The Instructional Systems Design (ISD) process was applied to a communication skills training project for the New York City Police Department. The purpose of the application was to reduce the number of unnecessary civilian complaints accumulated by police officers. The project passed through the five phases of ISD: analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation. During the analysis phase, an instructional need was perceived for a job-specific communications strategy that would transfer easily to learners and that they would choose to use on the job. The design phase resulted in a 4-hour workshop. The development of the project followed a module-by-module approach. A participant workbook was produced, along with a videotape of real police situations where problems resulted from the inability to use effective communication skills. Eight workshops were delivered. Data on learner reaction and learner acquisition of skills were collected during each workshop. The formative evaluation process included one-on-one trials using the "think aloud" protocol, small-group trials, and field trials. A summative evaluation was conducted. Findings indicated 90 percent of learners rated the workshop very good or outstanding, 75 percent used the skills effectively, and participants had a lower level of civilian complaints. (Project materials, including videotape scripts and the instructor/learner workbook are appended.) (YLB)
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Overview

This document presents the application of the Instructional Systems Design (ISD) process to a communication skills training project for the New York City Police Department. The ISD process includes the steps and substeps in the phases of analysis, design, development, implementation and evaluation. All procedures, instructional materials and evaluation results are contained within this document.

Background

In 1967, in the wake of urban rioting and racial strife, President Johnson created The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. This commission wrote several volumes of reports including one called, "Task Force Report: The Police" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967). The two key concepts that emerged and which still guide police administrators today were "professionalism" and the "service ideal". Simply put, professionalism is an attempt to emulate the "learned professions" of law, medicine and theology. Police colleges have been developed; educational requirements
have been steadily raised, the number of hours devoted to training have been increased, and a body of technical material and language has been developed.

The service ideal has been described as, "nothing more than dedication to the needs of one's clients or constituency. Whenever there is a conflict between personal goals and that of the client's interests, it is the client who must prevail" (Blumberg and Niederhoffer, 1970). Both of these concepts are at the heart of this training project. The performance deficiencies that emerged from the needs analysis can be described as gaps in the professional, community-oriented policing strategies that law enforcement administrators are advocating in the late 1960's.

Dramatic improvements have been made in some areas of police professionalization over the last 20 years, and other areas are still a problem. Statistically, police use of force, both justified and unjustified, has been drastically reduced over the years. New York City Police Department guidelines for the use of deadly physical force have been dramatically revised so as to control shooting incidents. Systematic tracking, investigation and computer analysis of all firearms discharge incidents have also been brought to bear on this problem area. In another area of professionalizing
policing, one could point to the evolution of humanistic policies for managing such volatile incidents as hostage taking, dangerously emotionally disturbed people and intrusive field investigations (stop and frisk). However, the service ideal in police work seems to be suffering the same problems that are described in customer service industries across the United States. The perceptions and feelings that come from discourtesy, rudeness, gruffness, and other police behavior often called "police arrogance," are still producing thousands of allegations of misconduct to the New York City Civilian Complaint Review Board by people of all races and backgrounds.

Based on 20 years of experience in both policing and training police and culminating with graduate work in training and learning technology, the designer decided to develop a training program that operationalized the "professional, service ideal" in terms of the standard communication strategies used in client-centered businesses. The training project described here was an attempt to adapt those customer service skills to the routine, provocative police encounters that produce civilian complaints. As part of this attempt the designer wanted to motivate police officers to choose to use these verbal strategies.
The content of this project focuses on several aspects of provocative police-citizen interactions:

1. The rewards of customer service
2. The consequences of poor service
3. The identification of diffusing strategies
4. The practice of verbal strategies in drills

Statement of the Problem

"Don't call people assholes!" "Don't call people assholes!" A sergeant representing the Civilian Complaint Review Board spent 30 minutes telling an audience of young, fresh-scrubbed police officers, just assigned to Field Training Units from the Police Academy, not to call citizens "assholes." "Be courteous, use common sense, talk to people as you would like police officers to talk to your mothers and sisters," these traditional admonitions are part of the problem in human relations training because they either tell people what not to do or they offer concepts without specific behaviors to picture or physically execute.

In late 1973, the New York City Police Department, as a further step toward professionalization, totally restructured its recruit training. The recruit school was set up into three academic departments and a Physical School. Instructors were recruited and deployed to either
the Social Science, Law, or Police Science Departments based on their backgrounds and abilities. Each recruit company had an instructor for each discipline. The Social Science curriculum was the place for communication skills and the service ideal to be taught. Since then, transactional analysis has been the model used to teach recruits how to communicate with clients in difficult situations. Communication barriers are described and there are films and opportunities to practice.

Since practically every police officer on patrol in 1999 has had that Social Science training and the allegations of discourtesy and abuse still go up and down over time, it appears that this approach has not achieved the goal of enabling police officers to successfully manage emotionally charged situations where provocative remarks are made. "Successfully" in this case, means without generating unnecessary ill will or allegations of discourtesy and misconduct.

The difficulties arise from the escalation of negative communications. Officers get "hooked" into emotional responses that then serve as provocative stimuli for the clients. Often these situations culminate in a summons for disorderly conduct, an arrest for harassment, a felony arrest for assault or, in a highly charged atmosphere, serious physical injury and criminal or civil
litigation.

In order to assess today's picture of police-citizen interaction we must add several factors to the normally difficult situation. Due to the City's financial crisis during the mid to late seventies the department shrunk from some 31,000 members to 23,000. Once hiring began again, large numbers of young men and women were hired and mature officers who normally serve as mentors continued to retire. The net result in the late 1980's, is a patrol force of extremely young people with young supervisors and very few seasoned veterans to impart a calming influence. On the clients' side, one finds an increasing unwillingness to accept any authoritarian intrusions into private lives. One also finds a growing intolerance of police abuse and discourtesy among working-class minority communities.

The general atmosphere in New York City (and other urban areas) has been characterized as highly charged by writers, politicians and activists, as minority groups begin to seriously vie for political power. Today's police officers have a greater potential for improving or fouling the general climate of the City than ever before.
Purpose of the Project

The purpose of this project is to reduce the number of unnecessary civilian complaints accumulated by police officers. Unnecessary means that there will always be complaints made by people who, in their perception, observe acts of misconduct, feel that officers should have used discretion where they didn’t, or should not have used discretion where they did. In this project, the designer is focusing on non-criminal, order maintenance situations, where the inability of officers to verbally diffuse provocative remarks results in escalating hostility and complaints. He believes that police officers, in high activity commands, can be trained in a workshop to choose and to use standard customer service communication skills when dealing with angry “customers.”

The designer would also like to demonstrate the effectiveness of delivering training on the precinct level. It is very rare for in-service training of this nature to be delivered at a precinct. Usually, a small number of officers from each precinct in a patrol borough command, attend training in a large group at a central location. The designer believes that training officers who work together every day, at their precinct, with their supervisors, is more effective in transferring learning from the classroom to the field.
Definition of Terms

The following terms are used by the New York City Police Department’s Civilian Complaint Review Board and will be referred to in this report:

**Discourtesy** - Includes cursing, nasty words, profane or rude gestures, rudeness, sexist remarks, gay slurs, other.

**Ethnic Slurs** - Includes demeaning comments regarding race, religion, ethnicity, gender or sexual preference.

The following terms are used to describe the communication skills the designer attempted to transfer:

**Acknowledging Feelings** - Non-judgmental statements made in response to hostile, provocative remarks that lets speakers know that their feelings have been heard and understood.

**Active Listening** - Use of paraphrasing to accurately focus on the client’s issue and to create a perception in the client that the officer is sincerely listening.

**Giving Information** - Supplying directions, procedures, referrals, etc. to help the client resolve problems.
Assumptions

1. That, using the communication skills described above, officers will be able to successfully carry out order maintenance activities in the face of provocative stimuli and not generate unnecessary civilian complaints.

2. That, officers who accept the notion of being "in costume," and on-stage, will choose to remain in character (professional, service ideal officers) by using the skills described above.

3. That, personalizing the consequences of accumulating Civilian Complaints will also create an attitude of choosing to use these skills over maladaptive conditioned, emotional responses.

Limitations

This project was developed for the New York City Police Department as an in-service workshop for police officers assigned to a patrol precinct. The workshop was conducted at the 73rd Precinct in the East New York section of Brooklyn, New York. Its content may not be suitable for use in other programs, organizations, circumstances, times or countries without modification.
Method and Procedures

The method used in developing this project is based on the ISD format described in the "Interservice Procedures for Instructional Systems Development". This model was developed at Florida State University in 1976. This process is also described in Dick and Carey (1985). Each source describes the ISD process as having five similar components, called in this document, analysis, design, development, implementation and evaluation.

Analysis

The designer directly observed and participated in the order maintenance job tasks that police officers on patrol must perform. In addition, police department procedural directives and both entry and post-entry level training documents were reviewed. Other material examined in the analysis phase included data from the Civilian Complaint Review Board.

The designer conferred with police department executives at the host patrol precinct and up the chain of command to the Chief of Patrol's Office at Police Headquarters. Additionally, the designer conferred with many patrol officers identified as both successful and unsuccessful in police-citizen interaction regarding the development and implementation of this customer service approach.
The designer surveyed the literature on police communications training and found that the Transactional Analysis model and variations of it are still being used. He was unable to locate any attempts to directly adapt the type of customer service model described in this document to police training.

**Design**

Learning objectives were developed according to Mager (1984). Mager states that each objective should have three components:

1. **Performance** - what the learner will do
2. **Conditions** - under what conditions
3. **Criteria** - and how well

**Development**

The designer developed the training plan using the schematic of instructional events described by Gagne (1985). The methods of instruction were lecture, discussion, demonstration and application exercises. The media used included videotapes, flip charts, chalkboards and workbooks.

**Implementation**

The designer conducted the workshop according to the designed plan and delivered it eight times with modifications after the initial sessions. Data was collected for improvement.
Evaluation

The designer performed both formative and summative evaluations. He engaged in several concept-testing sessions with subject matter experts (SME's). Additionally, one-on-one and small-group testing was done prior to the field trials. The formative evaluation resulted in modifications to the material and increased cooperation from the host precinct commander. The time allotted was doubled from one-half to one full day and supervisors were authorized to attend along with the patrol officers.

Summary

Several factors come together at this point in New York City's history to compel further attempts at giving police officers the tools they need to successfully communicate with their clients - the citizens. One of these is the NYPD's commitment to inculcating the service ideal in all of its uniformed and civilian personnel. Another is the sensitive socio-political environment of the city as it grows more pluralistic and its various cultural communities vie for pieces of the pie.

The training project described in this paper focuses on those specific communication skills and strategies that will allow police officers to gain
compliance without generating civilian complaints as they try to maintain the public order. The project follows the ISD format and incorporates modifications made after field trials.
CHAPTER 2
ANALYSIS

Introduction

The first step in the systematic design of instruction is analysis. The writers of the Interservice ISD model state that this is the most critical phase of ISD, because it's here that the foundation is built for the remainder of the process...if the analysis is not valid and reliable, the resulting training will not produce personnel able to perform their duties at an acceptable level. In the case of the designer's target population, the performance deficiencies that might result from inadequate training, derived from a faulty analysis and design, could have serious consequences. Those consequences include continuing civilian complaints at best and the spark for civil disorders at the worst. Additionally, as the result of a February 28, 1989 United States Supreme Court decision (City of Canton v. Harris), reported in The New York Times of March 1, 1989, municipalities may now be held liable if "deliberate indifference" to the inadequate training of police officers results in actions that deprive people of their constitutional rights.
Needs Analysis

Maintaining the public order in terms of citing traffic violators, managing disputes, and managing public behavior that is disorderly and affects the quality of life (loud radios, public drinking, canine littering, tumultuous behavior), results in contacts that produce almost 70% of the civilian complaints against police officers. In view of the consequences of improper police performance, the designer carefully examined what he believed to be the sources that would produce a valid analysis outcome. These include:

1. Interviews of executives at the Civilian Complaint Review Board
2. Interviews of executives in the field in patrol precincts
3. Interviews with police officers identified as successful or unsuccessful performers
4. The designer’s experience as a police officer, supervisor, executive and trainer
5. A survey of current entry-level and in-service training
6. A survey of civilian complaints and statistics

The designer often represented the police chief responsible for North Brooklyn at regular in-service
Methods and Procedures Used

The ISD model followed in this project was a synthesis of the Interagency Service Model of Instructional Systems Design and the Systematic Design of Instruction Model presented by Dick and Carey. The project passed through five phases: analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation. The highlights of each phase are summarized below.

Analysis

In the analysis phase the designer used a variety of sources for information to help define the gap between what is and what should be. He examined statistics from the Civilian Complaint Review Board and he consulted with people from many areas in the police department. He talked to, observed, and participated with police officers in the host precinct and in the rest of north Brooklyn as they engaged in all levels of police-citizen interaction.

The "gap," as it was seen from the top down, was an increase in allegations of discourtesy and ethnic slurs among police officers citywide and in the host precinct in particular. From the bottom up, it looked and felt like the people in the community were out to get us and
we had better show them who's boss right from the first moment of contact. From the designer's point of view, the gap or deficit was that many police officers were not equipped with the communication skills to successfully diffuse provocative stimuli. They relied on conditioned "parent" responses, both verbal and non-verbal, to combat the hostile feelings that occur naturally when a resident of the United States of America is intruded on by the police. The goal then became to equip officers with those skills and with an attitude in the direction of choosing to use them when it counted!

From the research, the designer was able to construct a job task analysis that identified knowledges, skills, abilities, and beyond that, values that were necessary to do the job. Learner characteristics were analyzed and deemed by the designer to be critical factors in working through all of the subsequent phases of the project.

Literature on both communication skills and the use of workshop and experiential methods in training police officers was reviewed. A related theory, Transactional Analysis was described and noted as being a primary tool in recruit training. Additionally, existing instructional materials were also reviewed.
training sessions for patrol officers. At these sessions the designer would discuss "problems" from the chief's point of view and from the officers' point of view. Management would be concerned about civilian complaints of discourtesy and ethnic slurs. Officers would be concerned about accumulating a record of "unjustified" civilian complaints and a lack of support from the department and the public. They would resist accepting blame for poor police-citizen encounters.

After attending many of these sessions and after conducting countless informal interviews of line officers it became clear to the designer that the target population would not identify hostile police-citizen encounters as a problem that they could do anything about. The Police Commissioner should, the Mayor should, the media should, the people should... everyone else could and should do something about civilian complaints.

In interviewing officers identified by the host precinct commander as successful, in that they had a high level of activity and few if any civilian complaints, the designer discovered several things:

1. They understood that success was connected to the way you speak to people, the tone of the conversation and the ability not to take things
personally.

2. They found it difficult to articulate, beyond the concept level, the specific behaviors that made them successful (remain calm, don't get excited, talk man-to-man, etc.).

Interviews with executives at all levels put the responsibility for civilian complaints on the police officer and many blamed the young age of the patrol force, immaturity, a lack of veterans to model the right way to speak to people, a heightened sensitivity of the general public to poor treatment and a growing unwillingness to take direction from authority. In an interview with Dr. Martin Symonds, a Deputy Chief Police Surgeon and an eminent psychiatrist and expert in police behavior, the designer uncovered some interesting notions (personal communication). According to the doctor, police officers were simply failing to make a distinction between on-duty performance and their off-duty behavior. He stated that the officers who get civilian complaints react discourteously when they are provoked in off-duty situations and in fact that they fail to make the same off-duty, on-duty distinction about their driving styles. This idea, combined with the Disney training philosophy described later, led to the on-stage concept.
A review of the Civilian Complaint Review Board's statistics shows that there are some interesting demographic variables that emerge from the overall analysis of civilian complaints for 1987 (Appendix E). Complaints from the Black community made up approximately 43% of the total while that community represented only 24% of the general population. And, complaints from the White community made up approximately 30% of the total while they represented 52% of the population. Hispanic community complaints are in proportion to their percentage of the population. There were no significant racial, ethnic or gender differences between the groups of officers getting complaints and their proportions in the NYPD population.

The conclusion that the designer draws from these statistics is that it is the combination of situational dynamics and the ability to use good communication skills that makes individual officers successful or unsuccessful in resolving provocative encounters and not their race or ethnicity. The designer's experiences as a police officer, supervisor, behavioral science instructor, and police executive, support this notion.
Job Task Analysis

In looking for order maintenance task descriptions, the designer could locate only the general NYPD performance evaluation form and some task descriptions in the entry-level Social Science curriculum. The lesson in the Student Guide is more of an outline of psychological aspects and instructions than a behavioral list of tasks and standards. The designer analyzed this lesson, his own experience and his direct observations to develop the following analysis for the task of interacting with citizens in non-criminal, order maintenance situations. The list was reviewed and approved by SME's in both the tactical and human relations areas of the police department.

**Required attitudes/values:**

- Compassion
- Skepticism
- Empathy
- Assertiveness

**Model worker performance:**

- Uses empathetic, non-verbal communication in attending to clients
- Uses paraphrasing to clarify, confirm and demonstrate empathy to clients
- Provides useful information to clients
• Repeats instructions calmly when challenged
• Uses appropriate titles and courtesies when addressing clients

Task Steps:
1. Greet violator
2. Describe the violation
3. Request credentials
4. Take enforcement action/warn and admonish
5. Explain follow-up procedures
6. Acknowledge cooperation
7. Assist violator back into traffic
8. Document incident in Activity Log
9. Vent feelings to partner in private

Target Population Analysis

The target audience for this project was patrol officers and supervisors assigned to a precinct where there is a high level of activity and a high level of civilian complaints. The learners were selected from all officers available on a shift when the training was scheduled. Among the learners were both successful and unsuccessful performers. That is, officers with few if any civilian complaints and officers with six or more. Six is a significant number because the police department has an administrative review procedure for officers who have six or more complaints, even if the
allegations are not substantiated. The "unsubstantiated" disposition is frequently used to describe allegations that cannot be proved or disproved.

Learner characteristics include the following:

1. Age can vary from low-twenties to mid-thirties. However, it will be unusual to find learners over thirty.

2. Racial, ethnic and gender breakdown will be approximately that of the general department population (11% Black, 11% Hispanic, 77% White, .5% Other, 11% female, 89% male).

3. The socioeconomic status of the learners will vary with most being from working class backgrounds and with 40% living in the suburbs.

4. The educational background of the learners will range upward from a minimum of High School education with many having undergraduate experience and/or degrees.

5. The learners will share contemporary cultural interests in popular music, films, sports and celebrities.

6. The learners will be defensive about what might be perceived as an attempt to keep them from being active in doing their jobs. They will need to be reassured that this is not the case.
They will be concerned about being labelled as problem performers by their selection for training and will need to be reassured about that as well.

7 The learners will share, to varying degrees, an "us against them" mind set. There are forces that tend to exclude them from the general population while making them highly cohesive as a sub-group (Skolnick, J. 1970, see Niederhoffer, Ambivalent Force, pps. 223-238).

8 The learners will have received "Meets Standards" or even "Above Standards" evaluations and this will have to be reconciled with what are being called "performance deficiencies" in some cases.

Organizational Constraints

The police department must show certain patrol strength figures on each of the three shifts. Days off patrol for training are carefully figured into general patrol availability. In doing this project, the designer had to accommodate all of the scheduling variables and not incur any overtime from backfilling for the participants. This resulted in an initial allotment of a four-hour block during the first half of the day shift on weekdays excluding holidays.
Additionally, the designer had to be sensitive to the union issue of labeling on the basis of "unsubstantiated" complaints against officers. This resulted in participants being selected on an arbitrary availability basis and with no knowledge of civilian complaint history. Sensitivity to union concerns also led the designer to decide not to use the videotaping of role plays in this series of field trials.

During implementation, the designer was temporarily transferred to the Department of Personnel to help develop a promotion exam. After that, he was permanently transferred into the Personnel Bureau to design training for the Police Cadet Corps. This unanticipated constraint affected the designer's ability to reach more of the target population and to follow through on certain post-workshop evaluation aspects of the training such as monitoring field performance and doing interviews.

The designer required a VCR, flip chart and chairs and these were provided. The only training location available with an adequate measure of privacy was cramped and had been subdivided for other purposes. Occasionally, there were distractions from activities in the connected portion of the room.
Instructional Goal

The "gap" in police performance that the designer is trying to bridge is described in meetings, memos and directives from the top of the Police Department down; and from the outside political world in, through the Civilian Complaint Review Board. All agree that there should be many fewer complaints from the public about police misconduct in all categories. The areas of discourtesy and ethnic slurs while not immediately threatening to life or limb, are of great concern as quality of life issues. As mentioned earlier, the potential for incidents of discourtesy to escalate and become the spark in a highly charged socio-political environment must also be considered. The designer defined an instructional goal in this area that is both attitudinal and intellectual (Dick and Carey, 1985):

Learners will choose to use the verbal strategies described by the On-Stage acronym in responding to the typical, provocative remarks that occur in police-citizen encounters, as simulated by other workshop participants during skills application drills.

The strategies are:

S State an acknowledgment of the client's feelings
T Titles and surnames only
A Active listening through paraphrasing
G Give useful information to the client
E Escape from no-win situations by walking away
The goal is stated to the workshop participants in
the no-nonsense vernacular that the designer expects
will appeal to these "street cops," that is, "You will
be able to do what you have to do and not get civilian
complaints." "Do what you have to do," is a phrase that
means taking the called for enforcement action or even
the simplest, yet unpleasant, order maintenance actions
in the face of unrewarding consequences be they
physical, political or disciplinary. Given the learner
characteristics described above, the deep-seated
suspicion, cynicism and defensiveness, it was very
important for the designer to provide elements in the
workshop that were unequivocally from the real world of
the "street." The street is a one-word description of
context that separates line officers on patrol from all
other police personnel. If an instructor attempts to
train patrol officers and discusses skills, knowledges
and abilities outside of the real context of "street
cops," that instructor will be dealing with a class of
POW's (prisoners of war). In recognition of this, the
designer located videotapes from a video verite
documentary about police in the roughest precinct in the
Bronx. Selected scenes were edited together and used as
demonstrations and case studies in the workshop.
Additional visual aids such as a chalkboard and flip
chart were used.

The outcomes expected from this intervention include the capability to perform the intellectual skills described in the On Stage method and an attitude in the direction of choosing to use these skills when experiencing emotional conflict from provocative stimuli.

**Literature, Existing Course, and Material Review**

The designer surveyed literature on communication skills training, on the use of workshop and other group training for police officers and on customer service. The literature includes books and articles from magazines and journals. The approaches and theories covered in the survey included transactional analysis, verbal judo, verbal akido, sensitivity training, conflict resolution, role-playing and case study.

**Related theory**

Every police officer in the New York City Police Department hired after November 1973 has had some entry-level training in the model of interpersonal communication developed by Dr. Eric Berne and known as Transactional Analysis (TA). This model has been popularized by Dr. Berne and others (Berne, 1964). "TA is widely used in business and industry for
communications training (rather than therapy) and its use is spreading to various public agencies including law enforcement” (Peoples, 1977 p. 202) The model uses three ego states, Parent (P), Adult (A), and Child (C) to both define the nature of stimuli and responses in exchanges or transactions between people and to analyze the patterns of interaction. The goal for police officers, in managing provocative stimuli, would be to "hook" citizens into an Adult (objective, problem-solving) state to diffuse hostility. The goal includes the converse of this principle; the officers should not get hooked into angry, Child responses to scolding Parent stimuli from defensive citizens. As a game that people play, "To most people, the policeman represents authority. When that authority is directed at them, it is received initially as Parent...and stimulates the Child to prepare” (Peoples, 1977, p. 214).

Peoples (1977) depicts the TA models as they apply to police-citizen transactions. His analysis of the type of problem transactions the designer is focusing on is represented in Figure 1.
The officer initiated with an Adult statement, hoping to hook the driver's Adult (1). The driver, however, responds to his perception of the officer as a punishing Parent with an angry Child statement (2). The officer uses paraphrasing to acknowledge feelings, hoping again to hook an Adult response (3). The driver is still upset. However, he is complying, with the officer's direction (4). The goal is to issue the summons without getting a civilian complaint.

Becvar (1974) uses a conflict-resolution model for developing effective communication skills where people have the goal of building positive relationships. He defines conflict and describes both the situations that
may precipitate it and the adaptive responses that ameliorate it. He also notes that people in authority roles, employers, teachers, parents and others (police officers are not specifically referred to), are in a more difficult situation. These authority figures will have to deal with people who have "learned to enjoy producing conflict in others...These individuals, for whatever reason, just continue to give nonverbal signals that produce conflict for you. They may respond compliantly to your request..."Yeah, sure. Anything you say." Or they may not respond verbally at all." The designer recognized that these covertly angry responses are, in some cases, more provocative than overt statements. Becvar's model offers a strategy called "extinction" (a term used in operant conditioning as a non-reinforcement process) for these situations. His advice to teachers in particular is, "Since getting a rise out of you seems to keep this behavior going, you can extinguish or stop this behavior by not letting it get a rise out of you. When you observe a distracting behavior, act as though you had not noticed it." The designer adapted this aspect of Becvar's model of conflict resolution for use in the crucible of police-citizen interaction by offering it to participants as a strategy for responding to provocative...
non-verbal and covert communication.

There is a significant difference between the assumptions Becvar makes about the goals of authority figures experiencing conflict producing stimuli and the designer's assumption about the goals of police officers in similar situations. The teachers, parents, employers, etc. that Becvar refers to are assumed to be taking responsibility for developing independent and effective expression of conflict in their "clients." The designer assumes that the goal for street cops, in managing the grind of daily overt and covert conflict producing stimuli, is to simply do what they have to do and not offend the citizen! There are many police officers who also accept the goal of using every citizen encounter, no matter how difficult, as an opportunity to boost good community relations. A question for further research, in terms of operant conditioning, would be which police officers get attention paid to them and are reinforced for their behavior.

Literature Review

A search of the literature in the areas of communication skills, police training and experiential learning was done at the facilities of NYIT. A library search produced six relevant sources. A computer search produced a bibliography from each of two sources; BRS
Information Technologies, Latham, New York, and, a DIALOG Information Retrieval Service search of the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) database. The latter represents the document collection of the National Institute of Justice/NCJRS, "...a clearinghouse of practical and theoretical information about criminal justice and law enforcement established by the U.S. Congress" (DIALOG Information Services, Inc., 1982).

The BRS search, using the descriptors of police and communication skills or verbal ability, produced 12 sources including doctoral dissertations, journal articles, periodicals and books. Many of those were found through the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, Urbana, Illinois. One document produced in 1972 was not available except through the author, the Director of Interpersonal and Organizational Communication at the University of Georgia in Athens, Georgia. One phone call located Dr. Richard C. Huseman at the university and he expeditiously copied and mailed a copy of his communications training handbook for police officers to the designer. The DIALOG search used two descriptors, police human relations training or police conflict resolution, and effective communications training or verbal skill. The first produced 209 items.
and the second 172 items. When combined, the two descriptors produced a bibliography of 26 items. The items included books, journal articles, magazines and some unpublished training materials as described above. The designer obtained a total of 18 of the relevant items produced by the computer search. Additionally, the designer searched his personal library of training materials, texts and periodicals and located several other books and articles. A survey of the New York City Police Department entry and post-entry level training curriculums produced several examples of communications training in the areas covered by this project.

The following summarizes the most significant of the many items uncovered in the literature search.

1. A Training Proposal: Developing Silver-Tongued Officers (Bradstreet, 1986)

This article looks at standard police recruit communications training and suggests that, to make it effective, it must be made simple and practical. The author proposes training that uses a basic list of skills taught in modules that use three levels of application and accomplishment. He further proposes required competency testing and performance incentives such as competitions the winner of which would be crowned the "Silver-Tongued Champion."

This article is adapted from an instructional manual prepared by the author for police communications training. The author uses the TA model created by Dr. Eric Berne to offer ways of understanding and coping with various types of interactions people in general and police officers in particular experience.


The authors surveyed 1,700 Chiefs of Police to find out the extent to which communications training is provided to police officers, who is responsible, the type of training currently provided, and the communication skills considered relevant by these agencies. They discovered that most training was done in-house with little focus on the interpersonal skills that, ironically, 25% of the responding chiefs said was the most important part of communication. Additionally, 79% believed that a course in communication should include intervention skills and techniques. The authors also discuss the pedagogical implications for speech and communication trainers.

This book is described as a "self-teaching guide" and proceeds through an analysis of the nature of communication, attending skills, and responding skills. There are explanations and examples and role-playing exercises for the broad range of readers the author is addressing (couples, teachers, parents, counselors, work groups, employers and employees, instructors and students).

5. Contact! Training Employees to Meet the Public (Zemke, R., 1986)

In this article the author reports on the poor state of customer service in the United States. He writes about the "culprits," (a New World bias against work seen as servile, poor management practices, and ineffective training), and about the remedies as described by HRD personnel from organizations that perform well.

6. Interpersonal Psychology for Law Enforcement and Corrections (Parker, L., Jr., and Meier, R., 1975)

The authors of this book present what they describe as an integrated approach to interpersonal psychology in the criminal justice system. Their goal was, "the presentation of psychological activities that were
optimally effective in developing helping and training relationships within criminal justice settings.” There is a strong emphasis on interpersonal theories, facilitating communication and modeling.

7. Verbal Judo: Words for Street Survival
(Thompson, G., 1983)

This book is written with the eastern spiritual approach of the martial self-defense arts. It suggests that police officers need to develop a method and a "habit of mind" that allows them to instantly invoke the rhetorical strategy that will be effective in any given situation.


The authors contend that in order for a business to survive and prosper in today's economy, every facet of the organization, particularly the people who contact the customers, must demonstrate the service ideal. They emphasize service management and training as remedies. They also offer "dull" and "shining" moments as vivid examples of what to do and what not to do.


The author's model for communication is a process and skills model as opposed to the typical, linear
model. His model has three components, staging (establishing the framework for the personal and environmental factors that affect interaction), building (bringing together the factors that result in and maintain an interaction), initiating (involves personal responsibility and decision making regarding what actions to take and how to implement them.


This dissertation reported on the author's development, implementation and analysis of a two-day interpersonal conflict management workshop. The findings lead him to conclude that such workshops are appropriate for all levels of police work, that an increase in cognitive learning can occur, and that the participants felt that they could employ the skills outside of the workshop.
Survey of existing courses and materials

There are innumerable training films and materials available in the area of communication and interpersonal skills. The designer surveyed the most current market place directories of training and found several programs that are aimed at customer service. The following examples were typical of the field.

1. If Looks Could Kill (Video Arts, Inc. London)

This is one segment in a series of customer service programs. Suggested uses include sales and retail training, transactional analysis programs, interpersonal skills seminars, and customer service courses. A 28 minute film is available along with discussion leader and participant materials. The program is available for a long-term license (undefined) at $720.00 and all materials are covered by detailed use conditions and restrictions. The price, restrictions on modification, and non-transferability to police work were factors in the decision not to use these materials.

2. Communication in Conflict: A Communication Training Handbook for Law Enforcement Officers (Huseman, R., University of Georgia)

This three and one-half day workshop uses four instructional methods: video-tape role playing sessions, conflict exercises in a game format, a one and one-half
hour film to test perception, and a team teaching approach (calling for several instructors to be present and participating at different points throughout the workshop). This program was developed under a Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) grant (#71-DF-870) and there is no fee for its use. The length, complexity and need for several trainers figured in the decision not to use this program.

**Plan for Design and Development Effort**

The designer used the program evaluation and review technique (PERT) to plan the design, development and implementation of this project. Development was begun in February, 1988 and ended with the last group trial on June 21, 1988.

**Project Plan**

The designer used PERT and Gantt charts to track the progress of the project and they may be found in Appendix A.

**Budget**

The hourly rate for the designer is calculated at $34.00 per hour and the rate for the police officers' time is calculated at $18.00 per hour (one sergeant at $23.00 per hour). Rates were based on the current salaries of the designer and the participants. Police
department vehicles or authorized private vehicles were used for travel and therefore travel expenses outside of time were not a significant cost item. The budget is displayed in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$1,428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-on-1 trials</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field trials</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revision</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>8,104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordinator</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total labor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$18,360</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>printing/collating</td>
<td></td>
<td>$345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>videotape</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tape editing</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flip charts</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$460</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Diem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total per diem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$75</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$18,895</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

What transpired from the analysis phase of this project was a picture of young, relatively inexperienced police officers, in a high-activity precinct, having difficulty in responding courteously to the typical police-citizen interactions they faced on a frequent and continuing basis. All parties appeared to be uncomfortable with results of these problematic interactions. The instructional need that the designer perceived included a job-specific, effective communications strategy that would transfer easily to the learners and that they would choose to use on the job. The project therefore, involved both the cognitive and affective learning domains.

The project was planned to be a two-day workshop, facilitated by one instructor, with videotaping of skills application exercises. The designer surveyed the available materials and the professional literature in the area of police related communications training and decided to develop new materials. The plan for developing these materials followed time lines and a PERT chart. The actual order of events may differ from the original schedule.
CHAPTER 3

DESIGN

Introduction

Training is successful, on one level, when the skills described in the instructional goal make it across the wide gulf between the pages of analysis and the actual classroom performance of the learners. The success of this transition is directly related to the quality of the designer's instructional design process. In some cases, that is, for some tasks, the ramifications of not adequately applying this process can simply be frustrated learners or workers who won't be able to do produce an unblemished product in a cost-effective manner. While the tasks of order maintenance may not have the same zero tolerance for error that police use of deadly physical force has, the consequences of poor performance in this area can dramatically affect the quality of life in a community and can lead to disrespect and active hostility towards law enforcement. In fact, a mismanaged police-citizen interaction can, albeit rarely, lead to escalating violence and ultimately to physical injury or death.

An additional obstacle for a designer working on communication skills or any "soft" or human relations skills for police is overcoming poorly designed and
ineffective previous training interventions. The residue from training that labels people as "wrong" or "defective" and that tries to fix them through correcting their thinking, is very apparent on the faces of learners who are ordered to attend another "bullshit training session" (to use the language of police training accountability).

The designer felt a very strong sense of responsibility to provide training that would be valuable for the learners and that would absolutely support their physical safety above all else. He first identified tasks for instruction based on observation, consultation with tacticians and twenty years of experience. The steps that followed; determining instructional objectives, identifying entry behaviors, developing performance objectives, test items, instructional strategies and materials, were all done with this same sense of responsibility and respect for the learners. Methods for evaluation were developed and, finally, the literature and available training materials were reviewed.

**Instructional Task Analysis**

In following the standard ISD models, the designer identified the subordinate skills and enabling
objectives for the specific task of citing a hostile traffic violator. The overall instructional goal, choosing to use the suggested communication skills when confronting hostile citizens in non-enforcement situations, was somewhat complex and included learning from both the cognitive and affective domains. Therefore, the designer used the hierarchical, information-processing technique suggested for intellectual-attitudinal goals. He analyzed the task both procedurally, in terms of the proper sequence of steps, and hierarchically in terms of what discriminations, concepts, rules and higher-order rules were prerequisites for using the appropriate communication skills (Gagne, 1985).

Instructional Objectives

The objectives were derived from the analysis and written following the format of Mager (1984).

The format includes three characteristics that help make an objective communicate an intent. These characteristics answer three questions: (1) What should the learner be able to do? (2) Under what conditions do you want the learner to be able to do it? and (3) How well must it be done? (p. 21)
These characteristics are labelled as performance, conditions, and criterion and they help designers to be accountable for the validity of training.

The objectives for this project are:

1. Given a series of role-play exercises, simulating provocative interactions with hostile citizens, learners will be able to perform each of the On-Stage elements. Learners will use a behaviorally-based rating guide to evaluate their own performance and will be able to describe at least the two elements of acknowledging feelings and active listening through paraphrasing. Each learner will do this for each exercise completed.

2. Given a fill-in posttest, the learners will be able to write appropriate responses to typical provocative stimuli and write accurate descriptions of the consequences of getting civilian complaints for individual officers, their "bosses," and for the NYPD as an agency. The learners will be successful if they write in some form of acknowledging feelings and paraphrasing in response to 90% of the stimuli and if they write in personally negative
consequences for each question in that area.

Entry Behaviors Defined

As a result of the instructional task analysis, the designer was able to decide on the following as learner behaviors that would be prerequisites to attending the workshop:

1. Be able to execute tactically correct approaches and positions in relation to hostile, provocative citizens
2. Be able to use all equipment (radio, defensive weapons) effectively
3. Be capable of basic reading, writing and attending skills
4. Be able to identify concepts, understand their use in rules, and apply those rules to simulated reality

Group and Sequence Objectives

The designer used several factors in the grouping and sequencing of objectives. The analysis of learner characteristics suggested that there would be a strong potential resistance to this type of training and that the learners would not be in a state of "readiness" until those issues were addressed. The instructional
analysis model suggested that, in order to achieve a high energy level in the direction of choosing to learn and apply the communication strategies, the attitude goal should be addressed first. Therefore, he sequenced objectives from the resistance group first and from the attitude group second. Specifically, these involved objectives such as:

1. Given learner suspicions, defensiveness and general resistance to "soft" skills training, the learners will be able to state their concerns to the instructor. Each learner will verbally or non-verbally (by nodding) acknowledge receiving a response to their concerns.

2. Given learner resistance to accountability for civilian complaints, the learners will be able to list and state the personal consequences of getting civilian complaints. They will list and state at least one consequence in career terms (good details denied), in terms of causing problems for their supervisors and managers ("close supervision"), and in terms of backlash from the public due to the tarnishing of the NYPD's image (unpleasant feedback from friends, family and non-police associates).
The third group of objectives involved the introduction of the On Stage strategy and its components. The sequencing of objectives within this group was based on the learning process described by Gagne (1985 p. 246). This is the heart of the program and the list of objectives would be as follows:

1. Given a dramatic simulation of provocative stimuli by the instructor, the learner will show a state of full attention by making eye contact and/or smiling.

2. Given a colloquial description of the goals ("Do what you have to do and not get any unnecessary civilian complaints"), the learners will demonstrate expectancy by nodding affirmatively in response to the question, "Wouldn’t that be a good thing for you to be able to do?".

3. Given a request to recall responses in other cases, the learners will state a brief description of what happened.

4. Given the presentation of each On Stage element, the learners will list and state an example.

5. Given the presentation of the overall strategy linking the elements, the learners will be able to list and state the element that is associated with each letter in the acronym (STAGE).
6. Given the exercises, each learner will respond appropriately with the necessary On Stage elements.

7. Given the critiques, learners will be able to state what they did correctly and incorrectly.

8. Given the performance of fellow learners, each learner will be able to write a correct evaluation on the On Stage Rating Guide.

9. Given the reiteration of exercises on three levels of difficulty, each learner will be able to correctly respond in new situations.

Learning Activities Specification

The designer organized the learning activities along the lines described above using specific instructional methods and media support as suggested by Anderson (1983). The organizational constraints described earlier shifted a very critical responsibility from the designer to the instructor in that a videotape, depicting the correct way to apply the On Stage strategies, could not be produced. The designer sought to insure the effectiveness of the training by having critical elements supported by a reliable and effective medium. Videotape does that and the designer can be accountable for the results. When that burden is put on
the instructor, the materials become dependent instead of independent and the designer must rely on a delivery system, most often provided by the host organization, which may or may not be effective.

The importance of this issue in relation to the instructional goals of this project should be discussed in terms of human modeling. Gagne focuses on this issue in his chapter on attitude change.

One of the most dependable methods of establishing attitudes is by means of a set of learning conditions that includes 'human modeling.' In brief, this method involves the demonstration or communication of the desired choice of personal action (the attitude) by a respected or admired person...any individual who inspires confidence and trust...the learner then perceives that the model is reinforced, or rewarded, for the action choice he or she has made, an event called 'vicarious reinforcement'." (p. 241)

The specific learning activities that were developed for each group of objectives can be most easily explained by using the matrix represented in Table 2.
Table 2

Learning Activity Instructional Strategy Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Activity</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Instructional Method</th>
<th>Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Readiness</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Photo/chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a.</td>
<td>Intro. skills in On Stage strategy</td>
<td>Lecture/demo</td>
<td>Print/chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b.</td>
<td>Develop practice simulations</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Video/print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c.</td>
<td>Practice skills</td>
<td>Role play</td>
<td>Videotaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d.</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Generalizing to other job uses</td>
<td>Discussion/Role play</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The video segment in #1 above is the Chief’s introduction. The photo in #2 is one of an officer writing a summons and absorbing abuse from a motorist. The flip chart is used to record learner concerns. In #3a the flip chart presents the On Stage strategy element by element. If a modeling video could have been produced it would have been used here. In #3b the video is the edited documentary segments showing officers having a hard time due to not acknowledging feelings. In #3c and #3d the learners would be videotaped and played back.
As described above, where learning activities are supported by the medium of video, the designer is referring to the viewing of pre-recorded videotapes. In the ideal version of this training project the designer would use videotaped representations of both the consequences of mismanaging hostile interactions, as well as a carefully constructed demonstration of the correct use of the skills and strategy. Given the organizational constraints already described, the designer could only produce a videotape of the difficulties and consequences. He located and selected segments from a video documentary on daily police patrol work in a high activity precinct in the South Bronx, New York City. It was produced for public television in 1975 (Raymond, and Raymond, 1975, Appendix B). The practice and evaluation activities should be supported by videotape recording and playback of the participants doing the exercises. The organizational constraint of sensitivity to union resistance discouraged the designer from attempting this in the field trials. However, the designer believes that the positive response to the field trials and his sensitivity to union and learner concerns, would allow him to negotiate the use of videotaping if this training is used in the future. Where the designer uses this training in his private
consulting, videotaping will be used.

**Assessment System Specification**

The designer included pretests and posttests as assessment devices to measure learning during the course of instruction. Data from these devices was collected and evaluated. Progress checks were also used during the field trials. These items appeared in sections of the participant workbook where the learners had to create scripts of dialogue in preparation for role-playing (Appendix D). Additionally, the On Stage Rating Guide (Appendix D) allowed the designer/instructor to check on the ability of the learners to correctly evaluate the use of the strategy in the exercises. The results were checked at the time by quickly walking around the room and observing the participants' work. The designer was not able to collect and analyze data from these items at the time since he was functioning as designer, instructor and evaluator without assistance. He acknowledges that this would have contributed to making the evaluation process more accurate and he would attempt to do so in the future. The assessment devices described above were selected because the project included skills from the cognitive domain where it was likely that the learners would have partial knowledge of the content (Dick and
Evaluation System Specification

The designer planned to use both formative and summative evaluation methods in this project. Modifications were expected as the field trials proceeded and revisions were anticipated for the project as a whole based on the evaluation of the data collected at its conclusion.

Formative

The designer conducted two one-on-one trials using the "think-aloud protocol" (McAlpine, 1987) to evaluate the language and structure of the workbook materials and assessment devices. He also used small group and field trials to get feedback on the materials and their use in the full context of the actual learning situation, the workshop.

Summative

The summative evaluation was planned to use data from two or three field trials with 10-to-12 learners in each trial depending on the availability of members of the target population and the level of cooperation from the host organization or, in this case, the local precinct in the East New York section of Brooklyn. However, cooperation from the parent commands, i.e., the
Division (a cluster of three precincts under an Inspector), the Patrol Borough (in Brooklyn, an artificial geographic unit of 10 precincts in North Brooklyn, under the command of an Assistant Chief), and the Chief of Patrol’s Office (Bureau chief of patrol operations citywide) was included as a critical factor. All commands mentioned had to sanction the removal of learners from patrol for the purpose of engaging in this training project. The model for summative evaluation was the four-tier model described by Kirkpatrick (1987). The designer planned to collect and use data to evaluate training on two levels. The levels and plan are represented in Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reaction</td>
<td>Anonymous Evaluation</td>
<td>Perception of usefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learning</td>
<td>Pre and posttests</td>
<td>Verify transfer of skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behavior</td>
<td>Questionnaires to be sent to learners and supervisors (not completed in project)</td>
<td>Check effectiveness and generalizability of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Results</td>
<td>Statistical analysis of learner complaints compared to others</td>
<td>Validate decreas compls. &amp; cost benefit to NYPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The evaluation plan was designed to be carried out on the first two levels due to the usual one-semester time frame for completion. The delay in carrying out the project allowed some attempts at looking at the third and fourth levels even though that is beyond the scope of the original project. Constraints placed upon the designer as a member of the host organization with full-time duties above and beyond the design and implementation of this project did not allow him to pursue these levels of evaluation as thoroughly as he would have liked. If this training project is adopted for use as an official department wide effort, evaluation will be done on all four levels.

**Learning Transfer System Specification**

The designer incorporated a series of strategies (Beaudin, 1987) into the project plan that would be implemented before, during and after the training intervention. Some organizational constraints that would have to be overcome include: accessibility to the learners, availability of supervisors to be included in the training, access to materials and printing facilities for posters and handouts, and other demands made on the designer in terms of his duties within the organization. Some of the more subtle constraints include, sub-cultural values that conflict with the
organizational values and reactions to significant events in the environment such as assaults on police officers and negative portrayals of police officers in the media. The "before" strategies included elements of effective instructional goal and task analysis as described previously, the "during" strategies included learner involvement in practice and feedback and "backsliding prevention" measures, and the "after" strategies included job aids, manager follow-up and designer/instructor follow-up.

Review and Selection of Existing Materials

The existing materials described previously were not used due to cost and time limitations. The designer also decided that, in the case of the Huseman's workshop for police officers, the learner characteristics of this target population would necessitate extensive revision.

Summary

In designing this project the designer used a multi-faceted approach to the instructional task analysis that included observation, personal experience, and interviews with both incumbents and experts. He developed objectives for the overall training and for the major component parts based on the three-part model.
of Mager and on the learning theory of Gagne. Entry-level behaviors were defined for the target population of experienced patrol officers. Performance objectives were grouped and sequenced into a strategy suggested by the combination of goals from the affective and cognitive domains of learning. Measures of learning in the form of pre and posttests were developed and incorporated into a summative evaluation plan. The plan for insuring transfer from the classroom to the workplace was developed and discussed along with possible barriers that would have to be overcome. Existing materials were reviewed and not selected for use due to financial and practical concerns the most important of which was suitability to this target population.
CHAPTER 4
DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

In the development stage of this project the designer followed the format suggested by Dick and Carey. An instructional strategy was formed based on the analysis outcomes and with particular attention and sensitivity to the learner characteristics. The specific elements of the strategy were derived by applying a standard schematic, appropriate for learning in the cognitive and affective domains, to a module-by-module approach. Learning activities were developed using the Gagne model. Media were also selected and the package of activities, media and materials were reviewed by SME's.

Learning Activity Development Scheme

The designer worked on the development of certain aspects of this project some time prior to the implementation. This was done in preparation for this project and before an unanticipated personal delay put it on hold for a year. At that time performance objectives and test items for each of the steps and sub-skills in the task of citing a hostile motorist were developed. Those objectives were then clustered and sequenced into modules and elements of the instructional
strategy were developed for each module in turn. The schematic that was used is described in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Performance Objective</td>
<td>Number &amp; description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Information Presentation</td>
<td>Information followed by examples and non-examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Participation</td>
<td>Practice items and feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of this process were checked by incorporating them into the designer’s presentation to in-service training meetings. He was frequently asked to represent the Patrol Borough Commander (the Assistant Chief) at these sessions as described earlier. The designer would bring up the issue of civilian complaints generally and the task of citing traffic violators in particular and would state that he was seeking the expertise of these officers in constructing a pilot training program. The officers would then help to supply the examples and non-examples for each performance objective. Additionally, the officers at these sessions would provide important information for the development of the first major component in the
instructional strategy, the preinstructional activities.

The designer learned that, in order to shift members of this target population away from the negative and toward a positive motivation he would need to use preinstructional activities that diffused feelings about the Civilian Complaint Review Board. He would introduce historical background information and an accurate description of the current civilian complaint process. He would also have to indicate, in graphic terms, what it was that the learner’s would be able to do differently as a result of the training. The importance of and the actual rewording of the instructional goal into lay terms was aided by these discussions. As described earlier in this document, officers are positively motivated by the notion of being able to “do what you got to do without getting jammed up.” That translates into taking the appropriate enforcement action, when called for, and not suffering a civilian or supervisory complaint as a result of doing the job.

This developmental work led the designer to produce a short videotaped piece for the preinstructional portion of the training. In this piece, the Patrol Borough Commander tells the viewers about how treating people with respect would produce positive tangible results from the community. The chief concludes with a
reiteration of the goal in lay terms, "This workshop will allow you to take necessary enforcement action and not get civilian complaints." The designer was extremely grateful to the chief for agreeing to allow the pilot project to go forward and for his direct participation in the project. The chief reviewed the materials as a SME and accepted the designer's script for his introduction. The script can be found in Appendix C1. The previously referred to constraints on producing a videotaped demonstration of the skills did not apply to the chief's introduction. The designer used his own home video format equipment to shoot a master and edit copies for use in the workshops during implementation.

The importance of the preinstructional activities component of the instructional strategy can not be overemphasized. In the literature search the designer came across several reviews of experiential training efforts with police officers by non-police academicians. Each one acknowledged that there were serious emotional barriers that got in the way of learning the various communication skills offered (Sata, 1975; Moore, 1975; Pfister, 1975; Reddy, and Lansky, 1975; McCabe, 1984). Given enough time (three-to-seven days), some of the individuals running these groups reported that they were
In the information presentation component of the strategy, several items were developed. First, lists of examples and non-examples were developed. Even these items proved to be very helpful to the designer because they were reviewed and shaped in the discussion sessions. The ability to offer non-examples that had the ring of truth and struck the responsive enhanced the instructor's credibility and introduce to element of humor that was unexpected.

Second, the designer developed a script for a videotape that demonstrated the various elements of the On-Stage skills. The script can be found in Appendix C.

The designer has extensive experience in developing scripts and in producing police training programs and documentaries. He believes that the organizational constraints that would not allow for production of the tape during the implementation of this project could be overcome for some future implementation of a revised On Stage program.

In reviewing the development of materials, the designer referred back to Gagne and decided to consider ways of enhancing the learners' ability to recall the communication skills being taught. He recalled the literature on customer service (Zemke, 1986) that
Learning Activity Development

The project that was developed, following the scheme described above, was planned as a two-day workshop with both attitudinal and intellectual components. The designer was going to present the materials in an informal classroom setting using videotapes, chalkboard and printed materials.

The theory of instruction that served as a base for this development is the nine-step model of instructional events (Egan, 1965, p. 243). The relationship between the internal processes, instructional events and
classroom activities, is presented in an overview in Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Process</th>
<th>Instructional Event</th>
<th>Action Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>Gain attention</td>
<td>Show real cops hooked by hostile remarks and paying for it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy</td>
<td>Inform learners of objectives</td>
<td>Describe how PO will be able to do what is needed without having problems/heartaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval to</td>
<td>Stimulate recall of prior</td>
<td>Ask learners to recall when they felt truly listened to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working memory</td>
<td>learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>Present stimulus</td>
<td>Present each On Stage skill in turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>Provide learning guidance</td>
<td>Link skills to the overall strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encoding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding</td>
<td>Elicit application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1 exercises set by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement</td>
<td>Provide feedback</td>
<td>Use rating guides to critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval and</td>
<td>Assessing Performance</td>
<td>Reiterate Level 1 exercises - using other participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval and</td>
<td>Enhancing retention &amp; transfer</td>
<td>More practice using more challenging levels of exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The introduction of the On-Stage strategy and skills was preceded by the attitude development module and preinstructional materials. The designer felt that he had a positive yet relatively unknown piece of information about the processing of civilian complaints that would gain the learners attention and begin to create an opening for learning the "new way to talk to people." Police officers are concerned about their civilian complaint records and are unaware, for the most part, that certain petty complaints, not falling into the categories of force, abuse of authority, discourtesy, or ethnic slurs do not appear on their computerized histories. Letting people vent their anger about how unfair many complaints are, and then telling them that those complaints of "the officer gave me a summons that I didn't deserve" don't appear on their histories, was very effective. This module also included the personalizing of the consequences for accumulating unnecessary civilian complaints. The introduction of the intellectual skills followed Gagne's model.

1. **Gaining attention** -- The designer used a photograph of a police officer issuing a summons to an irate motorist. The strained expression on the officer's face and the seething anger on the driver's face were
effective at capturing the learner’s attention.

2. **Informing learners of the objectives** -- The videotape of the chief and the description of the objectives in the participant workbook insured that the objectives were clearly understood. The designer’s use of colloquial language and police vernacular to further describe the objectives added to a positive affective reception of the objectives.

3. **Stimulating recall of prior learning** -- The learners were reminded via lecture and flipchart of the TA communication training they had all received in their recruit training. Additionally, the officers were asked to recall and describe emotional instances when they felt truly listened to.

4. **Presenting the stimulus** -- Each of the On-Stage skills was presented in turn with examples and non-examples.

5. **Providing learner guidance** -- The designer led the learners through what he described as a “tell, show, and do” demonstration of how the skills are linked to the overall strategy. Further, the workbook contained a step-by-step behavioral model for police-citizen encounters.

6. **Eliciting performance** -- The learners helped to develop scenarios that served as skills application
exercises. This was done for encounters on three levels of complexity and hostility.

7. **Providing Feedback** -- The designer developed a behaviorally based rating guide that participants used as a safe way to critique their fellow learners in the exercises. In the original plan for this project, the critique process would be done by watching the performances of learner teams who were videotaped in private. Organizational constraints did not allow for this in the pilot tests.

8. **Assessing performance** -- The exercise critique process includes many iterations on each level.

9. **Enhancing retention and transfer** -- The escalation of hostility in the three levels of exercise helped the learners to both retain the skills and be able to transfer them to new situations.

**Pretest**

A fill-in device was developed to test learner ability to use the On-Stage skills in response to typical provocative stimuli (Appendix D).

**Post learning questionnaire**

A device to measure learner reaction was constructed following the model used by the United States Department of Agriculture Graduate School. Learners were given an opportunity to comment about all
aspects of the training, the instructor, and the facility. Although the questionnaire was done anonymously, a space was provided for voluntary identification to be contacted for further feedback (Appendix D).

Posttest

A fill-in posttest was developed to test learner ability to use the communication skills in response to provocative stimuli and to test learner perception of the consequences of accumulating civilian complaints (Appendix D).

Instructor/learner workbook

The workbook was developed following a model by G. Ross Kelly for the USDA Graduate School, Interagency auditor training program. The designer had worked very closely with Mr. Kelly in delivering workshops on interviewing skills for auditors and his model of module by module worksheets for each step in this type of process was very helpful (Appendix D). Because the designer was going to present the material under the circumstances and constraints described, he did not develop a separate instructor guide. However, this would be necessary for other instructors and the guide would follow the learner workbook very closely.

The developmental stage was completed as scheduled.
During this process, the designer was also attempting to get permission, through the chain of command, to have access to the target population and to drum up organizational support for the project. He was pleased that permission was secured without any significant problem. He was disappointed, however, that the host precinct commander would only allow four hours (one-half tour of duty) for the two-day workshop. Additionally, it appeared that supervisors would not be able to attend due to a supervisor shortage and lack of overtime funds for extra coverage.

**Learning Activity Review**

The designer had access to several types of SME's in reviewing the learning activities. Geis (1987), in his article on formative evaluation, discusses the importance of classifying SME's by type and of using the proper types as called for. In the "substance" area of communication skills, the designer checked with an instructional designer who consulted in private industry on similar training projects. In the "teacher/instructor" area, the package of skills as applied to this particular police task was reviewed by several instructors in the Social Science Unit of the Police Academy. In the area of "sponsor" SME's, the entire concept was reviewed by the principles in the
chain of command from the commanding officer of the host precinct, to the division commander, to the borough commander to the designee in the Chief of Patrol’s Office. All agreed on the learning activities as described. In the "AU designer" area, the script was reviewed by the commanding officer of the Police Academy Video Production Center. He confirmed that it was not possible to produce at that time and he commented favorably on the script.

Although the designer stated that the ability to execute correct tactics was going to be presumed entry-level behavior, he also reviewed the learning activities and concepts with SME's in the Firearms and Tactics Section of the Academy. The tacticians confirmed the propriety of the actions and sequences described in the material.

Materials for Evaluation Produced

The designer produced a participant’s workbook for the On Stage workshop that included a pretest, a posttest, a reaction questionnaire, an introduction and a memorandum from the workshop leader to the commanding officer of the workshop participants. The memorandum was an acknowledgment of successful participation in the workshop and was to be filed in the participant’s
personnel folder. The designer reviewed this item with the host precinct commander. He liked the concept and the wording and agreed to reinforce the participant’s good faith efforts by personally congratulating each individual a short time after the memos from the workshop leader were received. Ten complete sets of materials were produced for use in the first small group trial. Production was accomplished by using the designer’s word processing facilities and by requesting materials and copying from police department Reproduction Unit.

Summary

The development of this project followed a module-by-module approach. The modules were derived from the internal processes, instructional events and action examples described by Gagne. The designer’s sensitivity to the affective concerns of the learners led to an emphasis on preinstructional activities and to a continuing regard for this learner characteristic through each module. Three levels of difficulty were worked into the series of role-play activities so that skills could be reinforced and so that the ability to generalize could be developed. Evaluative measures that tested the ability to use the specific communication skills in the strategy in response to typical stimuli
were developed for before and after the training. A reaction questionnaire was developed along with the learner workbook and both were modelled after an interviewing skills seminar used by the USDA Graduate School.

At several points in the development process the designer took advantage of a variety of SME's to review both concepts and materials. The results of these reviews were generally positive and always constructive. The designer was also the workshop facilitator in this project and his involvement with the instructional design process was an important boost for his presentation skills. A reproduction of one set of materials can be found in Appendix D.
CHAPTER 5
IMPLEMENTATION

Introduction

One of the opportunities that a target population of New York City Police Officers presents for instructional designers and instructors, is a zero tolerance for fudging and fuzziness in HRD. The designer's experience is that even in firearms and tactics training, where range instructors (in their own special uniforms) exude wisdom and expertise, very little gets by without at least vocal skepticism from the learners. The responsibility for engineering and implementing this new variation of communication skills training for this target population was an exciting challenge for the designer. Ideally, the designer would have trained someone else to be the workshop facilitator and, indeed, planned to do so when the final product was ready to go to field trial. However, the lack of funds to compensate a facilitator and the great flexibility needed to accommodate the somewhat unpredictable scheduling and availability of the host precinct officers mitigated against this for these field trials. Further, the designer's desire to make course corrections along the way, in order to maintain the integrity of the workshop, led him to be the test pilot.
of his own experimental craft.

Revisions were made based on the output of the formative evaluation process and new materials were produced in "market ready" form. The workshop was conducted on eight occasions over a period of four months and data was collected in each instance.

Materials for Implementation Reproduced

Elements of the workshop materials, including tests, evaluation sheet and section-by-section guide, were slightly modified after the one-on-one and small group trials. Each version was reproduced so that all workshop participants had their own complete package. The videotaped introduction by the Patrol Borough commander was produced once and the edited videotape of the real police-citizen encounters in the South Bronx was produced once and used in each field trial (Appendix B). The printed materials were produced on a word processor with a "near letter quality" dot matrix printer and revised material was simply replaced in the master copy for photocopying. Material produced on flip charts and chalk boards was produced fresh during each workshop. A flip chart was used to list learner concerns in an exercise (Appendix D). The flip chart was also used to introduce the five psychological
concepts that became part of the printed material after
the second small group trial (Appendix D). Revisions
included modifications of the material based on the
formative evaluation process. A summary of these
modifications can be found in Table 6.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Modification</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pretest</td>
<td>Quest's re civ. compl.</td>
<td>1 on 1, sm grp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Posttest</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Exercise re</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Application</td>
<td>Added learner written script of how interaction might go using</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercises</td>
<td></td>
<td>On Stage skills as pre-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>role-play exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Concepts</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Food for Thought&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructional Delivery

The first of the eight workshops was delivered on
April 6, 1988 in the 73rd precinct in the East New York
section of Brooklyn, New York. There were seven
participants including the precinct training officer (a
police officer whose duties include conducting
in-service training as well a host of general planning
and record keeping functions). The training was scheduled for the first four hours of the day immediately following roll call for the Second Platoon or day tour. The officers on the day tour fall in for roll call at five minutes past seven AM and receive an inspection and instructions for approximately 25 minutes. At that time they "fall out" and "take their posts." The officers assigned to participate in the workshop had no advance knowledge of this assignment and were available by virtue of having foot posts. Each precinct has a "minim staff" plan that dictates a certain number of supervisor and radio motor patrol cars for each of the three shifts or tours. When officers are available beyond that they may be deployed with some discretion to any one of a number of assignments.

The precinct commander has many concerns to balance. Some of those are the enforcement activity of his officers (recorded on various management plans and compared to other precincts), the occurrence of index crimes, and the occurrence of civilian complaints. This precinct was experiencing a high number and upward trend in civilian complaints. The other precincts in the division and patrol borough commands were experiencing a downward trend. The precinct commander was favorably disposed to the offer to use his precinct as a setting
for field trials of this new training effort. He is charged with explaining his efforts to reduce the number of civilian complaints and training is a valid response. After considering his options, the commander allotted the designer four hours or one-half day for training however many officers would be available without incurring overtime. That is, without ordering officers to appear beyond their regularly scheduled appearances. The training was to continue until all officers in the precinct (approximately 200) were trained.

The designer was known to the general population of officers due to his roles as both a uniformed "duty captain" responding to a wide range of serious and sensitive situations, and as a plainclothes supervisor on patrol to spot and report performance deficiencies to the chief. Neither of these roles generates a particularly favorable image. The best reputation one can hope for in these roles is a "fair guy." The worst reputation, that is, if being positively regarded is considered important, would be someone who is out to "harpoon" the working cop and who finds fault in matters that are insignificant ("chickenshit"). The designer accepted these roles as barriers to be overcome and he was highly motivated to have the participants perceive the training as valuable.
The designer had attempted to get the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association (PBA) to designate a high level official to support the workshop with a videotaped statement comparable to the chief's. A script was prepared and can be found in Appendix C2. The designer dealt with the PBA trustee in Brooklyn North and was advised that the PBA did not think it would be wise for an union official to appear on tape. However, they could support a program that allowed police officers to improve their skills and that did not detract from their safety. The trustee did consent to be present at the workshop to lend his support. He attended the first field trial and stayed through the introduction and first two segments at which point he had to leave for urgent business. The designer believes that this was a significantly positive event and helped to address learner concerns.

The designer chose to use the first floor "sitting room," where the officers had roll call, as the location for the introduction to the workshop. The videotape player was located in this room at the beginning of the day shift for regular in-service training. For each workshop the designer would have to request that the VCR be relocated to the second floor "training room" for the rest of the workshop. He began to establish a positive
rapport with the officers and offset their negative expectancies by taking every legitimate opportunity to respond to their physical and affective concerns. First, he suggested that they go back to the locker rooms and remove their body armor ("bullet-proof" vests) and other field equipment. When they returned he began by asking the learners if they knew why they were there in an attempt to get them to air their apprehensions and anxieties. After addressing the officers' expressed and unexpressed concerns, the designer/facilitator introduced and showed the videotape of the chief. After completing these preinstructional activities, the group was given a break to coincide with the arrival of the coffee truck ("roach coach" as it is affectionately known in Brooklyn). They were instructed to reassemble in the second floor training room for the rest of the workshop. The first floor room, while theoretically restricted from access by the general public, offers little in the way of privacy from non-participating officers and other people in the station house. Privacy and a sense that officers would not be embarrassed or subject to ridicule for their attempts at trying new techniques were critical elements in addressing learners' concerns. The break for coffee and the relocation upstairs were further attempts to establish rapport and
to keep the door open for the introduction of the new communication strategy.

The instruction was extremely rushed in the first workshop and participation was minimal due to the time constraints. The second workshop, conducted on April 14, 1988, was structured the same way except for the attendance of the precinct commander. The designer's decision to encourage the precinct commander to attend was a gamble. He balanced the inhibiting effect of having "the boss" present with the hope that the materials and enthusiastic learner participation would leave a positive impression. The designer conducted de-briefing sessions with the precinct commander or executive officer (second in command) whenever they were present after a workshop. On this occasion, the precinct commander offered, on his own, to expand the workshop to a full tour. The next six sessions (4/28, 5/10, 5/17, 6/10, 6/21 and 7/28) were all conducted over a full day with the last one being conducted on an evening shift (3:30 PM to midnight). The precinct commander attempted to respond to the designer's request that sergeants be assigned to attend the workshops along with the officers in their squads. However, an overall shortage of supervisors citywide prohibited this in all but one case. In order to free up precinct sergeants
from patrol and desk duties, other supervisors would have to be brought in on overtime. Therefore, at the conclusion of the eight sessions, 60 police officers and one sergeant had been trained in the On Stage workshop. There was an average attendance of seven officers at each workshop and there was generally an adequate representation of males, females, Black, Hispanic and majority officers. A mix of officers who lived in the suburbs and in the city was present in each workshop. There was also an arbitrary mix of "successful" and "unsuccessful" officers in each shop. That is, while the designer did not check any officers civilian complaint experience, self-disclosures revealed a some officers in each shop who had accumulated a significant number of civilian complaints.

The designer’s intent was to complete a summative evaluation after some field trials and then to produce a market ready final version for continuing use in this precinct. When the entire precinct had been trained, a further evaluation would have been done of the results over time and a proposal would have been submitted to expand the training to other precincts in Patrol Borough Brooklyn North. The designer hoped that with positive evaluations on four levels the model might have been put in use citywide. However, as implementation was about
to begin in the Spring of 1988, the designer was temporarily transferred to the Personnel Bureau to work on a police promotion exam. This made it difficult to devote as much time as desired to the workshops. He managed to conduct four field trials and he was then permanently transferred out of patrol and into another assignment in the Personnel Bureau, to develop training in the Police Cadet Corps (a leadership program for college juniors interning with police department). That assignment, working out of the police academy in Manhattan, made it even more difficult to conduct the project although he was able to finish four more workshops for a total of eight.

Data Collection

Data was collected at each of the eight field trials. Pre and posttests were given with learner identification information on each (Appendix D). An "On Stage Workshop Evaluation" sheet was completed anon mously by each of the 61 participants (Appendix D). Follow up interviews were conducted as well as a Spring 1989 computer check of each participant's civilian complaint experience subsequent to the workshop.

The pre and posttests were designed to measure the learners' ability to use the communication skills in the
On Stage strategy in response to the typical provocative stimuli police officers encounter in high experience precincts. High experience is a quantitative description that also has a qualitative connotation. High crime levels and high numbers of "radio runs" generally occur in poor and lower working class communities where the police are the only governmental service available after business hours. The designer sought to incorporate the language of provocation, typically found in these communities, into the material. Provocation can be found in the most well-to-do areas of the city but it is likely to be expressed in different terms, terms that are not necessarily "fighting words."

In the language of many psychological taxonomies, words beget thoughts which beget feelings which beget actions. That notion led the designer to focus narrowly on the specific language that the target population will have to deal with. Recommendations for other forms of data collection will be found in Chapter Seven.

While anecdotal reports from previous workshop participants were solicited and offered to the designer on-site over the four month period of implementation, these comments were not collected or analyzed. They were good for the morale of the designer, however, in order to be suitable for analysis, they would have to
have been collected in sufficient numbers, in a reliable way, and with adequate controls for distortion. When the person asking is a ranking officer with perceived ability to report on performance deficiencies to the chief, one should be careful about drawing any conclusions from the answers.

Summary

The goal of implementing the On Stage Workshop was achieved. Implementation followed a rocky road due to both anticipated and unanticipated organizational and personal constraints. The transfer of the designer out of the Patrol Borough Brooklyn North area where the three levels of command had agreed to sponsor the project and into completely removed and demanding assignments made implementation extremely difficult. Eight field trials were conducted with a total of 60 police officers and one sergeant participating. The designer's plan to train all officers in the East New York precinct could not be fulfilled. However, data was collected and conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of that data.
CHAPTER 6
EVALUATION

Introduction

The process of engineering instruction has as its goal the changing of some performance or behavior to close a gap between what is and what should be. The use of ISD is the current method of assuring a responsible attempt at effecting the needed changes. Within ISD, the recursive process of evaluation and revision is at the heart of making adjustments and steering a true course toward the goal. The designer of this project used the appropriate formative evaluation strategy for instructor-delivered materials and a four-level summative evaluation process. The goal was to make sure that the training was acceptable to the learners and workable in the way it was going to be delivered.

Formative Evaluation

The three major types of formative evaluation are one-on-one trials, small group trials, and field trials (Dick and Carey, 1985). When a designer is testing materials that will be instructor-presented, with participant interaction, it is suggested that field trials are the primary and most useful method. The designer also used one-on-one and small group trials as
secondary yet useful formative evaluation devices.

One-On-One Trials

When a rough draft of the materials was completed, the designer sought out representatives of the target population to test out the language, concepts, and skills of the workshop. On March 27, 1988, the designer visited a patrol precinct away from the host precinct and still in the Patrol Borough Brooklyn North area, looking for officers who shared the learner characteristics. He found a 15-year veteran officer (a rarity in the NYPD of 1989) who was described as average in his ability to do his job without getting civilian complaints. He took that officer to a private setting and asked him to go through the workshop materials, by himself, thinking out loud as he went (McAlpine, 1987). The designer engaged in verbal interaction only to the extent necessary to establish rapport, answer questions and reassure the officer. It was recognized that even though this officer was not under the direct command of the designer, the status inequality in rank was known and would be a barrier to generating feedback that sounded like criticism.

The officer proceeded smoothly through the materials. While he had no difficulty with the concepts, he did have some difficulty with the language
of some of the pre and posttest questions. He found the wording of the three-part questions on the consequences of accumulating civilian complaints to be awkward. Some of the instructions in the skills section of the material also had to be explained. Those difficulties were noted on the material. However, since the skills section were going to be presented by an instructor, the designer decided that modifications were not needed in those areas. In an interesting note, he told the designer that he thought that his method for dealing with provocative situations was the most effective. His method was to use humor and word plays to deflect hostility. The designer’s interpretation of the officer’s examples was that he used ironic and sarcastic humor and that it would not be an effective addition to the workshop on communication skills (i.e. Don Rickles as police officer).

This one-on-one test was repeated with one other officer on April 5, 1988, at the host precinct. This officer was recommended by the host precinct executive officer as a five-year veteran who was very effective in terms of his high activity and his ability to not get complaints. This officer had no difficulty with the materials except for one question on the pretest. This was the same three-part question about the consequences
of accumulating civilian complaints that the previously mentioned officer had trouble with. The officer's most valuable comment was in response to the designer's probe about whether using these skills affects, in any way, an officer's personal safety. The officer reported that he did not see any negative effect on safety. He also stated that the designer's concern for learner personal safety was not communicated by the material itself. Since this was believed to be a major affective barrier, the designer immediately adjusted the introductory material to make those assurances explicit. The following sentence was added, "Nothing being offered here is designed to, in any way, say that necessary force should not be used when it is morally and legally justified. In many cases, if the verbal strategies demonstrated in this workshop simply accompany the same physical force you would have used before, civilian complaints will be much less likely to occur" (Appendix D).

Small-Group Trials

The first workshop, on April 6, 1988, was considered a small-group evaluation by the designer. There were seven male participants including one Black and one Hispanic. The designer was looking for verification of several items; the language problems,
the palatability of the On Stage concept and skills, and
the response to written and verbal assurances of concern
with officer safety. The host precinct "training
officer" (one of the seven) attended this session at the
designer's request and offered positive feedback in a
debriefing. The designer reviewed the data and comments
on the pre and posttests as well as the anonymous
evaluation. The results did not differ from the results
obtained after the eight field trials (see Tables 7, 8,
and 9). There were no negative comments and very
positive indications.

The designer had presented the model for
interacting with citizens as a seven step procedure
starting with "the approach" and ending with
"documentation and debriefing." The four-hour format,
allotted by the precinct commander, barely allowed the
communication skills to be covered and did not allow any
time for the first and last steps. Although the
"approach" is basically about entry behaviors, a quick
review and commentary is an opportunity to once again
reassure the participants about the interest in their
personal safety. The "documentation and debriefing"
section is also not part of communication per se.
However, this step is very important to managing the
feelings that are left over when an officer has had a
particularly aggravating encounter. The data suggested that the officers were able to accept and use the skills without working on steps one and seven. The designer was not comfortable with this in spite of the data and decided to leave the written material in the package even if it was not going to be referred to directly. He hoped that the participants would be able to pick up some of these skills on their own and also hoped that other people who looked at the material would appreciate his concern for officer safety and well-being.

After digesting the information gathered in the small-group trial the designer made some modifications to the material. An exercise where the participants write down their must problematic encounters with provocative citizens was included in the section that began the explanation of the specific skills (Appendix D). While learner participation and interest was more than adequate in the April 6th trial, the designer felt that he could heighten the participants' feeling of buying into the workshop.

Pilot Test

In the first field trial, on April 14th, the seven participants (six male, one female, two Black, five White) were given an opportunity to articulate how provocative encounters with hostile and antagonistic
citizens were a problem for them (whether or not they got civilian complaints!). In the small-group trial, the designer used several psychological principles or concepts to explain certain dynamics in police-citizen encounters and to support the skills and strategy.

These were gleaned from the work of the psychiatrist and chief police surgeon mentioned earlier and introduced on the flip chart as they came up in the course of the workshop. These items provoked interest and discussion so the designer decided to produce them as part of the printed student materials for the April 14th workshop. These "food for thought" ideas were presented with figures and could be referred back to by learners after the workshop (Appendix D). They were well received in the pilot so they were kept in the material.

As noted earlier, the precinct commander was encouraged to attend this session and reported to the designer that he was very favorably impressed. He noted that he was aware of the rushed pace and limited opportunities for learner interaction. He offered to extend the time allowed for the workshop to a complete tour (eight hours instead of four).

The materials were revised, as indicated in Table 6, and used for the next six field trials. The eight hour version of the workshop began on April 28th and the
materials remained unchanged through the last field trial on July 28th.

**Summative Evaluation**

The purpose of the summative evaluation is to determine if the On Stage workshop in communication skills, as presented in the field trials, was a valid device for achieving the instructional goal. That is, can the communication skills described, be transferred to learners to the extent that they can use them in written and application exercises? Learner ability to manage provocative citizen encounters as measured by field performance was beyond the scope of this thesis project. To strengthen the conclusions, the designer would like to replicate this project with others delivering the training and doing the evaluation.

According to Dick and Carey, "instructional designers are typically absent during instruction, and have no responsibility for the summary and analysis of data." For reasons cited earlier, the designer was compelled to facilitate the workshop and conduct the summative evaluation. The evaluation covered all eight trials (including the two workshops used in the formative evaluation) and included the 60 police officers and one sergeant who participated.
The evaluation was done following the four-tiered approach of Kirkpatrick:

Step 1: **Reaction** - Did the learners like the program?

Step 2: **Learning** - What skills and/or attitudes were learned?

Step 3: **Behavior** - Did job behavior change as a result?

Step 4: **Results** - What were the tangible results of the program in terms of reduced costs, reduced complaints, improved community relations, etc.?

**Reaction**

The notion that learners do not need to like a training experience in order to achieve the goal is widely accepted. So too is the idea that they will do better if they are enthusiastically interested in it. In order to measure this level of training, Kirkpatrick suggests designing a questionnaire that can be quantified and tabulated, that encourages additional written comments and, especially in the case of in-house training such as this project, a form that is anonymous. The questionnaire used by the designer included all of these elements. Additionally, the designer included a statement on the form that asked the participant to "help us in improving the presentation and help us make..."
sure we are achieving the goal". The results of the reaction evaluation can be found in Table 7.

**Table 7**

**On Stage Workshop Reaction Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Course content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Useful in work</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relevant to career</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Objectives met</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Useful materials</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Methodology/Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowl. of skills</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participants involved</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presentation organized</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Respond to participants</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Environment Conducive</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Workshop overall</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructor</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Length of workshop</td>
<td>Too Long 30%</td>
<td>Just right 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level of workshop</td>
<td>Appropriate 90%</td>
<td>N/A 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Would you recommend this course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highly In passing as useful Not Recommend
50% 50% 0

The following written comments were typical of the participants' reactions to the workshop although there were few negative comments.
Strengths: “Learning about acknowledgements ... the importance of having a clean civilian complaint record ... how to avoid civilian complaints ... helps cops not get hooked and to listen to people more ... made you think ... how to deal with the public without losing your authority ... cops may now realize why they get civilian complaints.

Weaknesses: “It's a damned if you do, damned if you don't situation ... It's placating everybody ... too long in one session ... didn't focus enough on job-related occurrences ... practicing techniques in a closed environment ...”

General: “Interesting, useful situations ... effective workshop that allowed ventilation and discussion about problems we usually don't get a chance to talk about ... should be taught at the Borough level with someone from the Civilian Complaint Review Board to explain policies ... should be shorter and more concise ...”
Learning

"It is important to recognize that a favorable reaction to a program does not assure learning" (Kirkpatrick, p. 309). Although gratified at the learner reaction to the training, the designer looked to the next level of evaluation, what was learned, for a stronger indication of success in achieving the instructional goal. In this level of evaluation the designer measured whether the communication skills were transferred. Both the pretest and posttest were open-ended instruments designed to test officer responses to a variety of typical provocative remarks (Appendix D). The remarks were shaped by the designer's experience and by the input of incumbents during the analysis phase and the formative evaluation process. In order to test the learners' ability to actually generalize and use the skills, the posttest used provocative stimuli that were different from the pretest. Therefore, stimuli were labelled by type in order to make tabulation easier. That is, pretest stimuli one and two are called Traffic stop A and B. Pretest #3 is labelled "cursed at," and #4 is labelled "irrational." The responses to question 7, approaches that can persuade people to cooperate, were not used because the answers were vague, hard to categorize, and the designer judged that they were not
connected to the skills. That is, officers who answered, "treat people courteously and with respect," did not know which communication skills allowed them to do that. The responses of all of the 61 learners in the eight workshops were considered in the evaluation summary. The analysis of the pre and posttests was very revealing and encouraging to the designer. A summary of the pretest results can be found in Table 8.

Table 8

On Stage Workshop Pretest Evaluation Summary

| N-61 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Acknowl. Feelings</th>
<th>Paraphrased</th>
<th>Gave Info</th>
<th>Ignore</th>
<th>No Ans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Provocative Stimuli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Traffic stop A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Traffic stop B</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cursed at</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Irrational</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Knowledge of Consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Accumulating Complain. % (Question 5 a,b,c,)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. For invid. officer</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For officer's sgt.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. For the NYPD</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Knowledge of Consequences of Escalating Hostile Situations (Question 6 a,b,c,)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. For invid. officer</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For h/her partner</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. For other officers</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The pretest summary clearly indicated that while learners did have an average 70% awareness of the consequences of accumulating civilian complaints, there was no awareness of the communication knowledges and skills that were to be taught in the workshop. The designer's experience in doing this project led him to the conclusion that, almost universally, people will respond to provocative expressions of feelings by attempting to give information. When the underlying expression of feelings is not acknowledged, hostility escalates. When acknowledgement does take place, hostility tends to be diffused.

The posttest questions were labelled similarly to the pretest. However, in looking at the results the designer discovered that certain stimuli were poorly constructed and did not elicit responses from the learners. He therefore, decided to eliminate responses to stimuli that tested the ability to walk away or "evade" no-win situations rather than the ability to respond. That is, stimulus two, "I hope you get Aids," and four, "Take that badge off and I'll kick your ass." Stimulus #5, "What do I do with this summons now?" tested only for the ability to give information. That was something the learners could do well before the workshop and, therefore, the designer decided not to
tabulate those responses. The posttest was also structured differently than the pretest in that the learners were requested to supply specific types of responses (acknowledging feelings, paraphrasing, giving information) for each stimulus. This was done to measure the learners' skills in using the elements of the On Stage strategy. These results are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9

On Stage Workshop Posttest Evaluation Summary
N=61

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Acknowl. Feelings</th>
<th>Paraphrased</th>
<th>Gave Info</th>
<th>Ignore</th>
<th>No Ans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Domestic dispute</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Traffic stop curse</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Provocative Stimuli (Questions 1,3,6,)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Domestic dispute</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Traffic stop curse</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Badge # demand</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Knowledge of Consequences of Escalating Hostile Situations (Question 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>For invid. officer</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b.</td>
<td>For h/her partner</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>For other officers</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Knowledge of Consequences For Accumulating Complaints (Question 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>For invid. officer</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b.</td>
<td>For officer's sgt.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>For the NYPD</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results on "knowledge of consequences" were
analyzed to see if the learners could list the significant issues as mentioned in the workshop. The ability to do so would tend to support the attitude goal of getting the learners to choose the On Stage skills in responding to provocative remarks. Collecting the role-play rating sheets would have been a very inhibiting practice among a target population like this. Therefore, the designer decided not to use this source of data. Recommendations in this area will be addressed in Chapter Seven.

The results of the paper-and-pencil test shows that the learners made dramatic shifts in their responses to similar and typical provocative stimuli. There was no ability to use either acknowledging or paraphrasing before the workshop and a 70 percent or better ability to respond after the training. The designer feels that the ability to respond at that rate after a one-day workshop was a success even though he had initially deemed a 90% rate to be successful in the objectives. The objectives were created based on a two-day workshop and the designer believes that he could have achieved 90% if given the planned for second day and the planned for videotaping of the learners during the role-play exercises.
Behavior

The designer was not able to complete an evaluation on this level. The scope of this thesis project did not call for follow up and the designer was not in a position to make field observations or collect questionnaire data from the field after the implementation of the project.

Results

Here again, the scope of the thesis project did not call for long term follow up. However, with the cooperation of the chief statistician at the Civilian Complaint Review Board, the designer was able to learn that of the 61 people trained, 11 received one complaint each and one received two for a total of 13 civilian complaints from the time of their workshop until April 1, 1989 (approximately one year). The 61 participants represent approximately 28% of the total population of the precinct (218). The precinct amassed approximately 60 civilian complaints during that same period. The rate for the non-participants was one complaint for every 3.3 officers per year. The rate for the learners was one complaint for every 4.6 officers per year. The difference in rates between learners and non-participants was 1.3. The data is summarized in Table 10.
Table 10

Complaint Statistics - 1 Year After Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th># of complaints for the group</th>
<th>Rate of complaint per # of officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners (N=61)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 per 4.6 officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-learners (N=157)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1 per 3.3 officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60 complaints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions about the results of this training must examine variables such as the Hawthorne Effect and the reliability of the training in other precincts.

Learning Transfer

Several methods of facilitating learning transfer, based on Beaudin's work (Beaudin, 1987), were described in Chapter Three. They included "before, during, and after" strategies. Beaudin writes that, "The work environment has many variables that are not controllable by the HRD person, let alone totally known to those who constitute the population." The designer had planned to follow up the workshops with several of Beaudin's "after" ideas. Job aids in the form of posters describing the On-Stage acronym and strategy, meetings with past participants and their supervisors, and a redesign of the standard performance evaluation.
appraisal were going to be done during the Summer of 1968 while the workshops were in high gear. However, as mentioned previously, the designer was transferred to a new assignment, out of the area, and could not execute this portion of the plan.

Summary

The designer conducted a formative evaluation that included one-on-one and small group trials. The first two workshops were four hours in duration and served as small group trials. The remaining six were eight hours in duration and were labelled field trials. Modifications were made along the way (Table 6) and data was collected in all of the workshops. A summative evaluation and analysis was done using Kirkpatrick's four levels. Participant reaction was very good and the analysis of learning showed that the skills in the On Stage strategy had been transferred. The designer was not able to collect data on the behavior level other than anecdotes in personal communications. Statistics from the Civilian Complaint Review Board obtained one year after the workshop appear to indicate a lower rate of complaints per number of officers among the officers who participated in the training. Additionally, as reported by the Civilian Complaint Review Board analyst,
the host precinct as a whole showed a 20% decline in complaints in 1987 compared to 1986. This improvement was almost twice as good as the rest of the precincts in the patrol borough and in the whole city which showed a 12% decrease in complaints in 1987 over 1986.
CHAPTER 7
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The application of ISD to communication skills training for police officers, is a logical culmination of the work the designer has been engaged in since he was a Social Science recruit instructor at the Police Academy in 1974. His experience as a patrol officer, instructor, supervisor and manager helped him to focus on the need and motivated him to be responsible to the ISD process. The process allowed him to weave together several concepts and skills into the On Stage strategy; i.e., the awareness that many officers failed to distinguish between their on and off-duty behavior, the Disney approach of workers remaining in character while in the public eye, and the standard communication skills that operationalize the service ideal. He encountered some unforeseen delays before implementing the project and some unanticipated difficulties in the course of implementation. Some organizational constraints were overcome and some were not. Nevertheless, the project was implemented substantially as designed and it was concluded successfully both as an ISD project and as effort to achieve the project goal. The results were gratifying both professionally and personally as will be
Design

The design phase included work on articulating objectives (using Mager's model), grouping and sequencing objectives, determining an instructional strategy, and designing an evaluation strategy. The initial plan was for a two-day workshop that would use group discussion, videotape demonstrations of the good, the bad, and the ugly use of communication strategies, and exercises for the participants. Many organizational constraints developed and resulted in an initial project implementation that was a four-hour workshop, with no video modelling of effective communication and no videotaping of participant exercises. These constraints were managed and overcome to some degree. The host precinct commander doubled the workshop time after being encouraged to participate in one session.

Development

The materials used were developed using Gagne's nine instructional events. The attitude component of the training was addressed in part by a series of preinstructional activities that included a videotaped message from the patrol borough commander. The designer placed a great deal of emphasis on attending to the affective concerns of the learners in order to keep them open to the new skills and strategy. A comprehensive
participant workbook was produced along with a videotape of real police situations where problems resulted from the inability to use effective communication skills.

**Implementation**

Where the initial plan called for three field trials, the actual implementation saw eight workshops delivered in the Spring and early Summer of 1988. The designer had obtained the permission of the precinct, division and patrol borough commanders to run all members of the host precinct through the pilot workshop and to do this as part of his regular duties. During implementation, the designer was reassigned by higher level commands to duties outside of the area. With the cooperation of executives in other police department units the designer was able to complete the eight workshops. Data on learner reaction and learner acquisition of skills was collected during each workshop. Additional data was made available by the Civilian Complaint Review Board at the time of this writing.

**Evaluation**

The formative evaluation process included one-on-one trials using the "think aloud" protocol, small-group trials, and field trials. Minor problems were surfaced, confirmed, and revisions were made as
necessary.

The summative evaluation was conducted on three of the four levels in Kirkpatrick's model. The results are summarized in Table 11.

**Table 11**

**Summary of On Stage Workshop Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Subject of Measurement</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reaction</td>
<td>How did learners feel about the training?</td>
<td>90% rated the workshop very good or outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learning</td>
<td>Did the learners get the skills?</td>
<td>0% used skills in pretest - 75% avg. used them effectively on posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behavior</td>
<td>Did the learners use the skills on the job?</td>
<td>Data not collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Results/Impact</td>
<td>What benefits accrued to the host organiz.?</td>
<td>Learner group had a lower rate of civil. compls. per # of officers compared to non-learner group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**

In keeping with the elements of the ISD process, several disclaimers must precede any conclusions by the designer. First, due to constraints mentioned previously, the designer facilitated the workshops he designed. Had he but resources enough and time, he could have trained a trainer and an observer so that his
presence would not have been a variable in evaluation. Second, he had to deliver the workshop in one day instead of the two days planned for. This made the pace extremely fast and cramped. Third, data was not collected regarding on the job performance of the skills taught. Fourth, some controls would have to be added to future implementation to discount the Hawthorne Effect (the result from just paying attention to the officers). Fifth, he was not able to produce a videotape of model behavior using the skills. Last, he was not able to videotape the participants doing the skills application exercises so that they could see themselves.

In spite of the above, the designer feels that the results of the workshops confirm most of his notions going into the project. Officers were not able to use these standard "customer service" communication skills in responding to provocation before the training and they were able to use them in role plays and on the paper and pencil posttest. Additionally, it appears that with adequate attention to learner characteristics and affective needs, one can effectively manage the resistance, defensiveness, and negative attitudes toward HRD that a tough target population can bring to the classroom. With some effective video feedback and discussion, officers can come to see that they are on
stage when they appear in uniform in public.

**Recommendations**

The designer recommends that several possible uses of the concepts and skills presented in this project be acted on as follows:

1. That the On Stage Workshop be used in a high activity precinct in an entirely different location as a two-day project with data collected on all four levels of evaluation.

2. That the videotape model be produced and used in delivering the workshop.

3. That the agency head and union head appear together (or separately if necessary) endorsing the values and concepts behind the training.

4. That concerns about videotaping the participants' exercises be addressed and overcome.

5. That a training intervention in this skill area be designed for entry-level officers.

6. That the "customer-service" concepts and principles that are part of the workshop be part of an indoctrination plan that would pervade the entire six month recruit school curriculum and experience. This would condition all recruits to be able to respond effectively to the inevitable and difficult situations.
that all police officers face from time to time, and that the officers of high activity precincts face much too frequently.

7. That training such as this be made an integral part of the Civilian Complaint Review Board training program.

Concluding Statement

The designer has been involved in many police related training projects in the course of his career with the NYPD. He has seen many changes in this area including a substantial movement towards professionalizing the entire training function. Expert, Directors of Training have been brought in over the last several years to move the department in that direction and state of the art graduate school programs in ISD have been made available on site. The designer has been able to clarify his training philosophy in the course of completing this graduate program in instructional technology and has used that philosophy in this project. He firmly believes that attitudes will follow behavior. If learners can be motivated to choose certain behaviors over others, the perception of both the client and the learners will shift in the desired direction. More specifically, lectures on courtesy and admonitions on "police arrogance" should be rejected as unproductive
labeling. All of those precious resources should be put into several aspects of ISD. That is, defining exactly what behaviors equal the values we desire police officers to have and then developing effective means for transferring those behaviors to our officers. The designer believes very strongly that if all police officers could respond to provocative remarks with acknowledgments of feelings, paraphrasing, the giving of useful information, and with walking away from no-win situations that don't amount to violations of law, then the public would perceive them as courteous. If interactions were less stressful, officers would feel more secure and act less aggressively.

The designer is gratified to know that Police Academy staff, after consulting with him and attending his On Stage Workshop, have incorporated elements of his design and strategy into a three-day workshop on civilian complaints to be implemented department wide and known as PRIDE training. It will be delivered as a centralized training effort and will not focus on specific work groups or precincts such as the designer did in this project.
APPENDIX A

PROJECT PLANNING
On Stage Workshop Development Plan

Needs Analysis
Submit Proposal
Develop Objectives
Determine Content
Concept Test
Design
One-on-one Trials
Modify
Small Group Trials
Modify
Field Trials

Start
End

Alan Goodman
1/88

2/12
3/11
4/8
5/6
6/3
7/1
7/29
8/26
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence of Planning</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Start</td>
<td>2/12/88</td>
<td>2/12/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Small group trials</td>
<td>4/6/88</td>
<td>4/14/88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONAL VIDEO LOCATOR SHEET
INSTRUCTIONAL VIDEO LOCATOR SHEET

The instructional videotape that was produced in this thesis/ project is available at the office of the graduate program in Master of Science, in Training and Learning Technology, New York Institute of Technology Old Westbury, New York 11568. The format of the tape is 1/2 inch VHS. The tape consists of two items: An introduction to the On Stage Workshop delivered by Assistant Chief Louis Raiford, the Patrol Borough Brooklyn North Commanding Officer at the time of this project; And, a series of police - citizen confrontation scenes edited from a video documentary about the NYPD called "The Police Tapes." This program was produced for Public Broadcasting by Alan and Susan Raymond in 1975.
APPENDIX C1
SCRIPTS FOR VIDEO SEGMENTS
ASSISTANT CHIEF RAIFORD
PATROL BOROUGH COMMANDER
SUPER SIGNS:

Verbal Strategies for Gaining Compliance and Avoiding Civilian Complaints

A Workshop for Patrol Officers Working in High-Experience Commands

FADE UP:

INT. CHIEF RAIFORD'S OFFICE - DAY

MS

CHIEF RAIFORD is sitting at his desk in uniform.

Chief Raiford

It's important for each and every police officer, and I mean patrol officers and chiefs alike, to realize two things. First, that every time we take action, we're on stage and in the public spotlight. And second, that the profit that we stand to lose or gain in our business is the respect and support of the people in our communities. That support translates into calls to 911 when we're in trouble, into getting information about a crime when it's dangerous to talk, and even into how much tax money is allotted to the police.

The goal of this workshop is a positive one. It has been designed to offer verbal strategies to help us do what we have to do, in enforcement situations, and not get civilian complaints. The participation of experienced patrol officers, like yourselves, adds the kind of input that will help make the workshop effective. I want to thank you for your participation and for the good work you do day in and day out. Thank you.
APPENDIX C2

SCRIPTS FOR VIDEO SEGMENTS

PATROLMEN'S BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION TRUSTEE
(NOT PRODUCED)
SUPER SIGNS:

Verbal Strategies for Gaining Compliance and Avoiding Civilian Complaints

A Workshop for Patrol Officers Working in High-Experience Commands

FADE UP:

EXT. BROWNSVILLE STREET - DAY
ESTABLISHING SHOT

PBA Trustee Jim Higgins is standing across the street from the 73rd Precinct. The station house can be seen behind him. Start with a LS and SLOW ZOOM IN to a CU.

HIGGINS

My name is Jim Higgins and I'm the PBA Brooklyn North Trustee. I've been asked to introduce this workshop because the people in the Brooklyn North Command want you to understand exactly what it is and why it's being done. The goal of every cop out here on patrol should be to get the job done and do it in a way that, in so far as is possible, gains the respect of the people in the community. Now, it would be foolish to think that any cop could take enforcement action day in and day out and never have anyone get angry. That's the way it is. So, this workshop will offer some suggestions in the form of communication skills to avoid getting unnecessary civilian complaints. Complaints don't do anyone any good. And, anything you can do to keep them to a minimum is a plus for all over us. Thanks and good luck.

FADE OUT
APPENDIX C3

SCRIPTS FOR VIDEO SEGMENTS

MODEL PERFORMANCE DEMONSTRATIONS
AND EXPLANATION TAPE
(NOT PRODUCED)
FADE UP NYPD LOGO
SUPER SIGNS: Verbal Strategies for Gaining Compliance and Avoiding Civilian Complaints

CUT TO:

EXT STREET SCENES OF COPS AND RMPS
ESTABLISHING SHOT

A montage of POLICE OFFICERS on patrol and taking enforcement action. The VO introduces the On Stage Techniques in an overview.

VO
When people are angry enough to make complaints it's not good for business. In our business the profit is the public support that results in calls to 911 when a cop is in trouble, in breaking the silence when we need information, and even in how much tax money is spent on the police. The idea behind the verbal strategies we're offering in this workshop is, very simply, that people who are angry can be made to feel less so if they feel that they are really being listened to and if feel they're being allowed to save face. (:70)

CUT TO:
EXT STREET DAY
MS POLICE OFFICERS AND HOSTILE CITIZEN

Two POLICE OFFICERS are calmly managing a dispute with an irate CITIZEN. FADE DOWN the ambient sound under the VO

VO
The goal is to come up with tools to get the job done and avoid the unnecessary complaints that affect you, your sergeant, your commanding officer, and ultimately, the whole department. The point we all need to be reminded of from time-to-time no matter what rank or position, is that whenever we're taking action we're always (emphasize) ON STAGE. (:20)
FADE UP BG audio.
FREEZE FRAME
Let audio run over FF and FADE audio. Irate citizen in mid-fit with Police Officer listening intently (calm expression, head slightly cocked to one side.). SUPER the overview of On Stage Tactics

We’re always On...

S - State an acknowledgment of the person’s feelings

T - Titles and surnames only

A - Actively listen by paraphrasing their statements

G - Give information to diffuse hostility

E - Evade no-win, escalating situations

VO

The acronym STAGE covers the basic skills. The S stands for stating an acknowledgment of the person’s feelings. When someone is angry or hostile because you’re taking some enforcement action they’ll sometimes express that anger in ways that we could take personally. Like...

CUT TO:
POV of Police Officer. CU of ANGRY MALE BLACK MOTORIST looking right into the camera.

#1

God Damn...You just stopped me because I’m Black!

CUT TO:
Same shot with MALE HISPANIC

#2

...Puerto Rican!
CUT TO:
Same shot with MALE JEWISH MOTORIST

#3

...jewish!

CUT TO:
FREEZE FRAME XCU PO’S FACE FROM MOTORIST’S POV

VO
Instead of getting hooked into the other guy’s problem try stating a non-judgmental acknowledgment of their feelings. Something like... (:07)

UNFREEZE FRAME:
The officer speaks to the camera.

PO
I understand...No one likes to get stopped by the police. Especially if they feel like they’re being stopped unfairly. You were stopped because you passed a red light at the last intersection. May I have your license, registration and insurance card please?

CUT TO:
PO’S POV OF MOTORIST looking in his wallet for his license. SUPER "STAGE" layout under the VO. ZOOM IN on "T" portion.

VO
The T in stage reminds us to use titles and surnames only. (:05)

FADE SUPER:
The motorist hands the credentials to the PO who’s hand we see take them.

PO (VO)
Alright Mr. Jones if you’ll just wait here I’ll be back shortly.

CUT TO CU MOTORIST IN DRIVER’S SEAT.
The POLICE OFFICER hands the summons and credentials back to the MOTORIST who looks at the back of the summons and shakes his head in exasperation.
Here's your license sir...and this is your copy of the summons...If you look at the back you'll see that the instructions...

MOTORIST

(interrupting) I know what it says...this is the third summons you guys have given me in two months...You must have my license plate up on the station house wall...I can't afford...

FADE AUDIO TO BG
SUPER "STAGE":
ZOOM IN to the "A" for Active Listening

VO

Active listening is accomplished simply by nodding the head, making eye contact and paraphrasing or summarizing what it is you think the person said. This attempt to verify what you heard makes the other person feel like they're really being listened to. (:14)

FADE UP AUDIO:

MOTORIST

...When is this going to stop?

CUT TO:
XCU of Police Officer's face from motorist's POV

PO

So, you're saying that you've got three summonses in a short period of time and it's costing you a lot of time and money...
The paraphrase helps you to be in control of the situation and steer it where you want it to go...From here you can easily go to Giving Information as another way to diffuse some of the hostility.

When we stop people we don’t look at their driving record and we have nothing to do with the fines or penalties...I suggest you follow the instructions and answer the summonses so that the fines don’t increase...

The information focuses just on what the driver needs to know and avoids getting the officer hooked into an argument. (:10)

CUT TO:
LS of officers walking back to RMP. They ignore the driver’s parting remarks as they get into the RMP and close the doors.

I still say that you cops are harassing me...

When you know you just can’t win... escape. Remember, as hard as it is sometimes, the goal is to do what you have to do and not get the unnecessary complaints that ultimately affect us all.

LOSE SUPER AND FADE OUT
APPENDIX D
INSTRUCTOR/LEARNER WORKBOOK
Verbal Strategies for Gaining Compliance and Avoiding Civilian Complaints

A Workshop for Patrol Officers Working in High-Experience Commands Using the On-Stage Strategy

Designed for the New York City Police Department at the request of the Commanding Officer of the 73rd Precinct, Deputy Inspector Joseph Wodarski, and with the concurrence and sponsorship of the Commanding Officer: 13th Division, Inspector William P. Conroy, and the Commanding Officer: Patrol Borough Brooklyn North, Assistant Chief Louis Raiford.
STUDENT GUIDE FOR THE TASK:
INTERACT WITH THE HOSTILE PERSON

PRETEST
Verbal Strategies for Gaining Compliance and Avoiding Civilian Complaints

A Workshop for Patrol Officers Working in High-Experience Commands

Pretest - In order to make this training as effective as it can be, it is important to find out how you feel about the difficult job of dealing with a hostile citizen. Please fill in the appropriate responses as instructed.

What would be the appropriate response to the following statements?

1. "You only stopped be because I’m (Black, Jewish, Hispanic, White, Gay, Female, etc.)!

   What would be the most effective thing to say?

   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________

2. "Why don’t you go arrest some of the people that are killing cops?"

   What would be the most effective thing to say?

   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________

3. "All you fucking cops are the same!"

   What would be the most effective thing to say?

   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________

4. "I hope you get Cancer!"

   What would be the most effective thing to say?

   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
5. "Write down a consequence for each of the following parties, from an officer accumulating Civilian Complaints:
   a. The officer__________________________________________
   b. His/her sergeant_______________________________________
   c. The department________________________________________
6. Write down a consequence for each of the following, that can occur when a hostile, police-citizen encounter escalates to violence:
   a. The officer__________________________________________
   b. The partner__________________________________________
   c. Other officers responding to assist________________________________________
7. List three approaches that can persuade people to cooperate with your directions in enforcement situations:
   1. ______________________________________________________
   2. ______________________________________________________
   3. ______________________________________________________
Thank you!
STUDENT GUIDE FOR THE TASK:
INTERACT WITH THE HOSTILE PERSON

SEGMENT #1

REVIEW OF THE CIVILIAN COMPLAINT PROBLEM
Verbal Strategies for Gaining Compliance and Avoiding Civilian Complaints

A Workshop for Patrol Officers Working in High-Experience Commands Using the On-Stage Strategy

Introduction:

The purpose of this workshop is to explore ways of using specific verbal strategies to help you do what you have to do in enforcement situations without generating unnecessary civilian complaints. The strategies represent some very basic communication skills that we will adapt to dealing with the kinds of hostile people you face every day. The goal is to add tools to your toolbox. Nothing being offered here is designed to in any way say that necessary force should not be used when it is morally and legally justified. In many cases, if the verbal strategies demonstrated in this workshop simply accompany the same physical force you would have used before, civilian complaints will be much less likely to occur.

The workshop has five segments:

1. A review of the Civilian Complaint problem
2. An overview of the On-Stage skills model
3. A series of skills application exercises
4. An evaluation of the skills exercises
5. Workshop reaction questionnaire

Note: IT IS IMPORTANT THAT ALL OF US, FROM POLICE OFFICER TO CHIEF, REMEMBER THAT WHENEVER WE’RE TAKING ACTION WE ARE ON-STAGE!
Verbal Strategies for Gaining Compliance and Avoiding Civilian Complaints

A Workshop for Patrol Officers Working in High-Experience Commands

Segment I: What does it all mean?

A. Let's quickly review the Department's policy and philosophy regarding civilian complaints. Those policies are derived from the current state of criminal justice philosophy and from the consensus of the citizenry who express their will in the accountability of elected and appointed officials. Our Department's procedures, as described in the Patrol Guide and the Administrative Guide, are a vehicle for carrying out those policies.

List two reasons why we accept any and all complaints regardless of their vagueness or the anonymity of their source.

1. 

2. 

How does the Department decide which complaints get charged to your record?

Who investigates Force allegations?

What are Chief of Department complaints and what do they mean to you?

Who gets complaints?

Who makes complaints?

B. Let's focus on the effects of civilian complaints on the careers of individual officers like you. Please write out the answers to the following questions.

Do you know how many "official" civilian complaints you have?

Do you know the dispositions of those complaints?
Speculate on three effects that the accumulation of civilian complaints will have on you.

1.
2.
3.

Name three precinct assignments you would like to get

1.
2.
3.

Name three good "detail" assignments that you would like to get into.

1.
2.
3.

List those of the above where the Commanding Officer does not consider the candidate officer's civilian complaint history.

1.
2.
3.

List three reasons why a Commanding Officer might place so much emphasis on complaint history.

1.
2.
3.

C. To complete our perspective of this problem let's review the consequences for you and your fellow officers, aside from civilian complaints, that come out of escalating enforcement situations.
List four dangers that we all are exposed to when a fellow officer allows or causes an enforcement situation to escalate.

1.

2.

3.

4.

Summary

We all have to come to see that while it would be unrealistic to expect a working patrol officer to never get a civilian complaint or to never lose control of his or her emotions, the number and patterns of civilian complaints will have serious consequences for you, for your colleagues, for your Commanding Officer and for the Department. Based on your acceptance of this reality, let's go on to figure out ways to avoid unnecessary complaints while preserving our values about the way we should be treated.
"On Stage" Seminar Learner Concerns/Issues

Please consider for a moment, the many difficult situations you have been in where provocative comments made by those involved or by onlookers have either hooked you into becoming emotionally involved or sorely tempted you to react. Write down the three or four things that you would like to be able to do when people are giving you a hard time in these situations. These will help us focus the workshop on the most useful strategies for you!

1. I would like to figure out a way to ____________________________

2. I would also like to figure out a way to ____________________________

3. I would also like to figure out a way to ____________________________

4. I would also like to figure out a way to ____________________________

example: I would like to figure out a way to calm people down in family disputes when they’re angry and none of the people involved called the police.
STUDENT GUIDE FOR THE TASK: INTERACT WITH HOSTILE PERSON

SEGMENT #2

THE ON-STAGE MOL. OF VERBAL STRATEGIES FOR GAINING COMPLIANCE AND AVOIDING CIVILIAN COMPLAINTS
THE "ON-STAGE" COMMUNICATION MODEL

Step 1: Approach
- Survey scene
- Ask for info
- Tactical approach

Step 2: Contact Violator
- Greet the violator
- Ask re violation
- State viol. & T/P/O
- Request credentials
- Summarize action?
- Tactical approach

Step 3: Respond
- State acknowledgment
- Titles/surnames
- Active listening
- Give information
- Evade escalation

Step 4: Enforcement
- Request action
- Summons/est
- Frisk/Transport
- Evade escalation

Step 5: Respond
- State acknowledgment
- Titles/surnames
- Active listening
- Give information
- Evade escalation

Step 6: Close
- Note in Activity Log
- State feelings
- Acknowledge cooperation
- Process

Step 7: Document/Debrief
- Note in Activity Log
- State feelings
- Acknowledge cooperation
- Process
"On Stage" Workshop Food for Thought

The following concepts will be introduced throughout the workshop. They are presented for your consideration and should help to give a context to the people and situations we will be discussing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Aggressive Helpfulness</strong></td>
<td>When we attempt to help people by directing their actions and activity they often perceive that as an intrusion or as aggression. They seem to resent our help and even become hostile. If we are not aware of this we can become frustrated and angry and react in a negative way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example:</strong> You are trying to handle a vehicle accident with injuries and trying to keep the curious onlookers from crowding a victim.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Fear/Anger Amalgam</strong></td>
<td>When people become the victims of sudden, unexpected violence they generate anger at and fear of the criminal at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Displaced Anger</strong></td>
<td>Victims of violence or even property crimes are angry at a criminal that, by the time we get there, has usually fled. That anger may be vented on the first &quot;safe&quot; target that is available. Guess who that is?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example:</strong> You have been running from job to job and arrive at a past burglary some time after the victim called 911. The victim is obviously upset and angrily wants to know why it took so long for you to get there. You say, &quot;__________&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The Learning Curve

**Definition**
If you are performing a certain task and you introduce a new technique for doing that task, what happens to your performance?

**Example:** You play tennis or golf and decide to take a few lessons from the pro... What will happen to your game performance?

**Example:** You get through to Dr. Ruth on one of her shows and introduce a new technique. What might happen to your performance?

\[ P : E : \text{intervention} \]

\[ R : \_I \]

\[ F : \_I \]

--- TIME ---

5. Two Personality Models

**Definition**
One kind of person keeps his/her ego or opinion of self-worth tucked away inside. There is a large buffer of what can be called "self-preservation" around that ego core. When this person goes through the day and gets "bumped" or "poked" by others they don't feel like their very core is being threatened and they act in ways that help them stay out of trouble.

The other kind of person has the opposite arrangement. They keep self-preservation on the inside and wear their ego or self-worth on their sleeves. Every time they get bumped or poked in even the most insignificant way they react as if their very being is under attack.

* These concepts are from the work of Dr. Martin Symonds, MD on the psychology of victim and criminal behavior (Dr. Symonds is a Deputy Chief Police Surgeon, NYPD and a Professor and Consultant on Victim and Criminal Behavior)
Student Guide for the Task:
INTERACT WITH HOSTILE PERSON

Step 1 - The Approach

* Survey the scene for cover/danger

* Request all information available

* Make tactically correct approach
SG Page 2

Student Guide for the Task:

INTERACT WITH HOSTILE PERSON

Step 2 - Contact Person

* Greet the person: (For use in non-violent, less than criminal situations)

1. If appropriate, refer to the time of day: Good Morning, Afternoon, Evening

2. Use title and surname: Sir/M'am or Mister/Ms. if last name is known

* State violation and time and place of occurrence

* Take summary actions if appropriate: (For use in threatening or criminal situations)

1. Stop/Question/Frisk (Precautionary frisk if appropriate)

2. Arrest -

3. Summons -

* Request credentials

1. "May I have your license, registration and Insurance Card please."

Rationale?
Student Guide for the Task:

INTERACT WITH HOSTILE PERSON

Step 3 - Respond to Provocation: The On-Stage Approach

When people make provocative remarks, they're often looking for a certain kind of emotional response. In the heat of the moment, we often respond automatically by angry finger pointing and name calling. The objective of each element in the ON-STAGE strategy is to allow you to plan and choose responses that can short-circuit the escalating hostility that very often results in civilian complaints...or worse. Remember, we can't get away from the fact that...

We're always On...

S - State an acknowledgment of the person's feelings

T - Titles and surnames only

A - Actively listen by paraphrasing their statements

G - Give information to diffuse hostility

E - Evade no-win, escalating situations

The first element of the strategy is -

* State an acknowledgment of feelings: You start to diffuse or deflect some of the hostility by letting the person know that you know how they feel. This does not mean you agree or disagree with either the feelings or the way they are being expressed.

Models - "I can see (understand) that you are ___________. I might be __________ too if I felt that __________." Or, very briefly, "I hear you...no one likes to get stopped by the police...especially when ________________."  

List 3 situations where you do NOT think you could do this:

1.

2.

3.
Step 3: Respond to Provocation: The On-Stage Approach (Contd.)

The second element in the strategy is to always use Titles and Surnames. The use of first names or names that fit the physical description, gender or demeanor of the person are guaranteed escalators.

* Titles and Surnames:

Examples: Sir, M'am, Mister, Miss, etc.

Non-examples: (Your favorite descriptive names)

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

NOTE - If you were the CO of the Street Crime Unit in the area that covered the "Hill Street" precinct and one of the applicants for your unit had a series of "unsubstantiated" civilian complaints wherein he allegedly used the terms "Dog breath" and "Hairball" instead of titles and surnames, what would you do?
Step 3 - Respond to Provocation: The On-Stage Approach (Contd.)

Active Listening:

The third element is Active Listening by Paraphrasing what it is the person is saying. The goal here is to understand, clarify and confirm the statements or requests and, to make the person feel like he or she is really being listened to. The activity in active listening is simply paraphrasing or restating what was said. Paraphrasing is also a great conversation controller for you!

The model for a paraphrase is: "So, you are saying that..."

When part of the statement is that there is something the person is unable to do, you can make that a part of the paraphrase: "So, you are saying that you will miss the party because you've been arrested." Or, in a slightly different form, "So you're saying that you will be late for your appointment because you're being detained here with this summons?"

NOTE: You'll know that you are actively listening when the person says, "yes," or nods in agreement with your paraphrase. If they correct you, that is also a positive demonstration that you are paying attention to them.

NOTE: You can control the conversation by selecting the part of the statement that you want to deal with and using that part in your paraphrase. Ignore the rest, especially provocative remarks.
The fourth element in responding that will assist you to diffusing hostility and thereby, to avoid many civilian complaints is called simply, giving information. When we can give useful information to someone who is angry it diffuses hostility.

* Giving Information - What can we say to someone who says:

1. "Why aren’t you going after Crack dealers?"

2. "Am I going to lose my license now?"

3. "I still say I didn’t go through that red light?"

4. (Supply your own remark)
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The last but not least element of the strategy is:

- Evade no-win, escalating situations

When you have taken care of your enforcement business, that is, warned, instructed, summonses, or arrested, and finished courteously "giving information" (because that's the kind of person you are), THEN IGNORE ANY PARTING SHOTS (verbal shots that is) AND TAKE EVASIVE ACTION...GET THE HELL OUT OF THERE!

Example: Turning and walking away (be sure to glance back or have your partner watching).

Non-Example: Walking away and saying, "Your mother said she wouldn't tell!"
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Step 4 - Enforcement Action

* Give the violator directions on what you want him to do

* Summons, arrest

* Field Search (Stop, Question & Frisk)

* Remove from the scene/release from custody
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Step 5 - Respond to Provocation with On-Stage Strategy

Step 5 is repeated because there are several points during an interaction with a hostile person where an officer is going to have to respond to provocative statements. It is important to have a good understanding of the five elements in the strategy and when each one might be used because every situation will present its own variations on the theme.

We’re always On...

S - State an acknowledgment of the person’s feelings

T - Titles and surnames only

A - Actively listen by paraphrasing their statements

G - Give information to diffuse hostility

E - Evade no-win, escalating situations
Step 6 - Close transaction

- Acknowledge cooperation from the other person

- Allow face-saving on the other person's part

How can you do this? List three ways:
1. __________________________
2. __________________________
3. __________________________
Step 7 - Document and Debrief

- **Document** all significant facts, circumstances, AND PROVOCATIVE STATEMENTS in the Activity Log.

  NOTE - Be consistent in the way you document the situations you are involved in so that no one can accuse you of "lying in advance" of an investigation.

- **Debrief with a partner**

  Given a private place, tell each other how you feel about what happened during the interaction. Focus on the behavior of the people involved and do not use stereotypical, disparaging remarks about race, ethnicity, religion, or cultural background. There are three reasons for being careful in this debriefing. First, the person you were dealing with was an individual and does not represent anyone. Second, you wouldn't want to inadvertently offend another member of the service. Third, you would want to avoid even the slightest possibility that some offended party might make a civilian complaint.
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SEGMENT #3

SKILLS APPLICATION EXERCISES
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Segment #3 - Skills Application Exercises

Goal:
To get down and work with the On Stage response skills in the typical situations you are faced with as police officers in high-activity commands. There's no point in talking about these skills if you can’t see yourself using them in the "street".

Introduction:
In the first segment we talked about why we're going to choose to try the response techniques in the On Stage strategy. In the second segment we reviewed the overview model and each element of dealing with a hostile person. In the third segment we're going to get down to practicing. The workshop facilitator will ask you to form small work groups for the purpose of coming up with good, juicy provocative situations and then taking turns playing the roles of officer and civilian. As the exercises take place we'll use the On Stage Rating Guide to evaluate the performance of the officers. In the fourth segment we'll go over the evaluations and comments.

Exercise A:
In the first round we’ll work with a typical car stop for a red light infraction. Use your imagination to come up with two of the five most common provocative remarks made by the "%$%($%$!')s who blow right through steady red signals and then have a whole raft of stuff to say when we stop them.

1. ____________________________

2. ____________________________

Now let’s take five minutes to write a script that begins with one of the provocative remarks you or someone else has described and includes the police officer’s effective response (TCB with no CC). Turn the page and create a dialog that uses the On Stage strategies.
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Exercise B:

Let's bump it up a notch and work with a typical "Stop and Frisk" situation on the street. Come up with two typical responses that people have when involved in this type of interaction with the police. For the purpose of this exercise it doesn't matter whether the suspect is dirty or not.

1. 

2. 

Take another five minutes to script this scene.

citizen says:

PO says:

citizen says:

PO says:

citizen says:

PO says:
Exercise C:

Let's go to the kinds situations that seem to be the biggest problem here in this precinct, entering peoples homes, stores, or other private areas to investigate reported crimes. List two problem situations and the kinds of provocative statements you have to listen to when you try to help.

#1 Situation:

Remarks:

#2 Situation:

Remarks:

Script:

citizen says:

PO says:

citizen says:

PO says:

citizen says:

PO says:
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SEGMENT 04

REVIEW OF SKILLS APPLICATION PERFORMANCE
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Segment #4 - Evaluation of Exercises

Goal:

What we want to do here is give each participant useful feedback about how the response skills are being used. The emphasis, as you can see from the rating guide, is on the five skills or performances. The overall goal, as we said in the beginning of the workshop, is to take the investigative and enforcement action we are required to take AND USE LANGUAGE TO AVOID UNNECESSARY CIVILIAN COMPLAINTS from the subject of the interaction or any unfriendly bystanders.

"On Stage" Competency Based Rating Guide

| Situation: |
| Remarks: |

Steps

1. Did the officer....STATE AN ACKNOWLEDGMENT of feelings? ("I understand that...")
2. Did the officer use TITLES and SURNAMES?
3. Did the officer....ACTIVELY LISTEN by paraphrasing concerns? ("So, you're saying that...")
4. Did the officer....GIVE INFORMATION that he or she thought might help the person with his/her concerns? ("You might want to...")
5. Did the officer....EVADE a no-win, escalating situation? (ignore continuing provocation?)

Comments:
"On Stage" Competency Based Rating Guide

In reviewing the skills application exercises, it is important to focus on performance and behaviors. This guide will assist us by spelling out the behaviors associated with being On Stage as a police officer (including members of all ranks and positions).

Remember the GOAL!

Use language as a tool to help you take enforcement action and not get unnecessary Civilian Complaints.

Steps

1. Did the officer.....STATE AN ACKNOWLEDGMENT of feelings? ("I understand that ...")
2. Did the officer use TITLES and SURNAMES?
3. Did the officer.....ACTIVELY LISTEN by paraphrasing concerns? ("So, you're saying that...")
4. Did the officer.....GIVE INFORMATION that he or she thought might help the person with his/her concerns? ("You might want to...")
5. Did the officer.....EVADE a no-win, escalating situation? (ignore continuing provocation?)

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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SEGMENT #5

REACTION QUESTIONNAIRE & POSTTEST
"On Stage" Workshop Evaluation

The information we are requesting on this sheet is designed to get your reactions to this workshop. It will help us in improving the presentation and, most importantly, it will help us make sure we are achieving the goal. Please keep the goal in mind as you consider your responses, "...the workshop participant will be able to use language skills to avoid unnecessary civilian complaints".

Date ___________________ Workshop leader _______________________

Each statement is followed by numbers 5 to 1. Please circle the number that corresponds to your feelings about the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Course Content:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The material covered was useful in my work..............</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The material covered was relevant to my career development.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The course objectives were fulfilled........................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The course materials (student guide, videos, handouts, etc) were useful.................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Course methodology/instructor(s):</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Showed thorough knowledge of skills presented ..................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Involved the participants in discussion and practice of the skills presented ..................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presented material in a clear, organized and interesting manner ................................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Responded to questions or needs of the participants ..................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Environment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The facilities were comfortable and conducive to learning...</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MY OVERALL RATING OF THE WORKSHOP IS: | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|---------------|
| Outstanding | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor |
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MY OVERALL RATING OF THE INSTRUCTOR IS:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Other Comments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Length of workshop</td>
<td>(1) ______Too long (2) ______ Too short (3) ______ Just right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level of the workshop</td>
<td>(1) ______Too advanced (2) ______ Too elementary (3) ______ Appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The major strength of the workshop:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The major weakness of the workshop:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Any other comments (general or specific) about the workshop:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Would you recommend this course to those who perform similar duty to yours?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) ______ Highly Rec. (2) ______ In passing, as useful (3) ______ Not recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Posttest - In order to gauge the effectiveness of the Verbal Strategies workshop, it is important to get your responses to the following provocative situations. Please fill in the appropriate imagined responses using the On Stage strategy.

What would be the appropriate response to the following statements?

1. "You've got no right coming into my house!"

State an acknowledgement of feelings

Paraphrase

Give information (make it up)

2. "I hope you get AIDS!"

What would be the most effective thing to say?

State an acknowledgement of feelings

Paraphrase

Give information (make it up)

3. "Stick that summons up your ass!"

What would be the most effective thing to say?

State an acknowledgement of feelings
4. "Take off that badge and I'll kick your ass!"

What would be the most effective thing to say?

State an acknowledgement of feelings

5. "What do I do with this summons now?"

What would be the most effective thing to say?

6. "What's your badge number, I'm going to make a complaint against you!"

What would be the most effective thing to say?

7. What are 3 effects of escalating hostile situations?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

8. What are 3 ways that accumulating civilian complaints affect me?
   a. 
   b. 
   c.
From: Captain Alan Z. Goodman: Personnel Bureau
To: Commanding Officer: 73rd Precinct
Subject: RECOGNITION OF PARTICIPATION IN THE 73RD PRECINCT VERBAL STRATEGIES WORKSHOP BY PO

1. On 1988 PO participated in the workshop on Verbal Strategies for Gaining Compliance and Avoiding Civilian Complaints, given at the 73rd Precinct.

2. PO demonstrated an interest in improving his communication skills and in improving his ability to deal effectively with hostile citizens. He also recognized that the ability to take appropriate enforcement action while avoiding unnecessary civilian complaints is an important goal for all police officers.

3. Please make this memorandum part of their personnel folder.

4. For your INFORMATION.

AZG:ag

Alan Z. Goodman
Captain
APPENDIX E

CIVILIAN COMPLAINT REVIEW BOARD STATISTICS
### TABLE 1

**COMPLAINTS AND ALLEGATIONS RECEIVED**

**TOTAL NUMBER OF CIVILIAN COMPLAINTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>1987</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,120</td>
<td>4,757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misconduct Type</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>1987</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary/Excessive Force</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>3,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse of Authority</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourtesy</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>1,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Slur</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,075</td>
<td>7,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Every complaint contains at least one and, in many cases, more than one allegation of misconduct. Therefore, there will always be a greater number of allegations than complaints.
**TABLE 1C**

**DISCOURTESY ALLEGATIONS DISTRIBUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allegation</th>
<th># of Allegations</th>
<th>% of Allegations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curse</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasty Words</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profane Gesture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude Gesture</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudeness</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexist Remark</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Slur</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,948</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,989</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1D**

**ETHNIC SLUR ALLEGATIONS DISTRIBUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allegation</th>
<th># of Allegations</th>
<th>% of Allegations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
<td><strong>379</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Type</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>1987</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Incident/Traffic Summons</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aided Case</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally Distributed Person</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Crime or Crime in Progress</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patrol Incidents - General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop/Question/Frisk</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>1,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rept. Disturbance/Noise</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh. Stop &amp; Check</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compl. witnessing incident</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Patrol Incidents</strong></td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>1,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Station House</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call to Police Department Facility</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrest/Desk Appearance Tickets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest of complainant</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest/Not complainant</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Arrest/Desk Appear. Tickets</strong></td>
<td>489</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summons (Non-Traffic)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined *</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,120</td>
<td>4,757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As of the closing date of this report, the investigation of these cases was not been finalized, or the generating incident was unknown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>No. of Complaints</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>No. of Complaints</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.57%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>17.63%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>14.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>26.22%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>23.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>17.08%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>21.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>12.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>6.24%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>9.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,197</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,867</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ongoing/Undetermined: 923

Total: 5,120
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TABLE 12

COMPLAINTS COMPARED TO POPULATION

The following table shows the relationship between the population of each of the 5 boroughs and the number of civilian complaints filed in 1987 against that county's Borough/Precinct Patrol Units. Population is based on 1980 census data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough of Assignment</th>
<th>Borough Population</th>
<th>Complaints Against Patrol Boro Personnel</th>
<th>Complaints per 10,000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>1,428,285</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>1,168,972</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>2,230,936</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>1,891,325</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td>352,121</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the total city-wide population of 7,071,639 is compared to the 4,757 complaints made against all police officers, regardless of assignment, it breaks down as 6.7 per 10,000 residents.
Police officers within New York City have thousands of contact daily with members of the community. These contacts may be routine requests for assistance or information, or emergency calls regarding life-threatening situations. The vast majority of these public contacts are handled in a highly professional manner, without negative community response.

No major programs were initiated in the Department in 1987 which resulted in a specific increase in public contact. However, the following major projects were expanded in 1987: Community Patrol Officer Program; Police Cadet Corps; and Narcotics Program. The number of documented police/citizen encounters is illustrated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Encounter</th>
<th>Total Number of Encounters*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Run</td>
<td>3,952,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Summons</td>
<td>4,321,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Violation</td>
<td>1,625,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>227,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aided Case</td>
<td>345,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident Case</td>
<td>224,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,696,959</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since this table lists only contacts which have been documented by Department records, the actual number of police-citizen encounters far exceeds these totals. If the number of civilian complaints received in 1987 is compared to this list of documented encounters, the ratio of complaints to encounters is 4 complaints per 10,000 encounters. The true ratio is probably much smaller.

* Figures received from the Office of Mgmt. Analysis & Planning.
### Table 15

**Comparison of Complaints Received Regarding Officers Living Within and Outside the City of New York for 1987**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Officers Residing Within the City (12/31/87)</th>
<th>Officers Residing Outside the City (12/31/87)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPLAINTS AGAINST</td>
<td>16,770</td>
<td>10,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDING WITHIN THE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLAINT EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>15.41 per 100 officers</td>
<td>11.84 per 100 officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR OFFICERS RESIDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN THE CITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* First Identified officer only.

NOTE: These total do not include 890 cases in which the subject officer(s) have not yet been identified.
### TABLE 16

**COMPARISON OF RACE OF COMPLAINANT AND RACE OF SUBJECT OFFICER**

#### 1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Compls</th>
<th>% of Compls</th>
<th>No. of Subject Officers</th>
<th>% of Subject Officers</th>
<th>Overall Racial Distribution of Dept. Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>2,908</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>4,166</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3,871</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown*</td>
<td>591</td>
<td></td>
<td>886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Compls</th>
<th>% of Compls</th>
<th>No. of Subject Officers</th>
<th>% of Subject Officers</th>
<th>Overall Racial Distribution of Dept. Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>3,196</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>4,482</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown*</td>
<td>638</td>
<td></td>
<td>919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The complainant declined to answer questions pertaining to race, or the subject officer has not been identified

** First identified officer only
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1987</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBJECT OFFICER'S RACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,908</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>4,757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1986</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBJECT OFFICER'S RACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>1,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>3,196</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>5,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 18**

**COMPARISON OF SEX OF COMPLAINANT AND SEX OF SUBJECT OFFICER**

### 1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Compl</th>
<th>% of Compl</th>
<th>Sex of Subject Officer</th>
<th>% of Subject Officers</th>
<th>Overall Breakdown of Sex of Dept. Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3,154</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>3,601</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>4,665</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3,871</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td><em>92</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,757</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,757*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Compl</th>
<th>% of Compl</th>
<th>Sex of Subject Officer</th>
<th>% of Subject Officers</th>
<th>Overall Breakdown of Sex of Dept. Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3,387</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>5,001</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,201</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td><em>119</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,120</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,120*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* First Identified officer only.
TABLE 19

CROSS-TABULATION OF SEX OF COMPLAINANT AND SEX OF SUBJECT OFFICER

1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPLAINANT'S SEX</th>
<th>SUBJECT OFFICER'S SEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPLAINANT'S SEX</th>
<th>SUBJECT OFFICER'S SEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEFINITION OF F.A.D.E. CATEGORIES

F.A.D.E. - Force, Abuse of Authority, Discourtesy, Ethnic Slur

FORCE - Unnecessary or excessive use of force.

TYPES OF FORCE

- Gun Fired
- Mace
- Nightstick/Billyclub
- Gun Used as Club
- Radio Used as Club
- Beat
- Dragged/Pulled
- Push/Shove
- Gun Pointed
- Punch/Kick
- Slap

ABUSE OF AUTHORITY - Illegal search, unlawful seizure of property, etc.

TYPES OF ABUSE OF AUTHORITY

- Person Searched
- Detention
- Arrest/D.A.T.
- Threat of Force
- Property Seized
- Threat of Property Seizure
- Vehicle Search
- Summons/Other
- Property Damaged
- Premise Searched
- Other

DISCOURTESY - Profane, abusive and insulting language.

TYPES OF DISCOURTESY

- Curse
- Profane Gesture
- Rudeness
- Gay/Lesbian Slur
- Nasty Words
- Rude Gesture
- Sexist Remark
- Other

ETHNIC SLUR - Language or conduct which is derogatory of a person's race or ethnicity.

TYPES OF ETHNIC SLUR

- Black
- Jewish
- Italian
- Other
- Hispanic
- Asian
- White
- Other
DEFINITION

CONCILIATED
A complaint is classified as "CONCILIATED" when with the concurrence of the complainant, an informal process is used to resolve the complaint by retraining of the subject officer.

EXONERATED
A complaint is classified as "EXONERATED" when the investigation discloses that the subject or subjects were clearly not involved in any misconduct. Incident occurred but actions were lawful and proper.

OTHER MISCONDUCT NOTED
A complaint is classified "OTHER MISCONDUCT NOTED" when it is determined that an act of misconduct other than that alleged in the complaint was committed by the subject employee. This classification can be used with any of the listed dispositions.

SUBSTANTIATED
A complaint is "SUBSTANTIATED" when the investigation indicates that the subject employee has committed the alleged act of misconduct.

PARTIALLY SUBSTANTIATED
A complaint is "PARTIALLY SUBSTANTIATED" when the investigation indicates that the subject employee has committed one or more, but not all, of the alleged acts of misconduct.

UNFOUNDED
A complaint is classified as "UNFOUNDED" when the investigation indicated the acts complained of did not occur.

UNSUBSTANTIATED
A complaint is classified "UNSUBSTANTIATED" when investigation indicated insufficient evidence to clearly prove or disprove the allegations made.
APPENDIX F

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND TEST ITEMS
### Hostile Motorist Module - Performance Objectives

#### Step/Sub-Skill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step/Sub-Skill</th>
<th>Perf. Objective</th>
<th>Test Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 (Preliminary attitude development steps)</td>
<td>1.1 Given introductory discussion, the PO will state what percentage of civilian complaints emanate from car-stop/traffic incidents.</td>
<td>1.1.1 What percentage of civilian complaints develop out of car-stops or traffic-related incidents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Compute their own % of CC's from car-stops</td>
<td>1.2 Given their own CC history, the PO will compute the % of CC's resulting from car-stop or traffic related incidents.</td>
<td>1.2.1 How many and what percentage of your CC's have been connected in some way to car-stop or traffic related incidents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Project the % of CC's 2 years from now</td>
<td>1.3 Given their CC history, the PO will compute the rate of CC's and will project the number of CC's two years from now.</td>
<td>1.3.1 If you continue to get CC's at the same rate, how many will you have two years from now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 State consequences of CC's for career</td>
<td>1.4 Given the introductory discussion, the PO will state the career consequences of getting CC's. PO must state that he/she will be a liability to CO's, that Anti-Crime, RIP, CPD, or other precinct staff assignments will not be given. PO must also state that desirable jobs outside of the precinct, Emergency Service, Org. Crime Control (narcotics-public morals) will not be given.</td>
<td>1.4.1 What effect will the accumulation of CC's have on your career? 1.4.2 Name 3 good assignments where the PO's CC experience is not considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 State possible consequences for fellow PO's in escalating car-stop/traffic incidents</td>
<td>1.5 Given the intro. discussion, PO will state the possible consequences for his fellow PO's when traffic/car-stop incidents escalate. The PO must state that violence can result and that the PO's who speed to assist are placed in serious danger from both car accidents and fighting with civilians.</td>
<td>1.5.1 What are the dangers for your fellow officers when a summons or car-stop becomes a violent situation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Perf. Objective</th>
<th>Test Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 State a simulated car-stop radio message &quot;10-14,&quot; location and description of car</td>
<td>2.1 Given a car-stop role-play with the cars in the correct position and no apparent threat, the Radio Motor Patrol (RMP) car recorder will simulate a car-stop message to the dispatcher. The message must state the code signal &quot;10-14&quot;, the street, the nearest intersection and a description of the car.</td>
<td>2.1.1 How can you alert fellow officers of your car-stop? 2.1.2 How can you assure that help can find you if necessary? 2.1.3 How will fellow officers know what to look for if you can't transmit a call for assistance and the suspects leave?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 Execute approach to motorist and recorder prepares to transmit call for assistance

3.1 Given the transmission of a car-stop message and no apparent threat, the PD's will execute the approach to the motorist. The RMP operator will walk up to the rear edge of the motorist's door while scanning the interior of the car for furtive activity by the driver or other passengers. The RMP recorder will walk up along the passenger's side of the car and similarly scan for furtive activity. The recorder must have his/her portable radio in hand and must be prepared to radio a call for assistance, "10-13", if necessary.

4.1 Define acknowledging feelings

4.1 Given a class discussion, the learner will, from memory, state a definition of acknowledging feelings. The statement must include: a. accepting the motorist's right to have his/her feelings, b. letting the motorist know that we are aware of his/her feelings, c. using a calm tone of voice.

4.2 List 3 typical provocative remarks and acknowledgments

4.2 Given a class discussion, the learner will, from memory, list 3 typical provocative remarks and feelings acknowledgments that go with each.

5.1 Define clarifying and confirming

5.1 Given a class discussion, the learner will, from memory, state the definition of clarifying and confirming. The statement must include: a. paraphrasing the motorist's statements, b. using a calm tone of voice, c. looking for a verbal or non-verbal confirmation, by the motorist, of the clarifying statement.

5.2 List 3 typical issues raised by motorists when stopped for a traffic infraction and a clarifying statement for each

5.2 Given a class discussion, the learner will, from memory, list 3 typical issues raised by motorists when stopped for a traffic infraction and a clarifying statement for each.

6.1 Define giving information

6.1 Given a class discussion, the learner will, from memory, state the definition of giving information. The statement must include: a. a correction of the motorist's misperception, b. a repetition of directions or requests that have not been complied with, c. using a calm tone of voice.

6.2 List 5 typical examples of giving information to motorists

6.2 Given a class discussion, the learner will, from memory, state 5 typical examples of giving information to motorists.
7.1 State a greeting to the motorist

Given a role-play car-stop where an approach has been executed, and given an attending motorist, the PO (operator) will state a greeting. The statement must include a “Good afternoon (evening or morning) and a “Sir” or “Ma’am”.

8.1 State a request for the motorist to turn off the car

Given above, PO states request to shut off car. The statement must follow immediately after the greeting and must include a “please”. A “thank you” must follow compliance.

9.1 State an inquiry to the motorist re if s/he knows why h/she was stopped

Given that the motorist has not already asked, the PO will ask the motorist if he/she knows why they’ve been stopped. The inquiry must conclude with a “sir” or “ma’am”.

10.1 State violation and place of occurrence

Given that the motorist does not know why he/she has been stopped, the PO will state the violation and the place of occurrence. The statement must describe performance in plain language and without judgemental descriptions. (Ex. “You drove past the red light at...” not, “You blew the light at...” or “took the light” -- The PO should say, “You didn’t stop at the stop sign” as opposed to, “You went right past the sign” or, “I guess you didn’t see the sign back there.”

11.1 State request for license, registration and insurance card

Given the statement of violation, the PO will state a request for the motorist’s license, registration and insurance card. The request must begin with “May I have...” and end with “please”.

7.1.1 What is the first thing to say to a motorist in a routine car-stop?

8.1.1 How do you control the potential danger from movement of the car?

9.1.1 What question should you ask the motorist first?

10.1.1 How can you let the motorist know what they’ve done?

10.1.2 Should you use plain or technical language to inform the motorist of the violation?

10.1.3 Give 3 statements describing violations in plain language without judgements.

11.1.1 What are the 3 required credentials?

11.1.2 What are the required phrases in a proper request for credentials?
12.1 **CONTINGENCY - If**

Motorist refuses or makes provocative remarks, "Why don't you go arrest some Crack dealers?... You just stopped me because I'm (ethnicity, race, etc.).

State an acknowledgement of feelings, clarify remarks, and state a second request for license, registration & insurance card.

12.1.1 What's the most effective response to provocative remarks?

12.1.2 Write the standard acknowledgment phrase.

12.1.3 Write 2 other acknowledgement phrases.

12.1.4 What are the elements of a second request for credentials?

12.2 **CONTINGENCY - If**

Continues to refuse and makes further provocative remarks, "F...k you, I ain't giving it to you!", State an acknowledgment of feelings, clarify remarks and give info re summons in lieu of arrest. State a third request for lic., regis., ins.

12.2.1 What verbal technique can you use to deflect provocative remarks and remain in control of the situation?

12.2.2 How can you get the motorist's credentials?

---

**RESUME NORMAL SEQUENCE OF STEPS GIVEN COMPLIANCE WITH POLICE OFFICERS DIRECTIONS**

13.1 State a request for motorist to remain in the car

13.1.1 What do you say to the motorist before retreating to the RNP to write the summons?

13.1.2 What are the elements of the request?

13.1.3 What is the Department's policy about forcing motorists to stay in their cars?

14.1 Return to RNP car to write summons

14.1.1 How can you return to the RNP safely?

15.1 Prepare summons(es)

15.1.1 How quickly should summonses be written?

15.1.2 Does all information regarding this type of summons have to be entered?

15.1.3 Does all of the information have to be accurate?
Given the class discussion, state the reason for preparing summonses in four minutes or less each. The statement must include: To minimize the duration of hostile and/or potentially dangerous contacts.

State the consequences of missing or inaccurate data on the summonses. The statement must include:

a. Possible dismissal of the summonses,
b. Possible disciplinary action after several such occurrences,
c. Develop a reputation for carelessness with Precinct CO and/or staff.

After completing the summonses, the PO will record the required data on the Summons Record Card.

Given a non-threatening situation, the PO's will return to the motorist using the same tactics as in Step 12.

Given an attending motorist, the operator will hand the credentials back to the motorist and will present the summonses along with a statement paraphrasing the instructions for answering the summonses. The presentation of the summonses must include pointing to the printed summonses answering instructions on the motorist's copy of the SMOG and the statement must be clearly spoken and refer to the printed instructions.

Given a completed summons transaction, the PO's will ignore any "last word" or provocative remarks and prepare to assist the motorist back into the flow of traffic.

What is the reason for preparing summonses as quickly as possible?

What is a reasonable amount of time to prepare a summons?

State 3 consequences of missing or inaccurate data on summonses.

What is the first form of documentation after writing a summons?

List the elements of a proper tactical approach in a car-stop?

In what order are the credentials and summonses returned to the motorist?

What gestures and statements accompany the presentation of the summonses?

What text must the verbal instructions refer to?

How must the instructions be spoken?

What should the officers do if the motorist makes a provocative remark after the transaction has been concluded?
18.2 Given a class discussion, from memory, the PO will state (3) reasons for ignoring provocative remarks once a transaction has been completed and the public is not alarmed or threatened. The statement must include:

a. Ignoring reduces the possibility of escalation or violence,
b. Ignoring has no cost for the PO,
c. Ignoring reduces the possibility of getting a civilian complaint.

18.3 Given a continuing course of threatening or alarming behavior, the PO's will state a warning to the motorist that he/she will be arrested. The statement must include a description of the disorderly behavior and instructions that "if you continue, you will be arrested for Disorderly Conduct." The statement must also be made in a calm tone of voice.

19.1 Given a completed car-stop contact, the PO's will assist the motorist back into traffic. This assistance must be done using hand signals.

20.1 Given a completed car-stop, with the motorist having resumed travel, the PO operator will document this activity in his/her Activity Log. The documentation must include the summons data, the motorist and car data, and any unusual or provocative activity engaged in by the motorist.

20.2 Given a class discussion, from memory, the PO will state (3) reasons for documenting any unusual or provocative remarks or activity by the motorist in the Activity Log. The statement must include:

a. For presentation at the administrative violations hearing,
b. To assist the supervisor in reviewing the appropriateness of actions taken,
c. To the Civilian Complaint Review Board investigators in the event of a CC being filed.
21.1 Debrief with partner

21.1 Given the completion of documenting activity and given the privacy of the DIP, the PO's will state to each other how they feel about what transpired in the incident. The statements must focus on the behavior of the people involved and must not include any stereotypical disparaging remarks about race, ethnicity, religion, or cultural background.

21.2 State (3) reasons for focusing on behavior and not using stereotypical disparaging remarks

21.2 Given a class discussion, the PO's will, from memory, state (3) reasons to focus on behavior and refrain from using disparaging remarks about race, ethnicity, religion or cultural background. The statement must include:

- a. The motorist does not represent any particular group,
- b. I don't want to offend another MOS,
- c. I must avoid even the remote possibility of someone making a civilian complaint.

21.1.1 How should an officer who has been involved in a car-stop with a hostile or provocative motorist express pent up feelings?

21.1.2 What conditions are necessary before the discussion of feelings can take place?

21.1.3 What kind of remarks are not acceptable in conversation between uniformed members of the service?

21.2.1 State three (3) reasons for focusing on behavior in making critical remarks and avoiding the use of disparaging remarks about the race, ethnicity, religion or cultural background of the people involved in the incident.
APPENDIX G

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGY
A. Preinstructural Activities

1. MOTIVATION:

Introductory material will be included regarding attitude development, the nature of the training, and the instructional goal from the learner's point of view, as follows:

a. Definition of the training as a workshop on managing hostile and provocative police-citizen contacts with a special emphasis on car-stops and traffic incidents.

b. The supportive and non-punitive nature of the training as endorsed by the Commissioner of the Civilian Complaint Review Board and the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association (PBA).

c. Why there are serious professional consequences for continuing to accumulate Civilian Complaints.

d. Why there are possible serious consequences for those who work with the learners if police-citizen contacts escalate into arrests and violence.

e. Explanation of the training format and the videotaping of the role-plays.

f. An explanation of the instructional goal from the learners point of view, i.e., After mastering the interpersonal skills offered in this training, you will be able maintain a high level of enforcement activity, preserve your values about the way police officers should be treated, AND, GREATLY DIMINISHED YOUR CHANCES OF GETTING CIVILIAN COMPLAINTS.

2. OBJECTIVES:

A list of the overall objectives that includes the major steps in interacting with a hostile motorist will be included.
3. **PREREQUISITE SKILLS:**

It will be assumed that each of the learners can execute a tactically correct car-stop. If any minor errors appear in carrying out the role-plays, they will be corrected in the class review of the videotapes.

B. **Testing**

1. **ENTRY BEHAVIORS:**

   No testing as per 3 above.

2. **PRETEST:**

   A pretest of the acknowledging and responding skills, in the context of a hostile police-citizen encounter, will be given as part of the preinstructional activities.

3. **EMBEDDED ITEMS:**

   At the beginning of each lesson the instructor will use overhead questions to stimulate recall of prior learning and to make a preliminary assessment of how many learners already can meet the performance objectives.

4. **POSTTEST:**

   The role-plays will be videotaped and the learners will be tested by using a competency-based rating guide. The guide will ask a question for each performance objective:

   1. Given an unfriendly motorist role-player, the learners will state specified greetings and requests.

   2. Given provocative remarks by the motorist, the learners will state acknowledgements of feelings, clarification and confirmation of issues and give information or take action.

   3. Given the above, the learners will note unusual or provocative activity in their Activity Logs.

C. **Follow-up Activities (pending field trial)**

1. **REMEDICATION:**

   Learners who do not master the performance objectives, as indicated on the rating of the role-plays, will be required to repeat the workshop at the next opportunity. If
they can not master a second workshop then a letter will be sent to their commanding officers indicating that they need close supervision and training from their immediate supervisor in this area and that referrals to Psychological Services for individual counseling be considered if any more civilian complaints are received.

2. ENRICHMENT:

Learners who master all of the interpersonal skills in this training will have a positive letter from the Commissioner of the Civilian Complaint Review Board sent to their commanding officers for inclusion in their personal folders. The letter will state that they have successfully completed the workshop on managing difficult police-citizen encounters. The letter will also include a recommendation that they be considered, along with other candidates, for special assignments if they maintain a high level of activity for twelve months without getting a Civilian Complaint.
D. Information Presentation

1. SEQUENCE AND CLUSTER OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subskill #</th>
<th>Learning Time</th>
<th>Subskill #</th>
<th>Learning Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. INFORMATION PRESENTATION AND LEARNER PARTICIPATION:

Objective 4.1 Define "acknowledging feelings"

Objective 4.2 List 5 typical provocative remarks and acknowledgements for each

Information Presentation

INFORMATION:

The instructor will explain that acknowledging feelings includes, a) accepting the motorist's right to have h/er feelings, b) letting the motorist know that you are aware of h/er feelings and, c) demonstrating acceptance by responding in a calm tone of voice.

MATERIALS/METHODOLOGY:

A videotape of a simulated car-stop with a hostile motorist. The tape will use human modeling to both demonstrate the acknowledging technique and to foster a positive attitude in the direction of choosing to use the technique.
EXAMPLES:

1. I understand how you feel, no one is happy about being stopped by the police and getting a summons.
2. I can see that you’re angry about being stopped when you’re in a hurry.

NON-EXAMPLES:

1. What’s your problem, pal?
2. Are you talking to me?

Student Participation

PRACTICE ITEMS:

1. List five typical provocative initial statements made by hostile motorists and write an acknowledgement phrase following each one.

2. During the role-play the learner will have to improvise an acknowledgement phrase in response to a provocative statement from the motorist.

FEEDBACK:

During the review of the learner’s videotaped exercise h/she will state whether the responses made would exacerbate the situation or reduce the possibility of a civilian complaint.

Objective 5.1 Define clarifying and confirming
5.2 List 3 typical issues raised by motorists and a clarifying statement for each

Information Presentation

The instructor will explain clarifying and confirming techniques. Those techniques must include, a) paraphrasing the motorist’s statements, b) using a clam tone of voice, and c) looking for a verbal or non-verbal confirmation by the motorist of the clarifying statement.

MATERIALS/METHODOLOGY:

The videotape described above will continue to be used here and in a similar fashion.

EXAMPLES:

1. You’re angry because you think that I only stopped you because you’re Black (Hispanic, Asian, etc.)
2. You had to get to the dentist by three o'clock and now you'll be late.

Student Participation

PRACTICE ITEMS:

1. List 3 typical issues raised by hostile motorists and write a clarifying and confirming phrase following each one.

2. During the role-play the learner will have to improvise clarifying and confirming in response to issues raised by the motorist.

FEEDBACK:

During the review of the learner's videotaped exercise h/she will state whether the responses made would exacerbate the situation or reduce the possibility of a civilian complaint.

Objective 6.1 Define, "giving information"

6.2 List 5 typical examples of giving information

Information Presentation

The instructor will explain "giving information" as a means of diffusing hostility. Giving information may be in response to an issue raised by the motorist or may be part of the summoning process.

MATERIALS/METHODOLOGY:

The instructor will continue to use the videotape to demonstrate and model the desired behaviors.

EXAMPLES:

1. ...We stop anyone we see going through red signals because it is so dangerous. It has nothing to do with race (nationality, ethnicity, etc.)

2. ...Arresting drug dealers is important and so is stopping injury and damage in this community due to car accidents.

NON-EXAMPLES:

1. ...I don't give a damn what color your skin is!

2. ...For your information, pal...
Student Participation

PRACTICE ITEMS:

1. List 5 typical examples of giving information to motorists

2. During the role-play the learner will have to "give information" in response to issues raised by the motorist.

FEEDBACK:

During the review of the learner's videotaped exercise h/she will state whether the responses made would exacerbate the situation or reduce the possibility of a civilian complaint.

Objective 7.1 State a greeting to the motorist

Information Presentation

INFORMATION:

The instructor will explain the elements of a proper greeting. The greeting must include a "Good (time of day) and a title (sir or m'am)."

MATERIALS/METHODOLOGY:

Videotape as above

EXAMPLES:
1. Good Evening, Sir
2. Good Afternoon, Sir

NON-EXAMPLES:
1. Where you going Asshole?
2. What's wrong with you, Mac?

Student Participation:

PRACTICE ITEMS:
1. List the elements of a proper greeting
2. How do you greet officials of the Department?

FEEDBACK:

State that a proper greeting sets a professional and cordial tone and helps to diffuse defensiveness and hostility.
Objective 8.1 State a request to turn off ignition

Information Presentation

The instructor will explain that the purpose of this request is to protect the officer and the motorist from inadvertent or purposeful movement of the car. The request must include a "please," and conclude with a "Thank you" after they cooperate. If the motorist balks add the explanation that you're trying to protect everyone from accidental movement of the car. This language leads the motorist to "cooperate" instead of comply. Cooperation is done voluntarily as opposed to compliance which is done under duress and which sets a tone of defensiveness that can easily escalate. IN ANY CASE, ALWAYS KEEP YOUR ARMS AND HANDS OUTSIDE OF THE SUSPECT VEHICLE!!!

EXAMPLES:

1. Would you shut the car off please?...Thank you.
2. Please turn the ignition off...Thank you.

NON-EXAMPLES:

1. Shut the car off!
2. Turn it off, pal.

Student Participation

PRACTICE ITEMS:

1. How do you secure the motorist's vehicle against accidental or purposeful movement?
2. Give two examples of a request to turn off the motorist's ignition.
3. What do you say if the motorist balks at the request?
4. Give an example of the explanation.

FEEDBACK:
Objective 9.1 State an inquiry as to whether the motorist knows why s/he has been stopped.

Information Presentation

INFORMATION:

The instructor will explain that this inquiry can reduce the potential for argumentativeness if the motorist states that h/she is aware of having committed the infraction. The inquiry should be done in the "passive voice." This language makes the actions of the officer appear more impersonal. The less the motorist perceives the officer's actions as being personal, the less defensive h/she is likely to become. The inquiry must end with a "Sir" or "M'am".

EXAMPLES:

1. Do you know why you've been stopped, Sir?
2. Do you know why you've been stopped, M'am?

NON-EXAMPLES:

1. Do you know why I stopped you?
2. Do you know why we pulled you over?

Student Participation

PRACTICE ITEMS:

1. What is the "passive voice"?

FEEDBACK:

Objective 10.1 State the violation and place of occurrence.

Information Presentation

INFORMATION:

The motorist should know that this intrusion is not arbitrary and or personal in nature. One way to accomplish this is to tell h/im why s/he has been stopped. The statement is made in non-technical (ie. not citing the sections or language of the statutes) and non-judgemental language. It includes a description of the violation and the place of occurrence.
EXAMPLES:

1. You drove through the red light at....
2. You did not stop at the stop sign at....
3. You turned on to ...from ... without signalling.

NON-EXAMPLES:

1. You blew the light, pal.
2. I guess you didn't see that sign back there.
3. You went right past that light as if it wasn't there.

Student Participation

PRACTICE ITEMS:

1.
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