= \Omega_{84} \xi_4 + \beta_{87} \eta_7 + \zeta_4 \\
\end{align*}
\]
The measurement model for the dependent variables is:

\[ y = \lambda y_n + \varepsilon \]

where \( y \) is a vector of measures of the dependent variable; \( \lambda \) (lambda) is a matrix of coefficients of \( y \) on the unobserved dependent variable (\( n \)); \( \varepsilon \) (epsilon) is a vector of errors of measurement of \( y \). When there is only one indicator for a variable it is assumed there are no measurement errors and the correlation is perfect (1.0). When there are two or more indicators of a variable, one is set to 1.0, this properly assigns the unit of measurement to each latent variable (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1983). The measurement model for the endogenous variables for the two models are:

**Model 1**

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma_1 &= \lambda_1 n_1 + \varepsilon_1 \\
\gamma_2 &= \lambda_2 n_2 + \varepsilon_2 \\
\gamma_3 &= \lambda_3 n_3 + \varepsilon_3 \\
\gamma_4 &= \lambda_4 n_4 + \varepsilon_4 \\
\gamma_5 &= \lambda_5 n_5 + \varepsilon_5 \\
\gamma_6 &= \lambda_6 n_6 + \varepsilon_6 \\
\gamma_7 &= \lambda_7 n_7 + \varepsilon_7 \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Model 2**

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma_1 &= \lambda_1 n_1 + \varepsilon_1 \\
\gamma_2 &= \lambda_2 n_2 + \varepsilon_2 \\
\gamma_3 &= \lambda_3 n_3 + \varepsilon_3 \\
\gamma_4 &= \lambda_4 n_4 + \varepsilon_4 \\
\gamma_5 &= \lambda_5 n_5 + \varepsilon_5 \\
\end{align*}
\]
The measurement model for exogenous variables is:

\[ X = \lambda X + \xi + \delta \]

where \( X \) is a vector of measures of the independent variables; \( \lambda \) (lambda) is a matrix of coefficients of \( X \) on the unobserved independent variables; and \( \delta \) (delta) is a vector of errors of measurement of \( X \).

The measurement models for the exogenous variables for the two models are:

Model 1

\[ x_1 = \lambda_1 \xi_1 + \delta_1 \]

Model 2

\[ x_1 = \lambda_1 \xi_1 + \delta_1 \]
\[ x_2 = \lambda_2 \xi_2 + \delta_2 \]
\[ x_3 = \lambda_3 \xi_3 + \delta_3 \]
\[ x_4 = \lambda_4 \xi_4 + \delta_4 \]
\[ x_5 = \lambda_5 \xi_5 + \delta_5 \]

The input for the LISREL computer program falls into three groups. First, specification of the data. The data card contains the following information; number of input variables, sample size, and the type of matrix to be analyzed. For this study, there was one group, 15 input variables, sample size=242, and the matrix imputed for analysis was a correlation matrix (see Appendix A). Second, specification of the model. This card specifies the parameters for the model to be estimated. For each model the parameters for the \( y \) variables, the \( x \) variables, \( \xi \) variables and the \( \eta \) variables have to be specified.
Third, specification of the output. This card specifies the output desired. T-values, total effects, variances and covariances, and modification indices, were options utilized for this analysis.

Estimation of path coefficients by LISREL is based on maximum likelihood statistical theory. By this method, the computation procedure functions by means of the iterative process "which minimizes a definite fitting function by successively improving the parameter estimates" (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1983:1.28). That is, the computer checks the field of estimates until it can no longer improve on the estimates.

The level of significance specified for testing the causal paths was set at the .05 level (critical value = 1.96).
CHAPTER V
FINDINGS

Introduction

The results of the data analysis for this study are presented in this chapter in four sections. The first section describes the socio-demographic characteristics of the sample. The second section contains the distributions of scores for the major variables. The third section tests the hypotheses associated with the two models developed in Chapter III. Finally, based on the results of the empirical tests of the hypotheses, a revised model is formulated and tested.

Descriptive Analysis

Respondent characteristics are important for interpreting social science research. Their characteristics establish the validity for generalizing the results of the study to other populations. This first section provides the descriptive analysis of the socio-demographic characteristics for this sample of police officers.

Table 3 presents the demographic characteristics for the four communities involved in this study (Ames, Iowa; Sioux Falls, South Dakota, Columbia, South Carolina; and Lexington County, South Carolina). Population ranges from 45,775 (Ames) to 140,353 (Lexington County). Three of the four communities experienced a population growth between 1970 and 1980, while Columbia experienced a decline. Columbia is located in Richland county (269,735) which is adjacent to Lexington County which combine to form the Columbia standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA) with a total population of 410,088. Sioux
Falls is also classified as an SMSA with a population of 109,435. Sioux Falls is located in Minnehaha County. Ames is a part of Story County which has a total population of 72,326.

Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of the Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>-/+ since 1970</th>
<th>% Black</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Department Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>45,775</td>
<td>+ 15.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>85,834</td>
<td>+ 14.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>101,208</td>
<td>- 10.9%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington County</td>
<td>140,353</td>
<td>+ 57%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 3 illustrates, the percent Black and median age varies from community to community. Iowa State University is located in Ames with a student community of 26,000 which is reflected in the median age of 22.5. Columbia also has a large university (University of South Carolina) resulting in a median age of 25.4, however, Columbia has a much larger non-student community than Ames, which is graphically illustrated in the higher median age. Sioux Falls and Lexington County have similar median ages. Two of the communities are located in the north central region of the country, and have small Black populations. The other two areas are located in the south. Columbia's population is 40 percent Black, whereas Lexington County is 10 percent Black.

The last characteristic dealing with the community is the size of the department. The number of officers each department employs ranges from 48 (Ames) to 215 (Columbia). It is not surprising to find
Columbia's police force so much larger than the Lexington County Sheriff's Department. Stahura and Huff (1979) found the size of police force is related to the age composition and the racial composition of the area. According to Stahura and Huff, large Black populations are indicative of large low income populations. These three factors; high percentage of young people, a large Black population and a high percentage of low income people combine to produce high crime rates which require high police employment. Columbia has a larger Black population and a lower median age than does the Lexington County Sheriff's Department, which supports Stahura and Huff's thesis on differential police employment rates.

The second characteristic divides the police officers by sex and department. Table 4 indicates that 91 percent of the respondents were male, while nine percent were female. However, 67 percent of the female respondents were from the Columbia Police Department while the Sioux Falls and Ames Police Departments each had one female respondent.

Table 4. Sex by Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>27 (95%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>59 (98%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>80 (85%)</td>
<td>14 (15%)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>55 (92%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>221 (91%)</td>
<td>21 (9%)</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third characteristic examines the departments by race of the
officer. Table 5 shows the police sample is predominately White (88 percent). However, of the Black respondents, 96 percent were from the two departments in the south. One obvious explanation for this disparity is that between the Sioux Falls and Ames departments there are only two Black police officers.

Table 5. Race by Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>27 (96%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>60 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>77 (82%)</td>
<td>17 (18%)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>50 (83%)</td>
<td>10 (17%)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>214 (88%)</td>
<td>28 (12%)</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth category is the respondents age. Police officer's ages ranged from 21 to 61, with a mean of 34.6.

The fifth characteristic, years experience as a police officer, correlates with age (Zero order correlation, .81). Police experience ranges from one year or less to 38 years, with a mean of ten years. Table 6 displays the differences between the departments in the south and the north. Officers with less than five years experience (Ames, 14%; Sioux Falls, 13%; Columbia, 46%; and Lexington County, 45%) comprised a higher percentage of those responding to the survey in the south than in the north whereas those with over ten years experience (Ames, 62%, Sioux Falls, 50%; Columbia, 37%; and Lexington, 30%) were more likely to be respondents from the two departments from the north.
Table 6. Police experience by department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>6-9</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>16-38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>10 (36%)</td>
<td>8 (29%)</td>
<td>6 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>15 (25%)</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
<td>23 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>20 (21%)</td>
<td>23 (25%)</td>
<td>16 (17%)</td>
<td>16 (17%)</td>
<td>19 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>16 (27%)</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>15 (25%)</td>
<td>15 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44 (18%)</td>
<td>38 (16%)</td>
<td>56 (23%)</td>
<td>53 (22%)</td>
<td>51 (21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 displays officers rank by department. Supervisors (25 percent of the sample) included sergeants, lieutenants and captains. As expected, the majority of the officers (75 percent) were patrolmen.

Table 7. Rank by department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patrolmen</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>25 (89%)</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>45 (75%)</td>
<td>15 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>66 (70%)</td>
<td>28 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>46 (77%)</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182 (75%)</td>
<td>60 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 8 and 9 look at the respondents education by department. Table 8 indicates 68 percent of the officers have more than a high school education, with 22 percent claiming to have a college degree or more. Table 9 displays the officers response to the question: Have you taken any college courses in the last year? Officers from all four of
these departments have easy access to a college or university, which may explain the high mean of 13.7 years of school completed. The results indicate that officers from Ames and Columbia are more likely to take advantage of the educational facilities available.

Table 8. Education by department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-12</th>
<th>13-15</th>
<th>16-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>16 (57%)</td>
<td>11 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>24 (40%)</td>
<td>26 (43%)</td>
<td>10 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>29 (31%)</td>
<td>45 (48%)</td>
<td>20 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>24 (40%)</td>
<td>24 (40%)</td>
<td>12 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78 (32%)</td>
<td>111 (46%)</td>
<td>53 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Officers in school by department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not in school</th>
<th>In school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>20 (71%)</td>
<td>8 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>55 (92%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>69 (73%)</td>
<td>25 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>53 (88%)</td>
<td>7 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>197 (81%)</td>
<td>45 (19%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The eighth characteristic examines the marital status of the officers by department. As Table 10 illustrates, 68 percent of the sample is married, with 24 percent being single and 9 percent being
divorced or widowed. The two departments from the south had a higher percentage of their officers single than the departments from the north, however, the departments from the south have a higher percentage of younger officers than those from the north (zero order correlation, .38).

Table 10. Marital Status by department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Divorced/Widowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>4 (14%)</td>
<td>24 (86%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>7 (12%)</td>
<td>46 (77%)</td>
<td>7 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>30 (32%)</td>
<td>58 (62%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>16 (27%)</td>
<td>36 (60%)</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57 (24%)</td>
<td>164 (68%)</td>
<td>21 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Officer's fathers occupation by department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Low(16-39)</th>
<th>Medium(40-49)</th>
<th>High(50-82)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>7 (28%)</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>10 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>21 (40%)</td>
<td>21 (40%)</td>
<td>10 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>21 (29%)</td>
<td>34 (46%)</td>
<td>18 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>14 (28%)</td>
<td>25 (50%)</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=200)</td>
<td>63 (32%)</td>
<td>88 (44%)</td>
<td>49 (24%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ninth characteristic, father's occupation, was measured using the prestige scale utilized by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago. For this sample, scores ranged
from 16 to 82 with a mean of 36. Table 11 shows the distributions by department.

Table 12. Family fight calls by department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 10</th>
<th>10-49</th>
<th>Over 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>11 (39%)</td>
<td>16 (57%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>10 (17%)</td>
<td>38 (63%)</td>
<td>12 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>28 (30%)</td>
<td>30 (32%)</td>
<td>36 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>16 (27%)</td>
<td>24 (40%)</td>
<td>20 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65 (27%)</td>
<td>108 (45%)</td>
<td>69 (29%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next category looks at the number of family fights (Table 12) the officer had handled in the last year as well as the percentage of calls the officer handled that were family fights (Table 13). Officers from the Columbia Police Department and the Lexington Sheriff's Department handled more family fight calls than officers from the other two departments. Moreover, the percentage of calls that were family fights were also higher for the two departments in the south.

The eleventh category relates to the officers experience handling family fights. Officers were asked to categorize how experienced they were based on their prior training and personal experience as a police officer. Table 14 shows the majority of officers feel skilled, however, officers in the Columbia and Lexington Departments were more likely to indicate they were very skilled at handling family fights than were officers in the other two departments. This finding coincides with the findings in Tables 12 and 13, that is, the more
family fights the officer handles, the more likely the officer is to feel very skilled in handling family fights.

Table 13. Percent of calls that are family fights by department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Less than 10%</th>
<th>10-39%</th>
<th>Over 40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>17 (61%)</td>
<td>10 (36%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>29 (48%)</td>
<td>30 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>29 (31%)</td>
<td>51 (54%)</td>
<td>14 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>19 (32%)</td>
<td>27 (45%)</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94 (39%)</td>
<td>118 (49%)</td>
<td>30 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Officers' skill level for handling family fights by department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Not Very Skilled</th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Very Skilled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>5 (18%)</td>
<td>18 (64%)</td>
<td>5 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
<td>39 (65%)</td>
<td>15 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>52 (55%)</td>
<td>37 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
<td>32 (53%)</td>
<td>20 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24 (10%)</td>
<td>141 (58%)</td>
<td>77 (32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next category involves the officers perceptions of which intervention strategy is the most useful for responding to family fights. Officers were given five interventions ranging from arrest to referral. Table 15 illustrates their responses. Approximately half the officers felt the best strategy for resolving family fights is to
have one party leave till the situation "cools" down, while approximately 40 percent viewed helping and referring as valuable intervention strategies.

Table 15. Intervention strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work itself out</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One party leave</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Training and the police subculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.14 S.D. = .76

The next descriptive variable looks at the police subculture and officer’s attitudes about training. Table 16 presents the officers responses to the following question: In handling family fights,
techniques learned from experienced officers are more important than those learned in training sessions. Officers overwhelmingly agreed (70%) with this statement. This indicates that the training officers receive is being filtered through their perceptions of what is acceptable based on the police subculture. In other words, officers are more influenced by their peers than by training sessions.

Table 17. Public's view of the police role by race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>190 (89%)</td>
<td>15 (54%)</td>
<td>205 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>24 (11%)</td>
<td>13 (46%)</td>
<td>37 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214 (88%)</td>
<td>28 (12%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson's R .313

Officers were asked to specify what role the public expected of them when responding to family fights. The majority of officers (85%) indicated the public expects them to respond as an authority figure. However, when this is broken down by race, Blacks were more likely to view their role as a service provider than were Whites. Table 17 illustrates these findings.

The final category (Table 18) reflects the officer's perceptions on the usefulness of instituting tough laws mandating arrest as a technique for reducing family fights. Sixty-six percent of the officers did not perceive this technique as a viable means for controlling family violence. There were noticeable differences, however, between officers of different educational levels. The highly
educated were more likely to disagree (80%) with the proposition tougher laws will reduce family fights than were those with a high school education or less (60%).

Table 18. Need for stronger laws by education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7-12</th>
<th>13-15</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31 (40%)</td>
<td>41 (37%)</td>
<td>11 (20%)</td>
<td>83 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>47 (60%)</td>
<td>70 (63%)</td>
<td>42 (80%)</td>
<td>159 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78 (32%)</td>
<td>111 (46%)</td>
<td>53 (22%)</td>
<td>242 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive Analysis Profile

Based on the socio-demographic characteristics displayed in Tables 3 through 18, the data would suggest the following profile of characteristics are relevant for the majority of officers in this sample.

The officer is most frequently:
- male (91%)
- White (88%)
- experienced (over six years as a police officer, 66%)
- patrolman (75%)
- educated (more than a high school education, 68%)
- not taking college classes (81%)
- married (68%)
- from a middle class or lower class family (76%)
- working in a department with over 100 officers (88%)
- handling more than 10 family fights a year (73%)
feels the most useful intervention tactic is to have one party leave (46%)
- over 10 percent of an officer's calls are family fights (61%)
- feels skilled at handling family fights (90%)
- more influenced by fellow officers than training sessions (70%)
- feels the public views the police as authority figures (85%)
- against tougher laws for controlling family violence (66%)

Distribution of Major Variable Scores

The second objective of this study is to present the distribution of scores for the major variables.

Table 19. Department role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.56
S.D. = 1.36

The hypotheses in this study test the relationships between concepts in two models; the organizational model and the psychological predispositional model. Since these concepts are critical to this study,
the distributions are presented below to provide additional information on the within-sample variations. The first set of concepts discussed are the organizational variables, followed by the psychological predispositional variables.

**Department role**

Table 19 displays the results of the officers' perceptions of the role the department plays within the community. Lower numbers (1-3) are indicative of a law enforcement orientation, while (4-6) denote a service orientation. The mean of 3.56 indicates about half the officers believe the departmental role to be law enforcement oriented while the other half perceive the departmental role in terms of service to the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean = 3.34**  
**S.D. = 1.41**

**Officer's role**

Table 20 presents the officer's perception of their role within the community. Values of 1-3 represent a law enforcement role,
whereas 4-6 note a service orientation. Slightly over half (53 percent) of the officers perceive their role in terms of law enforcement.

**Amount of training**

The amount of training (Tables 21 and 22) reflects the officer's response to the following two questions. First: How much training have you had for handling family fights? Seven percent of the officers claim to have had no training while 13 percent indicate they have had very much training. The mean of 2.71 indicates the majority of officers have had some training in handling family disturbance calls. The second question: The training you have received has adequately prepared you to handle family fights. The majority of the officers, 55 percent, agreed with this statement. Again, the mean of 2.67 indicates the majority of officers feel that training they have received had adequately prepared them to handle family fights.

**Table 21. Amount of training - first indicator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.71  
S.D. = .76
Type of training

Table 23 through Table 25 illustrate the officer's perception of the type of training offered by the respective departments. Officers were asked to rank order the six types of training listed in the questionnaire (question 15, part 2) with 1 being the most stressed type of training by the department and 6 being the least stressed. As Table 23 so clearly points out, safety to officer (1.56) is overwhelmingly the most stressed training by the departments, while arrest is the least stressed (4.85). Help and refer are also not high priority types of training for officers in these four departments (4.02 and 4.65, respectively).

Table 22. Amount of training - second indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.67 S.D. = .69

Table 24 presents the inter-relationships between these six forms of training. By reversing the order of help and refer, the correlations should be positive to fit the hypothesized model. The relationships between the service variables (help and refer) and the four law enforcement variables are in the hypothesized direction, and therefore, fit the model. The interrelationships between the four types of law enforcement training
variables do not, however, fit the hypothesized model. Arrest does not positively correlate with the other three proposed types of law enforcement training; minimum involvement, safety to the officer and restoring peace to the area. Minimum involvement also has an inverse relationship with safety to officer and restoring peace to the area, while the relationship between restoring peace to the area and safety to the officer are in the expected direction.

To test the effect of type of training, the six forms of training were combined to form a single variable reflecting the departments philosophy on training. The mean of 2.91, Table 25, indicates officer's perceive the department's training concerns emphasizing the law enforcement orientation. This is verified by the results in Table 23, minimum involvement, safety to officer, and restoring peace to the area are the three most stressed forms of training by the departments.

Table 23. Type of training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Training</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24. Type of training - correlation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arrest</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Peace</th>
<th>Help</th>
<th>Refer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. Type of training - combined variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.91  S.D. = .655
Table 26. Administrative orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 4.16  S.D. = .911

Table 27. Peer influence: law enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value (Low)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (Low)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (High)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 242  100

Mean = 5.78  S.D. = 1.27

Administrative orientation

This concept reflects the orientation of the administrative head of the department. The data for this concept were gathered through personal interviews with the department heads, who were asked to characterize their
departments orientation. The Chief of the Sioux Falls Police Department and the Sheriff of the Lexington County Sheriff's Department stated their departments orientation was close to the middle, but leaned toward service to the community. The Ames Police Chief contends his department is law enforcement oriented while the Chief of the Columbia Police Department indicates the departments philosophy is to provide services to the community. Table 26 illustrates the results of these interviews.

Table 28. Peer influence: service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (Low)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (High)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 5.96  S.D. = 1.46

Peer influence

This concept measures the influence peers have on an officers concept of the police role at family fights and also the officers response to domestic disturbances. As stated in Chapter IV, respondents noted their
peer's response to family fights using five measures. Four of these measures (leave was omitted) were then combined to form two variables, which are presented in Tables 27 and 28. The means for these two tables indicate officers perceive their peers to be slightly more service oriented (5.96) than law enforcement oriented (5.78) in their response to domestic disturbances.

**Value of training**

This concept measures the value officers place in training sessions. As Table 29 illustrates, the majority of officers find training sessions valuable in providing techniques for handling family fights, however, approximately 14 percent of the sample contended training sessions were not helpful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Helpful at all</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Helpful</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Helpful</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.04 .616

**Value of intervention**

Value of intervention examines the officer's belief in police intervention at family fights. Table 30 indicates the majority of officers believe responding to family fights is "real" police work.
Table 30. Value of intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.87  S.D. = .722

Family fight role

This concept analyzes the role officers take at family fights. This variable is measured using two indicators. The first indicator (Table 31) asked officers to specify their major concern at family fights. Seventy-three percent indicated their main priority would be to help the couple resolve their differences. The second indicator (Table 32) assesses the officer's role at family fights. The majority of officers acknowledged their role to be service oriented when responding to family fights.

Table 31. Family fight role - first indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 1.73  S.D. = .444
Table 32. Family fight role - second indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enforce Law</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediate</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 1.64  S.D. = .481

Officer response

Officer response is the dependent variable for this study. Table 33 indicates officers in this study are more likely to utilize the leave strategy (3.47) than the other four responses for handling family fights. Table 34 presents the inter-relationships between the five variables. The correlations, to be consistent with the hypothesized model, should show positive correlations between Warn, Leave, and Arrest, while showing negative correlations between these three variables and Help and Refer. Furthermore, the relationships between Help and Refer should be positive. As Table 34 indicates, the relationships between Leave and Arrest, and Leave and Refer are not in the predicted direction. The relationships between Warn and Arrest and Help and Refer are in the predicted direction.

The Leave variable was not consistent with the hypothesized model. This analysis indicated officers were likely to use the intervention strategy of having one party leave regardless of their orientation, law enforcement or service. Therefore, the Leave response was dropped from the analysis.

The correlations between the four remaining variables were not strong
(Alpha = .40) enough to form a single scale to explain officer response. Therefore, two subscales were formed which combined Help and Refer into a service response, and Warn and Arrest into a law enforcement response. Tables 35 and 36 display the frequencies for these two responses. These scales indicated officers were more likely to utilize a service response (mean = 6.1) than a law enforcement response (mean = 5.1).

Table 33. Officer response - five strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warn</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34. Officer response - correlation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Warn</th>
<th>Leave</th>
<th>Arrest</th>
<th>Help</th>
<th>Refer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warn</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35. Officer response - law enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (Low)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (High)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 5.079  S.D. = 1.23
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (Low)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (High)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 6.095    S.D. = 1.368
Figure 6. Path coefficients for the law enforcement response
Figure 7. Path coefficients for the service response

\[ R^2 = .189 \]

Chi-square 13df, 29.74 (p<.005)  
Goodness of Fit (.971)
Test of the Hypotheses

The results of the empirical tests of the hypotheses proposed for the two models in Chapter III are reported in this section. The dependent variable, officer response, consists of two subscales; law enforcement and service response. To test the effects of the variables on officer response, each model will be analyzed twice; first, utilizing the law enforcement response as the dependent variable, and second, utilizing the service response as the dependent variable. The tests are based on a path analysis, utilizing the LISREL computer program, which uses the correlation matrix reported in Appendix A. The hypotheses for the organization model will be analyzed first.

Organizational model (Model 1)

The organizational model consists of thirteen hypotheses the literature suggests are associated with police response from an organizational perspective. This model consists of one exogenous variable (community size), five endogenous variables (administrative orientation, department role, amount of training, type of training, and officer role) and the dependent variable, officer response. The results of the analysis are graphically displayed in Figure 6 (law enforcement response) and Figure 7 (service response).

The first set of hypotheses examined the effect of community size on three variables. The path coefficients are identical in Figures 6 and 7 for this set of hypotheses. Community size was hypothesized to be associated inversely with administrative orientation (hypothesis 1), department role (hypothesis 2), and officer role (hypothesis 3). The paths between community size and administrative orientation and
department role are not in the predicted direction. This analysis indicates the larger the community, the more likely the administrative orientation will be service oriented (.401). The path between community size and department role is also not in the predicted direction, however, the path coefficient (.129) is not statistically significant. The final path from community size is to officer’s role and the coefficient is in the predicted direction and statistically significant (-.138) which suggests officers in large communities perceive their role in terms of law enforcement while officers in smaller communities perceive their role in terms of service to the community. Of these first three hypotheses, one (hypothesis 3) is supported by the data, one (hypothesis 2) is not supported by the analysis and the third one (hypothesis 1) is statistically significant, but not in the predicted direction.

The second set of hypotheses examines the effect of administrative orientation on the department role (hypothesis 4) and the officer’s response (hypothesis 5). It was hypothesized that administrative orientation would be positively associated with the service response and negatively associated with the law enforcement response. As Figures 6 and 7 clearly point out, this is not the case. Administrative orientation was inversely correlated with the service response (-.203) while being positively related to the law enforcement response (.221). These findings indicate officers respond to family fights utilizing techniques that are in direct opposition to the orientation of the administrative leader of the department. It was also hypothesized that administrative orientation would be positively
associated with department role. The relationship was negative (-.046), however, the path coefficient was not statistically significant. The path analysis indicates hypothesis 4 is not supported by the data and hypothesis 5 is not in the predicted direction.

The third set of hypotheses examines the relationship between department role and the following variables; officer response (hypothesis 6), officer's role (hypothesis 7), amount of training (hypothesis 9), and type of training (hypothesis 11). It was hypothesized the path coefficients would be positive for all these relationships in Figures 6 and 7, except for the path to officer response: law enforcement, which was the case. The path between department role and amount of training and the path between department role and type of training were not statistically significant and indicate the department role does not greatly influence the type or amount of training offered by the department. Department role does, however, have a strong effect (.403) on how officer's perceive their role. The role of the department also influenced the officer's response to family fights. Tables 37 and 38 illustrate the decomposition of effects for the variables in the model. For the law enforcement response, the direct influence of department role on officer response is -.167 which is statistically significant. However, department role influences officer response through indirect paths, combining for a total effect of -.221. In other words, 24 percent of the total effect of department role on officer response is through indirect effects. Table 38 also indicates a significant proportion (35 percent) of the effects of department role on a service response was
Table 37. Decomposition of effects for Model 1: Law enforcement response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Admin. orien.</th>
<th>Department role</th>
<th>Amount of training</th>
<th>Type of training</th>
<th>Officer role</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community (T)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size (D)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative (T)</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientation (D)</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>-.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>-.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$ for structural equations 

Total $R^2$ for structural equations = .188

<sup>a</sup>Total effects.

<sup>b</sup>Direct effects.
Table 38. Decomposition of effects for Model 1: Service response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Admin. orien.</th>
<th>Department role</th>
<th>Amount of training</th>
<th>Type of training</th>
<th>Officer role</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community (T)</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size (D)</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative (T) orientation (D)</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department role (T)</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role (D)</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of training (T)</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training (D)</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of training (T)</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training (D)</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer role (T)</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role (D)</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ for structural equations</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$ for structural equations</td>
<td>= .188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Total effects.
b Direct effects.
through indirect effects. The direct path from department role (.133) to officer response:service, was significant. This analysis suggests officers are likely to conform to the orientation consistent with their department's role. The analysis for this third set of hypotheses indicates two (hypotheses 9 and 11) were not supported by the data, while two (hypotheses 6 and 7) were supported by the analysis.

It was hypothesized that type of training (hypothesis 12) would be positively associated with an officer's service response while being negatively associated with the law enforcement response. As Figures 6 and 7 illustrate, the path coefficients for the service response (.225) and the law enforcement response (-.183) were statistically significant and in the predicted direction. It was also hypothesized an officer's role definitions would be influenced by the type of training offered by the department. This analysis indicates that type of training does not significantly influence (.105) how officers perceive their role (hypothesis 13). Therefore, this analysis supports the proposition that the type of training offered by the department influences an officer's response to family fights. However, it does not support the hypothesis that type of training influences an officer's role development.

The last two paths in the model to be examined produce varying results for the two responses. In Figure 6 (hypothesis 8), an officer's role definition (-.133) significantly influences an officer's law enforcement response, however, in Figure 7, officer role does not affect an officer's response (.065). The amount of training (hypothesis 10) an officer receives strongly influences (.301) an
officer's service response, while the effect is not significant (.175) for those officers utilizing a law enforcement response. These findings suggest the law enforcement response is correlated with officer's perceptions of their police role in the community, whereas the service response is dependent on the amount of training officers receive.

Results from the path analysis for the law enforcement response indicates six of the 13 hypotheses (2, 4, 9, 10, 11, 13) were not statistically significant, and thus not supported by the data. Two of the hypotheses (1, 5) were statistically significant but not in the predicted direction. Finally, five of the hypotheses (3, 6, 7, 8, 12) were significant and in the predicted direction, and thus supported by the analysis.

The results of the path analysis for the service response are consistent with the law enforcement model except for two hypotheses. For the service response, hypothesis 10 was a significant predictor of officer response, whereas it was not for the law enforcement response. Conversely, hypothesis 8 was a significant predictor of the law enforcement response, but was insignificant in predicting the service response.

The insignificant paths in Figures 6 and 7 were eliminated from the model. The model was then reexamined to determine if the revised model (with the insignificant paths eliminated) was significantly different from the full model. To test for significance (law enforcement response), the chi-square for the revised model (9.15, df8) was subtracted from the chi-square for the full model (13.64, df13) and
compared to the critical value (11.07, df5) for chi-square at the .05 level. The amount of change, 4.49, was well below the critical value which indicates the revised model was not significantly different from the full model. Similarly, the change in the chi-square for the revised model (service response), 3.46, was less than the critical value, also indicating no significant difference between the revised and full model.

In examining the results of a path analysis, it is essential to determine how well the model fits the data. There are a number of tests for determining this, however, the point must be stressed that these tests do not prove the model is correct (Pedhazur, 1982), rather, they provide a level of confidence for examining the findings. However, when a model consistently fails to fit the data, this provides a basis for refuting the model.

Wheaton et al. (1977) devised a test to examine the goodness of fit for the model. The chi-square is divided by the degrees of freedom, if the result is less than 5, the model fits the data reasonably well. Carmines and McIver (1981) contend the result of the Wheaton et al. test should be less than 2 or possibly 3, in order for the model to fit the data. Hoelter (1983) developed a test that takes into account sample size when testing the goodness of fit for a model. The critical N, in order for the model to fit the data, must meet or exceed 200. The final test this analysis will utilize is the goodness of fit index which is computed by LISREL. The goodness of fit should exceed .90 for the model to fit the data.

Model 1 (law enforcement response) had a chi-square of 13.64 with
13 degrees of freedom resulting in a 1.05 goodness of fit ratio. The critical N was 437 and the goodness of fit index was .986. For the service response, the goodness of fit ratio was 2.29, with a critical N of 200 and a goodness of fit index of .971. These tests indicate the model fits the data reasonably well providing a level of confidence for the findings presented in Model 1. By comparing the tests for the law enforcement response and the service response it is readily apparent the model more closely fits the data when predicting the law enforcement response rather than the service response.

Psychological predispositional model (Model 2)

The psychological predispositional model consists of eleven hypotheses which are graphically displayed in Figures 8 and 9. The model consists of four exogenous variables (sex, education, police experience, and peer influence), three endogenous variables (value of training, value of police intervention, and family fight role) and the dependent variable, officer response.

The first set of hypotheses examines the effect sex has on values relating to training and intervention. The literature suggests female officers place more value in police intervention at family fights as well as training for said interventions. There should be a positive correlation for the paths relating to hypotheses 1 and 2. Figures 8 and 9 indicate just the opposite. There is an inverse relationship between gender and the two variables relating to value. This suggests female police officers perceive the police role at family fights in terms of law enforcement and not service as predicted by the literature. The path to value of training (-.163, Figure 8 and -.162,
Model 2

\[ R^2 = .40 \]
Chi-square 24df, 29.13 (p = .215)
Goodness of Fit (.977)

Figure 8. Path coefficients for the law enforcement response
Figure 9. Path coefficients for the service response

R² = .47
Chi-square 24df, 42.39 (p<.012)
Goodness of Fit (.967)
Figure 9) was significant (hypothesis 1), however, the path to value of intervention was not, which suggests females are less likely than males to place value in training sessions.

The second set of hypotheses examines the influence of education on values relating to police intervention and training. The path from education to value in training (hypothesis 3) was not statistically significant, however, the path to value of intervention (hypothesis 4) was significant (.155) and in the predicted direction. Thus, the more education officers have, the more likely they will perceive the value of police intervention in family fights.

The third set of hypotheses examine the relationship between police experience and values relating to training and intervention. It was hypothesized the more years experience, the less valued training and intervention would be, thus an inverse relationship. Figures 8 and 9 display such a relationship. Both path coefficients denote an inverse relationship. However, the path to value of intervention (hypothesis 6) was not statistically significant. The path to value of training was significant (-.249) and portrays a strong relationship (hypothesis 5) which indicates younger officers are more likely to value training than are older, more experienced officers.

The next set of hypotheses present the influence value of training (hypothesis 7) has on the officers role at family fights and the effect value of intervention (hypothesis 8) has on the officer role. Both of these paths are statistically significant and in the predicted direction. The data support the proposition the more value officers place in training and the more officers value police intervention at
family fights, the more likely officers will perceive their role at family fights in terms of a service orientation.

The fifth set of hypotheses looks at the influence police peers have on the officers conception of their role at family fights (hypothesis 9) and the effect of peers on an officer's response at family fights (hypothesis 10). The hypotheses indicate there should be a positive association in Figure 9 and a negative correlation in Figure 8 for the path to family fight role, and positive correlations for the path to officer response, the data supports these contentions. Both path coefficients are statistically significant and in the predicted directions. This analysis, in essence, supports the police subculture hypothesis, in that peers not only exert a direct influence on an officer's conception of the police role at family fights, peers also effect how officers respond to family fights.

The last hypothesis (11) predicts officer's response to family fights are directly influenced by officer's perceptions of their role at family fights. This hypothesis is supported by the data, the path coefficients of -.401 for the law enforcement response and .347 for the service response indicate a strong association. This suggests officers responding to family fight calls are guided in their choice of intervention techniques by the particular role they perceive themselves playing at family fights.
Table 39. Decomposition of effects for Model 2: law enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value of training</th>
<th>Value of intervention</th>
<th>Family fight role</th>
<th>Officer response law enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>(.T) -.163</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.D) -.163</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>(.T) -.082</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.D) -.082</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police experience</td>
<td>(.T) -.249</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.D) -.249</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer influence</td>
<td>(.T) -.121</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.D) -.121</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of training</td>
<td>(.T) .177</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.D) .177</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of interven</td>
<td>(.T) .245</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.D) .245</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family fight role</td>
<td>(.T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.D) -.401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 for structural equations</td>
<td>(.T) .063</td>
<td>(.D) .056</td>
<td>(.T) .208</td>
<td>(.D) .400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total R2 for structural equations = .398

The results of the path analysis were consistent for both the law enforcement and the service response. Model 2 examined 11 hypotheses, of which 3 (2,3,6) were found to be not statistically significant, 1 (hypothesis 1) was statistically significant, but not in the predicted direction and 7 (hypotheses 4,5,7,8,9,10,11) which were supported by the data.
Table 40. Decomposition of effects for Model 2: service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value of training</th>
<th>Value of intervention</th>
<th>Family fight role</th>
<th>Officer response service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family fight role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 for structural equations</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R2 for structural equations = .462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eliminating the non-significant paths from the model produced a change in the chi-square of 7.45 for both the law enforcement and the service response. The critical value of 7.81 indicates the revised models were not significantly different from the full model. In testing for the goodness of fit, the law enforcement response had a goodness of fit ratio of 1.2, with a critical N of 325 and a goodness of fit index score of .977. Tests for the service response were not as strong, 1.7, 223 and .967, respectively, but were well within acceptable ranges. These statistics indicate the model is consistent
with the data, and supports the analysis presented in Model 2.

The variables in Model 2 explained 47 percent (service response) and 40 percent (law enforcement response) of the variance in the dependent variable. In comparison, the variables in Model 1 explained 19 percent (service response) and 17 percent (law enforcement response) of the variance in officer response. These findings suggest officer’s psychological predispositions may be more important than organizational influences in understanding police response to family fights.

**Combined model**

Model 3 combines those paths from Models 1 and 2 that were found to be statistically significant into a single model to explain police response. Figures 10 and 11 graphically display the results of combining the two models into one causal model.

For the law enforcement response (Figure 10), 15 paths were included in the analysis, eleven proved to be statistically significant. By combining Models 1 and 2, the direct paths from the organizational variables (administrative orientation, officer’s role, type of training, and department role) to officer response which were significant in Model 1, proved to be not significant in Model 3. In effect, the influence of the organizational model on officer response was insignificant. Furthermore, Table 41 indicates even the indirect effects of the organizational variables added little to the explanation of officer response.

All the paths derived from the psychological predispositional model remained statistically significant. The two direct paths to officer response, family fight role and peer influence proved to be
Model 3

\[ R^2 = .391 \]

Chi-square 65df, 198.89 (pI=.000)
Goodness of Fit (.905)

Figure 10. Path coefficients for the combined model, law enforcement response
Model 3

$R^2 = .493$

Chi-square 73df, 236.07 (p=.000)
Goodness of Fit (.895)

Figure 11. Path coefficients for the combined model, service response
strong predictors of an officer's choice of intervention techniques at family fights.

Figure 11 illustrates the results of combining the significant paths from Models 1 and 2 for the service response. Ten of the 13 paths proved to be statistically significant. Three variables, administrative orientation, department role and type of training were not significant. Again, as with the law enforcement response, these variables indicate the weakness of the organizational variables when combined with the psychological predispositional variables. One organizational variable proved to be a strong indicator of the service response, amount of training (.284). Family fight role (.295) and peer influence (.539) also proved to be strong predictors of an officer's response.

By eliminating the posited paths in the initial models which were not supported statistically, and combining the significant paths to form one model, the revised model provides a stronger interpretation for the structural equations within the model. The total coefficient of determination for the structural equations in Model 1 was .188, Model 2 increased to .398 for the law enforcement and .462 for the service response, while the revised model produced a .565 law enforcement and .564 service response (see Tables 41 and 42) total coefficient of determination. Comparing the total coefficients is relevant to understanding the models because the larger the total coefficient of determination, the more reliable the measurement model (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1981).

The findings for Model 3 must be examined cautiously. For the law
enforcement response, the goodness of fit ratio was 3.0, the critical N was 111, and the goodness of fit index was .905. For the service response, the tests resulted in 3.2, 101, and .895 respectively. Compared to Models 1 and 2, the overall fit of Model 3 to the data was very poor. Model 3 does illustrate, however, the strength of the psychological predispositional variables when they are combined with organizational variables.
Table 41. Decomposition of effects for Model 3: law enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value train.</th>
<th>Value interv.</th>
<th>Family fight</th>
<th>Admin. orient.</th>
<th>Officer role</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (T)</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (D)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (T)</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (D)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer influence (T)</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer influence (D)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community size (T)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department role (T)</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of training (T)</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of training (D)</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of interven. (T)</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family fight role (T)</td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administ. orient. (T)</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer role (T)</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 for structural equations</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R2 for structural equations = .565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 42. Decomposition of effects for Model 3: service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value of training</th>
<th>Value of intervent.</th>
<th>Family Fight role</th>
<th>Administ. orient.</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (T)</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.159)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (T)</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.175)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police experience (D)</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.193)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer influence (T)</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.125)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community size (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.401)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department role (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.401)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of training (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.059</td>
<td></td>
<td>.059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.059)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of training (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.284</td>
<td></td>
<td>.284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.284)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of training (T)</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.203)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of intervent. (T)</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.263)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family fight role (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.295</td>
<td></td>
<td>.295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administ. orient. (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 for structural</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R2 for structural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review the significant research findings reported in this dissertation and to discuss the implications these findings hold for police policy.

Summary

The primary objective of this study was to construct and test causal models that would explain and predict police response to family violence calls. To this end, two theoretical models were developed, the organizational model and the psychological predispositional model.

The first, the organizational model, hypothesized that organizational factors influence an officer’s response to family violence calls. From the literature, six variables were identified as either having a direct or indirect effect on the dependent variable, officer response. Furthermore, 13 hypotheses specified the causal relationships among these variables.

Results of the statistical analysis for the law enforcement response indicated that the variables specified in Model 1 explained 17 percent of the variance in officer response. Furthermore, five of the predicted relationships were confirmed by the data, six were statistically insignificant and two were statistically significant, but not in the predicted direction.

For the service response, the variables in Model 1 explained 19 percent of the variance in officer response. As with the law
enforcement response, the same proportion of relationships were significant (5), not significant (6), and significant but not in the predicted direction (2). The significance for two of the hypotheses (8,10) varied by response.

For the law enforcement response, the type of training offered by the department proved to be one of the strongest predictors of officer response (-.183). This finding suggests an officer's decision to utilize a law enforcement response is influenced by the training priorities of the department. In other words, officers use those techniques approved by the department for responding to family fight calls.

Type of training also strongly influences a service response (.225). However, the amount of training proved to be the strongest predictor of an officer's service oriented response (.301). The type of training reflects departmental priorities, whereas, amount of training includes not only training administered by the department, but also training received outside of the department. For those officers utilizing a law enforcement response, amount of training does not significantly affect their choice of intervention strategies, whereas, officers utilizing the service response are more likely to be influenced by the training they have received.

Training plays a crucial role in determining an officer's response to family fights. This analysis suggests officers are more likely to arrest when departmental training reinforces arrest as an appropriate intervention strategy. Furthermore, expertise in making arrests do not require a large amount of training, rather, the priority the department
places on arrest serves to promote or hinder the use of this strategy. Conversely, the service response requires a large amount of training, not only from the department but from outside sources, such as shelters for abused women, seminars on family violence, etc. Departmental priorities also influence the service response, in that training emphasizing service techniques offered by the department influence an officer's choice of intervention strategies. However, those officers committed to the service approach will obtain training from other sources if their department does not provide the training. In sum, this analysis suggests that training plays a significant role in fostering the use of service oriented interventions. Moreover, departmental priorities, manifested through the type of training offered, influence both the service and law enforcement response.

Officer role was a significant predictor of the law enforcement response (-.133) but proved to be not significant (.065) in predicting the service response. Brown (1981) contends officers develop an operational style which influences how they respond to calls. This analysis indicates officers with law enforcement orientations are more likely to utilize arrest, and thus supports Brown's hypothesis. However, an officer's style of operation does not predict the service response. In essence, officers who perceive their police role in terms of law enforcement are more likely to make an arrest at a family fight. However, style of operation does not impede an officer from illiciting a helping response.

An officer's operational style is strongly influenced by the department role (.403), and community size (-.138). These findings
support the literature (Wilson, 1969; Brown, 1981; Smith, 1984) in that officers take their cue in developing their role from the organization and the community they belong to.

Department role not only influences the development of the officer's role, it directly affects how officer's respond to family violence calls. This finding indicates officers accept the guidelines consistent with the orientation espoused by the department for handling family violence calls.

Although the relationships between department role and the variables officer role and officer response were statistically significant, the hypothesized effects of department role on the training variables were not significant. The literature suggests that administrative orientation and community size influence the development of a department role (Wilson, 1969; Brown, 1981), which in turn influences the type and amount of training offered by the department. These relationships were not supported by the data.

This analysis produced two unexpected relationships that were statistically significant, but not in the predicted direction. Both involved the variable administrative orientation. The first relationship hypothesized community size affects administrative orientation. The path coefficient of .401 statistically confirms the hypothesis, however, the literature indicates an inverse relationship between these variables. In other words, the larger the community, the more likely the administrative orientation will be law enforcement oriented. The second relationship that was unexpected predicted administrative orientation influences an officer's response to family
fights. Again, the path coefficients for the law enforcement response (.221) and the service response (-.203) are statistically significant, but not in the predicted direction. This finding suggest an officer's response is in direct contradiction to the orientation of the administrative head of the department.

There are several possible explanations for these unexpected relationships. First, the small number of communities analyzed in this study may not reflect the true nature of the effect of community size on the administrative orientation. For example, there are no small departments (e.g., rural communities) or very large departments (e.g., New York or Los Angeles) represented in this sample. Second, the influence of community size on administrative orientation may be only an indirect effect of a more important underlying influence, that is, the type of government that controls the political bureaucracy of the community (Wilson, 1969). Third, the personal characteristics of the administrative heads may be more predictive of their orientation than community influences. For example, the Sheriff of Lexington County has a Ph.D., while the Sioux Falls Chief of Police has a master's degree.

Finally, the effect of the police subculture may be more influential than the administrative orientation of the head of the department. For example, officers respond to family fight calls in pairs. Those norms advocated by the police subculture are reinforced by the presence of a partner. Therefore, policies which are advocated by the department head (who takes a holistic approach to the problem) may be in direct opposition to those guidelines established by the police subculture (which advocates methods developed through years of experience on the
streets). Table 16 presents support for this supposition. Officers are more likely to adopt techniques learned from experienced officers than techniques learned in training sessions. Assuming that most training is endorsed by the administrative head of the department, it would appear the police subculture commands more influence in determining officer response than the administrative head of the department.

In summation, the two tests of the hypothesized relationships for Model 1 indicate that organizational variables offer an explanation for police response to family violence, however, the amount of explained variance was less than 20 percent for either response. The relationships between the variables were similar for both the law enforcement response and the service response except for the effect of amount of training and officer role on the dependent variable. For the service response, the amount of training proved to be the strongest predictor of officer response, however, it was not significant in explaining the law enforcement response. Conversely, an officer's role definitions were significant predictors of the law enforcement response but were not significant in predicting the service response.

The tests for goodness of fit for both the law enforcement response and the service response were within acceptable ranges and indicated that Model 1 fits the data reasonably well. This provides a level of confidence for the findings presented above.

The second model tested was the psychological predispositional model which hypothesized psychological predispositions influence an officers response to family violence. Seven variables were identified
by previous research as either having a direct or indirect effect on officer response while eleven hypotheses specified the casual relations among the variables.

Results of the statistical analysis indicated Model 2 explained 40 percent of the variance for the law enforcement response and 47 percent of the variance for the service response. Furthermore, seven of the predicted relationships were supported by the data, while three were statistically insignificant and one was statistically significant, but not in the predicted direction.

Family fight role had a very strong direct effect on officer response as was predicted by the literature (Schonborn, 1975; Brown, 1981). Furthermore, the values an officer holds on training and police intervention proved to be strong determinants of the type of role an officer will adopt.

Peer influence also had a very strong direct effect on officer response as well as a significant impact on the formation of the officer's family fight role. These findings provide support for the hypothesized influence the police subculture has over officer's role definitions and role performance (Brown, 1981).

Police experience was hypothesized to be causally related to the values an officer holds in training and intervention. The statistical analysis indicates officers with less experience are more likely to value training in intervention techniques (-.249), however, the relationship with values in intervention was not significant. These findings indicate years experience as a police officer does not change the values officers hold toward intervening in family fights, however,
as officers gain experience training becomes less valued.

The officer's educational level was hypothesized to be influential in the formation of the values officers hold in training and intervention. Officers with higher levels of education are more likely to value police intervention in family fights (.155), however, the relationship between education and value of training was insignificant. These findings suggest the more education the officer has, the more likely the officer is to perceive police intervention at family fights as an important element of the police function. Consequently, the more value an officer places in intervention, the more likely the officer is to get involved and help the couple resolve the situation. This analysis also suggests that the value officers place in training is not related to the officers educational level.

The final independent variable hypothesized to influence the values an officer places in training and intervention was sex. It was predicted female police officers would be more likely to value training and intervention (Kennedy and Homant, 1983; Greenwald, 1976; Bloch and Anderson, 1974). The analysis indicates the relationship with intervention is insignificant, however, the relationship with training is statistically significant but not in the predicted direction. According to these findings, male officers are more likely to value training than are female officers, however, gender does not significantly influence an officer's values on police intervention at family fights.

The variables in Model 2 were consistent for the service response and the law enforcement response. The strength of the path
coefficients varied for the two responses, however, there were no changes in significance levels for any of the relationships. The psychological predispositional model proved to be a strong causal model for predicting both the service (R2 = .47) and the law enforcement (R2 = .40) response. These findings indicate attitudes, values, and perceptions play a large part in determining how officer's respond to family fights. Moreover, these attitudes, values, and perceptions are influenced by peers, education, experience, and sex.

The psychological predispositional model explained over twice as much variance in officer response than did the organizational model. Furthermore, seven of the eleven hypotheses (63 percent) were supported by the data in Model 2 compared to 5 of 13 (38 percent) in Model 1. The goodness of fit for both models were within acceptable limits, indicating the models fit the data reasonably well. Model 2, however, offers the strongest causal model for predicting officer response.

Model 3 was developed by combining the significant paths found in Models 1 and 2 into one causal analysis. Results indicate the model explained 39 percent of the variance in the law enforcement response and 49 percent of the variance for the service response. Furthermore, the total coefficient of determination for the structural equations was .565 for the law enforcement response and .564 for the service response. These findings are significant, however, they must be examined carefully in light of the tests for the goodness of fit, which were at or below acceptable standards. In essence, the model did not fit the data well, and therefore, provides little confidence for the findings presented in Model 3.
Nevertheless, Model 3 provides strong support for the psychological predispositional variables, while illustrating the relative weakness of the organizational variables. For the law enforcement response, all the organizational variables directly influencing officer response were insignificant. In Model 1, these same variables were significant predictors of officer response. Similarly, the organizational variables predicting the service response were insignificant except for amount of training. Conversely, all the paths for the psychological predispositional model were significant regardless of response. These findings suggest for the law enforcement response, all the organization variables can be eliminated from the model leaving the psychological predispositional variables. By eliminating these variables, the R2 increases from 39 percent to 40 percent. Likewise, for the service response, all the organizational variables can be eliminated except for amount of training which exerts a strong direct effect (.284) on officer response. However, for the service model, the R2 decreases from 49 percent to 48 percent when the insignificant organizational variables are eliminated from the model.

Implications

The second major objective of this research was to examine the recommendations for the two perspectives discussed in Chapter II in light of the findings on police response presented in Chapter V. Policy implications for each model will be discussed separately with overall recommendations presented at the end of this section.
Training perspective

The training perspective asserts that by improving the training officers receive, the police will be able to offer skilled interventions to disputants in family crisis situations. Furthermore, increased training will facilitate inter-agency cooperation between the police and social services resulting in an increase in referrals by officers to shelter homes and social agencies. Finally, trained officers will be more responsive to the needs of those involved in domestic disputes.

The training perspective has had a strong impact on police policy makers. Prior to 1966, no police departments were providing training in crisis intervention for handling domestic disputes (Liebman and Schwartz, 1972), however, by 1972, mainly through the influence of Morton Bard, 14 police departments were experimenting with crisis intervention training programs. Since the early 1970s, there has been a rapid growth in police training programs focusing on domestic dispute intervention in the United States (Levens and Dutton, 1980).

The majority of officers in this study have been exposed to training for handling family fights either through recruit training, seminars, training sessions or presentations by social service agencies. The officers contend this training has adequately prepared them for handling family fights. Moreover, the officers insisted the police should be trained in intervention techniques for handling family disturbance calls, thus seminars, training sessions and workshops were viewed as valuable tools for providing these techniques.

Even though the majority of officers have been exposed to training
and do support the need for training, their predominant response involved having one party leave till the situation "cools" down, a response consistent with a non-involvement approach. Furthermore, officers seldom utilize arrest as an option for resolving family fights nor do they refer participants to other agencies for follow up counseling or help.

There are two possible explanations for this divergence in attitudes and response. First, the training provided by the departments focuses on safety to the officer, restoring peace to the area, and handling the situation with a minimum of involvement. The least stressed types of training were arrest, referral and helping the couple. These findings suggest even though officers value training that provides them with tools for increasing their effectiveness in handling family fights, they do not receive these types of skills from departmental training programs. In essence, the value officers place on crisis intervention training was mitigated by departmental priorities.

The second possible explanation involves the police subculture. Officers insist they value crisis intervention training because it provides them with techniques for handling family fights. However, officers overwhelmingly assert techniques learned from experienced officers are more important than those learned in training sessions. Moreover, officers are strongly influenced by how other officers respond to family fight calls. According to the officers in this sample, their peers frequently utilized the ploy of having one party leave till the situation cooled down, while seldom referring either
party to other agencies.

Despite these inconsistencies between attitudes and response, Models 1 and 2 offer strong support for the training perspective. For the service response in Model 1, the two strongest predictors of an officer’s decision to utilize the Help or Refer intervention technique were amount of training and type of training. These two training variables support the training hypothesis in that the more training an officer receives, the more likely the officer will employ a service response. Furthermore, departmental priorities that stress service intervention techniques encourage officer utilization of said strategies. In essence, the more committed departments are to providing crisis intervention training, the more likely officers will utilize the techniques learned in said training. However, an officer’s training is not limited to departmental training programs. Those officers supportive of the service response will acquire training from other sources when police departments do not view service oriented training as a high priority.

There is a wide disparity in the amount and type of training officer’s receive within each department. Some officers have received extensive amounts of training. However, for the most part, line officers have received training that focuses on officer safety, restoring peace to the area and handling the situation with a minimum of involvement, while receiving very little training in the form of crisis intervention, or helping the couple through counseling or referral. These findings suggest organizational priorities must change before crisis intervention training programs will be effective.
Model 2 also supports the training perspective in that the more value an officer places in training, the more likely the officer is to perceive the family fight role in terms of helping the couple to resolve their problems, which in turn influences the officers choice of intervention techniques when responding to a family fight. This model suggests the success of a training program will depend on the values officers hold toward training and intervention in family fights. These values influence how officers perceive their role at a family fight which in turn influences their choice of intervention techniques.

In summation, Models 1 and 2 clearly portray the important role values and training play in determining an officer's response. This analysis suggests training programs based on the training perspective are viable solutions, however, the role of psychological predispositions can not be undermined.

Future research needs to explore the link between values and training. It is clear from this analysis that each influence officer response, however, it is not clear what effect training has on values and vice versa. An understanding of these issues are necessary prior to implementing a training program. If values influence training, the training programs may be ill fated from the beginning.

Mandatory arrest perspective

Advocates of mandatory arrest contend police officers have too much discretion and consequently do not make arrests when they are justified at family fights. This perspective insists laws should be implemented mandating officer's arrest when violence occurs at a family disturbance. The officer's role would be to determine if a law has
been violated, and if so, make an arrest.

Although the officers in this sample agreed with Oppenlander (1982) that the public views the police as authority figures at family fights, they did not agree with her assertion tougher laws mandating arrest will reduce the incidence of family violence. In fact, they did not view arrest as a valuable intervention strategy either in theory or application. However, findings from this study uphold the critiques by advocates of this perspective in the following areas. First, officers do not make arrests at family violence calls and are encouraged by their departments not to do so. Second, officers are not trained by their departments to act as trained counselors at heated domestic interpersonal disputes. Finally, even though officers are aware of community services for troubled families, they seldom refer them for help or shelter.

These findings support mandatory arrest arguments calling for stringent guidelines limiting officer discretion. Model 1 provides theoretical support for implementing these guidelines. An officer’s decision to arrest is based on organizational factors which directly influence the officer. Therefore, by changing the orientation of the department, as reflected in the department role, guidelines established and implemented by the department will not only directly effect officer response, but will also indirectly effect response through training and the officer’s perception of their role within the community. In other words, if mandatory arrest guidelines are to be implemented, departmental priorities must reflect this change in orientation.

In Model 2, an officer’s decision to arrest is based on the same
processes that influence the service response. Officer's values, attitudes and perceptions about the police role influence the officer's response to family fights. This model suggests that changes in the law will not necessarily mean changes in response. Officers committed to the law enforcement response will identify with the changes and freely adopt arrest procedures as a means for responding to family fight calls. However, officers endorsing a service orientation are not necessarily going to adopt a law enforcement response. In fact, the path between an officer's perception of the police role at family fights and officer response is very strong. This indicates officers hold strong convictions about the appropriateness of the officer's responsibilities to disputants at family fights. Therefore, interpersonal processes reflecting an officer's orientation towards family violence must be examined and dealt with for changes to occur, regardless of changes in law or procedure. For in reality, even though advocates of mandatory arrest demand discretion be eliminated, this would be an impossible task. Officers must have the ability to define those incidents that are clearly abusive from those that are minor in nature. With this discretion, comes a definition of the situation, which ultimately relates back to values, attitudes, and perceptions. In other words, when officer's values are consistent with proposed legislation or training, the chances of a successful implementation are enhanced. When they are not, officers will fall back on those responses consistent with their values and orientation.
Recommendations

Two major findings from this research provide strong support for implementing recommendations from the mandatory arrest perspective as well as the training perspective. First, police officers do not perceive arrest to be a viable technique for intervening in domestic disturbances, and therefore, seldom utilize the arrest response. Second, officers indicate they value the skills crisis intervention training provides them, however, for the most part, line officers contend they do not receive these skills. Therefore, these findings suggest the following changes be implemented at the organizational level:

1. Revise the focus of police training from non-intervention to crisis intervention (as espoused by Bard).
2. Insure that all line officers responding to family violence calls receives crisis intervention training.
3. Develop departmental guidelines reinforcing the viability of arrest when violence occurs.

The findings from this research stress the importance psychological predispositions play in determining an officer's response. The values and perceptions of police officers proved to be strong predictors of not only the service response but also the law enforcement response. This suggests changes recommended by either perspective may meet with strong opposition from police officers whose attitudes, values, and beliefs are being challenged. In other words, officers are more likely to accept proposed changes when they do not conflict with their own values on police intervention at family fights.
However, when they do conflict, officers are more likely to utilize discretion and handle the situation in a manner consistent with their own perceptions of appropriate police behavior. Therefore, these findings suggest officer's psychological predispositions must be taken into consideration when planning and implementing programs to improve the effectiveness of the police response. This can be accomplished by focusing on four areas that influence an officer's values and beliefs:

1. Education. Officers with higher educations strongly value police intervention at family fights. Furthermore, highly educated officers are more likely to insist that mandatory arrest laws will not reduce the incidence of domestic violence. Therefore, the higher the level of education in the police department, the more likely changes consistent with the training perspective would be readily adopted, whereas, mandatory arrest laws would meet with opposition and resistance.

2. Police experience. Newer officers are more likely to value training in crisis intervention techniques than are veteran officers. This finding indicates departments with high percentages of officers with less than three years experience are more likely to successfully implement crisis intervention training programs than are those with predominately veteran officers. Similarly, this research suggests that implementation of mandatory arrest laws would also be met with opposition from veteran officers. In effect, veteran officers are more likely to espouse a non-involvement intervention strategy.

3. Police subculture. Officers are strongly influenced by their peers
not only in how they respond to family fight calls, but also in how they perceive their role at domestic disputes. Moreover, officers contend they are more influenced by techniques learned from fellow officers, than by those acquired in training sessions. These findings suggest the police subculture must be considered when developing new programs for officers. In other words, programs that focus solely on the formal organization of the department, neglect the influence, be it reinforcement or subversion, the informal structure (police subculture) of the department contributes to the acceptance or failure of programs.

4. Sex. The literature indicates female police officers are more sensitive to the needs of battered women, and therefore, more likely to support the need for crisis intervention at family fights. This research does not support the literature. In fact, female police officers in this study were more likely to devalue training and police intervention at family fights. These findings suggest female police officers may be more inclined to accept mandatory arrest laws than crisis intervention training. These findings, however, call for further research investigating the link between sex of the officer and police response.

This study illustrates the need for further research examining the effect values, attitudes, and beliefs have on discretionary choices officers make at family fight calls. Psychological predispositions proved to be very strong predictors, however, it is not clear from the research how these predictors interact with organizational variables. Furthermore, it is not clear which variables (psychological or
organizational) are more likely to influence the other. In effect, for developing programs, understanding these interactions may be crucial to a successful implementation.
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APPENDIX A  CORRELATION MATRIX
Table 43. Variable labels for Table 44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>Community size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>Police experience - first indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>Police experience - second indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>Amount of training - first indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7</td>
<td>Amount of training - second indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X8</td>
<td>Value of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X9</td>
<td>Family fight role - second indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X10</td>
<td>Value of intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X11</td>
<td>Family fight role - first indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X12</td>
<td>Department role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X13</td>
<td>Officer role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X14</td>
<td>Peer influence - law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X15</td>
<td>Officer response - law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X16</td>
<td>Administrative orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X17</td>
<td>Type of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X18</td>
<td>Officer response - service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X19</td>
<td>Peer influence - service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 44. Correlation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
<th>X8</th>
<th>X9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-.253*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-.119*</td>
<td>.814*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.234*</td>
<td>-.233*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>-.137*</td>
<td>-.277*</td>
<td>-.268*</td>
<td>.159*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-.130*</td>
<td>-.111*</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.128*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7</td>
<td>.109*</td>
<td>-.168*</td>
<td>-.104*</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.543*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X8</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.178*</td>
<td>-.103*</td>
<td>-.116*</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.313*</td>
<td>.334*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X9</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.192*</td>
<td>-.149*</td>
<td>.109*</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.148*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X8</td>
<td>X9</td>
<td>X10</td>
<td>X11</td>
<td>X12</td>
<td>X13</td>
<td>X14</td>
<td>X15</td>
<td>X16</td>
<td>X17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.245*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.254*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.158*</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.224*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.212*</td>
<td>.339*</td>
<td>.273*</td>
<td>.396*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.191*</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.124*</td>
<td>-.119*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.324*</td>
<td>-.156*</td>
<td>-.227*</td>
<td>-.213*</td>
<td>-.222*</td>
<td>.564*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.120*</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.317*</td>
<td>.240*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.181*</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.280*</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.133*</td>
<td>-.114*</td>
<td>-.203*</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.204*</td>
<td>.196*</td>
<td>.370*</td>
<td>.204*</td>
<td>.186*</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.202*</td>
<td>-.185*</td>
<td>.272*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.193*</td>
<td>.227*</td>
<td>.131*</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.226*</td>
<td>.205*</td>
<td>.635*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Title of project (please type): POLICE RESPONSE TO FAMILY VIOLENCE

I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are properly protected. Additions to or changes in procedures affecting the subjects after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review.

Michael G. Breci
Typed Name of Principal Investigator

11-11-85
Date

Signature of Principal Investigator

419 East Hall
Campus Address

294-4612
Campus Telephone

Signature of others (if any)

Date

Relationship to Principal Investigator

RECEIVED

ATTACH an additional page(s) (A) describing your proposed research and (B) the subjects to be used, (C) indicating any risks or discomforts to the subjects, and (D) covering any topics checked below. CHECK all boxes applicable.

☐ Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
☐ Samples (blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
☐ Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
☐ Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
☐ Deception of subjects
☐ Subjects under 14 years of age and/or ☐ Subjects 14-17 years of age
☐ Subjects in institutions
☒ Research must be approved by another institution or agency

ATTACH an example of the material to be used to obtain informed consent and CHECK which type will be used.

☐ Signed informed consent will be obtained.
☒ Modified informed consent will be obtained.

Anticipated date on which subjects will be first contacted: 12 1 85
Anticipated date for last contact with subjects: 12 30 85

If Applicable: Anticipated date on which audio or visual tapes will be erased and/or identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments:

Signature of Head or Chairperson

Date

Department or Administrative Unit

Decision of the University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research:
☒ Project Approved
☐ Project not approved
☐ No action required
The following questionnaire was distributed during line up to those officers on duty. You were not working that day and so I have left a copy of the questionnaire in your mail box. There is an envelope attached, after completing the form, please give it to the Chief's secretary or slip it under the Chief's door if he is not in.

I appreciate your taking time to help me with this project.

THANK YOU!

Michael Breci
During the last ten years, family violence has become a hot topic in this country. Research has focused not only on family dynamics that contribute to violence, but also on the police response to handling family disturbances. Two unique orientations have developed regarding the police response; one calls for more intensive police training, while the other calls for mandatory arrest in family violence situations. Being a former police officer, I am concerned about the implications these systems of thought have for future police policy on handling domestic disputes. I am also concerned about the lack of input police officers have had in this debate, especially considering the dangerousness of the call and the implications that holds for the police response.

This research focuses on the police response from your perspective. The findings will be used for research purposes. All questionnaires and responses will be strictly anonymous. Do not put your name on this form. Your participation in this project is voluntary; you are the experts on police response to family fights, and your cooperation in sharing your insights and knowledge is greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your assistance.

Michael Breci
Doctoral Candidate in Sociology
Iowa State University
PART 1

Instructions: Please write in or check the most appropriate answer to each of the questions in Part 1.

1. How many years have you been a police officer or deputy sheriff? _________

2. What is your present rank? _________

3. Which shift do you currently work? _________

4. What is your age? _________

5. What is your race? White _____ Black ____ Other ____

6. What is your sex? Male _____ Female _____

7. How many years of school have you completed? _________

8. Have you taken any college courses in the last year? _________

9. What is your marital status? Single ____ Married ____
   Divorced _____ Widowed _______

10. What was your father's occupation? _________

11. Approximately how many family fights have you responded to in the last year?
   
   _____ None
   _____ Less than 10
   _____ 10-24
   _____ 25-50
   _____ Over 50

12. Of all the calls you have handled in the last year, approximately what percentage were family fights?

   ____ 0
   ____ 1 to 9%
   ____ 10 to 19%
   ____ 20 to 40%
   ____ Over 40%

13. How much training have you had for handling family fights?

   _____ None
   _____ Very little
   _____ Some
   _____ Very much
Instructions: Please place a check next to the choice that best expresses your answer to each of the questions in Part 2.

1. Based on prior training and personal experience, how skilled would you say you are in handling family conflicts?
   - ______ Extremely skilled
   - ______ Very skilled
   - ______ Skilled
   - ______ Not very skilled
   - ______ Poorly skilled

2. Which intervention strategy do you perceive to be the most useful when responding to family fights?
   - ______ Arrest
   - ______ Let the situation work itself out
   - ______ Have one part leave till the situation "cools" down
   - ______ Help the couple resolve the situation
   - ______ Referral of one or both parties to community agencies (i.e. family counseling, battered women's shelter)

3. The training you have received has adequately prepared you to handle family fights.
   - ______ Strongly agree
   - ______ Agree
   - ______ Disagree
   - ______ Strongly disagree

4. In your opinion, how does the general public view the police role when intervening in family fights?
   - ______ Authority figure
   - ______ Service provider (for example, referral)

5. Tougher laws mandating arrest in family fight situations would reduce family fights in the future.
   - ______ Strongly agree
   - ______ Agree
   - ______ Disagree
   - ______ Strongly disagree

6. In handling family fights, techniques learned from experienced officers are more important than those learned in training sessions.
   - ______ Strongly agree
   - ______ Agree
   - ______ Disagree
   - ______ Strongly disagree
7. How often would you say the following techniques are used by other officers in this department for handling family fights:

A. Warn the parties to quiet down or else they will be arrested.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Most Always

B. Having one party leave for the rest of the day/night.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Most Always

C. Arresting one or both parties for disturbing the peace or assault.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Most Always

D. Helping the parties to work out the problem.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Most Always

E. Refer parties to detective bureau or other agencies for further action.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Most Always

8. Seminars, training sessions and workshops on family violence:

- are very helpful in providing techniques for handling family fights
- are helpful in providing techniques for handling family fights
- are not very helpful in providing techniques for handling family fights
- are not helpful at all in providing techniques for handling family fights
9. What is your role at family fight calls?
   - Enforce the law
   - Mediate/referral

10. Police officers should be trained in intervention skills to help the couple resolve the family fight.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

11. Intervening in family fights is not "real" police work.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

12. When you respond to a family fight, what should your major concern be?
   - Determine whether or not a law has been broken, and if so, make an arrest.
   - Determine the problem between the parties and help them to resolve their differences.

13. Responding to family fights is an important part of the police role.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

14. When you are called to a family fight, how often do you use the following responses:
   A. Warn the parties to quiet down or else they will be arrested.
      - Never
      - Rarely
      - Sometimes
      - Often
      - Most always
   B. Having one party leave for the rest of the day/night.
      - Never
      - Rarely
      - Sometimes
      - Often
      - Most always
C. Arresting one or both parties for disturbing the peace or assault.

____ Never
____ Rarely
____ Sometimes
____ Often
____ Most always

D. Helping the parties to work out the problem.

____ Never
____ Rarely
____ Sometimes
____ Often
____ Most always

E. Refer parties to detective bureau or other agencies for further action.

____ Never
____ Rarely
____ Sometimes
____ Often
____ Most always

15. For handling family fights, how much stress does your department place on the following forms of training? (Rank your answers from one to six, with one being the most stressed, to six being the least stressed)

____ arrest
____ quickly handling the matter with a minimum of involvement
____ safety to officer
____ restoring peace to the area
____ helping the couple solve the problem
____ refer one or both parties to other agencies for help with their problems

PART 3

Instructions: Circle the number closest to the choice that best expresses your answer to each of the questions in Part 3.

1. What role does your department expect of you?

       1  2  3  4  5  6
Law Enforcement               Service to the Community

2. What do you think the role of the officer should be?

       1  2  3  4  5  6
Law Enforcement               Service to the Community
PART 4

Instructions: Please write in your answers to the question in Part 4.

1. List the training you have received for handling family fights. (Examples of training received: Presentations, such as those given by the women's center or social services; Training sessions, for example sessions could focus on where to refer battered women or couples with problems; Recruit training, techniques learned on how to handle explosive and violent situations; Workshops, they could focus on violence in the family)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Hours</th>
<th>Focus or content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars, Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE!
During the last ten years, family violence has become a hot topic in this country. Research has focused not only on family dynamics that contribute to violence, but also on the police response to handling family disturbances. Two unique orientations have developed regarding the police response; one calls for more intensive police training, while the other calls for mandatory arrest in family violence situations. Being a former police officer, I am concerned about the implications these systems of thought have for future police policy on handling domestic disputes. I am also concerned about the lack of input police officers have had in this debate, especially considering the dangerousness of the call and the implications that holds for the police response.

This research focuses on the police response from your perspective. The findings will be used for research purposes. All questionnaires and responses will be strictly anonymous. Do not put your name on this form. Your participation in this project is voluntary; you are the experts on police response to family fights, and your cooperation in sharing your insights and knowledge is greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your assistance.

Michael Breci  
Doctoral Candidate in Sociology  
Iowa State University
PART 1

Instructions: Please write in or check the most appropriate answer to each of the questions in Part 1.

1. How many years have you been a police officer or deputy sheriff? __________

2. What is your present rank? __________

3. Which shift do you currently work? ________________

4. What is your age? ______

5. What is your race? Black____ White____ Other: Specify________

6. What is your sex? Male____ Female____

7. How many years of school have you completed? ______

8. Are you now going to school? ______ If yes, what type of courses are you taking? ______________________

9. What is your marital status? Married _____ Single _____
   Divorced ______ Widowed ______

10. What was your father's occupation? ________________

11. Approximately how many family fights have you responded to in the last six months?
   _____ None
   _____ Less than 10
   _____ 10-24
   _____ 25-50
   _____ Over 50

12. Of all the calls you have handled in the last six months, approximately what percentage were family fights?
   _____ 0
   _____ 1 to 9%
   _____ 10 to 19%
   _____ 20 to 40%
   _____ Over 40%

13. Based on your prior experience handling family fights, how skilled would you say you are in handling family conflicts?
   _____ Extremely Skilled
   _____ Very Skilled
   _____ Skilled
   _____ Not Very Skilled
   _____ Poorly Skilled
PART 2

Instructions: Please place a check next to the choice that best expresses your answer to each of the questions in Part 2.

1. The training you have received in crisis intervention has adequately prepared you to handle domestic disputes.
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

2. Which intervention strategy do you perceive to be the most useful when responding to family fights?
   ___ Arrest
   ___ Let the situation work itself out
   ___ Helping the couple to resolve the situation
   ___ Referral of one or both parties to community agencies (i.e. family counseling, battered womens shelter)

3. Tougher laws mandating arrest in family fight situations would reduce family fights in the future.
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly disagree

4. In your opinion how does the general public view the police role when intervening at family fights?
   ___ Authority figure
   ___ Facilitator/counselor

5. Warning the parties to quiet down is a common response by officers in this department for handling family fights.
   ___ Strongly agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly Disagree

6. Arresting one or both parties is a common response by officers in this department for handling family fights.
   ___ Strongly Agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly Disagree
7. Helping the parties to work out their problems is a common response by officers in this department for handling family fights.

___ Strongly agree
___ Agree
___ Disagree
___ Strongly disagree

8. Referring one or both of the parties to other agencies is a common response by officers in this department for handling family fights.

___ Strongly agree
___ Agree
___ Disagree
___ Strongly Disagree

9. Seminars, training sessions and workshops on family violence:

___ are very helpful in handling family fights.
___ are somewhat helpful in handling family fights.
___ are not helpful in handling family fights.

10. In handling family fights, techniques learned through experience are more important than those learned in training sessions.

___ Strongly agree
___ Agree
___ Disagree
___ Strongly Disagree

11. What is your role at family fight calls?

___ Enforce the law
___ Restore and maintain order
___ Mediate/counsel

12. Police officers should be trained in conflict management skills in order to help resolve family fights.

___ Strongly agree
___ Agree
___ Disagree
___ Strongly Disagree

13. Intervening in family fights is not "real" police work.

___ Strongly agree
___ Agree
___ Disagree
___ Strongly disagree
14. How would you compare your response time for bar fights and family fights?

____ Faster to bar fights
____ About the same
____ Faster to family fights

15. When you respond to a family fight, what should your major concern be?

____ Determine whether or not a law has been broken, and if so, make an arrest.
____ Determine the problem between the parties and help them to resolve their differences.

16. Responding to family fights is an important part of the police role.

____ Strongly agree
____ Agree
____ Disagree
____ Strongly disagree

17. When you are called to a family fight, how often do you make an arrest?

____ Never
____ Rarely
____ Sometimes
____ Often
____ Most always

18. When you are called to a family fight, how often do you warn the parties to quiet down?

____ Never
____ Rarely
____ Sometimes
____ Often
____ Most always

19. When you are called to a family fight, how often do you calm the situation by having one of the parties leave?

____ Never
____ Rarely
____ Sometimes
____ Often
____ Most always
20. When you are called to a family fight, how often do you counsel the parties and help them to resolve their differences?

   ___ Never
   ___ Rarely
   ___ Sometimes
   ___ Often
   ___ Most always

21. When you are called to a family fight, how often do you refer one or both parties to an outside agency?

   ___ Never
   ___ Rarely
   ___ Sometimes
   ___ Often
   ___ Most always

22. For handling family fights, how much stress did your department place on the following forms of training? (Rank your answers, 1 being the most stressed, 6 being the least stressed)

   ___ arrest
   ___ handling the matter as quickly as possible without getting too involved
   ___ safety to officer
   ___ restoring peace to the area
   ___ counseling the couple to help them to solve their problems
   ___ referral to other agencies for help with their problems

PART 3

Instructions: Circle the number closest to the choice that best expresses your answer to each of the questions in Part 3.

1. What role does your department expect of you?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Law Enforcement  Service to Community

2. What do you think the role of the officer should be?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Law Enforcement  Service to Community
PART 4

Instructions: Please write in your answers to the question in Part 4.

1. List the training you have received for handling family fights. (Examples of training considered useful are: Crisis intervention; Interpersonal conflict management; Conflict and violence in the family; Intervention methods; Referral networks, social services, battered women's shelters; and College courses relating to family dynamics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Provided by</th>
<th>#of hours</th>
<th>Focus or content of training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College courses relating to family dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE!