Influence of Professional Status on the Quality of Police Service

Warren Wylupski
Time Solutions, LLC
Time Solutions, LLC, Washington, DC
United States of America

David R. Champion
Slippery Rock University
Department of Criminology
Slippery Rock, PA 16057
United States of America

Abstract

This qualitative study investigates the effectiveness and quality of police service. We propose that there is a link between quality of police service and how officers attain extraprofessional status and intraprofessional status. The current research incorporates Abbott's model of extraprofessional and intraprofessional status in examining how police officers interacted with each other and with the public within each of the police roles as detailed by Wilson and Bittner. Concurrent attainment produces strain between these two status types, which suggests loss of effectiveness as officers choose one form of status over the other. A third type of status attainment, hands-dirty status, emerged as a differing form of intraprofessional status. The results indicate that new policing models must take into consideration the experiential world of officers, and in particular how they strive for professional status.

Key Words: police professional status, police professionalism, policing, police service, police culture

1. Influence of Professional Status on the Quality of Police Service

The effectiveness and quality of police service remain in question despite extensive research on the police profession. While not yet proven, it is expected that new implementations such as Community Oriented Policing (COP) will improve the quality of police service. Recent research on COP has begun to document improvements in the effectiveness and quality of police service, but also reveals how difficult this implementation is (Skogan & Hartnett 1997; Chicago Community Policing Evaluation Consortium 1999, 2000). Furthermore, the persistence of the darker side of police culture in the face of progression in management practices, racial sensitivity, police demographics and even technology continues to raise questions about the overall impact of the police services on an increasingly diverse society (Skolnick, 2008). We propose that there is a link between quality of police service and the officers' professionalization (measured by attainment of professional status) that is directly influenced by his or her choice of police role.

Bittner (1967) and Wilson (1969) discuss two traditional functions (roles) of policing; *law enforcement* and *order maintenance*. Order maintenance activities usually arise from a dispute between two individuals into which the police officer intervenes to keep the peace. Law enforcement encompasses administering justice through arrest or threatened arrest of an individual who has victimized another person. Though Bittner (1967) suggested that these roles or domains were independent of each other, more recently it has been recognized that the complexity of policing required officers to simultaneously manage multiple roles in policing (Meares & Kahan, 1998; Rosenfeld, Fornango, & Rengifo, 2007; Sousa, 2010). It is suggested that police professionalism helps the officer to balance the functions of his or her job, refine existing problems, and address new ones.

To this end, Goldstein (1977, 1990) introduced the concept of *problem oriented policing* (POP) as an approach to policing that focused on individuals' quality of life and the identification of the underlying causes of public problems and crime, such as poverty and the proliferation of street gangs. Under this model, responding officers would collect information with the goal of identifying and resolving the underlying issues of the crime. More recent police reforms are aimed at improving relations between the police and the public. By combining POP with increased focus on police-community relations, *community oriented policing* (COP) emerged as the new strategy for delivering police services.

2. Police Culture and Professionalization Status

Attainment of status is one aspect of police professionalization, and the one of primary interest in this discussion. The officers' role choices and how they manage their activities helps to form their professional status. Abbott (1981) described two types of professional status attainment: *Extraprofessional* and *intraprofessional*. Extraprofessional status is attained in relation to the broader public. Professionals confront public disorder or nonorder with a system that enables them to impose control. In doing this, patrol officers interact directly with the public to resolve their calls for assistance.

Intraprofessional status refers to the attainment of status by means of one's specialized policing duties. Examples of duties that reflect police intraprofessional status include tactical, investigative or canine units. Intraprofessional status is generally gained through rigorous advanced training and might be reflected through distinct duty uniforms, promotion in rank and, most importantly, increased selectivity of crimes to which these officers respond.

These professionals are more likely to be shielded from the routine, front-line exposure to the public experienced by line officers. Interestingly, this insulation has the effect of minimizing their extraprofessional status even as their intraprofessional status is enhanced. The potential to attain both types of status is a motivating factor for an individual within a profession. Yet, Abbott (1981) asserts that the professional is not able to simultaneously attain both forms of professional status without conflict. Therefore, a status-strain emerges.

It should be noted that Abbott did not study police. Still, his analysis would lead one to expect that the emergence of conflict or strain between intraprofessional and extraprofessional status would reduce the overall level of professional status and quality of police service. Emergence of status-strain forces the officer to struggle with how they should interact with the public and with their peers. As the officers seek to reduce status-strain, they would likely gravitate from one form of professional status to the other, thereby reducing their overall professional status attainment. As the officers struggle with professional status attainment, the overall quality of police service is negatively impacted.

This study focuses on the linkage between the officers' activities and how they attain professional status. The key question to be examined involves understanding how the intraprofessional and extraprofessional status-attainment dynamics differ for officers depending upon their choice of police roles. By conducting a study of police and their activities, we address the following questions:

- How are police job duties defined?
- How do police officers attain professional status - both with the public and among their peers?
- How do differing police roles influence how officers attain professional?

The importance of this work is that it shows that the two forms of professional status attainment don't necessarily conflict for the law enforcement profession. Understanding how police mediate their attainment of professional status is important when looking at ways to improve the quality of police service.

3. Defining Police Status

How does attainment of status act as a mechanism in the delivery of effective police service? One can attain intraprofessional status from peers, or extraprofessional status from the public. Following the Abbott (1981) model, the potential to attain one or both of these types of status is a motivating factor for the officer. A police officer that interacts frequently with the public and maintains a high public profile gains extraprofessional status.

Officers that demonstrate competency, knowledge, and skill among their peers gain intraprofessional status. Challenges to overall status attainment impair the quality of police service These two types of status are not complementary, as the most widely known and publicly venerated professional roles are often those that are the least respected within the profession. For example, popular historians, anthropologists, psychologists, attorneys and similar professionals who are highlighted in the media draw an impressive amount of extraprofessional status. Yet they may often hold little serious prestige with their actual peers in the discipline. Specialists receive intraprofessional status through specialization and avoid the disorder of issues drawn to the public eye in which they would receive extraprofessional status. The weatherperson on television receives status from the viewing public, but may command little status from other meteorologists who chose to pursue specialization rather than public interaction.

It is suggested that intraprofessional status, or gaining status among one's professional peers, is realized through income, power, client status, and substantive difficulty or non-routineness (Abbott, 1981). These methods of attaining status may not be directly correlated. For example, two lawyers practicing their own specialties may make the same salary, but one may have more status than the other. A criminal defense attorney may have more effective power (in the form of wealth) than a judge, but lower status.

In reality, intraprofessional status is a function of professional purity. Professional purity is composed of *purity of practice* and *purity of knowledge*. Professionals seek purity of practice through withdrawal from common interaction with the public and purity of knowledge through intellectual challenge (abstract knowledge and theory).

Purity of practice occurs when non-professional issues or irrelevant professional issues are excluded from practice. The lowest status professionals are "those who deal with problems from which the human complexities are not or cannot be removed" (Abbott, 1981, p. 824). Conversely, the highest status professional is the one that deals with issues that have human complexity stripped away (professionally defined) by other colleagues. This notion is readily discernible in the police hierarchy, in which line officers respond to and resolve a myriad of human conflicts. Line officers exercise a great deal of discretion in their duties in response to calls for service ranging from an argument between neighbors about loud music to arriving as first responders to major crimes. By contrast, command officers and specialized units are progressively insulated from the direct criminal events. They exercise their discretion in response to information that has already been filtered through line officer and patrol supervisor discretion.

Intraprofessional status can also be attributed to non-routine work. Difficult cases are referred to specialists, whereas exceedingly routine aspects of professional practice are degraded to the paraprofessional level.

Purity of knowledge is demonstrated in the professional that works in a pure context with abstract concepts (Abbott, 1981). One might imagine a secluded, theoretically driven research scientist as the prototype of this mode of professionalism. The status is derived from the narrow but deep mastery of an esoteric area of knowledge. Conversely, those professionals that link theories to an applied context lose theoretical purity, thereby diminishing their status related to purity.

In contrast to intraprofessional status, the basis of extraprofessional status is not purity, but rather the generalized public perception of authority. Professionals enjoy high status with the public because of the order-giving power permitted by their possession of specialized knowledge. The professional confronts disorder or nonorder with a system that enables him or her to control or order it. Even in failure, the professional makes effective contact with disorder. Abbott (1981) asserts this in his statement "It is this effective contact with the disorderly that is the basis of professional status in society" (p. 829).

In Abbot's model, as individuals within a profession seek admiration from their peers, they tend to withdraw from front-line activities. As stated above, professional purity is fundamental to intraprofessional status, yet occurs at the expense of extraprofessional status. As professionals withdraw (regress) from contact with the disorderly, an integration problem occurs. Professional regression comes at the expense of maintaining public prestige. Attempting to attain both types of professional status causes strain to form between the two, and an overall reduction in professional status occurs.

Each officer's level of intraprofessional and extraprofessional status varies within the police organization. Officers gain status during the performance of their duties through a variety of means, including experience, specialized training, organizational discipline (accepting and carrying out orders from superiors), and the ability to take charge of a situation.

There has been a shift in policing strategies away from incident-driven policing, in which officers focus on law enforcement and order maintenance, to community policing in which problem solving, building community partnerships, law enforcement, and order maintenance are all critical. How does this shift the impact on how patrol officers control crime and maintain peace? Let us review the patrol officer role to address these questions.

Most newly trained police academy graduates are assigned to a regular patrol function. The patrol officer serves as the front line in handling calls for service and interaction with the public. After gaining field experience, the officers become eligible to apply to serve in a specialized unit or to advance in rank. It is therefore appropriate to examine how the patrol organization determines the methodology by which police attain professional status within their perceived role: law enforcement, order maintenance, problem oriented policing, or community policing.

3.1. Professional Purity Status

The type of intraprofessional status police officers gain over other officers- through specialized training, promotions, assignment to specialized units, the use of specialty weapons, or intellectual challenge- is how we shall conceptualize professional purity status.

Police gain the highest level of intraprofessional status through attaining positions with specialized duties removed from general line patrol. The duties of these officers are such that others act as buffers from the public; thereby restricting the public's ability to make direct contact with them. This is an extension of Abbott's argument that individuals attain [intra]professional status through the avoidance of public interaction. Just as a surgeon gains status through patient referrals from general practitioners, so do drug recognition experts gain status when they are called in to determine if individuals are under the influence of substances other than alcohol, or detectives are summoned to conduct investigations.

Purity of practice entails intricate issues from which human complexity is limited or removed entirely. When dealing with routine issues involving human difficulty, the professional gains far less status than when dealing with complicated issues referred through a number of colleagues. Purity of knowledge is gained through intellectual challenge. An officer gains purity of knowledge through demonstrations of abstract knowledge and theory, and subsequent recognition and appreciation by fellow officers. Challenges to both purity of practice and purity of knowledge lead to a deleterious effect on the ability to attain professional status (Abbott, 1981).

Professional purity is the basis for intraprofessional status, while the public ignores it completely. The public conveys extraprofessional status only to those police officers with whom they have direct contact.

3.2 Extraprofessional Status

The professional has tools that allow him or her to deal with the problems of society without becoming defiled from that exposure. Though police officers deal with common public problems, they are able to maintain their professional status. It is from this exposure that the individual gains charismatic status, which is called extraprofessional status. "The risk of failure heightens the charisma of the disorder he confronts and hence heightens the status he draws from the confrontation" (Fox & Swazey, 1974, as cited in Abbott, 1981, p. 829). Police respond to calls for service, at which they must resolve situations to the best of their ability, given little or no information. In some situations they may comfort a victim or family member involved in a tragedy. In others they may have to use deadly force to protect others or themselves.

The public confers status to police in response to their effective contact with the disorderly, which counters the attainment of purity. Seron, Pereira and Kovath (2004) found that citizens tended to accept some level of "street-level discretion" (p. 665) from officers in quelling disorder, although African-Americans and those who identified themselves as politically liberal tended to judge questionable police conduct more harshly.

The professional prefers to specialize in his or her field and distance him or herself from the public, thereby receiving status and respect from peers. A police lieutenant has more professional purity than a patrol officer does; however, the patrol officer has more extraprofessional status than the police lieutenant does, due to direct contact with the public.

This problem of conflicting status attainment types may be resolved through new developments in policing. COP can potentially provide a mechanism for the officers to attain both intraprofessional and extraprofessional status simultaneously. The officers could gain extraprofessional status through direct exposure to the public, while gaining intraprofessional status through the specialization due to COP. The officers would gain the respect and admiration of other officers, while also effectively managing disorder found in the streets. In latter sections, we shall analyze the extent to which this actually occurs in the course of police duty.

3.3 Hands-Dirty Status - The Police Anomaly

Abbott (1981) has suggested that attainment of professional status is linked to activities that are exclusive of each other and suggests that individuals seek to remove themselves from common involvement with the public in order to achieve status within the profession. Patrol officers, by definition, directly contact the public by answering request-for-service calls. Abbott (1981) suggests that professionals that are prevented from withdrawing from public interaction are unable to attain the purity of practice form of intraprofessional status. Crank (1998), and Skolnick (1975) suggest that professional status in the policing model is different. These authors maintain that officers gain status among their peers through direct interaction with the public.

During their field training, a new police officer will often be subjected to dangerous neighborhoods and watched by the training officer as they are exposed to high-risk situations. These new officers are being tested for their interpretation and response to situations, ability to take care of themselves and others, and for their "willingness to back up other officers" (Crank, 1999, p. 64). Officers are wary of newly trained or unfamiliar officers until they are observed "committing their body and weapons to the fray" (Crank, 1999, p. 65). One of the biggest fears as an officer is that "no one will come to their aid when they are faced with peril during an assignment" (Sayles & Albritton, 1999, p. 158). For this reason police need to know that their fellow officers will be there to back them up and will use force without hesitation (Crank, 1998; Sayles & Albritton, 1999).

By providing backup through physical and coercive interaction with the public, officers are seen as "a tough cop who can be trusted" (Sayles & Albritton, 1999, p. 158) and is granted status from his or her peers. These police scholars suggest that, by "getting their hands dirty" through direct interaction with the public, backing up another officer and using force, police officers gain status among their peers, in contrast to Abbott's purity of practice theory (1981). The type of status police gain from their peers through direct contact with the public will be referred to as *hands-dirty status*. Abbott's concept of intraprofessional purity status is rooted in dealings with fellow officers rather than directly with the public, and the current research focuses on the latter. Therefore, we did not include this mode of status in our study. Table 1 defines the components of the various status types.

4. Methodology

This qualitative study focused exclusively on the activities of police officers while on patrol, and their interaction with other officers and the public. The officers' interaction with the public is characterized as direct interaction between police and private citizens. In addition to observations of regular patrol duties, non-patrol time such as roll call, dinner breaks, fueling, completing paperwork, and working out in the police fitness center were also observed.

4.1 Sampling

This study employed purposive and snowball sampling methods to access officers focused on clearing calls for service and who expressed little interest in community policing. These officers put their emphasis on answering calls for service, and tended to work on their reports between calls rather than proactively seeking out interaction with the public. These types of officers were relatively easy to find. Thereafter, we sought to access officers who advocated community policing and then others who were strongly opposed to it. At the time of data collection, only one of the police departments studied officially implemented COP.

Because community policing was absent as an official police role in the other two departments studied, and since very few officers in the first department acted within the COP role, this distinction became unimportant during data collection. The challenge then, was in gaining access to officers employing a variety of policing styles.

The sampling method ultimately used was a combination of convenience sampling and snowball sampling. We gained access to officers through random assignment when requesting a ride-along through the substations, through acquaintances and university contacts, and by referral from other officers. Police officers are accountable for their response to unpredictable and dangerous situations, and would tend to be reluctant to freely disclose to researchers. They tend to associate only with other officers, so gaining their trust in order to collect meaningful data is paramount. Because of this, other sampling methods were considered and discounted in favor of methods that provided access to officers most likely to participate.

Because of the sensitive nature of this research and the information collected, attaining participants presented a challenge. The result was a relatively small sample size ($N = 12$). Some of these officers referred me to others that would be willing to participate as subjects. Each data-collection session was in-depth, and lasted between four and 13 hours.

This snowball method of sampling potentially limits the reliability and validity of this study's results. Some bias may have crept into participant responses or actions. It is possible that through the snowball method of referral, we would only gain subjects sharing common beliefs, training, education, and so forth. Using a variety of initial sources to gain contact reduces the threat to validity. Gaining the trust and respect of these officers also helps minimize the threat to validity.

4.2 Data Analysis

The analysis took place concurrently with the data collection process, so we were able to progressively sharpen the focus subsequent interviews and observations. This allowed us to identify new issues or refocus as necessary during the data-collection process. In this way, we could develop issues and concepts, and build on them from one observation to the other.

5. Findings

For the purposes of this study, each officer's activities were placed in one (or more) of the four roles - law enforcement, order maintenance, problem oriented policing, and COP, and each of these roles provides the officers with opportunities to attain competing types of professional status. It has been argued by Abbott (1981) that status attained from making effective contact with the public limits or prevents these officers from gaining status with their peers. This would suggest that the resulting conflict between attaining these two types of status, extraprofessional and intraprofessional status, might somehow impede effective police service.

Observed police activities were identified and sorted into two main categories: 1) interaction with the public, and 2) interaction with other officers. We looked at both types of interactions and the link with police role in order to determine status attainment.

Interactions between officers primarily took the following forms: 1) (dis)approval, 2) conversations, 3) backup, 4) comparing styles, 5) acknowledgement, and 6) cooperation. These observed interactions indicated how officers confer and draw professional status among their peers.

The officers' interactions with the public were much more diverse. There was a wide range of situations and of police officer responses. From these observations we are able to see how officers gain status through direct involvement with the public.

5.1 Law Enforcement Role

Within the LE role, officers attempt to control criminal activity through methods that draw upon their formal authority as agents of the state, such as threats of arrest, writing citations, and enforcing warrants. They attempt to sort through human complexity (lies and deceit) to be able to figure out "what is going on." Officers successfully applied their knowledge to control the situation and sift through the available information, providing them with extraprofessional status. Officers within the LE role tended not to demonstrate abstract knowledge, therefore these officers did not gain purity of knowledge intraprofessional status.

5.2 Order Maintenance Role

Order maintenance, defined earlier, refers to breaking up fights, resolving neighbor disputes, controlling the activities of intoxicated people and transients. These activities draw upon the officers' informal authority designed to keep the peace and maintain public order. Officers in this role performed activities that enabled them to maintain effective contact with disorder, through threats of force and threat of arrest, allowing the officers to gain respect and extraprofessional status. Officers in this role tended not to demonstrate abstract knowledge, so the corresponding intraprofessional status type was absent.

5.3 Problem Oriented Policing Role

In POP, as stated earlier, police officers acting within this role strive to discern and address the underlying causes of crime. Identifying when incidents are related to each other and evaluating underlying issues that are causing those incidents to occur accomplish this. Police work with the public to link related calls for assistance to addresses known for drug distribution. In doing so, the police work to eliminate repeated calls for service at this location by addressing the underlying issue, such as drugs.

Through overt patrol of a targeted area, officers try to control the disorder in that neighborhood. Police officers use an authoritative and unyielding tone with suspected drug users from which they are able to gain compliance to search these suspects for drugs. This compliance provided the officers with extraprofessional status. Within this observation of police activity, purity of knowledge was negligible so intraprofessional purity status was not achieved.

5.4 Community Oriented Policing Role

By definition, COP is accomplished when the police response is adjusted in order to satisfy the community-set goals. Officers work in harmony with the neighborhood association to make sure the needs of the community were served and that illegal activity and public disorder would not be tolerated.

Within the COP role, the officers' interaction with the public was in the form of instruction and consulting. The officers worked to achieve policing goals that were defined through their relationship with the community by making effective contact with the tenants that were being evicted. These individuals were seemingly respectful of the officers during this conversation. While these officers sought to meet the needs of the community, they successfully interacted with the public, allowing them to attain extraprofessional status. The officers in this example did not demonstrate abstract knowledge. Intraprofessional purity status was not attained.

6. Emergence of Hands-Dirty Status

Bittner (1970, in Skolnick, 2008), Crank (1998), and Skolnick (1975) suggest that there is a third type of status attainment. Police officers achieve status with their peers when they interact with the public and demonstrate they are not afraid to get involved in dangerous situations and physical confrontations. By "getting their hands dirty" through direct interaction with the public, these officers achieve a *hands-dirty status*, a different kind of status vis-à-vis their peers. Officers that watch over each other and quickly take action to assist other officers in distress gain hands-dirty status. Police often work in conditions of perilous uncertainty. Officers want to know that if they are in a situation that turns bad and he or she is in trouble, other officers will come to their assistance without hesitation. When police officers demonstrate they are effective backup through their bravery, use of force, and control of dangerous situations, they gain the respect of other officers (Bittner, 1970, as cited in Skolnick, 2008). These respected officers achieve hands-dirty status.

As police encounter and interact with the public providing them the opportunity to gain extraprofessional status, these officers become exposed to dangerous and difficult situations from which they can gain hands-dirty status with their peers. As a result, hands-dirty status was demonstrated in three of the four police roles: Law enforcement, order maintenance, and problem oriented policing. The only example that didn't demonstrate hands-dirty status was the COP role. This absence might be important to officers during their selection of policing roles from which they attempt to gain status. Hands-dirty status seems to replace professional purity status, providing officers the opportunity to simultaneously achieve status through interaction with their peers as intraprofessional status, and with the public as extraprofessional status. Table 2 summarizes professional status and resulting strain that is experienced within the four police roles:

7. Implications

It was expected that police officers in this study would strive to attain the two forms of status described by Abbott (1981), intraprofessional (professional purity status) and extraprofessional status. It was suggested that strain occurs between the simultaneous attainment of extraprofessional status and professional purity status. In these observations, police tend to gain intraprofessional status by authoritatively interacting with the public and getting their hands dirty, rather than through purity of knowledge. By achieving status intraprofessionally via hands-dirty status, officers overcome status-strain, and are able to achieve both forms of professional status. By overcoming status-strain, police officers can more effectively integrate how they interact with their peers and with the public in order to maximum their professional status. This section addresses how surmounting status-strain might improve the quality of police service.

In this research we focused on what police officers did while on patrol, and how they interacted with other officers and the public. Data were collected by observing a small number of police officers through their entire shift, typically from eight to ten hours. By focusing on individual officers for a prolonged length of time, rich data were collected from which patterns of police behavior were established. By engaging these officers in an informal discussion of my observations, we gained a clear understanding of why these officers interacted with others as they did. We identified activities and interactions that fell within two of the four-targeted police roles: law enforcement and order maintenance. In contrast, very few observed activities fit into the problem oriented policing and COP roles. A larger sample would probably produce more incidents in each of the four police roles. However, time constraints may prevent such an in-depth observation of the officers' activities.

Awareness and management of these methods for attaining status should lead to future improvements in the quality of policing. It was demonstrated that by acting in the problem oriented policing role the officer was able to simultaneously achieve status with the public and with peer officers.

Despite research documenting the effectiveness of new initiatives, and support from the current police administration, there were a low number of observed interactions in the COP role. We speculate that the low popularity of COP among line officers is explained that by acting in this police role, patrol officers are unable to achieve either the hands-dirty or purity of knowledge form of intraprofessional status. The COP philosophy should address not only the relationship between police and the community, but also the relationship between police officers, and their role to mentor, monitor and react to the actions of fellow officers.

We suggest further research on the existing COP role to determine if it can effectively permeate police organizations as a popular police role, or if changes reflecting intraprofessional activities would lead to status attainment, if any, achieved within this role. It is also important to look at how new policing initiatives are implemented. Rather than focusing on quantitative outcomes, administrators would help facilitate adoption of new initiatives by building commitment within all levels of the organization, developing tools to evaluate police culture, and eliminating obstacles to status attainment within desired policing models.

Future research could also evaluate the congruency or disparity of the self-described police role and the observed police role, to evaluate how any disparity influences attainment of professional status, and what could be done to better align them – thus potentially improving the quality of police service.

Current and future implementations in policing need to recognize and react to how officers attain professional status. The rank and file will not easily adopt police initiatives that hinder their overall attainment of status. New implementations that focus on developing the officers intellectually may falter, since purity of knowledge seems to be less important than status gained by becoming involved in risky situations and providing backup to fellow officers. Hands-dirty status attainment appears central to the law enforcement profession. This intraprofessional status attainment type seems to provide officers with a way of effectively interacting with the public, while providing them with status from their peer officers. Since hands-dirty status is not yet recognized in the new police implementations, officers are not fully afforded the status made available through hands-on approaches to policing. By recognizing hands-dirty status, police administrators may be able to take advantage of this status attainment type to develop methods to motivate its patrol officers. The future direction of policing should look to find ways to implement new policing models that will reduce crime, while recognizing the status motive as a tool to generate change in police practices that would enhance performance.

Table 1 Components of Extraprofessional and Intraprofessional Status

Extraprofessional Status	Intraprofessional Status	
	Professional Purity Status	*Hands-Dirty Status*
Making effective contact with public and handling disorder. Status gained from the public.	Status is gained between peers through "purity of knowledge" (abstract knowledge).	Making effective contact with disorder, "getting their hands dirty." Status gained between peers due to interaction with the public.

Table 2 Attainment of Professional Status and Associated Strain within Police Roles

Role	Extraprofessional Status	Intraprofessional Status	
Observed Police Role	Attainment of Extraprofessional Status?	Attainment of Hands-Dirty Status?	Attainment of Professional Purity Status?
LE	Yes	Yes	No
OM	Yes	Yes	No
POP	Yes	Yes	No
COP	Yes	No	No

References

Abbott, A. (1981). Status and status strain in the professions. *American Journal of Sociology, 86,*819-835. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/page/journal/amerjsoci/instruct.html

Bittner, E. (1967). The police on Skid Row: A study of peacekeeping. *American Sociological   Review,32*, 699-715. Retrieved from http://www.asanet.org/journals/asr/

Bittner, E., 1970. The functions of the police in modern society. Cambridge: Oenschlager.

Chicago Community Policing Evaluation Consortium (1999). *Community Policing in Chicago,   Year Six: An Interim Report: Research and Program Evaluation in Illinois,* Chicago, IL.

Community Policing Evaluation Consortium (2000). *Community Policing in Chicago, Year Seven: An Interim Report: Research and Program Evaluation in Illinois*. Chicago, IL.

Crank, J.P. (1998). *Understanding police culture*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.

Fox, R.C & Swazey, J.P. (1974). *The courage to fail.* Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-oriented policing.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Kappeler, V. E., Sluder, R.D. & Alpert, G.P. (1997). Breeding deviant conformity: Police ideology and culture. In R.G. Dunham & G.P. Alpert (Eds.), *Critical issues in policing* (3rd ed.) (pp. 284-301). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Paoline III, E.A. (2004) Shedding light on police culture: An examination of officers' occupational attitudes. *Police Quarterly, 7,* 205-236. doi: 10.1177/1098611103257074

Sayles, S.L. & J. S. Albritton, J.S. (1999). Is there a distinct subculture in American policing? In J.D. Sewell (Ed.). *Controversial issues in policing* (pp. 154-171). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Seron, C., Pereira, J. & Kovath, J. (2004). Judging police misconduct: "Street-level" versus professional policing. *Law & Society Review, 38,* 665-710. Retrieved from http://www.lawandsociety.org/review.htm

Skogan, W.G. & Hartnett, S. M. (1997). *Community policing Chicago style*. New York: Oxford Press.

Skolnick, J.H. (1975). *Justice without trial* (2nd ed .) New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Skolnick, J.H. (2008). Enduring issues of police culture and demographics. *Policing & Society, 18,* 35-45. doi: 10.1080/10439460701718542

Sousa, W.H. (2010). Paying attention to minor offenses: Order maintenance policing in practice. *Police Practice and Research, 11,* 45-49. doi: 10.1080/15614260802586400

Wilson, J.Q (1989). What makes a better policeman, *Atlantic Monthly, 223,* 129-135.