

Old Dominion University
ODU Digital Commons

Communication & Theatre Arts Theses

Communication & Theatre Arts

Summer 2017

Intercultural Communication Training and Law Enforcement Officers: A Career-Span Analysis and Education Agenda

Amanda M. Franco
Old Dominion University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/communication_etds

 Part of the [International and Intercultural Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Franco, Amanda M.. "Intercultural Communication Training and Law Enforcement Officers: A Career-Span Analysis and Education Agenda" (2017). Master of Arts (MA), thesis, Communication/TheatreArts, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/QW1E-SM05

https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/communication_etds/3

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Communication & Theatre Arts at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication & Theatre Arts Theses by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

**INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION TRAINING AND LAW ENFORCEMENT
OFFICERS: A CAREER-SPAN ANALYSIS AND EDUCATION AGENDA**

by

Amanda M. Franco
B.S. May 2010, Old Dominion University

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

LIFESPAN AND DIGITAL COMMUNICATION

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
August 2017

Approved by:

Thomas J. Socha (Director)

Frances Hassencahl (Member)

Tim J. Anderson (Member)

ABSTRACT

INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION TRAINING AND LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS: A CAREER-SPAN ANALYSIS AND EDUCATION AGENDA

Amanda M. Franco
Old Dominion University, 2017
Director: Dr. Thomas J. Socha

This thesis examines intercultural communication training and law enforcement education at the local level by means of a qualitative case study. Emphasis is given to the role of perceptions in law enforcement/community interactions as a means of understanding current relations between groups, as well as the role that cultural understanding of this should play in the creation of training curricula. There is a greater societal issue relative to interactions between minorities and law enforcement, and this research seeks to highlight how training, specifically training related to intercultural communication, can be impactful toward increasing understanding and mending group relations.

For this study, officer interviews were conducted as the primary means of data gathering. However, training materials, as well as information gained from participant/observation in a community panel, were also utilized during this research. Results indicate that not only are intercultural communication training and bias-awareness training a part of law enforcement curricula, but also that these topics were well received by officers participating in the case study. While some challenges are noted, overall, the participating police department and officers showed consistently moderate to high levels of cultural and bias-awareness, as well as a consistent focus on the community.

Copyright, 2017, by Amanda M. Franco, All Rights Reserved.

This thesis is dedicated to understanding, understanding others, and understanding oneself.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to thank my advisor and my committee for all the insight and guidance you have provided throughout this endeavor. Thank you for allowing me the freedom that you have, while still providing the structure that I needed. I also want to thank the Chief of Police for allowing me to access to conduct this research, the Director of Training for his continued assistance throughout this project, and all the officers who participated in interviews. Without all your assistance, this thesis would not have been possible, and I cannot say thank you to everyone enough. I also want to thank my family and friends for their unwavering support, and my father for providing the foundation upon which I have been able to build what I now have. You have taught and given me so much. Thank you. And finally, I would like to thank my employers. It is because of your understanding and willingness to work with my schedule that completing this degree and this thesis was made easier. I am very appreciative of what you have done for me. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
Chapter	
I. OVERVIEW	1
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH	5
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	6
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	8
THE IMPORTANCE OF PERCEPTIONS	8
AN HISTORIOGRAPHIC APPROACH	16
TRAINING	21
III. METHODOLOGY	40
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	40
PROCEDURES	41
IV. RESULTS	45
ADMINISTRATIVE INTERVIEWS	45
OFFICER INTERVIEWS	59
TRAINING MATERIALS	68
PANEL	70
TRENDS	71
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	92
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	92
LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	95
CONCLUSIONS	97
REFERENCES	100
APPENDICES	
A. INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT	106
B. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE (SEMI-STRUCTURED ADMINISTRATIVE)	108
C. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE (SEMI-STRUCTURED BEAT OFFICERS)	113
VITA	115

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Depth of Responses	74
2. Cultural Awareness	78
3. Violent Crime Trends 1995 — 2015.....	90
4. Property Crime Trends 1995 — 2015	91

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

Communication. It is one of the most frequently used everyday skills, yet one of the most frequently taken for granted. Communication is not simply words spoken and gestures made. It is systematized with meanings varying from one culture to the next. But what happens when meanings are taken for granted? What happens when the interactions that occur are not between individuals of equal power? What happens when these interactions are between those performing public roles and private citizens? Individuals, of course, can also vary among ethnicities, levels of affluence, ages, and geographical localities. And multiple cultures and sub-cultures often exist pluralistically within a single locale. With communication being such an integral part of everyday human interaction and successful exchanges, it becomes imperative to further cultural knowledge in an effort both to understand one's surrounding environment, as well as to lessen the likelihood of miscommunication and create a more thorough understanding of one another. Communication between law enforcement officials and members of the public connects with these questions. That is, communication between law-enforcement and its publics highlight power differences, cultural complexities, and, indeed, stretches across the entire human lifespan.

Cultural competency is beneficial in all forms of human interaction, but with the advent of community policing, where law enforcement engages routinely with members of their communities, communication's importance cannot be overstated. For interactions to go smoothly, law enforcement officers need to understand not just the legal/criminal situations they encounter, but also *who* they interact with and what background information may influence their interaction. Individuals' past experiences heavily influence how individuals approach similar

experiences in the future. Part of cultural competency also involves understanding the lens through which some individuals approach situations based on their past experiences. While it is certainly not possible for law enforcement officers to know every experience an individual has had that weighs on their interaction with officers, it is desirable for officers to receive training to recognize that these lenses exist and influence interaction. Not every person has the same experiences and, in turn, not every individual will approach situations the same way. Understanding this may in turn influence the way an officer communicates and directs his/her own communicative actions, as well as the kinds of questions that are asked of members of the public. Yes, there are standardized procedures that must be followed, but increased understanding in turn can lead to better long-term relations.

On the other side of the communication model lies the public, where understanding the public's views toward law enforcement is equally important to consider. Depending on the locale, as well as the demographics within the locale, there may be varying outlooks toward law enforcement officers. While some individuals view the police in a positive light, others are more likely to hold views of mistrust. These perceptions heavily influence the manner in which individuals communicate with one another, and can include pre-conceptions, judgments made based on appearances, as well as perceptions of message conveyance during an interaction. Historically, whether law enforcement is viewed as a protector, or with suspicion and as a potential enemy, depends greatly on the group passing judgment.

While mistrust may be based on negative personal experiences, Campbell (1998) notes that it is also frequently a product of being unknown, to as he denotes, an "other." Campbell (1998) discusses this in terms of threat perception and identity. The other is perceived as dangerous because it is on the outside and a threat to what constitutes common identity on the

inside. While Campbell (1998) discusses these concepts in terms of the state and international relations, a macro idea, the same idea is applicable to interpersonal and intergroup interaction, a micro idea, for, after all, it is only through masses of individuals and groups that states exist.

The idea of “othering” and threat perception as relative to identity can also be found to be relevant to Anderson (1991) and the idea of the “imagined community.” Like Campbell (1998), Anderson’s ideas are more macro than micro, as his focus on the imagined community is one of nationalism; however, again, the concept can still be reduced to the micro level to examine the communities of police or minority populations within the greater national community. It is only through the sharing of an idea of what constitutes the community that boundaries are created that separates the in-group from the “other.” Indeed, the idea of the imagined community is the basis for what cultures and societies define as their respective groups.

While media platforms such as newspapers, television, and the Internet are influential to identity shaping and the differentiation between the in-group and the “other” within the imagined community, one should also remember the influence of closer familial and community ties in identity shaping. Navigation of these platforms (media and face-to-face) requires both traditional and cultural literacy. Understanding the idea of the imagined community, and the factors that influence its creation, becomes especially significant when one considers perceptions and how these perceptions affect intergroup interaction. Communities exist and have identities because of shared beliefs about what constitutes that community, be it ethnic or geographic. Only by acknowledging this idea of community, and the perceptions that are commonly existent within it (like fear of the police), can training be created and implemented to enhance interaction and work to diminish the perception of “threat.”

It is imperative that those in positions of authority, like law enforcement, exhibit cultural competence, both to understand how best to navigate public perceptions and how to better approach difficult culturally-sensitive issues, as well as have a greater understanding of one's community and internal relations. Within these competencies, it is important to not only distinguish appearance differences and how they may relate to cultural norms, but to recognize how different cultures can still share the same values. Perceptions matter, and as Campbell (1998) notes the "other" and how this can be construed as dangerous based on a lack of understanding of that which is different, increased cultural competence can mitigate "othering" and result in a greater sense of community.

While law enforcement officials, as they occupy a position of authority, should certainly advocate for culturally competent officers, the burden of trying to increase understanding does not rest solely on them, but is shared with the community. Giles, Linz, Bonilla, and Gomez (2012) cite Bayley (1994) in stating, "Effective policing and crime prevention is a cooperative venture between civilian and officer with responsibility lying squarely on the shoulders of both" (p. 424). However, as officers are the focus of this study, emphasis will be given to their role in affecting inter-group relations between the public and police. Societal interactions between law enforcement and community members are in a kind of pre-paradigmatic phase where communication has previously been on the periphery as a topic of emphasis with respect to public/police interaction. There has been a movement toward a more community-centered approach (community policing); however, communities are frequently diverse, and communication is a highly multi-faceted subject. Thus, examination should also occur that investigates how intercultural communication, and intercultural communication training, relates to community policing and the effect this in turn has on the paradigm shift.

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this research is to gain further understanding of local law enforcement's training in intercultural communication. As a society, public relations and law enforcement are in a crisis mode. As touched on during the previous section, society is living through a kind of pre-paradigmatic phase where the rules for what is socially acceptable with regard to law enforcement's interaction with the public are changing. How this crisis is handled, and the direction new training takes, will have a direct effect on the way law enforcement officers handle increasing diversity. This, in turn, has the potential to affect not only physical interactions, but also the manners in which law enforcement are viewed both locally and, with increased media coverage, around the world.

While numerous articles and books have been written regarding community and law enforcement interactions, these articles frequently deal with public perceptions of the police. There is a gap in the literature that deals directly with studying intercultural communication and intercultural communication training — factors that significantly impact interaction and subsequent perceptions. Indeed, Anderson, Knutson, Giles, and Arroyo (2002) note that the Communication discipline has not been significantly involved with law enforcement relations. When discussing sources for their contribution to the text *Law Enforcement, Communication and Community*, Anderson et al., (2002) stated that “less than 12% of the sources come from journals and publications issued by professional Communication associations” (p. 19). Instead, most sources were assembled from outside of the discipline. Similarly, this thesis heavily relied on sources from non-Communication databases due to a lack of information directly within Communication Studies. When communication is referenced as a part of training, despite its

importance in everyday interactions and job completion, it is often overshadowed by other forms of required training.

This research seeks to analyze current intercultural communication training procedures and desired outcomes at a local level to gain better understanding of interactions between law enforcement and the public. It is hoped that through a close, critical analysis of local law enforcement's current intercultural communication training materials, positive communication strategies can be recognized, areas for potential improvement can be identified, and future communication training can be improved upon. It is also hoped that, through increased understanding, community relations between law enforcement officers and the public can be improved.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The role perceptions play in interaction is continually emphasized in this study. Thus, because these perceptions play such an important role, it is critical to understand how they are formed and the spheres of influence that impact these thought processes. Therefore, Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Models of Human Development (Bronfenbrenner, 1994) was chosen as a basis for understanding. This perspective illustrates the effects of the microsystems, mesosystems, exosystems, macrosystems, and chronosystems on an individual's development, of which, perspectives are included (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). This perspective helps to glean understanding of the effect of familial and peer interaction, the workplace environment, as well as the greater cultural system in which an individual operates, to include culture and media, and the effect that changing times and shared experiences can have.

Because this study focuses on intergroup interaction, and the specific importance of training about intercultural interaction, Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) is also

invoked. As Giles et al. (2012) notes, “CAT specifies the ways in which individuals vary their communicative behavior to accommodate where they believe others to be, their motivations for so doing, and the resultant social consequences” (p. 409). This theory forms the basis of understanding of interaction between law enforcement officers and members of the public, as the accommodation, or non-accommodation, of individuals on either side guides both positive and negative interactions between groups.

Within both Bronfenbrenner’s model and CAT, Hofstede’s (2011) six dimensions of culture are also considered. While all six dimensions do shape cultural understanding and norms, the dimensions highlighted as specifically relative to interactions and perceptions in the context of this research include: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and individualism versus collectivism. The interplay of these three theoretical frameworks constitute the basis upon which this research has been built.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

THE IMPORTANCE OF PERCEPTIONS

The idea of perception is greater than that which is considered familiar or safe, than that which is considered part of one's group. It extends beyond values and beliefs to include the consideration of what is viewed as legitimate authority. So significant is this perception that it is acknowledged in *The Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing* (2015). Pillar number one of six formally addresses the importance of law enforcement building trust and perceived legitimacy (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015). This task force also addressed the importance of officers understanding the needs of the community, and the importance of training and education of a variety of topics — to include cultural mores and “effective social interaction and tactical skills” (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015, p. 4).

Bain, Robinson, and Conser (2014) also note Mazerolle, Antrobus, Bennett, and Tyler (2013) in suggesting the authority of law enforcement is more likely to be perceived legitimate if corresponding behaviors are perceived as fair and just. Bain et al. (2014) also argue that while the perception of legitimacy is important, the perception of open communications and fairness is increasingly playing a role in how effectively law enforcement officers are able to carry out their duties. It comes down to a basic issue of trust. Having the support of the community that is being policed is critical, and not having this support can not only lead to communication difficulties, but can also be problematic for law enforcement in that it can also potentially lead to increased hostility, hostility which has the potential to be detrimental to everyone involved, law enforcement officers and community members alike. The issue of legitimacy and trust is of such

import that it is addressed as the first pillar in the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing (2015).

There are a multitude of factors that influence how individuals interact with law enforcement officers, and even influence the degree to which law enforcement personnel are perceived as legitimate. Personal history is, of course, a factor, as is noting past law enforcement interactions with family and acquaintances, but popular media consumption also can play a significant role in how police are perceived by the public. Dramatized depictions of law enforcement officers in television shows, depictions by mass media news anchors, Internet stories, and social media, all converge to influence perceptions of law enforcement. Bain et al., (2014) note how technologically driven modern society is, and the effect near instantaneous access to information can have on the populace. This access can also exacerbate the police/community division that exists in many localities. The 2016 death of Philando Castile because of a police shooting caught on video and posted to Facebook is an example of this.

Social media plays a massive role in both disseminating information and in leading social movements that iterate dissatisfaction with current cultural relations — including those with law enforcement, and also in advocating social justice. The use of social media by followers of the Black Lives Matter movement exemplifies these qualities. This ease of access to information, and near-instantaneous connectivity despite vast distances, takes what may have once been only a local issue, and magnifies it for the world to see. Movements such as these can be beneficial in leading changes, but can also exacerbate negative inter-ethnic relations. This is yet another factor that required consideration in the creation of law enforcement training materials for interaction with the public. As thousands, and even millions, of people follow, retweet, and comment on news stories, suddenly community perceptions are influenced on a scale faster than law

enforcement training can typically accommodate — especially when budgetary constraints are considered. Bain et al., (2014) notes, (as cited in The Office of Community Orientated Policing Services [COPs, 2011]), concerns regarding these restraints and how they have, in turn, led to a reduction in forces and policy changes that require fewer officers to undertake their traditional roles and duties, but with fewer resources that will result in a breakdown between police and public relations.

The influence of social media can be profound. While Bain et al., (2014) cite Knibbs (2013) in stating that, worldwide, fewer than 1,000 police departments utilize Twitter and similar technologies to support and aid in investigative processes, Twitter users number in the millions (“Twitter,” 2017). These numbers highlight a significant disparity about usage, and, thus, information output and story-shaping potential. Both social and traditional media can be influential of perceptions, to include those of fairness and legitimacy. Maguire and Wells (2002) discuss perceived legitimacy and the effect the news media can have on these perceptions, while Van den Bulck (2002) discusses perceptions as relative to fictional media portrayals, all of which require consideration during training as spheres of influence.

To improve public relations, Bain et al., (2014) suggests implementing a, “‘you said — we did’ concept, identifying needs and highlighting the way(s) in which services have been developed to meet the needs of the local community” (p. 274). This may be done by greater numbers of local police departments utilizing social media outlets such as Twitter, or by other public relations means. The idea is that in advertising these open paths of communication, community members may increase their feelings of being valued and listened to, and thereby improve community relations.

Also, related to perceptions of fairness, Weitzer and Tuch (2005) analyze citizens' personal and vicarious experiences with, and perceptions of, bias in law enforcement — to include bias toward individuals as well as neighborhoods, based on national survey data of 1,792 White, Latino, and Black adults residing in United States greater metropolitan areas. Through their investigation, Weitzer and Tuch (2005) found support for the group-position theory of race relations, in that “attitudes toward the prevalence and acceptability of these practices [were] largely shaped by citizens' race, personal experiences with police discrimination, and exposure to news media reporting on incidents of police misconduct” (p.1009). This is worthy of consideration, for, as Weitzer and Tuch (2005) note, when perceptions of law enforcement officers' interactions with the public are perceived as racially motivated or unfair, consequent police/public interactions may have an increased likelihood of becoming severe as trust partnerships disintegrate.

Giles et al. (2012) also note the influence of perceptions on interactions between community members and law enforcement officers, as well as the importance and influence communication accommodation can have on the interaction. While Giles et al. (2012) focused on Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) in their content analyses of recorded traffic stops between non-Latino officers and Latino and non-Latino drivers in a single county (48% White, non-Latino and 43% Latino) from 2005-2009, the principles of communication accommodation in the context of intercultural relations are applicable on a broader scale of intergroup interactions as well.

While accommodation is frequently positive and shows consideration of one party for another party, resulting in an overall more productive and pleasant experience for all involved, over-accommodation is something that has the potential to be perceived as off-putting by the

party being catered to. For example, speaking slowly and loudly to someone older because of the assumption the individual has a hearing problem — the person trying to accommodate is attempting to be helpful, while the message received by the older individual is that they are less intelligent or disabled, which in turn may cause them to become defensive.

The study conducted by Giles et al. (2012) that focused on interactions between Latino and non-Latino drivers with non-Latino officers was conducted as a follow-up study to research Giles had previously conducted of stops between Black and White officers and drivers. In his research, Giles et al. (2012) noted his previous 2008 research, conducted along with Dixon, Schell, and Drogos, which had found that there was less accommodation on the part of Black drivers toward White officers, but that White officers also engaged in longer stops with more personal and vehicle searches of Black drivers than of White drivers. The follow-up research between Latinos and non-Latinos was conducted to investigate if there were similar patterns to interactions between other minorities and law enforcement. Noting these previous studies, and the outcomes of CAT as applied to intercultural interactions, is important as it helps to show a history of interaction, which in turn aids in understanding the resulting pre-conceptions of other groups that occur, and the perceptions that must be acknowledged during training for inter-group interaction.

Giles et al. (2012) found that Latino drivers had similar experiences to Black drivers in that they were stopped more than White driver for offenses such as an expired registration rather than moving violations. However, a significant difference between groups was that Latino drivers were found to not be more likely to experience “extensive policing” than White drivers — unless they were heavily accented. An important finding in this research was that the more that law enforcement officers were perceived to accommodate drivers, the more drivers

reciprocated this behavior and were accommodating in turn; likewise, the more law enforcement officers were perceived to be non-accommodating, the more drivers were perceived to be non-accommodating (Giles et al., 2012). This study further exemplifies the importance of intercultural understanding and the necessity of communication accommodation training for law enforcement officers, for the more positive communication skills are implemented in everyday interactions with the public, the more likely it becomes that negative perceptions can be overcome and more positive interactions result. Results such as these may also help to explain the perceptions held of the police by minority groups, as well as the perceptions held by minority groups toward other minority groups regarding police interactions — a topic that is explored in a Pew survey listed in *The Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing* (2015).

While accommodating practices may be easier for perceived same-group interactions, as there is greater implicit understanding between individuals, similar group status should not automatically be assumed. For example, the perception of belonging to the same ethnic group should not automatically make one default to speaking in another language to a stranger. There is something to be said though for dominant racial/ethnic groups and the overall accommodation of the group toward law enforcement.

To this end, Weitzer and Tuch (2005) noted how dominant racial groups typically view law enforcement as an ally. While in part this could be attributed to the idea of “White-privilege,” it could also be attributed to what Weitzer and Tuch (2005) discuss as more of a preservation of position. In other words, if dominant White groups acknowledge that there is a systemic problem in need of reformation to, not only better accommodate minorities, but to change approaches in a manner whereby biases practices perceived as crime-preventative are

altered, the perceived racial/ethnic status quo becomes threatened. This idea becomes significant not only from a community perspective, but also from an administrative perspective. While diversity has certainly grown in the upper-level management positions that control training content and dissemination, top-level managerial positions in the U.S. are still frequently White-male dominated, and the implicit biases of individuals in command is worthy of consideration.

The idea of dominant group accommodation also can be tied to Bain et al., (2014) and the perception of legitimacy. Perceived legitimacy by majority racial groups can reinforce the power of law enforcement, but this perception, in the face of cases of documented cases of biased police practices against minorities, can exacerbate minorities' perception of police illegitimacy. A 2014 Pew survey found differences in the perceived treatment of minorities by community police officers and claimed: 72% of individuals identifying as White hold a great deal, or at least a fair amount of confidence, that both Latinos and White individuals are treated equally, as well as that Black and White individuals are treated equally by police (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015). Latino-identifying respondents, and Black-identifying respondents, however, had significantly less confidence in equal treatment. Latino responses to the question of Latino and White equal treatment was only at 46% confidence, with Black and White equal treatment perception being only scarcely greater at 47% (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015). Black perceptions of equal treatment were even less at 41% and 36% respectively (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015).

Weitzer and Tuch (2005) present similar findings, noting that Black and Latino individuals both reported a belief that their respective groups were not treated equally to White community members by police. The perceptions of White community members were also noted. Almost equal to the 72%, 75% — 77% of White individuals cited a belief in equal treatment of

their majority group to minority groups by law enforcement (Weitzer & Tuch, 2005). Also, similar to the aforementioned 2014 Pew findings in *The Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing* (2015) is the belief by Black individuals that there is a greater deal of unfair treatment toward Latinos than even Latinos perceive of themselves (Weitzer & Tuch, 2005). The greatest perception of disparities however, comes with the self-perceptions of racial discrimination as a part of one's own experience. Weitzer and Tuch (2005) note that only 1% of White individuals identify as being "treated unfairly" solely as a result of their race, while 37% and 23% of Black and Latino respondents, respectively, identify as having experienced racial discrimination personally by law enforcement.

It should be noted that Latinos can hail from many countries, but it is interesting that, across studies, Black-identifying individuals had a greater perception of unequal treatment of Latinos and Whites than even Latinos perceived. This could be due in part to a more publicized historical mistreatment of Black individuals in America in comparison to Latinos, but also to self-identification of mistreatment and greater relation to another minority group, which, by extension, may feed into the idea that perceived injustice is a blanket-problem in minority communities. It is also possible that years of racially motivated mistreatment has led to the creation of biases that perceive racial/ethnic mistreatment more than others who have been less subjected to said treatment. There are a multitude of factors that can interplay to influence this perception; as such, more research should be conducted to understand the pattern of why Black-identifying individuals continue to perceive injustices across minority groups — even more than the other minorities polled perceived of themselves.

Overall, perceptions related to police appear to be cultivated within respective cultural systems. What is important to note here is that none of the above conclusively illustrates biased

policing practices, what it does show is that there is a clear correlation between ethnic identity and *perceptions* of bias. What previous research appears to be showing is a culturally taught set of beliefs. As an example, Black parents teach their sons how to behave when they start to drive based on the preconceived conception of problems with law enforcement and minority relations, and, cyclically, these teachings continue to be expressed in future teachings to rising youth. With the rise in technological availability, there is even an app to try to inform the public of best practices if pulled over, the “Driving While Black” (DWB) app (“Driving,” 2014). Despite the emphasis on perception, this does not mean that these perceptions are imagined problems. There are numerous documented cases of racial biases by the police leading to brutality — such as the beating of Rodney King in 1992, but like Campbell (1998) notes, identity, even false identity, can be projected onto another, and the more widespread this notion becomes, the more this dubbing is perceived to be factual. In other words, the more the perceived idea of widespread negative interaction with law enforcement is put forth, the greater the perception by the community at large that there is a prolific issue.

AN HISTORIOGRAPHIC APPROACH

Recommendation 1.2 of *The Final Report of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing* (2015) states, “Law enforcement agencies should acknowledge the role of policing in past and present injustice and discrimination and how it is a hurdle to the promotion of community trust” (p. 12). It is important to understand that there is evidence of a legally-sanctioned history of biased and discriminatory practices, and that from these practices stem many of the negative or leery views some minority groups have toward law enforcement officers. The topic may be uncomfortable, but the fact that community members feel as they do require acknowledgement, because these perspectives influence their communicative practices.

The only way to truly understand *why* individuals act as they do, is to understand the values and perspectives that drive their thought processes, for thoughts influence actions.

It is worth acknowledging also that both law enforcement and the public often hold differing views of the degree to which biased practices occur. Ioimo, Becton, Meadows, Tears, and Charles (2009) discuss variations in community and law enforcement perspectives toward biased policing practices in Virginia, with statistically significant findings. Ioimo et al. (2009) note that not only do perceptions vary between officers and civilians, but that perceptions also vary along racial lines (for both officers and civilians) and along management levels within law enforcement offices themselves. While there was a great deal of varying perceptions, and it was suggested that more research and work be done between groups, Ioimo et al. (2009) also note that officers and citizens, regardless of race, believed in the potential to find solutions to biased practices.

While optimism exists, police and minority relations continue to be problematic in many countries throughout the world. For example, Wortley and Homel (1995) note these interactions between law enforcement officers and the populations of Australia, and if one has followed media coverage pertaining to race-relations between law enforcement and the public in the United States, there is a history of negative interactions spanning decades. This historiographical approach is important to note because history influences the lens through which individuals view their world and interact with it.

To provide a few examples, riots ensued in 1992 after the beating of Rodney King in Los Angeles, and riots have continued to ensue over the years as police-community relations continue to deteriorate because of perceived injustices. The 2014 riots in the greater Ferguson, MO area after the killing of Michael Brown, and the 2015 riots in Baltimore, MD after the death

of Freddie Gray while in police custody, are more recent examples, as is the 2016 assassination of five police officers in Dallas, TX that occurred during a Black Lives Matter protest of police brutality. Media outlets reported that the sniper associated with this shooting was not affiliated with the Black Lives Matter movement, but this event is a testament to the ongoing problem of poor intercultural relations, specifically between the public and law enforcement. The fact that there is a movement entitled “Black Lives Matter,” and even an app with the name “Driving While Black,” that offers pointers for smoother relations with law enforcement should one be pulled over while driving, show that there is a widespread perception of biased treatment of minorities by law enforcement and that a change in communication and relations is needed. Both sides (officer and public) are frequently and greatly misunderstood by the other, and these resulting perceptions, and sometimes misconceptions, lead to difficult relations and even violence.

Pitt (2011) discusses the link between the U.S. Patriot Act and discriminatory profiling of minority groups in relation to Robert Agnew’s General Strain Theory. Pitt’s research is significant in that it not only notes social science research which correlates discriminatory practices and racial profiling with violent acts and diminished mental health, but in that it also links legalized culturally-discriminatory practices with religious practices instead of solely race/ethnic background. Pitt (2011) also heavily cites Whitehead and Aden (2002) in their analysis of the constitutionality of the U.S. Patriot Act and its violation of multiple amendment rights, often specifically targeting practitioners of Islam — despite clauses which prohibit said profiling and discrimination of Muslim and Arab-Americans. One may wonder how this research and approach is relative to local police-community practices, but it is federally institutionalized profiling practices such as these that also impact localized perceptions and relations between

both community members and each other, as well as community members and law enforcement officers.

While the problematic role racial profiling plays in community relations is well-known, and attempts have been made through the decades to minimize this bias, historically, such profiling has also been systematically built into certain forms of training. Community policing training advocates against racial/ethnic profiling; however, when it comes to training relating specifically to drug trafficking, racial and appearance stereotypes have historically been at the forefront. Tomaskovic-Devey and Warren (2009) note Operation Pipeline, a multi-state operation organized by the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) in 1984 that was centered around identifying, stopping, and searching potential couriers of drugs. Tomaskovic-Devey and Warren (2009) cite the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) as stating the profile for Florida's Highway Patrol "included rental cars, scrupulous obedience to traffic laws, drivers wearing lots of gold or who don't 'fit' the vehicle, and ethnic groups associated with the drug trade" (p.35).

New York City's "Stop and Frisk" policy is another example of institutionalized policy that has been viewed as widely discriminatory and largely ineffective. RAND Corporation (2007) notes New York City Police Department (NYPD) statistics, from February 2007, which indicate that almost 90% of the half-million individuals stopped during Stop and Frisk practices in 2006 were of minority descent. These statistics were as follows:

89 percent of the stops involved nonwhites. Fifty-three percent of the stops involved black suspects, 29 percent Hispanic, 11 percent white, and 3 percent Asian, and race was unknown for the remaining 4 percent of the stops. Forty-five percent of black and Hispanic suspects were frisked, compared with 29 percent of white suspects; yet, when

frisked, white suspects were 70 percent likelier than black suspects to have had a weapon on them. (RAND Corporation, 2007, p. xi)

Considering the above statistics, one of the key questions a member of the public may ask themselves regarding the “Stop & Frisk” policy is, what about the individual stands out to law enforcement officers to stop random citizens, and how “random” is the practice in reality? The numbers clearly illustrate what appear to be biased practices.

These numbers, however, do not illustrate the entire story. After being consulted by the NYPD and conducting its own inquiry, RAND Corporation, while finding some degree of racial disparities, found far less than previously published statistics. RAND’s adjustment of benchmarks to create more precise measurements for comparative study showed several key differences in analyses of outcomes of stops made, namely that when adjusting for stop circumstances, the percentage of White individuals who were frisked compared to “similarly situated” non-White individuals stopped was 29% compared to 33% — a significant difference compared to the original statement of 29% White compared to 45% Black and Latino. Also noted was that, except for Staten Island, search rates were nearly equal despite racial/ethnic group, with numbers between 6% and 7%. Relating to contraband discovery, RAND found that while White individuals were still slightly more likely to have contraband on their person than were Black or Latino individuals, percentage recovery rates were 6.4%, 5.7%, and 5.4% respectively (RAND Corporation, 2007).

Studies and statistics like those originally published by the NYPD are a contributing factor to negative public perceptions toward law enforcement officers and legal policies that appear to represent biased policing. Many people, and it could be argued that most people, will not consult third-party sources to verify statistical information and study findings. What is

published first, particularly when it appears sensational, drives conversation and shapes public opinion, regardless of its veracity. When members of the public recall publicized instances of perceived biased treatment, or their own personal negative interactions, and then combine these with statistics such as those initially published by the NYPD for the sake of transparency, it only lends credence to the perception of a more widespread problem of cultural and racial biases. Combined with the proliferation of social media and spreadable media, these perceptions can become even more exacerbated.

Despite varied forms of racial/ethnic profiling, across state lines, minorities have consistently been shown to be less likely to be found with contraband than White individuals. Over time, procedural changes in ethnic/racial profiling training have reduced disparities along cultural lines, which in turn has aided in reduction of overt shows of law enforcement biases in interaction with the public (Tomaskovic-Devey and Warren, 2009). This progress is important for intercultural interactions and perceptions moving forward, but the effects of such practices in the past can still be affecting present perceptions. This history, and its effects on both the public and law enforcement veterans, is a factor that needs consideration in creating intercultural communication training practices in academies and supplementary training moving forward. It is about not only understanding how individuals perceive each other based on historical interactions, but also being aware of the potential for stereotyping and unconscious biases. Only by acknowledging these uncomfortable topics can any pedagogical attempts be made to implement improved tactics for communication and interaction.

TRAINING

Even though police training is the central focus of this thesis, it has been saved as the last topic for initial introduction, because effective training materials are derived from an

understanding of the complex intricacies of the aforementioned. Despite multicultural training dating as far back as 1947 (Marion, 1998), and the positive effects that are understood to be associated with it, there is still a great deal left to be desired about intergroup interaction training — as evidenced by the continued strained interactions between law enforcement and members of the public and a lack of training uniformity.

In a manner of confronting some of these issues related to training, the fifth pillar addressed by the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing (2015) focuses solely on officer training and education. Specifically stated are recommendations for both recruit and veteran training and leadership development in “community policing and problem-solving principles, interpersonal and communication skills, bias awareness, ... [as well as] languages and cultural responsiveness” (President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015, p. 51), and the importance of training taking a historiographical perspective. Great emphasis is placed on supporting community policing policies and encouraging a working relationship between both academic and law enforcement institutions “to support a culture that values ongoing education and the integration of current research into the development of training, policies, and practices” (President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015, p. 55). Recommendation 5.1 also suggests support for the development of partnerships between the federal government and cross-country training facilities as a means of promoting consistent training standards (President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015).

While it is important to acknowledge the existence of a historical basis for culturally discriminatory practices, as these practices are influential in the shaping of perspectives and the negative orientation that some minorities hold toward the police, it is also important to acknowledge the history of attempts to further understanding between groups and diverse

cultures. Cultural sensitivity training and communication training is not simply inter-ethnic understanding or a politically-correct term for “race-relations.” Intercultural communication training is about furthering understanding of how other cultures operate, manners of both linguistic and nonverbal communicative practices, values that are held, and the histories that motivate these values and perceptions toward one’s world, for the influence of historical interpretation on values and perceptions in turn influences current cultural and communicative norms and actions of both individuals and groups. Acknowledging history is important both because it increases understanding, and because it shows a value of that which has come before and that influences the present.¹ Finally, through increasing these understandings, intercultural communication training lays a cognizant foundation so that individuals can better interact with others.

Racial-awareness training. The idea of including training relative to racial and ethnic differences in law enforcement curriculums is not a new concept, in the United States or otherwise. But just as important as administered training is training value and retention. Southgate (1984) examined the common themes in trainee (ranging in experience and ranked from Constable to Chief Inspector) reaction toward three groups of trainers presenting Racism Awareness training in England and Wales. While this study does not measure training retention, it provides a measure of insight into receptivity.

¹ In this context, showing value means both showing respect for the cultural history of others, as well as showing empathy and acknowledging painful historical actions as having occurred rather than being dismissive of them. It means facing even negative remembrances and confronting the roles of interacting groups. It means acknowledging the importance of the past as a guide to learning and not making similar mistakes in the future. Acknowledging the important role of individuals’ history acknowledges their humanity.

Racism Awareness Training (RAT) went outside of the traditional teaching methodologies, which consisted of only providing information, and instead also included characteristics associated with more modern education such as case studies, role-playing, and group discussions, to name a few (Southgate, 1984). Despite advancements in training approaches, there was a serious issue regarding training objectives, namely that instructors and trainees “largely failed to reach [a] consensus as to why they had come together and what they should be doing” (Southgate, 1984, p. 5). A related issue was that training failed to adequately convey subject understanding from something relatable that was smaller and concrete to a wider and more abstract meaning (Southgate, 1984). In other words, there were issues conveying how material in the classroom had a larger applicability. Of note here is the significance of the instructors themselves. Instructors need to be able to answer difficult questions and show trainees material applicability, while themselves conveying a knowledge of law enforcement and what it entails. Most RAT trainers were criticized by trainees for their lack of knowledge in this respect, which impacted credibility and understandably had a negative impact on the message the trainer was attempting to convey (Southgate, 1984).

As part of the police awareness approach, as previously mentioned, trainees were expected to participate in discussions. This idea of discussing previous experiences and attitudes, while now understood to be of importance, was largely rejected by police trainees as alien (Southgate, 1984). This observation is significant when considering modern intercultural training approaches, because receptivity is key to message conveyance. Through Southgate’s study, one can see the importance of making training relatable to trainees, and the impact that the culture of trainees themselves has on the educational experience. In the case of the exploratory study reported in this thesis, police trainees had been conditioned to expect that training involved the

imparting of information, generally not their active participation and applied experiences — except in the case of some senior officers (Southgate, 1984). This varying approach, even more so when combined with a lack of consensus on training objectives, dramatically impacted trainees' receptivity to RAT. This study shows the necessity to not only consider the police culture of trainees themselves, but also the impact of career experience on the educational experience. While intercultural communication training is of importance and is well understood to be necessary across the law enforcement officer experience spectrum, the present study shows that trainees may benefit from varying approaches to materials depending on their experience level rather than utilizing a blanket one-size-fits-all method.

Bull (1985), a North-East London psychologist, echoes the above sentiments of trainee receptivity to RAT in his discussion of the drawbacks of the program, while also providing an analysis and critique of the Metropolitan police's human awareness training (HAT), a program that builds from RAT as discussed by Southgate (1984). HAT consists of interpersonal skills, community relations — to include cultural and racial-awareness, and self-awareness (Bull, 1985). Bull (1985) notes that one of the primary achievements of HAT was that it was treated, “as an integral part of policing skills rather than as a separate entity which could be different from ‘real policing’” (p. 115).

Despite this achievement, Bull (1985) heavily critiques the HAT program for not focusing enough on the “principles governing and underlying human behavior” (p. 115), as well as for not having an effective means of evaluating success. This is noted as important for not only evaluating overall program success, but also for imparting the importance of HAT training to trainees through consistent monitoring as a condition of graduation (Bull, 1985). Bull (1985) also critiques HAT's community relations training as being inadequate, noting that both the

topics of racial and cultural awareness were insufficiently covered for either group knowledge or the nature of prejudice. Regarding prejudice training in specific, Bull (1985) related this back again to a lack of focus on the principles that shape behavior. Recommendations for training were made regarding these critiques toward principles, community relations, assessment, and trainers, and it was noted that the Metropolitan Police had been adjusting in accordance with the recommendations (Bull, 1985). This shows that training is a work-in-progress, and that it is important to include the experiences and knowledge of both those directly involved in law enforcement and academics, and to build on previous research to continue to better programs over time.

Academies: Recruits and culture. Culture in law enforcement academies can be very complex. On one hand, there is the greater organizational culture that is being instilled in recruits, while on the other hand, recruits are entering this environment with their own preexisting cultural values, some of which may clash — to varying degrees, with the greater organizational culture. Schlosser (2013) introduces the idea of the “color-blind” ideology. At first glance this ideology sounds like something positive, indeed politically-correct terminology has at times used this term as a means of advocating against biased ideologies and practices; however, in this context, color-blind is discussed as modern racist practices and views that stem from the White-privilege perspective that racial or ethnic discriminatory practices are no longer a current issue because they have been overcome in the past (Schlosser, 2013). As part of a Midwest study, Schlosser discusses law enforcement academy training and recruits’ views held in relation to this topic, finding that, over the course of their training, the high levels of color-blindness that recruits displayed upon entry did not significantly vary upon academy completion (Schlosser, 2013).

This finding — especially considering the defining characteristics of what color-blindness is in this context — is troubling. However, it is not entirely surprising considering that cultural diversity training at the academy in this study consisted of a single outdated four-hour PowerPoint lecture (Schlosser, 2013). The student performance objectives required by the state note required topics for inclusion as, “prejudicial behavior vs. non-prejudicial behavior, stereotyping, measures that can be taken to avoid stereotyping, special considerations when dealing with minority groups, and explaining the difference between stereotyping and bias” (Schlosser, 2013, p. 218). But, without any detailed history of interactions or cultural empathy training practices, this brief overview conveys the message that this training is in place more so to meet state-mandates than to impart recruits with the means to make real social changes. Schlosser (2013) mentions that the lack of academy training’s effect on increasing awareness of racial privilege, institutional discrimination, and even blatant racial issues, is cause for concern and calls for a re-evaluation to methodological approaches extending beyond curriculum changes and into a field-training community policing approach that continues across the career-span.

While it is easy to offer suggestions for improvement, implementation is always considerably more difficult. As Schlosser (2013) suggests, curriculum changes are only one consideration. A training overhaul would foremost require a departmental leadership *commitment* to updating and improving materials, and then to extending training time to exceed a single four-hour lecture. To increase understanding, common educational practices acknowledge the importance of revisiting content and lessons over time. Especially when concepts as intricate as culture, prejudice, bias, and stereotyping are first introduced, time needs to be allowed for discussion and the fielding of questions and answers.

Similarly related to training, but including the effects of group contact, Wortley and Homel (1995) discuss an Australian longitudinal study between 1988 and 1991 among 412 police recruits. For this longitudinal study, data were collected at the recruitment point, after 6 months of academy training, and after 12 months of on-the-job probationary experience. The study was conducted at a time when a new curriculum was being introduced after the deaths of Aboriginal people while in police custody, and included training specifically on Aboriginal culture. Findings note that while during academy training ethnocentrism ratings of recruits did not vary, however, during the field experience phase of training recruits' ratings of ethnocentrism and authoritarianism increased. Furthermore, police recruits who were assigned to districts containing large Aboriginal populations rated as significantly more ethnocentric, but not more authoritarian, than their counterparts assigned to less Aboriginal districts. As stated in the discussion of their findings:

Despite the apparent success of the Academy in containing prejudice, recruits quickly succumbed to environmental and occupational pressures once they were stationed in the community. As both motivational and cognitive theories suggest, prejudice developed as a function of intergroup contact, although there needed to be a critical mass of Aborigines in a district before this occurred. (p. 314)

A noted weakness of the above observation was that the quality of interaction between law enforcement officers and Aboriginal people was not part of the study. Wortley and Homel (1995) also note that past research surrounding police and prejudicial actions is frequently deficient, but go on to state that research does suggest that attitudes among law enforcement, "are related to the particular nature of their policing experience" (p. 306). This sentiment of cultural conditioning is prevalent among communication literature and can also be considered in

alignment with Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Models of Human Development (Bronfenbrenner, 1994).

Perhaps the most significant insight that can be pulled from Wortley and Homel (1995), and also in alignment with Schlosser (2013), is the idea that while academy training can provide a foundation, supplementary training should be implemented throughout the career to aid in retention and help to guard against environmental influences outside of the policing environment, and the idea that classroom training serves as more of a Band-Aid to the fixing of greater sociological issues. As was so eloquently stated:

If prejudice is the inevitable consequence of intergroup conflict and/or of conditions that foster perceptions of outgroup deviance, then an attack on police prejudice requires changes to the inequality experienced by racial minorities in society, and to the policies and practices of the police organization in responding to that iniquitous situation. There is a danger that, in emphasizing the role of police training, attention will be diverted from examining the social, occupational, and organizational factors that engender racist attitudes among police. (p. 315)

However, despite the understanding Wortley and Homel (1995) show of the importance of supplementary training, their research notes that in the 30 years prior to their publishing, that only five longitudinal studies were found to have been published that went beyond academy training. Wortley and Homel (1995) cite this research as being "of varying quality and hav[ing] produced contradictory findings" (p. 306), but including the work of Bennett (1984), Brown & Willis (1985), McNamara (1967), Sterling (1972), and Teahan (1975). The notation of quality variations, in conjunction with contradictory finding and limited studies, shows that more research is needed.

It is also noteworthy that in the mid-90s when Wortley and Homel's work was published, references to research relating to the topic of police interactions and early community-policing models were stated to be often relying on research from the 1960s, research that was considered to be potentially outdated (Wortley & Homel, 1995). This heavy reliance on dated research becomes even more significant as decades go by, because as times change, interactions change, and this newer history becomes influential of more current perceptions. Research must continue to occur, and newer findings be utilized in conjunction with older ones. Only through historiographic approaches can paradigm shifts be exposed and the most relevant communicative approaches for the time be developed and implemented for improved community relations.

The import of community approaches can be noted not only by their prevalence in suggested practices across the research, but also in the increasing number of state and local law enforcement academies that are incorporating the approach into their curriculum. The Bureau of Justice Statistics' (BJS) 2013 Census of Law Enforcement Training Academies (CLETA) reports that 97% of academies provide some form of community policing as part of their curriculum (Reaves, 2016), a noted increase from the former 90% the BJS and CLETA reported in 2002² (Hickman, 2005). Approximately 40 training hours is the standard allotment for modern community policing curricula, included in which is the history of community policing, training on how to identify problems within the community, cultural diversity, and human relations training, to name a few (Reaves, 2016). Cultural diversity and human relations training accounts for just 12 of the average 43 hours that participating institutions allot to community policing

² In 2002, Community Policing was counted as a separate topic area from Cultural Diversity and Human Relations. The BJS and CLETA report that 95% of academies provided training in Cultural Diversity, while 92% reported providing training in Human Relations. The median number of required training hours for both Community Policing and Cultural Diversity was 8 hours, while the median number of required training hours for Human Relations was 11 hours.

training (Reaves, 2016). While breaking the community policing curriculum down into multiple subsections means that each section may be afforded less time, acknowledging that community policing is a complex topic that requires multiple approaches to training illustrates that officials are aware of broadening community complexities and are working to accommodate them in the training of officers.

Although at first glance the number of academies participating in community policing training appears high and promising, these programs are still in flux. Chappell (2008) discusses law enforcement academy recruit performance based on a traditional curriculum in comparison to a newly implemented (and not yet standardized) community policing based curriculum. It should be noted that the community policing curriculum also focused on adult learning and problem solving. Chappell's study does not occur across academies, but rather at a transitory time within one. What is meant by a traditional curriculum is training focused on the physical, such as defensive tactics, firearms training, traffic enforcement, arrest, and knowledge of the law; a community oriented policing curriculum is training more focused on working with the public to build cultural understanding, increase communication, and prevent criminal activity by solving community problems (Chappell, 2008). Community policing gives the public a greater voice to help shape police training, and to guide focus on areas they deem as having the most issues.

Although the learning-through-application style of the newer curricula did not show recruits as performing significantly better than recruits learning through the traditional curriculum, it was noted that the newer curriculum may be more influential to more empathetic and educated recruits (Chappell, 2008). It was also noted that recruits who entered the program already possessing a higher level of education, as well as female recruits, performed better in the

more community-policing-oriented curriculum (Chappell, 2008). A significant finding was that while minorities, generally, had lower academy scores in this sample, they were often more likely to find employment post-graduation. It was presumed that this was due to the community policing push toward hiring individuals who “reflect the racial makeup of the communities they serve” (Chappell, 2008, p. 48). While there are benefits to officers reflecting their respective communities in appearance — the public may view them with less mistrust if they appear to be a part of their group, there are also inherent problems that arise from this method of hiring, namely that less qualified recruits are becoming officers based on their race or ethnicity rather than their qualifications and academy success. There needs to be more of a balance, and, it is suggested, more research on why minority recruits generally perform less well in an academy setting than their White peers.

Chappell and Lanza-Kaduce (2010) build on the research of Chappell (2008) in their discussion of police recruit socialization as often para-militaristically motivated. The notion of the instillation of the “us” versus “them” mentality that accompanies a militaristic approach is relative to Campbell (1998), and is something that requires careful consideration as a training approach in conjunction with one that is community relations and bridge-building centered. This idea of “othering” is something that is often inherent in human relations, but is further ingrained into recruits during academy training. There is the idea of building peer relations as an “us” in deference to ranking officers and instructors, as well as an “us” as a greater police organization in relation to a “them” as community outsiders. The integration of this mentality is prevalent across police training literature, and can also be found in work by Marion (1998). Both Marion (1998) and Chappell and Lanza-Kaduce (2010) note how values and police culture are conveyed through “war stories” and are used as a means of integrating recruits into the world of the officer.

While the paramilitary style of training certainly creates group solidarity among police recruits, just as it does in actual military training, it is the subliminal curriculum that often accompanies it, and that sometimes contradicts the formalized curriculum, that has been a subject of concern for past researchers (Chappell & Lanza-Kaduce, 2010). While on one hand military-style tactics are necessary at times to ensure greater public safety, the ostracization that can occur toward anyone that is not part of the “in” group of the greater police organization is counterproductive to the community policing goal of increasing understanding, improving relations, and improving communication with the community being policed.

Similar to Chappell and Lanza-Kaduce (2010), Marion (1998) discusses police academy training from an internal perspective — as an observer integrated with recruits, at a state-accredited facility in Ohio. Something of note is that each recruit was given a listing of the goals and objectives of lectures so that they would be aware of the expectations of training (Marion, 1998). This method is significantly different, and an improvement, from Southgate (1984) where neither instructors, nor recruits, had a clear consensus of what Racism Awareness Training (RAT) should entail and how it should be implemented. Also of note is that the academy setting Marion (1998) researched was not militaristically motivated as many police academies are. While there was still screening for attendants, the academy was also “open enrollment,” whereby attendees could consist of both recruits already tied to law enforcement agencies, as well as others who were not affiliated, but were willing to pay for courses on their own (Marion, 1998).³

³ While noteworthy, this is not completely unheard of. Chappell and Lanza-Kaduce (2010) also write of how not all attendees to the academy in their study were recruits already affiliated with a law enforcement department. In their study, Chappell and Lanza-Kaduce (2010) approximate only 20% of recruits already possessed a department affiliation and were being paid during academy attendance.

While there was still emphasis placed on field exercises, the majority of focus was placed on academics and “knowledge-learning” of subjects such as laws and policies as the foundation of becoming a peace officer, with practical skills mixed in (Marion, 1998). Instructors in the academy being researched viewed cultural diversity training as an important part of training; however, the topic was taken significantly less seriously by recruits. While training consisted of a mixture of “handouts, videos, exercises and discussion topics to increase student interest” (Marion, 1998, p. 64) student response was generally perceived as poor. Many recruits did not acknowledge that the topic was significant, nor did they acknowledge their own preexisting biases — despite derogatory terminology utilized when regarding other cultures (Marion, 1998).

This shows that while academies and instructors may acknowledge the importance of reviewing intercultural communication as a subject of training, there is another factor that should be considered: that of the recruit him/herself. Acknowledging that recruits approach training with their own preexisting perceptions is important, because these preconceptions can impact receptivity to materials. As such, consideration should be given to implementing a measurement with which to gauge pre-existing implicit biases prior to delving into materials. Acknowledging the existence of these views prior to intercultural communication training may serve to increase receptivity to information by illuminating where issues exist so that alternative methods of approach may be taken, such as cultural empathy training.

The idea of testing in relation to bias-awareness is raised by Hickey (2016) with the question of if cultural competency should be a part of testing for law enforcement. Due to limitations in the literature regarding cultural competency and law enforcement, Hickey (2016) primarily discusses cultural competency in relation to research done in public service fields such

as health care and counseling; however, she is able to correlate needed cultural competencies in these fields with other public service fields such as policing.

Cultural competency is discussed in varying levels to include metacognitive intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and behavioral intelligence (Hickey, 2016). Each of these levels contain respective subdivisions, which wholly result in an individual recognizing appropriate verbal and nonverbal communicative acts, as well as understanding and differentiating between varying cultural surroundings while being able to plan and react accordingly (Hickey, 2016). While Hickey (2016) relates these abilities to multiple public service fields, she focuses on how these abilities prove beneficial in relation to law enforcement officers' interaction with multi-cultural community members.

Cultural competency not only can increase understanding of communities' actions, but can also facilitate more open forms of communication and increase both officer and community members' safety. As community interaction is such an integral part of law enforcement, Hickey (2016) cites Glick (2006) in advocating for prospective officers to be screened for these competencies during the recruitment process, potentially by a board of diverse community members who may be more likely to ascertain cultural subtleties that other law enforcement officials may overlook. The importance of increasing the cultural competency of officers is noted as correlating with perceived legitimacy in the eyes of the public, something that continues to be noted throughout the research as being of significance, and is discussed in the aforementioned by the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing (2015), Bain et al., (2014), and Maguire and Wells (2002).

The influence of one's group cannot be overestimated in influencing personal perceptions, but it is not simply ethnic groups that influence outlooks, corporate groups can be

equally influential, even groups within the law enforcement community. This understanding further illustrates the need to improved intercultural communication training. Both Anderson et al., (2002) and Maguire and Wells (2002) note how even within the community of law enforcement officers, there are group distinctions. There is not just a cultural division between officers and the public, there are cultural divisions within law enforcement branches — such as those of federal, state, and city, as well as within single departments — such as those that exist hierarchically or between occupational specialties. When considering corporate communication and these differences, consideration should also be given to how this affects agency training and consistency, as well as instilled perceptions of one’s own group in relation to others.

Pielmus (2015) discusses law enforcement training as part of a greater organizational culture, and how recruits are conditioned into this greater culture. Pielmus’s research involves a qualitative case study in Romania, which while foreign, has many similarities to U.S.-based police academy training. Similarities can be found in relation to Chappell and Lanza-Kaduce (2010) in that the greater police organizational culture is instilled into recruits by their immersion into their occupational culture. This both creates a sense of camaraderie for the “in” group, as well as, as Campbell (1998) would say, “others” those not a part of the organization.

Pielmus (2015) also notes how the nature of culture is multidimensional. Culture is described as, on its first level, the “level of artifacts,” that it is easily observable, and can include “architecture, productions and creations, language, technology, visible behavioral patterns, dress code, rituals and ceremonies, myths and stories about the organization” (Pielmus, 2015, p. 441) The intermediate level of culture is described as the “values and beliefs” of the group or organization, something less visible in and of itself, but noticeable in how these internalizations guide the *actions* of those who hold them (Pielmus, 2015). The deepest level is defined as that of

“basic assumptions,” or “those beliefs that are understood by all members of the organization and based on their consensus on what mankind and society, truth and people’s interactions represent” (Pielmus, 2015, p. 441). It is through the combination of these dimensions, particularly in the closed and selective setting of the academy, that the organizational culture of the law enforcement officer is instilled in the recruit. Cultural lessons are further instilled by the willingness of recruits to conform and become a part of the organization. While there are certainly benefits to this in the sense of the police organization bonds of fellowship, it is noted that the strength of the culture can also become a hindrance to change implementation (Pielmus, 2015).

While cultural integration and training content have been subjects of focus, Gould (1997) discusses receptivity toward training. In his text, Gould (1997) discusses the responses of both recruits and veteran officers toward cultural diversity training, and proposes that the policing experience of veteran officers can “jade” and negatively impact their ability to be open to the ideas put forth in intercultural communication training. Through his study Gould found that overall, new cadets were more receptive to cultural diversity training than were veteran officers. Veteran officers not only approached training with increased levels of skepticism of real-world applicability, they noted their own resistance and that training would have probably made more of a difference for them if it had been received earlier in their careers. In the words of one 5-year veteran:

I guess it’s like trying to learn any new way of doing things. First, you have to forget the old way of doing it. I have developed a way of handling problems in minority neighborhoods and it works for me. It might not be right and it certainly does not go along with what has been said here, but it gets me through the day. (Gould, 1997, p. 349)

While there were some issues with receptivity, there were some beneficial outcomes that increased sensitivity to cultural topics. A noted beneficial point that arose from training, as noted by trainees, was the effect that language and terminology — specifically terminology that could be construed as derogatory, can have on interactions with individuals from other ethnic groups (Gould, 1997). Another noted beneficial point of training was increased awareness of differing communicative practices (both verbal and nonverbal) between ethnic groups (Gould, 1997).

An interesting factor to be considered in training reception, as noted by veteran officers, was the position of administrators. It was suggested that by not involving administrative personnel, front-line officers were being blamed for negative minority/police relations rather than these negative interactions being the result of “part of the institutional history of the department” (Gould, 1997, p. 353). It was also suggested that, to emphasize importance across the board, administrative officers also be involved in training, and, to further effectiveness, that supplementary training be administered across the span of an officer’s career (Gould, 1997).

Finally, touching on all the topics of perceptions, biases, and the importance of utilizing a historiographic perspective during training, Schlosser, Sundiata, Valgoi, and Neville, (2015) present research occurring at the University of Illinois regarding “diversity education” as part of the Policing in a Multiracial Society Project (PMSP) at the university’s Police Training Institute.

The objectives of the project are to build officers’:

- (a) awareness of their own social identities and racial beliefs
- (b) knowledge about theory and research related to police misconduct and the socio-historical experiences of racial minority communities, especially with police and the criminal justice system

- (c) efficacy to apply the communication and basic policing skills learned at the Police Training Institute in a culturally informed way. (Schlosser et al., 2015, p. 115)

The PMSP takes a pedagogic approach to cultural empathy and racial literacy by not only teaching from a contained academy curriculum, but also evaluating and growing the program based on feedback from recruits and veteran officers, as well as community members (Schlosser et al., 2015). The program takes a true “community policing” approach.

As part of program implementation, it was noted how difficult it could sometimes be to change the mindsets of recruits, and particularly veteran officers (Schlosser et al., 2015). A key idea regarding the community policing perspective, and the importance of factoring individual community issues into program implementation, can be summed by one recruit’s quote, “It was great to hear community member perspectives. Police and the community have different perspectives and that makes communication essential” (Schlosser et al., 2015, p. 120).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The researcher's interests in the topic of intercultural communication, relative to law enforcement, are twofold. The first reason is to contribute to the research regarding law enforcements' interactions with minority populations and the second is the mutual interest in intercultural communication and governmental work as a personal career path. Over the past few years, many media stories have emerged regarding these interactions, yet academic research into the types of communication training that directly relate to these interactions has thus far been minimal. There is some research about perceptions and law enforcement, and about police training, but little literature that involves studies of intercultural communication training in police departments as a basis for improved community interaction. Therefore, to further this understanding, this thesis sought to address the following research questions:

RQ1: What does the intercultural communication training of law enforcement cadets look like?

RQ2A: While at the academy, and prior to interaction with the public, are cadets' perceptions relating to ethnic culture assessed?

RQ2B: If cadet perceptions relating to culture are assessed, are they self-tests, or does the academy administer these tests?

RQ3: While at the academy, and prior to interaction with the public, do prospective law enforcement officers receive any training to distinguish cultural or ethnic stereotyping from necessary context-specific profiling of an individual?

RQ4: What does post-academy supplementary training of police officers about intercultural communication look like?

Whilst collecting data, a fifth research question also arose:

RQ5: What are working police officers' attitudes toward intercultural communication and bias-awareness training?

Information resulting from addressing these questions will help to form a foundation upon which future research about intercultural communication and law enforcement can be built, as well as form a foundation for future development of effective intercultural communication education programs for law enforcement officers.

PROCEDURES

Training is multi-faceted and is also an ever-evolving process. This study sought to examine not only current training that is in place, but also to examine training receptivity and efficacy. Approval for this study (#967745-1) was gained through the approval of Old Dominion University's Arts & Letters Human Subjects Review Committee, and was determined to be exempt from full IRB review. Rather than taking a comparing and contrasting approach between the protocols of multiple departments, this thesis chose to conduct a case study of a single South-Eastern United States police department. In part, the department chosen for this research was selected due to its representative demographics (a primary combination of suburban and rural jurisdictions).¹ More importantly, the selected department was willing to provide access to officers, training command, as well as its training and educational materials.

¹ By representative, it is meant that the demographics of the area this department is responsible for can be easily related to a large portion of American police departments.

Data were gathered in three ways: (a) interviews of officers and the Director of Training, (b) assessment of training materials (PowerPoint presentations), and (c) participant-observation in a police/community panel meeting (that the researcher was invited to attend). To gather the perspectives of both administrative personnel as well as those of the officer-on-the-street, the Director of Training was interviewed, as well as six police officers originating from varying precincts. Interview data were transcribed and qualitatively analyzed through a process of analytic induction as discussed by Bulmer (1979). To assess rating reliability, data were coded by both the primary researcher as well as a second coder (thesis director).

Officers who were interviewed were selected for the researcher by the Director of Training. When asked about how each officer had heard about the study, the responses from each officer were that they had been reached out to primarily via phone or e-mail — with one initial face-to-face request, notified of the research, and requested to participate. While their participation was requested by commanders, each officer appeared very receptive to being interviewed, and not at all unwilling.

Due to the small-scale size of this study, but still the desire to examine a diverse sample, these officers were also hand-selected by the administration for their demographic variety — see Table 1, as well as their perceived willingness by the Director to be open to talking. Officers were also selected in a manner that would maximize the number of participating precincts within the department. This was done to be as inclusive of the varying demographics of the area the department is responsible for as possible.

Table 1

Officer Demographics

Officer	Male	Female	Black	White	Latino(a)	Post-Secondary Ed.	< 5 Years Served (Total)	5 - 9 Years Served (Total)	10 - 14 Years Served (Total)	15 - 19 Years Served (Total)	20+ Years Served (Total)
Officer 1	X			X		X	X				
Officer 2		X		X		X				X	
Officer 3	X				X	X				X	
Officer 4		X	X		X			X			
Officer 5	X		X			X		X			
Officer 6	X		X			X		X			

Note. Post-Secondary Ed. includes earned college credits as well as earned Bachelor's degrees. This column does not include Graduate degrees.

Each interview was electronically recorded and later transcribed for analysis. Interview transcriptions resulted in a total of 65 typed pages. Interviewees were advised of why the recording was being requested and provided verbal consent prior to any recordings taking place. Interviews were conducted behind closed doors in conference rooms at Police Headquarters, and included only the researcher and the participant. Despite the formality, interviews were relaxed overall and even involved shared laughs. Following approved ODU-HSR protocols, each participant was advised that their identity would remain confidential, and each participating officer, to include the Director of Training and Chief of Police, also read and signed an informed consent document noting their agreement to participate in the research. All recordings,

transcriptions, and training materials given to the researcher were saved on a password-protected computer, and were destroyed upon completion of this thesis. A single back-up copy of transcribed interviews was saved on a flash drive, which was kept in a secured location until thesis completion, and was also later destroyed. Prior to their destruction, a content and discourse analysis approach was taken to all materials collected.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERVIEWS

Much insight was gained through the interview portion of this research. As such, there are moments when direct quotes are used to illustrate officers' perspectives rather than paraphrases. However, due to the small sample size and potentially recognizable speech patterns, it should be noted that speech fillers were removed to preserve officer confidentiality. The removal of fillers also serves to enhance message clarity. An exploratory discourse analysis was performed on interview data, which resulted in the identification of trends among officers, as well as information that coincided with previous research. Findings are reported related to each research question.

RQ1: What does the intercultural communication training of law enforcement cadets look like?

Cadet training. Much like in Southgate's Racism Awareness Training for the Police (1984), a multifaceted approach was also found to be taken to training officers in this study, to include case studies and case law, role-playing, and group discussions. However, given the modernity of educating practices, online platforms were also found to be used in conjunction with traditional in-class methods. Role-play was noted as heavily emphasized throughout recruit training, and, through observation, is a critical method by which recruits are assessed. A key reasoning behind this method of assessment is that, due to the stressors of the situation, recruits will default to their natural tendencies. This allows assessors to identify problems and potential biases so that they can either be amended, or the recruit dismissed. Assessment begins at the time of selection with a psychological examination, and occurs throughout a recruit's time at the

academy in the form of exams, practicals, and behavior examination. This finding also answers RQ2A: while at the academy, and prior to interaction with the public, are cadets' perceptions relating to ethnic culture assessed? And RQ2B: if cadet perceptions relating to culture are assessed, are they self-tests, or does the academy administer these tests? Regarding RQ2A, yes, cadets' perceptions relating to ethnic culture are assessed prior to public interaction; and, with respect to RQ2B, these tests are academy-administered rather than self-exams. Indeed, behavior is assessed over the span of an officer's entire career through the Ethics and Conduct Unit.

Just as training is implemented with a multi-faceted approach, so it is developed with a multi-faceted approach. While there are mandates by the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) — the regulating agency for police departments state-wide, regarding specific forms of testing and topics to be included within the lesson plan content, as well as specified training objectives in relation to desired performance outcomes, this department was found to consult an array of outside sources to create said curriculum. Of note during interviews was the inclusion of information from higher education, business communities, and other communities that educate on best practices, to include conferences on inclusion and diversity.¹ Indeed, a beat officer who also participates in academy and field training also noted during interviews the attendance of various conferences.

Training, however, is a complex subject, and, inevitably, there are time-constraints that require consideration when condensing the vast amount of material from a variety of subjects that recruits must be taught during their time at the academy. As such, the question was raised as

¹ This approach of including information from a variety of exterior sources throughout the greater community was also noted as a practice to be encouraged by Southgate (1984) when discussing police and racism-awareness training. This is significant to note, as Southgate identified this practice as a need in 1984, whereas this occurrence in present day 2017, shows the need as finally having been met.

to how material was chosen for inclusion in curricula. As the DCJS is the state-mandating agency and regulatory core for state-certification, their performance outcomes play the largest role in determining curriculum points; however, other noted sources of consultation include the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Presidential Task Forces, such as the previously mentioned force on 21st Century Policing, and Fair and Impartial Policing by Dr. Lorie Fridell. Of note, journals and other academically reliable sources derived from national organizations could be found as having been cited on PowerPoint slides utilized in the classroom, which shows not only that outside sources were being consulted as noted in interview, but also lends creditability to the material. Recruits can see that the information they are being introduced to is not only coming from their professional superiors within the department, but also from outside agencies. This act of citing sources on slides also subtly emphasizes topic importance by noting broader-scale applicability.

Regarding the curriculum itself, a noted topic of importance by both DCJS and this department involves fostering community relations. In relation to this topic, intercultural communication training and bias-based policing — now transitioning to fair and impartial policing, training go together. The DCJS discusses fostering these relations in Performance Outcome (PO) 1.4 — 1.4.1, as well as in 1.5 — 1.5.8 (Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services [DCJS], 2012). As part of the mandated lesson plan by DCJS for PO 1.5, defining bias and discrimination are noted, as well as the consequences of bias-based policing and impartial policing (DCJS, 2012). This is one of the first modules cadets encounter, and the information and related skill-sets are built upon throughout their time at the academy. Bias-awareness training is linked with cultural-awareness training, but will be further discussed as its own topic later in the thesis.

Interview data found the DCJS to mandate 2 hours of cultural diversity training, but this department was found to exceed this number. Current department classroom training has cadets being exposed to 4 hours of material; however, the department is looking to expand this further, and will soon be transitioning to a 6- to 8-hour curriculum that discusses intercultural communication and fair and impartial policing. This new training is scheduled to be implemented department-wide in the coming months for both officers and civilians. In addition to classroom training, cadets employ their teachings and skills during exercises throughout their 6 — 7 months² at the academy, making the exact number of hours of training prior to public interaction difficult to quantify, but certainly exceeding the state-mandated 2-hour minimum.

This current state of training transition is something that should be highlighted, as should varying academy lengths. It was noted during interviews that while curricula have a consistency of sorts due to regulating performance outcomes, that this department's instructors review its academy's materials yearly to determine what topics can be added to, adjusted, or omitted. This fluidity is noteworthy, as it shows that material is kept as up-to-date as possible. Current trends are considered for inclusion, and this review also allows the length of time it takes students to understand material to be considered so that topic-coverage may be extended to maximize retention as needed. This is considerable, as it shows that not only is there an effort toward continual improvement, but also that there is a commitment toward quality education and, as a result, officer proficiency.

Also of note is the DCJS mandate related to communication training as part of PO 3.1. Per mandated testing requirements, cadets are given either a practical, written, or audio-visual

² Academy duration may vary depending on class size. Larger class sizes may equate to lengthier academy time. In addition to academy training, recruits are also required to participate in 3 months of field training.

exercise, through which they must identify deceptive verbal and nonverbal behaviors (DCJS, 2012). Within this training and testing, it is specifically noted to be aware of cultural differences regarding eye-contact. This shows that not only is training occurring that seeks to recognize biases and that interaction with various cultures needs a degree of consideration, but that finer details in cultural variations and communicative practices are being noted and factored into officer training. These customs are also covered in PO 3.8, which discusses how to use verbal and nonverbal communication skills to calm individuals who are emotionally upset, as well as in PO 3.9, and heavily noted in 3.10 (DCJS, 2012). Within the lesson plan for PO 3.8, cultural awareness and the consideration of local customs are specifically noted, while 3.10 elaborates to define ethnocentrism and the importance of recognizing the varying cultures that inhabit a jurisdiction for the sake of increasing cultural awareness to enhance communication with individuals of varied backgrounds (DCJS, 2012).

It is significant that not only is training tailored to the communities being policed, but that it is also framed according to identified departmental needs. By this it is meant that training is also modified according to trends noted in current officer behaviors by the Ethics and Conduct unit. Specific trends were not noted during interview, but the general sentiment shown was that there is departmental self-reflection regarding officer behavior so that if the need for modification is noted — by either the Ethics and Conduct unit or by community surveys, training for both recruits and incumbent officers is also adjusted to meet these needs.

Actual curricula are of course important, but with training being so influential across an officer's career, there is also a high degree of responsibility placed on instructors. Consequently, this raises the questions of who are these instructors, and what teaching backgrounds do they come from? When the question of instructor backgrounds was raised, the response given was

that there are two types of instructors, DCJS general instructors and DCJS specialty instructors. While there is not a degree-requirement to be an instructor, this department does require specialized training and vetting prior to being charged with an instructorship. For specialty instructors — like personnel selected to teach fair and impartial policing, individuals go through what is dubbed “train the trainer” for the course prior to teaching the speciality.³ Specifically regarding cultural diversity training, the importance of selecting an individual who is considered to be both reputable and credible by their peers was also noted.⁴ Reputation appeared to be of high significance, as this word was used three times in the response given in addition to a separate notation of the importance of having a history of exceptional performance in the subject — to include no history of either bias-related complaints or public interaction complaints.

Training alone though does not guarantee placement as an instructor. Much like new college adjunct or graduate instructor observation, would-be-instructors are also viewed interacting with other officers in the classroom. During this phase of training it may be determined that the initial selection is not optimal; in these instances, prospective trainers are thanked for their time and interest, but are not placed in an instructorship position. This approach is better-rounded than simply hiring and placing instructors, as it allows for observed teaching

³ During officer interviews, one officer who was involved in the bias-awareness (transitioning to fair and impartial policing) specialty training course noted that this training lasted for approximately one week. As there are multiple types of specialty training though, this length of training for trainers should not be assumed to be uniform across specialties within the department.

⁴ The importance of positive reputation can again be linked to Southgate’s (1984) work regarding racism-awareness training. Southgate (1984) also noted that trainees respond/relate better to those perceived as understanding them, police culture, and the issues officers face. This consideration being given — especially in relation to such sensitive topics as intercultural-relations and race-relations, it seems like a logical approach to train select reputable officers to deliver this information rather than rely on largely unknown (to trainees) guest lecturers.

skills, as well as ensures that instructors know, and can convey, the material that they are charged with teaching others.⁵

RQ3: While at the academy, and prior to interaction with the public, do prospective law enforcement officers receive any training to distinguish cultural or ethnic stereotyping from necessary context-specific profiling of an individual? In short, yes. While connected, this training can also be distinguished from intercultural communication training that cadets go through during their time at the academy by its focus on the acknowledgment of both explicit and implicit biases.

Bias-awareness training. In 2002, the BJS and CLETA reported that 96% of state and local law enforcement training academies addressed, to some degree, the topic of racially-biased policing (93% in an academic environment, 40% as a part of practical skills training, and 31% addressed the topic during field training) (Hickman, 2005). Although approaches vary, especially considering the current social climate regarding law enforcement and public minorities, it was thought to be important to assess the level of bias-awareness training and training to mitigate cultural/ethnic stereotyping cadets received.

While the topic of bias-awareness training was covered in part during the section on cadet training, there are a few things that should be distinguished as separate, apart from intercultural communication or cultural diversity training. Department records reflect that bias-based policing began in 2005; however, all officers interviewed who have served longer than 15-years, recall

⁵ Another noted benefit of this face-to-face interaction is that, much like in academy training, conversations in the classroom also allow for the potential identification of biases held by those going through the training. As an example, one officer who had undergone this specialty training noted how it was interesting hearing the different perspectives people have, but sometimes you hear things that make you think, “I don’t know why you just told me that, but thanks for sharing; hopefully we can get rid of that.”

having some degree of bias awareness training prior to this date. This leads one to conclude that while training was present, it was grouped with another form of communication training, or was labeled using a different name, during earlier years. Training is consistently being updated, and the current transitory stage to fair and impartial policing exemplifies this.

Despite this current transition, it is important to note that prior to interaction with the public, while still at the academy, cadets' perceptions relating to culture are assessed. Just as assessment regarding intercultural communication skills is performed through recruit observation by academy officials rather than through written exams, so too is bias-awareness assessment performed via observation. This assessment method was again chosen as preferable, as, due to training stressors during role-play, recruits default to their natural tendencies, thereby providing a more accurate measurement of behavior and skill, as well as potential issues with biases.

Education relating to bias-awareness and the differences between implicit and explicit biases was noted as one of the most significant factors when discussing intercultural communication, not only in acknowledging the existence of biases, but in having open communication about the topic. Also of significance is that there are clear expectations set regarding interactions with others, both through observation as well as through psychological testing of recruits. Trainers ensure that cadets not only understand the difference between implicit and explicit biases, but also that they understand the effects that biases can have on decision-making and actions to create greater objectivity.

In addition to bias-awareness training, cadets also receive training to distinguish between cultural and ethnic stereotyping. This training relates to cultural awareness and intercultural communication training as various cultures, customs, and norms are discussed, as well as associated stereotypes. It is believed that through education, group stereotyping can be

minimized, and officers can better approach varying situations. Stereotyping is also acknowledged in that stereotypes are frequently associated with implicit biases as well; however, as will later be discussed in the section on training materials, recruits do receive training that educates on the differences between racial and criminal profiling. Recognizing the existence of biases, implicit and otherwise, is confronted head-on, without anonymity, in the classroom with face-to-face conversations between officers and recruits. It is recognized that only through acknowledging the existence of implicit biases can individuals take their existence consciously into account to approach situations as objectively as possible. This topic appears to be held with great significance throughout the department, not only within the recruit curriculum, but also in supplementary training, as the recognition of this training, and the existence of implicit biases, was mentioned throughout veteran officer interviews as well.

Within the DCJS training manual, cultural diversity and bias are mentioned throughout numerous performance objectives — some, but not all, of which are listed here. The discussion of culture is multi-faced, and the DCJS lesson plan for PO 4.19 — which relates to investigating suspicious individuals or activities, even notes culture itself as a potential contributor to biased policing (DCJS, 2012). The recognition of this concept is of importance when considering the potential role of implicit bias in interaction, and is significant as a part of the lesson plan in that it shows that officer training not only considers the cultural diversity of civilians as impactful, but also the role of cultural diversity amongst officers themselves. Interviews at both the administrative level, as well as the beat-officer level showed that officers recognized that implicit biases exist in everyone, and that training to identify this, as well as working toward overcoming it, was of importance.

In sum, both recruits and veteran officers are introduced to varying cultural norms and customs so that they can approach field situations in an educated manner rather than falling back on group stereotypes. Trainers recognize the importance of teaching cultural diversity and bias-awareness early in the academy and emphasizing these lessons throughout training, and beyond, to combat and overcome a lifetime's worth of exposure to stereotypes that even young recruits have been exposed to. There are high standards for acceptable behavior, and this is emphasized over the course of an officer's career through both training and monitoring by the Ethics and Conduct unit of the department.

RQ4: What does post-academy supplementary training of police officers concerning intercultural communication look like?

Supplementary training. Academy training provides an officer's foundation, but over the course of a career, supplementary training becomes increasingly important in not only grounding officers, but also in conveying the most current practices and ideals. Because this training should both reinforce academy ideals, as well as convey the most current best practices to veteran officers, it was important to examine this form of intercultural communication training as well. It was found that supplementary training follows much of the same criteria as academy training, and that it too is regulated by DCJS performance objectives. And, just as in the construction of academy curricula, current best practices and trends are also consulted during the yearly updates to materials.

The department has increased supplementary intercultural communication and bias-awareness training length from the DCJS mandated 4 hours every other year to a lengthy 6 — 8 hours for both officer candidates and veteran officers. As training has transitioned from bias-based policing to fair and impartial policing, it is also returning from an online platform to the

classroom where face-to-face discussions regarding implicit and explicit biases can take place with officers. Some training does include online modules and exams where if questions are not answered correctly, one must retake the online course again, but the inclusion of face-to-face dialogue is recognized as important due to both the high social-relevance of the topics, as well as being a means of officer and climate assessment. In other words, just because an officer has earned his/her shield does not mean that behavioral assessment ends. Ethical conduct remains of paramount importance throughout an officer's career.

Interviews revealed that there are also specific aspects of supplementary training that relate to understanding cultural variations in the context of domestic interactions. These variations apply between residents themselves, as well as how cultural norms affects officer interaction with residents. This specifically became a topic of discussion during interviews, because the week that interviews took place coincided with the week that this training was also occurring. Cultures reviewed are tailored to the communities that are policed, with patriarchal cultures specified as a topic of importance. This was noted as not only significant in tailoring communication, but also as important in maximizing safety and preventing the potential re-victimization of a non-dominant party. Within the topic of cultural-awareness, varying nonverbal communicative practices are also discussed. Officers review high and low power distances, as well as variations in eye-contact. Middle-Eastern, Latino, and African-American cultures were all specifically mentioned as having varying norms and practices that officers are trained to consider during interaction.

It is significant to note that officers continue to receive supplementary training in relation to varying cultural practices, customs, and norms throughout their careers. It is not only cadets who are exposed to this information in the academy, but the information is returned to

throughout an officer's time in uniform as a means of both positively influencing interactions with the public, as well as combating group stereotypes, thereby making officers more efficient at their jobs.

Challenges

Despite this department's movement toward increased officer education and emphasis on community policing, there are still obstacles to the process. The first noted obstacle during interviews was staffing. Turnover rates, in conjunction with required training time and a growing population, makes this an issue. While community policing was noted as occurring daily, it was noted that additional officers would allow for greater community interaction and relationship building outside of calls for service. Again though, these interactions and relationship-building attempts were still found to be taking place. During officer interviews, one officer noted playing football with local children, and yet another time when meeting publicly during the pre-interview phase of interaction, the researcher herself witnessed an officer interacting with a woman and child, whereupon after talking to the child for a few minutes, the officer gave him a sticker in the shape of a badge. This not only showed local outreach, but the preparedness to do so with children, as well as adults. From a lifespan perspective, the carrying of stickers shows that there is an understanding that there is an importance in reaching children and positively influencing their views toward law enforcement, which may carry-over into adolescence and adulthood.

The other obstacles noted during interviews was call volume and reporting (time spent), although, in a sense, this can also be connected to the main issue of staffing. Greater staffing would allow for a greater allocation of resources, therefore alleviating the burden placed on officers responding to incoming calls for service, while also allowing for a greater dedication of time toward preemptive community policing efforts. Regarding the issue of report-filing, while

potentially cumbersome, the digital system that the department uses also functions as an analytical tool that compiles data and allows the department to identify areas with greater amounts of crime. In doing so, this technology also functions as an aid to officers during the development of improved strategies to counteract the occurrence of crime in the identified areas. This, in conjunction with community outreach programs⁶ that show vocalized needs, shows that there is a tailoring to the community and that actual *listening* is occurring on the part of the department.⁷ This type of engagement, and a willingness to receive feedback on recommendations for improvement, not only functions as an aid for crime reduction, but also fosters community relationships and combats the frequent negative publicity associated with media depictions of police/public interaction.

The final obstacle that was discussed was more relative to mutual understanding between law enforcement officers and the public. While there is a clear distinction between racial profiling and criminal profiling for police — as evidenced both from reviewing training materials, as well as from interviews with both administrative officials and beat officers, there is a belief held that this distinction is less clear in the public-eye. One of the perceptions held among officers as to why there is such a negative view held of the police by the public is that this differentiation is not fully, if at all, understood, and that the solution to this would be greater education on the part of the community. The topic can be complex, and, depending on one's own

⁶ This department utilizes multiple community outreach programs, both digital and face-to-face. Online social networking platforms such as Facebook are used, as are more traditional methods like monthly or quarterly meetings with neighborhood watch groups or civic leagues. Regular meetings are also held with formal and informal community leaders that are faith-based or spiritual leaders, as well as business partners and other civilian partners in the community.

⁷ Citizens are, in some ways, viewed as a “force multiplier” for the department, an extension of their eyes and ears. This view further emphasizes the importance of the community and the regard held toward the community policing perspective, because citizens are viewed as less of an “other,” and more as fellow group members acting as an ally against criminal activity.

experiences, interpreted differently, which further exacerbates the divide. However, greater community education would aid in not only understanding how law enforcement officers perform their duties when race or ethnicity becomes a factor in building a profile, but further education would also serve to increase understanding on the positive aspects of policing, even when the policing presence within the community is frequent. After all, the greater community consists of both officers and civilians alike. Relationships can be improved by training, but lasting change and betterment can only come from *mutual* understanding, education, and reciprocal communication.

General

A critical point that this department focused on was the importance of the community, and making every effort to ensure that contact with the public is as positive of an experience as possible. This importance can be seen in both the multi-faceted approach that training itself takes, as well as that academy lengths vary to best accommodate class size and ensure the greatest retention of material. There is also a focus on creating positive relationships within the community — as evidenced by the inclusion of community members in panels, as well as other forms of community outreach like interacting with local children.

The continued references to bias-awareness training (implicit and explicit) and importance of said training shows that not only does the department understand the effects of biases on actions, but also the effects that biased practices have on the public's perception of law enforcement. Training focused on this understanding is not only done so from an ethical standpoint, but also because there is a clear understanding that in order to build trust and perceptions of legitimacy, officers must adhere to high standards of expectation that also show

cultural understanding and accommodation, while behaving in a manner that conveys fairness and a high moral code.

OFFICER INTERVIEWS

This section discusses the categories to which questions related during officer interviews. To provide perspective, diversity of patrol beats will first be discussed, after which follows responses related to intercultural communication training, bias-awareness training, and community involvement in the police academy. This section is meant to provide a general understanding of the topics discussed, as well as note overall question and training reception. Detailed trends that emerged throughout response analysis will be discussed in the final section of this chapter, after greater context is provided by review of the topics of training materials and a community panel.

Beat diversity. As cultural understanding is of paramount importance in this research, it was thought to be important to not only examine the diversity of the officers themselves, but also of the areas they patrol. While tolerance of cultural differences can aid in more harmonious community relations, cultural understanding first begins with recognizing differences. Tolerance does not equate to understanding, it simply means that differences are put-up-with despite themselves. Understanding may go together with tolerance, but it first means recognizing differences, embracing them, and trying to learn more about not only what divisions exist, but what similarities are also present. Understanding correlates with education. And as recognizing the existence of differences is the first step, it is important to note if officers recognize the differences that exist in the areas they are responsible for patrolling. This not only shows the diversity of the area — and highlights the importance of this study, but also that officers recognize this diversity so that intercultural interactions can, hopefully, go more smoothly. After

all, culture is omnipresent, so how can communication occur effectively if this factor is not considered, and subsequently tailored to, as situations vary?

Recognition of “beat diversity” occurred throughout officer responses, although the focus of this diversity was not always racial or ethnic diversity. While some officers focused more on the diversity of people during their responses (labeled people-centered), others focused more on diversity of geography and landmarks (labeled geography-centered), with some noting a combination of all of the above, as well as varying socio-economic statuses. Although a people-centered approach is preferable to a geographic one when considering community relations, geographical and socio-economic considerations are also important to note, as these factors influence lifestyles, and are also impactful to culture. Several responses indicated the co-existence of multiple races and ethnicities within the same beat, and, within each, varying levels of socio-economic status. Specifically noted races and ethnicities included: White, Black, and Latino, to include specifically Mexicans and Guatemalans. Regarding geography, beats were reported to include urban, suburban, and rural areas, often within the same precinct.

While the effect of socio-economic status may seem less prominent, when discussing culture its influence should not be underestimated, as this factor can be effectual to many other life experiences such as educational level, community, and respective stereotyping. For example, the experiences of someone who is White, living in a trailer park, and shopping at discount stores to make ends meet are going to be vastly different from someone who is also White, but lives in a million-dollar home, and can afford to wear clothing that is more expensive than many people’s cars. The race may be the same, but income-level potentially affects the enactment of their respective cultures. The same is true across racial and ethnic lines, and the recognition of

these variations and hierarchies within beats is important, because a compilation of these factors affect perceptions (within both the public and officer community), and need to be accounted for.

RQ5: What are working police officers' attitudes toward intercultural communication and bias-awareness training?

Intercultural communication training. While overall responses related to intercultural communication training were positive, there was also a trend among officers interviewed for a desire for more training on the subject.⁸ One officer even noted that while training exists, that there was a desire for greater training related to diversity, to include recognizing differences in the community and being sensitive to varied life experiences as a means of not only combating racism, but also assisting in peace-keeping. Indeed, multiple officers noted that part of their job involves acting as “conservators of the peace,” which is considerable, because it recognizes that law enforcement is not only about legal adherence, but is about the community and relationships between others. For this respondent however, a lot of the perceived focus for intercultural relations dealt more with adhering to code rather than how to enhance everyday communication and more effectively respond to calls to maintain the peace.

Perceived efficacy and training resonance varied across responses, but officers did note helpfulness. To clarify, responses indicated that training enhanced personal knowledge; training did not stand alone, but rather enhanced what was already known, served as a self-check, or was considered illuminating for those less versed on the subject. On whole, awareness ratings also consistently rated as moderate or higher with respect to research questions specifically related to intercultural communication.

⁸ See page 84 — 85 for further details.

Supplementary intercultural communication training. Supplementary training was another important factor to examine in this research, as this is the training that officers will experience most over the course of their careers. Academy training, while foundational, is initiative and happens only once. Supplementary training is important, because it should not only reinforce previous lessons over the course of time, but should also be socially-relevant to the time in which an officer currently operates.

While not all officers interviewed in the study had been in uniform long enough to receive supplementary training related to intercultural communication, there was an overall positive trend in officer responses to the questions relating to supplementary training. Responses showed that 100% of officers who had been in uniform long enough to go through supplementary training relating to intercultural communication responded positively toward training, noting that they believe it reinforces previous training received. Officer responses also noted the perceived importance of supplementary training for themselves and other officers. When asked about how supplementary intercultural communication training relates to previous intercultural communication training, one officer made this important observation:

Definitely reinforces it... I think going through the training helps them [officers] kind of open their mind back up again to, 'You know what? Just because I had this one bad experience with this person, or with this neighborhood, doesn't mean that it's going to be that way.'

This statement shows that supplementary training not only kept information “fresh” for officers, but also served as a ground and a means of helping to prevent cynicism. Again, as a whole — for whom questioning about supplementary training applied, awareness ratings also consistently rated as moderate or higher with respect to supplementary intercultural communication training.

Finally, only two officers had been employed by multiple police departments, and as such were the only ones able to respond to questions that asked for a comparison between intercultural communication training received from their current department to that of previous departments. Interestingly, both officers responded that the training received from their current department was superior to that of previous employers. One response indicated that this superiority was due to training depth — to include discussions, case studies, and supporting research, while the other response noted superiority due to a complete lack of training related to interpersonal communication from their former department. While it is not entirely surprising to have a response indicate limited training on this subject, it was surprising to hear of its complete non-existence (especially when descriptions were provided that showed the diversity of the former area patrolled). This surprise was reiterated by the officer being interviewed by stating, “It surprised me too. It was kinda [sic] strange.” Cases like this illustrate that while the importance of this type of training are understood by many, a variety of factors (such as locale and leadership) are influential to implementation, and that application is not universal.

Bias-awareness training. Similar to intercultural communication training, bias-awareness training was also positively received by officers. Responses noted not only perceived efficacy in the form of new awareness of implicit biases, but also how self-checking occurred as a result. This training was not only noted as important, but was also welcomed by officers, with two even suggesting for there to be more, with greater depth. It is possible that such receptivity is due to the current tense social climate between law enforcement and the community, and the understanding that this is a subject that requires education; however, this climate can also correlate with greater insulation and have a polarizing effect, so it is positive to note that this effect was not displayed by those interviewed. Indeed, much like intercultural awareness levels,

awareness levels for interview questions corresponding to bias-awareness training also consistently rated as moderate or higher.

Bias-awareness was noted as being important not only in relation to interacting with other ethnic cultures, but also in relation to helping identify the close-mindedness that can occur from a lack of socialization with those of different social backgrounds. As one officer stated:

It [bias-awareness training] is important. If the only social exposure people — including police officers, are exposed to are the people in their immediate circle and whoever they deal with on Facebook, or whatever weird forum they use, they end up with a very one-sided view of the world. In this business, you can see an entire race as almost inhuman if your primary interaction with a particular group is putting them in handcuffs. I've noticed it with some officers here, and also in _____. It's sad, but it's true. It's not all officers, but it's some. The worst part is that they don't even notice that they are doing it.

This idea of the importance of open-mindedness occurred across several responses, with officers not only acknowledging its importance in and of itself, but also in relation to training receptivity. In other words, training only has as much of an effect as one allows it to.

Other officers took more of a reflective and meta-approach, noting not only their relationship to training, but also how it is impactful and important for the department.

If it's there [bias], do people understand that? Do people really confront it? Do they take time to say to themselves, 'Wait a minute, have I been wrong in the way I've treated this particular person, or that particular person?' whether it is in the department or outside of the department? Has it affected them to that height? Or, did they just look at it as a form of training that I [sic] have to go through, and that's it, it's gone?

This form of examination is also important to note, as internal reflection is also necessary of the force. While training affects individuals, it is individuals who comprise the department and create the entity that the community recognizes. The actions of individuals affect the reputation of the department, which in turn impacts community perspectives toward officers and perceived legitimacy. Taking the time to consider training, and the effects it has on creating well-educated and culturally sensitive officers, benefits the community: officers and civilians alike.

Supplementary bias-awareness training. Of the six officers interviewed in this case study, four participants had been with the department long enough to receive supplementary training related to bias-awareness, all of whom viewed responded positively to questioning. Responses indicated perceived efficacy by citing beliefs of reinforcement of previous bias-awareness training, and notations of self-checking. Also, while not a complete measurement of efficacy, analysis indicated that response awareness ratings correlated with officers' perceptions, with the most common rating being moderate-high awareness. To provide an example, one officer who cited perceived efficacy noted how cynicism can be common in police work, but training acts as a self-check to ward against this. This response illustrated not only an awareness of stereotyping and implicit biases on a personal level, but the effectiveness of training in that these identifications take place and renewed perspective is gained.

Questions were also asked that requested a comparison of bias-awareness training from officers' current department to that of previous departments. And, just as departmental comparison questions related to intercultural communication training only applied to two officers, so too did comparison questions relative to bias-awareness training only apply to two officers. Just as with intercultural communication training, the bias-awareness training received from the interviewed officers' current department was noted as superior, again, due to content

depth. The greatest difference between these responses, also again, was the existence (or lack thereof) of bias-awareness training.

While the officer who noted that bias-related training received from a previous academy was touched on by its related department, greater depth was cited as relative to more current training, due both to length of training, as well as supporting research behind the training. The officer who stated that their former department did not provide such training noted that not only was it not mandatory, but it was not even an elective-style course. It is interesting that elective-style courses were offered by the department — and discussed by the officer interviewed when recounting participation in a sexual assault and family violence investigator course, but this illustrates the priorities placed on varying training topics by leadership, that certain content is offered, while other socially and community-relevant topics are not even acknowledged.

Community involvement. Interestingly, in alignment with Chappell's (2008) findings related to recruits possessing higher education levels performing better in more community policing oriented curriculums, interviewees (all but one of whom also possessed education above the post-secondary level), trended toward holding positive beliefs regarding the community policing perspective. Interviewees noted the importance of maintaining positive ties with the community, the importance of interpersonal communication, and the importance of cultural understanding. However, although the officers interviewed held positive views toward the community policing perspective, views differed on community involvement in the police academy.

To begin, despite confirmation⁹ that community members outside of law enforcement are involved in the academy and in assisting with recruit selection, there appeared, on the part of beat officers, to be a degree of unawareness as to the level of current community involvement in the selection process and other academy activities. Therefore, it should be noted that when officers were specifically asked about their thoughts toward community involvement in the academy, that in an effort to reduce confusion as to exactly what sort of involvement was being discussed, interview question no. 9 of Appendix C was elaborated on to specify for each officer as being relative to community member involvement in the academy in the capacity of role-players.¹⁰ Once this specification was made, interviewees found the question more relatable and were able to provide responses. Still, it should be noted that some answered the question directly, while others maintained that citizen involvement was limited, and yet another did not recognize community involvement at all aside from participation in training during DUI week. Only two respondents directly noted citizen involvement in a training capacity.

Furthermore, although the aforementioned question was elaborated on for purposes of clarity during interviews, differing approaches were still taken as to how the question was interpreted by officers, with multiple references to the citizens' police academy noted rather than maintained focus on the academy officers go through for their own training. Three officers referenced the citizens' academy in their responses, either as the focused academy of their response or in relation to the actual police academy. For future research regarding this topic, further clarification should be given during question phrasing.

⁹ Confirmation was received by cross-referencing administrative interview data with participant-observation panel data. During this panel, community members were seen by the researcher to be volunteering to participate in upcoming academy events.

¹⁰ One officer did not receive this elaboration, but still maintained a very community-focused response.

While overall there appeared to be a positive outlook toward citizen participation — specifically in programs like the Citizen’s Police Academy, as it was noted that it is a program that allows citizens to better understand the policing perspective, there were also noted concerns relative to involvement in the academy that recruits attend prior to becoming officers. With this in mind, two respondents cited officer safety concerns in relation to exposing civilians to officer tactics during training. This concern is understandable, as the release of this sensitive information can put officers at risk, or at least at a disadvantage, depending on who is permitted access. Perhaps the best way to mitigate these concerns is to continue along the lines of what one officer noted, of participants being graduates of the Citizen’s Police Academy, which ensures that background checks have been performed on those gaining exposure.

TRAINING MATERIALS

As a part of the research for this thesis, access was permitted to lecture slides utilized in training officers on bias-based policing. Critical review of this material showed that officers are indeed being trained according to DCJS lesson plans. For example, the consequences of biased policing practices are discussed as recruits learn how these practices can affect legitimacy perceptions by the community. Historical recognition is given to minority mistreatment by law enforcement, as well as how these formerly sanctioned practices affect current perceptions and present modern challenges in interaction. A clear distinction is also made between racial profiling and criminal profiling, racial profiling being the unacceptable and damaging practice of singling out an individual based *solely* on race, ethnicity, or national origin. Criminal profiling, on the other hand, involves a set of criteria, a pattern, of which race may be included as a factor only if it helps to further develop said pattern. Within this section of training, misconceptions associated with potential ideas of the benefits of racial profiling were identified and countered

with the reality of the harm of the practice, not just toward individuals themselves, but to the greater minority community and to the perceived legitimacy of the criminal justice system.

Lecture materials were also found to discuss the importance of improving community relations and building community trust. Case studies were noted that showed the importance of not relying on racial profiling, as well as how positive interactions at one point in time can serve to improve trust and be beneficial in future encounters with other community members, even helping to de-escalate racially-charged situations. There was definite emphasis in the material placed on improving community relations and the importance of treating individuals well, not simply because this was considered the right thing to do, but because it was acknowledged that public opinions are formed not solely based on one's own interactions, but because opinions are also based on the knowledge of how others are treated and perceive treatment. The role of communication is acknowledged as both directly and indirectly effectual.

Also, noted as significant are the role of perceptions. It is acknowledged in training that the creation of these perceptions is complex and resultant of both direct and indirect experiences, as well as a multitude of other factors and attitudes. This is a noteworthy finding, as one of the points this thesis seeks to make is that perceptions are complex factors that influence interaction and, as such, are a subject that requires acknowledgement in law enforcement training. The finding of this attitude in training materials utilized by this department shows that this subject is not only being given attention, but that it is being acknowledged in a manner designed to improve relations between the community and law enforcement.

Training materials emphasize the importance of improving perceptions and even note methods of improving communication and education among both officers and community members, such as through civic meetings, a Citizen's Police Academy, and media forums

(traditional and social). It is noted that part of building trust occurs through communication, and that it is through communication that greater understanding can be gained regarding varying racial and cultural perspectives of racial profiling, as well as identifying common goals of community members and law enforcement officers. Open communication with community members and neighborhood meetings were noted as particularly impactful for improving relations and building trust.

PANEL

The approach of this department of including a panel of community members is like the suggestion noted in Hickey (2016) regarding interview screening of police recruits for cultural competency by a diverse board of community members who, as outsiders, may be more likely to ascertain cultural subtleties that other law enforcement officials may overlook. Community input was found to have a significant, and unexpected, role in this department's approach to training officers. Rather than the expected insulated academy approach, this department was found to attempt to tailor its academy's cultural teachings to the communities it serves by incorporating information it gains from community outreach programs and surveys, as well as through a citizen's advisory group. This group of formal and informal civilian community leaders provide direct feedback and advice to the Chief of Police, meeting on a regular, often quarterly, basis, and are also involved in the development of courses in the academy and supplementary training curricula.

This group is even involved in several phases of the officer selection process, both by sitting on a selection panel, as well as providing volunteer personnel for participation in role-play scenarios. During role-play, the feedback from this panel's volunteers also helps in addressing recruits' actions and behaviors. In other words, outside eyes and perspectives are considered, and

if a recruit's behaviors are not felt to meet expectations, police training personnel are informed to address the issue. The role civilian leaders are permitted to have in recruit training and selection was unexpected to hear of during interview, and was striking to witness first-hand while being permitted access to a panel advisory meeting, wherein members both recounted and re-volunteered for role-play.

TRENDS

The final section of this chapter discusses the trends found during this research. In this section, prominent trends in officer responses will be discussed, as well as overall crime trends in the area the department participating in this study is responsible for. When officer response trends are discussed, the role of communication practices should be considered; that is, the responses should be considered with a historiographic perspective — the role one's life experiences have in shaping current perceptions, as well as how education (departmental and traditional higher-education), interact and shape one's personal relational dialectic. When examining crime trends, consider the overall pattern rather than the specific documented amounts each year, as, outside of a yearly population count, these numbers can easily be taken out of context. These charts have been included as a reference to examine the community outside of the department itself, and to see if any relationships could be found in relation to department approaches to community interaction.

It is important to note before moving forward that for both violent and property crime, no data were available for 2001. As this was a pivotal year due to the events of the terrorists' attacks on 9/11, the simultaneous coming together as a nation — yet divisiveness between ethnically-marginalized groups, should also be considered when reviewing subsequent years, particularly those directly following 2001. Another factor that deserves great consideration is changes in

leadership. The current department Chief of Police maintains a very community-focused approach, which includes how officers are trained, as well as neighborhood watch programs, and community panels, all of which may influence overall crime trends. Public outreach materials state that the current Chief was promoted to this position in 2008, but that he has been influentially involved in community-focused initiatives since holding the position of Lieutenant in 1996.

Officer response trends. This section begins with illustrations of specificity and awareness (intercultural and bias-related) ratings for officer responses during interviews, and ends with a discussion of trends found within responses given. For specificity ratings, responses were rated on a Likert scale of low/vague specificity (1) to high specificity (5). Awareness ratings were ranked similarly on a Likert scale of low/vague awareness (1) to high awareness (5). Lower ratings for specificity or awareness correlate with more generalized responses or responses that did not directly answer the question (such as responses that deflect to focus on others when the self was the subject). High specificity ratings include detailed responses that include detailed examples and information, landmarks, noted time-frames, and specified cultures or cultural practices. High awareness ratings similarly include specified cultures, cultural practices, sub-cultures, notations of CAT, and dialogue which indicates a thorough understanding and/or application of implicit and/or explicit bias-awareness training (as relative to the question). Ratings that fall in the moderate range (moderate, moderate-high, or moderate-low) are indicative of responses that provide enough examples to not be generalized, but not enough detail to rate as high specificity. Similarly, moderate-scale awareness ratings show a degree of awareness, such as acknowledgment, but, again, are affected by details provided and relatability to the question. Derailment from the question at hand to focus on personal

experiences, or focusing on others when the self was the topic, also affected awareness ratings. Low specificity ratings do not necessarily indicate low awareness, as the overall message was also analyzed in each question apart from the descriptors within each sentence. Likewise, high specificity ratings can also be correlated with low awareness ratings when the details given do not directly connect with the cultural or bias-focus of a question, but instead a focus is given to another aspect — like more generalized communication, or there is a strong focus on interpersonal communication without relation to the influence of culture.

As reliability is important in qualitative research, inter-rater reliability was determined for this study by the following. First, all responses provided during interviews were rated by the primary researcher in terms of global specificity and global awareness using a 1 – 5 point Likert scale as described in the previous section. Second, a sample of 33% of these responses were rated by a second reviewer using the same set of level-descriptors. Third, limits of agreement for both sets of ratings were calculated using the following formula: sample mean \pm 2 x sample variance. Initial limits came to 0.912 — 2.21 (specificity) and 0.39 — 2.39 (awareness), which are higher than recommended by prior research. However, after discussion and further clarification, the second rater re-rated the list resulting in the final calculated limits of agreement of 0.05 — 0.95 (specificity) and 0.19 — 1.31 (awareness). These final levels fall within the recommended range for assessing the application of a scale as reliable. Thus, for purposes of reporting, the researcher's original ratings have been used.

Officer response specificity ratings




Figure 1. Depth of Responses

Note. Specificity level is on a scale of low/vague to high. 1 is indicative of low specificity, 3 of moderate, and 5 of high specificity. Each line is indicative of an officer's response trends.

^aBreak in lines indicates a lack of question applicability to the officer being interviewed. Q.'s 7 and 12 applied to 4 of the 6 officers interviewed; however, a detailed response was still given by one of the other officers in relation to Q. 12 and what the new bias awareness training will entail once it is fully applied departmentally, so this response was still noted. Q.'s 8 and 13 only applied to 2 of the 6 interviewed.

^bQ. 5 was skipped during interviews with one officer, because an applicable response had been provided during the previous answer. For this one officer, the high specificity rating (5) is indicative of relative specificity during the aforementioned as applicable to the current.

While the above shows a great range of specificity ratings, there are consistent troughs and peaks across responses depending on the question being examined. The first dip, which

occurred for 5 of the 6 responses, can be seen for question 3. While the previous questions related to personal demographics (length of time as an officer and length of time with the present department), questions that can be answered directly and easily, this question, which asked for a description of the area patrolled, was the first one to be more open-ended and request greater detail. The nature by which this question was posed allowed for a greater range of responses than the previous two, which accounts for the sometimes-dramatic plummeting in ratings.

The next consistent trough, which occurs across 4 of the 6 responses, can be found between questions 4 and 5. While question 4 was posed in a more generalized fashion, which asked officers how well they thought the intercultural communication training they received from the department prepared them to deal with other cultures, question 5 was a bit more direct and asked for *how* those who felt the training to be beneficial helped them. There are several factors that may be correlative to this dip in specificity. One may be that the switch toward direct applicability caused some to feel “put-on-the-spot,” which may have caused somewhat of a mental shut-down, leading to more generalized, rather than specific, examples being provided. Another factor to consider may be that the lower specificity rating is indicative of a lack of clarity as to exactly what was being examined/meant by intercultural communication training, so when examples/details were requested, responses were more reserved.

Questions 6 and 7, on the other hand, showed a rise in specificity for 4 of the 6 responses given. One possible reason for the rise in specificity for question 6 is that this question asked what part of an officer’s intercultural communication training most resonated, so by making the officer him/herself the focus again, this question may have been easier to answer. The rise in specificity for question 7, however, especially when compared to questions 4 and 5, is most interesting. For all officers to whom question 7 applied (thoughts about how well supplementary

training reinforced previous intercultural communication training), rises in specificity were noted. This is interesting, because it seems to reaffirm the high ratings associated with question 4 (a prequel to question 7). These peaks in specificity relating to feelings/thoughts toward training, but the trough relating to application benefits, appears to illustrate that officers can easily recall and discuss details of their training — something that is certainly a positive, but that there is greater difficulty discussing how they apply it. This is not problematic in and of itself, as specificity does not always directly correlate with awareness, but it is an interesting insight into states of mind.

Question 8 (a comparison of intercultural communication training from officers' current department to that of a previous one) only applied to two of the officers interviewed, and with differing ratings, did not provide enough of a pattern to analyze apart from a noted similar rating again to question 4. Question 9, however, which related to thoughts toward community involvement in the academy, noted a range of specificity ratings. This question is noteworthy not in comparison to other specificity ratings, but to the awareness rating in the next graph, especially considering that this question shows the most dramatic difference in ratings between the two graphs. While 5 of the 6 responses to this question show moderate to high specificity, 4 of the 6 responses for this question show moderate to low awareness. This finding will be further explored in the next section.

While the previous questions focused on intercultural communication training, the following questions (10 – 13) explore thoughts toward bias-awareness training. Question 10 asked officers a more generalized question about their thoughts toward this training, which resulted in 5 out of 6 ratings of moderate to high specificity. This is, again, similar to other

questions which received higher ratings in conjunction with questions that did not ask for specific examples of applicability, but rather asked for more personalized views.

The dramatic trough for question 11, “Do you feel that this training has helped to make you more aware of the existence of biases?” is attributable to the lack of specificity required to answer the question. This question was posed in a manner that required nothing more than a simplified response, “yes” or “no,” and as such, received simplified answers, overall. The spike across responses directly following this question though, related to views toward supplementary bias-awareness training, is considerable. This question was very like question 7, and while not every response increased between questions 10 and 12 as they did between 4 and 7, the pattern between the two similar questions is still noteworthy. The lack of complete specificity increases for the latter two as for the previous ones may be due to the questions occurring late in the interview and the feeling that the question had been answered previously, thereby only requiring only a generalized response. It may also be attributable to the perceived overlap in training for intercultural communication and bias-awareness.

The final question with a plotted specificity rating again asked for a comparison between the training received from the current department to that of previous departments, and as such was only applicable again to two officers. Interestingly, both officers rated the same for this question; however, the same specificity rating alone, apart from further context, does not provide enough information to draw a correlation here at this time.

Officer response awareness ratings




Figure 2. Cultural Awareness

Note. Awareness level is on a scale of low/vague to high. 1 is indicative of low awareness, 3 of moderate, and 5 of high cultural, or bias, awareness (Q.'s 10 — 13 only). Each line is indicative of an officer's response trends.

^aBreaks in lines indicate a lack of question applicability to the officer being interviewed. Q.'s 7 and 12 applied to 4 of the 6 officers interviewed, while Q.'s 8 and 13 only applied to 2 of the 6 interviewed.

^bQ. 5 was skipped during interview with one officer, because an applicable response had been provided during the previous answer. For this one officer, the high awareness rating (5) is indicative of relative awareness during the aforementioned as applicable to the current.

^cQ.'s 1 and 2 have been eliminated from the graph due to their focus on officer demographics rather than intercultural relations or bias-awareness.

The overarching trend in this graph is positive, as it is indicative of overall moderate to high intercultural and bias-awareness ratings for the officers interviewed. Where high areas of

awareness are noted for question 3 (description of beat patrolled), this indicates descriptions where notations were made that detailed the human demographics of the area — in addition to notations of physical areas officers were responsible for. Multiple descriptors that related to not just race and ethnicity, but also socio-economic status (as this is also a cultural factor requiring consideration), result in higher ratings for this section, while lower ratings indicate responses where there were either vague descriptions that did not touch on demographics, or descriptions that focused on landmarks rather than individuals.

Question 4 (which asked officers how well they thought the intercultural communication training they received from the department prepared them to deal with other cultures), elicited a variety of responses. While 3 responses maintained their awareness level, 2 responses noted an increase, and 1 noted a decrease. One reason for this may be that the question itself elicited a variety of responses. While some officers noted how they felt the training benefitted them, there was a great focus on personal experiences and interactions with specific ethnicities (not lack thereof) they had been exposed to prior to receiving training. As focuses varied, so too did awareness levels based on how detailed/descriptive officers were when discussing cultural variations, or how well officers identified associated cultures when discussing norm examples. For example, notation of a specified cultural norm relating to power distances, but self-identification of not being able to differentiate which culture in specific was being referenced, resulted in a moderate rather than a high awareness rating. A moderate awareness result was noted due to the higher awareness that is needed to recognize that varying cultures have differing norms related to power distances (and how CAT is necessary as a result), appearing in the same response as the low awareness associated with not being able to vocalize a specific cultural example of one's own power distance variation example.

Questions 5 and 6 (which relate to feelings of intercultural communication training efficacy and resonance with training, respectively), generally maintain their ratings. This is understandable, as these questions go together. While specificity was generally lower for question 5, awareness was noted as higher. For example, references could also be made back to responses to question 4, and examples provided for this question, for how well training prepared officers for intercultural relations in the field. This helps to account for a lower specificity than awareness rating. Similarly, question 6 also allowed officers to directly reference back to their responses in question 5 for examples. This should be considered when examining the similar ratings between the two. After all, it is understandable to reference training resonance with an example of how said training benefitted one on the job, as some degree of resonance would have had to occur to allow the association to be made with how training was found to be beneficial.

While responses for question 7 showed a general rise in specificity, awareness levels largely remained the same for responses regarding supplementary training, with the exception of two officers whose awareness levels showed an increase. Responses largely reflect moderate through moderate-high awareness levels, which is encouraging. Question 8 (a comparison of intercultural communication training from officers' current department to that of a previous one), again, only applied to two of the officers interviewed, and with differing ratings, did not provide enough of a pattern to analyze apart from having the same awareness rating as specificity rating, and noted similarities again to responses from question 4 (for both awareness and specificity), with the exception of one officer's responses which noted a leap in awareness from initial responses given regarding thoughts toward intercultural communication training.

As mentioned previously when discussing specificity levels related to question 9, one of the most significant findings related to interview questions can be found in examining the

specificity and awareness ratings for this question, as it reflects the most dramatic difference in ratings between the two graphs. While 5 of the 6 responses to this question show moderate to high specificity, 4 of the 6 responses for this question show moderate to low awareness.

Awareness for this question was again rated based on indicated cultural awareness rather than awareness of community involvement; however, only two responses indicated direct awareness of involvement, while the remainder of responses indicated moderate to low awareness of community involvement in the police academy. Interestingly, the two officers who showed higher levels of awareness of community involvement, rated as showing moderate-low or low cultural awareness when responding to this question.

During interviews, it appears there was a degree of confusion in relation to this question, and further clarity had to be given to relate the question to role-playing (something the researcher knew occurred as a form of community involvement). While officers could detail their thoughts on the community, and community interactions (which impacted the specificity rating), there was a degree of unawareness as to the extent of community involvement in the academy — as noted previously throughout this thesis. This graph is reflective of cultural awareness when responding to this question; however, it also correlates well with how the full extent of community involvement in the academy, role-playing and otherwise — such as aiding in recruit selection, appears to not fully be known. Responses also frequently referenced the Citizen's Police Academy rather than the actual academy police recruits attend. This may have been due in part to the way the question was phrased, "What do you think of the community involvement in the academy?" but focus on this form of community involvement in police affairs — rather than that of participation in the actual police academy, may have also impacted responses, and, consequently, ratings.

Question 10 is where the bias-awareness questions begin, as officers' thoughts are asked regarding the bias-awareness training received from the department. While specificity ranges varied greatly, bias-awareness ratings are noted as being moderate to high across the chart, with only one moderate awareness rating, and 5 of 6 responses rated as moderate-high to high awareness. This finding was unexpected, but is a very positive reflection of not only individual officers' awareness levels, but also of the efforts of the department, as officers overwhelmingly acknowledged the importance of this training and spoke positively of lessons learned.

While responses for question 11 (feelings regarding if training made the officer more aware of the existence of biases) remain consistently in the moderate range, drops in recorded awareness level may be due to the question being answered so simplistically by so many. Although some officers delve into details when providing their responses, the question is posed in a manner where a simple yes/no could be given as a response — and as such received, generally, simplified responses that did not provide enough details to result in higher ratings.¹¹ This question also directly followed the first question related to bias, which was more open-ended and asked for thoughts on the bias-awareness training received. This is important to consider, because when an officer provided a detailed response to this question (Q. 10) — or previous questions, they may have inadvertently already answered this question (Q. 11), resulting in a direct, but short, response, thereby reflecting a lower number on the specificity and awareness scales.

¹¹ Where 1 — 3 word responses of “yes,” or “absolutely,” etc., were provided, these responses were rated as low specificity, but as moderate awareness. Low specificity ratings were given due to the limited detail provided that would otherwise elicit a higher specificity rating, but moderate awareness ratings were listed due to responses' reflected acknowledgement of bias-awareness, but again, lack of detail which would convey a higher level of understanding.

Question 12 asked officers how well they thought that supplementary bias-awareness training reinforced previous bias-awareness training they received. The question only applied to 4 of the responding 6 officers, and while specificity ratings varied greatly between responses, awareness ratings were consistently higher. Responses indicated that all officers to which the question applied noted feelings of efficacy, and higher awareness ratings also correlated with responses which acknowledged self-checking. Two responses directly identified self-checking, while a third response focused more on others than the self, but also noted training effectiveness in relation to how it forces individuals to self-examine. Acknowledgment of not only feelings of efficacy, but supporting stories of personal application, resulted in the high awareness ratings for this question.

The final interview question only applied to two officers interviewed, and asked for a comparison between the bias-awareness training received from their current department in relation to previous departments worked for. Responses were rated as moderate-high specificity and moderate awareness for both officers. While there were great differences in the training offered — namely that one indicated that their previous employer did not require any bias-awareness or intercultural communication training, while the other indicated differences, but still the existence of training, ratings were also affected by a focus more on the details of content delivery and related specifications rather than the content itself. This also contributed to higher specificity than awareness ratings, as the focus of responses was less on the content of the materials themselves and more on implementation specifications, or other departmental differences.

Response trends and recurrent themes. While several trends emerged during the analysis of officer responses, the most prevalent one was an issue with relational dialectics. Officers

frequently noted their personal experiences with relation to exposure to varying cultures, norms, and practices prior to exposure to department training on the subject, which, at times, resulted in conflicting outlooks toward training. There was an overarching self-perception of personal life experiences being more impactful than departmental training with respect to intercultural communication when officers felt that their experiences provided more in-depth knowledge on the subject, and that training just reiterated what was already known. However, personal experiences were not limited to the manner in which officers were raised or live outside of the uniform, but also include the college experience and education related to intercultural communication in an advanced academic setting.

The aforementioned being considered, 4 of the 6 officers interviewed definitively noted the role life experiences played in their understanding of other cultures, while a 5th officer's responses noted the effects of personal experiences in conjunction with received training, but did not state that these experiences were more impactful than training that was received from the department. A 6th officer's responses, while not explicitly, trended toward life experiences playing a more significant role. While not entirely surprising as life experiences, in time quantified, significantly outweigh any amount of time that can be spent on training, the fact that each officer, on some level, noted the effect of personal experiences outside of training on their understanding of intercultural relations illustrates the uphill battle that trainers face if these life experiences are not culturally-enlightening and mentally-expansive.

Although officers noted the role their personal experiences played in their understanding of other cultures, there was also a trend in feelings toward the need for greater training on the subject of intercultural communication. While only two respondents vocalized this desire, the small sample size of this study should also be considered. It is possible that even though only

two responses vocalized this, greater numbers within the department share the same disposition. Responses reflected that there was a need not only because of the current diversity of the community, but also because the area is still changing.

Similarly, there was also a trend of officers wanting more bias-awareness training. While again only noted by two officers, there was not a complete overlap in who desired further bias-awareness training with who desired further intercultural communication training. This illustrates that not only is there an openness to the subject matter (3 of 6 feeling that there should be more training between these two subjects), but also that there is a recognition of the importance of these subjects.

The next most prevalent trend appeared within responses for half of all officers interviewed. As previously stated, results show that there was a trend toward the positive influence of implicit bias-awareness training. Something that is important to note in relation to this is the other trend of showing open-mindedness, that training can only be as effectual as one is open to receiving it. In other words, one gets out of training what one puts into it; 3 officers noted this of intercultural or bias-awareness training without prompting, either by outrightly stating so, or by noting in their responses the importance of going into training with an open mind, and then thinking about what was said. 3 officers also specifically noted the term(s) “open-mind/edness” in relation to receiving training or to applying training in real life. In the words of one officer:

... you have to go with [sic] things with an open mind. You're there to learn. You have to kind of listen, take it at face value, think about it, process it yourself, and with everything, you've got to verify. Even in class, verify. Look through the book yourself, and try to

really make sure you have your understanding. So I think it's really—I enjoyed the training, because, I think, like I said, I think it really opened up my eyes...

Of note, when responding the question 11 (the question which asked officers to self-assess efficacy in relation to bias-awareness), there was also a trend of 3 of the 6 respondents who answered the question as more than just 1 — 3 word responses of some form of “yes,” deflecting on some level to others rather than focusing solely on themselves. This occurred both in the acknowledgment of others’ struggle with grasping the concepts, or in concern for how others absorb/apply the information conveyed during training. While greater reasoning as to why this occurred is more psychologically-based — and is outside the scope of this analysis, the sensitivity of the topic question should be considered as effectual.

Also in relation to bias-awareness, 3 of the 6 officers interviewed identified the presence of some degree of inter-departmental biases. Identification of biases was not limited to the respondent officer's race or ethnicity, nor was it limited to years served in uniform. Interestingly, within these numbers, the same officers who identified the presence of biases in the department did not note training as acting as a self-check against their own implicit biases; however, one did note how training can act as a form of self-examination, despite not personally identifying this action. These officers did, however, consistently respond with moderate to high levels of both bias and cultural awareness. This being said, 3 of the other 6 responding officers (those who did not identify inter-departmental biases) specifically noted self-reflection and how the training they received from the department has aided in the identification of implicit biases.

This brings to the forefront another trend in responses, the trend of noting how training acts as a self-check. 4 out of the 6 officers interviewed noted how training acts as a self-check either in a manner that helps to avoid implicit biases and stereotyping, or, particularly in the case

of supplementary training, as a means of staying grounded and preventing cynicism.

Interestingly, regarding this form of self-checking, two different officers noted an age and gender related stereotype, that of the “sweet old lady” or grandmother. Officers not only noted the importance of self-checking this implicit bias, but, in the case of one officer, also noted the personal benefit of employing this consideration in the field with this exact stereotype.

Notations of the aforementioned topics are not only encouraging, but their accompanying stories also serve as a form of efficacy measurement when assessing training methods. Another positive trend noted relating to efficacy occurred among 5 of the 6 responding officers, stating the perception that training aided in making them more aware of the existence of biases. The one officer who did not note feelings of efficacy related this to feeling that the training was not in-depth enough, while simultaneously not being delivered in a manner that lead to ease of accessibility/understanding for all. While notations were detailed as to what the training entailed — such as a detailed peer-reviewed article, the perception was that, due to personal experiences, which included more in-depth outside education on the subject, further information was needed. Also noted was the perception that the inclusion of the peer-reviewed article was perhaps at a level that was somewhat inaccessible to those less familiar with this linguistic styling, i.e. those unfamiliar with college-level coursework and writing styles. This is an important consideration to make, because while information reliability exists within the context of peer-reviewed literature, and this medium should be consulted in the creation of curricula, considerations also should be made as to the audience receiving the information and how well lessons will resonate based on the delivery methods utilized. In other words, when reading materials are distributed, consideration should be given as to the overall reading-level of the recipient audience, and care

should still be taken to verbally review, in a language that is easy to understand, comprehension of material by all those receiving training.

Also, potentially correlative to training efficacy, is the interesting trend that emerged in officer responses that indicated 3 of 6 officers, seemingly unknowingly, discussed using CAT. Responses indicated high levels of cultural awareness and the use of CAT when officers identified nonverbal cultural variations in areas like high and low power distances, or eye-contact, and how these require consideration in interaction. As an example, one officer noted how some cultures like to talk closely, but as police officers, for safety reasons, a greater degree of distance is preferred. Consequently, officers need to have the understanding that an individual's being closer is not always an attempt to cause harm or show aggression, but rather is an attempt to communicate. It was noted that the training received aided in understanding this, and the response given noted a willingness to meet somewhere in the middle with these cultures.

Although not specifically related to interview questions, the final trend that emerged during response analysis was the contradictory approach to training known as Power DMS. It is noteworthy that this discussion only occurred among the two officers interviewed who had undergone training for "train the trainer." While this trend is only a trend in topic — as the views discussed are contradictory approaches by two individuals, it was thought important to discuss in this section. Not only did views differ in relation to feelings of efficacy, but one respondent officer discussed the training in relation to delivery format more than content (with a lower reported feeling of efficacy), while the other focused on the content itself (with a higher reported feeling of efficacy). Although both officers noted that this training was delivered online, the one that focused on format also noted the classroom-approach taken — in comparison to the online click-through style, in a more positive manner, and how this aided with resonance. This format

approach echoes a recurring sentiment in teaching approaches about the greater benefits of face-to-face education/training compared to those of online.

Violent crime trends. As previously stated, department records reflect that official training for bias-based policing began in 2005. While there appears to have been some form of training on the subject prior to this date (due to officers' recollections), the specifics surrounding earlier training remain unknown at the time of the writing of this thesis. As a result, the official noted date was used as a defining point in the following crime rate comparison.

Although department training regarding the handling of biases does not necessarily directly reflect the actions of community members and crime rates, it is interesting that, statistically, there was an overall steady decline in violent crime rates post noted implementation of bias-awareness training (of which intercultural communication training is included). Also, while the following does not seek to imply a causative, or directly correlative, relationship between department training actions and community crime trends, it is worth considering that the community-focused curriculum that officers are exposed to — and that emphasizes positive communication and community ties, has helped in decreasing overall violent crime. The following chart illustrates violent crime rates within the jurisdiction of the participating department from 10 years prior to the noted beginning of biased-based policing training, as well as for the first 10 years after noted implementation.





Figure 3. Violent Crime Trends 1995 — 2015

- Pre-training
- Post-training

Note. Graph reflects a compilation of data from both the U.S. Department of Justice's Uniform Crime Reporting Statistics and the department participating in this study. Data includes the crimes of homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. No data was available for 2001.

Property crime trends. While yearly property crime far exceeds yearly violent crime, there also has been a decline in this form of crime since 2005; however, this appears to be most notable after 2009. When considering comparisons between these two types of crime trends (violent and property), the type of crime and relationship to communication, and community ties, should also be considered. Again, while not causative, it is interesting that overall crime trends appear to be decreasing after implementing department training that emphasizes a community-

policing perspective. When the ties are strengthened between community members and law enforcement, as noted in a previous interview, members of the public are more likely to act as an ally, as extensions of the eyes and ears of the department, rather than a hindrance.



CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Qualitatively, if not quantitatively, officers say that there are good police/community relations in general; and, responses indicate, at least among the officers interviewed, that there are promising levels of cultural and bias-awareness. While the majority of officers noted the influence of their personal experiences with regard to understanding other cultures, there was a clear indication that the bias-awareness training received from the department was perceived as both important and effectual, and aided in the identification of implicit biases. When officers noted lower feelings of efficacy regarding intercultural communication training, it was consistently noted that this was due to entering into the training with prior diversity experiences — either relative to College Studies or being surrounded by a variety of cultures across their lifespan. Also, responses indicate that despite feelings of lower personal efficacy, there was not an overarching feeling of training inadequacy, but rather that the concepts, generally, were not novel. When further training was requested, a noted reason was to gain greater depth; however, it was also frequently noted by officers, even those with a desire for more training, that the training received had been beneficial and necessary (for the self and the department), which is a very positive and encouraging result.

As an aside, as greater depth of intercultural training was requested, specifically in the context of everyday interactions with the public as peace-keepers aside from law enforcement, it is suggested that further emphasis be given to a review of Hofstede's six dimensions of culture and varying nonverbal communicative practices. While data indicated that training relating to variations in nonverbal communication occurs, Wood (2011) delves into these topics as they

relate to communication introductory studies at the undergraduate level, and may be more accessible to those unfamiliar with these topics. Although her text is designed for a college academic environment, the lessons and information put forth are straightforward, and can easily be applied to communication training in a law enforcement environment. What is illustrated is foundational information designed to increase interpersonal understanding, thereby improving interpersonal interaction — important lessons that can be related to all fields. High and low power distances, proxemics, varying practices in eye-contact, as well as varying artifacts and linguistic practices are all noteworthy subjects for training and have practical applicability. As education relating to cultural and bias-awareness appeared to exist both as a means of improving community relations and as a necessity for understanding others and improved job-performance, this suggestion would be beneficial to both of these points.

To return to officer perceptions, just as with other discussed forms of training, officers also responded positively toward the supplementary training received from this department. Perhaps one of the most significant comments relating to training can be seen in the following officer statement:

I get supplementary training because I want to. I go to other conferences to learn more about intercultural communities, to learn more about diversity, to learn more, and, especially with everything that we see going on in our world today, because being an officer, being in law enforcement, is a culture by itself.

This echoes receptivity concerns relating to Southgate (1984) and Bull (1985). It also illustrates the important notion that training of any sort will only be as impactful as the trainee is receptive toward it. This is particularly emphasized by the statement, “I get supplementary training because I want to.” While this statement shows openness and a willingness to learn, a message

sent is not always a message received, and personal experiences, and even biases, can impact receptivity to messages and training of any kind.

Officers also illustrated more advanced levels of communication skills than was expected when entering this study. Empathetic approaches were noted by officers in how they analyzed communication approaches with others, two of whom specifically considered approaching a situation with the question of, “Would I want someone to treat a member of my family in this manner?” CAT was also illustrated — in both verbal and nonverbal forms. In the words of one officer:

... each call you've gotta [sic] handle a little bit differently... whether it be race, whether it be— I don't mean that in a way like, [changes voice] 'Hey, what's going on man, how you...' No, it's not like that. But you've got to understand, with their background, you're not going to be able to make statements, make comparisons, or explain things in a certain way, because you know that they're not going to quite equate with you on that level, because they haven't had that experience.

During interviews, and as examples of this point, many officers shared stories about their interactions with the public, as well as community-bridging practices such as playing with local children. This is significant, as cultural values are frequently passed on through stories. Both Marion (1998) and Chappel and Lanza-Kaduce (2010) note the sharing of stories as a means of passing on values and integrating recruits into the world of the officer. This inside look at community relations — which occurred without specific question-prompting, illustrates the value officers themselves place on building relations and its importance, as well as, through story-telling, that this importance is conveyed as a continuing part of police-community relations moving forward.

LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

One limitation of this study was its smaller respondent size and the manner by which respondents were gathered. While selections were made based on the necessity for diversity within a small group, in future research, it would be better to gather participants through outreach methods that allow interested persons to contact the researcher directly with their request to participate. This could be done by sending out an e-mail bulletin to officers (with administrative permission) advising them of the project and requesting their participation in an online survey. This method would allow for a greater number of participants, more randomization, and would also increase confidentiality levels by preventing overseeing officers from being aware of everyone's participation. While officers were requested to provide honest answers to questions, and indeed (in the researcher's opinion) did answer candidly, not all officers may feel at ease in a face-to-face interview scenario. An online survey with the option to enter personal statements may increase feelings of ease and openness, especially when administrative officials are unaware of individuals' participation.

Another limitation of this study lays in its nature of being a case study. While case studies can provide great insight into the particularities of a situation, they are inherently limiting. As a case study, this research can provide a basis for future research, but can certainly not be considered all-inclusive, or in any way representative of training and receptivity across every police department. It is suggested that future research be of a more expansive size to include a multi-departmental intercultural communication training and efficacy comparison.

While analysis was performed on the training materials the researcher was permitted access to, due to the need to maintain confidentiality, direct examples of content could not be published; results could only be reported in the aggregate. It is recommended for future research

that a content analysis of training materials be performed where permission is received to not only publish examples of this content, but to examine changes in the curriculum over time. Examination with a focus on content through a chronological lens will not only highlight changes (value and otherwise) during the paradigm shift, but will also illustrate changes in how police imagine their jobs over time.

Furthermore, it is recommended that, if a content analysis is performed, emphasis also be given to implicit content in addition to explicit content. An explicit analysis would allow for the examination of the content itself (and the lessons departments attempt to convey to their officers), while an implicit analysis would allow for the examination of the subliminal messages being conveyed through the visual aids utilized during training. For example, the use of noticeably outdated materials subliminally conveys that the topic being discussed is not of great significance and/or is not taken seriously by leadership. Both an implicit and explicit examination are needed for a thorough content analysis.

Finally, it is also suggested that research be conducted to include more of a focus on female law enforcement officers as their own cultural group within the traditionally male-dominated culture of policing. Female officers need to balance not only intercultural relations with the public, but also intercultural relations within their own policing culture between males and females, even more so if the female officer is of racial or ethnic minority descent. Further research should be conducted to examine not only how female officers balance intercultural relations with the public and within their own policing community, but also how being part of a minority group within the workplace environment themselves (female)¹ relates to their

¹ According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), per the 2013 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS), only about 1 in 8 officers are female, which includes about 1 in 10 for first-line supervisors (Reaves, 2015).

understanding and empathy toward public minority groups. It is known that female officers are an asset to law enforcement agencies for a number of reasons, but such research would provide a different perspective that could serve not only to further shine a light on their value, but also potentially identify areas where female officers could be further supported.

CONCLUSIONS

This thesis sought to illustrate the importance of acknowledging and understanding the varying cultural perspectives that influence interaction between groups — namely those of the public and law enforcement, and how as a part of police training, attention should be given to culture and the effects of varying historical interactions as influential of current relational dialects. Through the examination of interview transcriptions, training materials, and data gathered from a participant/observation sit-in of a community panel, a critical analysis was performed of a local agency's approach to intercultural communication training with surprisingly positive results.

The participating department's officers showed greater than expected levels of cultural and bias-awareness, as well as greater levels of communication skills than expected. Through stories, officers indicated an understanding of how perspectives are formed and influenced — such as how children's views toward the police are influenced by their families, or the influence of the media in perception shaping. Through stories, officers also displayed empathy toward their community and evidence of CAT. Although personal experiences were noted as sources of knowledge, training was also often cited as beneficial and as having resonated with officers, thereby impacting their relations with the community. Training materials themselves, coupled with interviews with those participating in training construction and implementation, also

reflected the importance this department places on community-relations, which correlates well with officer perceptions toward community policing.

Overall, the department participating in this study showed an impressive level of community-focus and understanding of culture. While there are challenges, such as manpower, to the community policing movement, what was conveyed was a strong focus and effort toward understanding both the diverse community the department oversees, as well as recognizing the role its officers hold in interaction and perception-shaping. Officers showed an understanding that their own actions shape not only the situations they walk into, but also how their actions affect perception shaping and the manner by which the community will remember them as a result of these actions.

While this study was relatively small, it is hoped that the ideas presented herein will inspire similar studies that involve more departments and greater numbers of officers, with greater comparisons between respective training methods and materials. The participating department showed themselves to be very forward-thinking toward community relations, and a positive example of how departments can take steps toward improved community policing policy efforts. As officer interviews relative to department comparisons illustrated, not every department holds themselves to the same standards as the participating one. It is hoped that through the exposure of training methods, trends, and officer suggestions for improvement, as well as examples that this department has taken to increase the awareness of its officers, not only will academics gain further understanding of law enforcement's training of intercultural communication, but that other researchers can build upon the research conducted herein. It is also hoped that through this exposure, law enforcement departments whose training is less

progressive will have a guide to improve their own training, and therefore relations, within their own communities through education.

REFERENCES

- American Civil Liberties Union. (n.d.). *The Racial Justice Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.aclu.org/racialjustice/racialprofiling/index.html>
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origins and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, M. C., Knutson, T., Giles, H., & Arroyo, M. (2002). Revoking our right to remain silent: Law enforcement communication in the 21st century. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Law enforcement, communication and community* (pp. 1 — 32). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bain, A., Robinson, B. K., & Conser, J. (2014). Perceptions of policing: improving communication in local communities. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 16(4), 267 — 276. doi: 10.1350/ijps.2014.16.4.345
- Bayley, D. (1994). *Police for the future*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bennett, R. R. (1984). Becoming blue: A longitudinal study of police recruit occupational socialization. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 12, 47 — 58.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. In *International Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 3, 2nd. Ed.* Oxford: Elsevier.
- Brown, L., & Willis, A. (1985). Authoritarianism in British police: Importation, socialization or myth? *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 58, 97 — 108.
- Bull, R. (1985). Police awareness training. *Policing*, 1, 109 — 123.
- Bulmer, M. Concepts in the analysis of qualitative data. *Sociological Review*, 27(4), 651 — 677. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.1979.tb00354.x

Campbell, D. (1998). *Writing security: United states foreign policy and the politics of identity*.

Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Chappell, A. T. (2008). Police academy training: Comparing across curricula. *Policing: An*

International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 31(1), 36 — 56.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13639510810852567>

Chappell, A. T. & Lanza-Kaduce, L. (2010). Police academy socialization: Understanding the

lessons learned in a paramilitary-bureaucratic organization. *Journal of Contemporary*

Ethnography, 39(2), 187 — 214. doi: 10.1177/0891241609342230

Dixon, T., Schell, T., Giles, H., & Drogos, K. (2008). The influence of race in police-civilian

interactions: A content analysis of videotaped interactions taken during Cincinnati police

traffic stops. *Journal of Communication*, 58, 530 — 549.

Driving while black the app. (2014). *Driving while black the app*. Retrieved from

<http://dwbtheapp.com>

Giles, H., Linz, D., Bonilla, D., & Gomez, M. L. (2012). Police stops of and interactions with

latino and white (non-latino) drivers: Extensive policing and communication

accommodation. *Communication Monographs*, 79(4), 407 — 427.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2012.723815>

Glick, B. (2006). *Cultural competency standards for programs serving victims of domestic*

violence and sexual assault and other crimes in Oregon. La Grande, OR: Criminal

Justice Services Division, Oregon Department of State Police.

Gould, L. A. (1997). Can an old dog be taught new tricks?. *Policing: An International Journal of*

Police Strategies & Management, 20(2), 339 — 356.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13639519710169171>

- Hickey, R. (2016). Should Cultural Competency Be a Part of Police Testing?. *Law Enforcement Executive Forum*, 16(2), 85 — 97. Retrieved from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=6e4dc3f9-d2e6-4770-9be5-3690260c449e%40sessionmgr4006&vid=7&hid=4205>
- Hickman, M. J. (2005). *State and local law enforcement training academies, 2002* (NCJ 204030). U.S Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs Bureau of Justice Statistics
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- Ioimo, R., Becton, J. B., Meadows, L. M., Tears, R. S., & Charles, M. T. (2009). Comparing the police and citizen views on biased policing. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 22(2), 123 — 140. doi: 10.1080/14786010902975408
- Knibbs, K. (2013). *In the online hunt for criminals, social media is the ultimate snitch*. Retrieved from <http://www.digitaltrends.com/social-media/the-new-inside-source-for-police-forces-social-networks/>
- Maguire, E. R. & Wells, W. (2002). Community policing as communication reform. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Law enforcement, communication and community* (pp. 33 — 66). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Marion, N. (1998). Police academy training: Are we teaching recruits what they need to know?. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 21(1), 54 — 79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13639519810206600>

Mazerolle, L., Antrobus, E., Bennett, S., & Tyler, T. (2013). Shaping citizen perceptions of police legitimacy: A randomized field trial of procedural justice. *Criminology*, 51, 33 — 64.

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

Office of Community Orientated Policing Services (COPs). (2011). *The impact of the economic downturn on American police agencies*. A report of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Orientated Policing Services. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Pielmus, C. (2015). An ethnographic approach to the organizational culture of law enforcement training schools a case study. *Land Forces Academy Review*, 20(4), 440 — 451.

Retrieved from

<http://proxy.lib.odu.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/docview/1792476829?accountid=12967>

Pitt, C. (2011). U.S. Patriot act and racial profiling: Are there consequences of discrimination? *Michigan Sociological Review*, 25, 53 — 69. Retrieved from

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41289191>

President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). *Final report of the president's task force on 21st century policing*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

RAND Corporation. (2007). *Analysis of Racial Disparities in the New York Police Department's Stop, Question, and Frisk Practices*. Santa Monica, CA: Ridgeway, G.

- Reaves, B. A. (2015). *Local police departments, 2013: Personnel, policies, and practices* (NCJ 248677). U.S Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs Bureau of Justice Statistics
- Reaves, B. A. (2016). *State and local law enforcement training academies, 2013* (NCJ 249784). U.S Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs Bureau of Justice Statistics
- Schlosser, M. D. (2013). Racial attitudes of police recruits in the United States midwest police academy: A quantitative examination. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences (IJCJS)*, 8(2), 215 — 224. Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=14b4c4e9-bcec-40bc-91c6-d6435f0ef6bd%40sessionmgr103&vid=4&hid=120>
- Schlosser, M. D., Sundiata, C., Valgoi, M. J., & Neville, H. A. (2015). Improving policing in a multiracial society in the united states: A new approach. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 10(1), 115 — 121. Retrieved from <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=6baadc74-d0b6-4354-94c7-d2cc0321c5ea%40sessionmgr4003&vid=1&hid=4108>
- Southgate, P. (1984). *Racism awareness training: Report of a pilot study by the home office*. (Research and Planning Unit Paper 29). London, ENG: Home Office.
- Sterling, J. W. (1972). *Changes in role concepts of police officers*. Washington, DC: International Association of Chiefs of police.
- Teahan, J. E. (1975). A longitudinal study of attitude shifts among black and white police officers. *Journal of Social Issues*, 31, 47 — 56.
- Tomaskovic-Devey, D. & Warren, P. (2009). Explaining and eliminating racial profiling. *Contexts*, 8(2), 34 — 39. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41960003>

- Twitter. (2017). *Twitter usage/company facts*. Retrieved from <https://about.twitter.com/company>
- Van den Bulck, J. J. M. (2002). Fictional cops: Who are they, and what are they teaching us? In H. Giles (Ed.), *Law enforcement, communication and community* (pp. 107 — 127). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services. (2012). *Virginia Criminal Justice Training Reference Manual*. The Commonwealth of Virginia.
- Weitzer, R. & Tuch, S. A. (2005). Racially biased policing: Determinants of citizen perceptions. *Social Forces*, 83(3), 1009 — 1030. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3598267>
- Whitehead, J. W. & Aden, S. H. (2002). Forfeiting enduring freedom for homeland security: A constitutional analysis of the U.S. Patriot Act and the Justice Department's terrorism initiatives. *American University Law Review*, 51(6), 1081 — 1133.
- Wood, J. (2011). *Communication mosaics: An introduction to the field of communication* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth.
- Wortley, R. K. & Homel, R. K. (1995). Police prejudice as a function of training and outgroup contact: A longitudinal investigation. *Law and Human Behavior*, 19(3), 305 — 317. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1394006>

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

PROJECT TITLE: Intercultural Communication Training and Law Enforcement Officers

RESEARCHERS

Amanda Franco, Graduate Student, Masters of Arts Candidate, Lifespan & Digital Communication, Old Dominion University, Department of Communication & Theatre Arts. Advised by Dr. Thomas Socha, Graduate Program Director, Lifespan & Digital Communication, Old Dominion University, Department of Communication & Theatre Arts.

DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH STUDY

The purpose of this study is to better understand how local police departments teach cadets and veterans about communicating with people from varied cultures. This includes educational approaches taken, materials used, length of training, as well as learning objectives. A goal of this study is to help to improve communication between law enforcement officers and culturally diverse publics.

If you agree to participate you will be interviewed about intercultural communication training practices, procedures, and materials used by law enforcement officers to teach police cadets and to train police veterans. Interviews will be scheduled at places/times that are convenient to you, will not interfere with day-to-day operations, and will only take as much of your time as is necessary. Should any instructional materials (e.g., training manuals) be shared with me, I agree to follow your organization's protocols and policies regarding their handling and will maintain their confidentiality.

RISKS AND BENEFITS

There are no foreseeable risks to participation. You will be offered a copy of the findings of the study when it is completed.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. The researcher will not identify you or your law enforcement organization by name in any write ups of the study. The results of this study will be reported in the aggregate in reports, presentations and publications.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT

By signing this form, you are acknowledging that you have read it, understand what is being asked, the study's safeguards, and that you are choosing to voluntarily participate. If you have any questions either now or throughout the study, I am happy to answer them. And, you may cease your participation at any time.

Please contact Amanda Franco at afran025@odu.edu or Dr. Thomas Socha, tsocha@odu.edu (757-683-3833) with any questions you may have about the study. Should you have any questions about your rights regarding this study please contact: Dr. Randy Gainey, Chair of Human Subjects Review for the College of Arts and Letters at 757-683-4794, or the Old Dominion University Office of Research, at 757-683-3460.

Subject's Printed Name & Signature

Date _____

INVESTIGATOR'S STATEMENT

I certify that I have explained to this subject the nature and purpose of this research, including benefits, risks, costs, and any experimental procedures. I have described the rights and protections afforded to human subjects and have done nothing to pressure, coerce, or falsely entice this subject into participating. I am aware of my obligations under state and federal laws, and promise compliance. I have answered the subject's questions and have encouraged him/her to ask additional questions at any time during the course of this study. I have witnessed the above signature(s) on this consent form.

Investigator's Printed Name & Signature

Date _____

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE (SEMI-STRUCTURED ADMINISTRATIVE)

Section 1: Cadet Training

RQ1: What does the intercultural communication training of law enforcement cadets look like?

1. Can you describe, in general terms, how your organization goes about training its cadets in communicating with people of varied cultural backgrounds?

A. Form of training:

2. Is there a class? An in-service training module? Lecture(s)?
3. Live? Online?

B. Length of training:

4. How long is intercultural relations and communication training?

C. Content of training:

5. Is there a specific training manual provided of required points that have to be covered in academy training?
6. If yes, who is the mandating agency?
7. What kinds of obstacles do you find are in existence in community policing and communication?
8. What are your primary instructional goal(s) with respect to intercultural communication training at the recruitment level?
9. What is covered in this class, module, lecture? Is it possible to arrange to review these materials?
10. How are choices made as to what to include in this training?
11. How frequently are materials updated?

12. Are intercultural communication college-style courses consulted for information to include?
13. Does the curriculum of your academy attempt to tailor cultural understanding training programs specifically to the communities it serves?
14. If yes, how?
15. Do you consider community input in intercultural program design at the academy level?
16. If yes, how do you reach out to the local community to involve them in the process?
17. Time constrictions are frequently a factor in training. How do you decide what material is cut, and how are cuts made in the communication curricula that is included?

D. Instructors:

18. Can you describe the background of the instructors of these courses, modules, lectures?
19. Are outside sources or researchers specializing in intercultural communication consulted when constructing training materials?

E. Assessment:

20. How are the effectiveness of these courses, modules, or talks assessed?
21. At the academy level, are exams given or is it just a sit through it and sign off on a sheet indicating presence?
22. Are there specific tests, quizzes, exams for the cadets?

Section 2 Bias, Stereotyping, Profiling

RQ2A: While at the academy, and prior to interaction with the public, are cadets' perceptions relating to culture assessed?

RQ2B: If cadet perceptions relating to culture are assessed, are they self-tests, or does the academy administer these tests?

RQ3: While at the academy, and prior to interaction with the public, do prospective law enforcement officers receive any training to distinguish cultural or ethnic stereotyping from necessary context-specific profiling of an individual?

1. While at the academy, is there training on how to identify and limit personal bias when dealing with other cultures?
2. If yes, what kind of training exists?
3. Are there any anonymous methods utilized to identify the presence of bias in the classroom so that training can be tailored to what is most relative to your locale?
4. If yes, what methods are used?
5. When training new cadets, how do you define profiling?
6. Do you think there is a difference between the way police define profiling and the way the public defines it?
7. While at the academy, are cadets trained to differentiate between case-specific profiling of individuals and group stereotyping?
8. If yes, what kind of training exists?
9. Are outside sources or researchers specializing in this sort of differentiation, such as FBI resource materials, consulted when constructing training materials?
10. How do you assess to ensure cadets are profiling in-context to an assignment as opposed to falling back on stereotypes?
11. What do you think are the downsides to using a profile when it comes to communication and interaction?

Section 3: Post Academy Training

RQ4: What does post-academy supplementary training of police officers with regard to intercultural communication look like?

1. Can you describe, in general terms, how your organization goes about training its officers (post academy) in communicating with people of varied cultural backgrounds?

A. Form of training:

2. Is there a class? An in-service training module? Lecture(s)?
3. Live? Online?

B. Length of training:

4. How long is intercultural relations and communication training?

C. Content of training:

5. Is there a specific training manual provided of required points that have to be covered in supplementary training?
6. If yes, who is the mandating agency?
7. What are your primary instructional goal(s) with respect to intercultural communication training at the recruitment level?
8. Is training on intercultural communication ever mandatory prior to supervisory promotions?
9. What is covered in this class(es), module, lecture? Is it possible to arrange to review these materials?
10. How are choices made as to what to include in this training?
11. How frequently are materials updated?

12. Are intercultural communication college-style courses consulted for information to include?
13. Does the curriculum of your academy attempt to tailor cultural understanding training programs specifically to the communities it serves?
14. If yes, how?
15. Do you consider community input in intercultural program design at the academy level?
16. If yes, how do you reach out to the local community to involve them in the process?
17. Time constrictions are frequently a factor in training. How do you decide what material is cut, and how are cuts made in the communication curricula that is included?

D. Instructors:

18. Can you describe the background of the instructors of these courses, modules, lectures?
19. Are outside sources or researchers specializing in intercultural communication consulted when constructing training materials?

E. Assessment:

20. How are the effectiveness of these courses, modules or talks assessed?
21. Are there specific tests, quizzes, exams for the veterans?

General

1. What would you say is the most optimal way to train law enforcement officers to be effective communicators with the public?
2. Is there anything that you'd like to add about intercultural communication and law enforcement?

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE (SEMI-STRUCTURED BEAT OFFICERS)

Demographic info: (indicate)

		Male	Female		
White	Black	Latino(a)	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native		
		Asian	Other _____	Prefer Not To Disclose	

1. How long have you been a police officer?
2. How long have you been with _____ PD?
3. How would you describe the area that you typically patrol? Diverse? Rural? Urban?
4. How well do you think that the intercultural communication training you received from this department prior to dealing with the public prepared you for interaction with those from other cultures?
5. Do you feel that the intercultural communication training you received has directly benefitted you on the job? If so, how?
6. What part of your intercultural communication training most resonated with you?
7. Regarding supplementary training, how well do you feel that this reinforces, or does not reinforce, previous intercultural communication training you have received?
8. If applicable, how would you compare the intercultural communication training you received from this department to what you received from working with prior departments? Please explain.
9. What do you think of the community involvement in the academy?
10. What are your thoughts on the bias-awareness training you received from this department?
11. Do you feel that this training has helped to make you more aware of the existence of biases?

12. Regarding supplementary training, how well do you feel that this reinforces, or does not reinforce, previous bias-awareness training you received?
13. If applicable, how would you compare the bias-awareness training you received from this department to what you received from working with prior departments? Please explain.

VITA

Amanda M. Franco
 Department of Communication and Theatre Arts
 Old Dominion University
 Norfolk, VA 23529

Education

M.A., Lifespan and Digital Communication, Old Dominion University (expected August, 2017)

B.S., Communication, Old Dominion University May 8, 2010

Professional Experience

Graduate Teaching Assistant — Instructor 2017
 Department of Communication & Theatre Arts Spring
 Old Dominion University
 Course: *Public Speaking (Online)*

Graduate Teaching Assistant — Instructor 2016
 Department of Communication & Theatre Arts Fall
 Old Dominion University
 Course: *Public Speaking (Online)*

Research Assistant 2016
 Department of Institutional Assessment Summer
 Old Dominion University

Graduate Teaching Assistant 2016
 Department of Communication & Theatre Arts Spring
 Old Dominion University
 Teaching Assistant for Associate Professor Dr. Burton Saint John III
 Course: *Understanding Media*

Graduate Teaching Assistant 2015
 Department of Communication & Theatre Arts Fall
 Old Dominion University
 Teaching Assistant for Senior Lecturer Ms. Carla Harrell
 Course: *Introduction to Human Communication*