

1972

Policeman's Occupational Personality, The

Robert C. Trojanowicz

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Robert C. Trojanowicz, *Policeman's Occupational Personality, The*, 62 *J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci.* 551 (1971)

This Criminology is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

THE POLICEMAN'S OCCUPATIONAL PERSONALITY

ROBERT C. TROJANOWICZ

Robert C. Trojanowicz, Ph.D. is an Associate Professor, School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University. Prior to his present appointment he was practicing social worker and director of a halfway house for delinquent boys, as well as a consultant for Urban Dynamics Inc. of Detroit, Michigan. Dr. Trojanowicz received his Bachelors Degree in the field of Police Administration, his Masters Degree in Social Work, and his Doctorate in Social Science, and currently specializes in the study of Deviant Behavior and Organizational Analysis.

There is an increasing amount of research literature dealing with personality differentiation of occupational groups. Walther has shown that persons engaged in different occupations are characterized by distinctive personality patterns and sets of values.¹ Although the relationship between personal and occupational characteristics has only recently been delineated, Veblen alluded to this relationship when he said that the kind of work which men perform not only influences their thoughts but also is a determining factor in their relations with one another, their culture and their institutions of control.²

Walther has also pointed out that persons bring certain personal characteristics to the job and at the same time operate in a work environment that is usually unique within the general culture of society. A psychological climate is developed on the job as the result of persons having similar values and behavioral norms. Persons who are attracted to and accepted on the job take on and reinforce the values and the norms of the particular profession. Hence, it is a process of selecting, being accepted, and then reinforcing existing patterns of behavior. An example of how an individual adjusts to emulate the "significant others" who are about him is when a person enters a new occupation. When an individual takes on the norms, values, and interests of the group with which he is a member, he is being socialized.³

Because, as just pointed out, it is not sufficient to study the personality or jobs apart from one

another, research has to emphasize and consider both the professional cultural context and the psychological predispositions of members of the profession. The structure of an occupation provides a framework for the carrying out of a social role.

The following is the report of an exploratory study of the measured behavioral styles of persons in the police profession. Measured behavioral styles refer to the consistent ways an individual organizes his physical, emotional, and energy resources. For the purpose of this report behavioral styles are those characteristics which are hypothesized to be relevant to job functioning and the formulation and measurement of these styles is obtained through the use of the Job Analysis and Interest Measurement (JAIM), a self report instrument.⁴

A sample of policemen was compared with a sample of social workers. A gross comparison was made between social workers and policemen as well as comparisons between age groups, ranks, and sub-specialty. Even though this paper will report on the results of the gross comparison between the two professions it will place its major emphasis on the results of the age, rank, and sub-specialty comparisons within the police profession.

ORIGIN OF THE STUDY

There are probably not two other professions that have been "typed" or "stereotyped" more than the police and social work professions. Adjectives like "authoritarian" personality and "dogooder" are commonly heard when reference is made to the two professions. It was felt that some degree of consensus about two professions obtained via scientific procedures would be helpful in

¹ R. H. Walther, *The Psychological Dimensions of Work: An Experimental Taxonomy of Occupations*, The George Washington University, Center for the Behavioral Sciences 1964. Available from the U.S. Office of Education, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED003, 075, National Cash Register, Box 2206, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

² R. M. MACIVER, *SOCIETY: A TEXTBOOK OF SOCIOLOGY* (1936), p. 453.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Walther, R. H., *Job Analysis and Interest Measurement*, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1964.

Table 1
SUB-SPECIALTY, RANK, AGE & SEX OF THE POLICEMEN

Sub-Specialty	Number of Policemen	Rank	Number of Policemen	Age	Number of Policemen	Sex	Number of Policemen
Juvenile	8	Command	29	20-29	42	Male	100
Patrol	72	Trooper	71	30-39	35	Female	0
Training	9			40-49	23		
Crime Lab	11						
Total	100		100		100		100

The social worker sample of 100 was selected from the Lansing, Michigan area. All social workers had Master's Degrees in social work.

objectively assessing and designating the norms and values of the two mentioned professions.

The writer has worked in settings where social workers and the police are in frequent contact with one another. Often, hostility toward each other's profession is blatant and this hinders the process of cooperatively working together to combat the social ills of society.

Clark states that:

A significant portion of the police and other agency personnel manage to curtail interaction in official matters and therefore, mutually isolate each other within the social control system. This phenomenon is particularly noticeable between the police and social workers which may reflect the presence of conflicting operating ideologies, lack of professional respect and ignorance of the others' operations.⁵

Even though some of the observations and accompanying adjectives leveled at the Police and Social Work professions are without scientific substantiation, it does appear that certain behavior patterns and attitudes of social workers as compared to policemen are in many cases different. Furthermore, different behavior patterns and attitudes appear to exist within the two professions depending on the area of specialization, age and rank order in the particular organization.

These observations prompted the writer to hypothesize that because different kinds of work and work situations demand different types of orientations and behavioral styles of persons who operate them there should be different and distinguishable behavior styles when policemen and social workers are compared. A further assumption

⁵ John P. Clark, *Isolation of the Police: A Comparison of the British and American Situations*, 56 JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY, AND POLICE SCIENCE, 313 (1956).

was that there would also be varying behavioral styles within the two professions in accordance with the particular area of specialization, rank order, and age of the person in the organization.

Sub-specialty, rank, and age comparisons of social workers will not be discussed in this report.

SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE STUDIED

The Police Sample. There is a wide variety of police departments and there are great numbers of policemen. The police officers for the study were selected from a department that engages and specializes in all of the functions that are considered an integral part of police work. For example, the department is actively engaged in juvenile work, training, crime laboratory work, and patrol. Responses were received from a sample of 100 from the selected department. The number of responses from patrol personnel was much greater because of the fact that patrol is the major function of the department. Hence the patrol division is by far the largest unit of that organization.

In addition to the answer sheets being coded by particular specialty (training, juvenile, crime laboratory, and patrol) they were also coded by rank, sex and age. The respondents were classified into two rank categories, trooper or command officer. A command officer was considered to be any officer with the rank of corporal or above. With the rank of corporal, the officer assumes command responsibilities. All respondents had at least one year of service. (See Table 1)

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The scales of the JAIME are correlated with previous research on the two professions.

The following JAIME scales, Perseverance, Prefer Routines, Orderliness, and Directive Leader-

ship should correlate with Skolnick (1966), Niederhoffer (1967), and Walther's (1964) comments about the policeman's adherence to rules and regulations. Clark's (1956) discussion about the enforcement of laws being an integral function of police work should also support the findings of the above scales and in addition have implications for the External Controls scale. Reddin's (1968) thesis about the policeman's moralistic attitudes not only relates to the above discussion but should be reflected in the Moral Absolutes scale. The Role Conformity scale should measure the degree to which the policeman values himself according to how successfully he conforms to the role requirements of society.

North and Hatts (Nosaw and Form, 1962) discussion of the low prestige of the police profession should have implications for the Self-Confidence Scale.

The Move Against Aggressor, Persuasive Leadership, and Self-Assertiveness scales relate to comments made by Skolnick (1966), Sheldon (1942), Turman, and Mills (1936). For example, Skolnick believes that danger and authority in an occupation are incompatible because danger undermines the judicious use of authority and yields self-defensive conduct. Because of the many danger situations, persuasive leadership is not expedient and self-assertiveness becomes commonplace. Also in relation to self-assertiveness, the police fit into Sheldon's (1942) mesomorphic classification. Mesomorphy is highly correlated with the temperament of Somatotonia. This temperament is characterized by assertiveness, dominance, and competitive aggressiveness. Skolnick supports this when he says that the policeman needs to have physical agility.

Niederhoffer (1967) mentions the feeling of "esprit de corp" in the police profession. Furthermore, both Skolnick and Niederhoffer talk about the policeman's dependence on his colleagues and the need for teamwork. The Participative Leadership and Delegative Leadership scales relate to these concepts.

The Social Interaction scale should reflect Clark's (1956) and Skolnick's ideas about police isolation.

The Intellectual Achievement and Academic Achievement scales are related to Giaradin's (1968) comments and the results of the New York police survey in which it was learned that most policemen come from the lower portions of their graduating

high school classes and generally have not been successful in past academic endeavors.

The Identifies with Authority scale should be significant in terms of statements by Adorno (1950) and Niederhoffer (1967) in relation to the policeman as an authoritarian personality.

Certain scales of the JAIME are also related to research on the social work profession. Pins (1963) and Ginsberg (1951) mention the profession of social work being the "second choice" of many social workers. The Perseverance scale might be significant in this case.

The Moral Absolutes and External Control scales should reflect the work of Freud (1936), McCormick, Kidneigh (1958), and Glockel (1966). Freud's writing emphasizes how external controls inhibit expression of man's needs and drives. McCormick and Kidneigh (1959) talk about the social worker's dislike for conservative personalities, while Glockel (1966) alludes to the social worker's liberalism.

McCormick and Kidneigh (1959) also discuss "the social work personality" and their general dislike for athletic people. The Self-Assertiveness scale should measure these feelings. The Move Toward Aggressor scale should be significant for the same reasons as above and should also reflect Roe's (1956) research concerning the social worker's distaste for physical activities and their scoring on his effeminate scale. The Move Against Aggressor scale should be low for the opposite reasons as those stated for the Move Toward Aggressor scale.

Glockel's (1966) research showed how social workers dislike independence and are not leadership oriented. The Independence and Directive Leadership scales should measure these relationships.

The Problem Analysis Scale should reflect Glockel's (1966) findings about social workers not being interested in original or creative activities. McCormick and Kidneigh's (1959) findings that social workers dislike scientific people could also have implications for this scale.

McCormick and Kidneigh (1959), Pins (1963), and Glockel (1966) all mention that social workers like activities which involve working with people and helping them. Piotrowski (Roe, 1956) also mentions that social workers are interested in people although Harrower and Cox (Roe, 1956) found the opposite to be true. The Social Interaction, Social Service, and Group Participation scales should measure these concepts.

The Status Attainment scale should reflect Glockel's (1966) comments about social workers not being interested in monetary rewards and McCormick's and Kidneigh's (1959) discussion of social worker's dislike for competitive persons.

There has been much contradictory discussion concerning the intelligence of social workers. Pins (1963) states that they are above average intelligence while Glockel (1966) mentions that they are below the average in comparison with

most college graduates. Glockel (1966) further mentions that social workers are uninterested in the intellectual component of a job. The Intellectual Achievement and Academic Achievement scales are designed to measure these concepts.

METHODOLOGY

The standard score program was used. The standard scores are based on the average of forty-two occupational groups including foreign service officers, lawyers, secretaries, business executives, ambassadors, engineers, physicists, army officers, and judges who took the JAIM. The mean is equated to 0 and the standard deviation to 100.

The higher the score on a particular scale, the more often the subject has chosen the options for this scale as being descriptive of himself in preference to the options for the other scales and has avoided options which are negatively scored for the scale.

The .05 level of confidence was the criteria for the acceptance or rejection of a relationship. Because there is an extensive number of scales in the instrument, thirty-four to be exact, this means that two of the thirty-four scales can be significant at the .05 level of confidence by chance alone. Therefore, in order for a hypothesis to be accepted, three or more scales had to be significant at the .05 level of confidence.

THE POLICE AND SOCIAL WORK COMPARISON

The major hypothesis of the study was that different kinds of work and work situations demand different types of orientations and behavioral styles of the person who operate them. Since policemen and social workers operate in different work situations, there should be different and distinguishable behavioral styles when the two professions are compared.

Table number two compares the actual results with the expected results on the thirty-four scales in terms of their significance at (at least) the .05 level of confidence.

It can be seen that nineteen scales are the same in both expected and actual results. Fifteen scales do not match. Some of the implications of Table 2 will be discussed later.

Table 3 illustrates the F-ratio results when policemen and social workers were compared on standard scores on the JAIM scales.

The analysis of variance technique was utilized and the F-ratio in the case of one degree of freedom is the square of the T-value. Any scale over 3.84

Table 2

COMPARISONS OF THE EXPECTED RESULTS WITH THE ACTUAL RESULTS ON THE JAIM SCALES WHEN POLICEMEN AND SOCIAL WORKERS WERE COMPARED

JAIM Scales	Expected Results	Actual Results
Optimism	0	0
Self-Confidence	X	X
Perseverance	X	X
Orderliness	X	X
Plan Ahead*	0	X
Moral Absolutes	X	X
Slow Change*	0	X
Persuasive Leadership*	X	0
Self-Assertiveness	X	X
Move Toward Aggressor	X	X
Move Away From Aggressor	0	0
Move Against Aggressor*	X	0
Prefer Routines	X	X
Authority Identification*	X	0
Independence	X	X
Directive Leadership	X	X
Participative Leadership	X	X
Delegative Leadership	X	X
Knowledge of Results*	0	X
External Controls	X	X
Systematical-Methodical*	0	X
Problem Analysis*	X	0
Social Interaction	X	X
Mechanical Activities*	0	X
Supervisory Activities*	0	X
Activity-Frequent Change	0	0
Group Participation*	X	0
Status Attainment*	X	0
Social Service	X	X
Approval From Others	X	X
Intellectual Achievement*	0	X
Maintain Societal Standards*	0	X
Role Conformity	X	X
Academic Achievement*	0	X

0 = Not Significant; X = Significant at .05.

* Means expected and actual results were different.

is significant at the .05 level of confidence and any scale over 6.63 is significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Twenty-five scales were significant at the .01 level of confidence. A brief, general profile of social workers and policemen will be given as will be given as a reflected by the outcome of the scales in Table 3 when the two professions were compared.

THE POLICE PROFILE

The policeman profile suggests that he has a preference for working in a structured setting (Prefer Routines, Orderliness) and prefers the use of the structure for guiding the behavior of others (External Controls).

He is guided by internal standards, believes that moral principles come from a power higher than man and that it is important to have faith in something (Moral Absolutes). In reference to leadership styles, he has a preference for a directive approach through the use of external controls (Directive Leadership).

He knows what he wants and is willing to strive to reach some goal that he has established for himself (Perseverance, Supervisory Activities). He pursues goals and performs his duties even though he may not receive the approval of others. He values himself according to how successfully he has conformed to the role requirements and duties of society (Role Conformity). He is cautious concerning abrupt changes and feels that change should be initiated in a conventional manner (Slow Change).

He uses systematic methods for processing information and reaching decisions (Systematical-Methodical).

He likes mechanical and outdoor activities (Mechanical Activities), does better under stress and competition and is proficient in athletic endeavors (Self-Assertiveness).

THE SOCIAL WORKER PROFILE

The social worker profile suggests that he has a preference for working independently (Independence, Delegative Leadership), directing his own activity toward goal achievement (Plan Ahead) and utilizing groups for decision making (Participative Leadership). He believes that people are motivated best by intrinsic motivation and knowledge of the results (Knowledge of Results).

He prefers a job that involves interaction with other people (Social Interaction). He wishes to be

Table 3

COMPARISON OF POLICEMEN AND SOCIAL WORKERS ON STANDARD SCORES ON THE JAIM SCALES (N = 197)

JAIM Scales	f-Ratio	CL
Police Higher (N = 99)*		
Perseverance	23.392	.01
Orderliness	64.923	.01
Moral Absolutes	44.767	.01
Slow Change	18.793	.01
Self-Assertiveness	44.368	.01
Prefer Routines	39.709	.01
Directive Leadership	53.090	.01
External Controls	65.314	.01
Systematic-Methodical	28.166	.01
Mechanical Activities	79.458	.01
Supervisory Activities	9.166	.01
Role Conformity	75.203	.01
Social Work Higher (N = 98)*		
Self-Confidence	25.209	.01
Plan Ahead	12.527	.01
Move Toward Aggressor	11.908	.01
Independence	33.760	.01
Participative Leadership	9.168	.01
Delegative Leadership	15.121	.01
Knowledge of Results	6.695	.01
Social Interaction	42.033	.01
Social Service	52.955	.01
Approval From Others	20.045	.01
Intellectual Achievement	12.244	.01
Maintain Societal Standards	7.154	.01
Academic Achievement	24.157	.01

P < .01 with R = 6.63. P < .05 with P = 3.84.

* Three answer sheets were eliminated because of coding problems.

considered understanding and charitable and prefers work which permits him to be helpful to others (Social Service). He also likes congenial co-workers, desires to be well-liked and to please others through his work (Approval From Others).

He feels he can influence future events by his own action (Self-Confidence) and values himself by his contribution to social improvement (Social Service). He also values himself for his intellectual pursuits (Intellectual Achievement) and he does well in academic situations (Academic Achievement).

Because, as mentioned earlier, the major purpose of this article is to discuss sub-specialty, rank, and age differences within the police profession, the implication for the gross comparisons between and social workers will not be discussed extensively.

Table 4

COMPARISON OF COMMAND OFFICERS AND TROOPERS IN MEAN SCORE ON THE JAIM SCALES (N = 99)

	t-value	CL
<i>Command Officers</i> Higher (N = 29)		
Orderliness	2.05	.05
Moral Absolutes	2.43	.05
Move Toward Aggressor	2.88	.01
Directive Leadership	2.19	.05
Supervisory Activities	2.11	.05
<i>Troopers</i> Higher (N = 70)		
Independence	-2.66	.01

P < .05 with t = 2.000 for df = 97.
 P < .01 with t = 2.660 for df = 97.

POLICE RANK COMPARISON

The table 4 illustrates the results when command officers (corporal and above) were compared with troopers and when the various police sub-specialties and age categories were compared.

The investigation of the differences among sub-specialties and rank levels was undertaken by way of computation of T-Tests of the mean differences between the various sub-specialties, age, and rank levels.

Command officers have more of a preference for directive methods of leadership, enjoy supervising others and are generally guided by internal standards and moral principles. They prefer to try to "win the person over" when they are treated in an aggressive manner. Troopers on the other hand scored higher on only the Independence scale.

Because command officers scored significantly higher (.01) on the Move Toward Aggressor scale it can be speculated that when an officer becomes a commander and is removed from "on the line duties," he deals with aggressive situations differently because he is not directly involved in the alteration.

There is then, substantiation for the assumption that rank in an organization does make a difference in a persons behavioral style.

POLICE SUB-SPECIALTY COMPARISONS

When sub-specialties were compared four of the relationships were not significant. These were:

- Police Patrol Division vs. Police Training Division
- Police Juvenile Division vs. Police Crime Laboratory

Police Juvenile Division vs. Police Training Division

Police Juvenile Division vs. Police Patrol Division

Only three scales significantly differentiated patrol policemen from crime lab policemen (Table 5).

Patrol policemen utilize internal standards to a great extent while crime lab policemen use systematic methods for processing information. They also perform better in academic situations.

When training division officers were compared with crime lab officers, six scales were significant (Table 6).

Training division officers, like patrol officers when they were compared with crime lab officers, score higher on the Orderliness scale. They also prefer to move against an aggressor when they are treated belligerently. On the other hand, crime lab officers prefer to try to "win the aggressor over" when they are attacked. Again they prefer

Table 5

COMPARISON OF POLICE PATROL DIVISION AND POLICE CRIME LABORATORY DIVISION IN MEAN SCORE ON THE JAIM SCALE (N = 82)

JAIM Scale	t-value	CL
<i>Police Patrol</i> Higher (N = 71)		
Orderliness	2.69	.05
<i>Police Crime Lab</i> Higher (N = 11)		
Systematic-Methodical	-2.98	.05
Academic Achievement	-2.53	.05

P < .05 with t = 2.000 for df = 80.

Table 6

COMPARISON OF POLICE TRAINING DIVISION AND POLICE CRIME LABORATORY IN MEAN SCORE ON THE JAIM SCALES (N = 20)

JAIM Scale	t-value	CL
<i>Police Training</i> Higher (N = 9)		
Orderliness	2.56	.05
Move Against Aggressor	2.19	.05
<i>Police Crime Laboratory</i> Higher (N = 11)		
Move Toward Aggressor	-2.49	.05
Systematical-Methodical	-2.16	.05
Mechanical Activities	-2.88	.01
Approval From Others	-2.70	.05

P < .05 with t = 2.101 for df = 18.
 P < .01 with t = 2.878 for df = 18.

systematic methods for processing information and making decisions. The crime lab officers enjoy mechanical activities and in addition they consider it important to have congenial co-workers. The results might be more illuminating when it is considered that crime lab officers usually work in a group office situation. An integral part of their job is also the methodical "sifting" of information.

Although the evidence for differentiation between police sub-specialties is not as impressive as might be expected there is nevertheless evidence to support the assumption that area of specialization for policemen does effect their behavioral style.

POLICE AGE COMPARISONS

All of the comparisons between the age groupings were significant at (at least) the .05 level of significance.

Police age group 20-29 was higher on three scales when compared to age group 30-39 while police age group 30-39 was higher on six scales (Table 7).

The results suggest that age group 20-29 prefers to withdraw from the aggressor when treated belligerently, operate independently, and feel that most people require external controls. Age group 30-39 is more optimistic, persevering, and conservative. They believe in moral absolutes, enjoy

Table 7

COMPARISON OF POLICE AGE GROUP 20-29 AND POLICE AGE GROUP 30-39 IN MEAN SCORE ON THE JAIME SCALES (N = 76)

JAIM Scale	t-value	CL
<i>Police Age Group 20-29 Higher (N = 41)</i>		
Move Away From Aggressor	2.25	.05
Independence	2.65	.05
External Controls	2.63	.05
<i>Police Age Group 30-39 Higher (N = 35)</i>		
Optimism	-2.90	.01
Perseverance	-3.13	.01
Moral Absolutes	-4.40	.001
Slow Change	-3.24	.01
Mechanical Activities	-3.45	.01
Social Service	-2.10	.05

P < .05 with t = 2.000 for df = 74.

P < .01 with t = 2.660 for df = 74.

P < .001 with t = 3.460 for df = 74.

Table 8

COMPARISON OF POLICE AGE GROUP 20-29 AND POLICE AGE GROUP 40-49 IN MEAN SCORE ON THE JAIME SCALES (N = 64)

JAIM Scale	t-value	CL
<i>Police Age Group 20-29 Higher (N = 41)</i>		
Move Against Aggressor	3.13	.01
Independence	3.36	.01
Status Attainment	2.16	.05
<i>Police Age Group 40-49 Higher (N = 23)</i>		
Mechanical Activities	-2.05	.05
Approval From Others	-2.08	.05

P < .05 with t = 2.000 for df = 62.

P < .01 with t = 2.660 for df = 62.

Table 9

COMPARISON OF POLICE AGE GROUP 30-39 AND POLICE AGE GROUP 40-49 IN MEAN SCORE ON THE JAIME SCALES (N = 58)

JAIM Scale	t-value	CL
<i>Police Age Group 30-39 Higher (N = 35)</i>		
Perseverance	2.37	.05
Slow Change	2.37	.05
Persuasive Leadership	2.40	.05
Move Against Aggressor	2.54	.05
<i>Police Age Group 40-49 Higher (N = 23)</i>		
Move Away From Aggressor	-2.34	.05

P < .05 with t = 2.021 for df = 56.

mechanical activities and value their contributions to social improvement.

When age group 20-29 was compared with age group 40-49 there was a significant difference on five scales (Table 8). Group 20-29 scored higher on three scales while age group 40-49 scored higher on two scales.

The results suggest that age group 20-29 would more readily move against an aggressor when treated belligerently than would age group 40-49. They are also more independent and value achievement and status symbols. Age group 40-49 enjoys mechanical activities and values and seeks the approval of others.

When age groups 30-39 and 40-49 were compared the following conclusions can be made (Table 9). Age group 30-39 perseveres even when the activity is not particularly interesting. They

are conservative, they move against an aggressor when treated belligerently and they exert leadership in interpersonal situations. Age group 40-49 only scores higher on the Move Away from Aggressor scale which suggests that they more readily withdraw when persons act toward them in a belligerent or aggressive manner.

There is substantiation then that age of the policeman does make a difference in his behavioral style.

Because all of the respondents in the police sample were males there was not a comparison made between males and females.

In summary then all of the assumptions were proven correct.

Many of the findings as a result of the comparison of policemen and social workers and subspecialty, rank, and age comparisons were anticipated and hence substantiate the findings of many of the theorists who were discussed earlier.

The general profiles of persons in the two professions and the summary after each age, subspecialty and rank comparison do not provide the reader with many major "surprises."

When the two professions were compared all twenty-five scales were significant at the .01 level of confidence. None of the nine remaining scales were even close to the minimum .05 level of confidence. In other words, each scale was either extremely significant or else there was very little difference between the two professions.

Not all of the significant twenty-five scales, however, were expected to be significant. Conversely some of the remaining nine scales that were expected to be significant were not.

The rationale for predicting a scale either significant or not significant was related to whether the particular scale had prior empirical substantiation from theorists in the two professions.

Glockel's extensive discussion of the social workers' aversion to being independent was the major reason for predicting that the Plan Ahead scale would not be significant. Contrary to Glockel's findings, the results of this study illustrates that social workers do prefer to "direct their own activity." Furthermore they prefer to be motivated and motivate others by intrinsic methods as reflected by the outcome on the Knowledge of Results scale. The results on this scale are not surprising, however, when one consults the social worker's profile which shows his preference for flexibility and the use of internal controls. The Maintain Societal Standards scale measures the degree of emphasis

a person places on maintaining professional standards. The outcome of this scale is understandable when one considers the emphasis that the field of social work places on professionalism. Even though there is some question as to the social workers academic ability when compared to a general college population, the Intellectual and Academic Achievement scales should have been predicted significant in favor of social workers because of their more extensive academic backgrounds.

The police were higher on the Slow Change, Systematic-Methodical, Mechanical Activities, and Supervisory Activities scales. The results on all four of these scales are not surprising when they are compared to the policeman's profile. The profile suggests that the policeman is a conventional personality, likes masculine activities, is a deliberate planner and has a tendency to "weigh the facts" before he makes a decision. Hence these scales do not deviate from the theoretical and popular conception of the policeman.

Six scales were not significant but were expected to be so. Among those six scales social workers were expected to score higher on the Persuasive Leadership and Group Participation scales because of their reliance on persuasion and other passive methods when working with clients. Furthermore they prefer social interaction and enjoy working with people. Apparently policemen do not feel that much differently in these two areas.

The Move Aggressor and Authority Identification scales were also expected to be significant. Because of the implications of the Move Against Aggressor scale it will be discussed more extensively.

DISCUSSION

Many persons would assume and expect that policemen would score higher than social workers on the Move Against Aggressor scale, which measures the degree to which the individual counterattacks when someone acts toward him in a belligerent manner. Recent confrontations of demonstrators with policemen and the resultant reactions of the police has lead many to criticize the police for counter-attacking too quickly and too indiscriminately.

While the policeman reported himself as self-assertive in pursuing his own goals, he scored slightly lower than the social worker on the Move Against Aggressors scale, indicating that he was no more likely than the average individual in the norm group to counter-attack when someone acted

toward him in a belligerent or aggressive manner. A premature labeling of the policeman as an aggressor is not substantiated by the present study. Indiscriminate labeling can have negative consequences. It helps perpetuate inter-agency conflict and negative perceptions.

The entire concept of behavioral styles has many implications and raises many questions. Knowing that different professions have different requirements and expectations, do we necessarily want policemen and social workers to have the same styles of behavior? For example, the policeman's profile reflects a tendency for him to want to preserve the status quo. This is not unusual when it is considered that policemen are charged with and evaluated by their ability to enforce and uphold laws as they presently stand. Likewise, it is not surprising that social workers score low on the Moral Absolutes scale, for it is their profession that is many times, either implicitly or explicitly, charged with evaluating and helping to change present outmoded laws which constrict the liberties of some disadvantaged groups.

Differences in behavioral styles of persons with different ranks and sub-specialization is not in itself necessarily detrimental. The breadth and flexibility of most professions permit different types of individuals to succeed for different reasons. Different sub-specialties and rank allows a person to utilize different attributes and skills.

The differences in behavioral styles between the age groupings probably reflected to a great extent the difference in organizational rank. Most of the younger officers would not be command officers while most of the command officers would be in the upper age groupings.

The results of the study can have implications for the training of social workers and policemen. Skolnick (1968) has advocated a new system of training policemen and social workers together in one institution so as to give police and social workers insight and sensitivity into the other's profession. Thus they would be better equipped to deal with present social ills and much of the ever present contest and inter-profession antagonism would be eliminated. He further believes that the commendable crusade for police professionalism has been too narrowly conceived. It has focused on improving efficiency of police performance through advanced technology and training but has neglected the human dimension of police work. He feels that true police professionalism would be sensitive to the social problems of the people they

deal with and would cease to regard social agency activities as outside of their domain. He feels that because police are already performing social agency activities the creation of joint education programs for training policemen would be logical.⁶ It might be added that the true test of social work professionalism may be how readily they accept others, many times less-educated, into their domain of dispensing of the social services.

CONCLUSION

In short, then, it would be helpful for the police to absorb from social workers some of the general theories and concepts which would help them in understanding social problems and the people who are inflicted. On the other hand, it would be helpful if social workers would absorb some of the policeman's "reality therapy" and appreciate some of the problems he encounters in his "face to face" confrontation with social deviants.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADORNO, T. W. ET AL. THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY. (1950).
 Clark, I. *Isolation of the Police*. 56 JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY, AND POLICE SCIENCE, (1956).
 Gockel, G. *Silk Stockings and Blue Collar*, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, (April, 1966).
 Koopp, E. F. *Authoritarianism and Social Workers: A Psychological Study*, SOCIAL WORK, (January, 1963).
 Kidneigh, I. C. and H. W. Lundberg. *Are Social Work Students Different?* SOCIAL WORK, (May, 1958).
 McCormack, R. L. and Kidneigh, J. C. *The Vocational Interest Patterns of Social Workers*. SOCIAL WORK JOURNAL (October, 1954).
 McCune, S. D. *An Exploratory Study of the Measured Behavioral Styles of Students in Five Schools of Social Work* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Catholic University of America 1966)
 NIEDERHOFFER, A. BEHIND THE SHIELD. (1967)
 NOSAW, S. AND W. H. FORM (EDS). MAN, WORK, AND SOCIETY. (1962).
 PINS, A. M. *Who Chooses Social Work, When and Why?* New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1963.
 ROE, A. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF OCCUPATIONS. (1956).
 SHELDON, W. THE VARIETIES OF TEMPERAMENT: A PSYCHOLOGY OF CONSTITUTIONAL DIFFERENCES. (1942).
 SKOLNICK, J. JUSTICE WITHOUT TRIAL. (1966).
 TERMAN, L. AND C. C. MILES. SEX AND PERSONALITY: STUDIES IN MASCULINITY AND FEMININITY. (1936).
 WALTHER, R. H. ORIENTATIONS AND BEHAVIORAL STYLE OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS. 1965.
 WALTHER, R. H. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF WORK. (1964).
 WALTHER, R. H. AND S. D. MCCUNE. SOCIALIZATION PRINCIPLES AND TRAINING GOALS FOR JUVENILE COURT JUDGES. 1965.

⁶ Jerome Skolnick, *Social Training for Police Recommended*, THE LOS ANGELES TIMES, Oct. 3, 1968.