

THE IMPACT OF EMOTIONAL LABOR, VALUE DISSONANCE, AND  
OCCUPATIONAL IDENTITY ON POLICE OFFICERS LEVELS OF  
CYNICISM AND BURNOUT

By

LONNIE MATT SCHAIBLE

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY  
Department of Sociology

MAY 2006

© Copyright by LONNIE MATT SCHAIBLE, 2006  
All Rights Reserved

© Copyright by LONNIE MATT SCHAIBLE, 2006  
All Rights Reserved

To the Faculty of Washington State University:

The members of the Committee appointed to examine the dissertation of  
LONNIE MATT SCHAIBLE find it satisfactory and recommend that it be accepted.

---

Chair

---

---

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Sir Issaac Newton once wrote “If I have seen further it is by standing on ye shoulders of Giants.” While I have no delusions that the present work is remotely akin to Newton’s *Principia*, I find his words no less true. As such, I must acknowledge all those whose work I have reaped the benefits of in developing the present dissertation. Only through the works of Karl Marx, Charles Horton Cooley, George Herbert Meade, Irving Goffman, C. Wright Mills and particularly Arlie Hochschild does the present work take on meaning and context. In their tradition and honor, I hope that the present work will make a small contribution to the broader understanding of the social world.

Aside from the great social philosophers, I must acknowledge those who have been my personal intellectual “Giants.” As such, I would like to acknowledge and thank all my professors at the University of Montana who afforded me with a better early education and grounding in sociology than I ever could have fully appreciated while receiving it. Specifically, Rob Balch, Rod Brod, Jim Burfeind, Dan Doyle, Jon Driessen, Paul Miller, and Fred Reed all filled my head with great insights and knowledge which have largely shaped who I have become as a sociologist today. The sacrifice and dedication these individuals exhibited towards me and all their students is a priceless treasure and serves as an inspiration to me as I begin my own career. I should be so lucky to be as successful in my own efforts.

Of all my professors at the University of Montana, I must specifically recognize Bill McBroom, Professor Emeritus at the University of Montana, who first introduced me to the discipline of sociology and served as my mentor throughout completion of my Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees. Without having chanced into his introductory sociology and social psychology courses my first semester of college, I am certain I would not have ventured down the path that I have traveled for the past 13 years. Nor would I have developed many of the skills or insights that have suited me so well during this time and led to so many rewards and triumphs.

Of course, I also owe a great deal of gratitude to those who provided me with the top notch education that I received during my time at Washington State University. Specifically, I must recognize the courses and experiences that I was fortunate enough to have with Peter Burke, Louis Gray, Carter Hay, Lisa McIntyre, Gene Rosa, and Jan Stets. Through their tutelage and guidance, I was able to develop the basic knowledge I arrived with into a more mature and sophisticated understanding which will undoubtedly fuel a lifetime of teaching and research.

I would particularly like to express my gratitude to my committee members, whom despite my procrastination and extended absence from the department have stuck with me to the end. Louis Gray has been of particular value in bouncing ideas off of, in addition to graciously taking care of administrative details from Pullman, allowing me the freedom to work from afar. Likewise, I must thank Steve Burkett who has been of immense help in ensuring that I had the resources and support necessary to complete my dissertation away from campus.

And of course, of particular importance to my experience at Washington State University has been Vik Gecas. From the first semester of my residence at Washington State University, I was always assured that I could rely on Vik who was always willing to provide me with the support, feedback and guidance I needed at just the right time. This assurance has continued despite great physical distance, a long foray into the applied world on my part, and Vik's own acceptance of a position as the Department Head at the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Purdue University. Vik continues to serve as an enduring source of motivation and guidance for me both in the completion of the present dissertation and in my academic work as a whole.

I would also like to acknowledge Dusten Hollist, now a Professor of Sociology at the University of Montana, with whom I started my graduate education, and whom has served as a constant source of inspiration, support, encouragement, and intellectual stimulation throughout. I truly believe that our ongoing friendly competition and frequent collaboration has only served to make us both stronger and push towards something grander. I look forward to the

continuation of our friendship, our future collaboration, and of course many fishing trips in the future.

I must also thank the members of the Spokane Police Department who either directly or indirectly contributed to the present work. First and foremost, I must thank all the officers who patiently endured my request to use them as ‘guinea pigs’, and graciously completed the survey on which the present study is based. I know it pained many of you greatly. Moreover, I must specifically acknowledge a number of officers who went above and beyond the call of duty in taking the time to discuss their unique perspective on policing with me, including: Alan Arnzen, Brian Tafoya, Paul Watson, Gordon Grant, Kelly Busse, Karl Thompson, Jim Nicks, and especially Sergeant Mike Yates. Through your words and tales, my depth of understanding of the police experience has been greatly shaped.

I must give specific thanks to Chief Roger Bragdon who was so gracious in providing me with invaluable access to the department and officers, and whom was always supportive of the quest for knowledge in his administration of the department. The Spokane Police Department is certainly better for it. Likewise, I must thank Amy Bragdon who, during the course of her work on the department’s historical committee, continually expressed an interest in the progression of my work. Additionally, I would like to recognize Bob Lincoln and Sharon Sprott, who afforded me the flexibility with my schedule to put the time necessary into the research presented here. Finally, I must thank my fellow planner, David Lund, who has become a trusted friend and intellectual sounding board during my time at the Spokane Police Department. Our exchange of ideas about the unique world of policing has heavily conditioned my writing on the present topic.

Lastly and most importantly, I must acknowledge the light of my life, my wife Kelly, who has provided me with unending support and encouragement, and endured many hardships of her own either directly or indirectly for my benefit. Without her unrelenting support, encouragement, patience and willingness to afford me the time to complete such an ominous feat, I certainly would not have completed the present task. I cannot adequately express in words how much I value, appreciate, and love all that you are.

THE IMPACT OF EMOTIONAL LABOR, VALUE DISSONANCE, AND  
OCCUPATIONAL IDENTITY ON POLICE OFFICERS LEVELS OF  
CYNICISM AND BURNOUT

Abstract

by Lonnie Matt Schaible, Ph.D.  
Washington State University  
May 2006

Chair: Viktor Gecas

Using measures collected from a survey of the Spokane Police Department's Uniformed Patrol Division (N=108), the present study examines the variety of ways self-processes, societal and institutional policing values, and demands for emotional presentation placed upon police officers interact to produce cynicism and burnout. Specifically, the present study assesses four primary hypotheses: 1) The greater the emotional management required of officers, the greater will be their levels of cynicism and burnout, 2) The greater the dissonance between officer's own values and those of various reference groups, the greater will be their reported levels of cynicism and burnout, 3) In combination, value dissonance and emotional labor should produce higher levels of cynicism and burnout than either would independently produce, 4) In combination, identity centrality and value dissonance should produce higher levels of cynicism and burnout than either would independently produce. Results provide mixed support for these hypotheses suggesting that the emotion work of officers has minimal effects on cynicism and burnout. To the contrary, the study finds substantial support for the hypotheses that value dissonance and identity condition the cynicism and burnout experienced by officers. The theoretical relevance of results is discussed and recommendations of interest to researchers and police administrators are provided.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. EMOTIONAL LABOR THEORY AND POLICING.....	5
Emotional Labor Theory.....	5
The Emotional Labor of Policing .....	13
Hypotheses.....	22
3. DATA AND METHODS .....	23
Data and Sample .....	23
Dependent Variables.....	23
Logic of Analysis.....	25
Control Variables.....	26
4. THE IMPACT OF EMOTIONAL REQUIREMENTS.....	33
Results.....	36
Discussion.....	41
5. THE IMPACT OF VALUE DISSONANCE.....	47
Results.....	49
Discussion.....	60



6. THE INTERACTION OF DISSONANCE AND EMOTION .....	66
Results.....	68
Discussion.....	75
7. THE INTERACTION OF IDENTITY AND DISSONANCE .....	79
Results.....	82
Discussion.....	88
8. FINAL COMBINED MODELS .....	94
Results.....	97
Discussion.....	104
9. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	122
APPENDIX	
A. GUIDE TO MEASURES AND SCALES.....	128
B. SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....	137

## LIST OF TABLES

1. Standardized Effects of Sex on Burnout and Cynicism.....	27
2. Standardized Effects of Minority Status on Burnout and Cynicism.....	28
3. Standardized Effects of Education on Burnout and Cynicism.....	29
4. Standardized Effects of Job Tenure on Burnout and Cynicism.....	30
5. Standardized Effects of Age on Burnout and Cynicism.....	30
6. Standardized Effects of Demographic Controls on Burnout and Cynicism.....	31
7. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Emotion Management Variables and Cynicism and Burnout.....	36
8. Standardized Effects of Surface Acting on Burnout and Cynicism.....	37
9. Standardized Effects of Deep Acting on Burnout and Cynicism.....	38
10. Standardized Effects of Expression on Burnout and Cynicism.....	39
11. Standardized Effects of Suppression on Burnout and Cynicism.....	40
12. Standardized Effects of Emotional Requirements on Burnout and Cynicism.....	41
13. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Policing Values Measures...	49
14. Standardized Effects of COP-Neutral Value Dissonance Between Officers and Lieutenants on Burnout and Cynicism.....	51
15. Standardized Effects of COP-Neutral Value Dissonance Between Officers and Chiefs on Burnout and Cynicism.....	52
16. Standardized Effects of COP-Neutral Value Dissonance Between Officers and Public on Burnout and Cynicism.....	53
17. Standardized Effects of COP-Neutral Value Dissonance Between Officers and All Reference Groups on Burnout and Cynicism.....	55
18. Standardized Effects of COP-Specific Value Dissonance Between Officers and Lieutenants on Burnout and Cynicism.....	56
19. Standardized Effects of COP-Specific Value Dissonance Between Officers and Chiefs on Burnout and Cynicism.....	57
20. Standardized Effects of COP-Specific Value Dissonance Between Officers and Public on Burnout and Cynicism.....	58

21. Standardized Effects of COP-Specific Value Dissonance Between Officers and All Reference Groups on Burnout and Cynicism .....	60
22. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Value Dissonance and Surface Acting on Cynicism and Burnout .....	68
23. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Value Dissonance and Deep Acting on Cynicism and Burnout .....	69
24. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Value Dissonance and Requirement for Expression on Cynicism and Burnout .....	71
25. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Value Dissonance and Requirement for Suppression on Cynicism and Burnout.....	72
26. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Value Dissonance and Emotional Work Requirements on Cynicism and Burnout.....	74
27. Baseline and Interaction Effects of COP-Neutral Dissonance and Work Centrality on Cynicism and Burnout .....	82
28. Baseline and Interaction Effects of COP-Specific Dissonance and Work Centrality on Cynicism and Burnout .....	84
29. Baseline and Interaction Effects of COP-Neutral Dissonance and Identification on Cynicism and Burnout .....	85
30. Baseline and Interaction Effects of COP-Specific Dissonance and Identification on Cynicism and Burnout .....	87
31. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Deep Acting, Centrality, and COP-Specific Dissonance on Cynicism and Burnout.....	97
32. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Deep Acting, Identity, and COP-Specific Dissonance on Cynicism and Burnout.....	99
33. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Deep Acting, Centrality, and COP-Neutral Dissonance on Cynicism and Burnout.....	101
34. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Deep Acting, Identity, and COP-Neutral Dissonance on Cynicism and Burnout.....	103

## **Dedication**

This dissertation is dedicated to the men and women of law enforcement whom daily confront perils of the mind and body the rest of us can neither know nor fully understand.

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

Since Hochschild's now classic book, "The Managed Heart," was published in 1983, both social science and management researchers have exhibited a heightened interest in the role of emotion in the workplace. As a result, numerous studies have been conducted over the past two decades assessing emotional labor in a variety of service professions, including: flight attendants, health professionals, legal assistants, bank workers, professors, bill collectors, engineers, ride-operators, food service workers, supermarket cashiers, and insurance agents (See Steinberg and Figart 1999). Despite this proliferation of studies, research on the emotional labor of policing has received relatively little attention (Stenross and Kleinman 1989; Rafaeli and Sutton 1991; Martin 1999). This is unfortunate, as the study of emotional labor within policing should be of great interest to researchers on many different levels.

First, unlike any other profession, police officers are put in the unique role of enforcing law and order (acting as the "heel" of capitalism), while often simultaneously fulfilling a customer service role (acting as the "toe" of capitalism). Often, these two tasks require highly inconsistent and incompatible expectations for conduct that can place officers in a state of confusion about what exactly their overarching role in society is and should be. On the one hand, officers are expected to be authoritative, commanding, and cool toward their client base in order to maintain a sense of distance, respect, and control and to ensure officer safety (what has been referred to as 'Professionalism' within policing) (Walker 1977; Wilson 1950). On the other hand, officers are expected to be warm, comforting, compassionate, and understanding of those within the community they are responsible for policing (otherwise referred to as 'Community Oriented Policing') (Kelling and Moore 1988; Trojanowicz and Buceroux 1990). Thus, officers

are held to two distinct sets of expectations for conduct and emotional display which correspond with two dominant themes in contemporary policing: “Professionalism” and “Community Oriented Policing.” To further complicate matters, these two distinct sets of expectations imposed upon officers often conflict with one another leaving a great deal of ambiguity about which course of action or set of behaviors are appropriate (Kelling and Pate 1973; Hunt 1983). Such inconsistencies at the structural level are certain to produce clear effects and consequences at the individual level, especially inasmuch as officers embrace one set of expectations over another.

Second, as a consequence of the unique social structural position and the competing expectations that accompany it, officers are required to engage in a broad range of emotional displays during the course of their duties (Pogrebin and Poole 1995; Martin 1999). In a given shift, an officer might be called upon to give notification to a family that a loved one has died from some tragedy, assertively hold a dangerous suspect at gunpoint not knowing when they might be required to take the suspect’s life to preserve their own, and take a routine burglary report where they must patiently and compassionately listen to the concerns and stories of individuals who live in a crime and disorder-ridden neighborhood. In as much as these displays conflict with an officer’s own self-definitions and internally held values, these conditions are likely to constitute emotional labor and may have vast implications for the psychological well being of officers.

Third, aside from the antecedents of emotional labor produced by the unique location of policing in society and the emotionally volatile nature of the job, law enforcement also possesses a number of unique organizational and demographic features that make it an interesting domain for the study of emotional labor. In particular, the traditionally masculine character of police

work and male-dominated face of its occupants, its quasi-military structure, the interdependence of colleagues for support and safety, and the autonomous nature of police work all have relevance for emotional labor and potentially serve as important moderators and aggravators of emotional labor. Therefore, within policing there are certain innate structural and cultural characteristics that are likely to aggravate or mediate the impact of emotional labor.

Finally, given the unique conditions described above and the potential for a discrepancy between expectations imposed upon officers and their own internal self-definitions, and the unique job characteristics likely to aggravate such discrepancies, it should be no surprise that law enforcement officers experience a higher prevalence of certain adverse phenomena relative to other professions. In particular, it has been widely documented that police have higher rates of substance abuse, divorce, suicide, cynicism, burnout, job dissatisfaction, and lower morale than members of other professions (Gilmartin 2002; Brown and Campbell 1990; Violanti 1996). While other causes, especially the innately dangerous nature of police work have been proposed as the primary cause for these adverse consequences, to date emotional labor has not been fully explored or ruled out as an additional causal factor. Undoubtedly, the emotional labor that the men and women of law enforcement endure over the course of their careers is likely to serve as a substantial aggravator of these and other problems. As such, it is important to better understand the dynamics that contribute to such issues.

Given the unique social structural position of policing in our society, its peculiar organizational and demographic tendencies and pressures, and the necessity that its officers utilize a broad range of emotion work in the execution of their duties, it seems that law enforcement provides fertile ground for the study of emotional labor. It is the purpose of the present work to explore the antecedents and consequences of emotional labor within policing. It

is proposed that a better understanding of the specific role that emotional labor plays in policing will help police administrators better understand the impact and social psychology of emotion within policing. It is also posited that with more information about the role of emotion in policing, a reconsideration of current practices and policies can occur in which potentially detrimental practices are replaced or supplemented with those that better meet the emotional and psychological needs of officers.



## CHAPTER TWO

### EMOTIONAL LABOR THEORY AND POLICING

Emotional labor finds its theoretical underpinnings in structural Marxism, Symbolic Interactionism, and Goffman's Dramaturgical Perspective. As such, it presents an excellent framework for understanding the interconnection of macro- and micro- phenomenon. In particular, it provides insight into how societal conditions structure our experience and expression as individuals, and accentuates the fact that certain social arrangements are likely to have an array of consequences for the individual. This being said, a brief review of the theory and literature on emotional labor is necessary prior to applying it to the present concern with the emotional labor of policing.

In Arlie Hochschild's (1983) seminal work, she notes some social structural pre-conditions of emotional labor in modern society. In particular, she suggests that as a result of growing competition and a general trend toward growth in the service sector, corporations have become increasingly interested in portraying a more customer-service oriented image to their clientele. To achieve such an image, corporations subtly attempt to control the emotional displays of their employees. In doing so, corporate practices exploit stereotypical and sexually loaded role definitions of behavior in order to appease and satisfy customer expectations, requiring laborers to act in a manner that is not necessarily consistent with their own self-definitions. She further argues that in as much as these corporate or organizational expectations contradict one's internal self-conceptions and guides for behavior, laborers are likely to experience a strong sense of inauthenticity, alienation, and consequently dissatisfaction and burnout.

Corporate control and manipulation of expression is not problematic in and of itself for the average employee. In fact, in as much as an individual's self is institutionally grounded and truly embraces organizational expectations as their own, it may be beneficial and rewarding for the individual in that it verifies the self-concept and identities of the individual (Turner 1976; Swann 1983; Gecas 1982; Burke 1991). The problem with emotional labor emerges when an individual does not internally embrace and accept the expectations imposed upon them as one's own, yet is forced or compelled to act in a manner consistent with those expectations. Hochschild and others label this discrepancy between internal standards and expressive action 'emotive dissonance', and identify two primary means through which such a disjuncture may be carried out through Goffman's (1959) concepts of deep acting and surface acting.

Individuals engage in 'deep acting' when they attempt to artificially relate to and embrace organizational expectations by placing themselves in an altered state of mind, much like a stage actor might do when employing 'method' acting (Goffman 1959; Stanislavsky 1948). In other words, they are putting themselves 'in character' to deal with a situation in a manner consistent with the organizational expectations of their employers (Hochschild 1983). When an individual is deep acting, they are eliciting deep emotions and feelings within themselves that are consistent with organizational expectations, even though internally they might not be in complete agreement. In essence then, individuals temporarily fool themselves into believing in the expectations long enough to carry off the presentation and get the job done. This self-deception is likely to have deep consequences for the individual's sense of authenticity and alienate them from their labor (Hochschild 1983).

When deep acting is not a desirable option, individuals are also able to feign compliance with corporate or organizational expectations at a more superficial level (Hochschild 1983).

Through ‘surface acting’ individuals may engage in actions that support the organizational expectations, yet internally the actor feels no allegiance to those same expectations (Goffman 1959; Hochschild 1983). In other words, when an actor engages in ‘surface acting’ they are in essence going through the motions as a result of external pressures while maintaining their own expectations and standards without manipulation. Thus, actors avoid external consequences by superficially meeting expectations, while internally they may be apathetic or resentful toward the expectations imposed upon them. If surface acting is a persistent presence, it is likely to substantially alienate laborers from their work and lead to a variety of other adverse consequences.

Extant theory on emotional labor posits that only through disjuncture between action and feeling, as occurs in surface and deep acting, does emotional labor have any negative consequences for the individual. More specifically, without the presence of some form of acting, there is little opportunity for emotive dissonance to emerge. Therefore, both surface and deep acting are integral to the experience of emotive dissonance and emotional labor. This being said, surface and deep acting have relatively limited impact by themselves. As such, it is important to understand some of the factors that have been determined to interact with and mediate the consequences of acting contrary to one’s self-definitions, or in other words, emotional labor. Past research has identified a number of job characteristics having an impact on broad domains of self and psychological functioning (Kohn and Schooler 1969, 1971, 1973). Given their demonstrated impact on other areas of self, these characteristics are also likely to play a significant role in aggravating or moderating emotional labor. A brief discussion of the literature on job characteristics and their relevance for the study of emotional labor is in order.

One of the most significant contributions to understanding the impact of job characteristics on social psychological functioning comes from the work of Kohn and Schooler (1973, 1978, 1981, 1982, 1983). In their studies of work and personality, Kohn and Schooler suggest that specific structural conditions of work are likely to have significant impacts on the individual. This is supported in their repeated findings that more self-direction and complexity in work are beneficial to the psychological functioning of individuals, while more managerial control and routineness of tasks have adverse consequences. This being so, it is likely that specific job characteristics are also important mediating and aggravating factors in emotional labor. In particular, five factors identified by Kohn and Schooler are of particular relevance to the study of emotional labor: Status, Autonomy, Closeness of Supervision, Substantive Complexity, and Routineness of Task.

The degree of autonomy workers experience in their work environment appears to be one of the most salient factors affecting psychological functioning and personality. Specifically, those individuals who are subject to less managerial control and are given more latitude and discretion in how they execute their work functions are much more likely to have psychologically beneficial experiences than others. Presumably, this is due to the fact that when given the latitude to act autonomously, individuals can develop a stronger sense of ownership and identification with their decisions and products. This being so, individuals in more autonomous labor arrangements should be less likely to experience adverse effects of emotional labor because autonomy affords them the latitude to act consistently with their internally held self-definitions and expectations for emotional expression. Therefore, individuals with less autonomy and greater managerial control should be more likely to experience emotive

dissonance, while those with greater autonomy and less managerial control should be less likely to experience emotive dissonance.

In addition to autonomy, the complexity and variety of work tasks should also have significant implications for emotional labor. In particular, those tasks that are more complex and less routine should significantly mediate the impacts of emotive dissonance. Past research has demonstrated that individuals subject to routine and simple tasks are likely to be less satisfied, more alienated, and generally less psychologically healthy than those with more complex and novel tasks (Spenner 1988; Spenner and Otto 1985; Miller et al 1979; Mortimer et al 1986). It appears this is the case because simple and routine tasks are less intrinsically rewarding and self-verifying, and are more monotonous than more complex and challenging activities. To complicate matters further, simple and routine tasks are often paired with repeated emotional transactions with customers that are likely to contradict one's internal values and self-definitions. Under such circumstances it is likely that emotive dissonance will be considerably aggravated. As such, those individuals who perceive their work as being more complex and novel should be significantly less likely to experience the adverse effects of emotional labor. In contrast, those who are subject to routine and simple tasks should be more likely to experience emotive dissonance.

Aside from the general characteristics of labor identified above, a number of specific characteristics of emotional management have also been identified. In particular, it has been posited that the qualitative nature and quantity of various acts of emotion management in work are important in determining the degree of impact work has on emotive dissonance (Morris and Feldman 1996, 1997). Past research has identified six factors which are likely to condition the impacts of emotional labor, including its: frequency, intensity, variety, duration, level of deep

acting required, and level of surface acting required (Brotheridge and Lee 1998, 2003; Brotheridge and Grandley 2002).

In general, the magnitude and kinds of emotion management required by a job should play a significant role in moderating or aggravating the impact of emotive dissonance. Those jobs where employees are required to frequently adapt their emotions to comply with customer and managerial demands should experience greater emotive dissonance. Likewise, those jobs with little variety and a great deal of repetition in dissonant behavior are more likely to aggravate the dissonance of employees. Further, those jobs where individuals must act contrary to their internal definitions for a substantial duration should experience greater emotive dissonance. Finally, jobs that require more intense interactions, and therefore more detailed and involved expression management, should be more detrimental in terms of emotive dissonance.

In addition to the four factors cited above, extant theory also suggests that the degree to which one is required to engage in either surface or deep acting is likely to produce varying degrees of emotive dissonance (Hochschild 1983; Steinberg and Figart 1999). Of the two forms of acting, deep acting should produce the greatest degree of emotive dissonance for individuals as it requires literally fooling one's self. When discovered or realized, this self-deception can be incredibly traumatic in the sense that it leaves individuals with a deep sense of inauthenticity. In contrast, surface acting allows an escape from dissonance in the sense that less is compromised psychologically. In other words, because those individuals engaging in surface acting are essentially going through the motions, they are not as invested in the actions of expression as deep actors. Therefore, by virtue of their relative psychological distance from the dissonant behavior, and rationalization of the behavior as a necessary evil, surface acting should not have such a profound effect upon them as deep acting. Despite this, surface acting can be equally

detrimental to the degree that it is a persistent reality in the individual's work-life. Thus, in their own unique ways, both deep and surface acting have implications for the experience of emotive dissonance.

In addition to the basic characteristics of work identified above, the structural demands for expression or suppression of emotion in one's position has also been suggested as being likely to have a significant impact on emotive dissonance. Best et al (1997) have developed the Emotional Work Requirements Scale that measures two such important factors, including: the requirement to express emotion, and the requirement to suppress emotion. The requirement of emotional expression is consistent with Hochschild's initial observations and theory about emotional labor in that employees are expected to overtly act in a manner consistent with managerial expectations. This is problematic inasmuch as the individual is internally experiencing feelings and emotions contrary to those they are outwardly expressing. On the other hand, emotional suppression mandates that employees refrain from expressing emotion in order to maintain consistency between their behavior and managerial expectations. The core commonality between expression and suppression is the mandate that employees are required to engage in emotional displays contrary to their internal inclinations thereby invoking a sense of emotive dissonance. As such it is important to understand the degree to which employees are required by their jobs to either express or suppress internally experienced emotions.

Another element of work environment likely to have a significant impact on emotive dissonance comes from the pressures or support of co-workers. Specifically, Hochschild (1983) suggests that "collective emotion management" should be an important factor in the degree of emotive dissonance experienced by employees. If fellow employees and supervisors attempt to support one another in carrying out corporate expectations, it should significantly aid in

individual employees private and internal ability to appropriately manage their emotions. As such, a high degree of support from co-workers should significantly mediate the effects of emotive dissonance. In contrast, if adequate support does not exist, or co-workers or supervisors outright reject compliance with corporate expectations, emotive dissonance could be significantly aggravated. Thus, the degree to which co-workers are supportive or unsupportive should be a significant mediator or aggravator of emotive dissonance.

Finally, numerous scholars have identified the importance of work in shaping one's self-concept (Spenner 1988; Mortimer et al 1986; Gecas 1982). As such, a key factor likely to aggravate or mediate the impact of emotive dissonance is an individual's identification with their work. In particular, the degree to which an individual identifies work as an important and central part of their self-concept should have a significant impact on emotive dissonance. Those individuals who have a strong work identity should observe more positive impacts from emotional labor in as much as their own identity is confirmed by organizational expectations. Likewise, those who have a strong work identity that is inconsistent with corporate expectations should experience significantly more negative impacts. For those individuals with relatively weaker work identities emotive dissonance should not have as significant an impact in either direction as it does for those with work identities that are highly central. Thus, the degree to which an individual holds their work identity as central to themselves, and the degree to which that identity supports or rejects corporate expectations should act as a significant moderator or aggravator of emotive dissonance.

Having briefly discussed the potential aggravators of emotive dissonance, one might question how emotive dissonance might affect the individual. One of the primary consequences of emotive dissonance identified by Hochschild is the experience of in-authenticity. Because



individuals who experience emotive dissonance are repeatedly acting in contrast to their own internally held values and self-concepts, they are keenly aware that they are being untrue to themselves and others. This stands in opposition to the basic human drive to act consistently with one's internal self-definitions (Turner 1976; Gecas 1991). Consequently, individuals are likely to suffer from a broad range of residual outcomes including job dissatisfaction, burnout, alienation, and cynicism. Thus, inasmuch as the emotive dissonance is aggravated by the factors identified above, and produces some degree of in-authenticity, workers subjected to emotional labor are likely to experience an array of adverse consequences. The purpose of this study is to better understand which factors contribute to the proliferation of these adverse consequences amongst police officers, and to provide a better general understanding of which social psychological factors are most likely to have a significant impact on adverse consequences.

Given our understanding of the underlying theory of emotional labor, identified aggravating and mediating factors, and its potential adverse consequences, it is now necessary to discuss the unique aspects of policing which are likely to contribute to the experience of emotional labor and emotive dissonance. As such, the following section will detail the unique elements of policing that are likely to contribute to the experience of emotive dissonance, and produce a number of predictable and widely documented consequences.

### **The Emotional Labor of Policing**

In many ways, modern urban and suburban law enforcement agencies operate much like any other service-sector corporation. The Chief or Sheriff act as the chief executive officer and/or chief financial officer with their subordinates acting as vice presidents, unit and division managers, mid-level supervisors, on down the line. Modern police agencies are also often accountable to a corporate board in the form of the City Council or County Commission.

However, the similarities do not stop here. Much like modern corporations, modern police agencies are also pre-eminently concerned with the perceptions of their customer-base, efficient operation, and ultimate supremacy over the competition. As such, modern police agencies and their employees are equally susceptible to the conditions that produce emotional labor. The purpose of this section is to further discuss the features of law enforcement and its occupants that are likely to produce emotional labor.

Traditionally, police agencies have held a virtual monopoly on the function of law enforcement and order-maintenance in modern western societies. As a consequence, there has been little incentive for them to compete by providing a customer-satisfaction oriented service. As such, the primary focus of traditional police agencies has been on professionally fulfilling law enforcement and order maintenance functions. In order to do so, police agencies have trained their officers to be physically and emotionally tough, authoritative, distant, assertive, professional, and efficient with little emphasis on public or customer-relations (Kelling and Moore 1988; Trojanowicz and Buceroux 1990). The net consequence of such practices has been a divide between police and the communities that they are responsible for enforcing the laws of and maintaining order within.

Beginning in the 1960's, however, the face of policing began to change. Much like Hochschild observed in the airline industry during the same time-period, police agencies were forced to become more cognizant of the needs perceived by their customer-base, albeit for different reasons. Due to the proliferation of private security, and increased competition from other enforcement-based government organizations, modern police agencies were forced to redefine and expand their long-held niche within society. To further complicate matters, at roughly the same time, civil disobedience became the preferred method of activism regarding the

war in Vietnam, civil rights, and the sexual revolution. As a consequence of this strife and underlying conflict within society, police were often pitted against the people and viewed as lackeys for the powers that be, serving to oppress the will of the people. In response, the police were in need of a new image that redefined their role and function in society, and reduced the distance felt between police and some elements of the public. The answer was what we have come to refer to today as “community-oriented policing” or the “community/problem-solving era of policing.”

During the community/problem-solving era of policing, which by most accounts we still occupy today, the police began to adopt a more customer-oriented approach to policing. As an outcome, police agencies began to transition from the traditional expectations imposed upon their employees of being tough, distant, professional, and efficient law enforcers to a kinder gentler image with a public-relations focus. Unlike other service-sector industries, however, which had always been more or less customer-oriented, police agencies still confronted the problem of serving the basic underlying functions of law enforcement and order maintenance they had always served. Thus, simultaneously police were expected to fulfill the functions of law enforcement and order maintenance, and to provide customer, or in this case, community-oriented service. These underlying conditions present a significant and troublesome paradox for police agencies and their officers (Lurigio and Skogan 1994; Wycoff and Skogan 1994; Mastroski et al 1995). Specifically, is it possible to be both community-oriented and fulfill the traditional function of order maintenance and law enforcement?

As a product of this paradox, modern police agencies impose two distinct sets of role expectations upon their employees. On the one hand, under traditional expectations, officers are expected to be physically and emotionally tough, distant, professional, and efficient in carrying

out their duties to maintain public order, enforce the law, and preserve officer safety. On the other hand, under the expectations of community-oriented policing, it is expected of officers that they be warm, understanding, and compassionate toward the members of the communities they police. As a consequence of the structural paradox identified above, law enforcement officers are simultaneously placed in the position of acting as both the “toe” and the “heel.” The result being that officers are placed in the precarious psychological position of determining which self to present to the public, and more generally determining which self should endure in the daily practice of their careers, and sometimes daily lives. To further complicate matters, norms for when one style of behavior is appropriate over another are nearly always ambiguous and seldom present (Kelling and Pate 1973; Hunt 1983).

As a further complication to the structural paradox identified above, a wide range of personalities are drawn to law enforcement as a career. Some more progressive personalities wholly embrace the premises of community-oriented policing as noble and necessary, while others with more traditional attitudes tend to reject them wholesale in favor of “real police work,” otherwise referred to as “RPW.” Depending upon which perspective an officer tends to favor, he or she may have difficulties with executing the role expectations associated with either traditional policing or community oriented policing.

On the one hand, progressive and community-oriented officers may experience a great deal of dissonance as a consequence of repeated negative interactions with the criminal element, and little contact with the more conforming and conventional portion of the population<sup>1</sup> (Van

---

<sup>1</sup> Ironically, the experience of newer officers likely to come in with a progressive view of policing is to be put on graveyard or night shifts where the bulk of their contact is negative. This likely contributes to a gradual degradation and decay of their progressive values toward community-oriented policing. Likewise, once they sustain enough tenure to get them into a

Maanen 1973, 1975). As a consequence, they may become alienated by virtue of constantly having to act contrary to their internally held values of community-oriented policing. In contrast, more reactionary and traditional officers may find repeated interaction with the conforming public taking routine reports, and listening to citizen concerns incredibly difficult because it does not conform to their view of themselves as emotionally and physically tough, professional, and efficient crime fighters. As a consequence, they may come to view themselves as “secretaries with guns,” and consequently become further alienated from their work. Therefore, depending upon which perspective an officer is coming from, and the nature of their current duty assignment, all officers are likely to experience some degree of emotive dissonance in as much as they are incapable of reconciling the competing sets of expectations imposed upon them with their own internal values and self-definitions.

Given that nearly all officers are likely to experience some degree of emotive dissonance on a regular basis due to the factors above, it is important to identify some features of law enforcement as an occupation that is likely to aggravate or mediate value dissonance. As such, a discussion of the specific aggravating and mediating features of law enforcement on emotive dissonance and emotional labor is now in order.

An important element of the experience of emotive dissonance has a great deal to do with the self-concept and self-processes. If officers have no conflicts between themselves and the expectations imposed upon them, dissonance should be at a minimum. Likewise, if there is a great deal of dissonance between one’s self-perception and the expectations imposed upon an officer, that dissonance has an array of potentially adverse consequences. As such, one

---

dayshift position where community-oriented activities are more likely, they are likely to be on the opposite side of the spectrum resulting in further alienation.

important element in understanding the emotional labor of police officers is an understanding of the centrality of the “cop” identity to many if not all officers.

The “cop” identity is the product of a number of interesting factors. First, by virtue of their function and special powers to maintain order and enforce the law, law enforcement officers are often treated as a distinct subset of the population apart from the average citizen. In other words, one is either a “cop” or a citizen. Second, unlike many other professions, cops constantly rely upon one another for their safety. Consequently, officers tend to develop highly cohesive peer networks. Third, because of the perception of constant physical threat, some officers come to believe that they can never trust anyone besides other cops, and sometimes not even them until they’ve proven their trustworthiness. Finally, because of the unique qualities of the three factors above, it is often perceived by officers that it is difficult if not impossible for the average citizen to relate to them. This is evident in the commonly espoused statement that “no one knows what it’s like to be a cop until you’ve worked in the field.” Thus, as a consequence of the factors above, officers are often placed in the position of being isolated and alienated from the general public (Skolnick 1966; Trojanowicz 1971).

Due to the unique social conditions identified above, officers tend to develop strong identities as “cops.” This is a potential aggravator of emotive dissonance, inasmuch as a police officer’s self-identification conflicts with the expectations imposed upon him or her. If officers have strong and highly central identities as traditional police officers, but happen to work a highly community-oriented detail or under a very community-oriented administration, then they are likely to experience more emotive dissonance than officers with more community-oriented identities. Likewise, if an officer has a strong community-oriented identity as a police officer, and works a detail in which they are constantly required to act more in line with traditional

expectations of police officers, then they too are likely to experience dissonance. In contrast, if an officer's duty assignment and identity are highly compatible with one another, they are likely to benefit from the centrality of their identity and its consistency with their duties. Thus, depending upon the degree to which officers' identities are central, and the degree to which they are consistent or inconsistent with their duties, officers should be predictably more or less likely to experience emotive dissonance.

Given the close-knit peer culture of police officers in the field, and their constant reliance upon one another for support and safety, peers are likely to play a substantial role in the process identified above in as much as they exert social pressures to conform to one set of expectations over another. This makes the observation of line-level culture as generally resistant to community-oriented policing all that much more relevant. More specifically, in an atmosphere hostile to community-oriented policing, it should be much more likely that officers sanction community-oriented activities and reward traditional activities producing a great deal of dissonance for those individuals who internally identify with a community-oriented policing identity. Likewise, for the members of the line-level culture resistant to community-oriented principles, they will be likely to have their traditionally-based identities verified, and thereby mediate any dissonance they might otherwise be experiencing.

Due to the para-militaristic structure of modern police agencies, supervisors are also likely to exert a significant influence over the emotive dissonance experienced by officers (Aldag and Brief 1978; Engel 2000; Reuss-Ianni and Ianni 1983; Wycoff and Skogan 1994). However, given certain practices and trends in policing, this effect should be in the opposite direction of that posed by the rank and file culture. Specifically, most promotional examinations in modern police agencies require candidates to display some degree of knowledge and the ability to apply

community-policing principles, as such those individuals occupying supervisory positions should assumedly also possess some degree of buy-in and commitment to community-oriented policing principles. In addition to personal buy-in, supervisors should be compelled to espouse community-oriented principles by virtue of the demands upon their position. In other words, given the emphasis which modern police agencies place upon community-oriented policing, it would be logical to conclude that supervisors should generally feel some degree of pressure to see that a community-oriented emphasis is carried out through the execution of their duties. Given this, officers are likely to face yet another source of emotive dissonance depending upon the degree to which the practices of their supervisors either match or conflict with their own personally held identification with community-oriented or traditional values.

Another factor likely to have a significant impact on the degree of emotive dissonance experienced by officers is gender (Martin 1979, 1980, 1990, 1996, 1999). In particular, women must confront a number of complications when they have selected a career in law enforcement. Policing has traditionally been and continues to be a male-dominated field that highly values and rewards masculine traits and behaviors and often rejects more feminine aspects as completely inappropriate. As such, women confront a disadvantage in terms of social pressures from the very start. This being so, many women in law enforcement are likely to accentuate and amplify their more masculine attitudes and behaviors in order to secure social support and acceptance, especially given that there is likely already a great deal of skepticism about their capability to effectively do their jobs. Second, due to the relatively high attrition of women in policing who leave the field to rear children, or because they find it is not an appropriate fit, the demographics of women in police work are likely to be such that women are likely to be younger, have less tenure, be more educated, and be more progressive than many of their counterparts and therefore



more likely to embrace the values and principles of community-oriented policing. This high value for community-oriented policing, and relatively low status within the police hierarchy, along with the battle to engender support and acceptance from peers as cited above, should result in substantially greater emotive dissonance on the part of females. Thus, women are likely to confront a number of unique disadvantages innate to police work and culture which result in substantially greater emotional labor<sup>2</sup>.

In sum, by virtue of its unique social structural position, contemporary trends, the underlying culture of policing, and unique job characteristics, officers of law enforcement are likely to experience a combination of factors contributing to emotional labor and emotive dissonance unparalleled in any other profession. As a consequence, in as much as officers are incapable of coping with this multitude of pressures, officers are also likely to experience a number of adverse consequences to a greater degree than other professions. This is evidenced by the fact that among all professions, law enforcement tends to have higher levels of alcoholism, drug abuse, divorce, and suicide than other professions (Gilmartin 2002; Brown and Campbell 1990; Violanti 1996). In addition, it has been widely suggested that officers suffer from higher levels of burnout, cynicism, and alienation than occupants of other professions (Cannizo and Liu 1995). The purpose of the present research is to assess how the unique conditions cited above contribute to the experience of emotive dissonance, and consequently to a number of adverse consequences. Developing a better understanding of such phenomena has both the potential to further enlighten research on emotional labor and benefit law enforcement administrators.

---

<sup>2</sup> Men too are likely to experience their own unique pressures of emotional labor as a consequence of policing. In particular, Hochschild argues that men are substantially less prepared to cope with emotional labor than women. As such, men might have a great deal more difficulty coping with emotional labor than women, especially those placed in roles where emotional labor is more greatly demanded than others.

## **Hypotheses**

Based on the theory above, the purpose of the present study is to assess how various emotional features of law enforcement impact emotional labor. Specifically, the present study seeks to examine how factors like job characteristics, individual characteristics, and emotional demands of work have main, interacting, or mediating effects on the relationship between role dissonance experienced by officers and adverse psychological outcomes. The present study seeks to address each of the following hypotheses independently in regard to the dependent variables of cynicism and burnout:

Hypothesis 1: The greater the emotional management required of officers, the greater will be their levels of cynicism and burnout.

Hypothesis 2: The greater the dissonance between officer's own values and those of various reference groups, the greater will be their reported levels of cynicism and burnout.

Hypothesis 3: In combination, value dissonance and emotional labor should produce higher levels of cynicism and burnout than either would independently produce.

Hypothesis 4: In combination, identity centrality and value dissonance should produce higher levels of cynicism and burnout than either would independently produce.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **DATA AND METHODS**

#### **Data and Sample**

The proposed study uses data from a survey administered to 153 officers employed by the Spokane Police Department and assigned to the Uniformed Patrol Division. The survey was administered in July of 2005 at which point responding officers were likely to have had at least 6 months in their present assignment. The survey was administered during roll-call sessions occurring at the beginning of each 10-person team's shift. Officers were given approximately ½ hour to complete the 8-page survey. Participation in the survey was voluntary and no personal identifiers were included in the survey so that results would remain confidential. The sample is representative of the demographics of the department's patrol division, and has a high response rate (n=109). Due to the nature of the sample, external validity is admittedly weak. Despite this fact, the data are expected to serve adequately in testing the theoretical hypotheses derived and presented here.

#### **Dependent Variables**

As stated previously, the proposed study will assess effects on two different sets of dependent variables measuring adverse psychological characteristics widely experienced by police officers as a consequence of their work conditions. These variables are only a select few among many potential adverse consequences officers are theorized to experience as a product of emotional labor and/or adverse working conditions.

*Cynicism.* Beginning with Niederhoffer's (1967) study of police recruits in New York City, numerous studies have assessed the cynicism police officers are at risk of developing throughout their careers. The measure of cynicism used here is a contemporary adaptation of

Niederhoffer's scale used to assess the cynicism of police recruits. Since the scale's inception, several authors have adapted and refined the scale to incorporate Likert-scaling thereby improving variability (Hickman et al 2004; Regoli 1976). The scale items used for the present study reflect these contemporary adaptations by providing respondents with a variety of cynical statements and asking them to state the degree to which they agree or disagree with each statement (strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, neither agree nor disagree = 3, disagree = 2, strongly disagree = 1). For example, using the response categories presented above, respondents were asked the degree to which "The public is more likely to obstruct police work than cooperate." Assessment of the scale reliability suggested that the full scale did not possess a high enough degree of inter-item correlation. As such, a number of items from the broader scale were excluded. The subsequent scale possessed an overall reliability of .65.

*Burnout.* Given the stressful nature of policing described above, a high rate of burnout has been identified among law enforcement officers. In order to measure burnout, the present study has adopted 13 items from a widely used 22-item measure developed by Maslach et al (1996). This measure is designed to tap into three dimensions of burnout, including: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Specifically, the scale asks respondents to state how frequently they experience each of the listed phenomena related to various elements of burnout (0=Never, 1=Once in a While, 2= Some of the Time, 3 = Most of the Time, 4= All of the Time). For example, using the response categories above, officers were asked to report the degree to which "working with people all day is really a strain." Analysis of the inter-item correlation between scale items indicates that the selected measures have an alpha reliability of .76.

## **Logic of Analysis**

Using OLS regression, each of the hypotheses presented above was assessed with attention to their effects on cynicism and burnout. Prior to the final analysis which combined all variables of interest, the hypotheses regarding the independent effects of each specific class of variables was assessed with demographic controls included. These results were written up in individual chapters with the intention of identifying which dimensions of the selected independent variables have the most noteworthy effects. In doing so, results from these limited analyses were utilized to determine the independent variables and interactions that were included in the final models. Results are presented in five distinct chapters assessing: The Independent Effects of Emotion Management, The Independent Effects of Value Dissonance, The Interactive Effects of Dissonance and Emotion, The Independent and Interactive Effects of Identity and Dissonance, and Final Combined Models.

Within each of these chapters, a series of multivariate OLS regressions is presented which examine distinct dimensions of the hypothesized relationships. These results are compared in their effects on cynicism and burnout and in relation to one another. Given that the sample size in the present data is relatively small, increasing the risk of Type II errors, traditional measures of statistical significance were expanded to include what has been referred to as substantive significance. As such, all relationships that attain significance beyond the .15 level and have a standardized effect greater than .100 will be discussed. In adopting this practice, it is understood that these effects are tentative in nature given the elevated risk for Type I errors; however, given their relative strength and the nature of the sample it seems worthwhile to discuss the possibility of such effects.

## **Control Variables**

In order to assess the proposed hypotheses, a number of demographic controls will be incorporated into all analyses. Specifically, the present study will assess the theorized effects of: sex, minority status, education, tenure as a police officer, and age. Control variables exhibiting a significant effect will be included in all subsequent analyses. The impact of each of these control variables will be briefly discussed.

According to the Uniform Crime Reports published annually by the FBI, almost 75% of law enforcement officers in the United States during 2004 were male. As such, despite the general trend toward feminization of the broader work force, policing remains a relatively male-dominated occupation. Along with this fact comes the reality that the culture of policing is extraordinarily masculine resulting in a climate into which women often have difficulty fully infiltrating. Thus, sex is perhaps one of the principal variables that should be controlled for in any study of policing.

In the present study, female officers comprise only 12% of the sample. This number is significantly lower than the general proportion of female police officers in the United States; however, it is representative of the proportion of female officers within the Spokane Police Department. Given this unusually high ratio of male to female officers in our sample, it is important to note what effects the sexual assignment of officers has on cynicism and burnout. In order to do this, a dummy variable coded to reflect being female was regressed independently on both selected dependent variables, respectively: burnout and cynicism.

	Burnout	Cynicism
Female	.007 (.912)	.165* (1.208)
R - Squared	.000	.027*

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

Results presented in Table 1 suggest that there are no significant differences between male and female officers in regards to levels of either cynicism or burnout. Despite this failure to achieve accepted levels of significance, sex does exhibit what has been referred to as a substantive effect on cynicism. Stated another way, the standardized effect of sex on cynicism exceeds .100 with the probability of a type I error (alpha) exceeding .15. Given the relatively limited sample size and the small number of women in the sample, it seems reasonable to hold the effects of sex constant in any subsequent analyses.

Much as female officers are underrepresented among police populations, minority officers are also dramatically underrepresented. This paired with the long and sordid history of police-minority relationships in the United States, and the inherently differential experience of minorities in our society makes minority status an important demographic control. Specifically, one would expect to find that minorities have more progressive views of policing than the mainstream. This might lead to differential levels of both cynicism and burnout depending upon the degree to which one's experience corresponds with these views.

Almost 14% of the respondents in the present sample reported being of non-white or Hispanic origin. This is consistent with the Spokane Police Department's overall demographics. In order to assess the effects of minority status on our selected dependent variables of cynicism

and burnout, a dummy variable was coded to reflect one's origin as non-white or Hispanic. This variable was regressed on both cynicism and burnout. Results are presented below.

Table 2. Standardized Effect of Minority Status on Burnout and Cynicism

	Burnout	Cynicism
Minority	.078 (.834)	.098 (1.109)
R - Squared	.006	.010

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .05$ , \*  $p < .15$

The results presented in Table 2 indicate that minority status does not exhibit any significant effects on either cynicism or burnout. Moreover, none of the coefficients reach the substantive criteria previously established. Once again, the failure to show significant effects may be a product of small sample size or the small number of minority officers in the sample. Given the lack of significance, and failure to meet our established criteria of substantive significance, minority status will be excluded as a control in subsequent analysis in order to maintain as many degrees of freedom as possible given the relatively limited sample size.

Another control of theoretical interest to the present study is level of education. Historically, police agencies have not strongly valued higher education. As a consequence, law enforcement has been heavily criticized for its failure to integrate progressive ideas, or attract the best and brightest. In response to this deficit, beginning in the 1960's many agencies began recruiting on college campuses, and offering signing bonuses and pay incentives to college graduates. Given the unique perspective such candidates are likely to bring into policing; it would seem that education is an important control for subsequent analyses.

In the present sample, roughly 40% of respondents reported achieving a bachelor's degree or higher. As such, police officers in general have a higher level of education than the



population they are policing (approximately 25% in Spokane at the time of the study). In order to assess what effects one’s education has on levels of cynicism and burnout, an ordinal scale measuring level of education was regressed on both the dependent variables. Results of this regression are presented in Table 3.

	Burnout	Cynicism
Education	-.026 (.242)	-.018 (.323)
R - Squared	.001	.000

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

Despite theoretical reasoning to the contrary, one’s education level has no discernible or significant effects on levels of either cynicism or burnout. Interestingly, while not significant, the effect has a negative association with the adverse consequences of cynicism and burnout. In other words, the greater one’s level of education, the less likely one is to experience burnout or cynicism. Given the lack of significance, education will be excluded from subsequent analyses to maintain as many degrees of freedom for other variables given the relatively limited sample size.

Of all control measures likely to impact burnout and cynicism, perhaps the most relevant is the amount of time one has been a police officer. Studies of work have long demonstrated that time as an officer has significant adverse effects such as cynicism and burnout (Cannizo and Liu 1995). Given this, it is important to control for the potential effects of time on dependent variables. In order to assess the potential effects of time as a police officer, respondents were asked to report the number of years they had worked as a police officer. This measure was then regressed independently on both cynicism and burnout to assess potential effects. Results are presented in Table 4.

	Burnout	Cynicism
Tenure	.094 (.214)	-.063 (.289)
R - Squared	.009	.004

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .05$ , \*  $p < .15$

There are no significant bivariate effects of tenure on either cynicism or burnout.

Moreover, where there was a positive association expected between cynicism and tenure as a police officer, the results reveal a weak and non-significant negative association. This stands in contrast to the expected positive effect found between tenure and burnout. Taken together, these findings suggest that tenure does not have a significant effect in the present data. In order to be certain that there are no significant effects, the highly correlated variable of age was also regressed on the dependent variables for comparative purposes. Results are presented in Table 5.

	Burnout	Cynicism
Age	.077 (.338)	-.124 (.453)
R - Squared	.006	.015

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .05$ , \*  $p < .15$

As was the case with tenure, age also failed to exhibit a significant effect on either burnout or cynicism. Despite this, age does have a slightly more significant effect on cynicism than tenure. Although not statistically significant, this lends further credence to the idea that a counter-intuitive relationship does exist between cynicism and age/tenure. In this case, the effect may be a product of the specific sample we are using to assess the hypotheses at hand.

Specifically, during recent years, the Spokane Police Department has been forced to make

dramatic cuts in which a number of younger officers had to be laid off. Considering this, it makes sense that in the present sample, younger officers might be more cynical than older officers who are more secure in their careers. Given this and the stronger effects of age in this case, age will be used as a control in subsequent analyses.

As a final test of the effect of control variables on the dependent variables, all controls presented above were included in a combined OLS model and regressed on each of the dependent variables. Results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. The Effects of Demographic Controls On Burnout and Cynicism

Variables	Burnout	Cynicism
Sex	.011 (.959)	0.185* (1.263)
Minority	-.044 (1.183)	.003 (1.559)
Education	-.032 (.254)	-.059 (.334)
Age	.077 (.343)	-.125 (.453)
R - Squared	.009	.047

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .05$ , \*  $p < .15$

Incorporating the controls into an integrated model did not yield results substantially different from the bivariate analyses. Specifically, sex and age are the only two control variables that approached our pre-determined criteria for substantive significance (a standardized beta of .1 or greater), and only did so in regards to their effects on cynicism. All in all, the combined model explained less than 1% of the variance in burnout, and less than 5% in cynicism. As would be expected, most of the variance in both models was attributable to sex and age with minimal changes in the measures of association resulting from inclusion of the other non-

significant variables (education and minority status). Given this, age and sex are the only demographic controls that will be included in subsequent analyses.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### THE IMPACT OF EMOTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

A critical factor in explaining the impact of emotional labor on the individual is the degree and types of emotional expression one is required to engage in as a part of their work. In order to measure the frequency, intensity, variety and duration of emotional expression, the proposed study adapted a number of measures from two prominent scales used in past research on emotional labor: Brotheridge and Lee's (2003) Emotional Labor Scale and Best et al.'s (1998) Emotional Work Requirements Scale. Items selected from these scales ask respondents to express how frequently they are required to engage in specific types of emotional expression as part of their work with possible response categories of: 'Not At All', 'Seldom', 'Often', 'Usually', or 'Always'). These measures provide indicators of frequency for a broad range of emotional expression or suppression that might be required in one's work. In addition, items intended to assess the specific emotions experienced by individuals were also collected. These measures are drawn from the work of Erickson and Ritter (2001). For this set of questions, respondents are asked to express whether they have expressed or suppressed each of the following emotions as a part of their work over the past week: Anger, Shame, Calm, Excitement, Guilt, Joy, Helplessness, Irritation, Nervousness, Pride, Sadness, or Fear.

In order to assess the hypothesis that emotional requirements in one's position contribute to higher levels of burnout and cynicism, several scales measuring emotional work requirements were constructed using the items described above. Among the scales developed for this analysis were scales measuring: surface acting, deep acting, expression of intense emotion, suppression of intense emotions, and a global measure of emotional work requirements.

*Surface Acting.* Central to the theory of emotional labor is the concept of surface acting, which has been previously defined as the requirement for one to repetitively present emotions demanded by one's occupation to clientele. While most often associated with lower-level service-sector jobs such as cashiers, retail sales persons, or bank tellers, police officers are also required to engage in some level of surface acting. In order measure this requirement, the following indicators of surface acting were collected: requirement to display emotions required by job, requirement to display many different emotions, requirement to resist expressing true feelings, requirement to express emotions that one really doesn't have, and the requirement to express friendly emotions. Of all the measures available in the study, these best reflect the theoretical descriptions of surface acting. When combined into a summated scale, the component measures possessed acceptable internal reliability with an alpha of .70. The scale also appeared to be normally distributed (mean = 9.44, standard deviation = 3.81).

*Deep Acting.* Another factor identified by emotional labor theory as likely to have a significant impact is deep acting. Deep acting involves making a concerted effort to experience and adopt as one's own emotions those demanded by one's position, even if they might be contrary to one's own ideals. When this is done, individuals are likely to feel inauthentic and suffer from adverse consequences such as cynicism and burnout. In the present study, only one measure of deep acting was collected which asked respondents to express the degree to which they made an effort to actually feel emotions required by their position. The response categories for this item were a five-item Likert-scale ranging from 'Not At All Required' to 'Always Required'. It is not possible to provide a measure of reliability for a single-item; however, the item is relatively normally distributed and possesses sufficient variation across response categories for use in the present analysis (mean = 1.19, standard deviation = 1.02).

*Emotional Expression.* At a more basic level, it is important to assess the effects that frequent requirements for the expression of emotion might have on cynicism and burnout. Specifically, theory suggests that being frequently required to express any sort of emotion may have adverse impacts on an individual's psychological health. This is particularly true when those emotions are particularly intense, and the requirement to express them is relatively frequent. As such, a number of items measuring the general requirements for intense emotional expression as perceived by officers were included in a summated scale. Among the measures included were items measuring the requirements of officers to: make someone afraid, express sympathy, express surprise, express disgust, express anger, apologize to someone, express friendly emotions. When combined into a summated scale, these measures demonstrated adequate reliability ( $\alpha = .72$ ) and were normally distributed (mean = 11.1, standard deviation = 3.91)

*Requirement for Suppression.* Aside from the requirements to engage in emotional expression, the requirement for suppression of intense emotions has also been theorized to have a significant effect on cynicism and burnout. Specifically, it has been posited that bottling up emotions without adequate releases has potentially adverse impacts. As such, a number of measures including the requirement to hide one's amusement over something, hide one's anger or disapproval, hide one's disgust, and to hide one's fear were included into a summated scale. The subsequent scale measuring the requirement for the suppression of emotion demonstrated sufficient reliability with an alpha of .78, and was normally distributed about the mean (mean = 7.87, standard deviation = 3.28).

## Results

Prior to proceeding with the analysis, bivariate correlations between each of the independent measures presented above and cynicism and burnout were examined. This was done in order to provide a preliminary indication of what the relationships between dependent and independent variables should be, and to assess the role that multicollinearity might play. Results from this analysis are presented in the correlation matrix in Table 7.

Table 7. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Emotion Management Variables and Cynicism and Burnout.

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Cynicism	2.23	4					
2. Burnout	-6.43	2.9	.165** (106)				
3. Suppression	7.87	3.3	-.092 (108)	-.087 (105)			
4. Expression	11.1	3.9	.028 (109)	-.015 (106)	.530*** (108)		
5. Surface Acting	9.44	3.8	.008 (107)	-.003 (104)	.383*** (106)	.597*** (107)	
6. Deep Acting	1.19	1	0.096 (109)	.138* (106)	.057 (108)	.395*** (109)	.304*** (107)

Note: Values in parantheses are N.

$p < .01$  \*\*\*,  $p < .05$  \*\*,  $p < .15$  \* (two-tailed tests)

The correlation matrix presented in Table 7 indicates that there are a number of significant bivariate relationships between each of the selected independent variables. As such, multicollinearity is likely to be an issue in any multivariate analysis of the data that includes all of the proposed independent variables. Given this, each of the dependent variables was regressed independently on each of the dependent variables along with controls. Results from each of these analyses will now be discussed briefly beginning with the effects of surface acting on cynicism and burnout presented in Table 8.



Table 8. Standardized Effects of Surface Acting on Burnout and Cynicism

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.082 (.336)	0.085 (.340)	-.123 (.449)	-.121 (.455)
Sex	.000 (.903)	-.004 (.920)	.167* (1.206)	.165* (1.23)
Surface Acting		.020 (.082)		0.015 (.109)
R - Squared	.007	.007	.043*	.043

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .05$ , \*  $p < .15$

With regard to burnout, the requirement of officers to engage in surface acting does not have a significant effect. This is further evidenced by the fact that incorporation of surface acting explains no variance beyond that explained by the basic controls. Moreover, none of the standardized coefficients even approach a standardized effect of greater than .1, and therefore fail to meet our criterion for substantive significance. As such, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that surface acting and burnout are unrelated among police officers in the present sample.

We also fail to reject the null hypothesis that the requirement to engage in surface acting is unrelated to cynicism. As was the case with burnout, the surface acting scale explains little variance in cynicism above and beyond that accounted for by the basic controls. Likewise, the standardized effect of cynicism does not even approach the criterion set for substantive significance, while both controls do have minimal effects in this case. Given this failure to find significant effects of surface acting on either dependent variable, we will now proceed to test our null hypothesis in regards to deep acting.

Table 9. Standardized Effects of Deep Acting on Burnout and Cynicism

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.077 (.340)	.087 (.337)	-.124 (.449)	-.117 (.449)
Sex	.007 (.914)	.023 (.907)	0.17* (1.205)	0.18* (1.206)
Deep Acting		.181* (.292)		0.119 (.386)
R - Squared	.006	.038	.044*	.058*

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

Based on the results presented in Table 9, we fail to reject the null hypothesis regarding the effects of deep acting on burnout. Despite this, we observe several interesting relationships when we enter the measure of deep acting in conjunction with controls. First, there is a noticeable increase in the amount of explained variance in burnout with the controls explaining 1% and the combined model explaining 3.8% of the variance in burnout. Second, we observe a substantial increase in the significance of the overall model. Finally, the standardized effect of deep acting exceeds our criteria of a standardized effect larger than .100. Given this, while we lack sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis by conventional standards, there is evidence of a substantively significant effect worth exploring further.

Much like our findings on the effects of deep acting on burnout, we observe a non-significant, but substantively interesting relationship between this factor and cynicism. Specifically, we observe a standardized effect of deep acting on cynicism of greater than .100, and an overall model with a probability of .112. Additionally, the amount of variance in cynicism explained by the deep acting measure improves by 1.4% from the 4.4% explained by controls to the 5.8% explained by the overall model. Given this, while we lack sufficient

evidence to reject the null hypothesis by conventional standards, there is evidence of a substantive effect.

Given that neither deep acting nor surface acting possess strong significant effects, it is theoretically important to assess whether broader requirements to express or suppress one's emotions have greater effects than those observed so far. We will begin by briefly discussing the effects of requirement to frequently express intense emotion on cynicism and burnout.

Table 10. Standardized Effects of Expression on Burnout and Cynicism

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.077 (.340)	.082 (.347)	-.124 (.449)	-.105 (.455)
Sex	.007 (.914)	.007 (.918)	.170* (1.205)	.169* (1.203)
Emotional Expression		.029 (.080)		0.113 (.105)
R - Squared	.006	.007	.044*	.057*

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .05$ , \*  $p < .15$

Examination of Table 10 reveals that requirements to engage in the expression of intense emotion have no statistically significant effect on burnout. The measure of requirement to express emotion does not substantially improve the explained variance, holds a weak standardized effect, and fails to even approach statistical significance. Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that the expression of emotion has no effect on levels of burnout among police officers in our present sample.

In contrast, while there is no statistically significant effect of expression by conventional standards, there is a substantive effect on cynicism. This is evidenced by the fact that the standardized effect exceeds .100, and the improved explanation of variance in cynicism (from 4.4% to 5.7%). Moreover, given the relatively limited sample size, and the calculated probability of .13, we should assume that some sort of effect is likely to exist, although it may not be clearly established with the present data.

Table 11. Standardized Effects of Suppression on Burnout and Cynicism with Controls

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.077 (.340)	.076 (.343)	-.124 (.449)	-.128 (.451)
Sex	.007 (.914)	.003 (.970)	.170* (1.205)	.137 (1.272)
Emotional Suppression		-.061 (.099)		-.020 (.125)
R - Squared	.006	.009	.035	.035

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

The results presented in Table 11 suggest that there is no support for the research hypothesis that suppression of emotion results in higher levels of either burnout or cynicism among officers. As such, we cannot successfully reject the null hypothesis by conventional standards. Moreover, given our pre-determined criteria for the existence of a substantive relationship, we cannot find support for any substantive effects on either cynicism or burnout.

As a final test of our assertion that emotional work requirements should result in higher levels of cynicism and burnout among officers, a global measure of emotional work requirements was regressed on cynicism and burnout with controls. This global measure was comprised of all measures used in the scales presented above, and possessed an alpha of .84. Aside from strong

reliability, the measure appears to be distributed evenly about the mean (mean = 27.1, standard deviation = 8.9). Results of the regression including the global scale measuring emotional management in combination with controls are reported in Table 12.

Table 12. Standardized Effects of Emotional Requirements on Burnout and Cynicism

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.081 (.337)	.084 (.341)	-.127 (.449)	-.121 (.453)
Sex	-.015 (.942)	-.018 (.950)	.132 (1.252)	.126 (1.262)
Emotional Requirements		.031 (.035)		.056 (.047)
R - Squared	.007	.008	.033	.037

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .05$ , \*  $p < .15$

Consistent with the findings in regard to each of the subscales presented above, the global scale does not significantly affect either cynicism or burnout. In general, the effects of emotion work attain very low levels of significance and weak standardized effects. Moreover, the improvement in explained variance is less than 1% in both cases. Taken together, the failure to find significant effects of emotional work requirements on the selected dependent variables is troubling. Given that one of the central premises of emotional labor theory is that emotional management required by one's position should result in adverse consequences, a brief summary of the substantial findings, a potential explanation for those findings, and discussion are in order.

## Discussion

Overall, the results presented above suggest that there are no statistically significant effects of emotional requirements on levels of cynicism or burnout. Moreover, there are very few effects that even begin to approach our criteria for a substantive relationship. In fact, the

analysis revealed that only deep acting had an effect on both dependent variables of interest, while the model including requirement for expression only had a substantive effect on cynicism. In and of itself, these non-significant findings are important given that there is no relationship where extant theory and past research suggest that there should be a relationship. In order to better understand this absence of significant effects, we must first address the potential contribution of methodological and statistical factors.

Among the methodological factors most likely to result in an absence of significant findings are the characteristics of the sample utilized in the present study. Specifically, while the sample size was sufficiently restrained to provide a great deal of power, it may not have been adequate in providing the desired level of reliability. In other words, because of the relatively limited sample size we can be more certain of significant relationships that do emerge because of the reduced risk of a ‘Type-I’ error, or rejecting the null hypothesis where we shouldn’t have, is greatly diminished. However, on the flip side of the coin, by increasing our confidence in the true impact of findings, we thereby increase our risk of ‘Type-II’ error, or accepting the null hypothesis where we should have rejected it. Future studies of the impact of emotion on cynicism and burnout among law enforcement officers should strive to balance both power and reliability more adequately with larger sample sizes.

In addition to sample size, there may be a number of inherent limitations on the variation of perceptions of emotion at work in the present sample. First, as mentioned previously, the policing profession is among the most masculinized of all professions. As a consequence, officers may not be particularly aware of the emotional requirements of their jobs, whether they objectively exist or not. Moreover, even if they are aware, they may be hesitant to openly acknowledge that awareness, even if it is on a confidential survey. This was evidenced

numerous times during the administration of the present survey as officers made disgruntled remarks about having to fill out “a bunch of crap about emotions” and the statement that “police officers don’t have emotions”. Given this, it is possible that a number of officers reported inaccurate portrayals of the emotion they did experience, thereby attenuating any possible relationships to non-significant levels. As such, it may be necessary for future studies to take a more indirect approach to the measurement of emotion such as observation with inter-rater assessments, as opposed to addressing the issue head on and confronting the strong self-perceptions of police officers as being emotionless through a self-report survey.

Another factor that may have limited the variation in reported emotions is the scope of the present sample. Specifically, the present study only examined police officers, only used officers from one department, and only within the uniformed patrol division. In doing so, a representative level of variation in perceived emotional work requirements may not have been achieved due to the fact that officers held highly similar and consistent experiences thereby reporting a limited range of emotional requirements. Had the study possessed more resources, it would have been desirable to apply the present study to a broader sample of law enforcement officers, and perhaps make comparisons between emotional requirements within law enforcement and other related professions with variable levels of the forces of interest at work (e.g. military police, forest rangers, security guards, etc.). It is recommended that future studies strive to utilize samples which possess a broader range of emotional requirements.

Another methodological limitation on the variation of emotional requirements is the arbitrary truncation of response categories, and the reliability of the scales developed from these truncated measures. Each of the component measures for the scales used in the analysis above had five possible response categories ranging from ‘Never Required’ to ‘Always Required’.

While these categories cover the possibility of a true-absence of requirement all the way through a constant requirement, the increments between categories might not sufficiently capture the level of requirement experienced by the officers. Future studies should strive to refine the measurement of emotion by utilizing scales in which there is greater possible variation in the response categories.

Despite the potential criticisms cited above, there appears to be sufficient variation in the measures and data on emotional work requirements used in the present study. This is evidenced by the normal distribution of scales around the measures of central tendency. Moreover, the measures used possess sufficient reliability and inter-item correlations such that one would not expect a significant attenuation of results. Thus, it is possible that failure to find significant relationships is not a statistical or methodological artifact at all, but a theoretically informative finding. As such, we must explore alternative and competing theoretical or logical reasons why significant effects failed to emerge between emotional requirements and cynicism and burnout.

One explanation for the lack of significant findings is that emotional management may not have the kind of long-term impacts that the present study was designed to assess. Specifically, emotion management may actually be more representative of a short-term technique called upon by officers as a matter of job survival than it is representative of a mandate from an outside source to act in a desired manner. In other words, officers may perceive the requirement to engage in emotional management as a necessary element of interaction on the job to mediate occupational stress in the immediate environment.

If this is the case, almost all officers would report having experienced a requirement to engage in the types of emotion management assessed here at some point in their careers. Moreover, in aggregate officers would be likely to report a normal distribution of the various



types of emotional requirements, thereby explaining the normal distribution observed in the present data. Under such a scenario, what is truly being measured is the variation in requirements to use emotion as a context-dependent interaction tool. As such, the act of emotion management reflected by officers' responses would lack the referential source posited by theories of emotional labor. Consequently, this brand of emotion management would not have the long-term impacts of emotion produced as a requirement of management or customers with competing interests, but instead would reflect the officers calling upon necessary emotions in their own interest as necessary. One would expect such a short-term tool consistent with the objectives of the actor to have neutral effects in the long-term because it is relatively detached from managerial expectations, at least so long as it remains within certain broad bounds. Stated another way, in as much as management gives officers a broad range of alternatives to deal with situations in the field, the officers may not feel any stress in the routine utilization of a range of emotions, thereby mitigating any long-term effects.

The present findings provides minimal empirical support for the assertion presented above in that only deep acting has a consistent substantive effect on both dependent variables. Not coincidentally, deep acting is also the only measure which implicitly grounds the requirement to feel a conflicting emotion to the will or mandate of another group or individual. This is significant in that it demonstrates that measures which reference where the perceived requirement to engage in specific emotion management comes from are more likely to have a stronger relationship with the dependent variables of interest.

The findings and discussion presented above have numerous implications for the development of theory and research in regard to emotional labor. Central to all of the explanations above are the very real possibility that the theoretical forces of interest were not

measured at a refined enough level or with a broad enough sample to produce significant results. This suggests that future research must make efforts to refine our conceptualization and measurement of emotional management to be more meaningful, and more reflective of the core principles of emotional labor theory. Specifically, the role that the sources of requirements for emotional management play must be disentangled. This stands in stark contrast to many past studies of emotional labor which have traditionally focused on the frequency, intensity, and duration of emotional requirements at the neglect of the sources of those requirements.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### THE IMPACT OF VALUE DISSONANCE

Traditionally, empirical studies of emotional labor have focused solely on the impact of emotional management. Unfortunately, this neglects an equally important aspect of emotional labor theory – the degree to which there is congruence or incongruence between management’s or customer’s values and the values of laborers. As discussed in the literature review, this is problematic in that when an individual sincerely subscribes to the values and ideals they are subjected to by virtue of their position, there is no potential for emotive dissonance. Given this, the present analysis seeks to assess the independent effects of value dissonance on the psychological well-being of laborers. In order to achieve this goal, the present study collected extensive data on the values of officers, and the values that officers perceived various reference groups to hold.

In order to measure policing values, the present study has adapted a number of extant measures, especially those developed by Mastrofski et al (1996) and Adams et al (2002). These items require respondents to read a series of statements and report to what degree they agree or disagree with statements about various aspects of policing (1=Strongly Agree, 2= Agree, 3= Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 4=Disagree, 5= Strongly Disagree), or find value in the policing activities described (4=Very Important, 3=Important, 2=Not Very Important, 1=Unimportant).

Using the response categories presented above, officers were asked a broad range of questions about their values and priorities of specific elements of policing. For example, respondents were asked to state the degree to which they agree that “A good officer should try to find out what residents think the neighborhood problems are,” and to express how important they feel it is to provide “rapid response to calls for service” (for a full review of questions, please

review the items included in the appendix). Additionally, officers were asked corresponding questions about the degree to which they believed individuals from the ranks of lieutenant, chief, and the general public would feel about the same elements of policing. From these data, a number of scales measuring the degree of dissonance between respondents and key reference groups were created by subtracting the officer's score from the specified reference group's score on individual items, taking the absolute values of this product, and summing these items together to produce scales. The result is a measure of the overall degree of discrepancy in values between the respondent and the selected reference groups. Using this general procedure, a number of subscales were developed for the reference groups identified by the study, and relating to selected dimensions of policing. The details behind the construction of specific subscales will be discussed briefly.

*Community-Oriented Policing Dissonance Subscales.* In order to create these scales, items measuring values favorable to community-oriented policing were selected. For example, selected items probe officers on the degree to which they believe citizens are more likely to better know what's going on in their neighborhood than police do, the degree to which foot patrols are a valuable activity, the degree to which police have a duty to address non-crime problems, and the degree to which officers must coordinate additional resources to address neighborhood problems (for a full itemization of these scale items refer to the appendix). Using selected items, the absolute difference between each officer's reported value and the perceived value for each of three reference groups was computed for each item. Next, all items measuring dissonance between the officer and a selected group were summed to create scales measuring the dissonance between officers and lieutenants, officers and chiefs, officers and the general public. A scale which summed all items measuring dissonance between officers and all groups was also

created to provide a global measure of perceived value dissonance between officers and important referential entities.

*COP-Neutral Policing Dissonance Subscales.* In order to discern whether dissonance in regard to community-oriented policing issues has a differential effect on the dependent variables, it was necessary to create a separate scale from the remaining COP-neutral items. These items are representative of general policing functions on which community-oriented policing holds a relatively neutral position. For example, items in this scale include the degree to which officers believe law enforcement is the primary function of police, good police officers engage in aggressive patrol, arrests and citations are an important activity, etc. (please refer to appendix for a complete breakdown of items included in this scale). Using selected items, the differences between officers and reference groups were calculated. These items were then included in scales measuring the dissonance between: officers and lieutenants, officers and chiefs, officers and the general public, and officers and all reference groups. Despite their theoretical independence from COP, the items possessed a high degree of correlation with the corresponding COP-scales and produced low levels of reliability; however, given that the body of literature on community-oriented policing does not take a clear position on these issues, it is believed that the scales provide a theoretically sound measure of dissonance in regard to non-COP policing values or values towards policing in general.

## **Results**

Prior to moving forward with the assessment of the current hypotheses, the eight scales described above were examined in regards to their univariate characteristics and their bivariate relationships with one another. Table 13 provides information about the inter-correlation of measures.

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Ofc. Vs. Lt.'s (COP)	7.076	5.517							
2. Ofc. Vs. Chiefs (COP)	10.179	6.514	0.842 (106)						
3. Ofc Vs. Public (COP)	11.333	5.914	0.667 (106)	0.674 (105)					
4. Ofc. Vs. All (COP)	26.4	16.141	0.920 (105)	0.932 (105)	0.862 (105)				
5. Ofc. Vs. Lt.'s (NTRL)	4.567	4.033	0.671 (105)	0.585 (104)	0.373 (104)	0.598 (104)			
6. Ofc. Vs. Chiefs (NTRL)	7.094	4.839	0.471 (106)	0.633 (106)	0.287 (105)	0.514 (105)	0.788 (104)		
7. Ofc Vs. Public (NTRL)	7.019	3.803	0.231 (104)	0.188 (104)	0.374 (104)	0.290 (104)	0.266 (103)	0.186 (104)	
8. Ofc. Vs. All (NTRL)	18.476	9.934	0.577 (103)	0.602 (103)	0.410 (103)	0.588 (103)	0.882 (103)	0.871 (103)	0.582 (103)

Note: Values in parantheses are N.

All relationships significant beyond the .10 level.

Examination of the correlations in Table 13, and visual plots of the data not displayed here, suggests that each of the variables is normally distributed, and has sufficient variation to proceed with analysis. It further suggests that each of the independent variables has a high degree of inter-correlation with one another. Given that incorporation of highly correlated independent variables into OLS regression violates the assumption regarding multicollinearity, the effects of each scale on cynicism and burnout was assessed individually while controlling for age and sex. Results assessing the impact of COP-neutral dissonance on cynicism and burnout are presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Standardized Effects of COP-Neutral Value Dissonance Between Officers and Lieutenants on Burnout and Cynicism

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.075 (.372)	.073 (.364)	-.160* (.484)	-.164* (.428)
Sex	.001 (.938)	.005 (.917)	0.173* (1.219)	.181** (1.078)
Officers vs. Lieutenants (NTRL)		.235* (.074)		.463** (.087)
R - Squared	.006	.029*	.035*	.270***

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .05$ , \*  $p < .15$

Table 14 provides results from multivariate regressions in which dissonance on COP-neutral policing items between lieutenants and officers are regressed on the dependent variables of cynicism and burnout, with controls for age and sex. Results suggest that while there is a significant effect, the overall model is not significant. Given our relatively limited sample size, and the degrees of freedom absorbed by incorporation of control variables, this is not a surprising finding. Despite this, the model does attain our criteria for substantive significance ( $p > .15$ ). We also observe a modest increase in the explanation of variance as measured by R-Squared, from .006 to .061. Taken together, these findings suggest that we are justified in rejecting our null hypothesis that dissonance between Lieutenants and Officers has no effect on burnout.

Unlike the results assessing burnout, for cynicism we observe a significant overall model, strong and significant coefficients, and a substantial increase in explained variance. Specifically, we observe a standardized coefficient of .463 which is significant beyond the .001 level, and an increase in explained variance of nearly 400% from the 5.5% explained by controls to the 27% explained by the overall model. This suggests that greater than 20% of the variance in cynicism is explained by this single item. Given this, dissonance between officers own values and the

perceived values of lieutenants have substantial effects on the levels of cynicism officers possess. As such, we have sufficient evidence to reject our null hypothesis that there is no effect of dissonance with lieutenants on cynicism.

Table 15. Standardized Effects of COP-Neutral Value Dissonance Between Officers and Chiefs on Burnout and Cynicism

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.086 (.348)	.092 (.346)	-.118 (.459)	-.096 (.386)
Sex	.002 (.927)	.009 (.924)	0.166* (1.223)	.192** (1.028)
Officers vs. Chiefs (NTRL)		.142 (.063)		.540*** (.070)
R - Squared	.007	.028	0.041*	0.332***

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

Upon examining the results presented in Table 15, in which perceived dissonance between officers and Chiefs in regard to COP-neutral policing activities was regressed on burnout, there is not sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. In this case, addition of the dissonance measure resulted in a minimal increase in the amount of variance explained by the model, did not produce a significant model, and possessed weak and insignificant coefficients. This is an interesting finding given that emotional labor theory predicts that the dissonance with the values of upper management should result in adverse outcomes such as burnout. Despite this, when compared with the findings in regard to dissonance with lieutenants, the present results suggest that dissonance with more proximal sources has a greater overall impact on burnout than dissonance with higher levels of management. Implications of this unexpected finding will be explored and discussed further in the conclusion to this chapter.



Unlike the findings presented above regarding burnout, dissonance with the Chief has a substantial and significant effect on the cynicism of officers. Incorporation of the dissonance measure in this case improves the predictive capabilities of the model from 4.1% to 33.2% and is significant beyond the .001 level. Moreover, the standardized coefficient is large at .540, and also significant beyond the .001 level. Taken together, this suggests that while COP-neutral dissonance between the values of line-level employees and upper management does not have a significant impact on burnout, it does play a substantial role in levels of cynicism. Thus, we can reject the null hypothesis in regards to the absence of effects on cynicism, but fail to reject the null with regard to burnout.

Table 16. Standardized Effects of COP-Neutral Value Dissonance Between Officers and Public on Burnout and Cynicism

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.077 (.364)	.100 (.364)	-.151* (.474)	-.119 (.467)
Sex	-.001 (.936)	-.016 (.931)	.177* (1.217)	.157* (1.192)
Officers vs. Public (NTRL)		.171* (.081)		.237** (.104)
R - Squared	.006	.034	.053*	.108**

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

In Table 16, we can clearly see that the model incorporating dissonance between officers and the public failed to achieve significance and added very little to the explanation of variance in burnout. Likewise, the coefficient exhibited weak and non-significant effects. Given that perceived dissonance between responding officers and chiefs did not have a significant effect on burnout, it is not surprising that perceived dissonance with the more distant reference group embodied in the general public did not show a significant relationship. This is likely a product of

the broad diversity and ambiguity of views represented by a group the size of the general public, and the relative social distance between the public and the officers. These results will be discussed further in the conclusions section of this paper.

With regard to cynicism, just as we found significant effects of COP-neutral dissonance between officers and lieutenants and officers and chiefs, we also find such an effect in regard to dissonance between the general public and officers. Specifically, we find that increased levels of dissonance result in greater levels of cynicism. This is evidenced by the fact that the explained variance (as indicated by R-Squared) increases to 10.8% when this measure of dissonance is incorporated producing an overall model that is significant beyond the .02 level. The effects of dissonance between officers and the public on matters that are COP-neutral are further evidenced by the relatively strong and significant coefficients. As such, we have sufficient evidence to reject our null hypothesis that there is no effect of value dissonance between the public and officers on cynicism.

As a final measure to assess our hypothesis that dissonance is likely to produce greater levels of cynicism and burnout, a measure of dissonance on COP-neutral items between officers and all selected reference groups was regressed on burnout and cynicism to assess the degree to which global dissonance is likely to have an impact on the cynicism and burnout of officers. Results are presented in Table 17.

Table 17. Standardized Effects of COP-Neutral Value Dissonance Between Officers and All Reference Groups on Burnout and Cynicism

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.067 (.375)	.083 (.367)	-.153* (.488)	-.118 (.414)
Sex	-.003 (.941)	-.005 (.918)	.176* (1.224)	.171** (1.037)
Officers vs. All (NTRL)		.243** (.030)		.524*** (.034)
R - Squared	.005	.063*	.054*	.328***

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

We find no significant effects on burnout for the overall model. Despite this, there does appear to be a substantive effect of global dissonance, according to our pre-established criteria ( $p < .15$  for model). Moreover, we find that global dissonance has a significant coefficient, and a standardized effect greater than .100. Thus, there is evidence that the global measure of dissonance on COP-neutral items does have the theoretically expected effect on burnout; however, we cannot reject the null hypothesis by conventional standards. This is consistent with the previous findings, which suggest that only dissonance with the lieutenants has a significant effect on levels of burnout. The overarching findings in regard to burnout and dissonance will be explored in more detail in the discussion.

In contrast, there is strong evidence that global dissonance exerts an effect on cynicism as evidenced by the substantial improvement in explanatory power that results when this measure is included. Specifically, the model incorporating the global dissonance measure explains 27% more variance than the control model. Likewise, the standardized effect on cynicism is large (.524), and significant well-beyond the .001 level. As such, we have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that dissonance has no effect on cynicism in all cases. Moreover, based on

the sum of the findings presented above, dissonance with the chiefs has the greatest effect, followed by global dissonance, lieutenants, and then the general public. These results will be discussed in more detail in the discussion section.

Having demonstrated that dissonance in general has at least some effect on both of our dependent variables of interest, it seems worthwhile to explore whether dissonance on specific policing values is responsible for the effect. Given the important role that community-oriented policing has played in shaping the values of officers over the past 30 years, dissonance on these values might be particularly important. As such, the remainder of our analysis will focus specifically on items measuring one’s value of community-oriented policing between the selected reference groups.

Table 18. Standardized Effects of COP-Specific Value Dissonance Between Officers and Lieutenants on Burnout and Cynicism

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.086 (.348)	.065 (.349)	-.118* (.459)	-.168* (.434)
Sex	.002 (.927)	.000 (.922)	0.166* (1.223)	.161* (1.146)
Officers vs. Lieutenants (COP)		.153* (.058)		.358*** (.072)
R - Squared	.007	.030	.041*	.167***

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

The results presented in Table 18 suggest that there is no evidence that dissonance between lieutenants and officers on community-oriented values has an effect on burnout. Specifically, neither the model nor the coefficients exhibit effects significant beyond the .05 level. Despite this, the standardized effect does approach our substantive criteria with a standardized effect greater than .100 and significance beyond the .15 level. Thus, despite the

failure to reach traditional standards of significance, there is limited evidence for the theoretically expected relationship. As such, this relationship should be further assessed with larger samples.

In contrast to burnout, dissonance on community-policing values between officers and lieutenants clearly has a strong and significant effect in the theoretically expected direction. In this case, the standardized coefficient is strong (.358) and significant beyond the .001 level. Moreover, the overall model is significant, and ultimately explains over 16.7% of the variance in levels of cynicism. Given these findings, we have ample evidence to successfully reject the null hypothesis which states that there should be no relationship. Stated another way, perceived dissonance with the lieutenants in regard to community-oriented policing values significantly increases one's level of cynicism.

Table 19. Standardized Effects of COP-Specific Value Dissonance Between Officers and Chiefs on Burnout and Cynicism

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.086 (.348)	.080 (.348)	-.118* (.459)	-.140* (.419)
Sex	.002 (.927)	.004 (.927)	0.166* (1.223)	0.176* (1.116)
Officers vs. Chiefs (COP)		.108 (.051)		.412*** (.061)
R - Squared	.007	.019	.041*	.210***

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

As was the case with our general measure of dissonance between officers and chiefs, the more specific measure of dissonance in regards to community-oriented policing values does not exhibit a significant effect. This is evidenced by the small contribution to explained variance of the model, and its overall failure to approach significance. Moreover, despite the fact that the

standardized coefficient exceeds .100, it is not significant beyond the .15 level. Therefore, even in regards to more specific and important values such as community-oriented policing, dissonance with the chiefs does not produce any differences in levels of burnout. As such, we must accept the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between dissonance with the chiefs and burnout.

In regard to the effects of perceived dissonance between the chiefs and officers, we find strong evidence of a relationship such that increased dissonance results in greater levels of cynicism. Incorporation of the scale measuring dissonance with the chiefs explains almost 17% more variance than simple controls. Moreover, there is a strong positive relationship between this scale and cynicism (standardized beta of .412) that is significant beyond the .001 level. Taken together these findings allow us to confidently reject the null hypothesis, thereby supporting our research hypothesis that community-oriented policing related dissonance with the chiefs does have a positive association with officers levels of cynicism.

Table 20. Standardized Effects of COP-Specific Value Dissonance Between Officers and Public on Burnout and Cynicism

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.084 (.362)	.082 (.365)	-.158* (.470)	-.185* (.447)
Sex	.002 (.933)	.001 (.938)	.174* (1.212)	.166* (1.149)
Officers vs. Public (COP)		.023 (.055)		.326*** (.068)
R - Squared	.007	.008	.050	.160***

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

Based upon examination of Table 20, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that dissonance has no effect on burnout. Specifically, in this case, we find no support for the research

hypothesis that dissonance between officers and the general public in regard to community-oriented policing should result in greater levels of burnout. Given this, we will move on to a discussion of the significant relationship between this type of dissonance and cynicism.

In regards to the effects of perceived dissonance between the officer and public in regard to COP, we find that there is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. While not as strong as other relationships between dissonance and cynicism, we still observe strong effects significant at the .001 level. Moreover, incorporation of the item measuring police/public dissonance as perceived by the officer considerably improves the amount of variance explained from 5% to 16%, a three-fold increase. Finally, the overall model is significant beyond the .001 level.

Thus far, we see similar effects in regards to the dependent variables as we observed with the more broadly defined measures of dissonance. Specifically, only dissonance between lieutenants and officers in regards to COP values even approaches significance in its effects on burnout, while all forms of dissonance have a significant effect on cynicism with the greatest effects coming from dissonance with the chiefs, lieutenants, and public respectively. As such, one final test of the overall dissonance between officers and all groups is necessary. Results are presented in Table 21.

Table 21. Standardized Effects of COP-Specific Value Dissonance Between Officers and All Reference Groups on Burnout and Cynicism

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.084 (.362)	.077 (.362)	-.158* (.470)	-.183* (.435)
Sex	.002 (.933)	.001 (.933)	.174* (1.212)	.171* (1.120)
Officers vs. All (COP)		.104 (.020)		.385*** (.024)
R - Squared	.007	.018	.054*	.202***

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

Consistent with the other equations presented previously, there is no significant relationship between global dissonance on COP and burnout, but there does appear to be strong evidence for an effect on cynicism. In this case, the global measure of COP value dissonance accounts for 15% more variance in cynicism than simple controls, while it contributes less than 1% to the explanation of burnout. Likewise, where the standardized effect of global dissonance on burnout is .104, we observe an effect of .385 on cynicism. Based on these results, and the results previously presented, we find substantial support for our research hypothesis in regard to cynicism, but only minimal support for our research hypothesis for burnout.

## Discussion

In aggregate the results presented above indicate that dissonance between management and line-level employees in their values has a substantial influence on levels of cynicism, and to a much lesser degree burnout. Moreover, the findings suggest that sources of dissonance that are more proximal have a greater effect on burnout, while dissonance with sources that are more powerful have greater effects on cynicism. Specifically, we find that respectively, Lieutenants,



Chiefs, and the General Public have the strongest effects on burnout; while Chiefs, Lieutenants, and the General Public have the greatest effects on cynicism. Taken together, these findings have a number of implications for future research and theory.

One of the greatest contributions of the analysis presented above is in the unique methods employed to measure the dissonance dimension of “emotive dissonance.” Unlike past studies, which have neglected the impact of value dissonance in favor of focusing on emotional management, the present study made explicit efforts to measure dissonance in a referential manner which made sense to the population being studied. Specifically, it assessed the degree to which line personnel perceived their values as being similar or different to various levels of management and the general public. Consequently, it is believed that a central element of the theoretical concept of emotive dissonance is more adequately measured by tapping into the disagreement between line-level and selected levels of management in regard to specific values. Moreover, unlike any other published studies to date, this measurement technique allows us to more closely examine the effects of dissonance with various reference groups independently to provide a more refined look at the effects of emotive dissonance.

Another area in which the present research extends the measurement of emotive dissonance is in regard to overarching management philosophies currently in vogue within the field of policing. Specifically, the present analyses measure and compare the effects of dissonance on community-oriented policing values versus COP-neutral policing values on cynicism and burnout. This is significant given the fact that no past studies of emotional labor have specifically looked at emotive dissonance in the context of values, especially in regard to specific management philosophies. As a result, the present study is capable of making inferences about the differential impact of value dissonance in global and specific contexts.

One area where the study could have been improved is through the addition of specific measures of perceived social distance between officers and selected reference groups. In employing such a measure, it would have been possible to more thoroughly assess the hypothesis derived from the present findings that proximity and dissonance interact to produce greater levels of burnout. Likewise, the addition of perceived authority and power of selected reference groups might have also been beneficial in that it would facilitate assessment of the hypothesis that dissonance interacts with status and authority to produce higher levels of cynicism. Given the findings presented above, which hint at these potential effects, future studies should seek to incorporate and better measure the concepts of social distance and power and authority to further test these hypotheses.

What is perhaps more significant than the use of the unique measures cited above are the substantive findings that emerged from use of those measures. Specifically, we find that while more proximal sources of dissonance have a greater effect on burnout, more organizationally powerful sources have a greater effect on cynicism. Moreover, we find that to a great degree the effect of dissonance in regard to community policing values mirrors the effects of dissonance on COP-neutral items. While these effects are only anecdotally supported with the present data, these are important findings because past theory and research has little to say in regards to specific effects that different sources of dissonance are likely to produce. A brief discussion of the theoretical implications and contributions of these findings is now in order.

The finding that dissonance with more proximal reference groups results in higher levels of burnout informs theory about the specific effects of emotional labor on burnout and points to some potential explanations. One explanation of this finding is that there is greater opportunity for dissonance to become salient when it resides with more proximal sources. This makes sense

considering that officers are much more likely to interact with a shift commander during the course of their daily duties than they would be to interact with a chief. During such frequent interactions, one would expect greater stress to occur when there is some level of perceived disagreement between involved parties. Thus, given that the commonly accepted cause of burnout is exposure to repeated stressful events, one would expect those who have repeated dissonance-laden encounters with more immediate supervisors to experience higher levels of burnout.

The finding that dissonance with relatively more powerful reference groups results in greater cynicism also makes sense, and informs existing theory about how the effect of emotional labor might be specified. Cynicism tends to result when we feel that matters are being influenced by some forces beyond our control, and for reasons or interests we are philosophically opposed to. Within the context of work, one such important guiding force is often management and the decisions they make which result in numerous consequences observed from top to bottom. Thus, in order to produce a sense of cynicism in others about one's actions, one must possess some level of authority or influence over decisions that directly or indirectly affect the subordinates. Within policing, management often makes decisions that are likely to appear to the line officers as self-interested, mindless, and absurd. However, as one moves down the ranks and closer to the line-level, interests become more aligned between supervisory and line personnel. As a consequence, officers are more likely to view upper management's decisions as more dissonant philosophically and more self-interested, and therefore are more likely to view the actions of upper management more cynically. Overall, one would expect individuals who view themselves as being in disagreement with management to be more cynical in general.

Given the theoretical arguments about proximity and power presented above, one must also note the findings in regard to dissonance about mainstream philosophies of policing. As mentioned previously, community-oriented policing in one form or another has been the dominant paradigm among police managers and academics for nearly 30 years. Despite this, there has been a widely recognized apathy and even resentment of community-policing among line-level personnel. As such, one would expect dissonance on this matter in particular to potentially have a differential impact on the cynicism and burnout of line officers. Interestingly, we find that dissonance in regard to community-oriented policing mirrors the impact of dissonance on policing values in general. There are several explanations for this finding.

First, despite explicit efforts to separate COP-related items from neutral policing activities, the scales were highly correlated with one another. This may be due to the fact that even though COP generally takes a neutral position on the items selected, it is difficult to completely disentangle policing practices that are COP-neutral from those that are COP-relevant. One consequence of this inter-correlation might be similar results. In order to more thoroughly explore whether dissonance on COP related values have differential effects, future studies should make efforts to incorporate more broad and neutral measures that are assured to be disconnected from the concept of COP. One potential way this could be done is to focus a set of questions on completely mundane or legalistic aspects of policing such as the importance of writing thorough reports, engaging in regular firearms training, etc.

Another potential explanation for the similar findings in regard to dissonance on COP and designated COP-neutral items might be a spurious effect. Specifically, dissonance between officers and administrators may have been viewed as an opportunity to express general discontent with management, even if there really was no philosophical disagreement. Given the

recent political climate of the department which the sample was drawn from, this is not unlikely. Specifically, in the two years prior to this survey, the administration was required to make a number of highly unpopular cuts to department resources as a result of a large budget deficit within the city of Spokane.

Given the theoretical arguments presented above, future studies of emotional labor should incorporate measures of dissonance that use referential groups that make sense to the specific occupation being studied. Further, these findings suggest that future efforts might employ efforts to measure the social distance and status of referential groups to determine what if any effects dissonance with relatively higher or lower status groups might produce. Finally, while it didn't seem to be important in the present study, any specific dissonance in regard to overarching management philosophies within the profession being studied should be measured in addition to global measures. Through these improvements in future emotional labor research, the ability to infer the specific effects of various elements of emotional labor should be greatly improved, and progress beyond the simple singular hypothesis that emotional labor results in adverse effects.

## CHAPTER SIX

### THE INTERACTION OF DISSONANCE AND EMOTION

Central to emotional labor theory is the concept of “emotive dissonance” or the experience of being required to repeatedly express or embrace emotions contrary to one’s internally held beliefs and in accord with the values of management or customers. In the last two sections, we have explored two distinct elements of this principle as independent effects in regard to police officers. First, we examined the effects of various perceived emotional work requirements on officers’ levels of cynicism and burnout, including: surface acting, deep acting, requirement for expression of intense emotion, requirement for suppression of emotion, and global emotional requirements. Later, we examined the impact of value dissonance on COP and non-COP aspects of policing between officers and selected reference groups, including: lieutenants, chiefs, the generalized public, and global dissonance with all these groups. Through these analyses a number of notable and significant independent effects were revealed, along with the surprising absence of some expected effects, especially in regard to emotional requirements. In this chapter, we will attempt to move beyond the independent effects of these factors and attempt to assess their interactive effects. In doing so, we hope to gain a better sense of how a more complex conception and operationalization of “emotive dissonance” or the combination of value dissonance and emotional work requirements impacts levels of cynicism and burnout.

In total there are forty possible interactions between the measurements of emotional work requirements and the two types of dissonance operationalized in the present study. If all these interactions were examined, this would equal 80 possible analyses. In order to make the results of this analysis manageable and accessible, only selected effects will be presented. First, given that there were negligible differences between dissonance on community-oriented values and

general or COP-neutral policing values, it was determined that a broader measure including all policing values would best capture the theoretical principles of interest. Additionally, in lieu of examining dissonance between officers and each of the three selected reference groups, we have elected to sum the disagreement between officers and all groups. Finally, it was determined that all measures of emotional expression would be utilized as these variables represent the relationships of greatest interest to past studies, and of the greatest theoretical importance in the present research. Through this decision, we are able to capture the theoretical essence of emotive dissonance by using a general indicator of dissonance, and explore further where dissonance might be likely to interact with specific types of emotional work requirements. This strategy refines the interactions used in the present analysis from eighty narrow and specific relationships to ten more general and theoretically informative interactions that provide a test of our overarching hypothesis that emotional work requirements and dissonance interact with one another to produce higher levels of cynicism and burnout.

In order to create the interaction terms described above, it was first necessary to center each of the variables in order to avert problems with multi-collinearity between the interaction and component variables (Jaccard et al 1991). Once this was done, each mean-centered measure of emotional work requirements was multiplied by the general dissonance scale to produce the following variables: surface acting X general dissonance, deep acting X general dissonance, requirement to express intense emotions X general dissonance, requirement to suppress emotion X general dissonance, and emotional work requirements X general dissonance. The interaction terms were then incorporated into OLS equations along with controls and their component variables.

In order to assess the effects of the interaction terms, results from equations incorporating the interaction components and control variables were compared with equations including the interaction terms. Specifically, the r-squared change between these models, and an f-test of the change was conducted to assess the degree to which interactions contributed to explained variance above and beyond its component parts (Jaccard et al 1991).

## Results

Table 22. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Value Dissonance and Surface Acting on Cynicism and Burnout with Controls

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.071 (.341)	.073 (.346)	-.144* (.399)	-.138* (.405)
Sex	.005 (.920)	.002 (.938)	.169* (1.077)	.163* (1.097)
Dissonance	.188* (.013)	.187* (.014)	.482*** (.016)	.478*** (.016)
Surface Acting	-.004 (.082)	-.003 (.083)	-.043 (.096)	-.040 (.097)
Surface Acting X Dissonance		0.013 (.004)		0.041 (.005)
R - Squared	.041	.041	.273***	.274***
Change in R-Squared		.000		.001

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

In regards to burnout, the results presented in Table 22 suggest that there is no contribution to the explanation of burnout added by the incorporation of the interaction term over the base model. Further, the interaction itself fails to achieve traditional or alternative standards of significance. As such, we find little support for our hypothesis that surface acting and dissonance interact to produce greater levels of burnout.



In contrast to the findings regarding burnout, both models incorporating and excluding the interaction effect between surface acting and general dissonance explain a significant amount of the variance in cynicism. Despite this, there is not a significant improvement from the base model to the model including the interaction effect, with a net change in R-Squared of only .002. Likewise, we observe that the interaction term has no significant effect on cynicism. In fact, only dissonance exhibits a significant effect on cynicism, and accounts for the greatest amount of variance in the dependent variable. Stated another way, the interaction term does not explain any variance in cynicism above and beyond that already explained by its component parts, particularly dissonance.

Table 23. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Value Dissonance and Deep Acting on Cynicism and Burnout

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.081 (.334)	.099 (.330)	-.134* (.395)	-.125 (.397)
Sex	.019 (.898)	0.007 (.886)	.169* (1.062)	.163* (1.063)
Dissonance	.174* (.013)	.233** (.014)	.470*** (.016)	.500*** (.016)
Deep Acting	.167* (.290)	.199* (.289)	.081 (.341)	.097 (.345)
Deep Acting X Dissonance		-.204* (.011)		-.101 (.013)
R - Squared	.068*	.105*	.278***	.287***
Change in R-Squared		.036*		.009

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .05$ , \*  $p < .15$

Table 23 shows that unlike surface acting, deep acting exerts a substantive effect on levels of burnout among responding officers. This is evidenced by the fact that even when

dissonance is entered into the equation, our measure of deep acting maintains a standardized effect greater than .100, and significance beyond the .10 level. More importantly, the model incorporating the interaction term explains somewhat more variance in burnout (an improvement of 3.6% in R-Squared), and results in an overall model with significance greater than .10. Additionally, the standardized effect of the interaction term itself is relatively large, as are its component parts of deep acting and dissonance, exerting an effect significant beyond the .10 level. Interestingly, this interaction coefficient is in a direction contrary to what theory would predict, suggesting that in combination with one another, higher levels of dissonance and higher levels of deep acting actually serve to reduce levels of burnout. This is a puzzling finding that warrants further exploration in the discussion section.

Interestingly, where a substantive yet unexpected effect exists between the deep acting interaction and burnout, there is no evidence for any such interaction effects on cynicism. Specifically, while both models are significant beyond the .001 level, there is no unique contribution to cynicism resulting from the incorporation of the interaction effect. This is evidenced by a non-significant test result comparing the F-ratios for the base and interaction models. Once again, dissonance exhibits a consistent effect in both models. Thus, the independent effects of dissonance and deep acting account for all of the explained variance in the model pertaining to cynicism reported in Table 23.

Table 24. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Value Dissonance and Requirement for Expression on Cynicism and Burnout

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.075 (.343)	.073 (.345)	-.123 (.400)	-.123 (.402)
Sex	.004 (.907)	.004 (.911)	.162* (1.058)	.161* (1.063)
Dissonance	.187* (.013)	.194* (.014)	.473*** (.016)	.471*** (.016)
Expression	.021 (.079)	.021 (.080)	.090 (.093)	.090 (.093)
Expression X Dissonance		-.036 (.003)		.008 (.004)
R - Squared	.042	.043	.279***	.279***
Change in R-Squared		.001		.000

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .05$ , \*  $p < .15$

Based on the results for effects on burnout presented in Table 24, only dissonance has an effect approaching significance prior to incorporating the interaction between dissonance and expression of intense emotion. As such, it is not surprising that the interaction term between these two items would also fail to produce a significant effect. Moreover, the incorporation of this interaction contributes minimally to the explanation of variance over that already accounted for by expression and dissonance. Finally, given that the difference between models is not significant, we must continue to accept the null hypothesis that there is no interaction effect between dissonance and expression on levels of reported burnout.

In regard to cynicism, we observe once again that dissonance is the only item which has a significant effect prior to incorporation of the interaction term, with emotional expression exhibiting a weak and non-significant effect. Despite the fact that the model only possesses a

singular significant effect, the overall model does achieve traditional criteria of significance, mainly due to the effect of dissonance. Upon incorporating the interaction term, the model continues to be a significant predictor of cynicism; however, only a nominal improvement occurs in the amount of variance explained by the model. Once again, dissonance plays a central role in the explanation of cynicism, with the requirement for emotional expression and the interaction effect contributing very little in this regard. Therefore, we must accept the null hypothesis that there is no interaction working to increase levels of cynicism among responding officers.

Table 25. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Value Dissonance and Requirement for Suppression on Cynicism and Burnout

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.072 (.337)	.066 (.341)	-.138* (.396)	-.135* (.401)
Sex	.013 (.918)	.020 (.932)	.163* (1.075)	.159* (1.091)
Dissonance	.185* (.013)	.182* (.013)	.477*** (.016)	.478*** (.016)
Suppression	-.054 (.097)	-.065 (.100)	-.003 (.110)	.003 (.113)
Suppression X Dissonance		-.051 (.005)		.028 (.006)
R - Squared	.044	.046	.271***	.272***
Change in R-Squared		.002		.001

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

Once again, Table 25 shows that the only variable exerting a substantive effect on burnout is the general dissonance reported by responding officers. Thus, suppression of emotion by itself does not show a significant independent effect on burnout. Given this, it comes as no surprise that there is not a significant contribution to explained variance by adding the interaction term between these two items. This is verified by the miniscule change in R-Squared, and the insignificance in the F-change between models. Therefore, we find no support for our research hypothesis that a significant interaction exists between suppression and dissonance, and must continue to accept the null hypothesis.

In regard to cynicism, we observe that dissonance exerts the strongest effect on cynicism, and when included in the model above helps to explain a significant amount of the variance (27.8%). Unfortunately, inclusion of the interaction term between suppression and dissonance does not significantly improve the amount of variance explained, and only contributes an additional tenth of a percent. Thus, we must once again discount the possibility of a significant interaction between dissonance and emotional work requirements in regard to its effects on cynicism.

As a final test of our broader hypothesis, that dissonance and emotional work interact to produce higher levels of cynicism and burnout, we explore the possibility of an interaction between general emotional work and general dissonance. Results from this analysis are presented in Table 26.

Table 26. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Value Dissonance and Emotional Requirements on Cynicism and Burnout

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.073 (.340)	.069 (.344)	-.136 (.398)	-.132* (.403)
Sex	.002 (.911)	.006 (.920)	.160* (1.067)	.156* (1.078)
Dissonance	.187* (.013)	.193* (.014)	.475*** (.016)	.470*** (.016)
Emotion	.020 (.035)	.014 (.036)	.029 (.041)	.034 (.042)
Emotion X Dissonance		-.039 (.002)		.031 (.002)
R - Squared	.042	.043	.272***	.273***
Change in R-Squared		.001		.001

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

With regard to burnout, we once again find that the inclusion of the interaction term contributes very little to the explanation of variance. Likewise, we find once again that dissonance exerts a substantial effect on levels of burnout, while no other indicators emerge as salient factors. Therefore, we must accept our null hypothesis that there is no interaction between dissonance and emotional work requirements which exert a significant effect on levels of burnout.

Regarding cynicism, we find once again that both models explain a significant amount of variance in the two dependent variables. Despite this, there is no significant difference between the models including and excluding the interaction terms. Specifically, we find that incorporation of the interaction term with other variables only contributes a meager 1% to the explained variance. Therefore, we find no support for rejecting the null hypothesis, and must

conclude that most of this variance is attributable to dissonance, and not emotional work requirements or any interactive effects between these variables.

## **Discussion**

In general, the findings presented above provide little evidence for our research hypothesis that emotional work interacts with dissonance to produce greater levels of cynicism and burnout. In fact, the only significant effect revealed in all of the analyses was between deep acting and dissonance, and was in the opposite direction to theoretical expectations. Specifically, the requirement to frequently engage in deep acting paired with dissonance between one's own values and those of selected referential groups actually serves to decrease levels of burnout.

The finding in regard to deep acting does have theoretical relevance in that it suggests that individuals who make an effort to feel dissonant emotions are able to ward off the bad effects of being in disagreement. In other words, based on the finding of the negative interaction effect presented above, deep acting seems to serve as a defense mechanism when paired with dissonance. In psychological research, there are several well-documented defense mechanisms which are likely candidates here – reaction-formation and cognitive dissonance (Freud 1926; Festinger 1956).

Reaction formation occurs when an individual attempts to compensate for feeling an undesired or unacceptable sentiment by expressing the opposite of that sentiment. In other words, if one is feeling particularly unfriendly, but it is unacceptable for them to exhibit this in their environment, they will feign being extremely friendly in order to cope. As a benefit, the stress of the immediate environment is mediated by covering one's true emotions with the situationally appropriate one. This is conceptually similar to “deep acting” or making an effort to feel an emotion or adopt a view that one does not already hold. Thus, by engaging in “deep

acting” or “reaction-formation” officers may diminish some of the stress of being dissonant with one or many reference groups. As a benefit of this practice, officers who make strong efforts to feel dissonant emotions or values may be better equipped to reduce their levels of burnout. An explanation for the benefit derived from this defense mechanism is found in theories of self-verification.

This finding is consistent with theories of cognitive dissonance and self-verification which state that a fundamental motive of the individual is self-consistency (Swann et al 1983; Burke 1991; Gecas 1982). Specifically, when confronted with information about one’s self that is incongruent with their existing conceptions of self, individuals will take measures to adapt their environmental inputs, presentation of self, or their internal attitudes to re-establish consistency. Considering that officers self-definitions are largely based on their occupational identity, dissonance on values or reactions related to police work should have a great deal of self-relevance. As such, officers must find some way of reconciling information that is not consistent with “what a cop is supposed to be” in the eyes of others, especially significant others and important reference groups.

Based on the results presented above, one way that officers seem to do this is through the use of “deep acting” or “reaction formation” which allows them to adapt their internal emotional reactions or beliefs to fall in line with the source of dissonance. Thus, when an officer feels that their internal values or reactions are not in line with the expectations of important reference groups, they will attempt to bring them back within socially acceptable parameters. To the extent that officers are able to successfully resolve this dissonance in their self concept, they reduce or diminish their overall levels of burnout. Aside from preliminary support for the



existence of a self-verification defense mechanism presented above, the failure to produce additional significant effects is also theoretically interesting.

Despite the fact that previous analysis did not find any independent effects of emotional work on burnout and cynicism, the possibility of interaction effects aggravating minor or undetected effects was left open. Specifically, it was anticipated that dissonance might sufficiently condition the non-significant effects of work requirements such that it aggravated them enough to significantly increase levels of burnout and cynicism. Thus, the present analysis sought to assess the degree to which interaction effects existed independent of non-significant direct effects. However, results from the analysis presented above, and numerous analyses not presented here, suggest that there is little evidence for independent or interaction effects involving emotional work. Thus, in the present analysis we observe that emotion management has no expected significant effects on selected dependent variables either independently or through interactions with dissonance.

One likely reason that significant findings failed to emerge is methodological limitations in the study. As mentioned previously, the relatively small sample size and biased standard errors are among the most likely candidates. However, another contributing factor may have been the failure of the present study to link the emotional requirements to specific sources, as was done with dissonance. Had requirements to engage in various types of emotional management been linked to various reference groups, and not merely the job itself, stronger and more significant effects might have been observed. Future studies should employ larger samples and referential measures of requirements for emotional management to improve the likelihood of significant findings. Likewise, future studies should attempt to measure potential defense

mechanisms more thoroughly, and control for the possible benefits of emotion management which seem to result in beneficial effects of “deep acting.”

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### INTERACTION OF IDENTITY AND DISSONANCE

Based on previous analyses, dissonance is a central factor in cynicism and plays at least a substantive role in burnout. As such, it is necessary to gain a better understanding of what might condition these effects. One important factor identified by the theory presented previously, and emotional labor theory in general, is the degree to which one holds work and one's identification with their profession as central. Specifically, those individuals who hold work as central to their self concept should be more affected by the presence of dissonance than those individuals whose self concepts are based on other domains such as family, friends, religious activities, or volunteerism. This is due to the fact that dissonance in regard to something one does not identify with in the first place is of less importance, while dissonance in regard to something that is central to one's self concept takes on special relevance, particularly when the source of that dissonance resides with individuals who hold power or influence over one's actions.

Given the degree to which police officers strongly identify and are strongly defined by others through their occupation, one would expect an interaction between dissonance and identity to have a particularly relevant effect within the law enforcement community. Specifically, individuals who identify strongly as police officers or consider police work central to their identity will likely be more greatly impacted by dissonance on this highly salient and central set of values. Moreover, inasmuch as the source of dissonance lies with a referential group which has influence or power over an officer's actions, such as management or the general public, one would expect identity to have a strong conditioning effect such that increased levels of cynicism and burnout result from the interaction between these factors. There are a number of measures within the present data that are well-equipped to assess this hypothesis.

The present study draws on past research on identity in attempting to establish the degree of importance work has in relation to other identities the individual holds. Specifically, based on the work of Reitzes and Mutran (2002) the present study asks individuals to rank each of a number of commonly held identities in relation to one another (e.g. Neighbor, Parent, Police Officer, etc.). Such a measurement permits evaluation of the diversity and relative rank of a number of identities held by individuals, especially the theoretically important police officer identity. The study also employs a measure of the centrality of work to the individual developed by Pallay et al (1994) which asks individuals to express the degree to which they agree or disagree with a series of Likert items about the importance of work in one's life.

*Work Centrality.* The survey in the present study included a number of indicators of the degree to which respondents held work as a central aspect of their lives. For example, respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with statements, including: work should be a small part of one's life, the major satisfaction in my life comes from work, I have other activities in my life more important than work, my work is a significant part of who I am, most things are more important in life than work, and my own feelings are not affected much by this job. All items were coded to reflect a positive view of one's work as central, and then combined into a summated scale. The alpha reliability of the resulting scale was .60. While lower than desired, the scale is normally distributed, theoretically sound, and suitable for use in the present analysis.

*Officer Identity.* Officers were asked to rank order a selection of commonly occurring identities leaving the ranks of those identities that did not pertain to them blank. Among the identities included in the ranking process were: spouse/partner, parent, sibling, child, grandparent, relative, religious person, friend, volunteer, neighbor, and police officer. These

items were ranked from 1 to 11 from greatest to least importance. Given that our interest is in the relative importance of the officer identity, it was necessary to reverse code the rank of the officer identity so that higher scores reflect greater importance, making the results easier to interpret.

*Value Dissonance.* Based on analysis of the impact of dissonance on burnout and cynicism, it was observed that no referential source of dissonance stood out from the others in its effects. Therefore, in order to simplify presentation of this analysis, only global measures of COP-neutral and COP-specific dissonance will be used (i.e. measures of dissonance between officers and all other reference groups). Through their broad measurement of dissonance, these measures adequately capture the overall level of disagreement between officers and selected reference groups on both their general policing values, and specifically in regard to COP. These measures are highly correlated with each of the subscales of dissonance measuring disagreement between officers and selected groups, including: lieutenants, chiefs, and the public. Therefore, use of these global measures serves as a suitable proxy for testing the theoretical relationships of interest<sup>1</sup>.

*Interactions.* Prior to creating the interaction terms to be used in the present analysis, it was necessary to mean-center each of the component variables. Once this was done, each of the measures of professional identity were multiplied times each of the measures of dissonance to create four distinct interaction terms, including: work centrality X COP-neutral dissonance, work centrality X COP dissonance, officer identity X COP-neutral dissonance, and officer identity X COP dissonance. Each of these variables was relatively normally distributed and suitable for use in OLS analysis without requiring further transformation.

---

<sup>1</sup> While results are only presented for interactions involving global dissonance, results involving each of the subscales were also assessed. As expected, these results exhibited similar patterns to one another and the global scale.

In order to assess the degree to which interaction terms had a significant effect, the analysis compared models that included and excluded interaction effects in combination with controls and the interaction components (Jaccard and Turisi 2003). These models were then examined to assess the degree to which incorporation of the interaction term resulted in a significant increase in F for the overall model, and the degree to which interaction terms themselves exhibited statistically or substantively significant effects. Through this procedure, it is possible to determine whether interactions have a significant effect above and beyond their component elements, and thereby test the research hypothesis – that identification with work and dissonance interact to produce greater levels of cynicism and burnout. Results from the selected regressions are reported in the results section.

## Results

Table 27. Baseline and Interaction Effects of COP-Neutral Dissonance and Work Centrality on Cynicism and Burnout

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.177*	.164*	-.146*	-.133*
	(.355)	(.353)	(.427)	(.424)
Sex	.020	.035	.163*	.148*
	(.861)	(.859)	(1.037)	(1.030)
COP-Neutral Dissonance	.212**	.195**	.533***	.551***
	(.029)	(.028)	(.034)	(.034)
Centrality	-.370***	-.396***	.111	.138*
	(.084)	(.085)	(.101)	(.101)
Centrality X Dissonance		-.150*		.155*
		(.009)		(.010)
R - Squared	.189***	.210***	.339***	.362***
Change in R-Squared		.021*		.023*

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

Both centrality and dissonance on COP-neutral values exert significant effects on burnout in the baseline model. Specifically, dissonance increases burnout while centrality exhibits a significant negative effect such that increased levels of work centrality result in lower levels of burnout. While no specific hypothesis was presented in regards to the independent effects of centrality, it makes sense that individuals who value their work would experience less burnout.

Despite the apparent benefits of work centrality, one would still expect the interaction of dissonance with work centrality to have a significant interaction effect due to the fact that officers who consider policing to be an important aspect of their lives are likely to suffer even greater adverse consequences when confronted with dissonance. However, in this case, we find no evidence that incorporation of the interaction effect improves the predictive powers of the model, or that the interaction term itself has a significant effect on burnout in the expected direction. In fact, if the effects had been more significant, the model would suggest that a centrality/dissonance interaction actually has an effect contrary to our expectation, serving to decrease burnout. Therefore, we must accept the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between burnout and the interaction of general dissonance and work centrality.

In regard to cynicism, the base model suggests that work centrality does not have a significant effect while COP-neutral dissonance significantly increases levels of cynicism. However, when the interaction term is incorporated, we see that the interaction between dissonance and work centrality has a substantive effect ( $p > .15$ , and standardized coefficient  $> .100$ ). Likewise, the amount of variance explained by the model does increase from .339 to .362. Thus, there is some evidence to suggest that a substantive effect exists such that cynicism and work centrality interact to result in higher levels of cynicism.

Table 28. Baseline and Interaction Effects of COP-Specific Dissonance and Work Centrality on Cynicism and Burnout

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.166* (.332)	.153* (.336)	-.189** (.429)	-.147* (.415)
Sex	.029 (.860)	.038 (.866)	.156* (1.111)	.129* (1.068)
COP-Specific Dissonance	.051 (.019)	.011 (.021)	.400*** (.024)	.526*** (.025)
Centrality	-.369*** (.083)	-.384*** (.084)	.154* (.107)	.201** (.103)
Centrality X Dissonance		-.097 (.005)		.309*** (.006)
R - Squared	.141***	.149***	.208*	.283***
Change in R-Squared		.007		.075***

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .05$ , \*  $p < .15$

Given the findings regarding interaction effects between COP-neutral dissonance and work centrality, it is interesting to compare the degree to which dissonance in regard to community-oriented policing values has similar or dissimilar effects. In Table 28, we observe consistent effects for burnout. Specifically, we find that centrality exhibits a significant negative effect on burnout, while the interaction of the two fails to have a significant effect. Therefore, we are unable to reject the null hypothesis, and must continue to accept that there is no significant interaction effect between dissonance and centrality on burnout.

For cynicism, we find that COP-specific dissonance, centrality, and the interaction between these variables have effects comparable to those exhibited in the models assessing COP-neutral dissonance. In this case, however, the effects achieve traditional standards of significance. Therefore, we are able to successfully reject the null hypothesis that centrality and dissonance on COP-related values has no effect on cynicism. Stated another way, we find



evidence that dissonance on COP related matters interacts with work centrality to produce greater levels of cynicism. Given these findings, we will now assess the degree to which there are differences and similarities between the effects of work centrality and officer identity.

Table 29. Baseline and Interaction Effects of COP-Neutral Dissonance and Identification on Cynicism and Burnout

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.087 (.311)	.104 (.377)	-.124 (.410)	-.117 (.422)
Sex	.001 (.011)	.000 (.923)	.162* (1.029)	.161* (1.034)
COP-Neutral Dissonance	.243** (.072)	.269** (.032)	.524*** (.034)	.535*** (.036)
Identification	-.100 (.147)	-.096 (.153)	.146* (.170)	.147* (.171)
Identification X Dissonance		-.080 (.015)		-.033 (.016)
R - Squared	.073*	.078	.349***	.350***
Change in R-Squared		.005		.001

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

In Table 29, we observe that only dissonance on COP-neutral items has a significant effect on cynicism and burnout. Despite this, there are a number of notable substantive effects that are consistent with findings on work centrality reported earlier in this analysis. Specifically, we observe that one's identification as a police officer has a negative effect on burnout in both the base and interaction models. This suggests that increased self-identification as a police officer serves to decrease levels of burnout. While these effects are not significant, they are consistent with our previous finding in which work centrality exhibited a significant negative

effect on burnout. As such, the degree to which work centrality and identification as an officer have beneficial effects on reducing burnout should be further explored in future studies.

Just as we observed consistent effects in the base model, we observe that the interaction term has an effect in an unexpected direction, suggesting that if there were a significant interaction between identification and dissonance, it actually serves to decrease levels of burnout. This counter-intuitive finding combined with the failure to meet our pre-established criteria means we fail to reject the null hypothesis for the time being. Nonetheless, it would be worthwhile to explore the possibility of a negative interaction effect using larger samples and with alternative measures.

In the base model assessing effects on cynicism, we find that COP-neutral dissonance exerts a significant positive effect on cynicism. Moreover, we find that identification as an officer fails to exert a significant effect by traditional standards, but does possess a substantive effect. These effects carry over to the model in which the interaction term is incorporated, in which both variables result in increased levels of cynicism with controls for age, sex, and their cross-product interaction.

Despite the independent effects of the components, we once again fail to reach substantive significance with regard to the interaction effect. In this case, there is minimal improvement in explained variance, and the standardized beta coefficient of  $-.033$  is not large enough to justify a substantive finding. Moreover, the effect is in a direction contrary to that predicted by theory. Therefore, we must accept the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between the identification-dissonance interaction and levels of cynicism.

Table 30. Baseline and Interaction Effects of COP-Specific Dissonance and Identification on Cynicism and Burnout

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.074 (.342)	.086 (.337)	-.157* (.412)	-.167* (.407)
Sex	.012 (.917)	.022 (.905)	.154* (1.104)	.146* (1.092)
COP-Specific Dissonance	.102 (.020)	.079 (.020)	.382*** (.024)	.401*** (.024)
Identification	-.084 (.149)	-.074 (.147)	.177* (.179)	.169* (.177)
Identification X Dissonance		-.199** (.008)		.166* (.010)
R - Squared	.024	.062	.218***	.245***
Change in R-Squared		.039**		.027*

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .05$ , \*  $p < .15$

As a final test of the hypothesis that dissonance and identity interact to produce greater levels of cynicism and burnout, we assess the relationship between COP-specific dissonance and identification as a police officer presented above. In examining burnout, we find that there are no significant independent effects for either component in the base model. Thus, dissonance on COP-specific values and identification as an officer do not have any direct effects on burnout. However, once the interaction term is incorporated, it has a standardized effect of -.199 significant beyond the .05 level. Likewise, we observe that the contribution to explained variance (R-Squared Change of 3.9%), as indicated by the improved F between base and interaction models, is significant. Interestingly, this interaction is opposite to the predicted direction, indicating that the interaction of COP-specific dissonance and strong identification as a police officer decreases levels of burnout. Thus, we must continue to accept our null hypothesis

that the interaction between COP-specific dissonance and the police identity does not significantly increase levels of burnout.

In our examination of cynicism, we find that both identification as a police officer and dissonance on COP-related values exhibit significant independent effects on the dependent variable. Once the interaction term is included, the effect of identification is reduced to a substantive effect ( $\beta = .166$ ,  $p = .064$ ), while COP-specific dissonance continues to exhibit a strong positive effect. Additionally, we find that the interaction term meets our criteria for a substantive effect, and improves the amount of variance explained by the model by 2.7%, which is substantively significant beyond the .07 level. Taken together, we find limited support for our research hypothesis that COP-specific dissonance and strong identification as a police officer interact to produce an effect on cynicism.

The findings presented above offer mixed support for the proposed hypotheses. In terms of individual relationships, some findings hypothesized to be significant produced no significant or substantive effects. Likewise, some instances where no relationship was expected resulted in substantively interesting findings. Given this, a brief discussion of significant findings and their broader implications are in order.

## **Discussion**

There was no specifically hypothesized relationship for the effects of identification with burnout. Despite this, one would expect identification, as measured by centrality and identification as an officer to significantly mediate burnout. This is confirmed by the finding that identification with one's work and work centrality both have a negative relationship with burnout, irregardless of which type of value dissonance was controlled in the equation. Despite this negative relationship, only centrality exhibits a substantively noteworthy effect. Thus,

centrality seems to have more benefits than self-identification. In light of this finding, some further explanation and discussion is in order.

At first glance, the presence of effects of centrality and lack of effects in identification appear contradictory. However, when examined more closely this makes a great deal of sense. While centrality and dissonance are similar in that they generally measure the importance of work to the individual, they are distinct in important ways. Specifically, centrality measures the degree to which officers consider their work to be an important activity in their life, while identification measures the degree to which one's self-definition is shaped by being an officer. This difference helps to explain the presence of significant effects for centrality because individuals who are burnt out are likely to de-emphasize work as a central activity and vice versa as a defense mechanism. In contrast, individuals who view being an officer as important to who they are may completely separate the pleasure of work from the importance of that work in defining who they are to themselves and others. Thus, our failure to find a significant effect of self-identification is largely a product of role-occupancy, where the existence of effects for centrality is largely a product of enjoyment found in work as an activity.

Given the argument above, we are presented with a tautology in the relationship between centrality and burnout. Does centrality truly reduce burnout, or does burnout reduce one's perception of work as a highly central and important activity? Unfortunately, the present study did not employ the measures or methods necessary to address this question. Future studies should attempt to assess this relationship using longitudinal data. Specifically, it would be best to measure burnout and centrality at the beginning of one's career and at regular intervals throughout. Moreover, any future studies should attempt to refine measurements of work

centrality to control for such factors as one's general work ethic, overall job satisfaction, and other relevant factors.

Another area where no specific hypotheses were formulated was in regard to the independent effects of self-identification measures on cynicism. Despite this, a clear pattern emerged in the present data which suggests that strong self-identification as a police officer serves to increase cynicism, while centrality does not have any notable substantive effect. This effect is enhanced when dissonance resulting from COP-specific items is controlled in the equations. This suggests that dissonance on COP-neutral or traditional policing values results in stronger and more significant relationships between cynicism and identification. Thus, individuals who strongly identify as traditional police officers have a more skeptical and cynical view of the world.

These findings make sense in that they support the idea that traditional policing values promote a sense of elitism and isolation from the general public. It also suggests that there are a number of benefits to one's mental health and worldview in balancing one's identity as a police officer with other important roles and identities. Moreover, it suggests that adoption of COP, which in many ways requires a de-identification with policing and embracing of one's other roles as a human being, facilitates a more productive and healthy world-view than traditional policing values, a fact often argued, but seldom empirically supported by advocates of community-oriented policing. Thus, the present findings have a great deal of value in providing officers with insight about the potential consequences of their career, and suggest some clear strategies that departments and individual officers can employ to avoid the trap of cynicism. Specifically, caution about over-emphasizing one's role as a police officer, especially of a traditional sort, and losing sight of other important roles in life.

Aside from a secondary interest in the independent effects presented above, the primary purpose of the analysis was to assess the interaction of dissonance and identification on levels of cynicism and burnout. In regard to the effects on burnout, there was no consistent effect. Centrality exhibited a substantive effect on burnout when combined with COP-neutral dissonance, but not when combined with dissonance on COP-specific matters. Identification as an officer had a substantive effect when combined with COP-specific dissonance, but not when combined with COP-neutral dissonance. The only consistency that did emerge was the direction of the relationship for all interaction effects being negative such that dissonance and identification actually combined to reduce levels of burnout. Unfortunately, this finding is inconsistent with our stated hypotheses which suggest that identification and dissonance should interact to produce greater levels of burnout.

In general, these findings suggest that dissonance and identification don't interact to effect levels of burnout. The most likely explanation for this finding is that the independent benefits of identification as an officer and viewing one's work as highly central offset any adverse effects of being in disagreement with important reference groups. Given the ambiguity of these findings, future studies should employ the longitudinal methods and measurement improvements suggested in the discussion of independent effects, and seek to explore relationships on larger and more diverse samples.

Despite the failure to find expected effects on burnout, there were clear interaction effects in the expected direction in regard to cynicism. Specifically, three of the four interactions between dissonance and identification on cynicism had a significant or notable substantive effect approaching significance. Moreover, these relationships were stronger and more significant

when the interaction included COP-specific dissonance than when it included COP-neutral dissonance.

Above all, the findings presented above support the hypothesis that the rift between management and line-level interests in regard to community-oriented policing values has implications for the health and well-being of officers. Likewise, it supports the notion that this adverse effect is aggravated when police officers have a strong identification with the role of officer or when they consider work to be a highly important activity in their lives. Thus, individuals who strongly identify with being an officer and view themselves in disagreement are at significantly greater risk of becoming alienated and cynical than other officers.

There are a number of strategies officers and police managers might utilize to manage this rift and minimize adverse impacts. First and foremost, there is a great deal of merit in the strategy of buffering one's identity as a police officer with other relevant identities. As such, officers should seek to find satisfaction in roles and identities outside work that balance their own and others views of themselves. If officers are unable to do this, they appear likely to develop an "us versus them" mentality, and in general a more negative and unhealthy worldview. Police departments might go so far as to provide incentives for involvement in non-policing activities, as well as generally encouraging and sensitizing officers to the dangers of over-identification.

Another potential action that police departments could take in order to reduce the adverse impacts of dissonance is to improve communication between line-level and management concerning the rationale and purpose of specific values. Through interaction and participation between line and management, some level of compromise and understanding is likely to be reached which should reduce the perception of social distance between competing factions. Such



a change might also result in a greater alignment of values, or the recognition that it's okay to have different values, perhaps even reaffirming the worth of competing or traditional values. As a benefit, the power of perceived incongruence could be reduced and result in a more optimistic and less cynical workforce. Such improvements would also have significant benefits for quality of service provided to the citizens.

In conclusion, the findings presented here provide further support for the hypothesis that there is a pervasive and multiplicative effect when disagreement exists between line-level and management on fundamental values. Moreover, it provides auxiliary support for the position that COP, which police management tends to embrace, is beneficial in producing a more balanced and optimistic world-view. Likewise, it suggests that over-identification with the role of police officer, especially when paired with a traditional view compounds these adverse effects. As such, officers and police departments should make special efforts to address these issues and promote a healthier and better-rounded approach to the profession of policing.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### FINAL COMBINED MODELS

The analyses presented previously have helped clarify which elements of emotional work requirements, value dissonance, identification with one's career, and two-way interactions between these variables are likely to have a significant effect on the selected dependent variables of cynicism and burnout. However, to this point, we have not controlled for the simultaneous effects of theoretically important variables from different classes of variables, unless an interaction between variables from those classes was specified. As a consequence, significant effects revealed in the previous analyses could be a product of spurious relationships. Given this possibility, the purpose of the present chapter is to combine the most relevant effects into a series of models to assess the degree to which these effects hold up once other theoretically important factors are controlled. In order to do this, a brief discussion of how effects will be incorporated into the final models is necessary.

*Emotional work.* Emotional labor theory suggests that the emotional requirements of one's work should have a substantial effect on one's psychological well-being. Thus far, results from the present study have failed to support this expectation. Specifically, in the analysis of emotional work requirements presented previously, there were no effects that were statistically significant by traditional standards. Only one element of emotion, a single-item measure of deep-acting, even approached a significant effect within the tested models. Likewise, the only interaction with a noteworthy effect was that between deep acting and dissonance. Given this, only one measure of emotional work requirements, the single-item measure of deep-acting, will be included in the analyses presented here.

*Dissonance on Policing Values.* In contrast to emotional work, the analyses of value dissonance revealed numerous significant effects on cynicism and burnout. Dissonance with upper-management, middle-managers, and the general public all had varying levels of influence on the cynicism and burnout experienced by officers. Likewise, dissonance on both COP-specific policing values and COP-neutral activities revealed differential effects on burnout and cynicism. Given that there were so many significant effects from dissonance, we must pare down the variables included in the final model in a way that preserves the ability to identify divergent effects but maintains parsimony within the final models. In order to conduct the final analysis, it is necessary to look to theoretical and logical justification for selecting the most parsimonious measures.

Given that the primary interest of the present study pertains to dissonance in regard to COP and non-COP items, it makes sense to first divide the measures utilized in the final model along these distinct lines. Moreover, since the effects of dissonance did not seem to substantially differ between management and line-personnel or between line-personnel and the general public, it is justifiable to utilize a composite measure of difference. Therefore, the present analysis will employ two measures of dissonance in the final model: COP-neutral global dissonance and COP-specific global dissonance. These items are be the sum of the difference between all reference groups on COP-neutral or COP-specific items. Use of these measures will enable us to assess the degree to which COP-specific and COP-neutral items have a differential effect on the selected dependent variables.

*Identification with Work.* In the analysis of identification with work, two measures were used to assess different dimensions of identification with one's work, work centrality and self-identification as a police officer. Analyses revealed that both sets of identification measures

exerted significant effects on one or the other of the dependent variables. In some cases, these effects were consistent across dependent variables, in others the selected measure of identification effected only cynicism or burnout, but not both variables. The final analysis will examine the effects of both measures of identification. In doing so, we will be able to assess the degree to which these measures have differential effects on the selected dependent variables when controlling for other theoretically relevant factors.

*Two-Way Interactions.* Two distinct sets of interaction terms between the independent variables presented above will be utilized in the final analysis, including the interactions between deep acting and both measures of dissonance, and both measures of identification and both measures of dissonance. No interactions will be included between deep acting and identification as there is no strong theoretical argument as to why such an effect would exist. Subsequent to entering all independent variables on cynicism and burnout, all interaction terms will be entered as a block of variables in order to assess the degree to which interactions account for a significant portion of the variance above and beyond the independent effects.

Using the variables selected above, a series of regressions were conducted to assess all possible combinations of variables, a total of eight. In each of these analyses, the explanatory power and significance of controls and independent effects were first simultaneously included into a single equation. A second equation was then run in which interaction variables were added to the variables from the first regression in order to assess the unique contribution of interaction effects.

## Results

Table 31. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Deep Acting, Centrality and COP-Specific Dissonance on Cynicism and Burnout

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.167* (.329)	.158* (.333)	-.186* (.426)	-.143* (.413)
Sex	.038 (.855)	.038 (.863)	.166* (1.106)	.135* (1.071)
Deep Acting	.116 (.278)	.131 (.280)	.142* (.359)	.150* (.348)
Work Centrality	-.348*** (.083)	-.353*** (.084)	.181* (.108)	.215** (.104)
COP-Specific Dissonance	.052 (.019)	.032 (.020)	.400*** (.024)	.521*** (.025)
Deep Acting X COP-Dissonance		-.107 (.016)		-.042 (.020)
Work Centrality X COP-Dissonance		-.105 (.005)		.299*** (.006)
R - Squared	.155***	.172**	.227***	.304***
Change in R-Squared		.018		.076***

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .05$ , \*  $p < .15$

In the results presented in Table 31, the effects of COP-specific dissonance and work centrality on cynicism and burnout are assessed in combination with one another, and with other theoretical variables of interest. Regarding burnout, the only significant effect that remains when other independent effects are controlled is that of work centrality. Likewise, the only effect that remains significant when the interaction terms are included is the negative effect of work centrality on burnout. This is consistent with previous findings on work centrality; however, it suggests that the previously significant effects of other variables do not have an effect when

one's level of work centrality is included in the equation. We can infer from these findings that work centrality is a proximal and relatively strong indicator of burnout.

With regard to cynicism, we find that dissonance for COP-specific values is the only factor which exerts a significant effect when other independent effects are controlled. Despite this, each of the variables included in the model has a substantive effect ( $p < .15$ , and  $B > .100$ ). The independent effects observed in the initial regression hold true once the two-way interactions are included in the equation. However, work centrality attains significance, and the interaction between work centrality and COP-specific dissonance has a significant influence. Taken together, these findings suggest that both work centrality and COP-specific dissonance serve to increase levels of cynicism independently, as well as in combination with one another. Stated another way, the more seriously invested one is in their job as a police officer, and the more in disagreement about community-oriented policing values one is, the more cynical officers are likely to be.

In order to cross-validate the idea that identification with one's work truly does have independent and interactive effects with dissonance, it is necessary to use the alternative measure of identification as a police officer. These results are presented in Table 32.

Table 32. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Deep Acting, Identity and COP-Specific Dissonance on Cynicism and Burnout

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.084 (.337)	.101 (.333)	-.149* (.411)	-.155* (.408)
Sex	.026 (.905)	.030 (.898)	.163* (1.105)	.144* (1.100)
Deep Acting	.177* (.289)	.197* (.287)	.111 (.353)	.115 (.352)
Officer Identity	-.082 (.147)	-.060 (.145)	.177* (.179)	.166* (.178)
COP-Specific Dissonance	.099 (.019)	.093 (.020)	.379* (.024)	.414*** (.024)
Deep Acting X COP-Dissonance		-.074 (.017)		-.102 (.021)
Officer Identity X COP-Dissonance		-.197* (.008)		.178* (.010)
R - Squared	.055	.103	.230***	.264***
Change in R-Squared		.048*		.034*

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

In Table 32, there are initially no significant independent effects on burnout. Only deep acting has a substantive effect with significance beyond the .15 level ( $p=.08$ ), and a standardized effect greater than .100. But, when the interaction effects are included in the model, the effect of deep acting is increased. Likewise, the effects of identification as an officer with COP-specific value dissonance interact to significantly reduce burnout, despite the fact that their independent components do not yield significant effects. All other variables fail to achieve significance and lack noteworthy effects.

In combination, these findings in regard to burnout call into question the general effect of identification with one's work revealed previously, as officer identity fails to exhibit a direct

effect on burnout. As was suggested previously, this suggests that the concept of work centrality may be tautologically inter-twined with burnout with one leading to the other. There does not seem to be much evidence of a direct effect from either measure of identification. However, through the use of the alternative measure of identification as an officer, there is evidence for an interactive effect in which the pairing of dissonance and identification as an officer has a substantively noteworthy effect.

In addition, the findings presented in Table 32 suggest that use of the work centrality measure may be masking an effect of deep acting on burnout. In the analysis where work centrality is utilized, deep acting fails to produce any significant effects; however, in the model where an alternative measure is used, this effect approaches significance ( $p > .052$ , and  $B = .197$ ). Thus, it seems that deep acting may in fact have an aggravating effect on levels of burnout among police officers when other factors are controlled. This will be explored further in the discussion section of this chapter.

For cynicism, all variables except deep acting exhibit at least a substantive effect on the dependent variable when. These results hold up even after interaction terms are included, and the interaction between identification as an officer and COP-specific dissonance is substantive and rapidly approaching significance. This is consistent with the results presented previously which utilized centrality as the measure of identification with one's work; however, in this case deep acting does not attain significance or even a substantive effect. This suggests that COP-related dissonance and identification as an officer overlaps with the variance explained by deep acting, where centrality and COP-specific dissonance do not. The present model suggests the possibility that a more parsimonious explanation of cynicism does not necessitate the inclusion of deep-acting.



Given that one of our key interests is in whether or not COP-specific and COP-neutral values result in differential effects, it is important to assess the same relationships presented above utilizing COP-neutral measures of dissonance. The results from these analyses are presented in Table 33.

Table 33. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Deep Acting, Centrality and COP-Neutral Dissonance on Cynicism and Burnout

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.180*	.202**	-.126*	-.104
	(.321)	(.311)	(.393)	(.393)
Sex	.034	.048	.161*	.147*
	(.837)	(.805)	(1.026)	(1.018)
Deep Acting	.091	.154	.074	.095
	(.274)	(.271)	(.336)	(.342)
Work Centrality	-.343*	-.359***	.152*	.181*
	(.081)	(.078)	(.099)	(.099)
COP-Neutral Dissonance	.200*	.258***	.520***	.549***
	(.028)	(.028)	(.034)	(.035)
Deep Acting X COP-Dissonance		-.269***		-.075
		(.022)		(.028)
Work Centrality X COP-Dissonance		-.170*		.156*
		(.008)		(.010)
R - Squared	.191***	.273***	.335***	.365***
Change in R-Squared		.082***		.030*

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .05$ , \*  $p < .15$

Only work centrality and dissonance on COP-neutral items exert significant effects on burnout when controlling for other theoretically relevant variables. Specifically, these variables have opposite effects in that centrality serves to decrease burnout, while dissonance serves to increase burnout. Although it did not exhibit a significant effect in the baseline model, deep acting increases levels of burnout significantly in the interaction model. Both interactions have

noteworthy effects on burnout with the interaction between deep acting and COP-neutral dissonance serving to decrease burnout, and the interaction between centrality and dissonance serving to substantially decrease levels of burnout.

Taken together the findings on burnout are divergent from the findings presented earlier in regard to COP-specific dissonance. Specifically, where deep acting did not seem to have any notable effects when COP-related dissonance was controlled, it has substantive independent and interactive effects in the present case. This suggests that there are likely differential implications when dealing with sources of dissonance grounded in either community-oriented values or more traditional or neutral policing activities. Namely, deep acting may increase burnout when acting by itself; however, decreases burnout when placed in combination with dissonance on COP-neutral items. These findings are counterintuitive, and will be assessed further in the discussion section of this chapter.

Dissonance continues to be the dominant influence on cynicism irregardless of the domain from which that dissonance emerges. Likewise, the degree to which one considers their work as a police officer to be a highly central activity significantly contributes to one's level of cynicism. And, last but not least, there does not appear to be any evidence of interactive effects between dissonance and work centrality or level of deep acting. The processes influencing dissonance appear to be the same whether that dissonance is between officers and reference groups in regard to community-oriented or more traditional policing values. Thus, dissonance of any type seems to increase cynicism.

Table 34. Baseline and Interaction Effects of Deep Acting, Identity and COP-Neutral Dissonance on Cynicism and Burnout

Variables	Burnout		Cynicism	
	1	2	1	2
Age	.103 (.330)	.142* (.331)	-.097 (.380)	-.080 (.391)
Sex	.023 (.887)	.020 (.868)	.157* (1.021)	.156* (1.025)
Deep Acting	.149* (.286)	.211** (.288)	.049 (.329)	.074 (.340)
Officer Identity	-.085 (.144)	-.056 (.141)	.169** (.165)	.181** (.167)
COP-Neutral Dissonance	.220** (.030)	.293*** (.031)	.511*** (.034)	.543*** (.037)
Deep Acting X COP-Dissonance		-.254** (.025)		-.100 (.030)
Officer Identity X COP-Dissonance		-.027 (.014)		-.019 (.017)
R - Squared	.092*	.151*	.342***	.352***
Change in R-Squared		.058**		.010

Note: Values in parantheses are standard errors.

\*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05, \* p < .15

In comparison to the models presented previously, where the effects of COP-specific dissonance were controlled, the results presented in Table 34, focusing on COP-neutral dissonance, reveal a number of similarities and differences. While deep acting exhibits a substantive independent effect in both models, the effects are divergent for dissonance in both the independent and interaction models. Specifically, where COP-neutral dissonance exhibits a significant independent effect on burnout in both the tables above, COP-specific dissonance did not produce any effects in the previous model. Likewise, in the present model where COP-neutral dissonance is controlled, deep acting and dissonance interact to produce a significant effect on burnout, while identification and dissonance do not. Despite these differences, both

sets of interactions appear to substantively decrease levels of dissonance. These findings will be discussed further in the discussion section of this chapter.

The results presented here on cynicism are highly consistent with those results where we controlled for COP-specific dissonance. Specifically, identification as an officer and both COP-specific and COP-neutral dissonance exert significant or near significant effects on cynicism in both models. Moreover, these effects are consistent when interaction terms are included under either scenario. The only substantial difference between the models is in the lack of a significant interaction between dissonance and identification as an officer which existed previously. This suggests that where identification as an officer interacts with COP-specific dissonance to increase levels of cynicism, it has no such effect in combination with COP-neutral dissonance.

## **Discussion**

The findings presented above help to paint a more complete picture of the independent and interactive effects between deep acting, identification with work, and value dissonance on cynicism and burnout. In general, the overall models hold a high degree of explanatory power. In only one case did a model fail to achieve overall significance, yet it still contained several noteworthy substantive effects. Taken together, these findings provide mixed support for our overarching hypotheses, and suggest a number of ways in which our understanding of the relationships between emotion, value dissonance, identity, and adverse effects like cynicism and burnout function.

Previous analyses revealed that of all the measures of emotional management assessed in the present study, only deep acting had a substantive effect on the dependent variables. Therefore, deep acting was the only measure of emotion that was included in the final models presented above. Given the theoretical importance of emotion management to the framework of

emotional labor, the absence of effects from emotion work was both surprising and disappointing. Nonetheless, deep acting did result in a number of noteworthy effects that held up against other theoretically important controls.

The effects of deep acting on burnout were suppressed when the measure of centrality was incorporated in the equation, but not when the measure of police identity was included. This finding suggests that centrality masks the effects of deep acting, where identity does not. One explanation is that the relationship between centrality and burnout overlaps and overpowers whatever effects exist between deep acting and burnout. In other words, even if one engages in deep acting, officers who view their job as highly central will mitigate the adverse effects of being required to engage in deep acting. This stands in contrast to the effects of strong identification as a police officer, which seems to inhibit the ability to buffer the adverse effects of deep acting. So, the costs of deep acting may be outweighed by the benefits of considering one's work a central element of one's life, but not by the mere fact of strong self-definition as a police officer.

While no specific hypotheses about the relationship between centrality and identification as an officer and cynicism and burnout were specified in advance, there were a number of effects worth discussing further. Deep acting, centrality and identification have differential effects on cynicism and burnout depending upon the other variables controlled in the model. Work centrality has strong and consistent independent effects across models and variables such that it is likely to decrease burnout, and increase cynicism. In contrast, identification as an officer does not have any significant independent effects on levels of burnout. Yet, it does have substantive effects on cynicism in both the models where it is included.

The most likely explanation for the divergent findings in regard to our two measures of identification with one's work is partially a product of design. These two measures were selected for the very fact that they do measure different elements of identification with one's work. On the one hand, centrality is intended to measure the degree of value one holds toward the activity of work in relation to other activities in one's life. In contrast, the officer identity is intended to measure the relative degree of importance of being a police officer to self-identification. These differences provide some potential insight to the divergence in the present findings.

In terms of the effects of work centrality on burnout, it is not surprising that there is such a strong effect on burnout, as these variables are tautologically related when viewed in cross-sectional data. In other words, if one is burnt out they have likely abandoned the importance of work in their life, and vice versa. Future studies should attempt to disentangle this relationship using longitudinal panel data which should provide greater insight into the causal relationship between these variables. Specifically, it should be able to provide insight about whether burnout precedes weakened centrality, or whether weakened centrality precedes burnout.

The effects between the two measures of identification with one's work and cynicism are highly consistent across models. Centrality exerts a substantive effect in all models where it is included, as does the measure of identification as a police officer. This seems to suggest that in general, identification with police work as an activity and in regard to self-definition results in a significantly more cynical world-view, and supports our original research hypotheses in regard to relationship between identification and cynicism. Moreover, it generally affirms the notion that there is a cynical culture among line-level personnel that is strongly conditioned by the individual self-definitions of officers.

At the core of our theoretical framework is the notion that dissonance between line-level officers and selected reference groups on policing values leads to increased adverse effects. We hypothesized that wherever we find dissonance, we should find greater levels of cynicism and burnout. The study revealed unqualified support for this hypothesis with dissonance on both COP-specific and COP-neutral values resulting in higher levels of cynicism. However, in regard to burnout, only dissonance on COP-neutral values has a significant effect. As such, further discussion and explanation of this finding is required.

One likely explanation for the unexpected finding presented above lies in the relevance of the values on which officers perceive themselves to be in disagreement with important reference groups. Specifically, dissonance on COP-neutral values may actually take on more relevance than COP-specific values because they are representative of what many officers believe to be the non-negotiable core values of policing. In contrast, COP-specific dissonance may not produce as much anxiety because these values are considered to be more peripheral, and disagreement is more widely expected. Stated another way, any officer who believes they are constantly fighting a battle about the fundamental values which guide how they conduct themselves in their job are at risk of burnout. In contrast, some officers seem to almost pride themselves on disagreeing with COP-specific values and as a result suffer no adverse effects. Evidence for this assertion finds limited evidence in the finding that there is in fact a significant negative association between the interaction of COP-specific dissonance and identification as an officer on burnout. Unfortunately, there are also a number of contradictory interaction effects which suggest that dissonance of any form is a-productive.

Generally speaking, all significant interactions involving either form of dissonance seem to decrease levels of burnout. Specifically, there are three substantively noteworthy interaction

effects on burnout. Despite their commonality in reducing levels of burnout, each of the interactions has potentially divergent implications.

Beginning with the most straight-forward interaction, COP-specific dissonance and identification as an officer interact with one another to reduce levels of burnout. This suggests that the effects of dissonance are greatly conditioned by one's identification with work. Stated another way, there is evidence for an effect where dissonance on COP-specific values actually serves to decrease burnout when placed in combination with strong self-identification as an officer.

Moving to the more complicated relationship between deep acting and COP-neutral dissonance, there appears to be additional evidence for the premise that officers may actually find beneficial effects in priding themselves on being in disagreement with COP-specific values. Such a relationship suggests that when COP-neutral dissonance is controlled in the equation, deep acting continues to exert an effect. This implies that any remaining dissonance, for which deep acting would be required, would have to come from COP-specific dissonance which is not controlled in the model. Taken together, these findings do seem to suggest that dissonance in regard to COP-specific values may actually have beneficial effects for officers.

Despite the two supporting pieces of evidence cited above, the final interaction under consideration in its effect on burnout suggests that there may be a more general process at work. Specifically, the finding that centrality and COP-neutral dissonance interact to reduce burnout suggests that identification and work centrality substantially condition the relationship with dissonance of both forms to mitigate any adverse effects. Stated another way, these findings suggest that increased identification with and value of one's work have a general benefit to the individual and outweigh any potential adverse effects of either form of dissonance when working



in combination with one another. Thus, the primary message in regard to the effects of dissonance on burnout is that it is highly conditioned by the variables it is interacting with such that the generally adverse independent effects of dissonance can generally be mediated when one considers their work to be highly central or places a high value on the officer identity.

Aside from the interactive effects between dissonance and other theoretically important variables on burnout, there were a number of significant and noteworthy interaction effects on cynicism. Specifically, there were three interaction effects which achieved or surpassed the pre-established criteria for a substantive relationship ( $p < .15$ , and  $B \geq .100$ ). No significant interaction effects on cynicism occurred between deep acting and dissonance. However, a number of interactions involving the two measures of identification with work did produce significant and substantive effects. These effects were more pronounced where COP-specific dissonance was involved; however, they also produced noteworthy effects in combination with COP-neutral items. The implications of these effects will now be briefly discussed.

In the case of COP-neutral dissonance, only centrality and dissonance produced a significant interaction effect on cynicism. While this effect was not significant, it exceeded the pre-established criteria for a substantive relationship. In contrast, identification as a police officer failed to result in any significant effects when combined with COP-specific dissonance. Taken together these findings suggest that much of the effect of COP-neutral dissonance can be explained through a direct independent effect. In contrast, it suggests that COP-specific dissonance not only has independent effects, but also interacts with measures of identification to produce greater cynicism.

Given that COP-neutral dissonance interacts with centrality, but not with identification as a police officer, there are fundamentally different implications. Considering work as a central

activity paired with any form of dissonance results in increased cynicism, while identification as an officer only results in increased cynicism when disagreement about values is limited to COP-neutral items. In other words, the more seriously one takes their work as an important activity, the more likely they are to hold a cynical world-view; whereas, strong self-identification as an officer only has a negative impact when paired with disagreement about COP-specific matters. Thus, cops who see themselves as traditional, are in disagreement with community-oriented values, and are highly attached to their work tend to be more cynical. Likewise, officers who rely more heavily on other non-police identities, don't overemphasize the value of work, and take no strong position on policing values generally adopt a healthier and less cynical world-view.

In aggregate, the findings presented above suggest that burnout and cynicism are influenced by distinct processes in which the same causal variables have very different effects. For example, where strong identification and work centrality seem to be beneficial in reducing levels of burnout, they significantly aggravate levels of cynicism. Likewise, where deep acting seems to have an effect on burnout, there is no comparable effect on cynicism that is not explained by other theoretically relevant factors. Nonetheless, the mere existence of these effects provides some degree of support for the hypotheses assessed here. Further, it suggests that while there is a clear need to more explicitly clarify some relationships based on theory and empirical evidence, there is in fact a strong case that, in general, emotion, value dissonance, identity, and the interaction of these factors result in significant adverse effects for police officers. Finally, it suggests that only through greater awareness of these forces and a conscious effort to overcome the potential pitfalls of them can law enforcement agencies and individual officers avert the unintended consequences of their noble occupation.

## CHAPTER NINE

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings of the present study provide mixed support regarding the hypothesized effects of emotional labor on cynicism and burnout. In some cases, theoretically expected effects on one dependent variable were statistically significant and in the predicted direction, while the same predictor variables resulted in weak or unexpected findings on the other dependent variable. In other instances, significant effects emerged where none were explicitly hypothesized resulting in theoretically informative findings. Likewise, a number of effects that were expected to be strong and significant did not emerge at all. As such, the present results provide a great deal of insight about how theory and future research might be improved to more accurately capture the empirical realities of emotional labor, especially with regard to effects on policing.

One interesting finding in the present study, for which there were no explicit hypotheses, was in regard to the effects of sex. Specifically, it was observed on numerous occasions in the present findings that female officers tend to have higher levels of cynicism than their male counterparts when other theoretically relevant factors are controlled. Despite this elevated level of cynicism, there does not appear to be any significant difference between male and female officers and their levels of burnout. These findings are contrary to what contemporary knowledge and theory would predict given that female law enforcement officers also tend to be more educated and younger. As such, this finding is theoretically informative in a number of ways.

The finding that cynicism is elevated among female officers, while burnout is not, is most likely the product of an effort by female officers to assimilate into the traditional and dominant male culture of policing. Stated another way, female officers may adopt a disproportionately cynical view in order to promote the perception among their peers that they are not soft,

feminine, trusting, naïve, or weak, as they fear being perceived within a traditional culture; but to the contrary, are rigid, stern, skeptical, and strong willed, and are thereby perceived as fit as any male officer to engage in the behaviors culturally determined to be necessary to conduct “real police work.” As such, female officers are likely to engage in a range of adaptive behaviors including reaction formation, deep acting, and alternative display in order to better fit into a culture which is likely to sanction any outward display of femininity. Given this, future studies should make efforts to better understand and more thoroughly explore the adaptations female officers employ to cope with their unique social strains of fitting into a male dominated culture, and specifically to identify how those adaptations might have adverse consequences, such as cynicism.

One of the most surprising findings of the study was the consistent failure to show a relationship between various measures of emotion work and either cynicism or burnout. Of all the dimensions of emotion work considered, including surface acting, deep acting, expression of intense emotions, suppression of emotions, and overall emotional requirements; only deep acting had any notable independent effects. Despite this, the effects did not remain consistent when other theoretically important variables were controlled. Moreover, deep acting only produced interactive effects with COP-specific dissonance in a direction contrary to theoretical predictions, serving to decrease levels of burnout. Taken together, these findings suggest a substantial weakness in emotional labor theory as a framework for explaining levels of cynicism and burnout among police officers.

A key factor likely to explain the weak findings noted above is the inability of the present study to measure and operationalize the dynamic use of emotion work by police officers during the course of their daily duties. Unlike other service jobs, which require laborers to repeatedly

act out the will of management in order to maintain customer satisfaction with relatively little autonomy, emotion work and autonomy are integral tools for police officers in eliciting a wide range of desired responses from individuals with whom they interact. Stated another way, in executing their diverse duties which range from utilizing their authority to elicit compliance from a suspect, to providing sincere empathy and compassion for an accident victim in the midst of a crisis, officers are likely to frequently draw upon all of the emotion management techniques measured in the present study. In doing so, officers are utilizing their agency and autonomy to select emotional presentations which are best suited to respond to complex and situation-specific norms for their own benefit and survival. Therefore, it seems that within the present study, and in regard to policing in general, the substantial emotion work utilized by police officers is not adequately tied to the demands of management for it to result in the adverse effects observed and reported in other lower-level service professions with less autonomy.

Understanding the limitations of measuring emotion work presented above, future research should attempt to do a number of things to advance knowledge about the impact of emotion work on police officers. Specifically, future studies should make explicit efforts to measure the degree to which officers are mandated to act contrary to their own internally held values, as opposed to measuring their overall requirements of emotion work. Any such study should pay special attention to the sources of these situational demands considering the degree to which various levels of management, suspect behavior, or the general public exert differential effects. Studies should also examine how different shifts, duty assignments, and ranks are differentially exposed to situational demands. In doing so, a better link between the value dissonance perceived by officers and the situational demand for specific behaviors would be

established permitting researchers to assess the degree to which situation-specific emotive dissonance has effects on the adverse consequences of burnout and cynicism.

Among the strongest and most significant findings reported in the study is the finding that measures of value dissonance exert a consistent significant influence on cynicism and burnout. This is particularly important given the fact that past studies of emotional labor have neglected to examine the role of value dissonance despite its theoretical importance in Hochschild's (1983) statement of the theory. In recognizing this limitation, the present study sought to measure dissonance perceived between respondents and various important reference groups. As a benefit of these efforts, the present study reported a number of findings that indicate ways in which various dimensions of dissonance are likely to have an effect on cynicism and burnout.

One of the key findings in regard to the impact of dissonance on cynicism and burnout was the finding that burnout was associated with dissonance between officers and more proximal levels of management, while cynicism was associated with more powerful levels of management. This clearly illustrates that dissonance does not have uniform effects on adverse outcomes, but is likely to produce different outcomes depending upon the source of the dissonance. Therefore, future studies should make efforts to account for the source of dissonance, particularly in complex organizations where workers are subject to multiple levels of hierarchical management. In doing so, our understanding of the complex nature of institutional demands within various levels of organizations can be better understood.

Further evidence for the ways in which dissonance is likely to have differential effects can be found in the fact that COP-specific and COP-neutral dissonance have inconsistent effects on cynicism and burnout. Specifically, COP-specific dissonance consistently serves to increase levels of cynicism, where it has no significant effects on burnout. In contrast, COP-neutral

dissonance serves to increase both cynicism and burnout. Taken together, these findings suggest that dissonance on peripheral values such as COP-related matters only impacts cynicism; whereas, dissonance on more generic or COP-neutral policing values appears to have broad relevance serving to increase levels of both cynicism and burnout. These unique findings suggest that it is also important for future studies of emotional labor to examine the domain on which employees perceive value dissonance with management. Regardless of what occupation one is studying, one is likely to encounter a wide range of core and fringe values about how best to achieve the desired ends. Employees and management are likely to place different levels of relevance on these values, and as a consequence they are likely to have varying impacts on the key outcomes predicted by emotional labor theory. As such, it is important to thoroughly understand the cultural contradictions of greatest importance to the specific domain to which emotional labor is being applied.

Among the most interesting findings in the present study were those pertaining to the ways in which self-identification as an officer condition the effects of other variables. While no specific hypotheses were formulated in regard to the independent effects of these measures, a number of informative findings emerged from the present study. Specifically, work centrality had consistent effects on both cynicism and burnout serving to increase the former and decrease the latter. In contrast, identity had a consistent positive relationship with cynicism, but no apparent relationship to burnout. These effects carry through to the interactions where both centrality and the officer identity interact with COP-specific dissonance to increase levels of cynicism contrary to theoretical expectations, and decrease levels of burnout. Thus, identification with one's work clearly has some benefit in reducing one's levels of burnout, but

actually increases one's level of cynicism. These findings point to a number of ways in which theory and research on the interplay of work, identity, and emotional labor can be improved.

First and foremost, future studies should be attentive to the longitudinal nature of identification with work and the potential role that attrition might play in studies conducted using cross-sectional data. Specifically, due to the fact that individuals who are burnt out are not likely to stick around or persist under such conditions without alteration, it is highly likely that individuals who strongly identified with their work and became burnt out dropped out at an earlier point in their careers and were not included in the present study. Therefore, it is highly likely that the observed benefits of work centrality in the present sample are tautologically related to reduced burnout and a product of attrition. As such, future studies should make efforts to track the effects of identification with one's work over the course of an individual's career to assess what long-term and reciprocal impact factors such as identification as an officer and centrality of work are likely to have.

Second, given the finding that identification as an officer is consistently associated with cynicism indicates that there is a strong sub-cultural value for cynicism among officers. This is important as it reinforces the notion that sub-cultural values are important conditioning factors in examining any relationship; however, they are especially important when examining contradictions between cultures or subcultures, as is the case in the present study's focus on discrepancies between line and management values. Taken together, this suggests that future studies of emotional labor should be attentive to the ways in which the sub-cultural values and norms of the line-level culture can act as significant moderators of emotive dissonance grounded in differences between line and management values.



Aside from the theoretical and methodological contributions of the present study identified and discussed above, a number of practical implications can also be drawn from the findings of the present study. Specifically, the present findings clearly illustrate that there is great potential for a substantial cultural divide between the values of line and management in policing. Whether that distance is perceived or real, such a chasm is likely to have substantial impacts on the individual attitudes and psychological health of officers. Moreover, it is likely to have a great number of consequences for the relationship between these essential functions of policing (line and management). Combined, these problems are likely to dramatically impact the ability of police agencies to effectively carry out their primary functions of law enforcement, order maintenance, and service to the community. Therefore, in the interest of the health and well-being of their officers, the relationship between labor and management, and perhaps most importantly in order to improve their ability to provide quality service to the community, police agencies must make specific efforts to address this cultural divide. A number of recommendations are suggested.

One of the key problems in policing agencies leading to the cultural divide between line and management on policing values seems to be rooted in the unique history, function, and culture of policing in America. Specifically, modern policing is rooted in a highly militaristic and authoritarian functional paradigm which views the police (and to a broader degree the criminal justice system) as the lone protector of civilized society in which police are deemed superior, and citizens are viewed as subordinate or subject to that authority. Such cultural undercurrents are difficult to disrupt as they are often subtle, frequently reinforced by the behavior and expectations of citizens, and grounded in a very real legal mandate and necessary function to maintain order and uphold the law. Moreover, they are most reinforced on the street

where individual line-officers must repeatedly exercise their legally granted authority. Given this, it is no wonder individual officers would adhere to such a favorable definition of themselves and their role which resists giving up the traditional authority and prestige of the occupation. As such, it is all that much more important that police agencies attempt to promote cultural change through education and development of a more progressive perspective such as that offered by community-oriented policing.

One way in which police agencies can affect cultural change and promote a more progressive community-oriented culture in the long-run is through careful selection of police candidates. Traditionally, police agencies have over-emphasized physical prowess and military training in their hiring process while predominately neglecting education, progressive policing values, or diverse experiences. Thus, police agencies tend to recruit those who bring nothing new to the table and are likely to reinforce traditional values. Moreover, those who are recruited with diverse views are often hesitant to express their dissent within a culture that does not embrace open debate or progressive views. As such, there are few who enter policing willing or able to challenge traditional views and actively promote more progressive policing practices.

Another way in which police agencies can help to promote a progressive culture and reduce the cultural divide is through engaging in an ongoing dialogue with employees about the function of policing in society, and the importance of community-oriented values. All too often, modern police agencies focus their ongoing training almost solely on police procedures and tactics, and officer safety, and predominately neglect discussing community-oriented policing beyond initial academy training. This is particularly problematic in a number of ways. First, it communicates to the officers that what they learned in the academy isn't as important as matters which are frequently attended to in ongoing training. Second, it allows the officers to be shaped

more by their daily experiences, which have a tendency to involve an array of adverse interactions with certain narrow elements of the public, and make it too easy to forget who the public really is on the whole and why it is important to serve their interests. Therefore, it is highly recommended that officers' daily experiences are confronted and challenged with broader and more progressive organizational values on a somewhat regular basis.

Aside from selection of commissioned personnel, police organizations should also significantly benefit from the infusion and inclusion of non-commissioned and civilian personnel. Historically, police agencies have been hesitant to allow civilian employees in their operations, limiting civilian functions to clerical positions; however, with the advent of community-oriented policing and limited resources, police agencies have become increasingly receptive to the use of cost-effective, professional civilian resources. In doing so, police organizations are doing themselves a great benefit in reducing the cultural divide, even though they may not realize it outwardly. Specifically, inclusion of civilians in essential functions serves to increase contact between officers and the respectable civilian population, and interjects a citizen's perspective into the inner circle of policing culture. Such effects would seem to be facilitated even further by creating greater opportunities for professional advancement of civilians into administrative positions within police agencies, and in drawing civilians with unique professional skills such as police planners, crime analysts, and finance personnel.

In recent years, it has become popular among policing agencies to engage in a division of labor on community-oriented policing functions. For example, numerous departments have embraced the notion of neighborhood or community resource officers, school resource officers, or other such community-oriented positions. Moreover, they create a range of positions at the other extreme which emphasize traditional police activities such as SWAT teams, riot squads,

bomb squads, etc. In doing so, police agencies send a clear message to officers who do not occupy those specific positions that COP is really a fringe activity. Therefore, one way in which police agencies might reinforce the universal necessity and value of community policing might be to eliminate such specialty COP positions and refocus those duties to teams or divisions. Under such a system it becomes clear that each officer has a duty to some clearly defined segment or geographic constituency of the public, as opposed to leaving it to a specialty function.

Given the historical conditions and prevailing practices cited above, police agencies have traditionally adopted a militaristic approach to management and administration in which orders are filtered through the chain of command from top to bottom with little decision-making power filtering upward. As such, the bulk of individuals who conduct the work of policing at the line level have little autonomy over policies and procedures that guide the manner in which they are expected to conduct their duties. As a consequence, officers are likely to feel excluded and disconnected from the decisions made by their parent organization, and are likely to disaffiliate themselves from those very decisions further deepening the cultural divide between line and management. Therefore, one of the key ways in which police agencies might improve conditions is through the institution of participative management practices in which line-level employees are afforded increased input into managerial decisions.

There are a number of clear benefits in reducing the cultural divide by involving line-level interests in decisions. One benefit in particular is the improvement of vertical information flow about why specific decisions were made. In traditional organizations, decisions are often made based on a wide range of information that is not provided to subordinate levels. As such, it often appears to the line level that these decisions were made without thought or consideration

for their perspective, even if this is not the case. In openly involving and representing line interests in management decisions information is freed to flow vertically within the organization, and line interests will be likely to develop a stronger stake in those decisions as opposed to giving management full ownership over decisions which they resent.

In conclusion, the present study contributes to an understanding of the relevance of emotional labor to policing in a number of diverse ways. Methodologically, the study employs a unique approach in its measurement of dominant policing values and the degree to which those values are perceived as being similar or different between various levels of the police hierarchy. In doing so, findings reveal a number of weaknesses in emotional labor theory for explaining levels of police cynicism and burnout. Specifically, findings suggest the importance of considering both sources of value dissonance and culturally relevant domains of values in any study of emotional labor. The present study also makes a significant contribution to our understanding of police culture, and provides one previously unexplored explanation for the widely observed phenomenon of police cynicism. Specifically, it suggests that the divide between line-level and management values is paramount in understanding and explaining police cynicism. Last but not least, in recognizing this fact, the present study attempts to provide a range of recommendations to police administrators for how this cultural divide and philosophical paradox might be remedied. Among the factors considered are selection, recurrent training, operational and administrative practices. In doing so, it is hoped that the present study will serve to provoke further thought and discussion on the state of policing in America.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Richard E., William M. Rohe, and Thomas A. Arcury. 2002. "Implementing Community-Oriented Policing: Organizational Change and Street Officer Attitudes." *Crime and Delinquency* 48(3): 399-430.
- Aldag, R.J. and A.P. Brief. 1978. "Supervisory Style and Police Role Stress." *Journal of Police Science Administration* 6: 362-367.
- Best, R. G., Downey, R. G. & Gill, D. S. (1999). "The Nature of Customer Contact as an Antecedent of Job Burnout." Poster Presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, Atlanta, GA.
- Brotheridge, Celeste M., and Raymond T. Lee. 2003. "Development and Validation of the Emotional Labour Scale." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 76: 365-379.
- Brotheridge, Celeste M., Alicia A. Grandey. 2002. "Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of 'People Work'." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 60: 17-39.
- Brown, Jennifer M., Elizabeth A. Campbell. 1990. "Sources of Occupational Stress in the Police." *Work and Stress* 4(4): 305-318
- Brown, J.M. and E.A. Campbell. 1990. *Stress and Policing: Sources and Strategies*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Brown, Jennifer, Cary Cooper, and Bruce Kirkcaldy. 1996. "Occupational Stress among Senior Police Officers." *The British Journal of Psychology* 87(1): 31-41.
- Burke, Peter J. 1991. "Identity Processes and Social Stress." *American Sociological Review* 56(6): 836-849.
- Cannizzo, Thomas A., and Peter Liu. 1995. "The Relationship between Levels of Perceived Burnout and Career Stage among Sworn Police Officers." *Police Studies* 18(3-4): 53-68.
- Engel, Robin Shepard. 2000. "The Effects of Supervisory Styles on Patrol Officer Behavior." *Police Quarterly* 3: 262-293
- Engel, Robin Shepard. 2001. "Supervisory Styles of Patrol Sergeants and Lieutenants." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 29: 341-355.
- Erickson, Rebecca J. and Amy S. Wharton. 1997. "Inauthenticity and Depression: Assessing the Consequences of Interactive Service Work." *Work and Occupations* 24:188-213.
- Erickson, Rebecca J., and Christian Ritter. 2001. "Emotional Labor, Burnout, and Inauthenticity: Does Gender Matter?" *Social Psychology Quarterly* 64(2): 146-163.

- Federal Bureau of Investigation. 2004. "Uniform Crime Reports for the United States." Washington, DC : Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Dept. of Justice : U.S. G.P.O.
- Festinger, Leon. 1956. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson.
- Fielding, Nigel. 1999. "Policing's Dark Secret: The Career Paths of Ethnic Minority Officers." *Sociological Research Online* 4(1).
- Freud, Sigmund. 1926. *The Ego and the Id*. London, UK: Leonard and Virginia Woolf at the Hogarth Press.
- Gecas, Viktor. 1982. "The Self-Concept." *Annual Review of Sociology* 8: 1-33.
- Gilmartin, Kevin M. 2002. *Emotional Survival for Law Enforcement: A Guide for Officers and Their Families*. E-S Press.
- Golembiewski, R.T. and B. Kim. 1990. "Burnout in Police Work: Stressors, Strain, and the Phase Model." *Police Studies* 13: 74-80.
- Gutek, Barbara A. 1985. *Sex and the Workplace: The Impact of Sexual Behavior and Harassment on Women, Men, and Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hackman, J.R., and G.R. Oldham. 1975. "Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 69: 159-170.
- Hall, Elaine J. 1993. "Smiling, Deferring, and Flirting: Doing Gender by Giving 'Good Service'." *Work and Occupations* 20(4): 452-471.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1979. *Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure*. *American Journal of Sociology* 85(3): 551-575.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hunt et al. 1983. "Police roles: Content and Conflict." *Journal of Police Science and Administration* 11: 175-184.
- Jaccard, James, and Robert Turrisi. 2003. *Interaction Effects in Multiple Regression*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kelling, G. and A. Pate. 1973. "The person-role fit in policing: The current knowledge and future research." In Snibbe and Snibbe (eds.) *The Urban Policeman in Transition*. Springfield, IL: C.C. Thomas.

- Kelling, George and M. Moore. 1988. "From Political Reform to Community: The Evolving Strategy of Police" in J. Greene & S. Mastrofski (eds) *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality*. New York: Praeger.
- Kohn, Melvin L. and Carmi Schooler. 1973. "Occupational experience and psychological functioning: an assessment of reciprocal effects." *American Sociological Review*, 38: 97-118.
- Kohn, Melvin L. and Carmi Schooler. 1978. "The Reciprocal Effects of the Substantive Complexity of Work and Intellectual Flexibility: A Longitudinal Assessment." *American Journal of Sociology* 84: 24-52.
- Kohn, Melvin L. and Carmi Schooler. 1981. "Job Conditions and Personality: A Longitudinal Assessment of Their Reciprocal Effects." In *Factor Analysis and Measurement in Sociological Research: A Multi-Dimensional Perspective*, eds. D.J. Jackson, E. F. Borgatta. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kohn, Melvin L., Carmi Schooler, J. Mille, K.A. Miller, C. Schoenbach, R. Schoenberg. 1983. *Work and Personality: An Inquiry Into the Impact of Social Stratification*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Kunda, Gideon. 1992. *Engineering Culture: Control and Commitment in a High Tech Corporation*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Kunda, Gideon, and John Van Maanen. 1989. "Real Feelings": Emotional Expressions and Organizational Culture. In *Research in Organizational Behavior*, ed. Barry M. Staw and L.L. Cummings, Vol. 11. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Leidner, Rubin. 1991. "Selling Hamburgers and Selling Insurance: Gender Work, and Identity in Interactive Service Jobs." *Gender & Society* 5(2): 154-177.
- Leidner, Rubin. 1993. *Fast Food, Fast Talk: Service Work and the Routinization of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Love, Ken, and Ming S. Singer. 1988. "Self-efficacy, Psychological Well-Being, Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement: A Comparison of Male and Female Police Officers." *Police Studies* 11(2): 98-102
- Lurigio, Arthur J. and Wesley G. Skogan. 1994. "Winning the Hearts and Minds of Police Officers: An Assessment of Staff Perceptions of Community Policing in Chicago." *Crime and Delinquency* 40: 315-330
- Lurigio, Arthur J. and Dennis P. Rosenbaum. 1994. The impact of community policing on police personnel: A review of the literature. In Dennis P. Rosenbaum (ed.), *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Martin, Susan. 1980. *Breaking and Entering: Policewomen on Patrol*. Berkeley: University of California Press.



- Martin, Susan. 1990. *On the Move: The Status of Women in Policing*. Washington D.C.: Police Foundation.
- Martin, S. E. 1979. "Police Women and Police Women: Occupational Role Dilemma and choice of female officers." *Journal of Police Science and Administration* 7: 314-324
- Martin, Susan Ehrlich. 1999. "Police Force or Police Service? Gender and Emotional Labor." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 561: 111-126
- Maslach, C. 1993. "Burnout: A Multi-Dimensional Perspective. Pp. 19-32 In W.B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, and T. Marek (Eds.) *Professional Burnout: Recent Developments in Theory and Research*. Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis.
- Mastrofski, Stephen D., Robert E. Worden, and Jeffrey B. Snipes. 1995. "Law Enforcement in a Time of Community Policing." *Criminology* 33(4): 539-563
- Mastrofski, Stephen D., Roger B. Parks, Robert E. Worden, and Albert J. Reiss Jr. *PROJECT ON POLICING NEIGHBORHOODS IN INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA, AND ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA, 1996-1997* [Computer file]. ICPSR version. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University [producer], 2001. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political Social Research [distributor], 2002.
- Miller, J., Carmie Schooler, Melvin Kohn, K. Miller. 1979. "Women and work: the psychological effects of occupational conditions." *American Journal of Sociology* 85: 66-94.
- Morris, J. Andrew, and Daniel C. Feldman. 1996. "The Dimensions, Antecedents, and Consequences of Emotional Labor." *The Academy of Management Review* 21(4): 986-1010.
- Morris, J. Andrew, and Daniel C. Feldman. 1997. "Managing Emotions in the Workplace." *Journal of Managerial Issues* 9(3): 257-274.
- Mortimer, J. T., J. Lorence, D. S. Kumka. *Work, Family and Personality: Transition to Adulthood*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Niederhoffer, Arthur. 1967. *Behind the Shield*. Garden City, NY. Doubleday.
- O'Brien, Martin. 1994. "The Managed Heart Revisited: Health and Social Control." *Sociological Review* 42(3):393-413.
- Paules, Greta Foff. 1996. *Resisting the Symbolism Among Waitresses*. In *Working in the Service Society*, ed. Cameron Lynne McDonald and Carmen Sirianni. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Pierce, Jennifer L. 1995. *Gender Trials: Emotional Lives in Contemporary Law Firms*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Pogrebin, Mark R. and Eric D. Poole. 1995. *Emotion Management: A Study of Police Response to Tragic Events*. *Social Perspectives on Emotion*, Vol. 3. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Rafaeli, Anat. 1989. "When Cashiers Meet Customers: An Analysis of the Role of Supermarket Cashiers." *Academy of Management Journal* 32(2): 245-273.
- Rafaeli, Anat and Robert Sutton. 1991. *Emotional Contrast Strategies as Means of Social Influence: Lessons from Criminal Interrogators and Bill Collectors*. *Academy of Management Journal* 34(4): 749-775.
- Regoli, Robert M. 1976. "An empirical assessment of Niederhoffer's police cynicism scale." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 4 (3): 231-242.
- Regoli, Robert M. and Eric Poole. (1979). "The measurement of police cynicism: A factor scaling approach." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 7 (1): 37-51.
- Reitzes, Donald C. and Mutran. 2002. "Self-Concept as the Organization of Roles: Importance, Centrality, and Balance." *The Sociological Quarterly* 43(4): 647-667.
- Reuss-Ianni, E. and F. Ianni. 1983. "Street Cops and Management Cops: the two cultures of policing." Pp. 251-274 in M. Punch (editor) *Control in the Police Organization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Skolnick, Jerome H. 1966. *Justice Without Trial*. New York, NY. John Wiley & Sons.
- Spenner, Kenneth I. "Social Stratification, Work, and Personality." *Annual Review of Sociology* 14: 69-97.
- Spenner, Kenneth I., and L. B. Otto. 1985. *Work and Self-Concept: selection and socialization in the early career*. In *Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization*, ed. A. C. Kerckhoff, 5:197-235. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI.
- Steinberg, Ronnie J., and Deborah M. Figart. 1999. "Emotional Demands at Work: A Job Content Analysis." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 561: 177-191
- Stanislavsky, Konstantin. 1948. *An Actor Prepares*. New York: Theatre Arts Books.
- Stenross, Barbara and Sherryl Kleinman. 1989. "The Highs and Lows of Emotional Labor: Detectives Encounters with Criminals and Victims." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 17(4): 435-452.
- Swann, William B. Jr. 1983. "Self-verification: Bringing Social Reality into harmony with the self." In J. Suls & A.G. Greenwald (Eds), *Psychological Perspectives on the Self* (Vol. 2 pp 33-66). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Trojanowicz, Robert C. 1971. "The Policeman's Occupational Personality." *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science* 62(4): 551-559
- Trojanowicz, R. and B. Bucqueroux. 1990. *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Turner, R. H. 1976. "The real self: from institution to impulse." *American Journal of Sociology* 81: 989-1016.
- Van Maanen, John. 1975. "Police Socialization: A Longitudinal Examination of Job Attitudes in an Urban Police Department." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 20(2): 207-228.
- Van Maanen, John. 1973. "Observations on the Making of Policemen." *Human Organization* 32(4): 407-418.
- Van Maanen, John. 1984. "Making Rank: Becoming an American Police Sergeant." *Urban Life* 13(2-3): 448-449.
- Vega, M. and I. J. Silverman. 1982. "Female Police Officers as viewed by their male counterparts." *Police studies* 5: 31-39.
- Violanti, J. (1996). *Police Suicide: Epidemic in Blue*. Springfield: C. Thomas.
- Walker, Samuel. 1977. *A Critical History of Police Reform: The Emergence of Professionalism*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books
- Wharton, Amy S. 1993. "The Affective Consequences of Service Work: Managing Emotions on the Job." *Work and Occupations* 20(2): 205-232.
- Wharton, Amy S and Rebecca J. Erickson. 1993. "Managing Emotions on the Job and at Home: Understanding the Consequences of Multiple Emotional Roles." *Academy of Management Review* 18(3):457-486.
- Wilson, Orlando W. 1950. *Police Administration*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Wilson, James Q. 1964. "Generational and Ethnic Differences Among Police Officers," *American Journal of Sociology* 69, 522-528.
- Wycoff, Mary Ann, and Wesley G. Skogan. 1994. "The Effect of a Community Policing Management Style on Officers' Attitudes." *Crime and Delinquency* 40(3): 371-383

## APPENDIX A

## Dependent Variables

### **Cynicism [CYNICISM]**

( $\alpha = .6454$ ;  $\bar{X} = 2.2294$ ; s.e. = .3822;  $\sigma = 3.9898$ ; N=109)

Instructions: The following questions are intended to gain a better sense of your personal perspective on some specific aspects of police work. Please state the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

Response Categories: SD (-2); D (-1); N (0); A (1); SA (2)

Items Included in Scale:

- Disciplinary action is a result of pressure on supervisors from their command staff to give out discipline.
- When you get to know the department from the inside you begin to think that it's a wonder that it does one half as well as it does.
- When a police officer appears before the Office of Professional Standards (IA), the officer will probably be found guilty even when he/she has a good defense.
- The rules and regulations dealing with officer conduct off duty are fair and sensible (Reverse Coded)
- The public is more likely to obstruct police work than cooperate.
- When testifying in court, police officers are treated like criminals when they take the witness stand.
- The public shows a lot of respect for the police (Reverse Coded)

### **Burnout [BURNOUT]**

( $\alpha = .6695$ ;  $\bar{X} = -6.434$ ; s.e. = .2818;  $\sigma = 2.90162$ ; N=106)

Instructions: Below, there are a series of statements of job related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and completely fill in the circle that best reflects your views.

Response Categories: Never (0); Once in a While (1); Some of the Time (2); Most of the Time (3); All of the Time (4)

Items Included in Scale:

- I feel emotionally drained from my work.
- Working with people all day is really a strain for me.
- I feel I'm positively influencing people's lives through my work (Reverse Coded)
- I feel very energetic (Reverse Coded)
- I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job (Reverse Coded)
- In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly (Reverse Coded)

## **Independent Variables - Emotional Requirements**

Instructions: On average, how frequently are you required to do each of the following as a part of your job?

Response Categories: Not At All Required (0); Seldom Required (1); Often Required (2); Usually Required (3); Always Required (4)

### **Surface Acting [SURFACT]**

( $\alpha = .7117$ ;  $\bar{X} = 9.4393$ ; s.e. = .3683;  $\sigma = 3.80956$ ; N=107)

#### Items Included in Scale:

- Display specific emotions required by your job.
- Display many different kinds of emotions.
- Resist expressing my true feelings.
- Pretend to have emotions that I don't really have.
- Express friendly emotions (e.g. smiling, giving compliments, making small talk).

### **Deep Acting [DEEPACT]**

( $\alpha = N/A$ ;  $\bar{X} = 1.1927$ ; s.e. = .0980;  $\sigma = 1.02268$ ; N=109)

#### Items Included in Scale:

- Make an effort to actually feel emotions I need to display to others.

### **Requirement for Suppression [EMOTSUPP]**

( $\alpha = .7788$ ;  $\bar{X} = 7.8704$ ; s.e. = .3163;  $\sigma = 3.28717$ ; N=108)

#### Items Included in Scale:

- Hide your amusement about something someone has done (e.g. not laughing at mischief)
- Hide your anger or disapproval about something someone has done?
- Hide your disgust over something someone has done?
- Hide your fear of someone who appears threatening?

### **Requirement for Expression [EMOTEXPR]**

( $\alpha = .7117$ ;  $\bar{X} = 11.0642$ ; s.e. = .3749;  $\sigma = 3.91407$ ; N=109)

#### Items Included in Scale:

- Make someone afraid of something you could do to them because of your position.
- Express feelings of sympathy (e.g. saying you understand, are sorry to hear something)
- Express surprise over something someone has done?
- Express disgust about something someone has done?
- Express anger over something someone has done?
- Apologize to someone for something?
- Express friendly emotions (e.g. smiling, giving compliments, making small talk).

## **Independent Variables - Emotional Requirements (Continued ...)**

### **Emotional Work Requirements [EWRS]**

( $\alpha = .8444$ ;  $\bar{x} = 27.0755$ ; s.e. = .8648;  $\sigma = 8.90339$  ; N=106)

Items Included in Scale:

- Hide your amusement about something someone has done (e.g. not laughing at mischief)
- Hide your anger or disapproval about something someone has done?
- Hide your disgust over something someone has done?
- Hide your fear of someone who appears threatening?
- Make someone afraid of something you could do to them because of your position?
- Express feelings of sympathy (e.g. saying you understand, you are sorry to hear about something)
- Express surprise over something someone has done?
- Express disgust about something someone has done?
- Express anger over something someone has done?
- Apologize to someone for something?
- Express friendly emotions (e.g. smiling, giving compliments, making small talk).
- Display specific emotions required by your job?
- Display many different kinds of emotions?
- Resist expressing my true feelings?
- Pretend to have emotions that I don't really have?
- Make an effort to actually feel emotions I need to display to others?

## **Independent Variables – Value Dissonance**

Instructions: (A) For each question below, please fill in the circle below the level of importance you think each identified group or individual would place on the identified activity.

OR

(B) For each question, please fill in the circle below the level of importance you think each identified group would place on the activity.

Response Categories: (A) SD (-2); D (-1); N (0); A (1); SA (2)

OR

(B) Waste of Time (-2); Unimportant (-1); Important (1); Very Important (2)

## Independent Variables – Value Dissonance (Continued ...)

### Global Policing Values Dissonance Scales

#### Items Included in Scales:

##### Items Coded According to Convention (A)

- Enforcing the law is by far a patrol officer's most important responsibility.
- A good officer patrols aggressively by stopping cars, checking out people, running license checks, and so forth.
- A good officer should try to find out what residents think the neighborhood problems are
- An officer on foot patrol can learn more about neighborhood problems than can an officer in a patrol car
- Police officers should try to solve non-crime problems in their assigned patrol district.
- The prevention of crime is the joint responsibility of the community and police
- Citizens know more about what goes on in their area than the officers who patrol there.
- Police should make efforts to prioritize among a broad range of local problems.
- Police are so focused on crime and violence that they will never find the time to address other concerns.
- In most cases, referring a citizen to social, health, or welfare services is a waste of police officers time.

##### Items Coded According to Convention (B)

- Explaining crime prevention techniques to citizens.
- Analyzing and working toward solving local problems
- Coordinating with other agencies to improve the quality of life in the city.
- Working with citizen groups to resolve local problems
- Gathering information about local criminals and crime problems
- Rapid response to calls for service
- Making arrests and issuing citations
- Seizing drugs, guns, and other contraband
- Engaging in efforts to reduce the level of public disorder.
- Engaging in efforts to reduce citizen fear of crime in the community.
- Reducing the number of repeat calls for service at the same address.

#### Computation Methods for Individual Scales:

##### **Officer vs. Lieutenants (Global Values) [OFFVSLT]**

( $\alpha = .8574$ ;  $\bar{X} = 11.5673$  ; s.e. = .8590;  $\sigma = 8.75975$  ; N=104)

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported Policing Values – Perceived Lieutenants' Policing Values|)

##### **Officer vs. Chiefs (Global Values) [OFFVSCHF]**

( $\alpha = .8454$ ;  $\bar{X} = 17.2736$  ; s.e. = .9988;  $\sigma = 10.28317$  ; N=106)

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported Policing Values – Perceived Chiefs' Policing Values|)



## **Independent Variables – Value Dissonance (Continued ...)**

### **Officer vs. General Public (Global Values) [OFFVSPUB]**

( $\alpha = .7313$ ;  $\bar{X} = 18.2212$ ; s.e. = .7871;  $\sigma = 8.0266$  ; N=104)

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported Policing Values – Perceived Publics' Policing Values|)

### **Officer vs. All Groups (Global Values) [GENDISS]**

( $\alpha = .9162$ ;  $\bar{X} = 46.5825$  ; s.e. = 2.2961;  $\sigma = 23.303$  ; N=103)

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported Policing Values – Perceived Lieutenants' Policing Values|)

+

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported Policing Values – Perceived Chiefs' Policing Values|)

+

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported Policing Values – Perceived Publics' Policing Values|)

## **COP-Specific Policing Values Dissonance Scales**

### Items Included in Scales:

#### Items Coded According to Convention (A)

- A good officer should try to find out what residents think the neighborhood problems are
- An officer on foot patrol can learn more about neighborhood problems than can an officer in a patrol car
- Police officers should try to solve non-crime problems in their assigned patrol district.
- The prevention of crime is the joint responsibility of the community and police
- Citizens know more about what goes on in their area than the officers who patrol there.
- Police should make efforts to prioritize among a broad range of local problems.

#### Items Coded According to Convention (B)

- Explaining crime prevention techniques to citizens.
- Analyzing and working toward solving local problems
- Coordinating with other agencies to improve the quality of life in the city.
- Working with citizen groups to resolve local problems
- Engaging in efforts to reduce the level of public disorder.
- Engaging in efforts to reduce citizen fear of crime in the community.
- Reducing the number of repeat calls for service at the same address.

### Computation Methods for Individual Scales:

### **Officer vs. Lt.'s (COP-Specific Values) [OVSLTCOP]**

( $\alpha = .7685$ ;  $\bar{X} = 7.0755$ ; s.e. = .5358 ;  $\sigma = 5.1655$  ; N=106)

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported COP Values – Perceived Lieutenants' COP Values|)

## **Independent Variables – Value Dissonance (Continued ...)**

### **Officer vs. Chiefs (COP-Specific Values) [OVSCHCOP]**

( $\alpha = .7668$ ;  $\bar{X} = 10.1792$ ; s.e. = .6327;  $\sigma = 6.51416$ ; N=106)

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported COP Values – Perceived Chiefs' COP Values|)

### **Officer vs. Public (COP-Specific Values) [OVSPUCOP]**

( $\alpha = .6953$ ;  $\bar{X} = 11.3333$ ; s.e. = .5771;  $\sigma = 5.91391$ ; N=105)

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported COP Values – Perceived Publics' COP Values|)

### **Officer vs. All (COP-Specific Values) [COPDISS]**

( $\alpha = .8944$ ;  $\bar{X} = 28.4000$ ; s.e. = 1.5752;  $\sigma = 16.14097$ ; N=105)

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported COP Values – Perceived Lieutenants' COP Values|)

+

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported COP Values – Perceived Chiefs' COP Values|)

+

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported COP Values – Perceived Publics' COP Values|)

## **COP-Neutral Policing Values Dissonance Scales**

Items Included in Scales:

- Enforcing the law is by far a patrol officer's most important responsibility.
- A good officer patrols aggressively by stopping cars, checking out people, running license checks, and so forth.
- Police are so focused on crime and violence that they will never find the time to address other concerns.
- In most cases, referring a citizen to social, health, or welfare services is a waste of police officers time.
- Gathering information about local criminals and crime problems
- Rapid response to calls for service
- Making arrests and issuing citations
- Seizing drugs, guns, and other contraband

### **Officer vs. Lt.'s (COP-Neutral Values) [OVSLTNEU]**

( $\alpha = .7962$ ;  $\bar{X} = 4.6095$ ; s.e. = .3940;  $\sigma = 4.03708$ ; N=105)

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported COP-neutral Values – Perceived Lt.s' COP-neutral Values|)

### **Officer vs. Chiefs (COP-Neutral Values) [OVSCHNEU]**

( $\alpha = .7454$ ;  $\bar{X} = 7.1963$ ; s.e. = .4767;  $\sigma = 4.93053$ ; N=107)

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported COP-neutral Values – Perceived Chiefs' COP-neutral Values|)

## **Independent Variables – Value Dissonance (Continued ...)**

### **Officer vs. Public (COP-Neutral Values) [OVSPUNEU]**

( $\alpha = .5624$ ;  $\bar{x} = 7.0476$ ; s.e. = .3705;  $\sigma = 3.7962$ ; N=105)

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported COP-neutral Values – Perceived Publics' COP-neutral Values|)

### **Officer vs. All (COP-Neutral Values) [NEUDISS]**

( $\alpha = .8282$ ;  $\bar{x} = 18.6538$ ; s.e. = .9856;  $\sigma = 10.0511$ ; N=104)

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported COP-neutral Values – Perceived Lt.s' COP-neutral Values|)

+

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported COP-neutral Values – Perceived Chiefs' COP-neutral Values|)

+

Absolute Value of (|Officer's Reported COP-neutral Values – Perceived Publics' COP-neutral Values|)

## **Independent Variables – Identification with Work**

### **Work Centrality [WORKCENT]**

( $\alpha = .6035$ ;  $\bar{x} = -2.9444$ ; s.e. = .3418;  $\sigma = 3.55158$ ; N=108)

Instructions: The following items are intended to evaluate the importance of work in your life. Please state the degree to which you agree/disagree with each of the following statements.

Response Categories: SD (-2); D (-1); A (1); SA (2)

Items Used in Scale:

- Work Should Only Be a Small Part of One's Life (Reverse Coded)
- I have other activities more important than work in my life. (Reverse Coded)
- Most things in life are more important than work. (Reverse Coded)
- My own feelings are not affected much by how well I do on this job. (Reverse Coded)
- The Major Satisfaction in my life comes from my work.
- To me, my work is a significant part of who I am.

### **Identification as an Officer [OFFREV]**

( $\alpha = N/A$ ;  $\bar{x} = 5.43$ ; s.e. = .20;  $\sigma = 2.056$ ; N=105)

Instructions: Rank the roles such that the lower the number the more important the role (e.g. If being a parent is the most important to you it would be ranked as 1, if being a police officer was 2<sup>nd</sup> most important it would be 2).

Response Categories: Neighbor, Friend, Partner/Spouse, Parent, Officer, Grandparent, Child, Sibling, Relative, Religious Person, Volunteer

Computation Method: Reverse Coded Rank of Officer Identity.

## **Control Variables**

### **Sex of Respondent [SEX]**

( $\bar{X}$  = .12; s.e. = .03 ;  $\sigma$  = .325; N=101)

Response Categories: Male (0); Female (1)

### **Age of Respondent [AGE]**

( $\bar{X}$  = 2.83; s.e. = .09;  $\sigma$  = .877; N=100)

Response Categories: 18 to 24 (1); 25 to 34 (2); 35 to 44 (3); 45 to 54 (4); 55 to 64 (5); 65 Plus (6)

### **Years in Policing [TENURE]**

( $\bar{X}$  = 3.10; s.e. = .14;  $\sigma$  = 1.382; N=100)

Response Categories: 0 to 4 (1); 5 to 9 (2); 10 to 14' (3); 15 to 19 (4); 20 to 24 (5); 25 Plus (6)

### **Educational Level [EDUC]**

( $\bar{X}$  =4.96; s.e. = .12;  $\sigma$  = 1.232; N=101)

Response Categories: Less Than HS (1); HS Diploma or GED (2); Some College, No Degree (3); AA or AS (4); More Than 2 Years College (5); BA/BS (6); Graduate Courses But No Degree (7); Graduate Degree (8)

### **Minority Status [MINORITY]**

( $\bar{X}$  = .1376; s.e. = .0331;  $\sigma$  = .34609; N=109)

Response Categories: Non-Minority (0); Minority (1)

## **Interaction Terms**

\*All interaction terms are cross-products of the appropriate variables above. All variables were centered prior to computation of the cross-products in order to reduce the multi-collinearity of entering the terms and products into the same equations. Centered variables are used when dealing with interaction-terms, and un-centered variables are used in the models assessing independent effects of variables.

## **APPENDIX B**

**Section I. Perspectives on Policing.** The following section is intended to provide an assessment of how you personally feel about various aspects of policing, and your perception of how individuals from other reference groups feel about the same issues.

1. For each question below, please fill in the circle below the level of importance you think each identified group or individual would place on the identified activity.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>a. Enforcing the law is by far a patrol officer's most important responsibility.</b>					
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>b. A good officer patrols aggressively by stopping cars, checking out people, running license checks, and so forth.</b>					
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>c. A good patrol officer should try to find out what residents think the neighborhood problems are.</b>					
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>d. An officer on foot patrol can learn more about neighborhood problems than can an officer in a patrol car.</b>					
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>e. Police officers should try to solve non-crime problems in their assigned patrol district.</b>					
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>f. The prevention of crime is the joint responsibility of the community and police.</b>					
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>g. Citizens know more about what goes on in their area than the officers who patrol there.</b>					
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>h. Police should make efforts to prioritize among a broad range of local problems.</b>					
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>i. Police are so focused on crime and violence that they will never find the time to address other concerns.</b>					
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>j. In most cases, referring a citizen to social, health, or welfare services is a waste of police officers time.</b>					
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. For each question, please fill in the circle below the level of importance you think each identified group would place on the activity.

	<i>Very Important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Unimportant</i>	<i>Waste of Time</i>
a. Explaining crime prevention techniques to citizens.				
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Analyzing and working toward solving local problems.				
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Coordinating with other agencies to improve the quality of life in the city.				
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Working with citizen groups to resolve local problems				
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Gathering information about local criminals and crime problems				
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Rapid response to calls for service				
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Making arrests and issuing citations				
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. Seizing drugs, guns, and other contraband				
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. Engaging in efforts to reduce the level of public disorder.				
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. Engaging in efforts to reduce citizen fear of crime in the community.				
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. Reducing the number of repeat calls for service at the same address.				
Your Personal Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management's (Lieutenants') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Management's (Chiefs') Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The General Public's Opinion:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. Please read each statement below and fill in the circle below the option that best reflects how good/bad you feel you are at each of the following tasks:

	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Bad</b>	<b>Very Bad</b>
a. Identifying community problems?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Using problem-solving techniques to analyze problems?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Developing solutions to community problems?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Evaluating solutions to see how well they work?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Working with residents to solve problems in their neighborhood?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Handling violent offenders?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Handling domestic disputes?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. Handling riot situations?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. Handling youth problems?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. The following questions are intended to gain a better sense of your personal perspective on some specific aspects of police work. Please state the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
a.) Police supervisors are very interested in their subordinates.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b.) Disciplinary action is a result of pressure on supervisors from command staff to give out discipline.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c.) Arrests are made because the police officer is dedicated to performing his/her duty.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d.) The best arrests are made as a result of hard work and dedication to duty.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e.) A college degree requirement for appointment to the police department would result in a much more efficient and effective police department.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f.) When you get to know the department from the inside, you begin to think that it is a wonder that it does one-half as well as it does.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g.) Police academy recruit training should be cut in half.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h.) Some police officers in this department lack adequate professionalization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i.) When a police officer appears before the Office of Professional Standards (OPS), the officer will probably be found guilty even when he/she has a good defense.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j.) Police officers are dedicated to the high ideals of police service and would never hesitate to perform police duty.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k.) The rules and regulations dealing with officer conduct off duty are fair and sensible.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l.) The public is more likely to obstruct police work than cooperate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
m.) Getting special assignments in the police department depends on who you know, not on merit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
n.) When testifying in court, police officers are treated like criminals when they take the witness stand.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
o.) Police department citations for minor offenses are issued by police officers as part of a sensible pattern of law enforcement.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
p.) The public shows a lot of respect for the police.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
q.) Youth problems are best handled by officers who are trained as juvenile officers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
r.) Police officers have a different view of human nature because of the misery and cruelty of life which they see everyday.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
s.) The newspapers generally try to help police departments by giving prominent coverage to items favorable to the police.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
t.) Detectives have special skills that make them more qualified to do investigative work than patrol officers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Section II. Work Conditions.** The following section is designed to gain a better sense of the general conditions you are required to work under. These conditions could be experienced by anyone in any job. Please answer each question in regard to your experience in your current position.

1. Please carefully read each statement below and express the degree to which your current position holds each of the following characteristics by filling in the circle that corresponds with your selected answer and the item to which you are responding.

	A Great Deal	Somewhat	Very Little	Not At All
a. What degree of control do you have over how much time you spend interacting with people at work?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. To what extent does your job permit you to decide on your own how to go about doing your work?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. To what extent is your work a small part of an overall piece of work, which is finished by other people?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. To what extent do managers or co-workers let you know how well you are doing on your job?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. To what extent does doing the job itself provide you with information about your work performance?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. To what extent does the job require you to do many different things at work, using a variety of your skills and talents?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. To what degree does the job require you to use complex or high-level skills?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. To what degree is your job simple and repetitive?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. To what degree is your job likely to significantly affect the lives or well-being of other people?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. The following questions are intended to gain a sense of your perceptions of management. Please carefully read each statement and express the degree to which each level of management engages in the practices described. For each layer of management, please completely fill in the circle that corresponds to your selected response.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. This level of management clearly communicates the purpose and rationale behind new programs, activities and responsibilities in a way that wins employee acceptance.				
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
b. This level of administration actively works to communicate the agency's "vision" and mission to employees. Developing a shared vision and set of values is a fundamental objective of this agency's management.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Employees feel they can trust this level of management. They feel comfortable putting their fate in the hands of these managers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. When assigning projects and responsibilities this level of management makes sure that employees have sufficient power and authority to accomplish agency objectives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. This level of management practices what it preaches in terms of the management values, work effort, and reforms.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. This level of administration follows through on most of its promises regarding changes and reforms it expects employees to carry out.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. This level of management actively seeks to reward, praise and recognize high performance.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. When routines result in just average performance, this level of management looks for ways to alter the status quo, and actively initiates the changes such as in work procedures, programs, and responsibilities to make them more effective.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. This level of management is sensitive to changes in its environment, and is skillful in responding and adapting to short term demands and needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. This level of management has a deep interest in reform. These leaders are always coming up with new ideas on how to do things better.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
k. This level of management is willing to engage in some risks to bring about change and reform.				
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l. This level of management seems to be more concerned with what is going on outside the agency than it is with what is going on inside or down in the trenches where the actual work is done.				
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
m. This level of management lets officers know what is expected of them.				
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
n. This level of management is likely to treat an officer fairly when they get written up for a minor violation of the rules.				
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
o. This level of management is likely to support me when I am right, even if it makes things difficult for him/her.				
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
p. The approaches of this level of management tend to discourage me from giving any extra effort.				
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
q. This level of management is highly likely to criticize my independent decisions or judgments.				
Immediate Supervisor (Your Team's Sergeant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Middle Management (Lieutenants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Administration (Chief and Assistants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Section III. Law Enforcement Specific Working Conditions

1. On average, how frequently are you required to do each of the following as a part of your job ...

	<b>Not At All Required</b>	<b>Seldom Required</b>	<b>Often Required</b>	<b>Usually Required</b>	<b>Always Required</b>
a. Display specific emotions required by your job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Express intense emotions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Display many different kinds of emotions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Resist expressing my true feelings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Pretend to have emotions that I don't really have	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Make an effort to actually feel emotions I need to display to others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Reassuring people who are distressed or upset.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Not At All Required	Seldom Required	Often Required	Usually Required	Always Required
h. Repressing fear about something someone has done.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. Remaining calm even when you are astonished.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. Making someone afraid of something you could do to them because of your position.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. Expressing feelings of sympathy (e.g. saying you "understand", you are sorry to hear about something).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l. Hiding your amusement about something someone has done (e.g., not laughing at mischief).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
m. Expressing surprise over something someone has done.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
n. Expressing disgust about something someone has done.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
o. Hiding your anger or disapproval about something someone has done (e.g., an act that is distasteful to you).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
p. Hiding disgust over something someone has done.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
q. Expressing anger over something someone has done.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
r. Hiding your fear of someone who appears threatening.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
s. Apologizing to someone for something.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
t. Expressing friendly emotions (e.g. smiling, giving compliments, making small talk).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Section IV. Orientation Toward Work.**

1. Read through the list of roles listed below, and rank the roles such that the lower the number the more important the role (e.g. If being a parent is the most important to you it would be ranked as 1, if being a police officer was 2<sup>nd</sup> most important it would be 2).

- |                            |                      |                             |
|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| _____ Neighbor             | _____ Police Officer | _____ Cousin/Other Relative |
| _____ Friend               | _____ Grandparent    | _____ Religious Person      |
| _____ Husband/Wife/Partner | _____ Son/Daughter   | _____ Volunteer             |
| _____ Father/Mother        | _____ Brother/Sister |                             |

2. The following items are intended to evaluate the importance of work in your life. Please state the degree to which you agree/disagree with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. Work should be only a small part of one's life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. I have other activities more important than my work in my life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. I would probably keep working even if I didn't need the money.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. To me, my work is a significant part of who I am.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Most things in life are more important than work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. I feel I should take the credit/blame for the results of my work on this job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. My own feelings are not affected much by how well I do on this job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. The work I do on this job is very meaningful to me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Section V. Personal Evaluation of Work.**

1. Below, there are a series of statements of job related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and completely fill in the circle that best reflects your views.

	Never	Once in a While	Some of the Time	Most of the Time	All of the Time
a. I feel emotionally drained from my work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Working with people all day is really a strain for me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. I feel burned out from my work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. I feel I treat some people as if they were impersonal objects.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. I've become more callous toward people since I took this job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. I feel people I deal with blame me for some of their problems.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. I can easily understand how people I deal with feel about things.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. I deal very effectively with the problems of people I deal with.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. I feel I'm positively influencing people's lives through my work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. I feel very energetic.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
m. In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. Below you will find a series of questions intended to assess the degree to which you are satisfied/dissatisfied with your current position. Please read each statement carefully, and fill in the circle that best reflects the degree to which you agree/disagree with each statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. I am generally satisfied with the opportunities available for promotion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. I am generally satisfied with the amount of pay and benefits I receive.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. I am generally satisfied with the amount of independent thought and action in my job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. I am generally satisfied with my level of job security.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. I am generally satisfied with the chance to help other people while at work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. I am generally satisfied with the amount of challenge in my job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. I am generally satisfied with the overall quality of the supervision I receive.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Section VI. Demographics.**

1. What is your sex?     Male     Female
2. What is your approximate age?
 

<input type="radio"/> 18 to 24 years	<input type="radio"/> 25 to 34 years	<input type="radio"/> 35 to 44 years
<input type="radio"/> 45 to 54 years	<input type="radio"/> 55 to 64 years	<input type="radio"/> 65 + years
3. Would you identify yourself as?     White     Black     Asian     Native American     Other
4. What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?
 

<input type="radio"/> Less Than High School	<input type="radio"/> High School Diploma or GED	<input type="radio"/> Some Junior College But Did Not Earn a Degree	<input type="radio"/> Associates Degree (AA)
<input type="radio"/> More than 2 years Of College, but did not Earn a Bachelor's Degree	<input type="radio"/> Bachelor's Degree (BA/BS)	<input type="radio"/> Some Graduate Courses But Did Not Earn a Graduate Degree	<input type="radio"/> Graduate Degree (MA/MS/PhD, Etc)
5. What is your current rank?     Probationer     Patrol Officer (Sr, PFC, PO)     Corporal     Sergeant
6. How many years have you worked as a fully commissioned law-enforcement officer?
 

<input type="radio"/> 0 to 4 years	<input type="radio"/> 5 to 9 years	<input type="radio"/> 10 to 14 years
<input type="radio"/> 15 to 19 years	<input type="radio"/> 20 to 24 years	<input type="radio"/> 25 + years