



UNDERSTANDING ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIALIZATION PROCESS OF POLICE OFFICERS AND JOB SATISFACTION

POLİSİN SOSYALLEŞME SÜRECİ VE İŞ MEMNUNİYETİ

Yusuf YÜKSEL¹
Hamza TOSUN²

Öz

Polislerin sosyalleşme sürecini anlamak, polisi ve polisin mesleki yaşamındaki dönüşümünü anlamamızın temel koşuludur. Polisin sosyalleşme süreci ve bunun sonuçları üzerine yapılan çok sayıda yurtdışı kaynaklı araştırma vardır. Ancak, yapılan bu çalışmalar genellikle büyük ve suç yoğun polis birimlerini dikkate almıştır. Küçük ölçekli polis birimlerinde çalışan polislerin yaşadığı sosyalleşme süreci, son dönemde uygulamaya konulan toplum destekli polislik uygulamaları ve polisin değişen demografik özelliklerinin bu sosyalleşme sürecine etkisi üzerinde fazla durulmamıştır. Bu çalışma ile ABD’de bulunan küçük ölçekli bir polis teşkilatı analiz edilmiştir. Tümevarım yaklaşımı içinde farklı rütbe ve birimlerde çalışan polislerle mülakat yapılmıştır. Bu çalışmada, polis biriminin çalıştığı çevrenin (suç yoğunluğu, suç türü, hedef kitle) ve toplum destekli polislik gibi yaklaşımların polisin sosyalleşme sürecini etkilediği anlaşılmıştır. Ayrıca, geleneksel suçla mücadele taktiklerinin yanı sıra problem çözme, vatandaşla işbirliği yapma gibi yaklaşımların daha fazla önemsendiği, bu değişimin de polisin iş memnuniyetine olumlu etkisi bulunduğu ortaya konmuştur. Bu sonuçlar, toplum destekli polislik gibi polislik yaklaşımlarının artan oranda uygulandığı, suç yoğunluğu ve kurumsal büyüklük olarak değişen birimleri içinde barındıran Türk Polis Teşkilatı’nda yaşanan sosyalleşme sürecini anlamamıza da katkı sağlayacak niteliktedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyalleşme, Toplum Destekli Polislik, Hizmet Odaklı Polislik, Polis Kültürü, İş Tatmini.

Abstract

Understanding police socialization is significant not only for understanding the officers themselves but for understanding the transformation of police in his/her career. There are many studies regarding the socialization process of officers and its outcomes. However, these studies focus more on large, urban police departments and ignore the socialization process of officers in small police departments, and the influence of community policing philosophy and increasing diversity of police officers on the socialization and its outcomes. A small type police organization in the USA is analyzed in this study. Nine interviews were conducted with police officers in this inductive study. The results of this study show that the work environment (i.e., crime rates, crime diversity, neighborhood, and target population) and policing approaches such as community policing influence the socialization process of the police. In addition, police officers attach more importance to problem solving, partnership, and public relations in this new environment which, in turn, positively affect the job satisfaction of the police officers. These results are also meaningful for the Turkish National Police which has departments with different crime rates and size and is increasingly adapting community policing or similar policing approaches.

Key Words: Socialization, Community Policing, Service Style Policing, Police Culture, Job Satisfaction.

¹ Giresun Emniyet Müdürlüğü, yusufyuksel1976@gmail.com

² Polis Akademisi, tosunhamza@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Scholars of organizational behavior, management, anthropology, sociology and communication are becoming increasingly interested in the ways in which employees are socialized into organizations. There have been many studies on different aspects of socialization within different organizations (Feldman, 1976). Police organizations are also increasingly getting attention from scholars in the context of analyzing socialization process of police officers, the impact of the job environment and job duties on socialization process and the outcomes of socialization process (Barker, 1999; Feldman, 1976; Van Maanen, 1975).

Over the past 25 years, not only in the US but also in many other countries including Turkey, policing has changed in at least two major aspects: The spread of a community policing philosophy and the increasing diversity and training of police officers. These changes have inevitably influenced policing practices, occupational attitudes of police officers, patterns of interaction with public and socialization, which, in turn, increased the gap among new and older officers whose perceptions, behaviors, and concerns were formed in the 1970s and 1980s (Manning, 1994; Paoline, Myers and Worden, 2000). Therefore, in contrast to early studies demonstrating more integrated view of policing and police organizations, police organizations have become more culturally diverse and more complex in their function, practices, and socialization process.

In spite of the changes in policing and police organizations, there are limited studies taking into account how these changes mediate the socialization process of officers and its outcomes such as, commitment and satisfaction. Some studies taking into account these changes have been conducted in large metropolitan areas (Skogan and Hartnett, 1997). Few have focused on smaller or non-urban police and university police departments (Williams, 2002). There are some studies in Turkey that focus on satisfaction, stress and commitment, but ignore the influence of community policing and socialization on satisfaction, stress and commitment (Akbaş and Şanlı, 2009, Aksu, 2012). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to analyze university police that considers the impact of community policing and work environment on the socialization process of the police officers. More specifically, this study focuses on university police to understand how community policing and university environment influence police socialization and how police officers describe their job satisfaction at different stages of their careers. Understanding police socialization is significant, “not only for understanding the officers themselves but for understanding occupational and organizational environments of policing” (Barker, 1999:41).

1. Organizational Socialization

Organizational socialization has been defined in many different ways. Most of definitions focus on transformation process of employees within an organization. For instance, Ashforth and Saks (1996:149) describe it as “the process by which an organizational member learns the required behaviors and supportive attitudes necessary to participate as a member of an organization”. Van Maanen (1975) emphasizes the evolution of existing attitudes, values, and behaviors, while Feldman (1981: 309) stresses “the learning of organizational goals and rules”. The process of organizational socialization necessitates learning of culture, practices, values, beliefs, skills, and behaviors needed to fulfill the new roles and task requirements and function effectively within an organization (Feldman, 1976).

Literature mostly suggests stage models of organizational socialization because researchers considered years of experience to be important factor influencing degree of socialization. Each

stage is identified based on “degree of socialization into culture and experience” and the activities engaged in each stage in the process (Barker, 1999:6). Schein (1968:27) suggested a three stage socialization model: “Entry, accept organizational reality, mutual acceptance/signals of mutual acceptance”. Feldman (1976:310) suggested another three stage socialization model: “Anticipatory socialization (getting in), accommodation (breaking in), and role management (settling in)”.

The first year or years of organizational life take considerable attention in these models because this is probably the most critical time in the career of an employee. Employees get some organizational knowledge and the initial work assignment in this period. This stage involves “initial confrontations with organizational reality and the anxiety that accompanies reality shock” (Wanous, Reichers and Malik, 1984:673). In this early period, employees make personal judgments about the adequacy and compatibility of the organization which possibly affects employees’ rest of the career (Buchanan, 1974). In the second stage of socialization process, employees learn how the organization works and how to become a member of it (Feldman, 1976). The subsequent stage or stages involve the resolution of role conflict, and the achievement of role clarity (Feldman, 1981).

In terms of the outcome of socialization process, Feldman (1976) and Van Maanen (1978) identified four variables as possible outcomes of the socialization process: General satisfaction, mutual influence, internal work motivation, and job involvement. These studies identified the relation between socialization experiences of employees and its impact on the outcomes in different stages of the career (Feldman, 1976). However, they documented generally inconsistent findings on the outcome of the socialization experiences of employees (Katz, 1978). This might be due to the difference in the nature of each organization or job and reliance on heavily case studies.

2. Organizational Socialization and Police Organizations

Police researchers have extensively focused on socialization and its influence on the everyday police practices. Barker (1999) and Van Maanen (1975, 1978), presented comprehensively the aspects of police organizations in terms of socialization. Barker (1999) suggests extraordinary influence and formative effect of policing on the lives of police officers. Barker (1999) expresses isolation, danger, solidarity, and trust as the factors enforcing a socialization process. Van Maanen (1975) draws attention on police training process and hierarchical structure and their influence on ‘conformance to authority’ culture. According to Van Maanen (1975), in order to be accepted within police system, police officers must show ‘*loyalty and dedication*’ to the police system without questioning it.

As other organizational socialization models, police literature suggests stage models of police socialization. Barker (1999:2) clearly identifies the following five-stage model of organizational socialization for street cops: “Hitting the streets; hitting their stride; hitting the wall; regrouping; and deciding to retire”. In this model, Barker (1999) reflects the evolution of officers’ feelings, perceptions, and behaviors in the course of their career and the activities engaged in at each stage. In a similar vein, Van Maanen (1975:3) identified a four-stage socialization process: “Entry, introduction, encounter, and metamorphosis”.

The first stage covers training at the police schools and the official start to the job. The environment of the police schools imposes discipline of the organization and serves to detach recruits from old habits, beliefs, and attitudes. In the first years of their professions, police officers are introduced to the world of the streets through the experienced officers. The flow of influence

from one generation to another provides to some extent the stability of the pattern of police behavior. When they hit the streets, they learn informal as well as formal expectations of their colleagues, the realities of streets and what attitudes and behaviors are appropriate and expected (Barker, 1999; Van Maanen, 1975). Police officers learn mainly to “see and think like a cop” in the first a few years (Barker, 1999:45).

The following stage is roughly a five-year stage in which the officers gain confidence and believe that they know what is expected from them and they become more similar to their more experienced colleagues. Their lives continue to be drawn into conformity with police perceptions and practices (Barker, 1999). In the next stage, officers begin to question many aspects of the job. “This is a time, lasting roughly four years, when they recognize and acknowledge the nature and extent of their adversity distress and set about finding ways of coping with their disillusion” (Barker, 1999:116). In the subsequent stages, they re-evaluate their careers and choices and determine a course of action and strategy for finishing their career. Some officers choose to keep a low profile; do as little as possible and wait for retirement. Their main philosophy becomes “stay low and avoid trouble” (Van Maanen, 1975:222). Some others look for some other coping strategies such as, getting off streets or getting promotion (Barker, 1999).

2.1. Police Socialization and Organizational Outcomes

In contrast to other organizations, the researches regarding changes in the attitudes of police in different stages of socialization documented consistent findings. The findings indicate that satisfaction declines in the course of officer’s career (Paoline, Myers and Worden, 2000). These studies show powerful character of police socialization process resulting in a final perspective which stresses a “stay low and avoid trouble” approach to policing (Van Maanen, 1975). However, the problem is that these studies mostly focused on patrol officers at urban police departments and ignored the other groups of officers. In addition, they mostly neglected the role of changes, namely community policing, in this process. As community policing changes the role of police and police practices and the relationship between police and citizens, it might be expected to alter elements of both occupational and organizational environments of police and its outcomes (Wood, 2004). Therefore, this study brings together these issues in the context of a university police department.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Setting

The Rutgers University Police Department is a relatively large, geographically dispersed organization serving more than 50,000 academicians, students, and staff on seven campuses in eight separate municipalities and has a police force of approximately one hundred: 58 full-time armed police officers, 30 full-time security officers (Rutgers University Police Department, 2007). It has headquarters in New Brunswick, Camden and Newark. “The 58 Rutgers Police Officers operate under a community policing philosophy and are assigned to specific geographical areas to increase accountability and sense of shared ownership with the community to address safety and security concerns. Five of these police officers are assigned as community policing officers in the five Rutgers campuses” (Rutgers University Police Department, 2007).

The reason that this organization was chosen is because previous research has paid limited attention to this kind of organizations. In addition, the implementation of community policing and its impacts in the frame of socialization process have received little or no attention. Moreover, as understood from the above mentioned figures, the RUPD has a wide range of

officers operating under various units, functional areas, and hierarchical levels which make it an ideal organization to study.

3.2. Research Questions

The present study focuses on three major questions, each with a secondary question.

- 1- In what ways have officers' feelings, perceptions, and behaviors evolved in the course of their career?
- 2- What effects does community policing have on the socialization process of officers? Do community police officers actually perceive more differently than patrol officers?
- 3- What are officer's attitudes toward community policing and how is job satisfaction related to the changes associated with community policing?

3.3. Data Collection

The overall purpose of this study is to be able to provide a detailed description of organization in terms of organizational socialization. In-depth interviews were conducted for purposes of this study. The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. The interviews ranged from twenty to fifty minutes. The interview questions were semi-structured which provided interviewer "to explore, probe, and ask questions that will elucidate and illuminate that particular subject" (Patton, 1987:111). The interview questions were adapted and developed from interviews of several past studies (Buchanan, 1974; Feldman, 1976; Terrill, Paoline and Manning, 2003). The interview included general questions about police work and socialization, its impact on police attitudes, community policing, and work-related satisfaction. A brief description of the objectives of the study was made at the beginning of each interview session. Prior to the interview, officers filled out a consent form making it clear that their participation was voluntary, that the information supplied would be held strictly confidential and officer's given name or other identifying information was never be used. In presenting quotations, the researcher preserved the confidentiality of the officers without providing personal information that would identify them. The interviews took place at the police department.

Second source of data was documents. The organization produces a wide range of publicly available material (i.e. recruiting brochures, newsletters, and annual reports). These official documents were also included in the analysis in that they may corroborate to other data collected by the interviews. They also exposed the formal policies and procedures of the organization.

Although a representative sample is not required for qualitative research, it was of obvious importance to have individuals from the different groups within that population because a heterogeneous sample was more likely than a homogenous group to communicate different views and opinions, ultimately opening a fruitful forum for discussion (Lindlof and Taylor, 2002; Murray, 1998). Based on the researcher's concern to get a representative sample within the organization to reduce the risk of capturing only a narrow set of interpretations, the organization arranged voluntary officers representing managerial position, community policing unit, detectives' bureau, and patrol unit. Nine interviews out of fifty eight officers were conducted, which is more or less sufficient to explore the range of experience and feelings of officers.

3.4. Data Analysis

The data obtained from the interviews and official documents were used for the analysis. The researchers took an inductive approach to examine the present phenomenon, insofar as the “categories will emerge out of the examination of the data without firm preconceptions dictating relevance in concepts and hypotheses beforehand” (Walker, 1985:58). In other words, a grounded approach was used for purposes of this research endeavor (Lindlof and Taylor, 2002).

Briefly, the analytic process began with listening through the records and notes several times to identify repeated statements or strongly expressed feelings. These were described and categorized to signify the most important experiences, themes and concepts for each individual or group. Quotations from officers were used to support the themes. The benefit of this approach was that it directly represents the native’s point of view, giving more weight to the experiences of the ‘insider’ than to the researcher (Murray, 1998). In order to increase the reliability of interpretations, the researchers compared the findings with available studies of police socialization process. The data were presented by descriptive and interpretative accounts to preserve the richness of data. Moreover, by coding the data into standardized categories, the researchers were able to count the data and use in quantitative analysis.

3.5. Limitations

Certain limitations of the study should be kept in mind when interpreting the findings of the study. One limitation was our exclusive reliance on self-report measures. This reliance raises questions about common method bias and the accuracy of respondents’ perceptions and their willingness to respond honestly. It is accepted that self-report studies are weak in proving causal relationships. However, the purpose of this study is to collect information about an issue rather than providing a causal relationship. Therefore, while using a self-report measure can be viewed as one of the weaknesses or limitations of this study, the general purpose of this study requires self-reporting (Shadish, William, Thomas and Campbell, 2002). Moreover, this study supplemented self-report measures with data from documents (Wanous and Colella, 1989).

Another limitation is that the participation was voluntary. If random sampling techniques were used for improving the representation of the study population, the possible bias regarding to the interview respondents could be reduced. Moreover, the number of interviewees was limited which decrease possibility of comparison and contrast among officers. Due to the limited number of interviewees, the influence of the diversity of police personnel on socialization processes and the comparison of socialization process and its outcomes in different units except for community policing unit and patrol unit were disregarded in this study.

The case study approach is limited in terms of generalization, but helpful for getting rich information and understanding of an organization. In this regard, generalization across organizations is not a goal of this study. Even if there might be some common points across police organizations, it is more likely that the socialization process varies across organizations. Therefore, this study aimed to get rich and deep understanding of specific police department rather than generalizing knowledge for all police departments.

4. Results

The interview process verified the appropriateness of inductive approach for this case study. During the interviews, the officers underlined the points they deem important which were generally different than the literature suggests. This does not mean the nonexistence of the things

suggested in the literature, but it shows that the priorities of the officers in the RUPD were different in some respects. In this regard, instead of using the categories and models used in the literature to explain police socialization process, the researcher conceptualized the socialization process within different categories that emerged out of the examination of the data.

Within this context, most of the officers put more emphasis on the changing individual style of policing and the influence of community policing within the socialization process. Based on the priorities of the officers, the results might be best explained in the following categories.

4.1. *Becoming a Police Officer*

Understanding the reasons to decide to be a police officer is essential to understand the expectancy and perception of officers on their job before joining the police organizations. In fact, the stories behind police officers' decision to become a police officer were nearly identical and in a way underlined the characteristics of the job. Police officers cited varying combinations of a few principles for becoming police. Almost all of the officers cited idealist views as their primary reason for joining police organizations. More specifically, desire to make a contribution and serve society were the main principles expressed by the officers. Financial considerations were represented, but rarely mentioned as primary or even secondary reason. According to officers, the influence of relatives, friends and family history triggered a process to think about this occupation seriously. Illustrative of the family history in one officer's remark is as follows: "To me, I can't see myself doing anything else. Actually, I am coming from a family of police officers. My grandfather, step father were police officers". Another officer highlighted the influence of family and moral reasons for becoming a police officer:

We have a history in our family. I have seen my uncle regularly in uniform, working and coming home. You become interested and ask many questions. In young age, I see the impact he has, the power and respect he has. I have cousins, in law enforcement. It looked like very positive thing to do. You can make contributions to the society and at the same time you get self-gratification because you got what you will.

In fact, there were some other identical stories cited by the officers. Almost all officers expressed a desire to 'make a difference', 'make a change for positive', 'saving lives', and 'make a contribution to the society'.

4.2. *Changing Policing Style- From Fighting Crime to Problem Solving*

As understood from their stories, these officers mostly feel that 'being a cop' is honorable and exciting, and believe that they can make a difference. In compatible with these idealistic and strong feelings, most of the traditional officers (officers more than 15 years experience) expressed their individual style as 'aggressive policing' in their first years of the job. An officer commented on the style of policing referring to early 1990s: "We were all young aggressive officers. All I wanted to arrest problem makers". Remarks of another officer showed how having idealistic views and being a young officer influenced his attitudes in his early career: "You were young. You were excited, energetic. You want to make an impact immediately. You want bad guys out of streets, drug out of street. You want to help people and fight crime". As it is understood, these officers had a tendency to adopt a 'crime fighter' orientation at the beginning of their careers. Being an aggressive street police was the cultural ideal for many officers in the early years of their career.

However, when the officers spent years on the field, they learned the realities of the job and their views of the job and individual policing style dramatically changed. The remarks of the one officer illustrated how the views of officers changed after they worked in the streets for years:

When you graduate from the academy, you think that you can cure all and you can answer every think. The reality is that you can't control all people. You can't fix everything, but you still make a difference.

In fact, it takes a few years for police officers to learn the realities of the job and what attitudes and behaviors are appropriate and expected. One officer confirmed this point as follow: "It took a couple years to get the feeling that I knew what I was doing. For the first year, I had no idea. Somebody help me". At this stage, experienced officers become role models who influence police officers' habits and beliefs about the job. Police officers also pay attention to the way other officers handle the situation to learn the job. As stated by one officer: "I try to model the best parts of each officer". The evaluation of the peers can also be important in this early stage of your career. One officer said: "You have to prove yourself".

In addition to personal experience of officers in the field and their degree of socialization into culture, in the last two decades, the idea of policing, department's priorities in terms of community policing, community demands and needs have changed dramatically. Today, the basic concept that might be used to define the culture of the RUPD is '*service style department*'. In this regard, these organizational, social, and individual differences seem to affect the same officers' policing style. The officers who emphasized arresting, going out and fighting crime while describing their early years in the department, now express different approach for their policing style. The following statements illustrated this:

Most of the time, you have a different philosophy now. You are older. You are wiser. You still want to fight crime, but depending on technology now instead of your strength. You are speeding your energy by relying on your intelligence, your brain. It is basically the same, but you have a different way to get the result.

Another officer emphasized how getting experience changed his personal style:

My approach has definitely changed. I listen more instead of talking more. It is all about defusing problems, not going in there and making it worse. Take a step back, and listen to what people are saying. Talk softly. I used to talk overly. You just get it through experience.

In the same line of thought, another officer commented:

I became better what I do. My philosophy has changed in the sense of dealing with just the offense rather than dealing with big picture. I got more involved in prevention programs. I arrested a lot of people for alcohol violations. Double people almost died from excessive drinking. That was always law enforcement. I am becoming more involved in how we can stop this people doing these things to them in the first place. How can I put them treatment. Looking at why we are doing it, looking at from parental perspective.

It seems apparent that the officers' views about the meaning of being a police, the role they need to play and their personal style towards policing have changed in the course of their career.

4.3. Community Policing and Socialization Process

The RUPD operates under a community policing philosophy and implements structural change compatible with this philosophy. This fundamental change in policing style could be expected to affect the occupational environment and challenge the socialization models adapted in accordance with traditional policing. In fact, the results confirmed the considerable effect of community policing at the socialization process of the officer at the RUPD by changing philosophy of policing and rigid, centralized bureaucracy. One officer pointed out the structural change in the department:

I would call myself traditional when I started. Then, community policing came into play. It wasn't something we created, but we changed the department. Some of the traditional officers are now community policing officers. They started old fashion, this is on a beat. This is what I am going to do.

Another officer pointed out the change in philosophy:

Community policing is a problem solving technique rather than dealing the same problem over and over again, deal with the root causes of the problem. The same fight, how we can prevent it, contact with CPO to know that environment. In fact, I found out it is different way of what we are doing already.

In this way, community policing has provided positive experiences in problem solving and working with citizens. Under community policing, officers focus more on problem-solving. The remarks of an officer illustrated the problems in traditional policing approaches and why police needs alternatives:

In patrol that was one of the things that people did start to burn out. I did ten years. I was really believed it. I enjoyed what I did, but I am dealing with the same drug idiot over and over. It is like okay, Friday night at 11 o'clock, there will be some complains from the restaurant. One o'clock it is going to be four fights. I knew what was going to happen. And you got frustrated, burn out.

The same officer explained why community policing philosophy decreases the possibility of burning out:

Community policing solved some of the problems. You didn't have to go the same fight over and over again, deal with the root causes of the problem. They feel more controlled of their environment. It is the lack of control that really causes the burning out.

Moreover, in compatible with community policing, the importance of public relations was emphasized many times within the interviews. Officers talked about policing as being a more shared, listening, and partnership approach. An officer commented: "Community policing in general partnership. It is partnership between university community and public safety division". In this regard, officers tend to increase their interactions and communication with citizens in handling for crime problems. This environment has also lessened the need for a crime fighter image and use of solely law enforcement to control crime problems. The implication of these points in the frame of socialization are that it mitigates to some degree the perceived threats in officers' environments and leads to decreased suspicion, isolation among police and public. In this regard, the changes are likely to erode strong socializing influences over the police officer's perceptions, feelings and attitudes. They are more likely to get influenced by external demands and factors. Therefore, the changing conditions make the socialization process more diverse and contingent.

4.4. Job Satisfaction and Socialization

As already mentioned, the research documented generally consistent findings on the outcome of the socialization experiences of police officers. However, these studies mostly focused on urban police departments rather than small or university police departments. University police departments have different community demands, neighborhood, and target population compared to other police departments.

In this regard, officers at the RUPD expressed both similar and different outcomes of their work experience within the police department. Interestingly enough, officers made a distinction between the job satisfaction and department satisfaction. Almost all officers expressed a very high level of satisfaction about job where as some of them expressed a low level of satisfaction about department. The high level of satisfaction about the job has linked the honorable nature of the job, and their belief that they have contributed to the society. Illustrative of this point is one officer's remark:

Public service, moral reasons, and law enforcement appeal to me. I am applicant for the good guys. I can not change the world, but I can change little portion of it. I know I saved lives. It is not the hero complex, it is the satisfaction.

On the other hand, some personal problems, uncertainties and competitiveness in the department seem to have decreased the satisfaction level of some officers about the department.

The comparison of satisfaction level among officers showed that community policing officers and mid level managers express more satisfaction than patrol officers. For instance, one ranked officer commented: "My job is very rewarding. There are of course bad days and good days, fortunately, more good days. Overall, it is very satisfactory". Another ranked officer expressed similar position for the level of satisfaction: "Very satisfied. Ups and down, it has waives, just like life". In a similar vein, one community officer commented: "It is only human nature you want more. I am happy. There is room to be happy. I am content". On the other hand, one of the patrol officers expressed less level of satisfaction: "Satisfied some days, some days not, overall satisfaction is about 51 percent. That is not too good, that is not too bad, either". The other patrol officers also expressed less level of satisfaction.

Patrol officers are the most visible units of police organizations. They are subject to much more research than other units. Most of the research about patrol officers documented that they become progressively more negative in their views of both the public and the criminal justice system as well as job satisfaction (Manning, 1977). However, intensity of dissatisfaction among patrol officers at the RUPD and their reasons and concerns for the dissatisfaction was totally different than these researches suggest. There were two main reasons for the difference: community policing (problem solving) and university environment. As expressed by the officers, problem solving approach gives a base to be proactive to focus on the causes of the crime rather than just to respond the same fight over and over again. Thus, they feel more controlled of their environment. As expressed by one officer: "It is the lack of control that really causes burning out". In addition, university environment is different in its neighborhood, population, and nature of crime problems. As already mentioned, the officers put more emphasize on service roles over law enforcement or fighting crime in contrast to some urban police departments. Therefore, this perspective is likely to prevent the officers from being more negative in their views of both the public and the criminal justice system. However, for the same reasons, patrol officers experience an identity problem '*being a cop or social worker*'. Especially, the patrol officers experience this dilemma more than other officers working indoor. In this respect, the patrol officers who cannot internalize these mixed identities express lower level of satisfaction.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The main assumption of this study is that police socialization is more varied and less determined in a time of transition than previously thought. Police officers develop their own style compatible with their experience and their environment. Traditional models of socialization assume that organizational socialization process is homogeneous and stable within police organizations. However, the case of the RUPD demonstrates that the influence of community policing, the nature of the job, target population and the neighborhood in which police organization operate make a difference even within the same organization in terms of socialization and its outcomes.

It is possible to say that almost all officers had idealistic reasons for joining a police organization, such as '*an interest in police work*', '*personal experience with police*', '*to make a difference*', and '*to serve the community*'. In fact, the reasons officers were attracted to police work are

identical to the results of other studies. In parallel to the socialization literature, the new officers' idealistic views about police work turned out a relatively realistic view of police work in a certain period of time. These officers had a tendency to adopt a '*crime fighter*' orientation at the beginning of their careers. Being an aggressive street police was the cultural ideal for many officers in the early years of their career. However, when the officers spent years on the field, they learned the realities of the job and thus their views of the job and individual policing style dramatically changed.

It was clear that community policing, their neighborhood, target population, culture and priorities of the department have influenced the socialization process of officers. The officers at the RUPD stressed on service roles over law enforcement and supported partnership with public. Their personal style has also become more tolerant and open to their target population. This change is likely to be coordinated with the change in the department. In this new era, the RUPD has prioritized serving to community. Officers were expected to increase their interactions and communication with citizens in handling and coming up with responses for crime rather than just reacting crime. This process also mitigated to some degree the perceived threats in officers' environments and led to decreased suspicion, isolation among police and public. Thus, this environment has lessened the need for a crime fighter image and use of solely law enforcement to control crime problems.

Officers' attitudes regarding the crime problem are not created in a vacuum; they are formed and changed primarily through interactions with other officers, victims and offenders as well as organizational change in the scope of community policing. Over time these relationships might form their attitudes and help them to find out what works and what does not work in each case. In a socialization perspective, these traditional officers learnt to be more than a '*crime fighter*' in its traditional meaning and turned out to be '*problem solvers*'. It is hard to explain the change without emphasizing the role of community policing. Most of the officers have already declared the influence of community policing in their socialization and becoming a problem solver rather than just a crime fighter.

On the one hand, this change prevents the officers from being more negative in their views of both the public and the criminal justice system in contrast to Barker (1999) and Van Maanen (1975) suggest in their studies. As suggested in these studies, officers adapting solely traditional policing feel lack of control their environment, and eventually lose their motivation and keep public and criminal justice system responsible for crime problem. It was clear that this was not the case at the RUPD. On the other hand, the situation at the RUPD raised questions about their identity -*being a cop or social worker*- and the priorities of the department. Especially, the patrol officers experienced this dilemma more than other officers working in other units and indoor. They expressed less level of satisfaction compared to the community policing officers and mid level managers. There might be two main reasons for the difference: Community policing and university environment. Community policing and problem solving approach give a base to be proactive to focus on the causes of the crime rather than just to respond them. Thus, they feel more controlled of their environment. In addition, university environment is different in its neighborhood, population, and nature of crime problems. As already mentioned, the officers put more emphasize on service roles over law enforcement or fighting crime in contrast to some urban police departments. Therefore, this perspective is likely to prevent the officers from being more negative in their views of both the public and the criminal justice system. In this respect, the officers who seem to internalize the values and practices of the community policing express

higher level of satisfaction. The patrol officers who cannot internalize these mixed identities express lower level of satisfaction.

Most of the studies on socialization process of police officers and its outcomes have been conducted in large metropolitan areas. Few have focused on smaller or non-urban police. When it comes to university police departments, there is more likely not to find a single case study. The university police departments are different in some respects (i.e. neighborhood, the community served, and rate and nature of crimes) from other police departments. Thus, all these things make the RUPD different than other type of police organizations. The difference in occupational and the organizational environments of university police department change officers' priorities, expectations at the department, leading to different perceptions on socialization process and satisfaction.

References

- Akbaş, Turan and Şanlı, Savaş, (2009), "Adana İlinde Çalışan Polislerin İş Doyumu Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi", *Polis Bilimleri Dergisi*, C. 11, ss. 73-86.
- Aksu, Nedim, (2012), "İş Tatmininin Bazı Demografik Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi", *Polis Bilimleri Dergisi*, C. 14, ss. 59-79.
- Ashforth, E. Blake and Saks, M. Alan, (1996), "Socialization Tactics: Longitudinal Effects on Newcomer Adjustment", *Academy of Management Journal*, V. 39, pp. 149-178.
- Barker, C. Joan, (1999), *Danger, Duty, and Disillusion*, Illinois: Waveland Press Inc.
- Buchanan, Bruce, (1974), "Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organizations", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, V. 19, pp. 533-546.
- Feldman, C. Daniel, (1976), "A Contingency Theory of Socialization", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, V. 21, pp. 433-452.
- Feldman, C. Daniel, (1981), "The Multiple Socialization of Organization Members", *The Academy of Management Review*, V. 6, pp. 309-318.
- Katz, Ralph, (1978), "Job Longevity as a Situational Factor in Job Satisfaction", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, V. 23, pp. 204-223.
- Lindlof, R. Thomas and Taylor, C. Bryan, (2002), *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*, CA: Sage.
- Manning, K. Peter, (1977), *Police Work: The Social Organization of Policing*, Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Murray, Joanna, (1998), "Qualitative methods", *International Review of Psychiatry*, V. 10, pp. 312-316.
- Paoline, Eugene; Myers, Stephanie and Worden, E. Robert, (2000), "Police Culture, Individualism, and Community Policing: Evidence From Two Police Departments", *Justice Quarterly*, V. 17, pp. 2-37.
- Patton, Q. Michael, (1987), *How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Rutgers University Police Department, (2009), <http://publicsafety.rutgers.edu/rupd>, (Retrieved 2. 12. 2007).

- Shadish, R. William; Cook, D. Thomas and Campbell, T. Donald, (2002), *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Schein, H. Edgar, (1968), "Organizational Socialization and the Profession of Management", *Industrial Management Review*, V. 9, pp. 1-16.
- Skogan, G. Wesley and Hartnett, M. Susan, (1997), *Community Policing, Chicago Style*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Terrill, William; Paoline, Eugene and Manning, Peter, (2003), "Police Culture and Coercion", *Criminology*, 41, 1003-1034.
- Walker, Robert, (Ed). (1985), *Applied Qualitative Research*, Aldershot: Gower.
- Williams, Erick, (2002), "Officer Attitude Surveys in Community Policing Organizations: What Are They Really Telling Management", *Police and Society*, V. 12, pp. 37-52.
- Van Maanen, John, (1975). "Breaking In: A consideration of Organizational Socialization", Robert Dubin (Ed.), *Handbook of Work, Organization, and Society*. Chicago: Rand-McNally, pp. 407-418.
- Van Maanen, John, (1978). "People Processing: Strategies of Organizational Socialization", *Organizational Dynamics*, V. 7, pp. 18-36.
- Wanous, P. John; Reichers, Arnon and Malik, D. Sunita, (1984), "Organizational Socialization and Group Development: Toward an Integrative Perspective". *Academy of Management Review*, V. 9, pp. 670-683.
- Wood, Jennifer, (2004), "Cultural Change in the Governance of Security", *Policing & Society*, V. 14, pp. 31-48.