University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindsor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1997

The long-term effects of a police-school program on attitudes toward police.

Frank J. McShane *University of Windsor*

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd

Recommended Citation

McShane, Frank J., "The long-term effects of a police-school program on attitudes toward police." (1997). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 4088.

https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/4088

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI

films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some

thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be

from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the

copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality

illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins,

and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete

manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if

unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate

the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by

sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and

continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each

original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced

form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced

xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white

photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations

appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to

order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

NOTE TO USERS

The original manuscript received by UMI contains pages with indistinct print. Pages were microfilmed as received.

This reproduction is the best copy available

UMI

THE LONG TERM EFFECTS OF A POLICE-SCHOOL PROGRAM ON ATTITUDES TOWARD POLICE

by

F.J. McShane

Hon. B.A., University of Winnipeg

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Department of Psychology
in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts at the
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario, Canada

1996



National Library of Canada

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street Ottawa ON K1A 0N4 Canada Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Acquisitions et services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington Ottawa ON K1A 0N4 Canada

Your file Votre reférence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a nonexclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-30968-1



© Frank J. McShane

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effects of the Values, Influences, and Peers (VIP) program (Ministry of Education, 1984) on the attitudes of adolescents toward the police. The contributions of gender and grade (age) to the adolescents' attitudes also were examined. With a view toward providing further information about the long term effects of the VIP program on attitude formation, the study also examined the attitudes of adolescents toward the police-relevant concerns of law and order problems, police programs, and personal safety. The data were obtained from Horrobin's (1994) Community Youth Needs and Concerns Survey of 1,221 students enrolled in grades 9 through 13 from 15 high schools in a medium-sized southwestern Ontario metropolitan area. Multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs), using program (VIP/non-VIP experience), gender, and grade as independent variables, were performed on the 1,134 response scores utilized in the present study. In general, the results indicated that there was a relationship between VIP experience and respondents' positive attitudes toward police. Specifically, compared with non-VIP respondents, VIP respondents' attitudes toward police were significantly more positive. This was the case when they rated police in terms of nine characteristics/behaviors. Also officers with whom respondents had interacted within two years were evaluated more positively by VIP than non-VIP respondents. The results further showed that police performance was rated significantly more positively by VIP than non-VIP respondents. Whereas some variation in adolescents' evaluations of the police was due to gender and grade level (age), examination of the MANOVAs showed that there were no significant interaction effects involving program and the other independent variables of gender and grade. Furthermore, the results showed that whereas

there was no significant effect of program for the police-relevant dependent variables, gender showed consistent significant differences. Compared with males, females rated law and order problems as more serious, police programs as more important, and various urban locations as less safe, particularly at night. A significant grade effect was found only for attitudes toward police programs. MANOVA results also showed that there were significant Gender X Grade interactions for attitudes toward police programs and attitudes concerning personal safety in various metropolitan areas at nighttime. The results were interpreted as indicating that there are meaningful attitudinal differences between VIP and non-VIP adolescents and as providing support for the continued use of VIP intervention with Grade 6 populations. Implications of the present results for the VIP program and future research are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to the following people:

Dr. F. Schneider for serving as chairperson on my committee and his continuous patience and support;

Other members of my committee: Dr. F.C. Hansen and Dr. S. Towson for their insightful comments;

- Mr. B. Horrobin for generously sharing his knowledge of the VIP program and providing the raw data for this study;
- Mr. D. MacDonald for proof reading the manuscript;
- Ms. R. Young for her support and her patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Pag |
|--|
| ABSTRACT i |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTSii |
| LIST OF TABLES vi |
| Chapter |
| I INTRODUCTION |
| Attitudes Toward Police and Police-School Programs 4 |
| Attitudes Toward the Police 4 |
| Police-School Programs 5 |
| The VIP Program |
| VIP Program Topics, Resources, and Implementation 12 |
| VIP: Peel County |
| VIP: Windsor 16 |
| Cognitive Developmental and Social Learning Theories |
| Cognitive Developmental Theory |
| Social Learning Theory |
| Abstract modeling |
| Moral evaluation |
| Identification 24 |
| Contact |
| Problem and Hypothesis |
| II METHOD |
| Data Source |
| Materials 31 |
| Attitudes toward the police |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

| Chap | pter Page |
|------|---|
| | Perception of police performance |
| | Additional issues 34 |
| | Procedure 35 |
| | Statistical Analyses 36 |
| III | RESULTS 38 |
| | Overview 38 |
| | Data Screening and Sample Description |
| | Hypothesis 39 |
| | Perceptions of police characteristics/behaviors 41 |
| | Perceptions of officer(s) attributes by students |
| | who reported contact with the police 45 |
| | Evaluation of police performance 50 |
| | Additional Analyses 56 |
| IV | DISCUSSION73 |
| | VIP Program and Attitudes Toward Police |
| | Influence of Gender and Grade on Attitudes Toward the Police 78 |
| | Additional Analyses 81 |
| | Implications for the VIP Program and Future Research 84 |
| | Conclusion |
| REFE | RENCES |
| APPE | NDICES |
| A | Community Youth Needs and Concerns Survey 94 |
| В | Complete Univariate Results99 |
| VITA | AUCTORIS |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table |) | ?age |
|-------|---|------|
| 1 | Demographic Characteristics of the Police Evaluation Survey | 32 |
| 2 | Respondent Demographic Characteristics by Program and Gender | 40 |
| 3.1 | MANOVA Summary of Student Ratings of Police | |
| | Characteristics/Behaviors by Program, Gender, and Grade | . 42 |
| 3.2 | Summary of Significant Univariate Effects of Student Ratings | |
| | of Police Characteristics/Behaviors by Program, Gender, and | |
| | Grade | . 43 |
| 3.3 | Mean Student Ratings of Police Characteristics/Behaviors | |
| | by Program and Gender | . 44 |
| 4.1 | MANOVA Summary of Perceived Police Attributes by Program, | |
| | Gender, and Grade: Students who Reported Contact with Police | 46 |
| 4.2 | Summary of Significant Univariate Effects of Attitudes Toward | |
| | Police by Program, Gender, and Grade: Students who Reported | |
| | Contact with the Police | 47 |
| 4.3 | Mean Perceived Police Attributes by Program and Gender: | |
| | Students who Reported Contact with the Police | 48 |
| 5.1 | MANOVA Summary of Student Ratings of Police Performance | |
| | of Services by Program, Gender, and Grade | 51 |
| 5.2 | Summary of Significant Univariate Effects of Student Ratings | |
| | of Police Performance of Services by Program, Gender, and | |
| | Grade | 52 |
| 5.3 | Mean Student Ratings of Police Performance of Services | |
| | by Program and Gender | 53 |

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

| Table | | Page |
|-------|--|------|
| 6.1 | ANOVA Results of Student Ratings of the Overall Quality of | |
| | Police Services | . 54 |
| 6.2 | Mean Student Ratings of the Overall Quality of Police | |
| | Services by Program and Gender | . 55 |
| 7.1 | MANOVA Summary of Student Ratings of Community Problems | |
| | by Program, Gender, and Grade | . 57 |
| 7.2 | Summary of Significant Univariate Effects of Student Ratings | |
| | of Community Problems by Program, Gender, and Grade | . 58 |
| 7.3 | Mean Student Ratings of Community Problems by | |
| | Program and Gender | . 59 |
| 8.1 | MANOVA Summary of Student Ratings of Police Programs by | |
| | Program, Gender, and Grade | . 61 |
| 8.2 | Summary of Significant Univariate Effects of Student Ratings | |
| | of Police Programs by Program, Gender, and Grade | . 62 |
| 8.3 | Mean Student Ratings of Police Programs by Program and | |
| | Gender | . 63 |
| 9.1 | MANOVA Summary of Student Ratings of Safety by Program, | |
| | Gender, and Grade (daytime) | . 66 |
| 9.2 | Summary of Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Safety | |
| | by Program, Gender, and Grade (daytime) | . 67 |
| 9.3 | Mean Student Ratings of Safety by Program and | |
| | Gender (daytime) | . 68 |
| 10.1 | MANOVA Summary of Student Ratings of Safety by | |
| | Program, Gender, and Grade (nighttime) | 70 |

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

| Table | P | age |
|-------|--|-----|
| 10.2 | Summary of Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Safety | |
| | by Program, Gender, and Grade (nighttime) | 71 |
| 10.3 | Mean Student Ratings of Safety by Program | |
| | and Gender (nighttime) | 72 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decades, policing in North America has undergone a number of changes. In response to rapid urban growth, escalating crime rates, and societal "progress," the dominant style of policing of the 1960's emphasized motorized patrol, rapid response time, and the retrospective investigation of crime (Greene, 1989). These strategies, aimed at detecting and apprehending criminals, were particularly responsible for bureaucracy and centralization rather than substantive work efforts becoming the hallmarks of policing (Murphy, 1988). The fact that these strategies were never designed to address fundamental community problems helped produce increased feelings of alienation between the police and community that resulted in less effective policing and increasingly criminogenic communities (Cordner, 1986). In addition to these conditions, the political climate, research findings, organizational tactics, and experimental programs have helped progressive policing become synonymous with the term "community policing" (Curtis, Thurman, & Nice, 1991; Murphy, 1988). This newer police strategy involves officers working with communities on the identification, priority setting, and resolution of policing problems (Ellens, 1993; Goldstein, 1987; Watson, 1993). Furthermore, the traditional policing methods are supplemented in community policing with problem solving techniques, specialized types of patrols aimed at reducing alienation, and community education (Ellens, 1993; Greene, 1989). Modern policing is not only reactive and incident driven but also is focused on the causes of crime. In other words, the logic behind community policing is that the effectiveness of existing tactics may be enhanced if police increase the quantity and quality of public contact.

A recent development in police policy and practice involves the role of

the police as socializing agents of students (Fine, 1991; Hopkins, Hewstone, & Hantzi, 1992). As Hopkins et al. (1992) indicate, contact between the police and schools is not a new phenomenon. What is new is the interest shown by education and police policy-making authorities in promoting such contacts.

A good example of a collaborative socialization effort between educators and the police, and the focus of the present study, is the Values, Influences, and Peers (VIP) program developed by the Ontario Ministry of Education and the Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General (Ministry of Education, 1984). The VIP program is designed for implementation with Grade 6 students. Its general goals are to inculcate prosocial values and to promote more positive views toward societal authority, especially the police.

The most extensive evaluation of the VIP program was conducted by Fine (1991) in Peel County, located in southern Ontario. Fine found that students showed higher-level sociomoral reasoning after exposure to the program. Her findings also indicated that the program had a positive effect on students' understanding of the dangers of drugs and on their sense of self-worth. In addition, Fine compared students who had not been visited by police as part of the program with those visited once or three times. She found that Grade 6 students who received three police visits reported significantly more positive feelings about the police than their peers who did not receive a visit. A nonsignificant positive trend in attitudes toward the police was reported by Grade 6 students who received one visit compared with those who received no visits. Similarly, Grade 7 students who had received three police visits the year before expressed somewhat more positive attitudes toward the police than their peers who received no police visits during their Grade 6 VIP program.

The purpose of the present study was to evaluate the long term effects of the Windsor VIP program on student attitudes toward police. The research

extended Fine's (1991) work in three ways. First, the present study focused on the importance of police presence for VIP success. In the Peel VIP program the classroom teacher is mainly responsible for its presentation. In Windsor, police officers are much more involved in the teaching process. This greater involvement increases the potential to reduce negative police stereotypes as increased contact should provide students with opportunities to observe the behavior of police and discover areas of personal similarity (Grant, 1990).

The second way the present study extended Fine's (1991) work was in the provision of information regarding long term, as opposed to short term, VIP program effects. Fine's (1991) students were evaluated just prior to, immediately after, and 12 months following program completion. Students in the present study completed the VIP program in Grade 6 and were evaluated in Grades 9 through 13.

Fine's (1991) research design would have been strengthened if it had included a control group. Thus, the third way the present study extended her work was by using a control group, composed of students who were not taught the VIP program.

The present study examined whether increased police presence in VIP had a long term effect on adolescent attitudes about the police. The major focus of this paper was whether adolescents who had participated in Windsor's VIP program would exhibit a more positive pattern of attitudes toward police than adolescents who had not participated in the program.

The first section of this chapter focuses on research that examines the attitudes of youth toward the police and police-school programs. This is followed by a description of the VIP program. Next, a selective review of cognitive developmental and social learning theories relevant to the present study is provided. Finally, the thesis underlying this study is developed and

a hypothesis proposed.

Attitudes Toward Police and Police-School Programs Attitudes Toward the Police

Numerous studies have indicated that children and adolescents express generally positive attitudes toward the police (Amoroso & Ware, 1983; Derlega, Heinen, & Eberhardt, 1979; Murray & Thompson, 1985; Rigby, Schofield, & Slee, 1987; Singer & Singer, 1984). Consistent with students' generally positive attitudes toward the police is the finding that they consider police officers to be in a profession that ranks second in importance only to doctors and more important than teachers (Amoroso & Ware, 1981). In addition, students believe that the police possess more power and authority than teachers (Amoroso & Ware, 1981; Staub, 1979).

Researchers also have attempted to identify factors that influence attitude change toward the police. For example, evidence suggests that age (e.g., Amoroso & Ware, 1981; Rigby & Rump, 1981) and gender (e.g., Murray & Thompson, 1985; Rigby, Schofield, & Slee, 1987) need to be considered when examining adolescent attitudes toward the police. In Britain, Murray and Thompson (1985) found that young adolescents have more positive attitudes toward the police than older adolescents. Amoroso and Ware (1981) assessed the attitudes of almost 1700 Canadian students in Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12, using three different measurement techniques. They found that although police were generally well regarded at all ages, this positive regard showed a linear decline from Grades 6 to Grade 12. Bouma (1969) found similar age-related attitudes, although the largest decline in attitudes toward the police was found to occur after the age of 12. By contrast, Rigby and Rump (1981) found a significant positive linear trend for attitudes toward the police with a sample of 13 to 17 year old Australian students.

Gender differences in attitudes toward police also need to be examined because of inconsistent findings from earlier research. Murray and Thompson (1985) found that British female adolescents had significantly more positive attitudes toward police than males, and these results have been corroborated by Amoroso and Ware (1981) in a study of Ontario students attending separate and secular schools. However, Rigby, Schofield and Slee (1987) reported no significant gender differences in Australian high school students' attitudes toward police.

Police-School Programs

During the past few decades there have been many school programs that have focused on law-related issues. For example, Picard (1984) reported that in the 10 years preceding his study there were approximately 400 law-related programs incorporated into elementary and high school curricula in the United States. Fraser and Smith (1980) also indicated that the 1970's were witness to a surge in the academic endorsement of law-related agenda, although they noted that evaluations of law-related programs were not as robust as their proliferation. Picard (1984) identified several fundamental issues that limited the research evidence about how pragmatic the law-related curricula were for elementary schools in the United States. One issue was the fact that most of the programs were designed for high school students. Also there was a lack of valid and reliable measures to evaluate student attitude change after exposure to law-related programs in elementary school. Picard (1984) reported that these conditions contributed to the fact that only seven studies examined elementary school law-related programs. Derlega, Heinen and Eberhardt (1979), for example, assessed the attitude change of elementary school students toward police after participating in a police-school program, using pre-post measures of social distance, drawing police at work, and an attitude survey. Derlega

et al. compared students who had not been visited by the police with students who had received police visits as part of the program (and thus were privy to information about police work and the off-duty activities of police that the uniformed officers provided). In general, Derlega et al. (1979) found that participation in the Officer Friendly Program may improve students' attitudes about the role of police and positively increase their attitudes toward police. Based on these results, they concluded that the curriculum of a police-school program should include friendly personal contacts with officers to increase positive student attitudes toward police.

There is remarkably little published empirical research to support or refute the Derlega et al. (1979) finding that direct personal contact with police at school increases positive attitudes of students toward police. A literature review of the last decade or so revealed only three police-school studies that included police contact as part of the program curriculum (Fine, 1991; Hopkins et al., 1992; Picard, 1984). However, these studies show that there is some confusion regarding what the policy should be for police-school programs. A clear definition of police-school program policy is important in order that we do not overlook program components that are responsible for its success. Defining police-school programs is a necessary step in moving from successful individual programs to identifying principles that may be used in the design of new programs.

The difficulty in detecting useful program components is not because of methodologically unsound research. For example, Hopkins, Hewstone and Hantzi (1992) conducted a sophisticated study that attempted to evaluate what effect contact with a police officer, serving as a liaison with students at school, has on students' attitudes toward police. The police-school liaison program goals that they evaluated were described as:

'teaching' about citizenship and the philosophy of 'policing by consent', providing advice concerning personal safety/crime prevention, gathering (intelligence) information, encouraging the acceptance of particular police practices (such as 'stop and search') and improving young peoples' views of the police, etc. (Hopkins, 1994, p. 189).

Hopkins et al. (1992) gave 14 and 15 year old students a questionnaire to examine their attitudes toward the police in schools with a school liaison officer (treatment condition) and in schools without a school liaison officer (control condition). They found that there were no significant between-group differences, suggesting that the year long intervention was ineffective. In fact, their results showed that for both groups (treatment and control) there was a significant decrease in student attitudes toward police over time. A similar pattern of results was found for the treatment group student attitudes toward their school liaison officers. In other words, there was a significant decrease in students' liking for their liaison officer. Overall, however, the liaison officers were viewed more positively than police in general. police in general were seen as more aggressive, more rude, and less friendly and fair than were school liaison officers. Hopkins et al. interpreted these results as indicating that students categorize liaison officers differently from other police and postulated that the function of typicality is critical if students' positive attitudes toward school liaison officers are to generalize to the police as a whole. In other words, Hopkins et al. argued that student positive attitudes toward school liaison officers were related to the personalities of the officers (interpersonal) rather than the attributes of police as a whole (intergroup); that is, students viewed liaison officers as non-representative and atypical exemplars of police.

A major conclusion that Hopkins et al. (1992) drew from their study is that a police school liaison program will not decrease the negative stereotype

of the police because students believe that there are constraints placed upon police power in school. In other words, Hopkins et al. suggest that students experience "street" contact with the police in terms of a highly asymmetrical power relationship. This great power differential that students perceive the police to possess during street encounters, coupled with the nature and level of police discretion during these encounters, means that the student does not see the officer as simply representing authority but in an important sense as "being" authority. On the other hand, students presume that the highly asymmetrical power that police possess on the street is reduced when police enter the school realm as liaison officers because of the different set of authority demands required. Therefore, Hopkins et al. (1992) argued that the less asymmetrical power relationship results in the form of police-student contact being different in school from that outside the school. That is, the perceived atypicality of the power (and thus social) relations between school liaison officers and police on the street suggests that it is unlikely that school-liaison officers would beneficially affect students' attitudes toward police in general. In this regard, however, there are two results that need to be regarded when considering their argument. The first is that students reported police-contact scores of only 5 to 6 with school liaison officers, on a scale that ranged from 3 (no contact) to 21 (high contact). The second is that there was no difference found in the amount of police contact during school time between the treatment and control groups (Hopkins et al., 1992). These low rates of contact between school liaison officers and students suggest that Hopkins et al. may have been too hasty in drawing their conclusion. Increased contact may provide students with opportunities to observe the behavior of the police and discover areas of personal similarity, including interests and attitudes (Grant, 1990). The well-known "person

positivity bias" (Sears, 1983), in turn, suggests that students who like their liaison officer may modify their general attitudes toward the police.

In considering the question of whether program policy may moderate the influence of a police-school program on participants' attitudes, it is instructive to review one study that did find evidence of positive change in childrens' attitudes after exposure to a police-school program. In a study by Picard (1984), the goals of the Justice Education Teaching Strategies (JETS) program were stated as follows:

- (1) to promote and maintain positive student behavior;
- (2) to give students a more positive but realistic view of the law and the people who administer the law; (3) to assist students in understanding their rights and meeting their responsibilities to help insure the welfare of self and others; and (4) to increase knowledge of procedures used by police and other criminal justice agencies. (p. 7)

Picard assigned students in Grades 4 through 6 to one of two groups. In addition to their regular classes, one group of students received 30 hours of intensive instruction in justice education from a classroom teacher who had attended workshops that provided strategies for teaching the program to students. Students in this group also took part in field trips, mock trials, simulations, and classroom discussions that were designed to increase their knowledge about and affect their attitudes toward the justice system. In addition, this group received classroom presentations from the police. The other group received only their regular classroom curriculum. Picard (1984) found that program participants expressed increased positive attitudes toward police; also their knowledge of the justice system increased over time and increased more than that of controls. The findings suggest that police-school programs can increase positive attitudes of students toward police.

An examination of the differences between the police-school programs evaluated by Hopkins et al. (1992) and Picard (1984) may suggest whether or

not program policy played a role in the more positive findings reported by Picard. The goals of the program Picard evaluated required that students learn the rights and obligations of citizens. He reported that various strategies were used to help students learn the curriculum, including field trips and role playing. Some of the goals of the police-school program that Hopkins et al. (1992) evaluated may be construed as being antagonistic toward promoting trust in students toward adults. For example, it is difficult to see how program goals that require the police to collect "intelligence" on students and ask students to accept "stop and search" tactics will promote positive attitudes toward the police. These goals imply that one function of police-school liaison is to maintain social control rather than facilitate positive relations between students and police. In this regard, Menter (1987) has noted that many teachers have condemned the policy of the police liaison program that Hopkins et al. evaluated. Menter points out that the tactics of stopping, questioning and strip-searching students is a threat to their civil liberties.

Thus an implication of the results of studies by Hopkins et al. (1992) and Picard (1984) is that positive police-school program effects are more likely to occur when the program stresses attitude change rather than social control. Still, this is not to say that other factors may not be involved in determining the extent of program success. For example, students who were evaluated by Hopkins et al. (1992) were between 14 and 15 years old at the beginning of the year long intervention. In contrast, Picard's (1984) sample was drawn from Grades 4 through 6, suggesting that they were about 10 to 12 years old.

In summary, evidence indicates that the main purpose of a law-related program is to develop positive attitudes in students toward the police, legal

system, and legal processes. The evidence also suggests that a police-school program is most effective if taught to elementary students and if the program has goals that teach students moral issues rather than being aimed toward social control. However, there have been very few studies conducted that have examined elementary school law-related programs. Furthermore, fewer studies have examined programs that include direct personal contact with police as part of the curriculum. Therefore, it is somewhat precarious to draw any firm conclusion based on the limited literature reviewed.

The next section will describe the VIP program (Ministry of Education, 1984). Particular attention is given to Fine's (1991) evaluation of the Peel County VIP program and to the Windsor model of the program.

The VIP Program

The Values, Influences, and Peers program was established as a cooperative effort between the Ontario Ministry of Education and the Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General. As described in the VIP manual (Ministry of Education, 1984), the program focuses on values and value transmission in various areas. The program conceptualizes <u>values</u> as:

those qualities that an individual or a society considers important as principles for conduct and as major aims of existence.

Societal values, which serve as expectations for people in general, are the values generally accepted by its cultural traditions, structures, practices, and laws. Among the most important societal values in Canada are such principles as honesty, tolerance, compassion, and justice. Personal values are values which may be acquired by the individual. It is the individual's personal values that profoundly affect his or her thinking and behavior. (p.4)

The primary aims of a VIP program are described as providing students with opportunities to develop a positive sense of self-worth, to develop habits and values of good citizenship, and to learn to deal with negative peer pressure. The focus of the VIP program is on ensuring that students develop

personal value systems that are consistent with the values that our society considers important. It is assumed that young people are less likely to become involved in anti-social activities and react negatively to authority if they develop positive moral values that are compatible with those of the larger community.

The VIP initiative is based on a developmental perspective and is designed for students at the Grade 6 level. According to the VIP manual (Ministry of Education, 1984), it is important to introduce VIP to students at this level because students in Grade 7 are entering a time when they must make important decisions, such as whether or not to smoke or abuse drugs. The VIP manual also states that students' peer culture exerts an increasingly powerful influence on their lives. For these reasons, it is assumed that introducing a program that stresses good moral values and ways to deal with negative peer pressure would help students to cope better with the difficult choices and decisions that face them.

VIP Program Topics, Resources, and Implementation

Twelve curriculum topics are detailed in the VIP manual (Ministry of Education, 1984, p. 3). They are: (1) from values to standards; (2) creating impressions; (3) belittling of others; (4) peer pressure; (5) decision-making; (6) authority and authority figures; (7) being truthful; (8) the dangers of drugs; (9) vandalism and destructive behaviour; (10) shoplifting is stealing; (11) youth and the law; and (12) friends and friendships.

In addition to the VIP program manual, resource materials are provided by the Ministry of Education. These materials include a series of videotapes and manuals that may be used to support the instructor of the VIP program. The videotapes present skits of problem-solving dilemmas for classroom discussion. The manuals provide information that describes various concepts such as values

and strategies for developing a values curriculum. The VIP manual provides a list of available books, manuals, and audiovisual resources that are relevant to the program and may be used to supplement the curriculum. Furthermore, the VIP program manual suggests curriculum ideas for each of the 12 topic areas and provides implementation suggestions that may be utilized by those teaching VIP.

The VIP manual states that it was not designed as a set curriculum but developed to serve as a guideline for those who want to implement the program. The program manual recommends that the police should be involved in the delivery of the program. However, implementation variety occurs because each school jurisdiction may choose which of the 12 topics to emphasize and which resource materials and teaching strategies to use. For example, the VIP program in Windsor emphasizes law-related issues and promotes more positive views toward authority figures (e.g., police). The police coordinator for Windsor's VIP program stated that only 7 of the 12 program topics are taught to students (Stiener, personal communication, 1994). The VIP topics that officers primarily focus on are: (1) the dangers of drugs; (2) vandalism and destructive behavior; (3) shoplifting is stealing; (4) youth and the law; and (5) authority and authority figures. VIP topics of creating impressions and peer pressure are each discussed in one class. In addition, VIP students are provided with a tour of Windsor's Police Service that includes examining the holding cells for people who disobey the law (Stiener, personal communication, 1994).

An example of implementation heterogeneity may been seen in the differences between the VIP programs taught in Windsor schools and Peel County schools.

VIP: Peel County

The VIP program taught in Peel County started with program implementation being at the discretion of each school's administration (Fine, 1991). Fine noted that in the late 1980's Peel County made the VIP curriculum mandatory for all Grade 6 students. Now it is taught throughout the academic year, usually by the classroom teacher as part of another course and occasionally by a teacher as part of the guidance program. On the one hand, the mandatory requirement of teaching VIP implies that the Peel County School Board considers the program important for students. On the other hand, the expansion of the program to all schools has resulted in Peel Regional Police providing no more than three visits to any of the schools scheduling VIP. The five officers who provide VIP instruction during their visits do so as part of their regular duties. The classes that receive police visits are chosen on a first-request basis (Fine, 1991).

Fine states that the faculty who teach VIP are provided with a copy of the VIP manual. Moreover, she reports that the faculty who teach VIP for the first time are required to attend an inservice training program. The training is designed to provide faculty with the necessary materials and strategies to help them teach VIP to students and provide them with ways to integrate VIP topics into existing curricula.

There has been one study of Peel's VIP program (Fine, 1991). Fine's (1991) evaluation involved asking VIP teachers, school administrators, and the parents of students about their perceptions of the program. Some of the findings indicated that teachers believed that the VIP program provides information to students not available in other courses. Both teachers and school administrators stated that VIP training would be improved if VIP police attended the training program. Moreover, both groups stated that the presence

of police enhanced the effects of the program. The fact that only 24 percent of the parents returned their surveys made it difficult to know the extent to which their responses reflected all the parents' perceptions. However, the majority of those who did respond stated that they were aware of the VIP program and held positive attitudes toward it.

In addition to evaluating relevant adult perceptions, Fine (1991) examined the short term effects of VIP on students. She measured student cognitive reasoning levels before the program began, immediately after the program ended, and three months later. The measurement consisted of students' written responses to moral dilemmas that were designed to cover a number of VIP topics. Students also were asked to complete a short survey at the end of the program to assess its effects. In addition to Grade 6 students who had just completed the VIP program, Grade 7 students who had participated in the VIP program the year before were asked to complete the survey to assess their attitudes about the program.

Student responses to moral dilemmas about peer conflict revealed that students demonstrated higher-level sociomoral reasoning after exposure to the VIP program. Higher level sociomoral reasoning occurred in the VIP topic areas of belittling others, friends and friendships, peer pressure, creating impressions, and being truthful. Student responses to moral dilemmas about vandalism changed little from before to after the VIP program. This null result was interpreted by Fine (1991) as reflecting poor question structure.

The survey results indicated that VIP had a positive effect on student attitudes regarding the dangers of cigarettes, alcohol, and drugs. In addition, Fine (1991) reported the survey results indicated that police visits increased students' positive attitudes toward the police. More specifically, as noted before, Fine found that students who received three police visits as

part of the program reported significantly more positive feelings about police than those who were not visited. Moreover, she found that Grade 7 students who had three visits the previous year reported more positive attitudes toward police than peers who had no police visits during their Grade 6 VIP program. Thus, the latter findings seem to suggest that students' positive attitudes toward police increase with more police contact. In addition, the survey results indicated that students considered the police to have a positive effect on program impact, especially in the VIP topic areas of drug abuse and dealing with society's laws and the consequences of disobeying them.

VIP: Windsor

Since the inception of the VIP program in Windsor in 1984, there has been an increase in the number of schools participating. During the first year the VIP program was available, only three schools participated. During the academic year that the present research data were collected (1993-1994), 48 schools participated in the VIP program (Windsor Police Service, 1994).

As noted before, Windsor VIP police are volunteers from all sectors of policing (e.g., patrol, investigation, and administration). These officers are much more involved in the teaching of VIP than are police in Peel. In Windsor, each police officer involved in the program goes to a particular school for approximately one hour each week to teach VIP topics to Grade 6 students. The VIP curriculum is taught as a course that is separate from other courses. Although there is no set time frame to begin and end the VIP sessions, a program in a school usually begins in October and continues for the rest of the academic year, ending sometime in June. Thus, the program duration is from 8 to 9 months (Windsor Police Service, 1994).

In Windsor, the teaching process is a cooperative effort between the police officer and the classroom teacher. For example, the officer may take

the major teaching role with the classroom teacher acting as a confederate in role playing scenes. The use of role playing methods requires that officers and teachers plan their roles in advance. Thus, cooperation is an essential element between officers and teachers when developing the curriculum for a specific VIP topic.

Other learning activities that are used to teach Windsor's program are direct instruction, small group discussion, classroom discussion, question and answer periods, resolving moral dilemmas, and asking students to report any circumstances that they know or have heard about concerning VIP topics. When students convey any information that they are aware of, the rule of anonymity is strictly enforced. That is, students are told not to identify anyone during their disclosure of an event. This rule is strictly enforced, and if disregarded by students, they are reminded of the rule and possibly asked to sit down and discontinue their story. The rationale for anonymity is that VIP instructors want to promote an atmosphere of trust and cooperation in class (Ministry of Education, 1984).

Police and teacher novices to VIP program curriculum and those persons desiring a refresher lesson participate in a one-day training program that uses the VIP manual as a guide. The training program includes seminars on VIP topics, large and small group sessions, interactive opportunities, and a chance for participants to share and discuss ideas. The training schedule is designed to prepare participants to present the topic areas addressed in the VIP manual and acquaint them with the resources available to support the VIP program. In addition to receiving the VIP manual, participants are provided with various printed documents to help them teach students the VIP principles.

The VIP program is intended to align the moral values of elementary

school students with society's values and to help students resist negative peer pressure. The underlying assumption of VIP is that providing positive direction to students before rather than after they face moral decisions and negative influences that may affect the rest of their lives will enable them to make better decisions. In this regard, VIP intervention is similar to the proactive stance taken by many police organizations in that both attempt to influence basic issues before they can become problems.

The VIP manual (Ministry of Education, 1984) serves as a guideline to those communities that want to use the program. The fact that the manual is a guideline is evident in differences between the VIP programs that are taught in Peel County and Windsor. Further, the emphasis that Windsor's VIP program places on law-related values and increasing positive student attitudes toward authority figures, including police (Windsor Police Service, 1994), reflects the flexibility of program implementation.

Fine's (1991) work suggests that the VIP program can have short term positive effects on students' values and attitudes. Her work does not concern possible program effects beyond one year. As noted earlier, the purpose of the present study was to explore the long term effects of Windsor's VIP program on student attitudes. In particular, this investigation attempted to determine if the attitudes toward police of high school students who took the VIP program in grade 6 were more positive than those of student peers who did not take the program. Evaluation of the long term effects of the VIP program is especially important because of the profound implications these effects have for the well-being and quality of life of adolescents, and for VIP program implementation. A main goal of the VIP program is to provide students with opportunities to develop the habits and values of good citizenship, including respect for authority (Ministry of Education, 1984). Because the

energy and support necessary to implement the VIP program must come from the police and educators within local school jurisdictions, the effect of the VIP program in the development of positive long term attitude change becomes a major subject of inquiry. Furthermore, VIP participation correlated with positive adolescent attitudes toward authority (i.e., police) should be a reasonably good indicator that VIP program goals are being effectively attained.

The next section will examine how cognitive developmental and social learning theories apply to police-school programs and how these programs may have long term effects on student attitudes.

Cognitive Developmental and Social Learning Theories Cognitive Developmental Theory

The seminal research of Piaget (Phillips, 1975) provided much of the impetus for Kohlberg's (1984) developmental theory of moral reasoning (Picard, 1984). Piaget postulated a sequence of moral growth that roughly paralleled his doctrine of cognitive development. These "stages" are periods of the child's experiences in life gleaned from unique perceptions that epitomize reality. According to Piaget, all children pass through three stages of moral growth in an invariant stepwise fashion in which reality is perceived as being qualitatively different at each stage. Moreover, children of the same age and same level of development may experience the identical reality differently as a result of being exposed to unique environmental events. However, Piaget's three stage approach concentrates primarily on young children.

Kohlberg (1984) extended Piaget's invariant and sequential framework by proposing a six-stage model reflecting a mode of reasoning that is structured through adulthood. The six stages are grouped into three moral levels labeled preconventional, conventional, and postconventional. Preconventional children

are guided by an orientation toward punishment and obedience (stage 1) or a naive kind of hedonism (stage 2). No standard of morality really exists at the preconventional level. At the conventional level, morality is viewed as a matter of trying to maintain the approval of and good relations with others (stage 3) or a reliance on the precepts of authority (stage 4). In other words, loyalty is first directed towards other people because what pleases or helps others is right, and then to the social order simply because it is the existing social order and doing one's duty is right. At the postconventional level, morality is viewed in terms of contractual obligations and democratically accepted law (stage 5). Although the legal point of view is accepted at stage 4 and stage 5, a person at stage 5 will recognize the possibility of changing the law to best accommodate society. At the highest stage (stage 6) morality is defined by one's own conscience according to self-determined principles that are universal in nature (e.g., justice).

Kohlberg's (1984) paramount concern is the reasoning behind the moral choices people make rather than their actual moral behavior. In this regard, reaching a certain intellectual level is necessary to attain a specific moral stage. As Colby and Kohlberg (1987) have stated:

Piagetian concrete operations are necessary but not sufficient for stage 2 ...[and]... early formal operations are said to be necessary for stage 3 ... and consolidated formal operations are posited as the prerequisite for stage 4. (p. 12)

The reason concrete operations are "not sufficient" is that the logical factor interacts with people's motivation, their prospects for learning social roles, and their exposure to forms of justice. The nature-nurture interaction dictates that reaching a certain logical period does not guarantee a similar advance in a person's level of moral development.

Kohlberg (1984) suggests that the rate of moral development may be

expedited if children debate about moral issues that are one stage above their present levels. An adult may further facilitate the rate of moral development by supporting students who use higher-level arguments (Shaver & Strong, 1976).

There is research that suggests moral development may be accelerated through the moral stages (Blatt & Kohlberg, 1975; Fine, 1991; Johnson & Johnson, 1981; Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson, & Skon, 1981; Picard, 1984; Turiel, 1969, cited in Downey & Kelly, 1978). For example, Turiel presented children with a series of moral dilemmas to determine if moral development may be accelerated. Moral dilemmas that children were given ranged from one stage below to two stages above their current levels of moral reasoning. Turiel found that children who debated moral dilemmas that were one stage above their present levels used higher-level moral reasoning strategies in subsequent moral judgments.

Kohlberg proposes that there is a critical period in the development of moral reasoning between the ages of 10 and 14. At these ages children are usually able to reason in the abstract and understand moral issues. Prior to this time children have no concept of moral principles. In addition, after this time moral attitudes tend to stabilize and become less likely to change as people grow older. The importance of this aspect of the theory is that the VIP program is taught to Grade 6 students, that is, to students who are within this "window" of opportunity. This suggests that the VIP program should have long term effects on students' attitudes toward moral issues.

Research has investigated Kohlberg's position that there is a window of opportunity in moral learning related to age. As noted before, Picard (1984) taught the Justice Education Teaching Strategies program to children in Grades 4 through 6. He found that Grade 6 students scored significantly better than Grade 4 and 5 participants on a survey assessing their knowledge and attitudes

about the justice system. Therefore, Picard concluded that Grade 6 students process information qualitatively differently than lower grade students. On the same theme, Adelson, Green and O'Neil (1969) found that changes in the view of the law take place around age 13 years. That is, among 13 year olds the law loses the absolutistic, inflexible quality that is characteristic of the views of 10 year olds and begins to be seen more as a tool for achieving community ends. Moreover, Glover (1991) examined value selection regarding grade level and moral reasoning stage in students ranging from Grade 6 to Grade 12. His results indicated that there were no significant differences in variation of values reported across grades or stages of moral reasoning. These results indicate that moral issues taught in Grade 6 are retained in adolescence.

In summary, the application of cognitive developmental theory and research to police-school programs suggests three things. First, students who discuss moral dilemmas one stage above their present moral levels attain higher-level moral reasoning, especially if an adult is present to point out higher-level arguments. Second, the ages between 10 and 14 years are the most appropriate years to teach police-school programs to students. Third, moral issues learned during this critical time are less susceptible to change as students age.

Kohlberg (1984) provides one view of moral development. However, social learning theory is another perspective on understanding how we acquire moral attitudes. Social learning theory suggests there are numerous factors in the environment that contribute to the development of moral attitudes (Bandura, 1977). The following section will review this theory.

Social Learning Theory

Social learning theorists do not assume there is an invariant sequence

of development in moral judgment. Rather, they assume that learning is a gradual and ongoing process (Owens, 1992).

Abstract modeling. Bandura (1977) noted that observation of aggressive behavior, for example, affects symbolic processes. Through modeling children presumably learn that aggression is acceptable, they learn the means by which to aggress, and they store mental representations of these attitudes and the means of expressing aggression. Bandura (1977) states that whether children actually express the aggressive behavior that they have learned depends on certain mitigating conditions (e.g., being provoked or not) and reinforcing conditions (e.g., being rewarded or punished).

The concept of abstract modeling allows for the development of rules and principles that may initiate behaviors that are more general than any specific behavior observed. Observers may perceive patterns in diverse modeled behaviors and develop their own set of moral guidelines that fit these observations. Thus, Bandura's view takes into account the human capabilities for reason, thought, active self-regulation, and self-reinforcement, and his proposed model combines external events with individual decision-making (Bandura, 1977).

Bandura (1977) indicates that people are able to extract general rules from a diverse set of experiences because moral judgments are not universal but depend on specific experiential factors and may be applied in particular situations. Bandura also assumes a child will consider some experiences more important than others. An example of this is that the person whom a child respects may be a more important model than someone he or she does not respect. Also, observing behavior that is modeled rather than verbalized has a greater effect on subsequent behaviors of the observer (Staub, 1979).

Moral evaluation. Bandura states that the concepts of "self-censure" and

"exonerative" moral reasoning help explain why people do not always adhere to behaviors that complement their moral principles. Self-censure is defined by Bandura as adhering to a moral principle to avoid a sense of guilt that would be associated with deviant acts. Exonerative moral reasoning may weaken the internalized restraint of self-censure. Exonerative moral reasoning is the excuse that people find for engaging in specific behaviors that contradict their moral codes. This form of reasoning provides justification for people's behavior to themselves and to others (Bandura, 1977).

Identification. Others (e.g., Lerner, 1976) suggest that moral development cannot be fully explained by observing models; they posit the need for the concept of identification. The distinction between identification and modeling involves several factors (Staub, 1979). Identification requires that observers have emotional ties to the model, whereas modeling may occur without feelings of affection for the model. Also, identification can result in the observer adopting a total pattern of personal attributes, motives, attitudes, and values rather than discrete elements of the model's behavior. Moreover, the responses acquired by identification seem to emerge spontaneously and are relatively enduring. Imitating observed behavior is likely to involve conscious awareness, whereas responses acquired through identification are not ordinarily consciously initiated.

Lerner (1976) suggests that identification continues throughout a person's life. The establishment and maintenance of identification with a model is contingent upon several conditions. One condition is that the observer must perceive some resemblance to the model such as a distinct posture, walk, or speech. Another condition is that the model should possess qualities attractive to the observer. Therefore, identification with the police may happen in two ways. The first is that police are perceived to

possess traits of power and competence that youth consider admirable (Amoroso & Ware, 1983; Staub, 1979). These traits have been shown to be enhanced when police wear their uniforms (Singer & Singer, 1984). That is, youth consider police wearing uniforms as being more confident, reliable, and intelligent than when wearing civilian clothing. Thus, students who participate in Windsor's VIP program should identify with the attitudes expressed by their VIP officer because of the characteristics attributed to police. Furthermore, the fact that VIP officers wear their uniforms when teaching the VIP program suggests that they are perceived as representing the Windsor Police Service rather than being viewed as individuals. In addition, Lerner (1976) reported that the results of identifying with a model may be enduring. The enduring component of the identification process suggests that adolescents who participated in the Windsor VIP program should have more positive attitudes toward police than those students who did not take part in the program. fact that Windsor police wear uniforms when teaching the VIP program and when performing other duties (e.g., patrolling) further suggests that they are perceived as representatives of the community, which the adolescent is a part.

Contact. Numerous reviews (e.g., Amir & Ben-Ari, 1985) indicate there is evidence supporting the contention that positive interpersonal attitude change occurs through contact with a member of a negatively stereotyped group. The studies have focused on two factors: the opportunity to get to know the other person as an individual and working in a cooperative relationship (Brown & Wade, 1987; Cook, 1978; Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Miller, Brewer, & Edwards, 1985). In the few studies that measured changes in general attitudes of individuals (e.g., students) toward group members (e.g., police) other than those involved in the contact, the results have been equivocal. Some research has found that respondents change their attitudes toward the individual with

whom they had contact but not toward the person's group (e.g., Hopkins, 1994; Hopkins, Hewstone, & Hantzi, 1992). However, there have been a couple of studies that have found evidence of generalization. In one study, Wilder (1984) questioned students who had a negative or positive interaction with a confederate posing as a "student" from a disliked rival college. Results indicated that students liked the "student" with whom they had positive contact whether or not she acted in a manner that was consistent with the perceived stereotype of her college. The positive evaluation of the "student" generalized to the other college's students only when the "student" was perceived as a representative and typical student of the rival college.

In a study peripherally related to the present research, Brooks and Friedrich (1970) conducted a series of interviews on a sample of 231 adults to determine the effects of communication with the police on attitudes toward police. The results indicated that participants who reported direct personal contact with the police had significantly more positive attitudes toward the police than those who had no direct contact. The authors concluded that their results indicated the need to implement programs that enable the public to have more direct communication with the police in order to improve attitudes toward them.

In summary, social learning theory assumes that moral development is a gradual and ongoing process that continues throughout adulthood. The theory recognizes that there are numerous experiential factors contributing to the acquisition of moral attitudes. It also considers that compliance with moral attitudes depends on the desire not to experience internalized feelings of guilt (Bandura, 1977). However, internalized restraint may be disregarded if people find a reason to perceive their behavior as justifiable.

Social learning theory places considerable emphasis on the influence of

observing models and the process of identification. In other words, the logic behind social learning theory is that the opportunity to observe the behavior of models with desirable qualities (e.g., competent and powerful) encourages children or adolescents to identify with and adopt the model's attitude and behavior patterns. In this regard, direct contact can provide opportunities to discover areas of personal similarity, including interests and attitudes.

Problem and Hypothesis

The purpose of the present research was to explore the long term effects of the Windsor VIP program on participant attitudes toward police. The critical test of any program is its long term effects, and it is assumed by the Ministry of Education and Ministry of the Solicitor General that the VIP program produces enduring positive changes in student attitudes toward moral issues and authority. Thus, the indicator of effectiveness — attitudes toward police — used in the present study is appropriate for evaluating VIP effectiveness because one of the VIP goals is to develop student respect for authority figures, including the police (Ministry of Education, 1984).

The VIP manual (Ministry of Education, 1984) strongly recommends that the classroom teacher and police cooperatively teach the program. There is also a consensus among Windsor school administrators and police officials that schools participating in the program have an officer devote about one hour per week to teach students VIP topics (Windsor Police Service, 1994). Therefore, in Windsor there is a substantial amount of contact between students and VIP police officers.

The assumption that police presence increases VIP program effect is both empirically and theoretically supported. Fine's (1991) evaluation of the Peel County VIP program indicated that students considered police to have positive effects on the program, especially in the VIP topic areas of drug abuse and

dealing with society's laws and the consequences of disobeying them. Further, Fine reported that there was a positive correlation between increased police visits and student attitudes toward police.

Social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) also points to the likely role that police play in influencing people's attitudes. Social learning theory emphasizes the influence of observing models and the process of identification (Bandura, 1977). The logic behind social learning theory is that observing the behavior of a model (e.g., police officer) with desirable qualities provides the opportunity for people to identify with and adopt the model's attitude patterns. Direct positive contact may provide the opportunities to discover areas of personal similarity, including interests and attitudes, and thus enhance the degree of identification with the police officer.

Research that supports social learning theory's predictions is relevant to the influence police have on student attitudes. Research suggests that youth tend to identify more with models that they perceive as competent and powerful (Staub, 1979). The attributes police are perceived to possess by youth include being powerful, confident, reliable and intelligent, especially when they wear uniforms (Singer & Singer, 1984). Therefore, the attributes that youth believe police possess should enhance the probability that VIP students may identify with their VIP officers and adopt their behavior and attitude patterns.

Kohlberg (1984) proposes there is a critical period of susceptibility in the development of moral reasoning around the age of 10 to 14 years. Kohlberg suggests that usually it is not until this period that youth are able to reason in the abstract and understand moral attitudes. In addition, Kohlberg states that moral attitudes tend to stabilize and become less likely to change as the person grows older. Research has provided support for Kohlberg's idea

that the moral attitudes developed within this window of opportunity are those expressed in later adolescence (Glover, 1991). Thus, because the VIP program is taught to Grade 6 students who are within Kohlberg's proposed window of opportunity for learning and retaining moral attitudes, the program should have a long term effect on student attitudes.

In the present study, the instrument used to measure student attitudes toward police was a problem identification and needs assessment questionnaire designed by the Director of the Windsor Police Service Planning and Research Division for its strategic planning process (Horrobin, 1994). Specifically, high school student attitudes toward police were measured by examining their responses to questions about police attributes and performance. The decision to use an existing data set was made for two reasons. First, Horrobin's (1994) cross-sectional sampling design selected students from Grades 9 through 13 in all 15 Windsor high schools and, therefore, provided a large data base for the present study. Second, the survey provided the means to dichotomize students into those who had participated in a VIP program and those who had not taken part in any program. Therefore, the survey provided a line of demarcation to examine whether or not Windsor's VIP program had an effect on adolescents' attitudes toward police.

Based on both the theoretical and empirical literature reviewed, it was expected that the extent to which students reported positive attitudes toward police depended on whether or not they had participated in the Windsor VIP program. Hence, the following general hypothesis was examined:

Hypothesis. High school students who have participated in the Windsor VIP program have more positive attitudes toward the police than high school students who have not participated in the program.

Subsidiary issues included the influence of age and gender on adolescent attitudes toward the police. Evidence provided by Murray and Thompson (1985) and Amoroso and Ware (1981) suggests that young adolescents have more positive attitudes toward police than older adolescents. However, neither study examined age effects after students were exposed to a police-school program such as the VIP. It is important to recall that Kohlberg (1984) states there is a window of opportunity associated with a person's vulnerability for moral development. Kohlberg's proposal regarding people's age and their moral development suggests the possibility that teaching the VIP to students in Grade 6 may negate age differences found in earlier research. Age was entered into the analyses to investigate its effect on the results.

Evidence provided by Murray and Thompson (1985) and Amoroso and Ware (1981) strongly suggests that females are more pro-police than males. However, these studies did not examine gender differences in adolescents who have participated in a moral values program such as the VIP. Furthermore, Fine (1991) reported that there were no overall gender differences on the short term effects of the VIP program. Gender also was entered into the analyses to investigate its effect on the results.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Data Source

The data utilized in this study were obtained from the Community Youth Needs and Concerns Study that was conducted by Mr. Barry Horrobin, Director of Windsor Police Planning and Research Division. A stratified sample of high school students was selected from all 15 Windsor secondary schools in 1994, using grade for classification (Horrobin, personal communication, 1996). The overall sample retention was 83.6% (N = 1221) of the 1460 surveys that were provided to the high schools for the evaluation. Demographic characteristics of the student respondents are summarized in Table 1. Data for 14 students were excluded from the sample description owing to missing information on one or more demographic variables. Nevertheless, the percentages of completed surveys returned suggest that Grades 9 (22.3%), 10 (20.4%), 11 (20.9%) and 12 (22.9%) were similarly represented, whereas Grade 13 (13.6%) was underrepresented. However, the lower percentage of Grade 13 students may somewhat reflect the fact that two schools did not have Grade 13 classes. Horrobin's (1994) sample consisted of 635 males (mean age = 16.81, 13-30 years old) and 572 females (mean age = 16.64, 14-34 years old).

Materials

The Windsor Police Service Community Youth Needs and Concerns Survey is a self-report questionnaire that consists of 14 principal questions and a demographic section. The survey is presented in Appendix A. The questions were developed by Horrobin, the Director of the Windsor Police Service Planning and Research Division, to measure: (1) attitudes toward the police, (2) attitudes toward police performance, (3) perception of personal safety, and (4) satisfaction with police policy. The survey's demographic section

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Police Evaluation Survey

| | Grade | | | | | | |
|--------|----------|------------|------------|----------|-------------|--|--|
| | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | | |
| Gender | n 3 | n % | n % | n 3 | n <u>\$</u> | | |
| Male | 140 52.0 | 137 55.7 | 138 54.8 | 149 54.0 | 71 43.3 | | |
| Female | 129 48.0 | 109 44.3 | 114 45.2 | 127 46.0 | 93 56.7 | | |
| Total | 269 22.3 | 246 20.4 | 252 20.9 | 276 22.9 | 164 13.6 | | |
| Age | Я | Я | Я | Я | М | | |
| Male | 14.64 | 15.78 | 17.20 | 17.76 | 18.69 | | |
| Female | 14.52 | 15.48 | 16.48 | 17.86 | 18.84 | | |
| Total | 14.58 | 15.66 | 16.88 | 17.80 | 18.77 | | |

Note. There were 14 surveys with demographic responses missing.

asked respondents to state the length of time they had resided in Windsor, their age, gender, grade, area of residence, and whether or not they had participated in a VIP program while attending elementary school.

Attitudes toward the police. There were two types of question that were intended to directly measure student attitudes toward the police. The first kind of question (number 12; see Appendix A) constructed to directly measure student attitudes toward police asked respondents to indicate their perception of the police as a whole. Respondents indicated their degree of agreement that each of the following six positive and three negative characteristics/behaviors describe police: trustworthy, approachable, hassle someone, suspicious of everyone, do a lot of good, pick on teens who have been in trouble, open minded, respect teens, and are fair. Response alternatives for each characteristic/behavior were: "agree," "uncertain," and "disagree."

The second type of question required students to provide a response to a yes/no "filter" question (number 7) that asked if they had any form of contact with police during the past two years. If they responded in the affirmative to this "filter," they were directed to answer the next question (number 8) that asked them to report their perceptions of the officer(s) with whom they had contact. This question asked how well the officer(s) exhibited each of the following eight positive qualities: fairness, courtesy, honesty, clean appearance, job knowledge, concern, effectiveness, and professionalism. The response alternatives for each attribute were "not at all," "somewhat," and "very much." If students replied that they had no police contact during the last two years, they were instructed to skip question 8 and answer question 9.

The two step procedure with a branch was developed to acquire informed responses from participants. That is, the procedure was used to obtain a more reality based view of police from adolescents who had relatively recent police

contact rather than perceptions of police based on an abstraction by students who had no contact with police (Horrobin, personal communication, 1996).

Perception of police performance. There were two questions constructed to directly measure student views of police performance in carrying out their duties. One question (number 3) asked students to respond on a four point Likert-type scale (poor, adequate, good, and excellent) to nine items that covered the following specific duty areas: solving serious crimes, traffic enforcement, crime prevention, calls for information, community relations, visible minority relations, handling basic complaints, protection of property, and visible police presence. A second question (number 15) asked students to provide a global rating of the quality of police service. This measure used the same four point Likert-type scale (poor, adequate, good, and excellent) used in the first measure of police performance.

Miditional issues. In addition to the questions developed to directly measure student attitudes toward police, several other questions were examined with a view toward revealing additional information regarding student views about police-relevant issues. One question (number 2) asked that students rate how serious each of the following 11 problems was in Windsor: stealing from homes, stealing from stores, theft from vehicles, vandalism, family disputes, traffic violations, drug problems, youth gangs, assaults, robbery, and noise and disturbances. Response alternatives for each problem were: "not serious," "serious," and "very serious." Another question (number 6) asked students to evaluate how important 10 police programs or issues were to them as residents of Windsor (whether they had direct experience with the programs or not). The programs were: neighbourhood watch, impaired driving (RIDE), block parent, school liaison, police week, Devonshire Mall patrol, and marine patrol; the issues were violence against women, police recruiting, and

handling public complaints. Response alternatives were: "not important," "important," and "very important." A final question (number 9) that was examined asked students how safe they felt during daytime and nighttime in eight Windsor locations: their residence, shopping malls, school, public buildings, while driving, parks, their neighbourhood, and downtown Windsor. Response options were "safe" and "unsafe."

Six questions from the survey were not included in this study largely because they lacked relevance to this research. The questions omitted asked how often students saw patrolling police officers/cars (number 4), about the type of patrol (vehicle, bicycle, scooter, or foot) they preferred (number 5), if Windsor's casino increased a need for more police in various areas of the City, and if Windsor's casino would impact on crime and policing workload (number 11). Also, they were asked if they wanted specific initiatives in existing police services addressed (number 13), and if the answer was affirmative, to indicate what changes were wanted (number 14).

Procedure

In March of 1994 the Director of Research and Planning contacted by telephone the administration of each high school in Windsor and invited the schools to participate in a problem identification and needs assessment study (Horrobin, personal communication, 1995). The study formed part of an environmental scan that was being carried out by the Windsor Police Service for its strategic planning process. The City's 15 high schools agreed to participate.

One hundred questionnaires were subsequently left at each school with a pre-determined contact/coordinating teacher. The Director instructed each contact teacher about the steps to be taken regarding administering the survey to students. They were told that the 100 surveys were to be filled out by 20

students from each of grades 9 through 13. For two schools that did not have Grade 13, the contact person was told that 25 surveys were to be filled out by students in Grades 9 through 12. The contact teachers were told to use only English or Mathematic classes for each grade in order to increase the homogeneity of the students with respect to age and grade. According to the Director of Research and Planning, the purpose of this strategy was to obtain a stratified random sample of adolescent responses that offered a reasonably large and representative data base from all age and grade levels within the secondary school system of Windsor. Moreover, the contact teachers were told to hand out the surveys to students with the instruction that they were to be filled out independently. The participants completed the surveys in class under the supervision of the classroom teacher and contact teacher and were permitted to take as much time as they needed.

Statistical Analyses

Unless otherwise noted, multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to analyze the data. This approach was chosen because, although the dependent variables that were analyzed by each MANOVA were correlated with one another, they retained sufficient meaning as separate constructs so that it was desirable to consider them separately (and not, for example, perform principal component analysis and use the component scores in subsequent analyses). In calculating associated probability statements, the multivariate approach takes into consideration the correlations among the dependent variables (DVs).

These analyses determined whether the comparison groups significantly differed on the means of the composite DV for each issue as a function of VIP participation, gender and grade; they also identified univariate significance levels, and calculated means for univariate interpretation.

Given the large degrees of freedom (because the analyses were based on individual scores as opposed to school or class means), a strict criterion of statistical significance (p<.01) was set in order to reduce the possible occurrence of type 1 errors. The degrees of freedom in the reported analyses vary because of missing data and, given the large number of results, full details of univariate analyses are reported only for effects that are significant and associated with significant multivariate E ratios. Full univariate results are presented in Appendix B.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

<u>Overview</u>

Analysis of the data will be considered in three sequential phases. In preparation for the analyses, the data were screened to exclude any data sets that had missing data or outliers on the variables that were included in this study. Next, the major MANOVA analyses using program (VIP/non-VIP), gender, and grade scores as independent variables were examined. These analyses were used to test the general hypothesis using respondents' evaluations of police characteristics/behaviors, their evaluations of the attributes of officers with whom they interacted, and their ratings of police performance. Finally, additional analyses were undertaken in an effort to answer questions about respondents' views related to police-relevant issues.

Data Screening and Sample Description

Of the 1207 sets of data, 73 sets (43 males and 30 females; mean age = 18.1, range = 14-34 years old) were excluded for several reasons. Fifteen were students who had participated in a VIP program but not Windsor's. These students reported participating in a VIP program, however, the fact that they resided in Windsor for less than three years revealed that they could not have participated in Windsor's program. Data from 36 respondents who reported that they had never participated in a VIP program were excluded to complement the time residing in Windsor parameters of the VIP program students. Data from 22 cases were deleted because these students were identified as outliers related to respondent age and grade attended. The logic behind excluding these 22 cases was that research (e.g., Amoroso & Ware, 1981) has indicated that age may be a factor in determining how people depict police. Thus, it was

considered necessary to obtain an age-grade stratified sample of student responses that increased age homogeneity for each grade. Consequently, the upper age cut-off for each grade was as follows: grade 9: 17 years or older; grade 10: 18 years or older; grade 11: 19 years or older; grade 12: 20 years or older; and grade 13: 21 years or older.

The remaining sample of 1134 students included a total of 598 males (mean age = 16.4, 13-20 years old) and 536 females (mean age = 16.4, 14-20 years old). The majority of respondents reported that they had lived most of their lives in Windsor (n = 937, 82.6%). The mean age of the sample was 16.4 years, and approximately half (n = 590, 52.0%) indicated that they had participated in the VIP program.

The sample characteristics, presented in Table 2, showed significant differences between non-VIP and VIP students on several of the demographic variables. Non-VIP students had resided in Windsor longer (M = 14.88) than VIP students (M = 14.02; M = 14.02; M

<u>Hypothesis</u>

The purpose of the study was to examine the attitudes toward police of high school students in order to determine if positive attitude patterns were related to past participation in the Windsor VIP program. To this end, four sources of data were used to gauge the sample's attitudes toward police. The

Table 2
Respondent Demographic Characteristics by Program and Gender

| | | VIP s | tuden | ts | | Non-VIP | stude | nts | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|-------------------|------|---|--------------|--------------------|----|---------------|--|
| _ | Mal (n = 1 | es 317) | | males = 273) | | les 281) | | ales 263) | (Ñ | Total = 1134) | |
| Variable | Mean | | Mean | | Mean | | Me an | | - | Mean | |
| Years lived | | | | | - | ····· | | | | | |
| in Windsor | 14 | .12 | 13 | .92 | 14. | 83 | 14 | .92 | | 14.14 | |
| Age | 15 | .94 | 15 | .88 | 16. | 97 | 16 | .93 | | 16.41 | |
| Grade freque | ncies | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nine | 95 (3 | 30.0%) | 94 | (34.4%) | 35 | (12.5%) | 27 | (10.3%) | | 251 | |
| Ten | 91 (2 | 28.7%) | | (23.4%) | | (12.8%) | | (14.8%) | | 230 | |
| Eleven | | 20.5%) | | (21.6%) | 67 | (23.8%) | 53 | (20.2%) | | 244 | |
| Twelve | 50 (1 | .5.8%) | 32 | (11.7%) | | (33.1%) | | (31.6%) | | 258 | |
| Thirteen Total | 16 (317 (2 | (5.0%) (7.9%) | 24 273 | (8.8%) (24.1%) | | (17.8%) (24.8%) | | (23.2%) (23.2%) | | 151 1134 | |
| Residence ar | ea frequ | encies | | | | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | (20020) | | | |
| West | 45 (1 | 4 2%) | 52 | (19.0%) | 52 | (18.9%) | 44 | (16.7%) | | 194 | |
| East | 143 (4 | | | (40.7%) | | (42.3%) | | (45.2%) | | 492 | |
| South | 66 (2 | | | (23.8%) | | (19.2%) | | (17.5%) | | 231 | |
| Central | 40 (1 | 2.6%) | 31 | (11.4%) | | (13.2%) | 36 | (13.7%) | | 144 | |
| Downtown | | | 14 | (5.1%) | | (6.4%) | | (6.8%) | | 73 | |
| Total | 317 (2 | 7.9%) | 273 | (24.1%) | 281 | (24.8%) | | (23.2%) | | 1134 | |
| School board | frequen | cies | | | | | | | | | |
| Separate | 166 (5 | 2.4%) | 106 | (38.8%) | 119 | (42.3%) | 106 | (40.3%) | | 570 | |
| Public | 151 (4 | | | (61.2%) | | (57.7%) | | (59.7%) | | 637 | |
| Total: | 317 (2 | 7.9%) | 273 | (24.1%) | | (24.8%) | | (23.2%) | | 1134 | |

first measure involved student rates of nine characteristics/behaviors pertaining to the police (question 12). The second measure entailed student ratings of how well officers with whom they recently interacted exhibited eight qualities (question 8). The third measure involved student ratings of how well police perform nine specific services (question 3), and the fourth measure involved student ratings of the overall quality of police service (question 15).

Perceptions of police characteristics/behaviors. A Program X Gender X Grade MANOVA was performed on the 9 DVs of question 12 (see Table 3.3) to assess students' views of the police. The summary of the MANOVA results is presented in Table 3.1. Table 3.1 indicates significant main effects of program, F (9, 1089) = 10.57, p<.001, and gender F (9, 1089) = 5.59, p<.001, whereas the main effect of grade and the interaction effects did not achieve significance. The MANOVA was followed by Program X Gender X Grade univariate analyses. Table 3.2 summarizes the univariate analyses results; as previously stated, the significant univariate effects that are reported were associated with significant multivariate F ratios. Table 3.3 shows the mean scores for each of the nine DVs by program and gender.

The MANOVA revealed that VIP and non-VIP students differed in terms of their views of police characteristics/behaviors. The follow-up univariate tests (Table 3.2) show that this difference was primarily related to six of the police characteristics/behaviors. Examination of means in Table 3.3 reveals that relative to non-VIP students, VIP students rated police as being more trustworthy, approachable, doing a lot of good, open minded, respecting teenagers, and fair. These findings support the hypothesis.

The main effect of gender in the MANOVA indicated a difference between males and females on one or more of the police characteristics/behaviors. The

Table 3.1

MANOVA Summary of Student Ratings of Police Characteristics/Behaviors by

Program, Gender, and Grade (Question 12)

| Source of Variance | đ£ | Multivariate E |
|--------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Program | 9, 1089 | 10.56** |
| Gender | 9, 1089 | 5.59** |
| Grade | 36, 4082 | 1.33 |
| Program X Gender | 9, 1089 | .65 |
| Program X Grade | 36, 4082 | 1.25 |
| Gender X Grade | 36, 4082 | 1.11 |
| Program X Gender X Grade | 36, 4082 | 1.06 |

Note. Multivariate F ratios are based on Wilks' Lambda.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 3.2

Summary of Significant Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Police

Characteristics/Behaviors by Program, Gender, and Grade

| Variable | MS | E |
|------------------------|-------|---------|
| Program (df = 1, 1097) | | |
| a. Trustworthy | 28.96 | 65.69** |
| b. Approachable | 13.79 | 29.05** |
| e. Do a lot of good | 8.59 | 21.20** |
| g. Open minded | 14.69 | 33.00** |
| h. Respect teens | 11.50 | 23.83** |
| i. Are fair | 23.41 | 49.89** |
| Gender (df = 1, 1097) | | |
| a. Trustworthy | 6.27 | 14.23** |
| c. Only hassle | 17.18 | 29.39** |
| d. Suspicious | | |
| of everyone | 16.31 | 25.20** |
| e. Do a lot of good | 3.69 | 9.11* |
| f. Pick on teens | 3.83 | 7.92* |
| | 5.11 | 10.58** |

Note. Complete univariate results are reported in Appendix B.

[&]quot;Item was reverse scored so that high scores reflect positive attitudes.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 3.3

Mean Student Ratings of Police Characteristics/Behaviors by Program
and Gender

| VIE | students | Non-VII | ? stude nts |
|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Male (<u>n</u> = 317) | Female (n = 273) | Male (n = 281) | Female (n = 263) |

Question 12: Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. (about police)

| Variable | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| a. Trustworthy | 2.43 | 2.56 | 2.10 | 2.27 |
| b. Approachable | 2.57 | 2.62 | 2.35 | 2.40 |
| c. Only hassle | 2.32 | 2.51 | 2.24 | 2.55 |
| d. Suspicious of everyone | 1.80 | 2.02 | 1.77 | 2.03 |
| e. Do good | 2.57 | 2.62 | 2.34 | 2.52 |
| f. Pick on teens | 1.49 | 1.63 | 1.48 | 1.58 |
| g. Open minded | 2.16 | 2.20 | 1.91 | 2.00 |
| h. Respect teens | 1.74 | 1.86 | 1.52 | 1.68 |
| i. Are fair | 2.23 | 2.30 | 1.91 | 2.06 |

Note. Scores ranged from 1 ("disagree") to 3 ("agree"), where 2 = "uncertain."

"Item was reverse scored so that high mean scores reflect positive attitudes.

univariate tests for each dependent variable show that there were significant gender differences for all but three of the police characteristic/behavior categories. Suspicious of everyone, only hassle, and pick on teenagers were scored inversely; thus, as shown in Table 3.3, compared with males, females rated police more positively in terms of being less suspicious of everyone, not hassling people, and not picking on teenagers. Table 3.3 also shows that females rated police as being more trustworthy, doing a lot of good, and respecting teenagers.

Perceptions of police attributes of students who had direct contact with police within a two year period. A Program X Gender X Grade MANOVA was performed on the eight attributes of question 8 (see Table 4.3) that asked students to rate officers with whom they recently interacted. A summary of the MANOVA results is presented in Table 4.1. As indicated in Table 4.1, significant differences were identified for the main effects of program, \mathbf{F} (8, 707) = 3.49, $\mathbf{p} < .001$, gender, \mathbf{F} (8, 707) = 7.71, $\mathbf{p} < .001$, and grade, \mathbf{F} (32, 2608), = 1.81, $\mathbf{p} < .001$. Results of the univariate analyses are summarized in Table 4.2. Table 4.3 shows the mean student scores for each of the eight DVs by program and gender.

The MANOVA revealed that students who had taken the VIP program differed from non-VIP respondents in terms of their description of the officer(s) with whom they interacted. Univariate tests (Table 4.2) show that this difference was mainly related to the ratings of six attributes: fairness, honesty, clean appearance, concern for problems, effectiveness, and professionalism. The group means in Table 4.3 suggest that adolescents who had participated in the VIP program rated the officers in a more positive manner compared with those who had not taken the program. This finding supports the hypothesis.

The main effect of gender in the MANOVA indicates a difference between

MANOVA Summary of Perceived Police Attributes by Program, Gender, and Grade:
Students who Reported Contact with the Police (Ouestion 8)

| Source of Variance | đ£ | Multivariate E |
|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Program | 8, 707 | 3.49** |
| Gender | 8, 707 | 7.71** |
| Grade | 32, 2608 | 1.81* |
| Program X Gender | 8, 707 | .43 |
| Program X Grade | 32, 2608 | 1.08 |
| Gender X Grade | 32, 2608 | .72 |
| Program X Gender X Grade | 32, 2608 | 1.03 |

 $\underline{\text{Note}}$. Multivariate $\underline{\mathbf{F}}$ ratios are based on Wilks' Lambda.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Summary of Significant Univariate Effects of Perceived Police Attributes by Program, Gender, and Grade: Students who Reported Contact with the Police

| Variable | MS | E |
|------------------------|-------|---------|
| Program (df = 1, 714) | | |
| a. Fairness | 4.37 | 8.40* |
| c. Honesty | 6.31 | 13.54** |
| d. Clean appearance | 3.08 | 10.25** |
| f. Concern for problem | 8.10 | 12.76** |
| g. Effectiveness | 4.49 | 8.31* |
| h. Professionalism | 5.55 | 10.58** |
| Gender (df = 1, 714) | | |
| a. Fairness | 10.14 | 19.51** |
| o. Courtesy | 30.25 | 53.40** |
| : Honesty | 11.89 | 25.51** |
| 1. Clean appearance | 6.39 | 21.24** |
| . Knowledge of job | 11.26 | 27.96** |
| f. Concern for problem | 14.37 | 22.62** |
| g. Effectiveness | 7.65 | 14.17** |
| n. Professionalism | 7.75 | 14.77** |
| Grade (df = 4, 714) | | |
| a. Fairness | 11.67 | 5.62* |
| o. Courtesy | 9.61 | 4.24* |

Note. Complete univariate results are reported in Appendix B.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 4.3

Mean Perceived Police Attributes by Program and Gender: Students who

Reported Contact with the Police

| VIP | students | Non-VI | P students |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Male | Female | Male | Female |
| (<u>n</u> = 224) | (<u>n</u> = 149) | (<u>n</u> = 210) | (n = 153) |

Question 8: How well did the Windsor Police Member(s) with whom you dealt exhibit the following qualities?

| Variable | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| a. Fairness | 2.18 | 2.35 | 1.97 | 2.27 |
| b. Courtesy | 2.08 | 2.44 | 1.89 | 2.36 |
| c. Honesty | 2.38 | 2.56 | 2.13 | 2.46 |
| d. Clean appearance | 2.69 | 2.82 | 2.51 | 2.76 |
| e. Knowledge of Job | 2.43 | 2.63 | 2.34 | 2.64 |
| f. Concern for problem | 2.01 | 2.19 | 1.72 | 2.09 |
| g. Effectiveness | 2.10 | 2.22 | 1.88 | 2.16 |
| h. Professionalism | 2.29 | 2.44 | 2.08 | 2.32 |

Note. Police contact occurred within a two year period. Scores ranged from 1 ("not at all") to 3 ("very much"), where 2 = "somewhat."

males and females on one or more of the officer(s) attribute DVs. The univariate tests in Table 4.2 show that the difference in gender was significant for all police attributes. The means (Table 4.3) suggest that officers were rated more positively by females than males on each of the attributes.

There was also a main effect of grade on the attributes composite DV. Univariate analyses in Table 4.2 show grade differences were significant only for two attributes: fairness and courtesy. Examination of group means suggest that students rated officers as more fair as grade level increased (Grade 9: M = 2.08, Grade 10: M = 2.12, Grade 11: M = 2.14, Grade 12: M = 2.17, and Grade 13: M = 2.42). Grade 11 students rated officers' courtesy (M =2.02) less positively compared with students in junior (Grade 9: M = 2.21 and Grade 10: M = 2.10) and senior grades (Grade 12: M = 2.14 and Grade 13: M = 2.42). Post hoc comparisons based on the Scheffé procedure for differences among several means, however, indicated that the only comparison achieving significance (p.<.01) was the mean ratings of officers' courtesy by Grade 13 and Grade 11 students. In other words, Grade 13 students were more likely than Grade 11 students to depict the police officers with who they had come into contact as being more courteous.

In sum, in support of the research hypothesis, VIP students demonstrated more positive attitudes toward the police than did non-VIP students. This was the case when they rated police characteristics/behaviors (question 12). Also officers with whom respondents interacted within two years were evaluated more positively by VIP respondents than non-VIP respondents (question 8). The results also indicate that females rated police more favorably than did males on both question 12 and 8. In addition, Grade 13 students rated officers with whom they had relatively recent contact (question 8) as being more fair and

courteous than did students in more junior grades.

Evaluation of police performance. The indices of attitudes toward the police are derived from students' ratings of how well the police perform nine specific services (question 3) and students' ratings of the overall quality of Windsor's Police Service (question 15).

The MANOVA results presented in Table 5.1 reveal that the only significant effect for how well the police perform specific services was a main effect of program, F (9, 1090) = 2.45, p<.01. Table 5.2, which shows the univariate results, reveals that the difference between VIP and non-VIP respondents was significant for three police services: calls for information, community relations, and handling complaints. The means in Table 5.3 indicate that students who were taught the VIP program rated police performance higher in all three service areas.

Students also were asked to respond to question 15, "Overall, how would you rate the quality of police service provided by the Windsor Police Service?" A Program X Gender X Grade ANOVA was performed on the students' responses to this question. As the ANOVA summary in Table 6.1 indicates, there were significant main effects of program, £ (1, 112) = 22.96, p<.001, and gender, £ (1, 1112) = 7.62, p<.01; there were no significant grade or interaction effects. Examination of the means (Table 6.2) show that students who participated in the VIP program rated the overall quality of service provided by Windsor's police higher than students who were not taught the program. Furthermore, the means (Table 6.2) indicate that females rated the overall quality of service provided by Windsor's police more positively than did males.

In sum, the results show that VIP students rated the police performance of specific services significantly higher than non-VIP students. VIP students

Table 5.1

MANOVA Summary of Student Ratings of Police Performance of Services by

Program, Gender, and Grade (Question 3)

| Source of Variance | đ£ | Multivariate E |
|--------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Program | 9, 1090 | 2.45* |
| Gender | 9, 1090 | 2.26 |
| Grade | 36, 4086 | 1.42 |
| Program X Gender | 9, 1090 | 1.92 |
| Program X Grade | 36, 4086 | .88 |
| Gender X Grade | 36, 4086 | 1.07 |
| Program X Gender X Grade | 36, 4086 | .88 |

Note. Multivariate F ratios are based on Wilks' Lambda.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 5.2

Summary of Significant Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Police

Performance of Services by Program, Gender, and Grade

| Variable | MS | £ |
|------------------------|-------|---------|
| Program (df = 1, 1098) | | |
| d. Calls for | | |
| information | 5.51 | 7.40* |
| e. Community | | |
| relations | 5.77 | 7.43* |
| g. Handling | | |
| complaints | 15.23 | 17.96** |

Note. Complete univariate results are reported in Appendix B.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 5.3

Mean Student Ratings of Police Performance of Services by Program and Gender

| VIP students | | Non-VIP students | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Male (<u>n</u> = 317) | Female (<u>n</u> = 273) | Male (n = 281) | Female (n = 263) |

Question 3: How would you rate the performance of the Windsor Police Service in carrying out the services?

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|------|------|------|
| Variable | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| a. Solving Crimes | 2.56 | 2.65 | 2.50 | 2.64 |
| b. Traffic enforcement | 2.54 | 2.60 | 2.53 | 2.58 |
| c. Crime prevention | 2.42 | 2.39 | 2.28 | 2.37 |
| d. Calls for information | 2.45 | 2.39 | 2.16 | 2.43 |
| e. Community relations | 2.38 | 2.43 | 2.21 | 2.32 |
| f. Minority relations | 2.40 | 2.38 | 2.18 | 2.37 |
| g. Handling complaints | 2.36 | 2.37 | 2.05 | 2.22 |
| h. Protection of property | 2.29 | 2.44 | 2.16 | 2.39 |
| i. Visible presence | 2.60 | 2.61 | 2.44 | 2.73 |

Note. Scores ranged from 1 ("poor") to 4 ("excellent"), where 2 = "adequate"
and 3 = "good."

Table 6.1

ANOVA Results of Student Ratings of the Overall Quality of Police Services

by Program, Gender, and Grade (Question 15)

| Source of Variance | đ£ | MS | E |
|--------------------------|------|-------|---------|
| Program | 1 | 10.45 | 22.96** |
| Gender | 1 | 3.47 | 7.62* |
| Grade | 4 | .89 | 1.98 |
| Program X Gender | 1 | 1.62 | 3.57 |
| Program X Grade | 4 | 1.00 | 2.20 |
| Gender X Grade | 4 | .87 | 1.93 |
| Program X Gender X Grade | 4 | .08 | .17 |
| Residual | 1112 | .46 | |

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 6.2

Mean Student Ratings of the Overall Quality of Police Service by Program
and Gender

| VIP students | | Non-VIP students | | |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| Male (n = 317) | Female (n = 273) | Male (n = 281) | Female (n = 263) | |

Question 2: Overall, how would you rate the quality of police service provided by the Windsor Police Service?

| Variable | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|----------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Quality of overall service | 2.67 | 2.76 | 2.43 | 2.64 |

Note. Scores ranged from 1 ("poor") to 4 ("excellent"), where 2 = "adequate"
and 3 = "good."

also considered the overall quality of service provided by Windsor's Police Service as being significantly better than non-VIP students. Therefore, the general hypothesis was supported. The results also indicate that the quality of overall police service provided by Windsor's Police was rated higher by females than males.

Additional Analyses

In order to provide further information about the long term effects of VIP participation on positive attitude formation toward authority figures (i.e., police), four additional analyses were performed. The following section is presented in a format that conforms with previous sections that used multivariate analyses. The question that prompted each analysis is stated and the results reported. However, before reporting these analyses, the rationale for performing them is outlined.

The concept of identification (Lerner, 1970) suggests that students may adopt a total pattern of attributes and motives the VIP officer models. Thus, the positive attitudes held by students toward the police could generalize to police-relevant issues (e.g., seriousness of law and order issues, importance of police programs, and feelings of personal safety). The enduring qualities of identifying with VIP officers suggests that VIP adolescents may consider these police-relevant issues more important than non-VIP adolescents.

How serious would you rate the following problems in Windsor? (Question 2). A Program X Gender X Grade MANOVA was performed on student ratings of the seriousness of 12 law and order issues. The summary of the MANOVA results is presented in Table 7.1. Table 7.1 indicates only a significant main effect of gender, F (11, 1091) = 11.26, p<.001. The MANOVA was followed by Program X Gender X Grade univariate analyses. The results of the univariate analyses are summarized in Table 7.2; again, only those effects that were significant

Table 7.1

MANOVA Summary of Student Ratings of Community Problems by Program,

Gender, and Grade (Question 2)

| Source of Variance | nce df | |
|--------------------------|----------|---------|
| Program | 11, 1091 | 1.08 |
| Gender | 11, 1091 | 11.26** |
| Grade | 44, 4175 | 1.42 |
| Program X Gender | 11, 1091 | 2.01 |
| Program X Grade | 44, 4175 | 1.15 |
| Gender X Grade | 44, 4175 | 1.17 |
| Program X Gender X Grade | 44, 4175 | .94 |

Note. Multivariate F ratios are based on Wilks' Lambda.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 7.2

Summary of Significant Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Community

Problems by Program, Gender, and Grade

| Variable | MS | E |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| <u>Gender (df = 1, 1101)</u> | | |
| b. Stealing from stores | 12.04 | 28.28** |
| d. Vandalism | 10.84 | 21.84** |
| e. Family disputes | 24.94 | 49.61** |
| f. Traffic violations | 3.46 | 6.60* |
| g. Drug problems | 14.76 | 31.94** |
| h. Youth gangs | 12.41 | 20.02** |
| i. Assaults | 18.91 | 40.02** |

Note: Complete univariate results are reported in Appendix B.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 7.3

Mean Student Ratings of Community Problems by Program and Gender

| VIP st | VIP students | | students |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Male (<u>n</u> = 317) | Female (<u>n</u> = 273) | Male (<u>n</u> = 281) | Female (<u>n</u> = 263) |

Question 2: How serious would you rate the following problems in Windsor?

| Variable | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|-----------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| a. Steal from homes | 2.06 | 2.03 | 2.10 | 2.12 |
| b. Steal from store | 2.14 | 2.32 | 2.08 | 2.31 |
| c. Steal from cars | 2.12 | 2.03 | 2.04 | 2.13 |
| d. Vandalism | 2.04 | 2.23 | 2.01 | 2.22 |
| e. Family disputes | 1.81 | 2.09 | 1.76 | 2.08 |
| f. Traffic violations | 1.75 | 1.76 | 1.63 | 1.87 |
| g. Drug problems | 2.26 | 2.53 | 2.36 | 2.54 |
| h. Youth gangs | 1.83 | 1.98 | 1.77 | 2.06 |
| i. Assaults | 2.14 | 2.36 | 2.09 | 2.39 |
| j. Robbery | 2.14 | 2.16 | 2.08 | 2.25 |
| k. Noise and disturbance | 1.51 | 1.46 | 1.39 | 1.48 |

Note. Scores ranged from 1 ("not serious") to 3 ("very serious"), where 2 =
"serious."

and associated with significant multivariate F ratios are reported. Relevant means for program and gender are presented in Table 7.3.

The MANOVA indicated that males and females differed in terms of rating the seriousness of specific problems in Windsor. An examination of univariate analyses (Table 7.2) and group means (Table 7.3) reveals that compared with males, females rated the following problems as more serious: stealing from stores, vandalism, family disputes, traffic violations, drug problems, youth gangs, and assaults. However, finding a non-significant program effect is not consistent with the assumption that law and order problems would be rated more seriously by VIP than non-VIP respondents.

While you may not have had direct experience with the following programs, please indicate how important you feel they are to you as a resident of Windsor (Question 6). A MANOVA was performed to determine if patterns of respondent ratings of existing police programs would vary as a function of program, gender, and grade categories.

The MANOVA results, as presented in Table 8.1, revealed that there were significant main effects of gender, \mathbf{F} (10, 1084) = 22.70, \mathbf{p} <.001, and grade, \mathbf{F} (40, 4112) = 2.98, \mathbf{p} <.001. There also was a significant interaction effect between gender and grade, \mathbf{F} (40, 4112) = 1.79, \mathbf{p} <.01. The results of the univariate analyses are summarized in Table 8.2. Relevant means for program and gender are shown in Table 8.3.

The MANOVA revealed that VIP and non-VIP respondents did not differ in terms of their rating of the importance of police programs presented in the survey. However, the MANOVA showed a gender difference. Univariate tests for each dependent variable indicated that there were significant main effects of gender for all of the police programs, except police recruiting. Table 8.3 shows that females evaluated the police programs as more important to them

Table 8.1

MANOVA Summary of Student Ratings of Police Programs by Program, Gender, and Grade

| Source of Variance | d£ | Multivariate E |
|--------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Program | 10, 1084 | 1.30 |
| Gender | 10, 1084 | 22.70** |
| Grade | 40, 4112 | 2.99** |
| Program X Gender | 10, 1084 | 1.37 |
| Program X Grade | 40, 4112 | 1.25 |
| Gender X Grade | 40, 4112 | 1.79* |
| Program X Gender X Grade | 40, 4112 | .74 |

Note. Multivariate E ratios are based on Wilks' Lambda.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 8.2

Summary of Significant Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Police

Programs by Program, Gender, and Grade

| Variable | MS | £ |
|-------------------------------|-------|----------|
| Gender (df = 1, 1093) | | |
| a. Neighborhood watch | 13.91 | 35.66** |
| b. Impaired driving(RIDE) | 14.80 | 40.31** |
| c. Block parent | 36.41 | 83.33** |
| d. School liaison | 13.66 | 37.17** |
| e. Violence against women | 62.81 | 182.38** |
| f. Police week | 7.71 | 18.99** |
| g. Mall week | 15.44 | 34.33** |
| i. Marine patrol | 6.00 | 13.99** |
| j. Handling complaints | 4.36 | 10.78** |
| Grade (df = 4, 1093) | | |
| a. Neighborhood watch | 2.67 | 6.81** |
| o. Impaired driving(RIDE) | 4.51 | 12.28** |
| n. Police recruiting | 2.35 | 6.33** |
| j. Handling complaints | 1.61 | 3.98* |
| Gender X Grade (df = 4, 1093) | | |
| a. Neighborhood watch | 2.02 | 5.19** |
| n. Police recruiting | 1.37 | 3.70* |

Note. Complete univariate results are reported in Appendix B.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 8.3

Mean Student Ratings of Police Programs by Program and Gender

| VIP students | | Non-VI | P students |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Male | Female | Male | Female |
| $(\underline{n} = 317)$ | $(\underline{n} = 273)$ | $(\underline{\mathbf{n}} = 281)$ | $(\underline{n} = 263)$ |

Question 6: While you may not have had direct experience with the following programs, please indicate how important you feel they are to you as a resident of Windsor.

| Variable | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| a. Neighborhood watch | 2.15 | 2.29 | 2.08 | 2.38 |
| b. Impaired driving(RIDE) | 2.40 | 2.60 | 2.38 | 2.64 |
| c. Block parent | 1.96 | 2.31 | 1.93 | 2.30 |
| d. School liaison | 1.85 | 2.03 | 1.79 | 2.06 |
| e. Violence against women | 2.30 | 2.77 | 2.26 | 2.73 |
| f. Police week | 1.66 | 1.82 | 1.60 | 1.79 |
| g. Mall patrol | 1.81 | 1.96 | 1.62 | 1.94 |
| h. Police recruiting | 2.08 | 2.06 | 1.97 | 2.13 |
| i. Marine patrol | 1.81 | 1.89 | 1.75 | 1.97 |
| j. Handling complaints | 2.25 | 2.37 | 2.29 | 2.39 |

Note. Scores ranged from 1 ("not important") to 3 ("very important"), where
2 = "important."

than did males.

The MANOVA also indicated a difference by grade of respondent with regard to the importance of police programs. Univariate tests for the DVs (Table 8.3) showed that there was a significant grade difference associated with 4 of the 10 programs: neighborhood watch, impaired driving (RIDE), police recruiting and handling complaints. The pattern of means suggests that grade 13 students rated neighborhood watch (M = 2.39) as more important than students in less senior grades (Grade 9: M = 2.16, 10: M = 2.20, 11: M = 2.08, 12: M = 2.30). Also, the impaired driving (RIDE) program was rated as more important by grade 13 students (M = 2.73) than students in less senior grades (Grades 9: M = 2.39, 10: M = 2.40, 11: M = 2.43, 2: M = 2.62). Moreover, Grade 13 students (M = 2.18) rated police recruiting as more important than students in Grades 9 through 12 (M = 2.01, M = 2.04, M = 1.95, and M = 2.14, respectively). The handling complaints program was rated marginally more important as grade level increased (Grades 9: M = 2.25, 10: M = 2.26, 11: M = 2.28, 12: M = 2.41 and 13: M = 2.45).

Though the grade main effect was significant, it must be interpreted in terms of the Gender X Grade interaction. The univariate analyses (Table 8.2) show that there were significant interaction effects for two police programs: neighborhood watch and police recruiting. An inspection of the means associated with this interaction indicated that Grade 9 males (M = 2.20) rated neighborhood watch as more important than Grade 9 females (M = 2.14). However, females rated the program more important in more senior grades (10: M = 2.30), 11: M = 2.21, 12: M = 2.57 and 13: M = 2.48) than males in comparative grades (Grades 10: M = 2.11, 11: M = 1.97, 12: M = 2.07 and 13: M = 2.27). The means reveal a similar Gender X Grade interaction for police recruiting. Males rated the police recruiting program more important in Grade 9 (M = 2.06) than

Grade 9 females (M = 1.95), whereas females considered the program more important in Grades 10 (M = 2.08), 11 (M = 2.11), 12 (M = 1.95) and 13 (M = 2.06) compared with males (Grades 10: M = 2.00, 11: M = 1.82, 12: M = 2.17 and 13: M = 2.15).

In sum, it appears that the interaction between gender and grade for police programs of neighborhood watch and police recruiting is attributable to gender rating differences. Specifically, males rated the two programs more important in Grade 9, whereas females rated them as more important in senior grades.

How safe do you feel in Windsor? (Daytime) (Question 9). A Program X Gender X Grade MANOVA was performed on respondent ratings of personal safety in eight areas of Windsor. The MANOVA results, summarized in Table 9.1, show a significant difference only for gender, F (8, 1093) = 3.975, p<.001. The MANOVA was followed by Program X Gender X Grade univariate analyses. Table 9.2 summarizes the findings on a univariate basis, and Table 9.3 shows the relevant mean scores by program and gender.

The MANOVA revealed that males and females differed in terms of feeling safe in specific areas of Windsor during daytime. The follow-up univariate analyses (Table 9.2) show that this difference was mainly related to feeling safe in city parks and downtown. Examination of mean differences (Table 9.3) reveals that females, relative to males, rated city parks and downtown during daytime as being less safe.

In sum, VIP and non-VIP student evaluations of daytime safety in the City were not significantly different. Thus, the belief that VIP experience would increase feelings of safety in various city areas during daytime was not supported.

MANOVA Summary of Student Ratings of Safety by Program, Gender, and Grade

(daytime) (Question 9)

| Source of Variance | đ£ | Multivariate E |
|--------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Program | 8, 1093 | .75 |
| Gender | 8, 1093 | 3.98** |
| Grade | 32, 4032 | 1.54 |
| Program X Gender | 8, 1093 | .46 |
| Program X Grade | 32, 4032 | .79 |
| Gender X Grade | 32, 4032 | 1.25 |
| Program X Gender X Grade | 32, 4032 | .94 |

 $\underline{\text{Note}}$. Multivariate $\underline{\mathbf{F}}$ ratios are based on Wilks' Lambda.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 9.2

Summary of Significant Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Safety

by Program, Gender, and Grade (daytime)

| Variable | MS | E |
|------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Gender (df = 1, 1100) | | |
| f. City parks h. Downtown | 1.40 2.04 | 13.06** 12.07** |

Note. Complete univariate results are reported in Appendix B.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 9.3

Mean Student Ratings of Safety by Program and Gender (daytime)

| VIP students | | Non-VI | P students |
|--------------|--------|--------|------------|
| Male | Female | Male | Female |

Question 9: How safe do you feel in Windsor? (daytime)

| Variable | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|
| a. Residence | 1.00 | .98 | .99 | .98 |
| b. Malls | .98 | .97 | .97 | .97 |
| c. School | .95 | .97 | .96 | .97 |
| d. Public buildings | .96 | .94 | .97 | .93 |
| e. While driving | .93 | .92 | .92 | .93 |
| f. City parks | .92 | .85 | .90 | .82 |
| g. Own neighborhood | .94 | .96 | .97 | .96 |
| h. Downtown | .82 | .73 | .82 | .74 |

Note. Scores ranged from 0 ("unsafe") to 1 ("safe").

How safe do you feel in Windsor? (nighttime) (Question 9). A Program X Gender X Grade MANOVA was performed on how safe respondents felt in various City areas at night. Table 10.1 indicates a significant main effect only for gender, F (8, 1076) = 18.53, p<.001, as well as a significant Gender X Grade interaction, F (32, 3969) = 2.01, p.<.001. The MANOVA was followed by Program X Gender X Grade univariate analyses; the results of these analyses are summarized in Table 10.2. Relevant means for program and gender are shown in Table 10.3.

The MANOVA indicated that males and females differed in regard to their views about safety at night in Windsor. The univariate analyses (Table 10.2) show that the difference in gender was significant for all Windsor areas. The group means in Table 10.3 indicate that males, relative to females, reported they felt safer at night in all eight locations.

The MANOVA indicated a significant gender by grade interaction. The univariate analyses show a significant effect in the area of city parks. An examination of Gender X Grade means revealed that females rated safety in city parks generally consistent across grade level (Grade 9: M = .26, Grade 10: M = .27, Grade 11: M = 22, Grade 12: .13, Grade 13: M = .26). Feelings of safety in parks were lower for males in Grade 9 than for males in more senior grades (Grade 9: M = .39, Grade 10: M = .52, Grade 11: M = .52, Grade 12: M = .63 and Grade 13: M = .59). The means also indicate that males rated city parks as more safe than did females.

In terms of VIP program effects on perceptions of safety, however, there was no evidence that prior program experience differentiated student attitudes regarding the safety of Windsor locations. Therefore, the results provided no support for the idea there is a relationship between VIP program experience and more positive attitudes toward safety.

Table 10.1

MANOVA Summary of Student Ratings of Safety by Program, Gender, and Grade

(nighttime) (Question 9)

| Source of Variance | đ£ | Multivariate E | |
|--------------------------|----------|-------------------|--|
| Program | 8, 1076 | 1.41 | |
| Gender | 8, 1076 | 18.53** | |
| Grade | 32, 3969 | 1.18 | |
| Program X Gender | 8, 1076 | 1.19 | |
| Program X Grade | 32, 3969 | 1.27 | |
| Gender X Grade | 32, 3969 | 2.01** | |
| Program X Gender X Grade | 32, 3969 | 1.33 | |

Note. Multivariate F ratios are based on Wilks' Lambda.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 10.2

Summary of Significant Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Safety

by Program, Gender, and Grade (nighttime)

| Variable | MS | £ | |
|-------------------------------|-------|----------|--|
| Gender (df = 1, 1083) | | | |
| a. Residence | .79 | 7.08* | |
| b. Malls | 2.61 | 15.15** | |
| c. School | .74 | 6.61* | |
| d. Public buildings | 8.29 | 52.68** | |
| e. While driving | 2.17 | 12.90** | |
| f. City parks | 24.98 | 118.73** | |
| g. Own neighborhood | 4.30 | 24.50** | |
| h. Downtown | 10.82 | 51.57** | |
| Gender X Grade (df = 4, 1083) | | | |
| f. City parks | 1.08 | 5.12** | |

Note. Complete univariate results are reported in Appendix B.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 10.3

Mean Student Ratings of Safety by Program and Gender (nighttime)

| VIP students | | Non-VIP students | |
|----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Male (n = 317) | Female (n = 273) | Male (n = 281) | Female (n = 263) |

Question 9: How safe do you feel in Windsor? (Nighttime)

| Variable | Mean | Mean | Mean | Me an |
|---------------------|------|------|------|--------------|
| a. Residence | .89 | .84 | .91 | .86 |
| b. Malls | .81 | .72 | .82 | .72 |
| c. School | .89 | .86 | .90 | .82 |
| d. Public buildings | .86 | .72 | .89 | .67 |
| e. While driving | .82 | .75 | .84 | .73 |
| f. City parks | .50 | .22 | .55 | .22 |
| g. Own neighborhood | .83 | .72 | .80 | .67 |
| n. Downtown | .39 | .25 | .48 | .21 |

Note. Scores ranged from 0 ("unsafe") to 1 ("safe").

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The major aim of this study was to explore the possible relationship between VIP program participation (Ministry of Education, 1984) and the attitudes of adolescents toward police. To facilitate an examination of this relationship, the results will be considered in terms of the effect of the VIP program on attitudes toward the police and, then, in terms of the influence of demographic variables (gender and grade) on attitudes toward police. Next, the results regarding program effects on students' views about police-relevant issues will be examined. Consideration will then be given to the implications of the study for the VIP program and for future research. However, prior to discussing the results, some limitations of the study are presented, and they should be borne in mind when interpreting the findings.

A main limitation relates to the heterogeneity of the VIP program implementation in various school jurisdictions. The data in this study were obtained from a sample of high school students from Windsor. The VIP officers in Windsor go to a particular school for about one hour each week to teach the program. Although province-wide information on the extent of police involvement in VIP programs is not available, it is likely that few programs in other municipalities entail as much police involvement as in Windsor. For example, in Peel County, which has a fully operational VIP program, officers provide no more than three visits to any school. Therefore, it is not clear if the present findings can be generalized to school jurisdictions where the police are less involved in the teaching process than in Windsor.

Furthermore, the study did not include a measure of the students' ethnic background so that generalizing to VIP adolescents in general is not possible. However, the sample does represent an advance in moving beyond the more usual

sample limited to elementary school children (Fine, 1991; Picard, 1984).

VIP Program and Attitudes Toward Police

The results contradict the position advanced by Hopkins et al. (1992) that adolescent attitudes toward police are not affected by experiences gained from police—school interventions. In response to the nine police characteristic/behavior items (question 12), VIP respondents were significantly more likely than non-VIP respondents to perceive the police as trustworthy, approachable, open minded and fair, as well as doing a lot of good and being respectful of teenagers.

The data from question 8 further showed that VIP respondents differed from non-VIP respondents in terms of their descriptions of officers with whom they had interacted within a two year period. Compared with non-VIP students, VIP students rated officers as exhibiting more fairness, honesty, clean appearance, concern for problems, effectiveness, and professionalism. This finding is particularly noteworthy because the items on this guestion assessed the way in which respondents perceived specific officers with whom they had recently interacted. The items on the other question (number 12) assessed the way in which respondents perceived Windsor police in general. Therefore, what the present results indicate is that VIP participation seems to positively influence the attitudes of adolescents both toward the police in general and specific officers with whom they come into contact. In other words, VIP adolescents may tend to view their environments as relatively consistent with respect to the indices of attitude toward police measured in this study, a finding which supports the efficacy of the Windsor VIP program in achieving one of its general goals -- enhancing students' respect for authority figures (e.g., police). Furthermore, it seems that this interpretation is plausible given the fact that the study's sample represents a variety of high schools,

including both separate (i.e., Roman Catholic) and secular.

Consistent with the positive evaluations of police characteristics was the sample's evaluation of how well the Windsor Police Service performs different services (question 3). The results indicated that VIP respondents evaluated police performance more positively than did non-VIP respondents with respect to three areas of service: calls for information, community relations, and handling complaints. These services seem to reflect on communications and police-community relations. Since VIP children have opportunities to form a relationship (and identify) with a police officer through face-to-face discussions, it is not surprising that services that reflect on interpersonal communication/relations are more positively evaluated by VIP than non-VIP adolescents. Supporting this line of reasoning is a study conducted Brooks and Friedrich (1970) in which communication with police was found to be one of the prime indices of positive attitudes toward the police.

The finding that the overall quality of police services was evaluated more positively by VIP than non-VIP students suggests that a cornerstone of VIP intervention in elementary schools is to instill a broader understanding in students of the legitimate services that the police provide. Furthermore, in conjunction with the other measures of attitudes toward police assessed in the present study (questions 12, 8, and 3), this finding supports the notion that students may identify with and internalize the behaviors and attributes their VIP officer models and then generalize these attributes to other police and perceive police as representatives of community morality. This notion is consistent with Bandura's (1977) thinking that the model whom a youth respects has a greater effect on the youth's subsequent behavior and attitudes than a model not respected. Also, it is somewhat supported by the available literature (Fine, 1991; Singer & Singer, 1984). For example, Fine (1991)

indicated that Grade 6 and 7 students reported officer visits were important in promoting a positive relationship between students and visiting officers that generalized to "police in general," in discussing the dangers of drugs, and in dealing with the law and the penalties for ignoring it. Moreover, Fine noted that the positive effects on students' views about these moral issues (i.e., respect police and the laws that reflect issues society views as important), which were attributed to the VIP officer's participation, increased when the officer visited students three times rather than once.

It was not possible in the present study to statistically determine the effect of increased VIP officer participation on students' attitudes toward police because of the lack of variability in police-student contact; for most of the school year Windsor's officers devote about an hour a week to teaching students VIP topics. However, some evidence is provided by the fact that the four measures of attitude toward the police used specific questions in direct reference to police characteristics or performance. Furthermore, the level of Windsor's police involvement in the program is consistent with both theoretical (Allport, 1954) and empirical (Fine, 1991) expectations in terms of the magnitude and direction of the relation that was found between VIP and non-VIP responses. In other words, theory and research suggests that there is a correlation between increased police-student contact and improved students' attitudes toward police in general. This link between police involvement in the VIP program and adolescents' responses is particularly noteworthy because the assessment instruments used by Fine (1991) included a sociomoral reasoning task that required students to respond to a dilemma pertaining to vandalism and a survey with specific questions in reference to the police. Her survey data showed that police visits increased students' positive attitudes toward the police. However, the vandalism dilemma data indicated that their

sociomoral reasoning level changed little after exposure to the VIP program for the topic area of authority figures. Fine interpreted this null effect as reflecting a general flaw in the dilemma measuring the VIP topic; however, a second possibility is that students' more positive evaluation of police may have reflected not so much respect for authority figures per se but rather the students' interactions with their VIP officer. This explanation is consistent with the literature that suggests direct personal contact may be effective in improving students' attitudes toward police (Derlega et al., 1979). However, the effect of extensive police involvement in police—school moral programs on students' attitudes toward other authority figures (e.g., teachers) remains a topic for further research.

The extensive involvement of police in Windsor's VIP program has an important implication for the program. The results strongly suggest that extensive police involvement in the VIP program may promote positive attitude change in students which is sustained throughout adolescence. In this regard, this study found that positive attitudes toward police related more strongly to prior VIP experience than Fine's (1991) study reported. Fine reported that Grade 6 students who received three police visits during the VIP program expressed significantly more positive images of police than VIP students who received no police visits; however, she found that there was a non-significant difference between the two groups one year after completing the program. What is indicated in the present study is that extensive police involvement in the VIP program may be a necessary condition for maintenance of students' positive attitude change.

Because the present results indicate that VIP adolescents reported more positive attitudes toward police than non-VIP adolescents, a need for police input to increase the long term benefit for students taught the VIP program

seems to have been correctly identified by the Ministry of Education (1984).

Further, these results provide support for the Ministry of Education's (1984)

contention that Grade 6 students are at an appropriate age to be taught the

VIP program. The results also are consistent with cognitive developmental

theory (Kohlberg, 1984) and research (Adelson, Green, & O'Neil, 1969; Glover,

1991), suggesting the ages between 10 and 14 are most appropriate for learning
and retaining prosocial attitudes, including positive views of the police.

In sum, the findings indicate that students' positive evaluation of the police increased significantly with VIP intervention and support the merit of extensive police involvement in Windsor's VIP program to promote participants' long term positive attitudes toward the police.

Influence of Gender and Grade on Attitudes Toward the Police

The finding that gender was significantly related to respondents' views of Windsor police as a whole (question 12), their descriptions of the officers with whom they had recently interacted (question 8), and their evaluations of the overall quality of service provided by Windsor's Police Service (question 15) further qualifies the data in terms of adolescents' attitudes toward the police. Grade level also was significantly related to students' description of officers with whom they had interacted, though less so than gender.

Essentially these results suggest that female respondents' evaluations of police tended to be more favorable than males. Female ratings of police characteristics (e.g., trustworthy, do not hassle people, and are not suspicious of everyone) were more positive than were male ratings. Also, female respondents described officers with whom they interacted in more positive terms than did males. In particular, responses indicated that females perceived officers with whom they interacted as being more fair, courteous, honest, concerned with problems, as well as clean in appearance,

knowledgable of their jobs, effective and professional. Similar gender differences in attitudes toward the police have been reported in other research (e.g., Murray & Thompson).

It must be stressed that the present study's sample is a composite of the views of mainstream adolescents rather than those who may have particular delinquency problems of a transient or more enduring nature. Nevertheless, a possible interpretation of the gender differences is that males compared with females may have had more frequent and less favorable encounters with police (e.g., Isherwood, Adam & Hornblower, 1982). Furthermore, the more frequent and less favorable contacts between adolescent males and the police to some extent could reflect the greater mileage exposure and greater representation of male drivers in the population (Statistics Canada, personal communication, 1996). In this regard, young males have a particularly high risk of accident, but the average risk for women is low (Statistics Canada, 1993). Therefore, it seems probable that contacts between adolescent males and the police are less favorable than those by adolescent females. Unfortunately, the necessary data were not available to evaluate this concern, and it remains a topic for further research.

One finding that has not been previously described is that females did not differ from males in terms of evaluating Windsor police in performing nine specific services (question 3). On the other hand, a gender difference was found regarding the overall quality of service that Windsor police provide (question 15). The construction of the measures may help account for this discrepancy. In other words, the empirical operationalization of police performance (question 3) may have failed to adequately capture services related to adolescent concerns (e.g., youth gangs). In this regard, it is interesting to note that Fine's (1991) survey data revealed that VIP topics

involving peers (e.g., peer pressure) were perceived as most important and relevant by her sample. By the same token, question 15 required respondents to make a global evaluation of the quality of service provided by Windsor's Police Service. Hence, it could be argued that respondents were more likely to include police services more relevant to adolescents when responding to the latter measure.

The present findings are inconsistent with research that examined the influence of age on attitudes toward the police. Murray and Thompson (1985) and Amoroso and Ware (1981) suggest that attitudes toward the police become progressively less positive during adolescence. By contrast, Rigby and Rump (1981) in their study of Australian adolescents ranging from 13 to 17 years found a positive linear trend for attitudes toward the police. The present results revealed the existence of an "age" difference with respect to only one of the indices of attitude toward police (question 8). A marginally negative description of officers with whom respondents interacted occurred for Grade 11 students in their evaluation of officers' courteousness, whereas officers' fairness was evaluated slightly more positively by students in Grade 9 through Grade 13 in a monotonic fashion.

Although there are several possible explanations for the finding that grade effects were minimal, the most obvious possibility is that students may have been influenced, without the benefit of participating in the VIP program, by communicating with their school mates who previously participated in the program. This indirect effect may have resulted in non-VIP students emulating their school mates' behavior and attitudes toward police. This interpretation is partially supported by the fact that respondents' attitudes toward police were generally positive. Similar findings regarding attitude change without direct contact have been reported (see Grant, 1990).

Inasmuch as both gender and grade may serve to discriminate adolescent attitudes toward the police, it should be recognized that one primary finding of the present study concerns the failure to obtain significant interactions involving program and both gender and grade for the indices of attitude toward the police (questions 12, 8, 3 and 15). This finding disallows any claim that either gender or grade (age) has a differential effect on VIP program impact on adolescents' views toward the police. That is, the finding that program effect is independent of gender and grade provides more evidence that supports the program's importance in promoting long term positive attitudes toward the police.

Additional Analyses

Some interesting findings resulted from of the additional analyses. Of particular relevance to this study is that the mean scores of VIP adolescents did not differ significantly from the mean scores of non-VIP adolescents in terms of their perceptions of (1) the seriousness of law and order problems, (2) the importance of existing police programs, and (3) their personal safety.

The overall mean score for the law and order issues (M = 2.04; where 2 denotes "serious") suggests that the sample considered these issues as serious problems. Regarding the importance of existing police programs, the sample's overall mean score (M = 2.16; where 2 specifies "important") suggests that they regarded police programs as important. Overall mean scores for personal safety in the daytime (M = 0.93; where 1 specifies "safe") and at nighttime (M = 0.72; where 1 denotes "safe") suggests that VIP and non-VIP respondents felt safe, particularly during the daytime.

What the present results indicate is that the attitudes of adolescents regarding these police-relevant issues are positive whether or not they have participated in Windsor's VIP program. However, this finding calls into

question the use of such measures of police-relevant issues. Why would VIP respondents have more positive attitudes toward police than did non-VIP respondents and yet have similar attitudes toward the police-relevant issues? The answer may lie in the fact that respondents failed to generalize their views of police to the police-relevant issues. The finding that evaluation of the police programs is similar for both the VIP and non-VIP respondents is somewhat puzzling based on the assumption that VIP adolescents would have an increased sense of civic responsibility and thus realize the need for such programs to educate and protect the public. Nevertheless, this study did find more generalization of attitudes (i.e., to police in general, officers with whom students interacted and police performance) than some literature would suggest (Hopkins et al., 1992). Therefore, failure to generalize students' attitudes of the police and their performance to the police-relevant issues (e.g., police programs) may simply reflect a limitation of generalization of attitude change based on direct contact (Wilder, 1984). Furthermore, the VIP program's focus is oriented toward helping students make moral decisions that are in line with those of society rather than change their perceptions about external conditions. Therefore, it may be argued that VIP participation may serve to improve students' attitudes toward police but not to change students' perceptions and concerns about law and order problems, police programs, and personal safety.

Another interesting finding is that gender was significantly related to the seriousness of law and order issues, the importance of police programs, and respondents' personal safety in various Windsor locations. Compared with males, females rated law and order problems as more serious, police programs as more important, and various Windsor locations as less safe, particularly at night. Specifically, females considered seven law and order issues (question

2) as serious problems: drugs, assaults, stealing from stores, vandalism, youth gangs, family disputes and traffic violations. A similar gender pattern emerged regarding attitudes toward the police programs (question 6). Female respondents considered nine police programs or issues more important than did males. The programs were: neighborhood watch, impaired driving (RIDE), block parent, police week, mall week, marine patrol, and school liaison; the issues were violence against women, and handling complaints. In addition, female respondents rated various areas in Windsor as being less safe than did males (question 9). Females rated just two city areas as less safe during daytime (parks and downtown Windsor); however, they rated all eight city areas as less safe at nighttime.

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) have indicated that society assigns different role demands and expectations to males and females, although there is more familial and peer pressure on males than females to conform to sex-stereotyped attributes. These authors reported that a positive correlation exists between the popularity of males and the expression of masculine characteristics (such attributes as aggressiveness, independence, dominance, impulsivity, defiance and competitiveness); for females, no such association between sex-stereotyped attributes and peer acceptance is evident. Therefore, high school males may be especially concerned about adopting sex-stereotyped attributes prescribed by society, particularly their peers. An implication of this is that females may be less negatively affected by societal influence, and subsequently be more sophisticated than are males in their ability to judge what is important about being a responsible member of society. Some support for the notion of female adolescents' greater sophistication of civic responsibility has been reported by Bovasso, Jacobs and Rettig (1991).

Another possible interpretation regarding the gender differences is that

males and females may perceive vulnerability to crime differently because mass media forums (e.g., television and newspapers) tend to place more emphasis on the potential danger that isolated and dark areas pose for females rather than males. This emphasis may lead to a more critical perspective on the part of females which in turn leads to a less favorable view of neighborhoods and a decrease in their feeling of safety. This emphasis also may promote a more positive view of police programs designed to protect people from crime (e.g., neighborhood watch). Some support for this interpretation is provided by the fact that female respondents were significantly more likely than males to rate law and order issues as more serious (e.g., assaults). Also, police programs were considered more important by female than male respondents. Although this explanation is purely conjectural it does point out the need for research in this area.

In summary, the findings suggest the salience of gender with regard to attitudes toward the police-relevant issues addressed in this study. However, it should be emphasized that VIP and non-VIP adolescents reported a similar pattern of mean response scores for the police-relevant issues.

Implications for the VIP program and Future Research

Having given a tentative but positive answer to the Derlega et al. (1979) question about the value of a police-school program on participants' long term attitudes toward the police, it would be profitable to consider this study's implications for the VIP program and to suggest some recommendations for future research.

As stated earlier, the focus of this study was on the long term effects of the VIP program regarding positive attitudes toward the police. Moreover, additional analyses were performed to further understand the long term effects of the program on adolescents' views about police-relevant issues (i.e., the

perceived seriousness of law and order issues, importance of police programs and feeling safe in Windsor locations). This study's focus on adolescents' attitudes toward the police was dictated by the data available from the Community Youth Needs and Concerns Survey (Horrobin, 1994) and based on the fact that a goal of the VIP program is to promote respect for societal authority and authority figures, including the police (Ministry of Education, 1984). Nevertheless, further research is needed to acquire a more complete picture of the benefits of Windsor's program. By the same token, research on juvenile delinquency may benefit from taking a salutogenic orientation and exploring the relationship between VIP experience and the incidence of juvenile delinquency.

However, despite criticisms of police-school programs by Hopkins et al. (1992), this evaluation suggests that such programs can significantly affect long term attitudes toward the police. Participation in the VIP program may improve adolescents' positive attitudes toward the police in general, improve their attitudes toward officers with whom they have recently interacted (inside or outside of school), and improve their views about the services that the police render. These findings, coupled with previous research results (Fine, 1991), suggest that there is a reliable relationship between prior VIP experience and adolescents' positive images of the police. Inasmuch as causality cannot be determined from the present data, theory would suggest that participation in a VIP program with a high degree of police involvement has a broad and pervasive influence on its participants' positive attitudes toward the police, and that adolescents who lack VIP experience and associated VIP officer contact are likely to have less positive images of the police.

The present study used a cross-sectional research design that permitted comparisons to be made based on a large existing data set. This data and the

type of research design that was used offered an effective analytic strategy to investigate and provide evidence in support of the hypothesis that high school students who have participated in the Windsor VIP program have more positive attitudes toward the police than high school students who have not participated in the program. However, if future work is to provide knowledge in terms of the factors that contribute to VIP program success, research may need to test an appropriate model using structural equation modeling.

The advantage of structural equation modeling is that several predictor variables (e.g., measures of school climate, socioeconomic status and academic status) may be incorporated into a theoretical model that is tested to detect whether the model adequately describes the pattern of relations with a given data set (i.e., variance-covariance input matrix) and to assess the overall fit of the model to the data.

Another consideration for future research is that though VIP experience was found to have a positive effect on the attitudes of adolescents toward the police, there is no empirical evidence to support the assumption that these findings apply as well to attitudes toward other authority figures. As noted, adolescents' attitudes about the police may have reflected not so much respect for authority per se but, rather, prior interactions with a VIP officer. This possibility is consistent with findings of police—school intervention studies that indicate direct personal police contact during class time may improve students' images of the police (e.g., Derlega et al., 1979). In addition, the positive attributes that the police are perceived to possess by adolescents are enhanced when the police wear their uniform (Singer & Singer, 1984). In other words, adolescents consider police wearing uniforms as being more confident and intelligent than when wearing civilian clothing. Rigby et al. (1987), using a survey to assess adolescents' attitudes toward disparate types

of authority (teachers and police), found that their attitudes toward these authority figures were similar. However, research that uses disparate types of authority (e.g., uniformed correctional guards, plain clothed police and uniformed police) is needed to test long term effects of the VIP program on attitudes toward authority figures other than uniformed police.

The results suggest another trend that may have specific implications for VIP program implementation and deserves further study. VIP and non-VIP mean response scores did not differ significantly for any of the additional analyses regarding police-relevant issues. However, the results indicated that female adolescents evaluated law and order issues as more serious, police programs more important and personal safety less positively than did males, particularly at night. These findings are consistent with the interpretation that sociocultural patterns and sex role stereotypes may facilitate increased awareness in females of what constitutes a good or safe neighborhood.

However, the present results are at variance with Derlega et al. (1979) report regarding gender. These researchers found that boys who participated in a police-school program showed significant improvement in their attitudes toward the police compared with their female peers. Furthermore, Fine (1991) reported no overall significant gender differences in her evaluation of the VIP program in Peel County. These findings are discrepant with this study's results and indicate that observed effects of participating in a police-school program may depend on the type of evaluation measure used.

A review of the relevant literature indicated that there appears to be a shortage of appropriate and reliable instruments that would enable researchers to conduct studies that explore or affirm the beneficial effects of taking part in a police-school program. Furthermore, there is a need for properly constructed and standardized police-program instruments if the findings

obtained by researchers for these programs are to be meaningfully interpreted and compared. This point is particularly important for the evaluation of the VIP program in various school jurisdictions. Whereas using different words for the same question may affect response rates (Schuman & Presser, 1992), the use of one research instrument that incorporates a multiple-criterion approach simply affirms that research data obtained from various school jurisdictions teaching the VIP program will be more meaningful in determining those factors that have a beneficial effect on the program.

It would be of interest to conduct a between schools analysis of the VIP program using Finlayson's (1970) school climate measures to explore whether different schools have a distinct "climate" that meaningfully affects the VIP program impact. For example, are "progressive" schools less inclined to view authority figures in a favorable light compared with more strict schools? Conclusion

Though the present results concerning perceived attitudes toward the police are in several respects congruent with the findings reported elsewhere (Brooks & Friedrich, 1970; Fine, 1991; Picard, 1984), they also extend the understanding of these perceptions by highlighting the fact that Windsor' VIP program has long term positive effects on high school adolescents' attitudes toward the police and the services that they render. In addition, the results suggest that the high degree of police involvement in Windsor's VIP program is a crucial factor in promoting positive attitudes toward police by adolescents with VIP experience. Furthermore, the results provide support for Kohlberg's (1984) notion that 10 to 14 years is the appropriate age to learn and retain moral attitudes. The results are also consistent with Bandura's (1977) idea that models who are respected (e.g., police) influence the behavior and attitudes of an observer (e.g., student) more than models not respected.

The results of the study support the contention that adolescents benefit from participating in the VIP program. Of particular interest is the apparent role that VIP officers play in improving adolescents' views of police and the services they render. Though there is little indication of the optimal level of police involvement required to maximize the observed beneficial effects of participating in Windsor's VIP program, the present findings, in conjunction with Fine's (1991) results, suggest that police are an essential component of the VIP program, at least in terms of improving the perceptions of adolescents toward police and their performance. These findings not only support the need for increased collaboration between the police and schools in implementing the VIP program but suggest that the VIP program should be taught as a separate unit from other school curricula. Additional research on the replicability of the present results across samples and over time within the same subjects is needed. Nevertheless, this research provides the most methodologically sophisticated and theoretically based evaluation of the VIP program so far available and is the only research that has evaluated the long term effects of the program on adolescents' attitudes toward police, police performance and police-relevant concerns.

References

- Adelson, J., Green, B., & O'Neil, R. (1969). Growth of the idea of law in adolescence. <u>Developmental Psychology</u>, 1, 327-332.
- Amir, Y., & Ben-Ari, R. (1985). International tourism, ethnic contact, and attitude change. <u>Journal of Social Issues</u>. <u>41</u>, 105-115.
- Amoroso, D.M., & Ware, E.E. (1981). Adolescents' perception and evaluation of police. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science Review, 13, 327-335.
- Amoroso, D.M., & Ware, E.E. (1983). Youth's perception of police as a function of attitudes towards parents, teachers and self. <u>Canadian Journal of Criminology</u>, 25, 191-199.
- Allport, G.W. (1954). The nature of prejudice. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bandura, A. (1977). <u>Social learning theory</u>. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bouma, D. (1969). <u>Kids and cops: A study in mutual hostility</u>. Grand Rapids, MI: Ferdmans.
- Bovasso, G., Jacobs, J., & Rettig, S. (1991). Changes in moral values over three decades, 1958-1988. <u>Youth and Society</u>, 22, 468-481.
- Brooks, W.D., & Friedrich, G.W. (1970). Police image: An exploratory study. Journal of Communications, 20, 370-374.
- Brown, R., & Wade, C. (1987). Superordinate goals and intergroup behaviour: The effect of role ambiguity and status on intergroup attitudes and task performance. <u>European Journal of Social Psychology</u>, 17, 131-142.
- Colby, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1987). The measurement of moral judgement (Vol. 1). Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, S.W. (1978). Interpersonal and attitudinal outcomes in cooperating interracial groups. <u>Journal of Research and Development in Education</u>, 12, 97-113.
- Cordner, G.W. (1986). Fear of crime and the police: An evaluation of a fear-reduction strategy. <u>Journal of Police Science and Administration</u>, <u>14</u>, 223-233.
- Curtis, C., Thurman, Q., & Nice, D.C. (1991). Improving legal compliance by noncoercive means: Coproducing order in Washington State. <u>Social</u> <u>Science Quarterly</u>, <u>72</u>, 645-660.
- Derlega, V.J., Heinen, J.R.K., & Eberhardt, N.K. (1979). Officer friendly: Changing children's attitudes about the police. <u>Journal of Community Psychology</u>, 7, 220-227.

- Downey, M., & Kelly, A.V. (1978). <u>Moral education: Theory and practice</u>. London: Harper & Row.
- Ellens, J.C. (1993). Cooperative policing. Law Now, Feb, 12-13.
- Fine, J. (1991). <u>Values, influences, and peers (VIP): Program review</u>. Ontario: The Peel Board of Education.
- Finlayson, D. (1970). <u>School Climate Index</u>. Administrative Manual. Windsor: NFER.
- Fraser, B.J., & Smith, D.L. (1980). Assessment of law-related attitudes. Social Education, 44, 406-409.
- Glover, R.J. (1991). Value selection in relation to grade in school and stage of moral reasoning. <u>Psychological Reports</u>, <u>68</u>, 931-937.
- Goldstein, H. (1987). Toward community oriented policing potential, basic requirements and threshold questions. Crime and Delinquency, 33, 6-30.
- Grant, P.R. (1990). Cognitive theories applied to intergroup conflict. In R.J. Fisher (Ed.), <u>The social psychology of intergroup and international conflict resolution</u>. New York: Springer & Verlag.
- Greene, J.R. (1989). Police officer job satisfaction and community perceptions: Implications for comunity-oriented policing. <u>Journal of Research in Crime and Delinguency</u>, 26, 168-183.
- Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. (1986). Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the 'contact hypothesis.' In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters (pp. 1-44). Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Hopkins, N. (1994). School pupils' perceptions of the police that visit schools: Not all police are "Pigs". <u>Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology</u>, 4, 189-207.
- Hopkins, N., Hewstone, M., & Hantzi, A. (1992). Police-schools liaison and young people's image of the police: An intervention evaluation.

 British Journal of Psychology, 83, 203-220.
- Horrobin, B. (1994). [Survey of Community Youth Needs and Concerns]. Unpublished raw data.
- Isherwood, J., Adam, K.S., & Hornblow, A.R. (1982). Life event stress, psychosocial factors, suicide attempt and auto-accident proclivity. <u>Journal ofPsychosomatic Research</u>, 20, 371-383.
- Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R. (1981). Effects of cooperative and individualistic learning experiences. <u>Journal of Educational Psychology</u>, <u>73</u>, 454-459.

- Johnson, D.W., Maruyama, G., Johnson, R., Nelson, D., & Skon, L. (1981).

 Effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures on achievement: A meta-analysis. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 89, 47-62.
- Joreskog, K.G., & Sorbom, D. (1989). <u>LISREL VII analysis of linear structural relationships by the method of maximum likelihood, instrumental variables, and least squares methods</u> (5th ed.). Moresville, IN: Scientific Software.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). The psychology of moral development. New York: Academic Press.
- Lerner, M. (1976). <u>Values in education</u>. Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Maccoby, E.E., & Jacklin, C.N. (1974). The psychology of sex differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Menter, I. (1988). The long arm of education: A review of recent documents on police/school liaison. <u>Critical Social Policy</u>, 7, 69-77.
- Miller, N.., Brewer, M.B., & Edwards, K. (1985). Cooperative interaction in desegregated settings: A laboratory analogue. <u>Journal of Social Issues</u>, 41, 63-79.
- Ministry of Education. (1984). <u>Project VIP values. influences and peers:</u>
 <u>Curriculum ideas for teachers</u>. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education and Training. (1993). The common curriculum, working document Grades 1-9. Ontario: Queens Printer for Ontario.
- Murphy, C. (1988). Community problems, problem communities, and community policing in Toronto. <u>Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency</u>, 25, 392-410.
- Murray, C., & Thompson, F. (1985). The representation of authority: An adolescent viewpoint. <u>Journal of Adolescence</u>, 8, 217-229.
- Owens, T.J. (1992). The effect of post-high school social context on self-esteem. The Sociological Quarterly, 33, 553-577.
- Pedhazur, E.J. (1982). <u>Multiple regression in behavioral research</u>. New York: Academic Press.
- Picard, R.L. (1984). The effects of justice education on the attitudes and knowledge of elementary school children regarding the justice system. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.
- Phillips, J.L. (1975). The origins of intellect: Piaget's theory. San Francisco: Freeman & Co.

- Rigby, K., & Rump, E.E. (1981). Attitudes towards parents and institutional authorities during adolescence. <u>Journal of Social Psychology</u>, 109, 109-118.
- Rigby, K., Schofield, P., & Slee, P.T. (1987). The similarity of attitudes towards personal and impersonal types of authority among adolescent schoolchildren. <u>Journal of Adolescence</u>, 10, 241-253.
- Schuman, H., & Presser, S. (1992). <u>Questions and answers in attitude surveys</u>. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Sears, D.O. (1983). The person-positivity bias. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>, <u>44</u>, 233-250.
- Singer, M.S., & Singer, A.E. (1984). The effect of police uniform on interpersonal perception. <u>The Journal of Psychology</u>, <u>119</u>, 157-161.
- Staub, E. (1979). <u>Positive social behavior and morality: Socialization and development</u>. New York: Academic Press.
- Statistics Canada. (1993). <u>Annual report on police reported crime</u>. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services, Canada.
- Watson, J. (1993). Community based policing. Law Now, Feb, 9-11.
- Wilder, D.A. (1984). Intergroup contact: The typical member and the exception to the rule. <u>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</u>, 20, 177-194.
- Windsor Police Service (1994, November). <u>Values influences and peers:</u>
 <u>Training program</u>. Symposium conducted at the meeting for training teachers and police officers the program, Windsor.

APPENDIX A

Community Youth Needs and Concerns Survey

WINDSOR POLICE SERVICE

SURVEY OF COMMUNITY YOUTH NEEDS AND CONCERNS

| 1. | How is | ong hav | re you fived i | in Wind | sor? | | | years | |
|----|--|---|--|---|--|------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| 2 | Hows | serious v | would you ra | ate the | followin | g problen | ns in Winds | ior? | |
| | | (check | *) | • | not se | rious | serious | . ∨€ | ery serious |
| 3. | | stealing theft for vandal family traffic v drug p youth assaut robber noise a other (| disputes violations problems gangs ts | nces | —————————————————————————————————————— | the Winds | or Police S | ervice in | - - - - - - |
| | | (checi | k) | | poor | adequate | good | е | xceilent |
| 4. | a) b) c) e) f) h) h) | traffic crime calls for common visible handli protection | g serious criterions prevention or information unity relation minority relation of propertion of propertion of propertion of presention of presenting present | n extions mplaint erty ence | | officers/c | | - | |
| | (circ | ie) | often | occa | sionally | ra | rely | never | |

| 5. | Having regato see more | ard for how police patr e of? | ol our city, wi | nich of the follow | ving would you like |
|----|---|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | (circle) | vehide patrols | bicycl | e patrols | |
| | | scooter patro | ols | foot patrois | |
| 6 | While you rindicate ho | nay not have had directly important you feel t | t experience hey are to yo | with the followin ou as a resident | g programs, please of Windsor. |
| | (check) | | not important | important | very important |
| 7. | b) Imp c) Bloc d) Sch e) Viol f) Poli g) Dev h) Poli i) Hai | ghbourhood Watch aired Driving (RIDE) ck Parent cool Liaison ence Against Women ice Week vonshire Mall Patrol ice Recruiting rine Patrol andling Public implaints e past 2 years, were year? | | with the Winds | |
| | • | rcie) | Yes | No | |
| 8. | if "YES", i the follow | now well did the Winds ving qualities? | sor Police Me | ember(s) with w | |
| | (c | heck) | not at all | somewhat | very much |
| | e) Know f) Conce g) Effect | esy Appearance ledge of the job mr for Your Problem | | | |

| 9. | How safe do you feel in V | Vindso | r? | | | |
|---------|--|---------|-------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| | | | DAYT | IME | NIGH | Т |
| | (check) | safe | | unsafe | safe | unsafe |
| | a) in your residence | | | | | |
| | b) in/around shopping ma | | _ | | | |
| | c) at school | _ | | | | |
| | d) in public buildings | | | | | _ |
| | e) while driving | | | | _ | |
| | f) in parks | | | - | | |
| | g) in your neighbourhood | | | | _ | |
| | h) downtown Windsor | | | | | |
| | i) other | | | | | |
| 4.6 | | | | | | |
| 10. | Do you feel the new cas presence: | sino w | ill incre | ease the nee | d for police | response and |
| | (check) | not at | all | somewhat | very much | |
| | a) downtown | | | _ | | |
| | b) rest of Windsor | | | | | |
| | c) bridge and tunnel | | | | _ | |
| 11. | How do you feel the new Windsor? | w casii | lliw on | impact crime | and policin | g workload in |
| (circ)(| e) decrease no cha | ange | slight | increase | big increase | |
| 12 | Please indicate how much | you a | gree o | disagree wit | h the followin | g statements. |
| | (check) | | agree | uncertain | disagree | |
| | a) The police are trustwork | | | _ | | |
| | b) The police are approac | hable | | | _ | |
| | c) The only time you see to police is when they are "hassling" someone | he | | | _ | |
| | d) The police are suspicion | us. | | | _ | |
| | of everyone | | | | | |
| | e) The police do a lot of g | 000 | | | _ | |
| | f) Police officers pick on teenagers who have been in trouble before | en e | | | | |
| | g) Police are open minded | | | _ | - | |
| | h) Police respect teenager | • | _ | _ | _ | |
| | i) Police officers are fair | 3 | | | | |
| | ी : जाल्य जाल्यात्र वाच ।वा। | | | | | |

| 13. | Are there characteristic in | anges nitiative | that you s you fe | would like el we shou | to see in | the services we o | currently provide |
|---------|---|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| | (circl | e) | YES | NO | | | |
| 14. | If "YES", pleato see. | ase list | or descr | ibe the cha | anges or p | articular initiative | s you would like |
| 15. | | | | Aboonsile | | | |
| 13. | Police Service | would ≽9? | you rate | me quality | or police | service provided | by the Windsor |
| | (circle) | poor | a | dequate | good | excellent | |
| DEMO | OGRAPHIC II | VFOR | MOTTAN | | | | |
| t. | Are you: | m | ale | f | emale | | |
| 2. | Please indica | ate you | rage | _ years | | | |
| 3. | Please indica | ate the | grade in grade _ | which you — | are pres | ently enroled. | |
| 4. | While attendi | ing ele /.l.P.) p | mentary program? | school, did | d you part | icipate in the Val | ues, influences, |
| | (circle |) | YES | NO | | | |
| 5. | Where do yo | u live : | within Wi | ndsor? | | | |
| (circle | e) west | east | south c | entral | downtov | VΠ | |
| | Thank you fo in developing Windsor. | r taking g bett | g the time er ways | to answe | r these qu e police s | estions. Your inperiors through | Out will assist us |
| | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX B

Complete Univariate Analyses Results

Key for Table 3: Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Police Characteristics\behaviors by Program, Gender, and Grade

12A = Trustworthy

12B = Approachable

12C = Only hassle*

12D = Suspicious of everyone*

12E = Do good work

12F = Pick on teens

12G = Open-minded

12H = Respect teens

12I = Are fair

Note. Scores ranged from 1 ("disagree") to 3 ("agree"), where 2 = "uncertain."

*Item was reverse scored so that high scores reflect positive attitudes.

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 3
Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Police Characteristics/behaviors by
Program, Gender, and Grade

| Variable | MS | E | |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|--|
| Program (df = 1, 1097) | | | |
| 12A | 28.96 | 65.69** | |
| L2B | 13.79 | 29.05** | |
| 12C | .16 | .28 | |
| L2D | .02 | .03 | |
| 12E | 8.59 | 21.20** | |
| L2F | .22 | .46 | |
| 12G | 14.69 | 33.00** | |
| L2H | 11.50 | 23.83** | |
| .2I | 23.41 | 49.89** | |
| Gender (df = 1, 1097) | | | |
| 12A | 6.27 | 14.23** | |
| L2B | .79 | 1.67 | |
| L2C | 17.18 | 29.39** | |
| L2D | 16.31 | 25.20** | |
| .2E | 3.69 | 9.11* | |
| .2F | 3.83 | 7.92* | |
| .2G | 1.28 | 2.89 | |
| .2Н | 5.11 | 10.58** | |
| .21 | 3.05 | 6.49 | |
| kade (df = 4, 1097) | | | |
| 12 A | 2.05 | 4.64** | |
| .2B | .65 | 1.37 | |
| L2C | .25 | .43 | |
| L2D | .06 | .10 | |
| .ZE | 1.42 | 3.49* | |
| .2F | .07 | .14 | |
| L2G | .44 | .99 | |
| .2H | .97 | 2.02 | |
| 21 | 1.24 | 2.65 | |
| rogram X Gender (df =) | L. 1097) | | |
| 1.2A | .02 | .05 | |
| .2B | .01 | .01 | |
| .2C | .95 | 1.63 | |
| | | | |

Table 3 (cont'd)

| Variable | MS | E | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|--------|--|
| 12E | 1.16 | 2.87 | |
| 12F | .11 | .24 | |
| 12G | .12 | .29 | |
| 12H | .13 | .27 | |
| 121 | .43 | .92 | |
| Program X Grade (df = | 4. 1097) | | |
| 12A | .97 | 2.20 | |
| 12B | .23 | .50 | |
| 12C | .78 | 1.34 | |
| 12D | .23 | .37 | |
| 12E | 1.79 | 4.42** | |
| 12F | .62 | 1.30 | |
| 12G | 1.04 | 2.34 | |
| 12H | 1.10 | 2.28 | |
| 121 | 1.15 | 2.46 | |
| Gender X Grade (df = 4 | , 1097) | | |
| 12 A | .11 | .27 | |
| 12B | .27 | .58 | |
| 12C | .75 | 1.29 | |
| 12D | .63 | .98 | |
| 12E | .38 | .95 | |
| 12F | .20 | .42 | |
| 12G | .41 | .94 | |
| 12H | .25 | .52 | |
| 121 | .80 | 1.70 | |
| Program X Gender X Grad | de (df = 4, 1097) | | |
| 12 A | .91 | 2.07 | |
| 12B | .26 | .56 | |
| 12C | .36 | .62 | |
| 12D | .58 | .90 | |
| 12E | .68 | 1.69 | |
| 12F | .39 | .81 | |
| 12G | .23 | .52 | |
| 12H | .21 | .45 | |
| 12I | .31 | .67 | |

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001.

Key for Table 4: Univariate Effects of Perceived Police Attributes by Program, Gender, and Grade: Students Who Reported Contact with the Police

8A = Fairness

8B = Courtesy

8C = Honesty

8D = Clean appearance

8E = Knowledge of Job

8F = Concern for problem

8G = Effectiveness

8H = Professionalism

Note. Scores ranged from 1 ("not at all") to 3 ("very much"),

where 2 = "somewhat."

Table 4

Univariate Effects of Perceived Police Attributes by Program, Gender, and

Grade: Students Who Reported Contact with the Police

| ## 4.37 | Variable | MS | £ |
|--|--------------------------|-------|---------|
| 8 3.51 6.19 C 6.31 13.54** D 3.08 10.25** E | Program (df = 1, 714) | | |
| C | BA | 4.37 | 8.40* |
| 3.08 10.25** 3.08 10.25** 4.40 .99 8.10 12.76** 4.49 8.31* 5.55 10.58** ender (df = 1, 714) 3.08 10.25** 4.49 8.31* 5.55 10.58** ender (df = 1, 714) 3.08 10.276** 4.49 8.31* 5.55 10.58** ender (df = 1, 714) 3.08 10.276** 4.49 8.31* 4.49 8.31* 4.55 53.40** 4.63 9.25 53.40** 6.39 21.24** 6.39 21.24** 6.39 21.24** 7.65 14.17** 7.75 14.77** ende (df = 4, 714) 3.10 1.67 5.62** 9.61 4.24* 1.13 2.43 1.67 5.62** 9.61 4.24* 1.13 2.43 1.56 1.85 1.67 1.67 1.57 89 1.20 2.23 1.58 3.00 orgram X Gender (df = 1, 714) 3.35 6.7 1.51 90 1.75 1.62 1.64 1.75 1.62 1.76 1.67 1.77 1.62 1.78 1.79 1.01 1.87 | 3B | | 6.19 |
| E | 3C | | |
| 8.10 | | | |
| ## 1.0.14 | | | |
| 10.14 19.51** 20.30.25 53.40** 21.24** 21.26 27.96** 21.27** 21.26 27.96** 21.24** 21.27** 22.62** 23.26** 24.17** 24.17** 25.26** 26.26** 27.75 14.77** 28.26** 29.61 4.24* 29.62 4.24* 29.61 4.24* 29.61 4.24* 29.61 4.24* 29.61 4.24* 29.62 4.24* 29.61 4.24 | | | |
| 10.14 19.51** 3 30.25 53.40** 11.89 25.51** 6.39 21.24** 7.65 14.17** 7.75 14.77** 11.67 5.62** 9.61 4.24* 1.13 2.43 5.6 1.85 6.7 1.67 5.7 89 1.20 2.23 1.58 3.00 OGram X Gender (df = 1, 714) 3 5.62 3 5.4 1.80 2 6.7 1.62 5 7.5 1.62 5 1.14 1.79 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | | | |
| 10.14 19.51** 30.25 53.40** 11.89 25.51** 6.39 21.24** 11.26 27.96** 14.37 22.62** 7.65 14.17** 7.75 14.77** 11.67 5.62** 1.13 2.43 1.56 1.85 1.67 1.67 1.57 .89 1.20 2.23 1.58 3.00 Ogram X Gender (df = 1, 714) 35 .67 .51 .90 .75 1.62 .54 1.80 .28 .70 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | n | 5.55 | 10.58** |
| 30.25 | ender (df = 1, 714) | | |
| 30.25 | A | 10.14 | 19.51** |
| 11.89 | B | | |
| 6.39 21.24** 27.96** 21.262** 21.437 22.62** 27.65 14.17** 27.65 14.17** 27.75 14.77** 28. 9.61 4.24* 29.61 4.24* 29.61 4.24* 29.61 1.85 29.67 1.67 29.67 1.67 29.75 89 20.223 20.23 20.20 20.23 20.2 | C | | |
| 11.26 27.96** 14.37 22.62** 7.65 14.17** 7.75 14.77** rade (df = 4, 714) 11.67 5.62** 9.61 4.24* 1.13 2.43 1.56 1.85 1.67 1.67 .57 .89 1.20 2.23 1.58 3.00 cogram X Gender (df = 1, 714) 3.35 .67 .51 .90 .75 .162 .54 1.80 .28 .70 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | D | 6.39 | |
| 14.37 22.62** 7.65 14.17** 14.77** rade (df = 4, 714) 11.67 5.62** 9.61 4.24* 1.13 2.43 5.6 1.85 6.7 1.67 5.7 .89 1.20 2.23 1.58 3.00 cogram X Gender (df = 1, 714) 35 .67 51 .90 62 .75 1.62 54 1.80 63 .70 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | E | 11.26 | |
| 7.65 7.75 14.17** tade (df = 4, 714) 11.67 9.61 4.24* 1.13 2.43 5.62 1.67 1.67 5.7 89 1.20 1.20 2.23 1.58 3.00 cogram X Gender (df = 1, 714) 35 35 30 35 30 36 37 37 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 | F | 14.37 | |
| 7.75 14.77** rade (df = 4, 714) 11.67 5.62** 9.61 4.24* 1.13 2.43 1.56 1.85 1.67 1.67 5.77 .89 1.20 2.23 1.58 3.00 ogram X Gender (df = 1, 714) 35 .67 51 .90 75 1.62 1.80 28 .70 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | G | 7.65 | |
| 11.67 5.62** 9.61 4.24* 1.13 2.43 .56 1.85 .67 1.67 .57 .89 1.20 2.23 1.58 3.00 cogram X Gender (df = 1, 714) 35 .67 .51 .90 .75 1.62 .54 1.80 .28 .70 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | ł | 7.75 | |
| 9.61 4.24* 1.13 2.43 1.56 1.85 1.67 1.67 1.57 .89 1.20 2.23 1.58 3.00 Orgram X Gender (df = 1, 714) 3.35 .67 .51 .90 .75 1.62 .54 1.80 .28 .70 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | cade (df = 4, 714) | | |
| 9.61 | A | 11.67 | 5 62** |
| 1.13 2.43 .56 1.85 .67 1.67 .57 .89 1.20 2.23 1.58 3.00 cogram X Gender (df = 1, 714) 35 .67 .51 .90 .75 1.62 .54 1.80 .28 .70 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | В | | |
| .56 1.85 .67 1.67 .57 .89 1.20 2.23 1.58 3.00 cogram X Gender (df = 1, 714) 35 .67 .51 .90 .75 1.62 .54 1.80 .28 .70 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | C | | |
| .67 .57 .89 1.20 .223 1.58 .00 Ogram X Gender (df = 1, 714) .35 .67 .51 .90 .75 .1.62 .54 .1.80 .28 .70 1.14 .1.79 1.01 .87 | D | | |
| .57 .89 1.20 2.23 1.58 3.00 Ogram X Gender (df = 1, 714) .35 .67 .51 .90 .75 1.62 .54 1.80 .28 .70 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | 3 | | |
| 1.20 2.23 1.58 3.00 Ogram X Gender (df = 1, 714) .35 .67 .51 .90 .75 1.62 .54 1.80 .28 .70 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | र | | |
| 1.58 3.00 ogram X Gender (df = 1, 714) 3.00 3 | 3 | | |
| .35 .67 .51 .90 .75 .1.62 .54 .1.80 .28 .70 1.14 .1.79 1.01 1.87 | i | | |
| .51 .90 .75 .1.62 .54 .1.80 .28 .70 1.14 .1.79 1.01 1.87 | cogram X Gender (df = 1, | 714) | |
| .51 .90 .75 1.62 .54 1.80 .28 .70 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | A | ્રક | 67 |
| .75 1.62 .54 1.80 .28 .70 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | B | | |
| 1.02 1.80 .28 .70 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | | 75 | |
| .28 .70 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | | | |
| 1.14 1.79 1.01 1.87 | - 3 | | |
| 1.01 1.87 | F | | |
| 1.07 | 3 | 1.01 | |
| | I | .37 | .71 |

Table 4 (cont'd)

| Variable | MS | E |
|--------------------------|---------------|--------|
| Program X Grade (df = 4, | 714) | |
| 8 A | 2.40 | 4.61** |
| 8B | .58 | 1.02 |
| 8C | .63 | 1.34 |
| 8D | .08 | . 26 |
| 8E | .82 | 2.03 |
| 8F | 1.06 | 1.67 |
| 8G | .98 | 1.82 |
| 8Н | .83 | 1.58 |
| Gender X Grade (df = 4, | 714) | |
| 8A | .13 | .25 |
| 8B | .14 | .25 |
| 8C | .27 | .59 |
| 8D | .03 | .10 |
| 8E | .72 | 1.78 |
| 8F | .76 | 1.19 |
| 8G | .08 | .14 |
| 8H | .77 | 1.46 |
| Program X Gender X Grade | (df = 4, 714) | |
| 8A | .50 | .96 |
| 8B | 1.11 | 1.97 |
| 8C | .13 | .29 |
| 8D | .10 | .33 |
| 8E | .81 | 2.01 |
| 8F | .51 | .81 |
| 8G | .95 | 1.76 |
| 8H | .13 | . 25 |

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Key for Table 5: Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Police

Performance of Services by Program, Gender, and Grade

3A = Solving crimes

3B = Traffic enforcement

3C = Crime prevention

3D = Calls for information

3E = Community relations

3F = Minority relations

3G = Handling complaints

3H = Protection of property

3I = Visible presence

Note. Scores ranged from 1 ("poor") to 4 ("excellent"),

where 2 = "adequate" and 3 = "good."

Table 5
Univariate Effects of Student Attitudes of Police Performance of Services
as a Function of VIP, Gender, and Grade

| Variable | MS | E | |
|------------------------|----------|---------|--|
| Program (df = 1, 1098) | | | |
| 3A | .51 | .87 | |
| 3B | .01 | .01 | |
| 3C | 2.14 | 3.18 | |
| 3D | 5.51 | 7.40* | |
| 3E | 5.77 | 7.43* | |
| 3F | 3.88 | 5.73 | |
| 3G | 15.23 | 17.96** | |
| 3H | 2.63 | 3.41 | |
| 31 | .24 | .27 | |
| Gender (df = 1, 1098) | | | |
| 3A | 3.56 | 6.10 | |
| 3B | .65 | .85 | |
| 3C | .12 | .17 | |
| 3D | 2.47 | 3.31 | |
| 3 E | 1.93 | 2.48 | |
| 3F | 1.76 | 2.60 | |
| 3G | 2.08 | 2.45 | |
| 3H | 10.37 | 13.41** | |
| BI | 4.44 | .91 | |
| Grade (df = 4, 1098) | | | |
| 3 A | 2.23 | 3.81* | |
| 3B | 2.25 | 2.95 | |
| 3C | .75 | 1.11 | |
| 3D | 1.18 | 1.58 | |
| 3E | .71 | .91 | |
| 3F | .19 | .29 | |
| 3G | .59 | .70 | |
| 3H | . 46 | .59 | |
| 31 | 2.55 | 2.83 | |
| Program X Gender (df = | 1, 1098) | | |
| 3 A | .11 | .19 | |
| 3B | .05 | .07 | |
| 3C | .91 | 1.35 | |
| 3D | 7.40 | 9.93* | |

| Variable | MS | E | |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|--|
| 3E | .16 | 20 | |
| 3F | 2. 4 8 | .20 3.66 | |
| 3G | 1.48 | 1.75 | |
| 3H | .33 | .42 | |
| 31 | 3.72 | 4.11 | |
| Program X Grade (df = | 4, 1098) | | |
| 3A | .33 | .56 | |
| 3B | .81 | 1.07 | |
| 3C | .35 | .52 | |
| 3D 3E | .59 | .79 | |
| 3F | .37 | .48 | |
| 3G | .64 | .94 | |
| 3H | 1.66 .87 | 1.96 | |
| 31 | 1.30 | 1.13 1.44 | |
| Gender X Grade (df = 4 | , 1098) | | |
| 3A | .87 | 1.49 | |
| 3B | .19 | .25 | |
| 3C | 1.29 | 1.92 | |
| 3D | 1.06 | 1.42 | |
| 3E | .44 | .57 | |
| 3F | .20 | .30 | |
| 3G | .52 | .62 | |
| 3H 3I | 1.92 .38 | 2.48 .42 | |
| Program X Gender X Gra | | .72 | |
| 3A | .21 | 26 | |
| 3B | .21 | .36 .32 | |
| 3C | .06 | .09 | |
| 3D | .85 | 1.13 | |
| 3E | .60 | .78 | |
| 3 F | .32 | .47 | |
| 3G | .89 | 1.05 | |
| 3H | .54 | .70 | |
| 31 | 1.28 | 1.41 | |

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Key for Table 7: Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Community Problems

by Program, Gender, and Grade

2A = Stealing from homes

2B = Stealing from store

2C = Stealing from cars

2D = Vandalism

2E = Family disputes

2F = Traffic violations

2G = Drug problems

2H = Youth gangs

2I = Assaults

2J = Robbery

2k = Noise and disturbance

Note. Scores ranged from 1 ("not serious") to 3 ("very serious"),

where 2 = "serious."

Table 7
Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Community Problems by Program,
Gender, and Grade

| Variable | MS | E |
|------------------------|-------|----------|
| Program (df = 1, 1101) | | |
| 2A | 1.13 | 2.50 |
| 2B | .48 | 1.12 |
| 2C | .00 | .00 |
| 2D | .11 | .21 |
| 2E | .23 | .45 |
| 2 F | .04 | .07 |
| 2G | 1.03 | 2.23 |
| 2H | .00 | .01 |
| 21 | .00 | .01 |
| 2 J | .02 | .07 |
| 2K | .92 | 2.12 |
| Gender (df = 1, 1101) | | |
| 2A | .01 | .02 |
| 2B | 12.04 | 28.28** |
| 2C | .00 | .00 |
| 2D | 10.84 | 21.84** |
| 2E | 24.94 | 49.61** |
| 2F | 3.46 | 6.60* |
| 2G | 14.76 | 31.94** |
| 2H | 12.41 | 20.02** |
| 21 | 18.91 | 40.02** |
| 2 J | 2.14 | 5.03 |
| 2K | .10 | .24 |
| Grade (df = 4, 1101) | | |
| 2A | .13 | .29 |
| 2B | .68 | 1.59 |
| 2C | .24 | .48 |
| 2D | 1.01 | 2.02 |
| 2E | .26 | .53 |
| 2F | 1.51 | 2.89 |
| 2G | .30 | .65 |
| 2H | 1.30 | 2.10 |
| 21 | .29 | .62 |
| 2 J | .56 | 1.32 |
| 2K | .54 | 1.25 |

Table 7 (cont'd)

| Variable | MS | E |
|--------------------------|----------------|-------|
| Program X Gender (df = 1 | ., 1101) | |
| 2 A | .10 | .22 |
| 2B | .22 | .53 |
| 2C | 2.10 | 4.18 |
| 2D | .04 | .09 |
| 2E | .15 | .30 |
| 2F | 4.02 | 7.67* |
| 2G | .51 | 1.11 |
| H | 1.65 | 2.67 |
| 21 | .44 | .94 |
| IJ | 1.27 | 2.99 |
| K | 1.56 | 3.60 |
| rogram X Grade (df = 4, | 1101) | |
| ŽA | .35 | .78 |
| 2B | .87 | 2.05 |
| C | .31 | .62 |
| D | .50 | 1.01 |
| E | .29 | .59 |
| F | .29 | .56 |
| 3 | .80 | 1.73 |
| Н | .44 | .72 |
| I | .44 | .94 |
| J | .67 | 1.59 |
| | .12 | .27 |
| ender X Grade (df = 4. | 1101) | |
| PA . | .53 | 1.18 |
| B | .96 | 2.27 |
| C | .08 | .17 |
| | .77 | 1.55 |
| E | .98 | 1.94 |
| F | 1.15 | 2.19 |
| G | .50 | 1.09 |
| Н | 1.55 | 2.50 |
| I | .39 | .83 |
| J | .73 | 1.73 |
| C | .36 | .83 |
| rogram X Gender X Grade | (df = 4, 1101) | |
| 2 A | .09 | .21 |
| 2B | .09 | .21 |
| C | .65 | 1.30 |

Table 7 (cont'd)

| Variable | MS | E |
|------------|------|------|
| ? D | .41 | .84 |
| E | .18 | .36 |
| F | .34 | .65 |
| G | .24 | .53 |
| Н | 1.03 | 1.66 |
| I | .36 | .77 |
| J | .10 | .24 |
| K | .63 | 1.46 |

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Key for Table 8: Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Police

Programs by Program, Gender, and Grade

6A = Neighborhood watch

6B = Impaired driving(RIDE)

6C = Block parent

6D = School liaison

6E = Violence against women

6F = Police week

6G = Mall week

6H = Police recruiting

6I = Marine patrol

6J = Handling complaints

Note. Scores ranged from 1 ("not important") to 3 ("very important"),
where 2 = "important."

Table 8

Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Police Programs by Program, Gender, and Grade

| ariable | MS | E |
|----------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| rogram (df =1, 1093) | | |
| A | .05 | .13 |
| В | .11 | .31 |
| C | .05 | .12 |
| D | .04 | .13 |
| | .21 | .62 |
| | .50 | 1.24 |
| • | 3.08 | 6.86* |
| | .07 | .21 |
| | .11 | .25 |
| | .31 | .77 |
| nder (df = 1, 1093) | | |
| | 13.91 | 35.66** |
| | 14.80 | 40.31** |
| | 36.41 | 83.33** |
| | 13.66 | 37.17** |
| | 62.81 | 182.38** |
| | 7.71 | 18.99** |
| | 15.44 | 34.33** |
| | 1.05 | 2.83 |
| | 6.00 | 13.99** |
| | 4.36 | 10.78** |
| de (df = 4, 1093) | | |
| | 2.67 | 6.81** |
| | 4.51 | 12.28** |
| | 1.13 | 2.59 |
| | .67 | 1.81 |
| | .57 | 1.65 |
| | 1.20 | 2.95 |
| | 1.00 | 2.33 |
| | 2.35 | 2.23 6.33** |
| | 1.22 | 2.85 |
| | 1.61 | 2.65 3.98* |
| gram X Gender (df = 1, 109 | <u>3)</u> | |
| | 1.66 | 4 05 |
| | | 4.27 |
| | .30 | .81 |

Table 8 (cont'd)

| ariable | MS | E |
|-----------------------|------------------|--------|
| c | .05 | .13 |
| D | .83 | 2.27 |
| - E | .00 | .00 |
| P | .04 | .11 |
| 3 | 1.96 | 4.36 |
| ł | 2.10 | 5.66 |
| | 1.33 | 3.10 |
| | .00 | .01 |
| ogram X Grade (df = 4 | , 1093) | |
| | .36 | .93 |
| l e | .55 | 1.49 |
| | 1.09 | 2.49 |
| | .76 | 2.07 |
| | .62 | 1.79 |
| | .68 | 1.66 |
| | .47 | 1.04 |
| | .85 | 2.29 |
| | .19 | .43 |
| | . 29 | .59 |
| nder X Grade (df = 4, | 1093) | |
| | 2.02 | 5.19** |
| | .16 | .44 |
| | .09 | .21 |
| | .83 | 2.25 |
| | .25 | .73 |
| | .72 | 1.77 |
| | .75 | 1.66 |
| | 1.37 | 3.70* |
| | .61 | 1.42 |
| | .51 | 1.25 |
| ogram X Gender X Grad | = (df = 4, 1093) | |
| | .21 | .55 |
| 1 | .22 | .60 |
| | .17 | .39 |
| | .09 | .23 |
| | .27 | .78 |
| | .30 | .74 |
| | .21 | .47 |

Table 8 (cont'd)

| Variable | MS | E |
|------------|-----|------|
| 6Н | .09 | .25 |
| 6H 6I | .44 | 1.02 |
| 6 J | .58 | 1.42 |

^{*}p<,.01; **p<.001

Key for Table 9: Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Safety by Program, Gender, and Grade (daytime)

9A ≈ Residence

9B = Malls

9C = School

9D = Public buildings

9E = While driving

9F = City parks

9G = Own neighborhood

9H = Downtown

Note. Scores ranged from 0 ("unsafe") to 1 ("safe").

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 9
Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Safety by Program, Gender, and Grade
(daytime)

| Variable | MS | E |
|-------------------------|------------|---------|
| Program (df = 1, 1100) | | |
|)A | .02 | 1.35 |
| B | .01 | .32 |
| C | .00 | .06 |
| D | .00 | .07 |
| E F | .00 | .00 |
| r G | .11 .04 | 1.05 |
| H | .00 | 1.16 |
| | .00 | .00 |
| ender (df = 1, 1100) | | |
|)A | .04 | 2.95 |
| В | .00 | .09 |
| C | .06 | 2.07 |
| <u>D</u> | .15 | 3.31 |
| E | .00 | .06 |
| F | 1.40 | 13.06** |
| G H | .00 | .00 |
| | 2.04 | 12.07** |
| rade (df = 4, 1100) | | |
| A | .02 | 1.47 |
| В | .05 | 1.95 |
| C | .04 | 1.31 |
| | .10 | 2.37 |
| E | .11 | 1.60 |
| 7 | .14 | 1.33 |
| 3 | .10 | 2.51 |
| | .18 | 1.08 |
| ogram X Gender (df = | 1. 1100) | |
| A | .01 | .19 |
| В | .01 | .24 |
| C | .01 | .04 |
| D | .01 | .24 |
| E | .02 | .31 |
| ? - | .01 | .02 |
| 3 | .05 | 1.42 |

Table 9 (cont'd)

| Variable | MS | E |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------|
| Н | .01 | .06 |
| rogram X Grade (df = 4,] | 1100) | |
| 9A | .01 | .67 |
| B | .00 | .11 |
| OC . | .01 | .46 |
| 9D | .03 | .70 |
| E | .12 | 1.67 |
| F | .13 | 1.20 |
| G | .03 | .58 |
| f | .26 | 1.56 |
| ender X Grade (df = 4, 11 | .00) | |
| A | .02 | 1.68 |
| В | .03 | .98 |
| | .05 | 1.35 |
|) | .02 | .37 |
| E | .02 | .34 |
| י | .42 | 3.91* |
| 3 | .04 | 1.11 |
| | .27 | 1.57 |
| cogram X Gender X Grade (| df = 4, 1100) | |
| A | .02 | 1.42 |
| В | .02 | .67 |
| | .05 | 1.41 |
| | .02 | .43 |
| | .04 | .60 |
| | .08 | .75 |
| | .00 | _ /:1 |
| e 3 1 | .05 | 1.24 |

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Key for Table 10: Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Safety by

Program, Gender, and Grade (nighttime)

9A = Residence

9B = Malls

9C = School

9D = Public buildings

9E = While driving

9F = City parks

9G = Own neighborhood

9H = Downtown

Note. Scores ranged from 0 ("unsafe") to 1 ("safe").

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

Table 10

Univariate Effects of Student Ratings of Safety by Program, Gender, and

Grade (nighttime)

| Program (df = 1, 1083) 9A | | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------|----------|--|
| 9A | Variable | MS | E | |
| 9B | Program (df = 1, 1083) | | | |
| 9C .02 .25 9D .09 .57 9E .02 .14 9F .06 .77 9G .58 .3.32 9H .24 .1.17 Gender (df = 1, 1083) 9A .79 .7.08* 9B .2.61 .15.15** 9B .2.61 .15.15** 9B .2.61 .74 .6.61* 9B .2.9 .52.68** 9B .2.17 .12.90** 9B .24.98 .118.73** 9B .24.98 .118.73** 9B .10.82 .51.57** Stade (df = 4, 1083) 9A .35 .3.15 9B .17 .99 9B .18 .19 .19 9B .19 .22 .19 9B .19 .176 9B .19 .19 .19 .19 .176 9B .19 .19 .19 .19 .19 .176 9B .19 .19 .19 .19 .19 .19 .19 .19 .19 .19 | 9 A | .12 | 1.10 | |
| 9D | | | .02 | |
| 9E | | | .25 | |
| 9F | | | .57 | |
| Second S | | | .14 | |
| ## .24 1.17 Sender (df = 1, 1083) | | | | |
| Gender (df = 1, 1083) Samples | | | | |
| 7.08* 2.61 2.61 3.15.15** 3.10 3.29 3.268** 3.17 3.29** 3.18 3.19 3.10 3.24.50** 3.15 3.15 3.15 3.15 3.15 3.15 3.15 3.15 | Ж | .24 | 1.17 | |
| 2.61 | Gender (df = 1, 1083) | | | |
| 2.61 | | | 7.08* | |
| 8.29 52.68** 8.29 52.68** 2.17 12.90** 118.73** 3.66 4.30 24.50** 3.15 10.82 51.57** Scade (df = 4, 1083) 3.15 99 3.15 99 3.17 99 3.18 1.89 3.18 1.95 3.18 1.05 3.18 1.05 3.19 4.47 3.00 5.57 6.09 .47 3.00 6.09 .57 6.09 .57 6.14 .69 6.00 .00 6.00 | | 2.61 | | |
| DE 2.17 12.90** DF 24.98 118.73** DG 4.30 24.50** DH 10.82 51.57** Crade (df = 4, 1083) DA .35 3.15 DB .17 .99 DC .21 1.89 DD .13 .88 DE .09 .55 DF .22 1.07 DG .18 1.05 DH .45 2.14 COCTAIN X Gender (df = 1, 1083) DA .35 3.15 PF .09 .55 F .22 1.07 DF .18 1.05 DF .45 2.14 COCTAIN X Gender (df = 1, 1083) DA .30 .00 DF .47 3.00 DF .57 DF .14 .69 DF .14 .69 DF .13 .69 DF .14 .69 DF .14 .69 DF .13 .69 DF .13 .69 DF .14 .69 DF .13 .69 DF .14 .69 DF .13 .69 | | .74 | 6.61* | |
| 24.98 118.73** G 4.30 24.50** H 10.82 51.57** Exade (df = 4, 1083) A .35 3.15 B .17 .99 C .21 1.89 D .13 .88 E .09 .55 F .22 1.07 G .18 1.05 H .45 2.14 **rogram X Gender (df = 1, 1083) A .00 .00 C .19 1.76 D .47 3.00 E .09 .57 F .14 .69 G .02 .13 | | | | |
| A | | 2.17 | 12.90** | |
| The stade (df = 4, 1083) The stade (df = 4, | | | 118.73** | |
| A | | | 24.50** | |
| A .35 3.15 B .17 .99 C .21 1.89 D .13 .88 E .09 .55 F .22 1.07 G .18 1.05 H .45 2.14 **rogram X Gender (df = 1, 1083)* A .00 .00 C .19 1.76 D .47 3.00 E .09 .57 F .14 .69 G .02 .13 | Н | 10.82 | | |
| 17 .99 .99 .90 .13 .88 .99 .55 .96 .22 .99 .55 .96 .18 .99 .96 .96 .45 .96 .96 .96 .96 .96 .96 .96 .96 .96 .96 .96 .96 .96 .96 .97 | rade (df = 4, 1083) | | | |
| 17 | 9A | .35 | 3.15 | |
| C | | .17 | | |
| E .09 .55 F .22 1.07 G .18 1.05 H .45 2.14 rogram X Gender (df = 1, 1083) A .00 .00 B .00 .00 C .19 1.76 D .47 3.00 E .09 .57 F .14 .69 G .02 .13 | | .21 | | |
| E .09 .55 F .22 1.07 G .18 1.05 H .45 2.14 rogram X Gender (df = 1, 1083) A .00 .00 B .00 .00 C .19 1.76 D .47 3.00 E .09 .57 F .14 .69 G .02 .13 | | .13 | | |
| F .22 1.07 G .18 1.05 H .45 2.14 rogram X Gender (df = 1, 1083) A .00 .00 B .00 .00 C .19 1.76 D .47 3.00 E .09 .57 F .14 .69 G .02 .13 | | .09 | | |
| G .18 1.05 .45 2.14 rogram X Gender (df = 1, 1083) .00 .00 B .00 .00 C .19 1.76 D .47 3.00 E .09 .57 F .14 .69 G .02 .13 | | .22 | | |
| H .45 2.14 rogram X Gender (df = 1, 1083) A .00 .00 B .00 .00 C .19 1.76 D .47 3.00 E .09 .57 F .14 .69 G .02 .13 | | .18 | | |
| .00 .00 B .00 .00 C .19 1.76 D .47 3.00 E .09 .57 F .14 .69 G .02 .13 | H | .45 | | |
| B .00 .00 C .19 1.76 D .47 3.00 E .09 .57 F .14 .69 G .02 .13 | rogram X Gender (df = | 1, 1083) | | |
| OB .00 .00 OC .19 1.76 OD .47 3.00 E .09 .57 F .14 .69 G .02 .13 | 'A | .00 | .00 | |
| C .19 1.76 D .47 3.00 E .09 .57 F .14 .69 G .02 .13 | | | | |
| D .47 3.00 E .09 .57 F .14 .69 G .02 .13 | | | | |
| E .09 .57 F .14 .69 G .02 .13 | | | | |
| F .14 .69 .02 .13 | | | | |
| .02 .13 | F | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |
| | Н | 1.20 | 5.75 | |

| Variable | MS | E | |
|-------------------------|------------------|--------|--|
| Program X Grade (df = - | 1, 1083) | | |
| 9 a | .10 | .95 | |
| 9B | .16 | .94 | |
| 9C | .08 | .74 | |
| 9D | .20 | 1.31 | |
| 9 E | .05 | .30 | |
| 9 F | .27 | 1.31 | |
| 9G | .44 | 2.54 | |
| 9н | .54 | 2.57 | |
| Gender X Grade (df = 4 | 1083) | | |
| 9A | .17 | 1.49 | |
| 9B | .51 | 2.93 | |
| 9C | .12 | 1.08 | |
| 9D | .20 | 1.29 | |
| 9E | .14 | .85 | |
| 9 F | 1.08 | 5.12** | |
| 9 G | .59 | 3.38 | |
| 9Н | .28 | 1.32 | |
| Program X Gender X Grad | e (df = 4, 1083) | | |
| 9 A | .29 | 2.58 | |
| 9B | .17 | 1.03 | |
| 9C | .14 | 1.26 | |
| 9D | .30 | 1.91 | |
| 9E | .08 | .48 | |
| 9F | .20 | .98 | |
| 9 G | .37 | 2.13 | |
| 9Н | .48 | 2.32 | |

^{*}p<.01; **p<.001

VITA AUCTORIS

Frank J. McShane was born in Coventry, England before moving to Canada as a child. In spring of 1986 he graduated from the University of Winnipeg with a B.A. (Honors) in Psychology. In September, 1992 he enrolled in the masters program in applied social psychology at the University of Saskatchewan. Since September, 1994 he has been enrolled in the doctoral program in applied social psychology at the University of Windsor.