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ABSTRACT

Research evidence has shown that job expectations are usually unrealistic prior to organisational entry, but tend to decline to more realistic levels with time and work experience (Nicholson & Arnold, 1991). The process of organisational socialisation is a useful perspective from which to view this expectation development. When organisational socialisation is unsuccessful, new employees are likely to experience ‘reality shock’: the physical and psychological response to the realisation that their job expectations have been inaccurate. Other immediate consequences of having inaccurate job expectations can include poor health outcomes and low job satisfaction. The primary aims of the present study were, 1) to measure a number of job expectations in a sample of police recruits, and to determine whether these job expectations change with time and experience, and 2) to investigate whether inaccurate job expectations are related to reality shock and poor health outcomes and low job satisfaction. It was hypothesised that job expectations would be related to reality shock and negative health outcomes and low job satisfaction. Furthermore, it was predicted that reality shock would mediate the relationship between job expectations and poor health outcomes and job satisfaction. These aims and hypotheses were tested by surveying police recruits during their first week of training, and again after six months’ work experience. The results showed that expectations of both organisational stress and sexual discrimination were associated with reality shock. Organisational stress expectations were the only expectation variable to be related to reality shock, health outcomes, and job satisfaction. Regression analyses showed that reality shock mediated the link between organisational stress expectations and
psychological distress, negative affect, and job satisfaction. These results were discussed with reference to the reliability and validity of the measures used and possible avenues for future research. The present study’s results have important implications regarding current police recruit training procedures, and the usefulness of reality shock as a construct from which to understand the consequences of inaccurate job expectations.
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OVERVIEW

Research data indicate that approximately 25% of any organisation’s new employees will terminate their own employment within six months of joining (Wanous, Stumpf, & Bedrosian, 1978). Evidence suggests that inaccurate job expectations are an antecedent of voluntary turnover (Wanous, 1980). This is confirmed by research investigating reasons for police officer disengagement in New Zealand (New Zealand Police, 1998). Officer disengagement refers to those police officers that leave the organisation on psychological and/or physical grounds. Eleven percent of New Zealand police officers who disengaged between 1990 and 1996 said their decision to disengage was influenced by their unrealistic expectations of policing. Furthermore, 39% of disengaged police officers reported they were not given an accurate description of what to expect from policing. The same percentage of disengaged police officers also stated that policing was not what was expected. These figures indicate that inaccurate job expectations are an important aspect of the decision to disengage from the New Zealand Police.

Many authors have suggested that new employees with inaccurate job expectations are likely to experience ‘reality shock’, which is a period of uncertainty in which newcomers begin to realise that their initial job expectations have been inaccurate (Arnold, 1985; Dean, 1983; Pfifferling, 1984; M.S. Taylor, 1988): Voluntary turnover is but one extreme and long-term consequence of reality shock. Reality shock causes a host of other adverse consequences to both an organisation, and in particular, the individual. The immediate consequences of reality shock include poor physical and
psychological health, and low job satisfaction. Burnout, organisational cynicism, and absenteeism are long-term consequences of reality shock.

The first part of this dissertation is a review of the literature outlining job expectations, the processes of organisational socialisation and reality shock, and the outcomes of reality shock. Chapter one explores job expectations, focusing on job content and organisational expectations in particular. Chapters two and three address specific types of job expectations, from the perspective that potential police recruits are likely to have inaccurate expectations in these areas. The second chapter examines sources of organisational stress inherent in policing, while Chapter three highlights the experiences of sexual harassment and discrimination within the police. In Chapter four, the concepts of organisational socialisation and reality shock are introduced. The following three chapters integrate the different stages of organisational socialisation and reality shock, owing to their concordance in explaining the meeting of expectations with reality. Chapter five explores anticipatory socialisation and the honeymoon phase of reality shock. The sixth chapter outlines the encounter stage of organisational socialisation and the shock or rejection phase of reality shock. This chapter also discusses the immediate consequences of reality shock. Chapter seven addresses a number of issues. The change and acquisition stage of organisational socialisation and the recovery and resolution phase of reality shock are discussed along with the long-term consequences of reality shock. This chapter also presents a schematic model of the proposed relationships between the constructs discussed in the first part of the dissertation. In the second part of this dissertation, a study testing reality shock
as a mediator of inaccurate expectations and health outcomes and job satisfaction is described. Chapter eight states the goals and hypotheses of the study, designed to test the model introduced in chapter seven. This chapter also considers the impact of a number of demographic variables on the predicted relationships. Chapters nine and ten present the method and results of the study, while the final chapter discusses the results and conclusions of the study.
Chapter One

JOB EXPECTATIONS

Chapter Overview

The idea that individuals have several expectations before entering an organisation is explored in the first chapter. These expectations about organisational life can either help or hinder the smooth transition from organisational outsider to insider. The concept of job expectations is introduced as a basis from which to understand the formation of expectations regarding job content, organisational life, organisational stress, sexual harassment, and sexual discrimination. The importance of having realistic expectations regarding job content and organisational life is also highlighted in this chapter. In addition, the role that various sources of information play in forming job expectations is examined.

There are few definitions of job expectations in the literature. This is probably because job expectations are often not the primary focus for research; they are examined within other contexts, such as realistic job previews. Holton and Russell (1997) have proposed one of the more recent definitions. They refer to employee anticipation (which is essentially employee expectation) as "global cognitive and affective orientation toward a job caused by individual differences and environmental circumstances" (p. 165). This is a useful definition because it recognises that newcomers have both idiosyncratic thoughts and affective
expectations toward a job, while also acknowledging external influences in forming job expectations.

One of the earliest definitions of job expectations was formulated by Greenhaus, Seidel, and Marinis (1983). They defined a job expectation as "a person's belief that he or she will obtain an outcome (or a specified level of an outcome) on a particular job" (p. 395). This definition assumes the meeting of expectations, a concept that is fundamental to the organisational psychology literature. It is important to distinguish between unrealistic and unmet job expectations. Unmet expectations are often operationalised as the disparity between initial expectations and job experiences (Louis, 1980). Essentially, unmet expectations imply undermet expectations; an employee is experiencing less of a job component than was expected. In contrast, unrealistic expectations are often considered inaccurate expectations. Louis (1980) notes that unrealistic expectations are often operationalised as the opposite of expectation level; low expectations are more likely to be realistic than high expectations.

The role that met expectations play in long-term newcomer adjustment is unclear. Many authors have recognised that the meeting or exceeding of one's job expectations is associated with better initial adjustment to the job and organisation (e.g., Bauer, Morrison, & Callister, 1998; Fisher, 1986; Louis, 1980). However, it is yet to be determined whether the meeting of expectations has any long-term consequences.
Several authors note the importance of having realistic expectations in adjusting to the new job and organisation (e.g., Adkins, 1995; Bauer et al., 1998; Breaugh, 1983; Jackson, Schwab, & Schuler, 1986; Mabey, Clark, & Daniels, 1996; Meyer & Allen, 1988). For example, Bauer and Green (1994) found that doctoral students with an accurate picture of the requirements of a PhD prior to enrolment showed better subsequent role and social adjustment.

The following sections will examine the two fundamental components of job expectations; expectations about the organisation and expectations about the job itself. The importance of having a realistic image of both these components is emphasised.

Realistic Assessment of the Organisation

It is crucial that new employees have a realistic assessment of the organisation that they are entering (Chao, O'Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein, & Gardner, 1994). Research by Feldman (1976, 1981) discovered that potential employees who recalled having a realistic image of the organisation prior to entry found it easier to learn what was expected of them once employed. Measures of organisational realism indicate the extent to which a newcomer has a thorough and accurate image of the organisation's goals, climate, and philosophy.

It is important that new employees understand both the formal and informal goals and values of the organisation (Chao et al., 1994). A realistic assessment of the organisation encompasses its culture, reflected through norms, values, activities, and aims (Chao et al., 1994; Gundry & Rousseau, 1994). Through
exposure to this culture, the individual begins to develop a schema for understanding organisational experiences and political realities (Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992; Weick, 1979). As new employees increase their realistic knowledge about the organisation, they are better able to predict what is provided by the organisation (Hiltrop, 1995). Organisational members play a crucial role in constructing this organisational reality by communicating reliable information to newcomers (Thomas & Anderson, 1998). This, in turn, ensures that the organisation's values and norms are continually perpetuated (Bauer et al., 1998).

Organisational realism has been shown to impinge on many facets of a newcomer's job, including knowledge base, strategy, and mission (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979), awareness of interpersonal demands (Feldman, 1976), anxiety reduction (Nelson, 1987), and voluntary turnover (Premack & Wanous, 1985; Wanous, 1973). Adkins (1995) also suggests that organisational realism plays a significant role in performance, job satisfaction, and organisational commitment. While the importance of having accurate expectations of the organisation is clear, Bauer et al. (1998) note that few studies have investigated how new employees come to understand organisational norms and values.

Realistic Assessment of the Job

A realistic assessment of the job reflects the extent to which a newcomer has a thorough and accurate image of the new job responsibilities. Adkins (1995) defines realistic job expectations as "the extent to which the newcomer perceives aspects of the job and the work environment in the same way as
experienced organizational members” (p. 841). Therefore, individuals who have had experience within a similar organisation should have realistic expectations about the job. Nelson (1987) suggests that a realistic assessment of the job facilitates the adaptation to task and role demands, and the development of effective coping. As individuals gain more information about the prospective job, they imagine the job’s requirements, and what goals and rewards will be achievable (Frese, 1982). Major, Kozlowsk, Chao, and Gardner (1995) suggest that job expectations usually revolve around the new role that the employee will adopt in the organisation. This emphasis may be even more exaggerated for career as opposed to organisational newcomers, the former having little basis on which to form their job expectations (Bauer et al., 1998).

A review of the literature suggests that few empirical studies have investigated the realism of job content expectations. Arnold (1985) explored the greatest sources of surprise among newly employed graduates. He found that job content was one of the most often cited sources of surprise. Further studies indicate that organisational entry is characterised by the development of idealistic job expectations. A study involving the American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T; Bray, Campbell, & Grant, 1974) was the most comprehensive and longest investigation of employee expectations over time. The researchers became aware of newcomers’ inflated expectations when they compared what the recruits wanted in a job and what the recruits expected to find in their job at AT&T. A strong correlation between these two factors indicated that the new employees expected to find jobs in accordance with their job desires. These unrealistically optimistic expectations waned over the
following eight years, indicating that the reality of organisational life was discordant with newcomers’ expectations.

A study by Wanous (1976) of recently employed telephone operators showed a similar decline in expectations. The newcomers completed questionnaires prior to starting work, after one month’s experience, and after three months’ experience. The results highlighted declines in many types of organisational expectations at all three stages. While initial job expectations were unrealistically high, they declined to a more realistic level.

A more recent study by Nicholson and Arnold (1991) also showed this trend. They questioned new graduates to an oil company as to how their initial expectations compared with work experience. They found that the graduates had unrealistic expectations regarding job content that were unmet at organisational entry. However, the disparity between expectations and reality decreased with time and work experience.

It is clear that new employees construct expectations about both the job they will be starting and the organisation they will be entering. Research cited above has shown that newcomers typically have inflated views of the job and organisation prior to organisational entry. The following section examines possible sources of misinformation, with emphasis on the police role. The area of policing is of particular concern because individuals seeking a policing occupation are often misled by images of policing as an exciting and adventurous occupation.
Sources of Information

Fisher (1986) notes that job expectations are quickly formed and easily altered by new information. There are several sources of information used to develop job expectations (e.g., the self, intra-organisational referents, and extra-organisational referents) and they vary greatly in accuracy. When considering the widespread distortion of the police role in society, it may be most useful to examine the role of extra-organisational referents.

Individuals themselves are an important source of information in constructing job expectations. When individuals decline attractive positions, they are likely to evaluate their chosen alternative more favourably and the rejected positions less favourably (Lawler, Kuleck, Rhode, & Sorenson, 1975). This is an example of cognitive dissonance reduction; new employees are reassuring themselves that they have made the correct career decision. Vroom and Deci (1971) found that employees who inflated their job expectations in this manner were more dissatisfied and disillusioned after one year’s work experience than those who had not.

Past work experience may also be an important source of information. A number of authors note that previous experience in a similar organisation should encourage realistic expectations (Adkins, 1995; Bauer & Green, 1994; Fisher, 1986). Carp and Wheeler (1972) found that newly appointed judges with relevant prior experience adjusted better to the new positions than those with less relevant experience.
Intra-organisational referents (e.g., supervisors, coworkers, and mentors) have been recognised as important sources of information in the shaping of job expectations (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992), and are seen by new employees as reliable sources of information (Miller & Jablin, 1991). A study by Morrison (1993a) discovered that the use of intra-organisational referents for information acquisition benefited newcomer adjustment. Major et al. (1995) determined that supervisors moderated the unfavourable effects of unmet job expectations. It is suggested that coworkers and mentors help to communicate informal and subtle norms and expectations that supervisors may overlook (Kram, 1985; Schein, 1988).

Extra-organisational sources such as family, friends, and the media have been shown to play a key role in providing pre-entry job information (Miller & Jablin, 1991). While newcomers rely more upon intra-organisational than extra-organisational sources for information, at organisational entry it is unlikely that newcomers have established relationships with insiders that permit job reality checking (Settoon & Adkins, 1997). Consequently, other sources are sought to facilitate the initial sense-making process associated with beginning a new job. Settoon and Adkins (1997) caution that these sources often supply inaccurate job information as they tend not to have reliable knowledge about the organisation.

Bassis and Rosengren's (1975) study of naval cadets found that occupational commitment decreased due to unrealistic expectations about "the romance of the sea" that had been perpetuated by family, friends, and the media. Fielding
(1989) notes that police recruits' perceptions of policing are very much influenced by the attitudes of family and friends towards the police.

Bahn (1984) suggests that few occupational stereotypes are distorted to the degree that policing is. Some studies have examined the realism of police shows on television (e.g., Arcuri, 1977; Sparks, 1992), and most have concluded that the fictional portrayal of police officers is idealised. Reiner (1992) maintains that policing is glamourised, and that the advent of television has succeeded in elevating police officers to hero status. The traditional television crime narrative sees the law enforcers solving or foiling the crime as a result of extensive criminal investigation combined with remarkable personal skill (Reiner, 1992). Although real criminal investigation constitutes around just one percent of all police work, the police genre in both books and movies revolves around the crime of murder and its investigation (Klockars, 1983). This is of particular concern to the development of policing expectations, considering that the media is a fundamental source of information for billions of people (Newman, 1990).

Chapter Summary

It is clear that people have many expectations prior to beginning a new job. Although few definitions of job expectations exist in the organisational literature, it is acknowledged that job expectations are usually unrealistic or unmet upon organisational entry. A realistic assessment of the organisation encompasses the extent to which newcomers understand the organisation's goals, climate, and philosophy. These norms and values are communicated to new employees.
via organisational members, who have a vested interest in maintaining the organisational status quo. A realistic assessment of the job reflects the extent to which newcomers understand task and role demands. Research has shown that new employees often have idealistic ideas regarding the new job. However, these notions typically become more accurate with time and work experience. Inaccurate job expectations have been traced back to various sources of misinformation. The most common of these in distorting the police role are extra-organisational referents, including family, friends, and the media.

In Chapter one, the idea that individuals, and indeed police recruits, may have inaccurate expectations of the job they are starting and the organisation they are entering was highlighted. A specific sphere in which people may have inaccurate job expectations will be examined in the following chapter. Focusing on policing, it is believed that many new police recruits are unaware of the sources of police stress that are most troublesome to experienced police officers.
Chapter Two

ORGANISATIONAL STRESSORS

Chapter Overview

As the previous chapter shows, it has been established that people have several expectations prior to beginning a new job. Perhaps the most important of these relate to the content of the job itself, and the organisation one is entering. It is crucial that these expectations are realistic irrespective of the occupation chosen. People beginning a career in policing may have formed several expectations about the job, but may have overlooked other relevant aspects such as expectations regarding organisational stress, and sexual harassment and discrimination.

Recently, there has been a resurgence of interest in the organisational factors contributing to police stress. Previous research has largely focussed on traumatic stress experienced in the line of duty. Consequently, it is possible that people joining the police are largely unaware of organisational sources of stress, and have inaccurate expectations regarding police stress. Nelson and Sutton (1991) warn that the underestimation of stressors can lead to symptoms of distress and poor adjustment among newcomers.

The different sources of police stress will be briefly outlined in this chapter, with emphasis on organisational stressors. The concept of organisational stressors will be explained as being distinct from often-cited occupational stressors. The
Organisational Stressors

The remainder of the chapter will explore those organisational factors identified in the literature as being most troublesome to police officers.

**Police Stressors**

It is commonly believed that policing is one of the most stressful occupations, owing to its exposure to violence and danger (Conroy & Hess, 1992; Kaufmann & Beehr, 1989; Kirkcaldy, Cooper, & Ruffalo, 1995; Sigler & Wilson, 1988; Stevens, 1999). The unpredictability of the job and regular contact with the most undesirable members of society are frequently mentioned stressors. In fact, Axelberd and Valle (1981) claimed that: “Police work has been identified as the most psychologically dangerous job in the world” (p. 3). Contrary to these assertions, a number of recent studies have concluded that policing is no more stressful than other occupations (e.g., Alexander, Walker, Innes, & Irving, 1993; Brown & Campbell, 1994).

Brown and Campbell (1994) have devised a typology of routinely occurring police stressors (see Table 1). Most authors have focussed on the stressors involved with operational police tasks, such as the threat of danger (Reiser, 1974). These occupational factors are integral aspects of policing. However, research has demonstrated that police officers are actually more distressed by factors inherent in the police organisation, such as administrative policies and management practices (Band & Manuele, 1987; Cooper, Davidson, & Robinson, 1988; Graf, 1986; Hart, Wearing, & Headey, 1993; Kaufmann & Beehr, 1989; Martelli, Waters, & Martelli, 1989). These organisational stressors will be the focus of this chapter, as most people joining the police may not have
considered the nature of organisational stress in forming job expectations. The remaining aspects of Brown and Campbell's typology will not be examined in detail as anecdotal evidence suggests that job expectations are likely to be quite realistic regarding these facets of policing.

Table 1

Sources of Routinely Occurring Stressors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internal to the Police</th>
<th>External to the Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic Features</strong></td>
<td>Aspects of the organisation and management</td>
<td>Community relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Features</strong></td>
<td>Operational police tasks</td>
<td>Interaction with criminal justice system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Generic Features Internal to the Police**

**Administrative Policies**

Inflexible rules.

One of the most frustrating aspects of being a police officer is contending with certain policies and rules. Often, these rules seem arbitrary or even conflicting. A study by Crank and Caldero (1991) in which police officers were asked to nominate their greatest source of stress found that policies and rules were the fifth most stressful organisational components of policing. This finding is echoed by James and Hendry (1991) who found that 16% of police respondents cited police policies and procedures as the most important contributor to their resignation. The presence of stringent and inflexible departmental rules has
been positively correlated with frequency of emotional exhaustion (Cherniss, 1980; Gaines & Jermier, 1983).

Similarly, many police officers express feelings of rage with bureaucratic policies that obstruct them from efficiently performing their job. Brown and Campbell (1990) found that a large proportion of the constable ranks reported stress because of station or force politics. Bureaucratic problems are frequently cited as primary sources of stress for police officers (e.g., Cooper et al., 1988; Kroes, 1985; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986). It is difficult to determine whether police officers are frustrated because rules and procedures are truly inefficient, or because they would rather take the law into their own hands.

**Job overload.**

The term 'job overload' often refers to having too much to do and/or things being too difficult. Both Evans and Coman (1993) and Kaufmann and Beehr (1989) found job overload to be the highest ranked stressor by police officers. The significance of this stressor is reiterated by Brown and Campbell (1990) and Gudjonsson and Adlam (1985) who discovered that more than 50% of their police samples reported work overload as a source of personal stress. Storch and Panzarella (1996) also rated a heavy workload the fourth most disliked aspect of police officers' current assignments. The results from Biggam, Power, Macdonald, Carcary, and Moodie's (1997) study concluded that work overload may be dependent upon assignment location. Seventy-seven percent of urban officers perceived their caseload as a stressor, compared to only 51% of rural police officers.
The relevant literature suggests that quantitative job overload can be divided into two categories: excessive paperwork, and time pressures and deadlines. A survey conducted by Stevens (1999) showed that excessive paperwork was an important source of stress for the sample. Similarly, an early study by Kroes, Margolis, and Hurrell (1974) identified excessive paperwork as the second most frequently mentioned administrative stressor. Time pressures were considered a personal source of stress by 74% of police officers in Biggam et al.’s (1997) study, and by more than 50% of respondents to Brown and Campbell’s (1990) questionnaire.

**Lack of resources.**

Another common complaint within police organisations is the inadequacy of resources. Inadequate resources were the second highest-ranked stressor in Biggam et al.’s (1997) study. The literature suggests that the most frustrating departmental deficiency seems to be understaffing (Davidson & Veno, 1980), although Lester (1982) found no relationship between understaffing and self-rated stress. Brown and Campbell (1990) discovered that more than 50% of their sample reported stress in response to staff shortages, while Biggam et al. (1997) concluded that it was the most fundamental stressor facing police officers.

Inadequate equipment is also a concern amongst police officers. Kroes et al. (1974) were some of the first researchers to identify equipment problems as a personal source of stress, and discovered that officers were most troubled by either faulty or unavailable equipment.
**Shiftwork and long hours.**

Shiftwork is defined as any work undertaken beyond the parameters of the typical working week, or beyond an eight-hour shift (Kinicki, McKee, & Wade, 1996). Working shifts has been shown to affect sleep (Folkard, Totterdell, Minors, & Waterhouse, 1993), and appetite and energy levels (Healy, Minors, & Waterhouse, 1993).

At present, there is debate as to whether shiftwork is a significant source of stress for police officers. Studies by Davidson and Veno (1980) and Lester (1982) indicate that there is no significant relationship between perceived stress and shiftwork. Davidson and Veno (1980) argue that police officers eventually become accustomed to the disruptions that shiftwork causes, therefore decreasing the amount of stress it causes the individual.

Despite this justification, several studies have found that police officers frequently report shiftwork as a stressor. Ninety-six percent of participants in Gudjonsson and Adlam's (1985) study reported shiftwork to be a source of stress. Furthermore, it was ranked the most significant stressor by 17% of their sample. A classic study conducted by Kroes et al. (1974) found that shiftwork was the fifth most important job stressor.

More recently, results from Storch and Panzarella's (1996) survey indicated that shiftwork was the most unpleasant feature of being a police officer. Similarly, Brown and Campbell (1990) discovered that more than half of their sample cited shiftwork as a major cause of stress. It also seems that shiftwork is a pervasive
stressor, affecting both urban and rural police officers. Biggam et al. (1997) found that 52% of urban and 60% of rural police officers identified shiftwork as stressful.

Shiftwork can incorporate long hours. A study by Pierce and Dunham (1992) found that police officers that worked a compressed workweek (characterised by four twelve-hour shifts, then four days off) were very satisfied with many aspects of their lives and reported less stress and fatigue. This is in contrast to the findings of Biggam et al. (1997) in which 37% of participants reported long hours to be a significant source of personal stress. Long hours were identified by 95% of Gudjonsson and Adlam's (1985) sample as a stressor, and were the fourth-ranked job context stressor in a study by Evans and Coman (1993). Brown and Campbell (1990) also discovered that constables were more likely to report feeling stressed by long working hours than any other police rank. These variations in the perceived stressfulness of long hours suggest that other factors, such as location, are influencing stress rankings.

Management Practices

Lack of communication and consultation.

The management styles and practices adopted by senior staff within the police organisation also seem to be of great concern to the lower ranks. A study by James and Hendry (1991) found that 32% of police resignees attributed their resignation to the nature of police management and personnel. In particular, many officers report frustration at being omitted from decision making that directly affects crucial aspects of their job. The job of the police officer is made
more difficult by a lack of communication not only between police constables, but from senior staff as well (Lord, 1996). Highly centralised decision making was positively correlated with emotional exhaustion by Cherniss (1980), and related to job dissatisfaction by Buzawa (1984). Similarly, Brown and Campbell (1990) discovered that lack of consultation and communication was frequently rated as a stressor by police officers. This is echoed by Biggam et al. (1997) who found that lack of communication and lack of consultation were considered personal stressors by 70% and 65% of their sample, respectively. The Police Stress Survey (Spielberger, Westberry, Grier, & Greenfield, 1981) has identified lack of participation in job decisions as a relevant source of stress.

Lack of support from senior staff.

Police officers have customarily complained about the inadequate guidance and support offered by senior staff within the police organisation. Anecdotal reports suggest that senior staff are 'out of touch' with experiences at the street-level, and unsympathetic to the causes of police constables (Crank & Caldero, 1991). Kroes et al. (1974) found that police officers rated lack of administrative support as one of the most vexing sources of stress. Similarly, a pre-test conducted by Stevens (1999) revealed that police officers identified inferior supervisor support as a stress-producing work experience. A study by Violanti and Aron (1994) found that inadequate support from supervisors was ranked as the sixth highest organisational stressor. Sixty-one percent of participants in Biggam et al.'s (1997) study regarded lack of support from senior officers as stressful. Poor management support has been recognised as a source of stress by several researchers (e.g., Kirkcaldy et al., 1995; Manolias, 1983), and has been
extended to include the issue of poor managerial supervision (Graf, 1986; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986).

**Assignment and promotion.**

Numerous studies have also highlighted the constable ranks' frustrations with assignment and promotion (e.g., Band & Manuele, 1987; Buzawa, 1984; Sparger & Giacopassi, 1983). The significance of this issue was emphasised by Crank and Caldero (1991), who found it to be rated the third most significant organisational stressor by police officers. Organisational stress has been attributed to unfavourable job assignments by both Martelli et al. (1989) and Reiser (1974), and is referred to in the Police Stress Survey (Spielberger et al., 1981). Similarly, the limited opportunities for promotion have been recognised as stressors by Martelli et al. (1989), Kaufmann & Beehr (1989), and Storch and Panzarella (1996). A study by W. J. Brown (1986) found that constables disagreed that the best people get the promotions, that promotions are handled fairly, and that there are chances for future promotions.

**Favouritism.**

Much of this frustration probably stems from acts of favouritism and discrimination at senior levels (Kirkcaldy et al., 1995). Crank and Caldero (1991) found that favouritism was the sixth highest source of organisational stress in their sample of police officers. Lester (1982) also positively correlated self-rated levels of stress with favouritism in the police department. Presumably, those officers who are on good terms with senior staff are a priority for favourable job assignments and promotions.
In contrast, the literature suggests that lack of recognition for good performance is also a stressor for those individuals working within the police organisation (Lord, 1996; Stevens, 1999). Studies of American police officers have found that job dissatisfaction is related to the departmental failure to recognise good work (Buzawa, 1984; Sparger & Giacopassi, 1983). W. J. Brown (1986) found that constables were the most dissatisfied out of all police staff with recognition for doing a good job. The significance of this factor as a personal stressor has been highlighted by its inclusion in the Police Stress Survey (Spielberger et al., 1981).

**Excessive discipline.**

It has been suggested that the excessive and inappropriate meting out of discipline is a source of stress for many police officers. A survey of American police officers found that excessive discipline was ranked the fifth highest organisational stressor (Violanti & Aron, 1994). Disciplinary actions have been cited as police stressors by numerous other researchers (e.g., Kroes, 1985; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Manolias, 1983; Martelli et al., 1989; Spielberger et al., 1981).

**Sexual harassment.**

Sexual harassment is an often-overlooked source of stress that can affect women in any occupation. It is assumed that female police officers are especially prone to this type of stressor because they have entered into a traditionally male-oriented occupation (Brown & Fielding, 1993). Because this
issue is broader than the scope of this chapter, it will be discussed in further
detail in the following chapter.

Generic Features External to the Police

Public Criticism and Community Relations.

Most empirical studies have been concerned with police stressors that implicate
the police organisation or the criminal justice system. However, there is some
indication that police officers are stressed by public criticism and their
relationship with the community. Storch and Panzarella (1996) found that public
criticism and negative stereotyping of the police, combined with public distrust
and approval of the police were the second most disliked aspects of being a
police officer. Negative community attitudes have also been perceived as one of
the most frequently occurring police stressors (Evans & Coman, 1993).

A few authors have formulated explanations for these negative views of the
police. Eisenberg (1975) suggests that the media is a fundamental source of
stress to police officers, through their sensationalised and distorted accounts of
police activities. In addition, Wilson (1968) posits that community relations are
hampered by disagreement between the public and police as to the goals of
policing. The public expects police activities to be directed toward criminal
deterrence, while the police endorse service-based activities.
Specific Features External to the Police

Interaction with Criminal Justice System.

An often-cited police stressor is the criminal justice system. A number of studies have identified the court system as one of the most troublesome police stressors (e.g., Band & Manuele, 1987; Storch & Panzarella, 1996). Police officers worldwide perceive giving evidence in court and being cross-examined by defence counsel particularly stressful (Gudjonsson & Adlam, 1985). Forty-four percent of police officers in Biggam et al.'s (1997) study reported appearing in court to be a significant personal stressor. A study by Evans and Coman (1993) discovered that giving evidence in court was the most frequently occurring police stressor.

A second facet of police officers' stress with the criminal justice system is the inconvenience of scheduling court appearances. Police officers are frequently scheduled to appear in court on their day off, or on the day following a night shift (B. Dewar, personal communication, 18 February, 2000). Numerous police officers are disrupted by delays in criminal hearings and frequent adjournments (Coman & Evans, 1991). Almost 61% of police officers in Hurrell's (1977) sample, and 54% of police officers in Davidson's (1979) sample were bothered by court-induced inconveniences to their schedule. Although these accounts are dated, anecdotal evidence suggests that they are still relevant stressors.

Perhaps most frustration with the criminal justice system arises from its perceived leniency toward criminals. Many police officers complain of the insufficient rehabilitation of offenders and disagreeable court decisions
Organisational Stressors

(Davidson, 1979). Most importantly, there is a consensus that the criminal justice system is sympathetic towards offenders, rather than the police (Kroes et al., 1974; Stratton, 1986).

Chapter Summary

It is clear that the police see themselves as contending with a myriad of stressors. While previous research has focussed on specific police task stressors, there is now recognition that there are additional police stressors that warrant consideration. It is these stressors that police recruits may be largely ignorant of when beginning their police career.

One of the most frequently cited sources of administrative stress is the police organisation's emphasis on rules and regulations that can severely restrict the police officer's powers of discretion. Another administrative complaint is job overload. This, combined with an overall lack of resources within the police organisation, is a key source of stress to police officers. Shiftwork is perhaps the most integral source of stress to police officers. Many police officers find the adaptation to long and rotating hours of work disruptive to their eating and sleeping routines as well as to other aspects of their lifestyle.

While it is difficult to assess whether administrative or management factors are generally more stressful, a review of recent literature suggests that management practices may be the greatest source of stress. Police officers are frustrated at the lack of consultation with senior staff, especially with regard to decision making and supervisory support. In addition, several studies suggest
that assignments and promotions are handled unfairly, and that officers are subjected to favouritism, excessive discipline, and sexual harassment.

In addition to these organisational stressors, police officers also contend with stressors concerning the public's view of the police. Evidence suggests that they find public criticism and relationships with the community particularly bothersome. The literature has also highlighted the role of the criminal justice system in eliciting police stress. Numerous studies have found that police officers are frustrated with court-related inconveniences, giving evidence in court, and the perceived leniency of the courts.

Evidence reviewed in this chapter makes it clear that the job of a police officer, especially constables, can be very stressful. Given that so many potential stressors exist, it seems likely that police recruits will have unrealistic expectations about the job. Furthermore, for some officers there will be the additional problems of discrimination within the police and sexual harassment. These issues are raised in the following chapter.
Chapter Three

EXPERIENCES OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND DISCRIMINATION WITHIN POLICE ORGANISATIONS

Chapter Overview

In the present chapter, expectations of sexual harassment and discrimination within the police organisation will be examined. Specifically, the issue of gender will be addressed by discussing experiences that are unique to women in law enforcement. A great deal of American research was conducted on the experiences of women in law enforcement in the 1970s and 1980s. Much of this early research focussed on performance comparisons between policemen and policewomen, and on the ways in which women adapted to working in a male-oriented profession (J. M. Brown, 1998). The focus of this chapter will be on practices of sexual discrimination and prejudice toward women that are largely hidden from the public's view. Owing to the usually covert nature of discrimination, it is believed that many female police recruits are unaware that they may eventually encounter incidents of sexual discrimination. The first section of this chapter will provide an historical overview of women in policing to elucidate the foundations of contemporary discrimination.

The History of Women in Law Enforcement

Policing in America was established in the first half of the nineteenth century. During this era, women entered the field of policing in roles subordinate to those of men. Traditionally, women were required to fill matron positions, which necessitated their working with juvenile offenders, or in cases involving offences
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against minors (Talney, 1969). Since this time, women have fought an uphill battle in securing equality within law enforcement. When they were employed, they were limited to clerical duties and cases involving women or children, which was reflective of those duties performed by women in the previous century (Balkin, 1988).

The history of women in the New Zealand Police resembles that of the American Police (New Zealand Police, 1991). The New Zealand Police first employed women in 1895 as matrons and searchers, performing duties similar to those described above. Despite political opposition to the appointment of women in the police, the New Zealand Police Association gave full support to the presence of women in the police in 1936. Five years later the first women underwent training and were assigned the status of 'temporary constable', yet were prevented from wearing the traditional police uniform. Their status changed to 'constable' in 1946, and they were issued with the official navy blue uniform during 1951. Perhaps the pivotal moment in the history of women in the New Zealand Police was in 1956, when both men and women first trained together at the Royal New Zealand Police College in Trentham. Since this time, the role of women in the police has expanded with many officers entering specialist branches. Currently, women comprise approximately 15% of all sworn police staff (New Zealand Police, 1998).

Sexual Discrimination and Prejudice in Policing

A male-oriented profession, policing emphasises physical courage and strength combined with the excitement associated with danger (Brown & Fielding, 1993;
Smith and Gray (1985) developed the term 'cult of masculinity' to describe this stereotype of policing. They suggest that exaggerated stories of physical violence and sexual prowess among policemen are commonplace, and serve only to fuel this image of policing. Both Brown and Fielding (1993) and Worden (1993) indicate that policewomen have an inhibiting effect on this cult of masculinity; their very presence suggests that policing does not hinge upon physical strength but on interpersonal skills.

In addition to contending with general police stressors, policewomen face sexual discrimination and prejudice among the police. Both Heidensohn (1994) and Kroes (1982) claim that sexual harassment is the most highly ranked stressor facing policewomen in Britain and America. A study of policewomen in Australia reported that 36% of women had experienced either unwanted touching or sexual assault from their male colleagues (Prenzler, 1995). This figure seems conservative when British research is considered. J. M. Brown's (1998) study of women police officers in England and Wales found that 70% of her sample had experienced a form of sexual harassment directed at them personally. A study of Sussex policewomen by C. Martin (1996) portrayed a similar picture. Seventy-eight percent of her sample had been subjected to physical sexual harassment. Furthermore, 79% of British policewomen in Brown and Heidensohn's (1996) study had admitted encountering personal sexual harassment.

A review of the literature suggests that policewomen encounter the following components of sexual discrimination in policing: the negative attitudes of male
The Negative Attitudes of Policemen

Many males in law enforcement retain erroneous beliefs about the capabilities of women that lead them to look unfavourably upon women who enter the policing role. A recent study by Young (1991) confirmed that policemen in Britain were still openly hostile toward their female colleagues. Wexler and Logan (1983) also noted the angst of female officers who were exposed to male officers who would refuse to communicate with them. This was rated the second most stressful component of the negative attitudes of male officers. The literature suggests that all new female officers are completely ignored until it can be proven, to a certain degree, that they can be trusted. The prevailing 'cop culture' precludes male officers from extending a friendly gesture to new female officers, at least if they can be seen to be doing so by other male officers (Wexler & Logan, 1983).

An overwhelming 80% of the respondents in Wexler and Logan's (1983) study claimed that they had endured stress caused by the negative attitudes of male officers within their department. Consequently, this was judged to be the
greatest source of stress for the women in the study. They reported that their sexual orientation was constantly questioned; being branded as sexually promiscuous if they had a male sexual partner, and as a lesbian if they did not have a male partner. A study by Wong (1981) concluded that these examples of sexual harassment were widespread, reflecting expressions of hostility and degradation. Blatant anti-women statements were also noted by policewomen in Wexler and Logan's (1983) study as potential sources of stress. For example, one woman reported: "It's bad enough having one of you girls here: we don't need to have two in the same car".

Interestingly, experience with policewomen does little to foster sentiments of acceptance. Balkin (1988) revealed that policemen who had worked on patrol with policewomen for a year still regarded them as incompetent. An unpublished study by Glaser (1983, cited in Balkin, 1988) also found that policemen who had patrolled with policewomen had slightly more negative views of them after working together. Similarly, Vega and Silverman (1982) discovered that a slightly higher percentage of officers who had worked on patrol with female officers felt that they were "too soft-hearted, panicked easily in patrol situations, and were not strong enough" (p. 35).

This notion that policewomen lack the physical and emotional skills needed to perform policing effectively is widely held (Weisheit, 1987). Nearly three-quarters of male officers in Vega and Silverman's (1982) study believed that women are not strong enough to handle police patrol duties. A large number also asserted that female officers could not handle violent situations and were
not assertive enough to enforce the law effectively. Grennan (1987) also acknowledges that male officers perceive females to be ineffective as police officers because they lack the strength, stamina, and aggressiveness necessary to handle violent situations. The male officers in the studies by Balkin (1988) and Pendergrass and Ostrove (1984) reiterate this opinion. Balkin explained that policemen are concerned about their female colleagues' lack of physical strength because it could pose a problem in dangerous and violent situations. In addition, the wives of policemen prefer that their husbands patrol with another male officer, because female officers may be a liability in dangerous situations (Balkin, 1988).

Ironically, an analysis of the duties of police officers has revealed that incidents requiring physical force are rare (Balkin, 1988; Prenzler, 1995). When an act of physical strength is required, female officers participate at almost the same rate as male officers (Sichel, Friedman, Quint, & Smith, 1977). Physical strength has never actually been shown to be related to police functioning (Sherman, 1973). Thus, policemen who complain about the insufficient brute strength of policewomen are doing so on the basis of their beliefs, and not on the basis of actual observations.

S. E. Martin (1978) explains that these overt attitudes and behaviours are efforts at asserting dominance. Common overt behaviours also included cursing, put-downs and affectionate terms of address. Women pose a threat to the self-image of policemen by inhibiting their use of crude language and exposing the fact that police work does not routinely involve heroic and
dangerous conquests. More subtle forms of degradation include touch and 'chivalrous ceremonies' (C. Martin, 1996). Male officers often seek to protect their female partners in violent confrontations, as they are seen as a 'weak link' (C. Martin, 1996). Balkin (1988) suggests that male officers who protect their female peers are really protecting themselves by preventing displays of competence by the women.

Much of the literature concerning working relationships between policemen and policewomen is dated, and therefore reflects attitudes that were held a number of decades ago. While it would be encouraging to think that these misconceptions had changed over this time, there is compelling evidence to accept the applicability of previous research to a modern context (B. Dewar, personal communication, June 10, 2000; C. Martin, 1996).

**Group Blame**

Because policewomen are over-scrutinised by their male colleagues, any small error in performance by one woman is viewed as evidence for the incompetence of all policewomen (Poole & Pogrebin, 1988; Wexler & Quinn, 1985). The majority of women interviewed in a study by Wexler and Logan (1983) reported resentment at being treated as a group. Many of the women noted incidents in which the inadequate performance of another female officer sparked ill-founded beliefs among the male staff that all women were inadequate: "When a woman has trouble cuffing someone, it gives them the opportunity to say "Look at how women have trouble". When a man messes up, they cover for him" (p. 51).
Female officers have to go to greater lengths to 'prove' themselves to their male peers. In gaining their acceptance, they presumably have to perform at levels superior to those expected of new male officers (Holdaway & Parker, 1998). It is a well-reported frustration that the best efforts and contributions of female officers go unnoticed by their male colleagues (Johnson, 1991). In fact, when a policewoman performs a job particularly well, it is viewed as an exception to the rule (Heidensohn, 1992). This is an ironic contrast to the issue of group blame described above; if a female officer makes a mistake on the job, the credibility of all female officers is challenged. However, if a female officer shows job competence, the performance is attributed to the individual only.

Deployment Blocking

It is likely that many female police recruits expect to be encountering the same tasks and situations as their male colleagues on the job. However, the differential functional deployment of officers has been well established. A study by Brown and Fielding (1993) discovered that policemen were more likely than policewomen to be exposed to incidents involving the potential for violence, whereas policewomen were more likely to deal with the victims of violence and sexual abuse. Holdaway and Parker (1998) more recently reiterate this finding.

Similarly, there is a lack of female officers occupied in positions of specialty such as dog handling and firearm duties. An Equal Opportunities Commission review of the Metropolitan Police in Great Britain revealed that women were absent from a number of specialist deployments (Coffey, Brown, & Savage, 1992). Holdaway and Parker (1998) suggest that these differences in
deployment severely restrict policewomen's experiences, and consequently their career options. An overwhelming 70% of policewomen in a study by S. Jones (1986) believed that the reason for differential deployment patterns was police officer gender. Although entering a specialist field is the aspiration of many policewomen, they are precluded from joining because of perceived lack of experience (Coffey et al., 1992; Holdaway & Parker, 1998).

It is this perceived lack of experience that may be influencing the performance appraisals and promotion of policewomen. Beutler, Storm, Kirkish, Scogin and Gaines (1985) concluded that simply being a woman in law enforcement is associated with low supervisory ratings. Similarly, Holdaway and Parker (1998) found that female officers reported less supervisory and peer encouragement than male officers. It is clear that policewomen also face discrimination in retention and promotion decisions (Poole & Pogrebin, 1988). These trends have forced women to lower their career expectations, and alter their motivations and strategies for work (Poole & Pogrebin, 1988).

**Lack of Role Models**

Perhaps owing to the blatant discrimination against women within the police, few female officers have been elevated to positions of high esteem. While this is an obvious characteristic of the police hierarchy, it is unlikely that female police recruits fully appreciate the implications of failing to have female role models within the organisation. Research indicates that this causes many street-level female officers to feel disadvantaged and even disillusioned with their career paths (Wexler & Logan, 1983).
The guidance of experienced officers is an integral way in which to become oriented within the police department. It is often the case that female officers are excluded from these informal networks, because the majority of experienced officers are male and may prefer the company of other male officers (C. Martin, 1996; Wexler & Logan, 1983; Worden, 1993). The lack of role models within the police department results in female officers adopting their own roles in an effort to gain acceptance from male officers and to improve their policing style. This process is often referred to as defeminisation.

**The Defeminisation of Women in Law Enforcement**

When women enter male-oriented jobs, they experience role conflicts; they are violating the stereotype that dictates that women should be employed in jobs traditional to women (Brown & Fielding, 1993). Consequently, these women embrace certain strategies in a bid to limit the severity of role conflict. Defeminisation can be best described as the adoption of male characteristics in order to gain both the acceptance and trust of male colleagues (S. E. Martin, 1979). Defeminisation is the antithesis of deprofessionalisation, which is the maintenance of feminine characteristics combined with the acceptance of inferior status (S. E. Martin, 1979). Sherman (1973) suggests that female police recruits must forfeit some of their femininity in order to be accepted by their male counterparts. The defeminisation of policewomen can be conceptualised as a 'Catch-22' situation. On one hand, female officers can retain their femininity and work in areas traditional to women in law enforcement. But in doing so, women effectively limit their careers and decrease the likelihood of ever gaining a superior position. On the other hand, female officers can relinquish their
femininity in a bid to compete with male officers for positions of authority and command.

Women that emulate the male approach to policing and consequently perform well are seen as a career threat to men (Berg & Budnick, 1986). Conversely, those women who adopt the traditional female roles within the police organisation pose no career threat to the male police officer. It is believed that male officers characterise defeminised female officers as 'bitchy' and 'lesbian' in response to this threat (Gross, 1981).

Research suggests that women in law enforcement who adopt male characteristics may be more successful in their career. Gross (1981) concluded that the more successful female academy recruits displayed 'masculine' rather than 'feminine' mannerisms. Further, the more 'feminine' the recruits, the worse they felt about themselves at the end of eight weeks of training. This study serves to illustrate both the loss of role identity and self-worth created by defeminisation within policing. Berg and Budnick (1986) proposed that this defeminisation would also create role problems in other spheres of a female officer's life, for example being a mother, wife, sister, or friend.

It has been noted that women in law enforcement tend to adopt various role or behaviour styles in an effort to avoid the defeminisation typical of the 'cop culture'. This is of particular importance to female police recruits, as it is unlikely that they consider the manner in which they will balance their professional practice and interaction with male colleagues.
Wexler (1985) identified four role styles maintained by female officers in her study. The majority of women in her sample adopted the neutral-impersonal style. These women approached policing in a business-like manner, and interacted with their male colleagues on a purely professional basis. They commanded respect and treatment equal to that of their male peers. Wexler named the second style the semi-masculine style. Women who adopted this role assumed a number of male characteristics in order to be accepted and trusted by their fellow male officers. An interesting feature of this group was that their efforts at acceptance were in vain because they acknowledged that females would never be completely accepted as equals in law enforcement. Women who emphasised their femininity in their approach to policing adopted the feminine style. Their interactions with male colleagues were imbued with sexual undertones, and they expected special treatment. It was observed that male officers failed to take these women seriously enough to trust and accept them. Finally, Wexler identified the mixed style, which is essentially a combination of all three styles, with no particular style dominating. Women who adopted this style struggled for respect within the department, but often used their feminine characteristics to secure their goals. While researchers have proposed a number of other taxonomies of policing styles adopted by policewomen (e.g., Grennan, 1987; S. E. Martin, 1980), none seem to be as richly described and researched as that described by Wexler (1985). This classification also accounts for female officers who may employ components from each of the categories.
Chapter Summary

Historically, women have occupied positions of low esteem within police organisations. While this pattern of deployment is slowly changing, women are still under-represented in specialist departments and supervisory positions. The most recent data from the New Zealand Police (1998) show that women comprise 70% of low-graded non-sworn positions, and only 22% of high-graded non-sworn positions. Their male counterparts show an inverse relationship between gender and grading. This phenomenon can be partly explained by the disapproving attitudes of male colleagues, the lack of role models for women within the police, and deployment blocking. A number of researchers have noted that policewomen cope with this discrimination in a variety of ways. Defeminisation occurs when a woman relinquishes her feminine characteristics in a bid to compete equally with male officers. In contrast, women who are resistant to denying their gender may adopt alternative role styles in a bid to avoid the typical 'cop culture'. Women entering the New Zealand Police may be largely unaware of the nature and extent of sexual harassment and discrimination that may exist in this male-dominated profession. Consequently, they are likely to have inaccurate expectations regarding this facet of the policing role.

The types of expectations new employees, and police recruits in particular, may have before entering an organisation were examined in the previous two chapters. In the following chapter, the development of expectations via organisational socialisation will be addressed, and a model outlining the development of unrealistic expectations introduced.
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In this chapter, two important constructs, organisational socialisation and reality shock are introduced. The concept of organisational socialisation is introduced first as a useful way of understanding the development of job expectations. Organisational socialisation is discussed with emphasis on the police socialisation process. The most common models of organisational socialisation are outlined, and the pertinence of stage models of organisational socialisation in viewing the development of job expectations is explained.

'Reality shock' is introduced in the second section of this chapter. It is the immediate consequence of unsuccessful socialisation, in which new employees discover that their job expectations are inaccurate. Reality shock is examined from both a general and a police-oriented perspective.

Organisational Socialisation

Organisational socialisation is defined as "the process by which employees are transformed from organisational outsiders to participating and effective members" (Feldman, 1981, p. 309). Glaser and Strauss (1971) note that socialisation occurs whenever an individual adopts a new role, irrespective of previous socialisation experiences. Therefore, any promotion or transfer within an organisation requires some degree of socialisation.
Fisher (1986) distinguishes between organisational and occupational socialisation, noting that the two concepts are often confused. Organisational socialisation describes the induction to the norms and values specific to the organisation. In contrast, occupational socialisation encompasses the learning of occupation-specific knowledge and skills that can be transferred across organisations. Both types of socialisation occur when a newcomer begins a job (Fisher, 1986). When an individual begins a completely new area of work the two types of socialisation occur simultaneously, as in on-the-job training. They occur sequentially when training occurs in a formal setting prior to joining the organisation, as in police recruit training. This dissertation will focus on organisational socialisation.

The concept of organisational socialisation is useful for understanding the development of job expectations for two main reasons. Firstly, many authors note that organisational socialisation is the basic way in which organisational culture is conveyed and maintained (Bauer et al., 1998). Furthermore, it is a critical mechanism by which other important aspects of the organisation, such as politics and power dynamics are transmitted (Bauer et al., 1998). Organisational socialisation essentially facilitates the shaping of job expectations. Secondly, organisational socialisation emphasises the adjustment of new employees to organisations (Ashforth & Saks, 1996). Holton and Russell (1997) discovered that job expectations prior to employment have a significant impact upon socialisation processes and outcomes. This point is reiterated by Bauer et al. (1998), who suggest that the meeting of job expectations is strongly related to positive adjustment and organisational socialisation. Thus, job
expectations and organisational socialisation are inextricably related; organisational socialisation shapes job expectations, and its success is dependent upon the meeting of these job expectations.

**Police Organisational Socialisation**

The organisational socialisation process has been investigated over the past 20 years (see Saks & Ashforth, 1997, for a review), and most studies have examined this process in specific organisational contexts. Owing to its residential training programme, policing is one of the few occupations that have a formal socialisation process, yet it has scarcely been investigated. In fact, it appears that only two authors have proposed empirical models of police organisational socialisation (Bennett, 1984; Van Maanen, 1975). Furthermore, the most recent research concerning the police organisational socialisation process was conducted more than a decade ago. This is surprising considering that the period between 1992 and 1997 saw more published studies concerning organisational socialisation than any previous five-year span (Saks & Ashforth, 1997). The lack of interest in police organisational socialisation could be owing to the recent emphasis on factors that affect organisational socialisation in general (Bauer *et al*., 1998), rather than on the *process* of organisational socialisation in specific contexts.

Van Maanen (1975) noted that the police literature focussed on two different facets of the police socialisation process. Some authors have examined aspects of the police personality, while others have restricted their view to police attitudes toward certain groups. Although research has been varied, most
authors agree that the police organisational socialisation process develops a collective consciousness; the assimilation of expectations, attitudes, and values occurs (Hazer & Alvares, 1981; Van Maanen, 1975). A number of authors have noted that organisational socialisation is a relatively quick process amongst police recruits and is especially potent during the recruit's first year (Tuohy, Wrennall, McQueen, & Stradling, 1993; Van Maanen, 1975). Typically, police recruits enter the organisation as intensely motivated individuals. They have an elevated sense of organisational commitment, and expect constant excitement and adventure (Hazer & Alvares, 1981). Organisational socialisation and reality both contribute to the weakening of these work values.

Models of Organisational Socialisation.
Most research concerning organisational socialisation has focussed on the process of socialisation; investigating how a new employee learns an organisational role (Bauer & Green, 1994; Chao et al., 1994; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). Despite the existence of numerous publications on the issue of organisational socialisation and a recent resurgence of interest in the area, there is no one underlying theory of organisational socialisation (Saks & Ashforth, 1997) and few empirical studies (Baker, 1995; Morrison, 1993a). A review of the socialisation literature suggests that there are four common theoretical perspectives from which to view organisational socialisation (Klein & Weaver, 2000).
1. Socialisation Tactics Model

Van Maanen & Schein (1979) developed a theoretical model of organisational socialisation that focussed on socialisation tactics. They proposed that organisations may adopt at least six bipolar tactics in a bid to structure new employees' socialisation experiences; 1) collective versus individual (whether newcomers are socialised as a group or individually; 2) formal versus informal (whether newcomers are segregated from organisational members during socialisation); 3) sequential versus random (whether there are a prescribed series of steps that must be undertaken before adopting the new role); 4) fixed versus variable (whether there is a specific timetable for socialisation to occur); 5) serial versus disjunctive (whether newcomers are socialised by an experienced organisational member); and 6) investiture versus divestiture (whether newcomers are required to relinquish their prior identities).

G. R. Jones (1986) argued that these tactics mould the role orientations that newcomers eventually adopt. A custodial role orientation is adopted when collective, formal, sequential, fixed, serial, and investiture tactics are used to maintain the status quo. Newcomers are effectively encouraged to assume predefined roles. An innovative role orientation is adopted when individual, informal, random, variable, disjunctive, and divestiture tactics are used to challenge the status quo. Newcomers are encouraged to explore their own roles within the organisation.

G. R. Jones (1986) also suggested that the six tactics can be viewed on a continuum. The custodial role orientation is at one end of the continuum (called
institutionalised socialisation), and the innovative role orientation is at the opposite end (called individualised socialisation). Research has supported this conceptualisation, with studies reporting moderate to high correlations between the six tactics and indicators of newcomer adjustment (e.g., Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Baker & Feldman, 1990). In fact, Saks & Ashforth (1997) submit that the model of socialisation tactics may be the most testable theory of socialisation, because it delineates relationships between the tactics and subsequent behaviour. In contrast, Chao et al. (1994) suggest that the model lacks distinct criteria from which to gauge the extent of individual socialisation. The socialisation tactics model is useful because it challenges the uniformity of socialisation experiences across organisations (Morrison, 1993a). However, Morrison (1993a) cautions that socialisation tactic theories assume that new employees are passive rather than active in the socialisation process.

2. Socialisation Content

Another approach to the study of organisational socialisation focuses on the content of what newcomers need to learn in order to become effective organisational members. Chao et al. (1994) note that organisational socialisation is multi-dimensional, and that new employees may not be effective in every content dimension. The identification of areas of impaired socialisation is particularly important in understanding individual career development (Chao et al., 1994). A number of researchers have proposed various content dimensions that are integral to successful socialisation, each building on previous theories (Feldman, 1981; Fisher, 1986; Chao et al, 1994). The most recent conceptualisation has been formulated by Chao et al. (1994). They
suggested that organisational socialisation content includes performance proficiency, people, politics, language, organisational goals and values, and history. They have shown these six factors to be distinct and having varying importance at different stages of an employee’s career.

3. Information Seeking

The most recently popular theoretical basis of organisational socialisation concerns newcomers’ information acquisition and uncertainty reduction. Louis (1980) developed this cognitive perspective with her Sense-Making theory, and it has been extended by Falcione and Wilson’s (1988) Uncertainty Reduction theory. Unlike other theories of socialisation that emphasise the meeting of expectations, these theories focus on newcomers’ abilities to make sense of their environment (Louis, 1980).

Louis suggested that organisational entry is characterised by surprise; newcomers compare their expectations with organisational reality. Successful socialisation is measured by the extent to which newcomers are able to cope with organisational surprises and make sense of their new environment. This uncertainty prompts newcomers to seek information about the job, expected behaviours, the organisational climate, etc., via communication with superiors and peers (Falcione & Wilson, 1988).

In making sense, newcomers rely on many sources of information. They consider past experiences in similar situations, their own personal characteristics, and schemas for interpreting organisational surprises (Louis,
Perhaps most importantly, the information and interpretations of organisational insiders facilitate the sense-making process. Information given to newcomers can be formal or informal, generalised or personalised (Falcione & Wilson, 1988). These messages communicated to the new employee by their supervisors and peers help create an organisational reality. Consequently, information gleaned from different sources helps to reduce the sense of uncertainty, and influence the attitudes and behaviours of the new employee. This information reduces the uncertainty of the environment, rendering it more predictable and controllable. Consequently, employees become more adept at fulfilling their new role, more satisfied with their job, and less likely to leave the organisation (Morrison, 1993b).

A crucial problem with these theories is that it is virtually impossible to empirically study newcomer sense-making (Major et al., 1995). Researchers have instead opted to investigate how newcomers seek new information and feedback in a bid to adjust to their new roles and environment (Major et al., 1995). Despite this disadvantage, Sense Making theory relies upon basic tenets of information seeking and acquisition and has great potential for further understanding the cognitive processes involved during organisational socialisation (Saks & Ashforth, 1997).

Information seeking theories have a strong cognitive basis. These theories examine the cognitive processes that newcomers employ to adjust to the new organisation, and focus on the newcomers themselves rather than on the process of socialisation (Morrison, 1993a). In fact, Morrison (1993a) suggests
that the advantage of cognitive theories of organisational socialisation is that they do focus on the new employee rather than on the organisation. However, like the Socialisation Tactics theory, they portray the new employees as passive rather than active participants in the socialisation process. Because of these inadequacies, 'stage models' have remained the dominant framework for understanding the process of socialisation.

4. Stage Models of Socialisation

During the 1970s and 1980s, a number of authors proposed “stage models” of organisational socialisation. These models endeavoured to delineate specific phases that newcomers pass through as they develop into organisational insiders. The authors of these models argue that new employees move through successive stages of socialisation, experiencing marked attitudinal changes at prescribed times (Adkins, 1995; Bauer & Green, 1994).

There are important distinctions between the stage models of organisational socialisation and the other theories of organisational socialisation. While the socialisation tactics model emphasises the organisation specifically structuring employees' socialisation experiences, stage models downplay the importance of the organisation by emphasising new employees' own experiences. Further, the socialisation tactics models argue that socialisation experiences are not the same across different organisations and that this variety is a function of which tactics an organisation chooses to adopt. Stage models suggest that there is some uniformity in socialisation experiences across organisations; variety in
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experiences depends on the new employee's own expectations and organisational reality.

Theories that focus on socialisation content can also be compared to stage models of organisational socialisation. Socialisation content theories accentuate the specific content areas that require proficiency for successful socialisation to occur, and suggest that each are more prominent at certain stages of an employee's career. Stage models of organisational socialisation focus less on the content of socialisation, but agree that there are observable changes in many areas over stages of an employee's early career.

Finally, there is a difference between information seeking theories and stage models of socialisation. While information seeking theories focus on newcomers making sense of their new environment, stage models focus on newcomers meeting their expectations within that new environment.

Despite these differences, it is important to note a similarity between stage models and other theories of organisational socialisation. Stage models are able to accommodate other theories of organisational socialisation within their structure. Socialisation tactics, content, and information seeking theories are essentially competing theories. However, stage models do not exclude these theories; each theory can still be incorporated into the stage structure. For this reason, stage models have a fundamental advantage over other theories of organisational socialisation.
Stage models also have a number of other advantages over alternative theories of organisational socialisation. Of all the theories, stage models are the most appropriate from which to view the development of job expectations. It is known that organisational socialisation is most potent during organisational entry (Bauer et al., 1998; Klein & Weaver, 2000). Therefore, it is logical to investigate a model of organisational socialisation that specifically focuses on the sequence of stages that newcomers must progress through during this time. Stage models highlight the attitudinal changes that occur during organisational entry and delineate theoretical stages at which newcomers will experience attitudinal shifts (Morrison, 1993a). Baker (1995) notes that the experiences of new employees at organisational entry have a significant effect on their work attitudes and intention to remain in the organisation. Critics argue that stage models are limited because they fail to explain how these changes occur (Morrison, 1993a). However, they are useful as descriptive models of changes that occur over an employee's early career. Owing to its relevance to the development and meeting of job expectations, stage models will be the organisational socialisation framework adopted in the present dissertation.

Most stage models address three distinct phases of socialisation (e.g., Brief, Aldag, Van Sell, & Melone, 1979; Feldman, 1976; Louis, 1980; Thornton & Nardi, 1975), but use varying terms to describe each stage. All incorporate an anticipatory phase, an encounter phase, and a change and acquisition phase. The anticipatory socialisation phase encompasses all of the job expectations prior to entering an organisation. During this phase, employees gain information about the job from a variety of different sources, including peers and family, the
media, and other external influences. The next phase, encounter, is characterised by job expectations meeting organisational reality. The employees begin adjusting to the new organisation, and soon learn whether the job expectations formed in the previous phase were accurate. The final phase is the change and acquisition phase, in which the newcomer adapts to the new organisation. Employees have accepted that certain aspects of the new job were not as they originally thought, and have become proficient in their new role.

Three-stage models of organisational socialisation are the only theory to include mention of the experiences and learning that occur prior to entering an organisation through its anticipatory phase. However, both the encounter and change and acquisition phases bear strong similarity to the cognitive theories of organisational socialisation. The sentiment of surprise outlined in the sense-making theory relates well to the encounter phase of the stage models of organisational socialisation. Similarly, employees' efforts at making sense of their new environment and adapting to it is in accordance with the change and acquisition phase of the stage models. The three-stage model of organisational socialisation is a useful basis for empirical work because it describes common elements of socialisation while providing a prescribed time frame within which behaviours should occur.

A three-stage framework can be used to describe most organisational socialisation processes including police socialisation (e.g., Bennett, 1984). However, it may be more accurate to adopt a four-stage model in describing the
process particular to occupations that include a distinct training period. This period of intensive training requires a unique stage of socialisation (Saks, 1996). Van Maanen (1975) is the only author to apply such a four-stage model to police socialisation, identifying an additional stage termed the 'introduction' stage, which occurs after anticipatory socialisation. Although he has applied slightly different labels to some stages (e.g., the anticipatory phase is termed 'entry'), they are essentially identical.

Recent research suggests that organisational socialisation does not strictly adhere to specific stages; rather, it is a cumulative, career-long process (Bauer & Green, 1994). Thus, the model described here should not be viewed as a rigid temporal guide to the process of socialisation, but as a model that integrates the relevant variables that affect socialisation during the same general time period (Weiss, 1990). Owing to the similarity of each stage model, an integrated model of organisational socialisation will be described in the following three chapters to elucidate the general functions of each stage.

**Reality Shock**

Organisational entry dictates sudden exposure to unfamiliar surroundings, characterised by feelings of disorientation, foreignness, and sensory overload (Louis, 1980). Unsuccessful organisational socialisation has been linked to a number of negative outcomes including job dissatisfaction, negative work attitudes, poor performance, stress, and turnover (Feldman, 1981; Louis, Posner, & Powell, 1983; Nelson, 1987; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). However, the most immediate and important consequence of ineffective organisational
socialisation is reality shock. Organisational socialisation theories have long viewed reality shock as an essential problem in the adjustment and assimilation of new employees (Major et al., 1995).

When an idealistic new employee is forced to face organisational reality, the consequences can be devastating. One of the immediate responses to this uncertainty is reality shock. While this phenomenon is the most often cited consequence of having unrealistic or unmet job expectations (Arnold, 1985; Dean, 1983; Dean, Ferris, & Konstans, 1988; Patrick, 1984; Pfifferling, 1984; M. S. Taylor, 1988), few studies have investigated its process. In fact, the reality shock model has been poorly researched and has had little empirical definition. Other areas such as job satisfaction, burnout, and police cynicism have been more extensively researched, and will be addressed in Chapters six and seven.

The term 'Reality shock' was originally developed by Hughes (1958) to describe the psychological effect of unrealistic or unmet expectations in an occupational context. There are few carefully developed definitions of reality shock. Consequently, there is little consensus as to what it actually is. Firstly, since its conception, the term 'reality shock' has been used a number of different ways or used without definition (e.g., Arnold, 1985; Beck, 1993; Wanous, 1977).

Secondly, one of the most concerning problems is that authors often confuse it with similar constructs. It is often used synonymously with the term burnout (e.g., Pfifferling, 1984; Jackson et al., 1986), although reality shock may be an antecedent of burnout. A number of authors have also used the term 'reality
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'Organisational Socialisation & Reality Shock' to mean job disillusionment (e.g., Kanter & Mirvis, 1989). However, reality shock can be seen as more of an acute phase of job disillusionment.

Thirdly, a number of authors have referred to reality shock only in the context of unmet expectations (e.g., Buckley, Fedor, Veres, Wiese, & Carraher, 1998; Irving & Meyer, 1994; Major et al., 1995), or suggest that unrealistic or unmet expectations merely contribute to rather than cause reality shock (e.g., Louis, 1980). The prevailing view is that both unmet and unrealistic job expectations may lead to reality shock.

Finally, reality shock is a concept that was popular during the 1970s and 1980s, but now receives little research interest. This is probably because burnout has replaced reality shock as a more recognised construct. However, reality shock is a more appropriate construct from which to view the immediate consequences of having inaccurate job expectations. Reality shock encompasses the initial symptoms experienced when people realise their job expectations are inaccurate, while burnout can be seen as implicating more chronic and long lasting symptoms. Thus, reality shock may be seen as a potential determinant of burnout.

Although definitions of this phenomenon vary, it has been generally accepted that reality shock involves a discrepancy between pre-hire job expectations and post-hire perceptions (e.g., Dean, 1983; Dean et al., 1988; Niederhoffer, 1967; Pfifferling, 1984). One of the most detailed definitions of reality shock has been provided by Patrick (1984): "Reality shock can be defined as the confrontation
that generally occurs when values, beliefs, and skills possessed by the graduate professional are found to be in conflict or at variance with prevailing values, beliefs, or skill expectations of the work setting” (p. 28). For the purposes of this dissertation, reality shock will be defined in the following way. It will be viewed in terms of the immediate changes in attitude, behaviour, and general well-being that arise in response to the realisation that one’s expectations of a new job and organisation are inaccurate. This definition assumes that reality shock is expressed as specific changes in attitude, behaviour, and psychological and physical symptoms, which will be described in the following three chapters.

The reality shock model is based on the observation that new employees typically have unrealistic expectations. When the job fails to fulfil these expectations, they experience reality shock, and subsequently become dissatisfied with their job. Low satisfaction, in turn, often results in voluntary turnover as employees leave to seek satisfaction in another job (Miceli, 1985). The response to the gap between expectations and reality is so extreme that the individual simply cannot persevere in the job (Kramer, 1974). Patrick (1984) notes that it is virtually impossible for an educational process to provide sufficient life experience to avoid reality shock. Furthermore, reality shock is not restricted to organisational entry. Fisher (1986) suggests that reality shock may occur several years into an individual’s tenure, for example in response to a failed expected promotion.
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Much of the literature emphasises the negative aspects of unrealistic job expectations. It is important to note that the disparity between expectations and reality may also yield positive consequences. However, these anecdotal accounts of adaptation are infrequent. Kramer (1974) suggests that a period of disenchantment may lead to introspection and personal growth. Niederhoffer (1967) believes that the realisation that one's expectations were misguided can be a constructive experience that can enhance the newcomer's enthusiasm for the profession. For the most part, it is apparent that this uncertainty will result in a maladaptive coping response. Van Maanen (1975) suggests that the initial law enforcement encounter is likely to induce a period of reality shock.

Reality Shock and Policing

Much of the reality shock-related literature has focussed on the experiences of doctors, nurses, and teachers (e.g., Beck, 1993; Coombs, Perell, & Ruckh, 1990; C. E. Taylor, 1994; Weinstein, 1988). These occupations (and policing) all involve an internship period in which the individuals are experiencing occupational reality while continuing the appropriate training. In fact, Schmalenberg and Kramer (1979) found that internships may actually reduce the severity of reality shock for a first job because interns should be able to remedy any uncertainty before beginning their careers.

The literature concerning the occurrence of reality shock in a policing context is sparse, which is probably due to a lack of interest in reality shock as an explanatory construct. Despite this non-interest, there is some evidence to suggest that it is prevalent among recruits. In 1998, the New Zealand Police
compiled a report on turnover within the police organisation. The job not being what was expected was an often-cited reason for leaving the police.

Police recruit training is a period approached with great enthusiasm. Unfortunately, this enthusiasm diminishes once the recruits graduate and begin working in the law enforcement domain. Van Maanen (1985) highlights the irony of this enthusiasm. Typically, individuals are drawn to the area of policing by its excitement and adventure, only to discover a largely routine and mundane occupation. Additionally, he asserts that the crucial variable in the development of reality shock is the exposure to a demanding and unappreciative society. Police officers' typical response to this hostility is to unify themselves with the police organisation. Van Maanen recognises that reality shock may also result in dissatisfaction with the occupation itself.

The new police officer soon discovers that "doing everything by the book" is problematic in the real world of policing. Niederhoffer (1967) claimed that newcomers are forced to choose between the theoretical and professional ideals taught to them at the Police College, and the practical, station approach. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this is also a contemporary dilemma (A. Robinson, personal communication, January 23, 2000).

The identification of a predictable chronology of reality shock and typical responses to this phenomenon led Kramer (1974) to construct a model of reality shock identifying four consecutive phases: honeymoon, shock or rejection, recovery, and resolution. The honeymoon phase is characterised by employees
embracing the new job and enjoying its novelty. It is likened to the beginning of a new relationship; the new job and organisation are seen to be perfect and employees imagine their career to be promising. The shock or rejection phase heralds the end of the honeymoon phase. Employees are faced with organisational reality and may begin to realise the job and organisation are not what was initially expected. Rejection of oneself, one's educators, and the new organisational culture are common. Following this phase are the recovery and resolution phases. Employees have accepted the disparity between their expectations and reality, and have achieved competency in their new role. Each of these phases will be further detailed in the following three chapters.

Chapter Summary
This chapter has introduced the notion that organisational socialisation is the process by which new employees are introduced to an organisation's norms and values. Despite its relatively formal process, few authors have documented the organisational socialisation of police recruits. While several models of organisational socialisation exist, stage models are the most applicable to the current research problem. This perspective delineates three theoretical stages that a newcomer passes through during organisational entry. The unique police socialisation process adheres to a slightly modified version of this model of organisational socialisation.

Reality shock is the immediate consequence of unsuccessful organisational socialisation. When new employees realise that their initial job expectations are unrealistic or have not been met, this period of disillusionment can occur.
Although reality shock is seen as an important hurdle in the organisational socialisation process, little work has been conducted on this construct. Typically the term is used in many different ways, often being confused with other similar constructs. However, it is clear that reality shock may be an important problem in the socialisation of police recruits.

An integrated account of organisational socialisation and reality shock will be provided in Chapter five. The first stages of both organisational socialisation and reality shock will also be addressed.
Chapter Five

ANTICIPATORY SOCIALISATION AND THE HONEYMOON PHASE OF REALITY SHOCK

Chapter Overview

Chapter five introduces the integration of organisational socialisation and reality shock. The present chapter and the following two chapters will examine the phases of a three-stage model of organisational socialisation alongside the phases of a model of reality shock. The first stage of organisational socialisation, anticipatory socialisation, is outlined from both a general and police-oriented perspective. Owing to the particular nature of police socialisation, the anticipatory socialisation of police recruits is further divided into two stages: anticipatory and introductory socialisation. The first phase of the reality shock process, termed the ‘honeymoon phase’, is also briefly addressed.

Organisational Socialisation and Reality Shock: An Integration

It is pertinent to view organisational socialisation and reality shock together because each stage of organisational socialisation corresponds to a stage of reality shock. The anticipatory stage of organisational socialisation encompasses the forming of job expectations prior to beginning a new job, while the honeymoon phase of the reality shock process includes the feelings of euphoria and excitement associated with developing idealistic expectations. The encounter stage of organisational socialisation is characterised by the
realisation that job expectations are not being met on the job. Similarly, sentiments of surprise and bitterness in recognising this disparity typify the shock or rejection phase of the reality shock process. Finally, the change and acquisition stage of the organisational socialisation process signals acceptance of organisational reality and adaptation to the demands of the new job. This stage echoes the recovery and resolution phases of the reality shock process. Thus, the reality shock model can be viewed as further outlining the immediate attitudes and behaviours exhibited in the wake of unsuccessful organisational socialisation.

**Stage 1: Anticipatory Socialisation**

Essentially, anticipatory socialisation concerns the extent to which an individual is ready to enter the organisation. Major et al. (1995) suggest that it concerns all learning that occurs before the new employee enters the organisation. The recruitment and selection phases of organisational entry can be seen as most pivotal in this learning process (Major et al., 1995). During this time, individuals exchange and evaluate information with prospective employees, and make employment decisions (Feldman, 1976). Thus, the formation of job expectations typifies anticipatory socialisation (Katzell, 1968; Dunnette, Arvey, & Banas, 1973). It is important to develop realistic expectations of both the job and organisation during this stage. Fisher (1986) suggests that the anticipatory socialisation stage is crucial in facilitating newcomer adjustment. The more thorough and accurate the anticipatory socialisation process, the quicker and easier assimilation is into the organisation. Essentially, there are two phases to
the anticipatory socialisation of police recruits: anticipatory socialisation, and introductory socialisation.

**Anticipatory Socialisation of Police Recruits**

Potential recruits receive occupational information via two main reference groups: people external and internal to the police organisation (Bennett, 1984; Fielding, 1989). External influences such as family, friends, and the media offer opinions as to the nature of the police role. In addition, acquaintances who are police officers provide information concerning status and role-appropriate attitudes, values, and behaviours. This information is particularly valuable, as it facilitates acceptance of policing as a career choice (Bennett, 1984). Van Maanen (1975) found that before joining the police, almost 80% of recruits in his study had a close relative or friend who worked for the police.

Two factors contribute to the success of the anticipatory stage of the police socialisation process (Bennett, 1984). First, the length of time spent in this stage dictates the level of socialisation. Van Maanen (1975) maintains that a lengthy, competitive police selection procedure ensures that applicants have a high level of organisational commitment. The second factor concerns the accuracy of organisational information given to applicants. Essentially, the more accurate the information, the more likely that the applicant will be accepted into the organisation during the later stages of socialisation (Thornton & Nardi, 1975). Fielding (1989) points out that previous experience in a similar profession, such as a military police officer, also needs to be considered.
Introductory Socialisation of Police Recruits

Van Maanen's introduction stage begins on the first day of police recruit training. The recruit looks to the occupational reference group (usually experienced officers at the Police College) to serve a number of socialisation functions (Bennett, 1984). Firstly, the reference group is a rich source of cues regarding appropriate behaviours, attitudes and values. They provide a model by which the recruit can gauge their own performance. However, both Niederhoffer (1967) and Van Maanen (1975) caution that the information gleaned from officers at the training college may not always be useful on the actual job.

Secondly, the reference group supports the new recruits in their quest for new information and cognitions. The reference group manifests this support through feelings of acceptance and reinforcement. Essentially, the more experienced officers are exerting cognitive control over new members; those members not adopting the cognitions of the reference group are not accepted.

It is during the first three to six months of training that police recruits are likely to experience major changes in attitude. While the training period is typified by a period of high motivation (Niederhoffer, 1967), Van Maanen (1975) notes that this enthusiasm may be fleeting. After a few months of training, the officers in his sample lacked in organisational commitment, and became quite bitter about their training experiences. He suggests that the authoritarian style of police training serves to dispel unrealistically high expectations of policing.
Research has indicated that organisational newcomers consider on-the-job supervision to be a more useful source of information than formal training programmes (Nelson & Quick, 1991). There is anecdotal evidence to suggest that this is also true of the police. This may be a result of the residential training programmes used by the police. Reichers (1987) argues that collective socialisation procedures limit information acquisition because newcomers are in constant contact with each other rather than with experienced trainers.

Although many authors note the importance of forming realistic notions of both the organisation and job, initial job expectations are predominantly unrealistic (Wanous, 1976). The policing occupation is no exception. Many new police recruits acquire unrealistic images of policing. The first phase of the reality shock process helps clarify how these inaccurate expectations are formed.

**Phase 1: Honeymoon Phase**

The honeymoon phase of reality shock (Kramer, 1974) can be seen to occur simultaneously with anticipatory socialisation. Very little has been written about this phase of the reality shock process. However, it has received some attention in literature concerning culture shock. Essentially, the honeymoon phase of reality shock is analogous to the beginning of any new relationship. There is a period of naivety in which new employees pick and choose those elements of the new organisational culture that are most interesting. Consequently, the new job and organisation are idealised, and employees are enthusiastic about their new career.
For a certain period, the newcomer revels in the novelty and variety of the new culture. Differences between what was learned in training and what is actually experienced on the job are initially regarded as exciting and interesting. Kramer (1974) suggests that trainers and educators may serve as a buffer between the training environment and organisational reality. Common emotions include euphoria, excitement, discovery, and stimulation (Pedersen, 1995). While newcomers may experience some stress or anxiety, these emotions are often interpreted in a positive light (Winkelman, 1994). New employee behaviour tends to be motivated by curiosity, interest, self-assurance, and the gaining of new and interesting experiences.

Chapter Summary

Anticipatory socialisation encompasses all learning that occurs prior to the starting of a new job, and is typified by the formation of job expectations. The literature highlights the anticipatory socialisation of police recruits as being comprised of two distinct stages. During the anticipatory stage, potential recruits begin to develop expectations of policing and these expectations are refined when the recruits begin training. Anticipatory socialisation coincides with the honeymoon phase of the reality shock process. New employees in the honeymoon phase of reality shock are selectively forming job expectations, and are essentially unaware of the future implications of not having formed more accurate expectations. They begin their careers having idealised the new job and organisation, and are excited at the novelty of the new culture.
The following chapter will address the second stages of organisational socialisation and reality shock and examine the psychological and physical consequences of realising the inaccuracy of one's initial job expectations.
Anticipatory Socialisation & Honeymoon Phase
Chapter Six

ENCOUNTER AND THE SHOCK OR REJECTION PHASE OF REALITY SHOCK

Chapter Overview
The first section of this chapter outlines the second ‘encounter’ stage of the socialisation process. It is during this stage that new employees are likely to recognise a disparity between their idealistic job expectations and reality. Consequently, new employees may experience the second phase of reality shock, termed ‘shock or rejection’. The second section of this chapter addresses the immediate consequences of reality shock, namely poor psychological and physical health, and low job satisfaction.

Stage 2: Encounter
This stage of socialisation commences on the first day of work and usually occurs during the newcomer’s first six to ten months’ of work experience (Louis, 1980). The encounter stage is considered the most crucial stage of the socialisation process as the challenging of job expectations occurs. It is during this stage of realisation that new employees may become aware that some of their initial job expectations are not being met on the job. While it is clear that some employees form unrealistic job expectations prior to entering an organisation, a less recognised problem is the failure to have otherwise realistic expectations realised on the job.
In addition to realising unrealistic or unmet expectations, the encounter stage is characterized by three fundamental activities that the newcomer performs. Feldman (1976) suggests that new employees fulfil task, role, and interpersonal demands during the encounter stage. Task activities include learning new skills and procedures. Often employees must approach new equipment and learn how to use it effectively. Although extensive training may have occurred, the new employee must determine how to perform tasks in the new setting. During the encounter stage, new employees also struggle to define their role within the organisation. Role expectations are communicated to the employee in many ways (Frese, 1982). This information is often ambiguous and conflicting, resulting in confusion as to the role that the individual must fulfil. During this stage, the integration of work and personal roles can create difficulties. Interpersonal activities occur on two levels: the newcomer to the organisation must forge professional relationships with other organisational members and develop informal social relationships.

This broad overview of the encounter stage of organisational socialisation may be applied to specific occupations. The essential elements of the encounter stage of police socialisation have been identified by a number of authors.

The Encounter Stage of the Police Organisational Socialisation Process

Van Maanen’s (1975) description of the encounter stage of police organisational socialisation is very cursory. It is proposed that this stage begins on the graduated recruit's first day of work. However, it seems plausible that the encounter stage may even begin when the recruit is assigned to his or her first
station duty (a two-week internship as a training police officer), as this would be
the first experience of what being a police officer is really like.

It is during the encounter stage that the individual learns how to think and
behave as a bona fide police officer, and learns what behaviours the public
expect (Van Maanen, 1975). This stage also involves the recruit learning the
real nature of police work. The newcomer begins to develop interpersonal
relationships with other more experienced police officers, and may be subject to
harassment by senior staff members (Vaught & Smith, 1980).

Regardless of occupation, the central theme of the encounter stage of
organisational socialisation seems to be that of organisational expectations
meeting reality. The following section of this chapter addresses the second
phase of reality shock. The new employee's initial response to uncertainty is
characterised by a period of shock and rejection of the new organisational
culture.

**Phase 2: Shock or Rejection Phase**

The shock or rejection phase is the most crucial of the reality shock process
outlined by Kramer (1974). It is at this stage that self-discovery and growth can
either flourish or flounder. The newcomer struggles with conflicting values and
prescribed ways of completing tasks. Ultimately, the individual begins to feel
inadequate in terms of the availability of appropriate cues, skills, and responses.

\[1\] Much of the following section on the shock/rejection phase of reality shock is based on Kramer (1974).
While reactions to this phase can vary, most newcomers experience some form of rejection of the new culture.

This rejection may be manifested in many different forms. However, rejection of oneself is most common. Typically, the individual has recurrent thoughts of failure, and believes that all of the time, money, and effort spent on training have been wasted. Newcomers blame themselves for every little mistake, and become deflated when they are not immediately successful at everything they try.

Total rejection of their educators is also common. Newcomers resent their educators for encouraging idealism and professional values. Often, feelings of betrayal and bitterness surface as they realise that they were not adequately prepared for the realities of occupational life. Should rejection of one's educators fail to occur, there is excessive contact with them as the individual seeks reassurance.

This form of regression may also influence other elements of the new employee's life. They often place enormous importance on the sanctity of their home life, and develop a pervasive fear and mistrust of others. They withdraw from the aspects of the organisational culture that are most troubling, and associate only with those people who share the same values. A preoccupation with the past and excessive daydreaming may also occur.
Excessive criticism of the professional culture is usually apparent in the rejection phase. Newcomers may be hypercritical and unable to view situations objectively; they condemn the organisation universally and unilaterally. This paranoid criticism may be accompanied by frequent references to "the right way of doings this task", or "how we were taught to perform this task in training was....". This stubbornness only serves to divorce them from the culture, and limit their perspective and absorption of new information.

In addition to the psychological effects encountered in the rejection phase, many physical symptoms may arise. Excessive fatigue and illness typify the physical responses to shock, hostility, and frustration fundamental to this phase. New Zealand psychologists have indicated that idealistic police officers manifest many of the same symptoms. When disillusionment arises, common symptoms include sleep disturbance, anxiety, tearfulness, irritability, aggression, poor concentration, time wasting, excessive alcohol use, and the development of inappropriate attitudes (New Zealand Police, 1998).

**The Immediate Consequences of Reality Shock**

When organisational socialisation fails to improve the realism of job expectations, new employees will experience reality shock. There are further negative consequences of having inaccurate job expectations, and in turn, reality shock. During the shock or rejection phase of the reality shock process, new employees are likely to experience a number of adverse consequences. The most obvious and important of these are poor psychological and physical health, and low job satisfaction.
Poor Psychological and Physical Health

It is now understood that psychological and physical health are inextricably linked (S. E. Taylor, 1995). There is very little direct evidence that experiencing reality shock causes adverse psychological and physical consequences. However, the reality shock model posits that when people realise that their job expectations have been inaccurate, they will experience stress which in turn causes negative psychological and physical symptoms. These negative psychological and physical symptoms are most likely to manifest themselves during the shock or rejection phase of reality shock.

It is a well-established finding that stress affects individuals in a number of ways. Stress has been known to cause anxiety, depression, insomnia, shaking, distractability, sweating, and jumpiness (S. E. Taylor, 1995). Physical health problems that can arise in response to stress include hypertension, and heart, digestive, kidney, respiratory, and skin problems (Brown & Campbell, 1994; Ogden, 1996; S. E. Taylor, 1995). Stress is also known to affect the immune system, lowering resistance to infection (S. E. Taylor, 1995). Exposure to stress can elicit physiological and psychological symptoms that are illness precursors, such as fatigue and aching (S. E. Taylor, 1995). While these problems may be a direct result of stress, others may be indirect consequences. For example, people suffering from stress may expose themselves to harmful lifestyle factors such as alcohol or tobacco, which in turn have further adverse effects on their health.
Low Job Satisfaction

An important consequence of unrealistic or unmet expectations, and reality shock, is decreased job satisfaction (Miceli, 1985). In fact, the reality shock model posits that the greater the reality shock, the lower the job satisfaction (Miceli, 1987).

Wanous (1976, 1980) also links job satisfaction with reality shock, by theorising that job satisfaction involves a comparison process in which an individual compares job expectations with reality. Job satisfaction is low if one’s initial job expectations are unrealistic. This reasoning is an example of the met expectations hypothesis (Porter & Steers, 1973), which was introduced in Chapter one. The basic tenet of this theory is that job experiences that parallel job expectations will produce job satisfaction, and job experiences that are incongruent with job expectations will result in dissatisfaction (Greenhaus et al., & Marinis, 1983; Nelson & Sutton, 1991; Porter & Steers, 1973). Essentially, satisfaction is the result of expectations being met on the job. Met expectations have been moderately linked to job satisfaction in an extensive meta-analysis conducted by Wanous, Poland, Premack, and Davis (1991).

Wanous (1992) suggests that the met expectations hypothesis only applies to aspects of the new job that are important to employees. Obviously, there are individual differences in job facets that are considered important, but salary and chances for promotion are often cited examples. New employees are more likely to experience surprise than job dissatisfaction when unimportant aspects of the job are not met (Greenhaus et al., 1983; Locke, 1976).
Wanous (1992) suggests that studies showing decreasing job satisfaction over time can be seen as evidence for the met expectations hypothesis. The AT & T study (Bray et al., 1974) outlined in Chapter one investigated job satisfaction over an eight-year period. Job satisfaction increased slightly for the first three years, then steadily declined to the point where job satisfaction after eight years' experience was lower than after the first year's experience. A similar study conducted with Sears' department store employees also showed a decrease in satisfaction with increasing work experience (Smith, Roberts, & Hulin, 1976).

A number of studies further supporting the met expectations hypothesis collected data prior to entry and after entry. Lawler et al.'s (1975) investigation of accounting graduates showed that job satisfaction was high immediately after accepting a job offer, and then declined in the proceeding year. Another study of graduates found that 80% viewed their company as less attractive after one year's work experience than how they initially viewed it (Vroom & Deci, 1971).

Some authors argue that the original realism of job expectations may be the best indicator of job satisfaction rather than whether these job expectations are fulfilled. It is interesting to note that these authors have failed to examine job content expectations, favouring other aspects such as salary and holidays. Porter and Steers (1973) and Dugoni and Ilgen (1981) emphasise that low expectations are more easily fulfilled on the job than high expectations. Thus, new employees with lower expectations should be more satisfied with their job than employees with high expectations. Studies by Youngberg (1963) and Nelson, Quick, and Eakin (1988) examined the realism of job expectations. Both
studies concluded that employees who made realistic evaluations of the new job and organisation (and presumably had more met expectations), were more likely to experience job satisfaction and less likely to leave the organisation.

The relationship between job expectations and satisfaction has been questioned by a number of studies which have discovered a positive relationship between newcomer expectations and satisfaction (e.g., Dean & Wanous, 1982; Dugoni & Ilgen, 1981; Greenhaus et al., 1983; Miceli, 1987; Wanous, 1975). However, an examination of these studies' correlation coefficients reveals only a very weak relationship between these two factors. The majority of studies agree that either met or realistic expectations play a significant role in creating job satisfaction.

Chapter Summary

The second stage of the socialisation process, encounter, is characterised by newcomers realising that the job and organisation are not what they initially thought. This stage is characterised by the new employee “learning the ropes” and engaging in task, role, and interpersonal activities to continue the transition from organisational outsider to insider. It is during this stage that newcomers become aware that their job expectations are not being fulfilled, and may experience the shock or rejection associated with the second phase of reality shock. Employees encountering the shock or rejection phase of the reality shock process are likely to experience impaired psychological and physical health, and low job satisfaction.
The following chapter examines the final stages of organisational socialisation and reality shock. When an employee is unable to move beyond the shock and rejection phase of reality shock, a number of pervasive consequences can occur. Chapter seven will outline the most researched of these long-term consequences.
Chapter Seven

CHANGE AND ACQUISITION AND THE RECOVERY AND RESOLUTION PHASES OF REALITY SHOCK

Chapter Overview

The first section of this chapter will address the final stages of the organisational socialisation and reality shock processes. It is during these stages that changing from organisational outsider to insider can be accomplished. Individuals who fail to move past the shock and rejection phase to the final phases of reality shock may experience several adverse consequences. Often cited long-term consequences of reality shock that affect the individual, such as organisational burnout and cynicism, will be addressed in the second section of this chapter. The remaining section will examine the long-term consequences of reality shock that affect the organisation, including turnover and absenteeism.

Stage 3: Change and Acquisition

The final stage of socialisation is characterised by attempts at mastery over the organisational situation (Nelson, 1987). It is at this stage that the employee performs most effectively, owing to the increased level of demand (Welford, 1973). The employee has completed the transition from newcomer to settled and accepted employee, and has become competent in the undertaking of task, role, and interpersonal demands (Van Maanen, 1977). Although this stage serves important growth functions, it seems that Van Maanen (1977) is the only researcher to have investigated its occurrence in the police socialisation
process. By the sixth month of work experience, the new officer should have acquired appropriate cognitions and behaviours paralleling those of more experienced officers, including the realisation that policing is not as exciting and adventurous as initially thought.

The final stage of organisational socialisation is characterised by adaptation and acceptance, and these milestones are indicative of successful socialisation to the new organisation. According to Kramer's (1974) model of reality shock, once disillusioned employees have overcome the shock or rejection associated with realising their job expectations were inaccurate, they are finally able to proceed to the recovery and resolution phases of reality shock.

**Phases 3 and 4: Recovery and Resolution Phases**

The recovery phase essentially heralds the beginning of adaptation. Once the rejection phase has ended, employees experience a decrease in tension and regain their sense of humour. The organisational culture can now be objectively assessed and evaluated. Perhaps the integral skill achieved during this phase is the ability to increasingly predict the actions and reactions of others within the organisation.

Although few studies have examined the resolution phase of the reality shock process, those that have examined chronic cases of disillusionment have reached a clear conclusion. Oberg (1960) maintains that as long as employees are experiencing reality shock, they cannot adequately fulfil job expectations.
In general, the ability to perform efficiently in response to demands is indicative of successful adjustment to the organisation. An employee who has failed to meet these demands is likely to experience a host of adverse consequences. Individuals in the shock and rejection phase of the reality shock process are likely to experience poor psychological and physical health and job dissatisfaction. Those employees who are unable to progress through the shock and rejection phase to the recovery and resolution phase of reality shock may experience burnout, organisational cynicism, voluntary turnover, and absenteeism.

**Long-Term Individual Consequences**

**Burnout**

Burnout has been referred to as "physical, emotional, and mental (i.e., attitudinal) exhaustion" (Pines & Aronson, 1981, p. 202). Studies by both Cherniss (1980) and Meyer (1982) concluded that unrealistic job expectations prior to employment played a significant role in the development of burnout. Unmet job expectations were associated with burnout by Meadow (1981) and Sturgess and Poulsen (1983). Kahill (1986) claims that these studies failed to compare job expectations over varying degrees of experience, and also neglected to assess the accuracy of job expectations prior to entry.

A number of personal qualities have also been recognised as determinants of burnout. Often, it is the most enthusiastic, ambitious, and highly motivated employees that succumb to the effects of burnout (Patrick, 1984). Therefore, it is not surprising that burnout can begin to develop after only one year's work experience (Sullivan, 1989). The unusually high rate of voluntary turnover
during this period suggests that newcomers are ill equipped for the emotional experiences of the job (Cherniss, 1980; Freudenberger, 1974). Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) surmise that burnout is caused by disappointments in the organisational environment that result in the gradual loss of idealism and enthusiasm. Eventually, the individual becomes totally disillusioned.

Patrick (1984) has identified a number of ‘helping’ professional roles at risk of burnout, including policing. In fact, interpersonal contact is highly correlated with risk of burnout (Patrick, 1984). Several studies have examined the relationship between policing and burnout, noting the pertinence of unmet job expectations in the development of psychological burnout (e.g., Burke, 1993; Burke & Richardsen, 1993; Golembiewski & Munzenrider, 1988; Jackson et al., 1986; Maslach, 1982). A study by Burke (1993) found that emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and lack of personal accomplishment were significant predictors of burnout in police officers.

Burnout is associated with a number of psychological and physical symptoms (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). Lee and Ashforth (1990) found that psychological strain was correlated with the three primary determinants of burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and lack of personal accomplishment. Furthermore, physiological strain was correlated with two of these determinants, and most highly associated with psychological strain. Similarly, Kahill (1986) has associated burnout with several psychological and physiological factors including diminishing self-esteem, depression, helplessness, fatigue, insomnia, headaches, and gastrointestinal problems.
Welch, Medeiros, and Tate (1982) suggest that fatigue accompanied by sleep disturbances are early symptoms of burnout in police officers. Other physical symptoms include coronary problems and lower back pain. They also indicate that feelings of helplessness and inadequacy among police officers are precursors to depression. In a study of police officers and their wives, Jackson and Maslach (1982) found similar evidence for psychological and physiological symptoms of burnout. Emotionally exhausted husbands would often return from work upset, angry, anxious, and would report difficulty in sleeping. Burke and Deszca (1986) also discovered that the incidence of psychosomatic symptoms amongst police officers was correlated with the three components of burnout.

It is clear that there are several determinants of burnout, with each research article purporting to have identified the most significant factor. It is likely that burnout is a fluid construct, and its antecedents vary from individual to individual, organisation to organisation, and from study to study.

Organisational Cynicism

Cynicism may best be defined as "both a general and specific attitude, characterised by frustration, hopelessness, and disillusionment, as well as contempt toward, and distrust of a person, group, ideology, social convention, or institution" (Andersson, 1996, p. 1397). In an organisational setting, unmet expectations play a critical role in the development of cynicism. Andersson (1996) proposes three fundamental antecedents of cynicism. Primarily, the newcomer develops unrealistically high expectations. When these expectations
are not met, the individual suffers disappointment. Subsequently, disillusionment arises signalling the development of cynicism.

The cynicism literature has focused on a few main areas of study, of which police cynicism makes the largest contribution. Numerous authors concur that the police personality is characterised by cynicism (Chandler & Jones, 1979; Evans, Coman, & Stanley, 1992; Hillgren & Bond, 1975). Cynicism is also related to education and length of service (Niederhoffer, 1967), frustration and stress (Ulmer, 1992), hierarchical organisational structure (Violanti & Marshall, 1983), and organisational size (Regoli & Poole, 1978). Evans et al. (1992) indicate that police cynicism may be explained by the environment in which police officers work. Firstly, the nature of policing itself dictates suspiciousness and cautiousness of people. Secondly, officer cynicism may be derived from a perceived lack of support from the community and government. Although the community expects the police to fulfil a law enforcement function, it neither supports nor sanctions governments in giving police the legal authority necessary to fulfil this role (Kroes, 1985). Often, police officers place themselves in potentially dangerous situations to apprehend criminals, only to see them released or receive a lenient sentence (Davidson & Veno, 1980). Finally, police officers may become cynical of their own effectiveness (Kroes, 1985). These cynical feelings are only exacerbated by perceptions of the community as regarding the police with suspicion and hostility.

Similar to burnout, there seems to be numerous determinants of organisational cynicism. Additionally, a lot of the research in the area of police cynicism is
dated and anecdotal. Very few empirical studies have explored this construct, which raises doubt as to the validity of some of the factors mentioned above in the development of organisational cynicism.

It is clear that the personal ramifications of having unrealistic job expectations disrupted by reality are pervasive and accompanied by a host of psychological and physiological symptoms of disturbance. In addition to individual consequences of reality shock, long-term negative outcomes can also be seen at the organisational level. Organisations bear the cost of idealistic employees through increases in voluntary turnover and absenteeism.

**Long-Term Organisational Consequences**

**Employee Turnover**

Investigations of the antecedents of voluntary turnover indicate that job expectations play a critical role in the decision to resign (Dunnette et al., 1973; Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979; Porter & Steers, 1973; Wanous, 1980). Louis (1980) highlights the emergence of two different approaches to the relationship between newcomer expectations and turnover. The first suggests that turnover is caused by the disparity between expectations and met expectations, while the second argues that unrealistic expectations lead to employee turnover.

As outlined in previous chapters, the met expectations hypothesis states that employees whose job expectations are met are more likely to experience job satisfaction, and are consequently less likely to leave the job voluntarily. Note that the meeting of expectations makes no distinction concerning realism. Job
expectations can be realistic or unrealistic; it is whether they are fulfilled that is important. Obviously, it is assumed that realistic rather than unrealistic job expectations are more likely to be met.

Not surprisingly, many researchers have reported a direct relationship between unmet job expectations and subsequent turnover. Studies by Katzell (1968), and Reilly, Brown, Blood, and Malatesta (1981) found that employees who remained on the job believed that their initial job expectations had been met, whereas those employees who left the job did not, not unexpectedly, consider them to have been met. This finding is echoed by a meta-analysis of met expectations studies, conducted by Wanous and Premack (1987), that found that unmet expectations were strongly correlated with voluntary turnover.

The literature also highlights the importance of realistic job expectations in impeding employee attrition. Early studies found that nurses (Kibrick, 1958) and life insurance agents (Weitz, 1956) were more likely to remain in their jobs if their initial job expectations had been realistic. Focussing on the job expectations of those employees who leave the job, a longitudinal investigation of Navy recruits concluded that navy dischargees tended to have unrealistic expectations of recruit training (Hoiberg & Berry, 1978).

Newcomers’ initial expectations were manipulated in unpublished studies by Youngberg (1963) and Macedonia (1969, cited in Porter & Steers, 1973). The data indicated that there were sizeable differences in initial expectations
between stayers and leavers. Those employees who remained had more realistic job expectations upon entering the job.

There is also some evidence to suggest that officer disengagement (resignation on psychological or medical grounds) within the police may be attributed to unmet and unrealistic job expectations. A study of New Zealand police officers who disengaged between 1992 and 1995 found that 39% of participants reported that policing was not as expected. The belief that unrealistic job expectations were a potent factor in the decision to leave the police was shared by 11% of the participants.

Absenteism

While an empirical relationship between job expectations and absenteeism is yet to be established, it is a reasonable assumption that the two factors are connected. If the failure of a job to meet one's initial expectations can lead to turnover, then it is likely that absenteeism could be an antecedent of this behaviour.

The New Zealand Police (1998) compiled an extensive report on police staff disengagement. One interesting feature of this report was an investigation of sick leave taken by police staff prior to disengagement. The data indicated that employees who disengaged took 37 consecutive days sick leave, on average, before making an application to disengage. An average of 63 consecutive days sick leave had been taken by the time employees had received disengagement approval and had formally ceased duties. The New Zealand Police calculated
the cost of this sick leave to approximate $13,482 for every police constable who had disengaged. It is difficult to accurately comment on the total cost of idealistic police staff in terms of sick leave. However, it is estimated that approximately 80 police constables who disengaged between 1990 and 1997 did so as a result of having unrealistic expectations of policing, costing the New Zealand Police approximately $1,078,560 in sick leave alone.

Chapter Summary

During the change and acquisition stage, the new employee begins to show mastery over the environment. The reality of the job and organisation is realised, and the employee performs effectively in response to demands. Successful socialisation to the new organisation results in the employee overcoming the shock or rejection associated with reality shock, and proceeding to the recovery and resolution phases. The consequences of failed organisational socialization can be seen at both an individual and organisational level. Burnout is often a long-term consequence of having job expectations challenged. A culmination of chronic disillusionment, burnout tends to affect those who work in ‘helping’ professions, such as policing. In the realm of policing, police cynicism has been well researched. The pioneer of research into police cynicism, Arthur Niederhoffer (1967), suggests that police cynicism is the result of unpreparedness for the challenges of policing. Negative outcomes of reality shock can also be manifested at the organisational level. Of greatest concern to employers is voluntary turnover and absenteeism.
Summary of Part One

Chapter one introduced the concept of job expectations, and highlighted the importance of having both a realistic assessment of the job and organisation in which one is entering. The following two chapters examined additional expectations that may impact upon the adjustment to a policing career. Chapter two outlined the organisational stressors specific to policing, focussing on administrative policies and management practices, community relations, and interaction with the criminal justice system. Chapter three investigated experiences of sexual harassment and discrimination within police organisations. The fourth chapter introduced two theoretical models. Organisational socialisation was described as a useful way from which to view the formation of job expectations. Reality shock was introduced as a useful construct in understanding the negative effects of unsuccessful socialisation. Chapter five outlined the first stage of organisational socialisation, anticipatory socialisation, and emphasised the importance of constructing accurate expectations of the job and organisation. The honeymoon phase of reality shock was also introduced. The sixth chapter addressed the second stage of organisational socialisation, encounter, and examined the shock or rejection phase of reality shock. Job dissatisfaction and poor psychological and physical health were posited as the symptoms experienced during the shock and rejection phases of the reality shock process. The final chapter described the last stage of organisational socialisation, change and acquisition. The recovery and resolution phases of reality shock were also discussed. This chapter also examined some of the long-term consequences of reality shock, likely to be experienced by employees who are unable to progress past the shock and
rejection phase of the reality shock process. The second part of this dissertation will describe and discuss a study conducted to examine the relationship between job expectations, reality shock, poor psychological and physical health, and job dissatisfaction.

It is proposed that people entering the police organisation are likely to have inaccurate expectations in at least four main areas: job content expectations, organisational expectations, organisational stress expectations, and sexual harassment and discrimination expectations. Unrealistic or unmet expectations in these areas will immediately lead to reality shock, and subsequently poor psychological and physical health outcomes and job dissatisfaction. Thus, the relationship between inaccurate expectations and negative outcomes is mediated by reality shock. A schematic model of the relationships proposed among these constructs is presented in the next chapter. It will be seen that the model also accounts for the known effects of several other important variables on the above relationships. These variables are predicted to affect the development of job expectations, the development of reality shock, and have an effect on health outcomes and job satisfaction.
Chapter Eight

OBJECTIVES OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Chapter Overview

The present chapter aims to elucidate the relationships between the variables discussed in the first section of the introduction. The previous chapters focussed on how stage models of organisational socialisation can explain the formation and development of job expectations. Unrealistic expectations of policing can lead to a variety of negative consequences. The immediate consequences of having inaccurate job expectations include reality shock, poor psychological and physical health, and low job satisfaction. Having inaccurate job expectations and failing to overcome reality shock can also lead to long-term outcomes, including burnout, cynicism, voluntary turnover, and absenteeism.

The present study focuses on those outcomes of reality shock that coincide with the shock/rejection phase of reality shock, and the encounter stage of organisational socialisation. The objective of this study is to empirically test the relationships between inaccurate job expectations and the development of reality shock and its immediate negative outcomes. In addition, the present study will examine the influence that other demographic variables such as age, ethnicity, and level of education, have on the development of reality shock, poor psychological and physical health, and job dissatisfaction.
Assessing the Antecedents of Reality Shock

In Chapter four, reality shock was defined as the immediate changes in attitude, behaviour, and general well-being that arise in response to the realisation that one's expectations of a new job and organisation are inaccurate. The present study will concentrate on the expectations that police recruits have before beginning work as police constables, and how these expectations change with time and experience.

1. Job Content Expectations

A number of studies have shown that new employees often have idealistic expectations about the job they will be starting (Bray et al., 1974; Wanous, 1976). Job content has also been identified as a source of surprise to police officers by many authors (e.g., Arnold, 1985; Nicholson & Arnold, 1989a,b), indicating the importance of having accurate job content expectations. Evidence suggests that potential police recruits are exposed to many sources of policing information, some of which may provide inaccurate images of policing (Miller & Jablin, 1991). Anecdotal evidence suggests that many people join the police expecting constant thrills and excitement, only to discover a largely routine and monotonous occupation.

The first research goal is to measure the extent to which job content expectations change over time in a sample of New Zealand Police recruits, and the relationship of those changes to reality shock symptoms.
The first hypothesis is that there will be a positive correlation between changes in job content expectations and reality shock symptoms. Specifically, police recruits exhibiting a greater change in policing expectations between Time 1 and Time 2 will show greater reality shock.

2. Organisational Expectations

In addition to having a realistic assessment of the job, it is important to have a realistic assessment of the organisation in which a new employee is entering. A realistic assessment of the organisation reflects the degree to which an individual understands the organisation's goals, climate, and philosophy (Chao et al., 1994). An organisational newcomer gradually constructs a schema for interpreting organisational experiences and is increasingly able to understand and predict the organisation's climate (Hiltrop, 1995). The failure to develop realistic expectations about the organisation has been shown to affect many aspects of a newcomer's job, including anxiety reduction (Nelson, 1987), voluntary turnover (Premack & Wanous, 1985), and performance, job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Adkins, 1995). Anecdotal evidence suggests that police recruits are entering the police organisation with inaccurate organisational expectations, and are experiencing difficulties adjusting to organisational reality.

The second research goal is to measure the extent to which organisational expectations change over time in a sample of New Zealand Police recruits, and the relationship of those changes to reality shock symptoms.
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The second hypothesis is that there will be a positive correlation between changes in organisational expectations and reality shock symptoms. Particularly, police recruits exhibiting greater change in organisational expectations between Time 1 and Time 2 will show greater reality shock.

3. Organisational Stress Expectations

Policing has been characterised as an extremely dangerous occupation (Conroy & Hess, 1992). Recently, the police stress literature has shifted focus from the exposure to trauma to the experience of routine organisational stressors. Research reviewed in Chapter two has indicated that police officers experience more stress in response to organisational rather than occupational stressors (Hart et al., 1993). Studies have identified several factors that are most stressful to the police, such as administrative policies and management practices, community relations, and interaction with the criminal justice system.

Policing is known for its exposure to dangerous and sometimes traumatic tasks and situations. Therefore, it is likely that many recruits are ignorant of more mundane organisational stressors that they are likely to encounter on entering the police organisation. Consequently, encountering these unexpected stressors is likely to contribute to symptoms of reality shock.

The third research goal is to measure the discrepancy between the frequency of exposure, and the expected frequency of exposure to organisational stressors of a sample of New Zealand Police constables, and the relationship of this discrepancy to reality shock symptoms.
The third hypothesis is that there will be a positive correlation between expectations of exposure to organisational stressors and reality shock symptoms. In particular, police constables exhibiting a greater discrepancy between frequency of exposure and expected frequency of exposure to organisational stressors will show greater reality shock.

4. Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Expectations

Anecdotal evidence suggests that women joining the police are largely unaware of the sexual harassment and discrimination that they may encounter within the police organisation. As the earlier review of the research within this area shows, several authors report a high incidence of sexual harassment (e.g., J. M. Brown, 1998; C. Martin, 1996; Prenzler, 1995), and it is thought to be one of the most significant stressors facing policewomen worldwide (e.g., Heidensohn, 1994; Kroes, 1982). It is predicted that women who do not expect to encounter sexual harassment and discrimination, and subsequently do encounter this treatment, will develop reality shock.

The fourth research goal is to measure the discrepancy between frequency of exposure and expected frequency of exposure to sexual harassment amongst a sample of female police constables, and the relationship of this discrepancy to reality shock symptoms.

The fourth hypothesis is that there will be a positive correlation between expectations of exposure to sexual harassment and reality shock symptoms. Specifically, female police constables exhibiting a greater discrepancy between
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frequency of exposure and expected frequency of exposure to sexual harassment will show greater reality shock.

The fifth research goal is to measure the discrepancy between frequency of exposure and expected frequency of exposure to sexual discrimination amongst a sample of female police constables, and the relationship of this discrepancy to reality shock symptoms.

The fifth hypothesis is that there will be a positive correlation between expectations of exposure to sexual discrimination and reality shock symptoms. Particularly, female police constables exhibiting a greater discrepancy between frequency of exposure and expected frequency of exposure to sexual discrimination will show greater reality shock.

Outcomes of Reality Shock

1. Health outcomes
Reality Shock has been linked with a number of physical and psychological symptoms, including excessive fatigue and illness, anger, hostility, resentment, and depression (Kramer, 1974). Psychologists with the New Zealand Police suggest that disillusioned police officers exhibit sleep disturbance, anxiety, tearfulness, irritability, poor concentration, time wasting, excessive alcohol use, and the development of inappropriate attitudes (New Zealand Police, 1998).

It was believed that it would be most useful and interesting to focus on health symptoms once police recruits had six months' work experience. Assessment of
these constructs at this time would provide a more recent and therefore
accurate illustration of police constables' current state of health.

The sixth research goal is to measure health symptoms in a sample of New
Zealand Police constables. A further goal is to examine the relationship of
health symptoms to reality shock symptoms.

The sixth hypothesis is that there will be correlations between reality shock
symptoms and psychological and physical health symptoms at Time 2. In
particular, those constables who exhibit greater reality shock will also show
greater health symptoms in general.

2. Job Satisfaction
Many authors suggest that job satisfaction is an immediate consequence of
reality shock (Miceli, 1987; Wanous, 1980). Thus, new employees who
experience reality shock are also likely to experience low job satisfaction. To
date, no empirical study has examined job reality shock and job satisfaction
within a police organisation.

The seventh research goal is to measure job satisfaction in a sample of New
Zealand Police constables, and the relationship of job satisfaction to reality
shock symptoms.
The seventh hypothesis is that there will be a negative correlation between reality shock symptoms and job satisfaction. Specifically, those constables who exhibit higher reality shock will also show lower job satisfaction.

Reality Shock as a Mediator between Expectations and Outcomes

Reality shock is thought to be caused by inaccurate expectations (Arnold, 1985; Dean et al., 1988), and has been associated with negative health outcomes and job dissatisfaction (Kramer, 1974). Thus, reality shock may actually mediate the relationship between expectations and outcomes. Chapters one, two, and three reviewed research highlighting the areas in which police officers may have inaccurate expectations. Based on this research, it is predicted that expectations about different aspects of the policing role influence the development of reality shock. It is also predicted that reality shock influences psychological and physical health outcomes, and job satisfaction. Reality shock may account for any relationship found between expectations and outcomes.

The eighth research goal is to test whether reality shock mediates the relationship between policing expectations, and health outcomes and job satisfaction.

The eighth hypothesis is that reality shock will mediate the relationship between policing expectations, and health outcomes and job satisfaction. It is expected that a statistically significant relationship between expectations and reality shock, and reality shock and outcomes will be found, but not a statistically significant relationship between expectations and outcomes.
Extraneous Variables

It is believed that several individual variables may be related to expectations, reality shock, health outcomes, and job satisfaction. Very little research has been conducted on those variables that may be related to expectations and reality shock in particular. However, the influence of demographic variables on health outcomes and job satisfaction has been extensively researched (Martocchio & O'Leary, 1989; Mason, 1995). The following variables have been identified as potential influences upon expectations, reality shock, health outcomes, and job satisfaction.

Gender

In 1997, women represented 14.7% of all sworn New Zealand Police staff (New Zealand Police, 1998). As yet, no study has investigated gender differences in the development of reality shock, but it is important to note that most studies of reality shock have focused on female-oriented professions (e.g., nurses and school teachers). While several studies have examined gender differences in the development of burnout (e.g., Gaines & Jermier, 1983; Lemkau, Rafferty, Purdy, & Rudisill, 1987; Pretty, McCarthy, & Catano, 1992; Russell, Altmaier, & Van Velzen, 1987), the relationship between gender and reality shock is still unclear.

Age

Most police officers in the New Zealand Police are aged 25 to 32 (New Zealand Police, 1998). In a study of ethical ideologies, Forsyth (1980) found that older participants were less idealistic than their younger counterparts. Psychologists
with the New Zealand Police report that new police officers are typically idealistic (New Zealand Police, 1998), which may make them prone to reality shock.

While there is a lack of information regarding age differences in the development of reality shock, many studies have investigated the role of age in the development of burnout. Younger workers often exhibit more burnout than older workers (Anderson & Iwanicki, 1984; Maslach, 1982; Russell, Altmaier, & Van Velzen, 1987). This finding is echoed in a correctional domain by Whitehead (1987) who found that young probation officers were more likely than older probation officers to complain of depersonalisation, a significant aspect of burnout. This phenomenon is believed to be due to older workers adapting their job expectations in accordance with their job experiences (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993).

**Ethnicity**

There are no studies that have assessed the relationship between employee ethnicity and the development of reality shock. However, a study by Jasinski, Asdigian, and Kantor (1997) suggests that ethnicity may affect both the experience of and coping with work stress. A study by Smith and Ward (1986) investigated ethnic differences in the adaptation to military police roles. They discovered that African Americans had difficulty adjusting to police roles due to cultural and ethnic conflict. While most research on ethnic differences has been conducted in the United States, it is likely that its applicability to a New Zealand
context cannot be ignored. Ethnic differences and experiences may have an
effect on the development of job expectations.

Educational level
McIntosh (1991) suggests that assessing level of education is essentially
measuring socio-economic status, which may have an effect on the
development of reality shock. The burnout literature is also sparse in this area.
However, Patrick (1984) and Pfifferling (1984) have positively correlated level of
education with burnout.

Familiarity with the police
Traditionally, the majority of recruiting was accomplished via a network of family
and friends connecting police officers and potential recruits. While this may not
be applicable in a contemporary context, most people who join the police have
had a close friend or family member involved in the police organisation
(Fielding, 1989). Fielding (1989) suggests that having a family member or a
close friend who is a police officer has the potential to influence a recruit’s
expectations of policing.

Present station and background location
There is anecdotal evidence to suggest that the concordance between the place
of residence before and after joining the police may have an effect on the
development of reality shock (A. Robinson, personal communication, January
31, 2000). For example, a police constable who originated from a rural town
may form job expectations congruent with this setting, but are disparate with the
realities of policing in an urban context. Consequently, such an officer may experience difficulty in adjusting to work in an urban city. It is also believed that the transition from urban to rural work may be difficult.

**Shiftwork experience**

There are no studies investigating the relationship between shiftwork experience and expectations and reality shock. It is intuitively appealing to believe that people who have had shiftwork experience prior to joining the police will adjust to the demands of shiftwork more easily than people who have not had shiftwork experience. However, studies examining the effects of shiftwork experience on a variety of stress-related somatic complaints have found the contrary. When the effects of age have been controlled for, shiftwork experience has been found to be related to several symptoms of stress (Foret, Bensimon, Benoit, & Vieux, 1981; Kaliterna, Vidacek, Prizmic, & Radosevic-Vidacek, 1995).

**Wing membership**

The term 'wing' is used to refer to a recruit intake at the Royal New Zealand Police College in Porirua. Typically, each wing consists of approximately 80 police recruits who undertake their police training together. While the intensive and intimate nature of police training may affect each wing in a unique way, there is no known reason to predict that there will be differences between wings in the present sample.
The present study assumes that several relationships may exist between the extraneous variables and expectations and reality shock. It is also expected that the extraneous variables will be related to health outcomes and job satisfaction, as the literature is replete with studies testifying to these relationships. These variables (gender, age, ethnicity, educational level, familiarity with the police, present station, background location, shiftwork experience and wing membership) will be controlled for when testing the predicted relationships between expectations, reality shock symptoms, health outcomes, and job satisfaction. A schematic model of this relationship is presented in Figure 1.
Figure 1. A model of the relationship between expectations and health outcomes and job satisfaction, which is mediated by reality shock.
METHOD

Participants
The participants were surveyed twice. The first sample consisted of those participants who completed the questionnaire at Time 1, while the second sample consisted of those who completed the questionnaire both at Time 1 and Time 2.

Sample at Time 1
Four consecutive intakes at the Royal New Zealand Police College in Porirua were surveyed between April and December of 1999. Ninety-six percent of the police recruits completed the survey.

Recruits at the Royal New Zealand Police College complete a six-month on-site training programme during which they are required to live in dormitories. The formal training programme segregates the recruits from outside social contacts, and grants permission for home-leave during specified weekends. During training, recruits learn a variety of skills including defensive driving, weapon use, and standard police procedures.

Recruits complete a two-week station duty during their training, in which they experience policing for the first time. After this station duty, recruits are asked to list their first three choices of which town or city they would like to work in. Considerable effort is made to assign them to their preferred station. On training
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completion, most of the graduates begin work as general duties constables. Other graduates work as traffic or incident response constables, traffic safety officers, shift/watch-house keepers, or as communicators/dispatchers.

A summary of the demographic data is provided (see Table 2). Of the 287 participants surveyed at Time 1, 218 were male (76%) and 69 were female (24%). In 1997, women comprised 14.7% of all sworn police staff, so these data indicate that this number may be increasing (New Zealand Police, 1998). A census of all recruits who received police training between September 1998 and June 2001 showed women constituting close to 21% of all police recruits. Thus the present sample generally reflects recruit gender distributions, but consists of slightly more females. The police recruits were aged between 20 and 45 years ($M = 28.42$, $SD = 5.40$). The mean age of the present sample is far lower than that recorded in 1997 ($M = 35.08$), and very similar to that recorded by the recruit census ($M = 28.69$) suggesting that the mean age of police staff may be decreasing. Most of the sample described themselves as European ($n = 218$), Maori ($n = 33$), or Pacific Islander ($n = 4$). The remaining 32 participants were of mixed ($n = 14$) or other ethnicities ($n = 11$), or failed to stipulate ethnicity ($n = 7$). The level of education of the sample was varied, ranging from those participants with no formal school qualifications to those with university degrees or diplomas. Seventy percent had a familiarity with the police, defined as knowing someone well who has worked for the New Zealand Police. Similarly, 58% of the sample had experience in working shiftwork. There were no statistically significant differences in demographic characteristics between the four wings. For a summary of the demographic data for each wing, see Appendix A.
Table 2

**Summary of the Demographic Data of the Sample at Time 1 and Time 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N = 287 (%)</th>
<th>N = 191 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218 (76.00)</td>
<td>146 (76.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69 (24.00)</td>
<td>45 (23.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>185 (64.46)</td>
<td>121 (63.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>94 (32.75)</td>
<td>64 (33.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>8 (2.79)</td>
<td>6 (3.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand European</td>
<td>218 (76.00)</td>
<td>155 (81.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Maori</td>
<td>33 (11.50)</td>
<td>18 (9.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4 (1.40)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Ethnicity</td>
<td>14 (4.90)</td>
<td>9 (4.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11 (3.80)</td>
<td>4 (2.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7 (2.40)</td>
<td>5 (2.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No School Qualification</td>
<td>16 (5.60)</td>
<td>10 (5.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Certificate</td>
<td>28 (9.80)</td>
<td>20 (10.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form Certificate</td>
<td>69 (24.00)</td>
<td>45 (23.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Bursary</td>
<td>28 (9.80)</td>
<td>19 (9.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Professional</td>
<td>90 (31.40)</td>
<td>61 (31.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate or Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree/Diploma</td>
<td>56 (19.50)</td>
<td>36 (18.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Familiarity with the Police</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52 (27.23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>139 (72.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present Station</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>163 (85.34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>28 (14.66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>129 (67.54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>62 (32.46)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shiftwork Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76 (39.79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>115 (60.21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sample at Time 2**

A summary of the demographic data for the final sample is provided (see Table 2). Of the 189 participants, 146 were male (76.4%) and 45 were female (23.8%). The police recruits were aged between 20 and 45 years ($M = 28.72$, $SD = 5.12$). Most of the sample described themselves as European ($n = 155$) or Maori ($n = 18$). Thirteen participants were of mixed ($n = 9$) or other ethnicities ($n = 4$). Five respondents failed to indicate their ethnicity. The level of education of the sample was varied, ranging from those participants with no formal school qualifications to those with university degrees or diplomas. Twenty-seven percent had a familiarity with the police, defined as knowing someone well who has worked for the New Zealand Police. Forty percent of the sample had experience in working shiftwork. Most of the sample had come from an urban location prior to policing (67.5%), and had been posted to an urban location after graduation (85.3%). The analyses conducted in the following chapter used this sample of 191.
Measures: Time One
The initial questionnaire used in the present study included the following measures.

*Job Content Expectations*

Because there are no measures assessing the extent to which job content expectations in a policing context have been met, a suitable measure had to be developed for this study (see Appendix B for a description of the development of this measure). The 'Policing Expectations Scale' (PES) included 40 items that described tasks or situations that frontline police constables could find themselves in. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they thought each item is encountered frequently (at least once a week), or infrequently (less than once a week) by a typical frontline police constable in New Zealand. Half of the items should be correctly identified as being encountered frequently, while the remainder should be correctly identified as being encountered infrequently. By summing the number of items correctly identified, an overall score out of 40 is obtained. At Time 1, the mean score was lower ($M = 34.28$, $SD = 3.26$), than at Time 2 ($M = 35.94$, $SD = 2.52$). The coefficient alpha estimate was .71 at Time 1 and .68 at Time 2.

To measure changes in job content expectations, the PES was scored by calculating the difference in responses for each item between Time 1 and Time 2 to obtain a change score for each item. Each item's score was then summed to yield an overall change score on the measure, which is indicative of the extent to which initial job content expectations were realistic. For example, a low
score would suggest that initial job content expectations were realistic, and a high score would suggest unrealistic initial job content expectations. The possible range of change scores on the PES was from 0 to 40. The present sample’s change scores ranged from 1 to 17 ($M = 6.44$, $SD = 3.21$). The PES change score was used in all subsequent analyses.

**Organisational Expectations**

A modification of Part II of the Personal Styles Inventory (PSI; Kunce, Cope, & Newton, 1986) was used to measure organisational expectations. This inventory was developed through extensive empirical research (Kunce, Decker, & Eckleman, 1976; Kunce & Tamkin, 1981) and is designed to measure enduring personality characteristics in three areas: emotional, activity, and cognitive styles. The PSI has demonstrated sound reliability and validity (Kunce, Cope, & Newton, 1991; Schauer, 1991).

Part II of the PSI includes definitions for the 24 personal styles (see Table 3). There are eight definitions for each of the personality domains. Participants are required to indicate the extent to which each definition is true of them, by means of a ten-point rating scale. The PSI yields scores between 3 and 30 on each of the 24 styles, with higher scores indicating the presence of the particular style. These scores are produced by including the rating on the appropriate scale, and the ratings on another two theoretically related scales. For example, in the emotional domain the overall score for zestful includes the zestful rating and the ratings for expansive and empathic. So each score is an amalgamation of three scores that are theoretically linked in the model.
Table 3

The 24 PSI Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Style</th>
<th>Activity Style</th>
<th>Cognitive Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zestful</td>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>Ideological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansive</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontive</td>
<td>Venturesome</td>
<td>Divergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restive</td>
<td>Restless</td>
<td>Individualistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest</td>
<td>Introspective</td>
<td>Realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Regulated</td>
<td>Convergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic</td>
<td>Amicable</td>
<td>Conventional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scale was adapted to assess participants’ perception of the goals and values of the police organisation. Participants indicated the extent to which each definition describes a *successful frontline police officer* (rather than themselves). Kunce and Anderson (1988) assessed the personality profile of the ideal police officer as perceived by police supervisors using this method. They used a five-point rating scale, rather than the original ten-point rating scale. The present study also adopted a five-point rating scale in accordance with Kunce and Anderson’s study, and with other measures used in the present questionnaire.

As the present study is concerned with assessing organisational expectations over time, the PSI was scored in the same manner as the PES. Change scores were derived by measuring the difference on each item between Time 1 and Time 2. These differences were then summed to indicate the extent to which initial expectations had been accurate. Change scores on the PSI had a
possible range of 0 to 96. The present sample's change scores ranged from 4 to 46 ($M = 17.41$, $SD = 5.32$).

**Physical health**

A single-item measure was used to assess self-rated physical health. Participants were asked to compare their present health to that of a person in excellent health, and to indicate their assessment on a seven-point scale ranging from 'Terrible' to 'Excellent'. Self-rated health has been shown to predict six-year mortality better than a comprehensive assessment of health completed by a physician (Mossey & Shapiro, 1982). Using a single-item measure of self-rated health, Idler and Kasl (1991) found that older adults who perceived their health as 'Poor' were six times more likely to die than those who perceived their health as 'Excellent'. It has also been found to be a good predictor of future coronary heart disease (Moller, Kristensen, & Hollnagel, 1996).

Scores on this single-item measure had a possible range of 1 to 7. At Time 2, the present sample's scores ranged from 2 to 7 ($M = .57$, $SD = .93$).

**Affect**

The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) was used to assess affect. The PANAS is a 20-item scale based on a two-factor model of affect. It comprises the 10-item Negative Affect scale and the 10-item Positive Affect scale. There are 20 single-word descriptions of emotions, to which respondents indicate the extent to which they describe how
they feel. The alpha reliabilities for the PANAS are reasonably high, with coefficients of 0.87 for both the Negative Affect and Positive Affect scales. The coefficient alpha estimates for the PA and NA scales in the present study were: Time 1, .82 and .81; Time 2, .87 and .80. Watson et al. (1988) also show good evidence of convergent and discriminant validity for each scale. Negative affect has been shown to be related to self-reported stress and coping (Wills, 1986), neuroticism (Wilson & Gullone, 1999), physical health complaints (Watson & Pennebaker, 1989), and to the occurrence of unfavourable events (Warr, Barter, & Brownbridge, 1983). Positive affect has been shown to be related to extraversion (Burger & Caldwell, 2000; Wilson & Gullone, 1999), social interactions and satisfaction, and to the occurrence of favourable events (Watson, 1988).

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which each item describes how they have felt during the past few weeks, on a five-point scale ranging from 'Very slightly or not at all' to 'Extremely'. The PANAS is scored by summing each item on both the Negative Affect and Positive Affect scales, so that a total score for each scale ranges from 10 – 50. At Time 2, the present sample's scores on the PA scale ranged from 17 to 50 ($M = 36.37$, $SD = 6.04$). Scores on the NA scale at Time 2 ranged from 10 to 40 ($M = 16.60$, $SD = 4.82$).

**Biographic items**

The questionnaire included several items to assess gender, age in years, ethnicity, educational level, familiarity with the police (whether someone they know well has ever worked for the New Zealand Police), and whether or not
participants had shiftwork experience. Participants were also asked to include their Query Identification Numbers, which is their Police identification code, so that they could be contacted in a year's time to complete the second survey.

Additional Measures: Time Two
All of the measures that were used in the initial questionnaire were also used in the follow-up questionnaire, with the exception of the biographic items. There were two versions of the follow-up questionnaire: one for males and one for females. This was to allow for the inclusion of the sexual harassment and discrimination measures. Berdahl, Magley, & Waldo (1994) suggest that men be excluded from investigations of sexual harassment for two reasons. The victims of sexual harassment are almost always women, and recent research indicates that it may not be appropriate to apply these conceptualisations to men.

Present station and background location
Participants were required to indicate whether they were posted to an urban or rural station as a police constable. In addition, they were asked to indicate whether they lived in an urban or rural location before beginning work as a police constable.

Organisational stress expectations
The 33-item administrative/organisational pressures scale of the Police Stress Survey (PSS; Spielberger et al., 1981) was used to measure organisational stressors at Time 2. Items for the PSS were generated from those stressors identified by Kroes et al. (1974), and from additional investigations. The original
80-item form was pilot tested on American police officers and subsequently modified to include 60 items. The principal axis method of factor analysis of the PSS yielded a two-factor structure; 1) administrative/organisational pressures; and 2) physical/psychological threats. Those items that had the highest loadings on the first factor were included in the present study, because the research focussed on expectations of administrative and organisational stress, and not the threat of danger.

The PSS requires participants to indicate both the frequency of exposure to each item, and the perceived stressfulness of each item, on a scale of 0 to 100. For the purposes of this research, participants were not required to make judgements of item stressfulness because the focus is on the discrepancy between actual exposure to stressors and expectations of exposure to stressors. After indicating the frequency of exposure to each item on a five-point rating scale ranging from never to more than ten times, participants were required to indicate the extent to which they had expected to encounter each of these stressors using the same rating scale. This scale was scored by recording the discrepancy between frequency of exposure and expected frequency of exposure to organisational stressors. Each item was then summed to yield an overall discrepancy score on the measure, which is indicative of the extent to which initial organisational stress expectations were accurate. A low discrepancy score would indicate accurate initial organisational stress expectations, while a high discrepancy score would suggest that these expectations were inaccurate. The possible range of discrepancy scores on the
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PSS was 0 to 128. The present sample's discrepancy scores on this measure ranged from 4 to 46 ($M = 25.66$, $SD = 10.25$).

**Sexual harassment expectations**

Female constable exposure to sexual harassment was measured using a modified version of a 7-item scale developed by Brown, Campbell, and Fife-Schaw (1995). Brown et al.'s measure includes a four-point rating scale of exposure frequency. The present study employed a five-point rating scale in accordance with that of the PSS. Participants in the present study were asked to indicate the frequency of their exposure to each item ranging from never to more than ten times. Brown et al. generated items for this scale through interviews with both police and civilian women regarding their exposure to sexual harassment. This scale has reasonably high internal reliability indicated by a coefficient alpha estimate of .82 (Brown et al., 1995). The alpha coefficient for the present sample was slightly lower at .72.

For the purposes of the present study, Brown et al.'s (1995) sexual harassment scale was modified to include a measure of *expected* frequency of exposure to sexual harassment. After indicating frequency of exposure to each of the seven items, participants in the present study were required to indicate the extent to which they had expected to be exposed to each of these elements of harassment. Participants responded to the same seven items by means of the five-point rating scale described above.
This sexual harassment measure was scored by calculating the difference between each item score in terms of frequency of exposure and expected frequency of exposure. These differences were summed to provide an overall score. Discrepancy scores on this measure had a possible range from 0 to 28. The present sample’s discrepancy scores ranged from 0 to 10 ($M = 2.70$, $SD = 1.60$).

**Sexual discrimination expectations**

Female constable exposure to sexual discrimination was measured using a 7-item scale developed by J. M. Brown (1998). Participants were asked to indicate how often they encountered certain tasks and situations compared to their male colleagues. Three response alternatives were available; 1) Less Often; 2) Equally; and 3) More Often. Previous research by Brown, Maidment, and Bull (1993) demonstrated that subjective assessments of deployment were an accurate indication of actual deployment patterns. Unfortunately, J. M. Brown did not report estimates of the measure’s internal reliability. The coefficient alpha estimate for the present sample was only .32.

For the purposes of the present study, J. M. Brown’s (1998) sexual discrimination scale was slightly modified to include expectations of task deployment as well as actual task deployment. Participants were required to retrospectively indicate the extent to which they had expected to encounter each task and situation in comparison to other male and female colleagues. Participants responded to the same seven items by means of the three-point rating scale described above. The sexual discrimination measure was scored in
the same manner as the sexual harassment measure. It yielded discrepancy scores with a possible range from 0 to 14. The present sample’s discrepancy scores ranged from 0 to 7 ($M = 2.34$, $SD = 1.83$).

Frequency of exposure and expected frequency of exposure to sexual harassment and discrimination were only measured at Time 2 for a number of reasons. Primarily, it is unlikely that female recruits would have had much information on which to base expectations of sexual harassment and discrimination as a police constable before working in this role. Secondly, had these scales been included at Time 1, they may have altered the formation of sexual harassment expectations.

**Reality shock (shock/rejection phase)**

Despite the existence of a number of investigations of reality shock, there are few measures of this phenomenon. Although burnout is a related concept and has several measures (e.g., J. W. Jones, 1980; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Pines & Aronson, 1981), it is still too removed a concept to aid in the assessment of reality shock.

As no appropriate measure of reality shock was available, a 28-item scale was developed to assess this construct using the rational approach (Jackson, 1971). A number of construct definitions of the shock and rejection phase of reality shock were examined to identify common underlying themes (e.g., Kramer, 1974; Sproull, Kiesler, & Zubrow, 1984; M. S. Taylor, 1988). Items were then developed to directly measure these constructs, ensuring high content validity.
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(see Appendix C for a description of the measure’s development). The coefficient alpha estimate for the present sample was .81. Preliminary analyses suggested that the Reality Shock Survey could be divided into three subscales; bitterness with the police organisation, intentions to continue a career in policing, and sense of well-being and self-esteem (see Appendix C). Reliability analyses conducted with the present sample indicated that these subscales were still legitimate, producing coefficient alpha estimates of .60, .75, and .71, respectively.

This measure was scored by summing each item to provide an overall score of reality shock. The scoring of 11 items was reversed so that a high score on the scale reflected greater reality shock. The possible range of scores on this measure was from 28 to 140. The present sample’s scores ranged from 32 to 89 ($M = 57.14$, $SD = 10.52$). Because the police recruits had not yet encountered the job tasks and situations fundamental to policing, reality shock was not measured at Time 1.

Psychological distress

The Hopkins Symptom Checklist – 21 (HSCL-21; Green, Walkey, McCormick, & Taylor, 1988) was used to assess psychological distress. The original 58-item form is widely used and is an invaluable means of recognising both physical and psychological symptoms in normal populations (Caplan et al., 1985). Participants were asked to respond to each item by means of a four-point rating scale, ranging from ‘Not at all distressing’ to ‘Extremely distressing’. The possible range of scores on the HSCL-21 was from 21 to 84. The present
Sample's scores ranged from 21 to 66 ($M = 29.19$, $SD = 7.08$). The HSCL-21 was not used at Time 1 because it was not necessary to extensively assess psychological distress at Time 1.

The 21-item version of the HSCL was used in the present study for several reasons (Green et al., 1988). Primarily, it is less time-consuming to complete and best suited to situations in which participant motivation may be lowered due to the administration of a battery of measures. Secondly, the HSCL-21 has demonstrated high internal reliability, with a coefficient alpha estimate of 0.90 for the total scale. The present sample yielded a similar coefficient alpha estimate of .89. Thirdly, factor analyses have yielded a distinct three-factor structure. The HSCL-21 measures General Feelings of Distress, Somatic Distress, and Performance Difficulty. A score for each factor is calculated by summing the responses for each item of the scale, with a high score reflecting a high level of symptom distress. Finally, the HSCL-21 was developed and evaluated using normal New Zealand respondents (Green et al., 1988).

**Job satisfaction**

A single-item measure was used to assess job satisfaction. This measure is equivalent to the Job-in-General Faces Scale (Kunin, 1955), and has been used repeatedly since its construction. Scarpello and Campbell (1983) note that although a number of researchers prefer to use facet measures of job satisfaction, there is no evidence that the single-item measure of job satisfaction is unreliable. More recently, a meta-analysis conducted by Wanous, Reichers, and Hudy (1997) attested to the reliability and validity of single-item measures
of overall job satisfaction. They found a corrected correlation of .67 between single-item measures and scale measures of job satisfaction.

The present study asked participants how satisfied they are with their job in general. They were required to indicate their satisfaction on a five-point rating scale ranging from 'Not satisfied' to 'Extremely satisfied'. The present sample's scores on this measure ranged from 2 to 5 ($M = 3.98, SD = .75$). Job satisfaction was not measured at Time 1 because the police recruits were still training and had not yet begun work in a policing role.

**Procedure**

**Time 1**

All participants were surveyed on the Thursday or Friday of their first week of training at the Royal New Zealand Police College in Porirua. It was essential to survey the recruits as early as possible in their training, to minimise any socialisation effects. The researcher met with each wing in a lecture theatre, and explained the nature and purposes of the study. They were informed that should they agree to participate, a further questionnaire would be sent to them in one year's time after they had completed approximately six months' work experience.

Participants were advised that participation was voluntary, and that their responses to the questionnaire would be completely confidential. It was explained to them that although the New Zealand Police had approved the study, none of their employees would see any participant's responses to the
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questionnaire. Rather, data would be given to the New Zealand Police in summary form, so as not to identify any individuals. Once these issues had been explained, an information sheet and questionnaire (see Appendix D) were distributed to each recruit.

Participants were given as long as they required to complete the questionnaire; usually between five and ten minutes. The researcher was available to answer any questions the recruits might have. Once completed, they were handed to the researcher who thanked them for their participation.

Time 2

Approximately one year after the administration of the first questionnaire, a second questionnaire (see Appendixes E and F) was distributed to each participant via the New Zealand Police internal mailing system. By this time, each participant had been working for approximately six months as a police constable. The constables were surveyed at this time as, theoretically, they would be most likely to be experiencing the shock and rejection phase of the reality shock process. Participants were located using their Query Identification (QID) numbers, which they supplied in the first questionnaire. The QID number of each participant was given to the Senior Psychologist for the New Zealand Police, who provided the researcher with corresponding names and station addresses. An information sheet reminding participants about the nature and purposes of the study accompanied each questionnaire. Completed questionnaires were placed in a ‘prepaid’ envelope provided, and returned to the researcher by public post.
This resulted in an initial response rate of 37% ($n = 103$). Those participants who had failed to return their questionnaire within three weeks of receiving it were sent another copy with a personalised covering letter (see Appendix G). Following this reminder, a further 23% ($n = 65$) of the questionnaires were returned. In a further three weeks' time, the remaining participants who had yet to return a questionnaire were faxed a letter inviting them to complete the questionnaire (see Appendix H). This resulted in an additional 8% ($n = 23$) of questionnaires being returned, with a total return rate of 68% ($N = 191$).

All materials and procedures used in the present study were approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee, and adhered to the guidelines specified by the New Zealand Psychological Society.
Chapter Ten

RESULTS

Analyses
The statistical package, SPSS/PC (Norusis, 1992) was used for all data analyses, with an alpha level set at .05. Two-tailed tests were used for all analyses, except for the hypothesis testing which used one-tailed tests. Analyses were undertaken in four main stages. First, the research goals concerning the study variables were fulfilled by comparing Time 1 and Time 2 data or discrepancy scores, or by measuring the data at Time 2. Second, the relationships between the extraneous variables and the study variables were assessed using one-way ANOVA and bivariate correlation. Third, hypotheses one to seven were tested using one-tailed Pearson's $r$ correlations, owing to the hypotheses being directional. Fourth, hypothesis eight was tested using multiple regression analyses.

Data Screening
Before the main analyses were conducted, the data were screened for errors in data entry, missing values, and the fit between variable distributions and the assumptions of multivariate analyses.

Missing data were randomly distributed across the variables. In the regression analyses, the missing data were substituted by the mean for that particular variable. This was done to retain the remaining information from those cases so
that they could still be included in the analyses. Missing data for the nominal demographic variables were not replaced.

The data were also screened for multivariate outliers. Four cases were omitted from the regression analyses because of extreme Mahalanobis $D^2$ scores (> 8.00) and z-scores (> 3.00) for reality shock, negative affect, and the HSCL-21.

Normal probability and residual plots were used to verify normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, and independence of residuals. HSCL-21 scores were positively skewed (skewness = .82, kurtosis = -.03). For use as a dependent variable in regression analyses, a log transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989) was used to improve normality (skewness = .44, kurtosis = -.64). Independence of residuals was further affirmed through the Durbin-Watson test, which showed values close to 2.00.

Sample Description

Comparison of Responders vs. Non-responders at Time 2

Of the 287 police recruits who completed the questionnaire at Time 1, 96 failed to return the second questionnaire. Chi-square tests and ANOVAs were conducted to determine whether the responders and non-responders differed on any of the extraneous variables or measures used at Time 1. Three extraneous variables were dichotomised owing to unequal variances between groups. Ethnicity was also made into a dichotomous variable. Europeans constituted one group, and all other ethnicities were grouped together to form another group. Educational level was made into a dichotomous variable by
grouping those with no school qualification or a school certificate together, and by grouping those with a sixth form certificate qualification or higher together.

Wing membership was also dichotomised, owing to Wing 3’s scores on the HSCL-21 being significantly different from the remaining wings. Wing 3 constituted one group, and Wings 1, 2, and 4 constituted the other group.

The chi-square tests showed that responders and non-responders were not equivalent for two factors. There was a significant difference between responders and non-responders for ethnicity, $\chi^2 (1, N = 280) = 7.08, p < .01$. Responders who were European were more likely to return the second questionnaire than responders who were non-European.

There was also a significant difference for wing membership, $\chi^2 (1, N = 287) = 5.27, p < .01$. Recruits from Wings 1, 2, and 4 together were more likely to return the second questionnaire than recruits from Wing 3.

Finally, ANOVAs showed a significant difference between responders and non-responders for job content expectations, $F (1, 286) = 4.18, p < .05$. Responders had more realistic job content expectations ($M = 34.61, SD = 2.86$) than non-responders ($M = 33.88, SD = 2.74$).

**Comparison of Sample Across Time on Study Variables**

The following section addresses the research goals and outlines noteworthy differences found for each of the variables under investigation (see Table 4). The research goals required a comparison between Time 1 and Time 2 for
some variables (job content expectations, organisational expectations, physical health, and affect), and a comparison between exposure to incidents and expected exposure to incidents for other variables (organisational stress expectations and sexual harassment/discrimination expectations). The remaining variables (reality shock, psychological distress, and job satisfaction) were only measured at Time 2.

Table 4

Mean Comparison of Study Variables between Time 1 and Time 2 (N = 187)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Time 1 Mean</th>
<th>Time 1 SD</th>
<th>Time 2 Mean</th>
<th>Time 2 SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectation Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Content Expectations</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Expectations</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Stress Expectations</td>
<td>25.83</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment Expectations</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Discrimination Expectations</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reality Shock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.04</td>
<td>10.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Outcome Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Health</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Distress</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>40.29</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expectation Variables

Job content expectations

The first research goal was to measure the extent to which job content expectations change over time. There was a significant difference in job content expectations between Time 1 and Time 2, $t(186) = -5.09, p < .001$. Responses
on the Policing Expectations Scale (PES) became more realistic from Time 1 \((M = 34.65, \ SD = 2.84)\) to Time 2 \((M = 36.00, \ SD = 2.38)\).

A comparison of PES item scores between Time 1 and Time 2 showed several similarities. The tasks and situations with the highest and lowest mean scores were similar between Time 1 and Time 2 (see Table 5). ‘Making inquiries’ and ‘Writing down notes in a notebook’ had the highest mean scores at Time 1, eliciting a ‘Frequently’ response from the entire sample. At Time 2, the item with the highest mean score changed to ‘Preparing an incident file’. This item was also judged a frequently encountered task by the entire sample. ‘Discharging a firearm’ had the lowest mean score at Time 1. This item also had the lowest mean score at Time 2, along with the items ‘Raiding escort services’ and ‘Resuscitating people’. All three items were judged as infrequent tasks or situations by the entire sample at Time 2.

The item that showed the highest mean change between Time 1 and Time 2 was ‘Doing watch-house duty’. This item decreased 6% from Time 1 \((M = 1.62)\) to Time 2 \((M = 1.50)\). The item that showed the least mean change between Time 1 and Time 2 was ‘Dealing with drunk people’. This item’s mean score remained consistent over the two test administrations \((M = 1.99)\).
Table 5

Mean Comparison of Frequently and Infrequently Responses on the PES by the Sample at Time 1 and Time 2 (N = 187)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time 1 Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Time 2 Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Change*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making inquiries</td>
<td>2.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>1.98 (0.13)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing down notes in a notebook</td>
<td>2.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>1.99 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with drunk people</td>
<td>1.99 (0.01)</td>
<td>1.99 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering public inquiries</td>
<td>1.98 (0.10)</td>
<td>1.97 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing an incident file</td>
<td>1.98 (0.13)</td>
<td>2.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing a court file</td>
<td>1.92 (0.27)</td>
<td>1.99 (0.10)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Infrequently                |                  |                  |         |
| Discharging a firearm      | 1.01 (0.01)      | 1.00 (0.00)      | 0.50    |
| Extinguishing small fires  | 1.02 (0.13)      | 1.01 (0.10)      | 0.50    |
| Raiding escort services    | 1.02 (0.13)      | 1.00 (0.00)      | 1.00    |
| Resuscitating people       | 1.02 (0.14)      | 1.00 (0.00)      | 1.00    |
| Aiding customs officers    | 1.03 (0.16)      | 1.01 (0.01)      | 1.00    |

* The mean scores were divided by two (the highest possible score for each item) and multiplied by 100 to yield a percentage.

Organisational expectations

The second research goal was to measure the extent to which organisational expectations change over time. The Personal Styles Inventory (PSI) was scored by calculating the difference between each item's response at Time 1 and Time 2. The mean difference between Time 1 and Time 2 was 17.46 (SD = 5.33).

The personal styles with the highest and lowest mean scores were similar between Time 1 and Time 2 (see Table 6). 'Practical/Realistic' and 'Focused/Convergent' had the highest mean scores at both Time 1 and Time 2, while 'Restless/searching' and 'Strong-willed/Restive' had the lowest mean scores.
Table 6

Comparison of Mean Ratings of Importance for Each Attribute Between Kunce & Anderson's (1988) Study and the Present Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Style</th>
<th>Kunce &amp; Anderson (1988)</th>
<th>Present Study Time 1 (SD)</th>
<th>Present Study Time 2 (SD)</th>
<th>% Change Between T1 &amp; T2*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic/Cheerful</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.5 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.8)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansive/Self-Assured</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.7 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.8)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confronting/Spirited</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.9 (1.2)</td>
<td>2.7 (1.1)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong-Willed/Restive</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3 (0.7)</td>
<td>1.7 (0.8)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved/Quiet</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.6 (1.2)</td>
<td>2.7 (1.0)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest/Unassuming</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.7 (0.9)</td>
<td>1.7 (0.8)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient/Considerate</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>3.5 (1.0)</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic/Encouraging</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6 (1.1)</td>
<td>2.5 (1.0)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliating/Sociable</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.8 (0.8)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement-Seeking/Energising</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2 (0.7)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.7)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venturing/Daring</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6 (0.8)</td>
<td>1.6 (0.8)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restless/Searching</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3 (0.7)</td>
<td>1.4 (0.6)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitary/Autonomous</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.9 (1.1)</td>
<td>3.0 (0.9)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Occupied/Introspecting</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.7 (0.9)</td>
<td>1.9 (0.9)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulating/Cautious</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1 (0.9)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.9)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeable/Amicable</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.2 (0.8)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated/Ideological</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.3 (1.0)</td>
<td>2.2 (1.0)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative/Abstract</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0 (0.9)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.9)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiring/Divergent</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0 (0.7)</td>
<td>3.9 (0.8)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic/Questioning</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.0 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.8 (0.9)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeptical/Empirical</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1 (0.9)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.9)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical/Realistic</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.6 (0.6)</td>
<td>4.5 (0.6)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused/Convergent</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.2 (0.8)</td>
<td>3.8 (0.8)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional/Traditional</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.3 (1.0)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.9)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean scores were divided by five (the highest possible score for each item) and multiplied by 100 to yield a percentage.

The greatest mean change in responses between Time 1 and Time 2 occurred for the 'Patient/Considerate' personal style. This style's mean score increased 10% from Time 1 ($M = 4.00$) to Time 2 ($M = 3.50$). 'Modest/Unassuming',
Results

'Venturing/Daring', and 'Imaginative/Abstract' personal styles showed no mean change in responses between Time 1 and Time 2.

A study by Kunce and Anderson (1988) asked police supervisors to rate each item of the PSI in order of its importance to an ideal police officer. They also used a five-point scale, but with different anchors (0 to 4, rather than 1 to 5), so their mean ratings have been adjusted by one point to be in accordance with the scale used in the present study. The results of their study and those of the present study show marked time and cultural differences (see Table 6). While the 'Practical/Realistic' style was recognised by the participants in Kunce and Anderson's study as desirable in a police officer, their participants did not see the 'Focused/Convergent' style as desirable as some other styles. 'Regulating/Cautious' and 'Reserved/quiet' were the fifth most agreed upon desirable styles in Kunce and Anderson's study but were ranked considerably lower by participants in the present study. Similarly, styles seen as necessary for an ideal police officer in the present study were seen as less necessary by participants in Kunce and Anderson's study. 'Individualistic/Questioning' and 'Patient/Considerate' were viewed as necessary styles in an ideal police officer at both Time 1 and Time 2. Although patience and consideration were seen as helpful to police officers in Kunce et al.'s study, the 'Individualistic/Questioning' style was judged more undesirable in a police officer than in the present study.

'Restless/Searching' and 'Strong-willed/Restive' elicited the greatest agreement between studies as styles discouraged in the ideal police officer. However, the present study and Kunce and Anderson's (1988) study showed surprising
contrasts in terms of other styles judged as undesirable in a police officer. For example, participants in Kunce and Anderson's study viewed ‘Confronting/Spirited’, ‘Conventional/Traditional’, ‘Excitement-seeking/Energising’, and ‘Skeptical/Empirical’ as very undesirable styles, yet participants in the present study judged these styles less harshly. Similarly, ‘Modest/Unassuming’, ‘Self-occupied/Introspecting’, and ‘Dedicated/Ideological’ were viewed as undesirable styles in the present study, but were judged more favourably in Kunce and Anderson's study.

The personal style that showed the greatest difference between the two studies was ‘Individualistic/Questioning’, with participants in the present study judging this style to be more desirable than in Kunce and Anderson's study. The personal style that showed the least difference between the two studies was ‘Venturing/Daring’. Participants in both studies concurred that this was an undesirable personal style in a successful frontline police constable.

Organisational stress expectations

The fourth research goal was to measure both the frequency of exposure, and the expected frequency of exposure to organisational stressors of a sample of New Zealand Police constables. There was a significant difference between frequency of exposure and expected frequency of exposure to organisational stress, $t(186) = 6.87, p < .001$. Constables encountered organisational stressors ($M = 87.67, SD = 19.66$) more often than they expected to ($M = 79.12, SD = 18.22$).
Scores on the Police Stress Survey (PSS) indicated that several of the organisational stressors had been encountered by most of the sample. Furthermore, there were many similarities between the most and least frequently encountered stressors, and expected organisational stressors (see Table 6). ‘Excessive paperwork’ and ‘Changing from day to night shift’ were the two most frequently encountered and expected stressors. While ‘Court leniency with criminals’ was the third most frequently encountered organisational stressor, it was the eighth most frequently expected stressor. ‘Demands for high moral standards’ was the fifth most frequently expected stressor, but only the tenth most frequently encountered stressor.

The least frequently encountered and expected organisational stressors showed more discrepancies. ‘Excessive or inappropriate discipline’ and ‘Inadequate support by supervisor’ were the two least frequently encountered and expected organisational stressors. However, the only other stressor that appeared as both an infrequently encountered and expected stressor was ‘Inadequate support from the department’.

When the items were examined in terms of discrepancies between expectations and reality, ‘Court leniency with criminals’ showed the greatest discrepancy. This item’s mean discrepancy was 15.40% from encountered ($M = 3.74$) to expected ($M = 2.97$). ‘Competition for advancement’ showed no discrepancy between expectations and reality.
Table 7

Mean Comparison of Most and Least Frequently Encountered and Expected Organisational Stressors (N = 187)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Frequent Organisational Stressors</th>
<th>Encountered Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Expected Mean (SD)</th>
<th>% Difference *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excessive paperwork</td>
<td>4.20 (1.10)</td>
<td>3.66 (1.22)</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing from day to night shift</td>
<td>4.16 (1.27)</td>
<td>4.22 (1.18)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court leniency with criminals</td>
<td>3.74 (1.24)</td>
<td>2.97 (1.35)</td>
<td>15.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing negative attitudes toward police officers</td>
<td>3.69 (1.37)</td>
<td>3.45 (1.50)</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public criticism of the police</td>
<td>3.54 (1.21)</td>
<td>3.44 (1.33)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands for high moral standards</td>
<td>3.21 (1.46)</td>
<td>3.40 (1.48)</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Frequent Organisational Stressors</th>
<th>Encountered Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Expected Mean (SD)</th>
<th>% Difference *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excessive or inappropriate discipline</td>
<td>1.38 (0.60)</td>
<td>1.51 (0.79)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate support by supervisor</td>
<td>1.77 (1.09)</td>
<td>1.45 (0.70)</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition for advancement</td>
<td>1.79 (1.04)</td>
<td>1.79 (1.04)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate support by department</td>
<td>1.89 (1.12)</td>
<td>1.65 (0.88)</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court appearances on day off or following night shift</td>
<td>1.92 (0.84)</td>
<td>1.95 (0.92)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor or inadequate supervision</td>
<td>2.09 (1.26)</td>
<td>1.58 (0.78)</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plea bargainings and technical rulings leading to case dismissal</td>
<td>1.98 (1.01)</td>
<td>1.83 (0.90)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean scores were divided by five (the highest possible score for each item) and multiplied by 100 to yield a percentage.
Results

**Sexual harassment and discrimination expectations**

The fourth and fifth research goals were to measure both the frequency of exposure and expected exposure to sexual harassment and discrimination amongst a sample of female police constables. There were no significant differences between constables’ exposure ($M = 12.64$, $SD = 4.48$) and expected exposure to sexual harassment ($M = 12.81$, $SD = 3.94$). There were also no significant differences between constables’ exposure ($M = 14.40$, $SD = 1.60$) and expected exposure to sexual discrimination ($M = 14.36$, $SD = 1.40$).

A comparison of frequency of encountered and expected incidents of sexual harassment yielded several similarities (see Table 8). The items with the highest mean scores were exposure to ‘Suggestive comments about other women’s figures or appearance’, followed by exposure to ‘Suggestive stories or jokes about women in general’. The item with the lowest mean score was ‘Being subject to a serious sexual assault’, which no constable in the present sample had experienced. When the frequency of expected incidents of sexual harassment were examined, four items showed a difference between their ranking as an encountered and as an expected incident. The item that showed the greatest discrepancy between expectations and reality was ‘Suggestive stories or jokes about women in general’. This item’s mean discrepancy was 5.60% from encountered ($M = 2.86$) to expected ($M = 3.14$). Policewoman had expected to encounter this form of harassment more often than it actually occurred. The item that showed the least discrepancy between expectations and reality was ‘Being subject to a serious sexual assault’. There was no discrepancy between expectations and reality for this item.
Table 8

*Mean Comparison of Frequency of Encountered and Expected Incidents of Sexual Harassment (n = 44)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Encountered Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Expected Mean (SD)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heard comments about other women’s figures or appearance</td>
<td>3.23 (1.65)</td>
<td>3.05 (1.51)</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard suggestive stories or jokes about women in general</td>
<td>2.86 (1.59)</td>
<td>3.14 (1.44)</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard suggestive comments or jokes about your own figure or appearance</td>
<td>1.84 (1.18)</td>
<td>1.88 (1.04)</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been subjected to any unwanted and/or unreciprocated verbal or physical conduct</td>
<td>1.30 (0.67)</td>
<td>1.57 (0.99)</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been stroked, touched, or pinched</td>
<td>1.25 (0.53)</td>
<td>1.07 (0.33)</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been subjected to persistent requests for dates</td>
<td>1.16 (0.57)</td>
<td>1.10 (0.29)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been subject to a serious sexual assault</td>
<td>1.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean scores were divided by five (the highest possible score for each item) and multiplied by 100 to yield a percentage.

In general, female police constables were not exposed to sexual discrimination in any area measured (see Table 9). Note that a mean score of 2.00 would indicate that the sample had encountered the deployment equally as often as their male colleagues. A mean score of 3.00 would indicate deployment had been encountered more often, and a mean score of 1.00 would indicate deployment had been encountered less often than their male colleagues.
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The item with the highest mean score was 'Inside station duty'; female police constables were slightly more likely to encounter this task than their male colleagues. 'Dealing with violent offenders' had the lowest mean score; female police constables were slightly less likely to encounter this situation than male police constables. The greatest mean discrepancy between expectations and reality also occurred for above two items \((M = 0.18)\). Women expected to encounter these situations as equally often as men. 'Safe beats' had the lowest mean discrepancy score \((M = 0.00)\).

Table 9

Mean Comparison of Frequency of Encountered and Expected Deployment Compared to Colleagues \((n = 45)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Encountered Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Expected Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside station duty</td>
<td>2.22 (0.56)</td>
<td>2.07 (0.50)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with young offenders</td>
<td>2.16 (0.42)</td>
<td>2.04 (0.30)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanied patrol</td>
<td>2.11 (0.44)</td>
<td>2.16 (0.42)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public order duty</td>
<td>2.04 (0.52)</td>
<td>1.98 (0.34)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with sex offence victims</td>
<td>2.04 (0.67)</td>
<td>2.11 (0.53)</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe beats</td>
<td>2.02 (0.40)</td>
<td>2.02 (0.40)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with violent offenders</td>
<td>1.80 (0.55)</td>
<td>1.98 (0.34)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean scores were divided by three (the highest possible score for each item) and multiplied by 100 to yield a percentage.

Note: A mean score of 2.00 indicates equal deployment.
Results

Reality Shock

The RSS yielded an overall mean score of 57.04 ($SD = 10.29$). This mean score was relatively low, considering the measure's possible range is from 28 to 140. Most individual item scores on the RSS were in the expected direction with the exception of 'I can learn a lot from my mistakes' (see Table 10). This item was expected to be rated more highly as it is a positive virtue.

Health Outcome Variables

The sixth research goal was to measure health symptoms in a sample of New Zealand Police constables. Health symptoms were measured with the single item measure of physical health, the HSCL-21, and the PANAS.

Physical health

The physical health item was administered at Time 1 and Time 2. There was a significant difference between health ratings at Time 1 and Time 2, $t (186) = 4.83, p < .001$. Ratings of physical health decreased between Time 1 ($M = 5.99, SD = 0.86$) and Time 2 ($M = 5.66, SD = 0.92$). Forty-seven percent of participants did not change their health rating between Time 1 and Time 2, while one participant's health changed five points.
Table 10

Mean Comparison of Most and Least True Scores on the RSS (N = 187)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most True Items</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My home life has become very important</td>
<td>4.06 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been well-prepared for the job</td>
<td>2.90 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything I learned at the Police College has been very useful on the job</td>
<td>2.71 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel in control on the job</td>
<td>2.55 (0.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my former instructors at the Police College were ‘in touch’ with policing</td>
<td>2.50 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least True Items</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have contacted former instructors at the Police College for reassurance</td>
<td>1.05 (0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that I am a failure</td>
<td>1.14 (0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mistrust what my former instructors at the Police College taught me</td>
<td>1.25 (0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can learn a lot from my mistakes</td>
<td>1.42 (0.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel bitter toward the police organisation</td>
<td>1.44 (0.85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Psychological distress

Before transformation, the HSCL-21 yielded a mean score of 29.06 (SD = 6.82). Overall, responses on this measure were very low, with most participants judging the items to be “Not at all distressing”.

The item with the highest mean score was “Worried about sloppiness or carelessness”. The item with the lowest mean score was “Hot or cold spells”.
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The most distressing items are concerned with completing tasks thoroughly and accurately, while the least distressing items involve somatic complaints (see Table 11).

Table 11

Mean Comparison of Most and Least Distressing Items on the HSCL-21 (N = 187)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Distressing Items</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worried about sloppiness or carelessness</td>
<td>1.84 (0.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having to do things very slowly in order to make sure you are doing them right</td>
<td>1.66 (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having to check and double check what you do</td>
<td>1.61 (0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaming yourself for things</td>
<td>1.62 (0.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble remembering things</td>
<td>1.58 (0.60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Distressing Items</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hot or cold spells</td>
<td>1.10 (0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbness or tingling in parts of your body</td>
<td>1.11 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lump in your throat</td>
<td>1.12 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakness in parts of your body</td>
<td>1.22 (0.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling that people are unfriendly or dislike you</td>
<td>1.25 (0.50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affect

There was a significant difference in Positive Affect scale scores of the PANAS between Time 1 and Time 2, $t (186) = 8.03$, $p < .001$. The mean score on this
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scale decreased between Time 1 ($M = 40.29, SD = 5.75$) and Time 2 ($M = 36.39, SD = 5.82$). There was also a significant difference in Negative Affect scale scores of the PANAS between Time 1 and Time 2, $t(186) = 4.76, p < .001$. The mean score on this scale also decreased between Time 1 ($M = 18.29, SD = 5.39$) and Time 2 ($M = 16.41, SD = 4.43$).

A comparison of mean scores on the PANAS showed several similarities. The items 'Interested' and 'Enthusiastic' had the highest mean scores at both Time 1 and Time 2. While the items 'Active' and 'Excited' both were given high scores while the participants were in training, these two items were less highly rated at Time 2. It is worth noting that all of the items with high mean scores at both Time 1 and Time 2 were from the positive affect scale of the PANAS.

The item 'Ashamed' had the lowest mean score at both Time 1 and Time 2, and was followed by the items 'Hostile' and 'Guilty' which also had low scores at both Time 1 and Time 2 (see Table 12). While 'Irritable' had a low score at Time 1, it had a slightly higher score at Time 2. The items 'Jittery' and 'Scared' were given low scores at Time 2 and slightly higher scores at Time 1.

The changes in responses between Time 1 and Time 2 were particularly interesting. The 'upset' item showed the least change, decreasing only 0.60% between Time 1 ($M = 1.66$) and Time 2 ($M = 1.63$). However, the 'jittery' item showed the greatest change, decreasing 18.40% from Time 1 ($M = 2.23$) to Time 2 ($M = 1.31$).
## Table 12

**Mean Comparison of Most and Least True Items on the PANAS by the Sample at Time 1 and Time 2 (N = 187)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most True Items</th>
<th>Mean Time 1 (SD)</th>
<th>Mean Time 2 (SD)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>4.53 (0.62)</td>
<td>4.11 (0.77)</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>4.45 (0.65)</td>
<td>3.94 (0.78)</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>4.32 (0.72)</td>
<td>3.83 (0.81)</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>4.17 (0.71)</td>
<td>3.72 (0.89)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>4.04 (0.85)</td>
<td>3.23 (0.98)</td>
<td>16.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td>4.00 (0.66)</td>
<td>3.83 (0.69)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert</td>
<td>3.85 (0.73)</td>
<td>3.76 (0.70)</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least True Items</th>
<th>Mean Time 1 (SD)</th>
<th>Mean Time 2 (SD)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashamed</td>
<td>1.07 (0.33)</td>
<td>1.12 (0.41)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>1.09 (0.36)</td>
<td>1.61 (0.80)</td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilty</td>
<td>1.15 (0.42)</td>
<td>1.32 (0.69)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>1.66 (0.87)</td>
<td>1.63 (0.86)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritable</td>
<td>1.72 (0.88)</td>
<td>2.10 (0.93)</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jittery</td>
<td>2.23 (1.08)</td>
<td>1.31 (0.60)</td>
<td>18.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>2.01 (1.04)</td>
<td>1.53 (0.72)</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean scores were divided by five (the highest possible score for each item) and multiplied by 100 to yield a percentage.

### Job Satisfaction

The seventh research goal was to measure job satisfaction. Police constables' job satisfaction was relatively high \((M = 3.99, SD = .72)\). Nearly 99% of the sample rated their job satisfaction as moderate or better.

### Extraneous Variables

Between-groups variation was investigated using one-way ANOVAs, with the expectation variables, reality shock, health outcome variables, and job satisfaction as dependent variables. The extraneous variables constituted the
Results

independent variables, except for age, which was tested via bivariate correlation.

Extraneous Variables and Expectation Scores

The mean scores and $F$ values for the ANOVAs performed on the between-groups differences in the extraneous variables for the expectation variables can be seen in Table 13. There was a significant difference in job content expectation change scores between genders, $F(1, 186) = 4.88, p < .05$. Males' change scores were higher than females' change scores on this measure.

The only significant difference on PSI change scores was between different educational levels, $F(1, 186) = 5.38, p < .05$. Those participants with the highest level of education had the lowest change scores on the PSI.

ANOVA comparing PSS discrepancy scores and gender, age, ethnicity, educational level, familiarity with the police, background location, and wing membership yielded no significant differences. The only significant difference was between present stations, $F(1, 186) = 4.75, p < .05$, and different shiftwork experiences, $F(1, 186) = 4.76, p < .05$. Participants currently working at a rural police station and those without shiftwork experience showed greater discrepancies between expectations and reality on the PSS. There were no significant between groups differences on either the sexual harassment or the sexual discrimination measures.
Table 13

*Means and Significant F Ratios Showing Between-Groups Differences in the Extraneous Variables for the Expectation Variables (N = 187)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectation Variable</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.07 (2.76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.09 (1.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No School Certificate/School Certificate</td>
<td>19.50 (7.38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form Certificate or Above</td>
<td>17.07 (4.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Stress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Station</td>
<td>25.14 (10.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Station</td>
<td>29.71 (10.08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiftwork Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23.81 (8.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.15 (11.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Extraneous Variables and Reality Shock Scale Scores

There were significant differences in RSS scores between genders, $F(1, 186) = 6.75, p < .05$, with female constables having greater RSS scores than males.

There was also a significant difference between constables from different backgrounds, $F(1, 186) = 4.43, p < .05$, with constables from rural backgrounds having higher scores on the RSS than constables from urban backgrounds.

Means and $F$ values for these variables can be seen in Table 14.
Extraneous Variables and Health Outcomes and Job Satisfaction

The significant $F$ values for the ANOVAs between the health outcomes and extraneous variables are also presented in Table 14. Time 2 scores on the single-item measure of health were not significant for any of the extraneous variables.

Wing membership showed significant between-groups differences on HSCL-21 scores, $F(1, 186) = 4.96, p < .05$. Members of Wing 3 had higher scores on the HSCL-21 than members of the remaining wings.

There were significant differences in Positive Affect scale scores between genders, $F(1, 186) = 4.26, p < .05$. Males had higher scores on this scale of the PANAS than females.

There was a small but statistically significant negative correlation between the single-item measure of job satisfaction and age, $r(187) = -.15, p < .05$. 
# Table 14

**Means and Significant F Ratios Showing Between-Groups Differences in the Extraneous Variables for Reality Shock and Health Outcome Variables (N = 187)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reality Shock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55.96 (9.32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.47 (12.40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>55.95 (10.48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>59.30 (9.61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Distress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 4</td>
<td>28.20 (5.81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32.05 (9.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Affect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36.88 (5.84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34.84 (5.53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

## Hypothesis Testing

**Job Content Expectations and Reality Shock**

The first hypothesis was that changes in job content expectations would be positively related to reality shock symptoms. Bivariate correlations indicated that there was no significant relationship between job content expectations and reality shock. Participants who had higher change scores on the PES did not
have greater Reality Shock Scale (RSS) scores than participants who had lower change scores on the PES (see Table 15).

A small number of participants were working as traffic or incident response constables, traffic safety officers, shift/watch-house keepers, or communicators(dispatchers (n = 54), rather than general duties constables. It is possible that the position recruits were given after graduation affected their responses on the PES in particular. However, when those police officers who were not working as general duties constables were removed from the sample, bivariate correlations still failed to show a significant relationship between job content expectations and reality shock.

Organisational Expectations and Reality Shock

The second hypothesis was that there would be a positive relationship between change scores on the Personal Styles Inventory (PSI) and reality shock symptoms. There was no significant correlation between these two variables. Participants who had higher change scores on the PSI did not have greater RSS scores than participants who had lower change scores (see Table 15).

Organisational Stress Expectations and Reality Shock

The third hypothesis was that there would be a positive relationship between discrepancy scores on the Police Stress Survey (PSS) and reality shock symptoms. There was a weak but significant positive correlation between these two variables, $r (187) = .21, p < .01$. Police constables with a high discrepancy between actual and expected exposure to organisational stress tended to have
greater RSS scores than constables with low discrepancy scores (see Table 15).

**Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Expectations and Reality Shock**

The fourth and fifth hypotheses were that there would be a positive relationship between discrepancy scores on the measures of sexual harassment and discrimination, and RSS scores. No significant correlation was found with RSS scores for sexual harassment. Female constables who had high discrepancy scores on this measure had similar RSS scores to female constables who had low discrepancy scores. There was a weak but significant positive correlation between sexual discrimination and reality shock, $r(45) = .28, p < .05$. Female constables who had high discrepancy scores on this measure also tended to have high RSS scores. Bivariate correlations for all of the expectation variables and reality shock are shown in Table 15.

**Health Outcomes and Reality Shock**

The sixth hypothesis was that scores on the physical health item, the HSCL-21, and the PANAS would be related to RSS scores. Bivariate correlations indicated significant correlations between each of the health measures and RSS scores; physical health item, $r(187) = -.38, p < .001$; the HSCL-21, $r(187) = .57, p < .001$; Positive Affect scale of the PANAS, $r(187) = -.46, p < .001$; and the Negative Affect scale of the PANAS, $r(187) = .57, p < .001$. Participants who had high scores on the physical health item, the HSCL-21, and the Negative Affect scale of the PANAS tended to have higher RSS scores than those participants with low scores. Further, participants with low scores on the
Positive Affect scale of the PANAS tended to have higher scores on the RSS than participants with high scores on this affect scale (see Table 15).

**Job Satisfaction and Reality Shock**

The seventh hypothesis was that there would be a negative relationship between job satisfaction and RSS scores. Bivariate correlations showed a significant negative correlation between these two variables, $r(189) = -.50, p < .001$. Participants with a low score on the single-item measure of job satisfaction tended to have higher RSS scores than participants with high scores on the job satisfaction measure. Bivariate correlations between reality shock, health outcome variables, and job satisfaction are presented in Table 15.

**Table 15**

*Significant Pearson's r Correlations between Reality Shock, and Expectation Variables, Health Outcome Variables, and Job Satisfaction (n = 187)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Reality Shock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectation Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Content</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Stress</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Discrimination</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Outcome Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Health</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Distress</td>
<td>.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>-.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>-.50***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$  ** $p < .01$  *** $p < .001$ (one-tailed)
Regression of Expectation Variables on Health Outcomes and Job Satisfaction

The eighth research goal was to test whether reality shock mediates the relationship between policing expectations, and health outcomes and job satisfaction. The eighth hypothesis was that reality shock would mediate the relationship between policing expectations, and health outcomes and job satisfaction.

Bivariate correlations were performed between all of the study variables, and the Pearson’s $r$ correlations are reported in Table 16. Job content and organisational expectations were weakly related to all of the outcome variables, with correlation coefficients ranging from .01 to .10. Organisational stress expectations was the only expectation variable to be statistically significantly related to reality shock and any outcome variables. The significant correlations found between organisational stress expectations, reality shock, psychological distress, negative affect, and job satisfaction were examined further using multiple regression analysis. The relationships between sexual harassment and the outcome variables varied in strength, ranging from .01 to .20. The strong association between sexual harassment and negative affect was not statistically significant. Sexual discrimination had fairly equal correlation coefficients with all of the outcome variables, ranging from .11 to .15.
Table 16

Pearson's \( r \) Correlations Between the Expectation Variables and Outcome Variables (\( N = 187 \))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Physical Health</th>
<th>Psychological Distress</th>
<th>Positive Affect</th>
<th>Negative Affect</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Content Expectations</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Expectations</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Stress Expectations</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment Expectations</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Discrimination Expectations</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* \( p < .05 \) \quad \*\* \( p < .01 \)  (one-tailed)
The predicted mediating relationship was tested according to Baron and Kenny's (1986) guidelines. Several recommendations exist as how to best test mediating relationships. Evans & Lepore (1997) advise a different method for testing mediation, which was also used with the present data and yielded similar results. Baron and Kenny suggest mediating relationships be tested by three equations: first, the mediator is regressed on the independent variable; second, the dependent variable is regressed on the independent variable; and third, the dependent variable is regressed on the independent variable and the mediator. A mediating relationship is present if the independent variable affects the mediator in the first equation, the independent variable affects the dependent variable in the second equation, and the mediator affects the dependent variable in the third equation. The independent variable should also have no effect or a reduced effect in the third equation when the mediator is controlled.

**Reality Shock and Psychological Distress**

Three regression equations examined whether reality shock mediates the relationship between organisational stress expectations and psychological distress. First, reality shock was regressed on the control variables and organisational stress expectations. Second, psychological distress was regressed on the control variables and organisational stress expectations. Finally, psychological distress was regressed on the control variables, organisational stress expectations, and reality shock. The control variables that were associated with organisational stress expectations, reality shock, or psychological distress included gender, present station, background location, shiftwork experience, and wing membership. Initial regression analyses
Results

indicated that present station and shiftwork experience failed to contribute to the variance in psychological distress, so they were omitted from further analyses.

1. Regression of Reality Shock on Organisational Stress Expectations

Step 1

Gender, background location, and wing membership were entered at the first step. The results of this step are reported in Table 17. The standardised beta coefficient (Beta) is reported and the total variance explained by this step of the equation is provided (R^2 and adjusted R^2). R was significantly different from zero, F (1, 186) = 5.08, p < .01. The control variables explained 6.2% of the variance in reality shock (Adjusted R^2 = .062). Gender was related to reality shock (Beta = .19), with women being more likely to have high RSS scores than men. Background location was also related to reality shock (Beta = .15), with constables from rural locations being more likely to have high RSS scores than constables from urban locations. Wing membership was associated with reality shock (Beta = .14), with the third wing surveyed being more likely to have high RSS scores than the remaining wings.

Step 2

Organisational stress expectations was entered at the second step, and its effects on reality shock were assessed after the variance explained by wing membership was accounted for. The results of this step are also reported in Table 17. The same statistics are reported as for the first step, as well as the additional variance explained by the variables in the second step while controlling for those in the first step (R^2 change). R was significantly different
from zero, $F(1, 186) = 6.41, p < .001$. Organisational stress expectations explained 4% of the variance in reality shock (Adjusted $R^2 = .104$). Organisational stress expectations were related to high scores on the RSS ($Beta = .22$). Gender and background location were significant at step 2.

Table 17

*Regression of Reality Shock on Control Variables and Organisational Stress Expectations Showing Standardised Regression Coefficients (Beta), $R$, $R^2$, Adjusted $R^2$, and $R^2$ Change ($N = 187$)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Location</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing Membership</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Stress Expectations</strong></td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple $R$</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$  ** $p < .01$  *** $p < .001$
2. Regression of Psychological Distress on Organisational Stress Expectations

Step 1
Gender, background location, and wing membership were entered at the first step. The results of this step are reported in Table 18. The standardised beta coefficient (Beta) and the total variance explained by this step of the equation are provided ($R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$). $R$ was significantly different from zero, $F(1, 186) = 3.55, p < .05$. The control variables explained 3.9% of the variance in psychological distress (Adjusted $R^2 = .039$). Gender and wing membership had significant beta weights at step 1.

Step 2
Organisational stress expectations were entered at the second step. The results of this step are reported in Table 18. The same statistics are reported as for the first step, as well as the added variance explained by the variables in the second step while controlling for those in the first step ($R^2$ change). $R$ was significantly different from zero, $F(1, 186) = 4.08, p < .01$. Organisational stress expectations accounted for a further 2.3% of the variance in psychological distress, accounting for 6.2% of the variance in psychological distress (Adjusted $R^2 = .062$). Organisational stress expectations were associated with high scores on the HSCL-21 ($Beta = .17$). Gender and wing membership were significant at Step 2.
Table 18

Regression of Psychological Distress on Control Variables and Organisational Stress Expectations Showing Standardised Regression Coefficients (Beta), R, $R^2$, Adjusted $R^2$, and $R^2$ Change ($N = 187$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Location</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing Membership</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Stress Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple $R$</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$  ** $p < .01$
3. Regression of Psychological Distress on Organisational Stress Expectations and Reality Shock

Step 1
Psychological distress was regressed on the control variables. The percentage of variance explained and significant beta weights are reported in Table 19. The standardised beta coefficient ($Beta$) and the total variance explained by this step of the equation are provided ($R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$).

Step 2
Organisational stress expectations and reality shock were entered at the second step of the third regression equation. Their effects on psychological distress were assessed after the variance attributable to the control variables was accounted for (see Table 19). The same statistics are reported as for the first step, as well as the additional variance explained by the variables in the second step while controlling for the demographic variables ($R^2$ change). $R$ was significantly different from zero, $F (1, 186) = 18.31, p < .001$. Combined with organisational stress expectations, reality shock explained 31.8% of the variance in psychological distress, (Adjusted $R^2 = .318$). High scores on the RSS were related to high scores on the HSCL-21 ($Beta = .54$). Scores on the PSS became non-significant with a drop in $Beta$ to .05 from .17. None of the control variables had beta weights significantly different from zero. Figure 2 illustrates the mediation of psychological distress on organisational stress expectations by reality shock.
Table 19

Regression of Psychological Distress on Control Variables, Organisational Stress Expectations, and Reality Shock Showing Standardised Regression Coefficients (Beta), $R$, $R^2$, Adjusted $R^2$, and $R^2$ Change ($N = 187$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Location</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing Membership</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Stress Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reality Shock</strong></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple $R$</strong></td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.58***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total $R^2$</strong></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted $R^2$</strong></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$R^2$ Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.28***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05     *** p < .001
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Figure 2. Multiple regression testing mediation of psychological distress on organisational stress expectations by reality shock. Coefficients outside brackets are standardised regression weights (Beta); the value within the bracket is the standardised regression weight when reality shock was added to the third equation.

Reality Shock and Negative Affect

As in the previous regression, three regression equations were used to examine whether reality shock mediates the relationship between organisational stress expectations and negative affect. First, reality shock was regressed on the

---

2 Much of the description of the following two regression analyses may seem repetitive. It was decided that the same detail and description be included for two reasons. Firstly, had an outline of the procedure used for all regressions been included at the beginning of all of the regression analyses, it may have been onerous for the reader to keep referring to. Secondly, providing similar detail for each equation and step improves clarity and provides a framework from which to understand the regressions.
control variables and organisational stress expectations. Second, negative affect was regressed on the control variables and organisational stress expectations. Finally, negative affect was regressed on the control variables, organisational stress expectations, and reality shock. Gender, present station, background location, and shiftwork experience were related to organisational stress expectations or reality shock. Preliminary regression analyses indicated that present station and shiftwork experience did not contribute to the variance in negative affect, so they were omitted from further analyses.

1. Regression of Reality Shock on Organisational Stress Expectations

Step 1
Gender and background location were entered at the first step. Table 20 reports the standardised beta coefficient (Beta) and the total variance explained by this step of the equation ($R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$). $R$ was significantly different from zero, $F(186) = 5.52, p < .01$. Gender and background location accounted for 4.6% of the variance in reality shock (Adjusted $R^2 = .046$). Gender was related to reality shock ($Beta = .18$), with women being more likely to have high RSS scores than men. Background location was also related to reality shock ($Beta = .15$), with constables from rural locations being more likely to have high RSS scores than constables from urban locations.

Step 2
Organisational stress expectations were entered at the second step. The results of this step are also reported in Table 20. The standardised beta coefficient (Beta) is reported and the total variance explained by this variable is provided
(\(R^2\) and adjusted \(R^2\)). \(R\) was significantly different from zero, \(F(1, 186) = 7.23, p < .001\). Organisational stress expectations explained a further 4.5% of the variance in reality shock, explaining 9.1% of the variance in reality shock (Adjusted \(R^2 = .091\)). Organisational stress expectations were related to high scores on the RSS (Beta = .22). Gender and background location were again significant at Step 2.

Table 20

Regression of Reality Shock on Control Variables and Organisational Stress Expectations Showing Standardised Regression Coefficient (Beta), \(R\), \(R^2\), and Adjusted \(R^2\) (\(N = 187\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors:</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Location</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Stress Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple (R)</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (R^2)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted (R^2)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2) Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \(p < .05\)  ** \(p < .01\)
2. Regression of Negative Affect on Organisational Stress Expectations

Step 1
As in the previous equation, gender and background location were entered at the first step. Table 21 reports the standardised beta coefficient ($Beta$) and the total variance explained by this step of the equation ($R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$). $R$ was not significantly different from zero. No beta weights were significantly different from zero.

Step 2
Organisational stress expectations were again entered at the second step, and the results of this step are reported in Table 21. The standardised beta coefficient ($Beta$) is reported and the total variance explained by this variable is provided ($R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$). $R$ was not significantly different from zero. Organisational stress expectations were related to high scores on the NA scale of the PANAS ($Beta = .19$). No control variables had beta weights significantly different from zero at step 2.
Results

Table 21

Regression of Negative Affect Control Variables and Organisational Stress Expectations Showing Standardised Regression Coefficients (Beta), R, R², and Adjusted R² (N = 187)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors:</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Location</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Stress Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R²</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01

3. Regression of Negative Affect on Organisational Stress Expectations and Reality Shock

Step 1

Gender and background location were again entered at the first step. Table 22 shows the standardised beta coefficient (Beta) and the total variance explained by this step of the equation (R² and adjusted R²). R was not significantly different from zero. No beta weights were significantly different from zero.
Step 2

Organisational stress expectations and reality shock were entered at the second step. The results of this step are provided in Table 22. The standardised beta coefficient (Beta) is reported and the total variance explained by this variable is provided ($R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$). $R$ was significantly different from zero, $F(1, 186) = 23.78, p < .001$. Reality shock accounted for 32.9% of the variance in Negative Affect scores at Time 2 (Adjusted $R^2 = .329$). Reality shock was related to high scores on the Negative Affect subscale of the PANAS at Time 2 ($Beta = .58$). The effect of organisational stress expectations on negative affect was non-significant. None of the control variables had beta weights significantly different from zero at step 2. Figure 3 illustrates the mediation of negative affect on organisational stress expectations by reality shock.
Table 22

Regression of Negative Affect on Control Variables, Organisational Stress Expectations, and Reality Shock Showing Standardised Regression Coefficients (Beta), $R$, $R^2$, and Adjusted $R^2$ ($N = 187$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td><strong>Beta</strong></td>
<td><strong>Beta</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Location</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Stress Expectations</strong></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.58***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reality Shock</strong></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.59***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Beta</strong></th>
<th><strong>Beta</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple $R$</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.59***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***$p < .001$
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Reality Shock
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**.58***
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** p < .01   ***p < .001

Figure 3. Multiple regression testing mediation of negative affect on organisational stress expectations by reality shock. Coefficients outside brackets are standardised regression weights (Beta); the value within the bracket is the standardised regression weight when reality shock was added to the third equation.

Reality Shock and Job Satisfaction

Like the previous two regressions, three equations examined whether reality shock mediates the relationship between organisational stress expectations and job satisfaction. First, reality shock was regressed on the control variables and organisational stress expectations. Second, job satisfaction was regressed on the control variables and organisational stress expectations. Finally, job satisfaction was regressed on the control variables, organisational stress
Results

expectations, and reality shock. The control variables that were associated with organisational stress expectations, reality shock, or job satisfaction included gender, age, present station, background location, and shiftwork experience. Initial regression analyses indicated that present station and shiftwork experience failed to contribute to the variance in job satisfaction. Further analyses did not include these two variables.

1. Regression of Reality Shock on Organisational Stress Expectations

Step 1

Gender, age, and background location were entered into the first step of each of the following three equations to control for their effect. Table 23 provides the standardised beta coefficient (Beta) and the total variance explained by this step of the equation ($R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$). $R$ was significantly different from zero, $F(1, 186) = 4.00, p < .01$. The control variables explained 4.6% of the variance in reality shock (Adjusted $R^2 = .046$). Two variables had beta weights significantly different from zero. Gender was related to reality shock ($Beta = .18$), with women being more likely to have high RSS scores than men. Background location was also related to reality shock ($Beta = .16$) with constables from rural locations being more likely to have high RSS scores than constables from urban locations.

Step 2

Organisational stress expectations were entered at the second step, and its effects on reality shock were assessed after the variance explained by the control variables was accounted for. The results of this step are also reported in
Table 23. The same statistics are reported as for the first step, as well as the additional variance explained by the variables in the second step while controlling for those in the first step ($R^2$ change). $R$ was significantly different from zero, $F (1, 186) = 5.67, p < .001$. Organisational stress expectations explained a further 4.5% of the variance in reality shock, accounting for 9.1% of the variance in reality shock (Adjusted $R^2 = .091$). Organisational stress expectations were related to high scores on the RSS ($\beta = .22$). Gender and background location had significant beta weights at Step 2.
Table 23

Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Reality Shock on Control Variables and Organisational Stress Expectations Showing Standardised Regression Coefficients (Beta), R, R², Adjusted R², and R² Change (N = 187)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td><strong>Beta</strong></td>
<td><strong>Beta</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Location</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Stress Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R²</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05    ** p < .01
2. Regression of Job Satisfaction on Organisational Stress Expectations

**Step 1**

The control variables were entered at the first step. The results of this step are reported in Table 24. The standardised beta coefficient (Beta) and the total variance explained by this step of the equation are provided ($R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$). $R$ was not significantly different from zero. Age was the only variable to have a beta weight significantly different from zero. Increasing age was associated with low job satisfaction ($Beta = -.15$).

**Step 2**

As in the previous equation, organisational stress expectations were entered at the second step and the results of this step are reported in Table 24. The same statistics are reported as for the first step, as well as the added variance explained by the variables in the second step while controlling for those in the first step ($R^2$ change). $R$ was not significantly different from zero. Age was the only variable to have a significant beta weight at Step 2.
Table 24

Regression of Job Satisfaction on Control Variables, and Organisational Stress Expectations Showing Standardised Regression Coefficients (Beta), $R$, $R^2$, Adjusted $R^2$, and $R^2$ Change ($N = 187$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Location</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Stress Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple $R$</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$
3. Regression of Job Satisfaction on Organisational Stress Expectations and Reality Shock

**Step 1**

Job satisfaction was regressed on the control variables. The percentage of variance explained and significant beta weights are reported in Table 25. The standardised beta coefficient (Beta) and the total variance explained by this step of the equation are provided ($R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$).

**Step 2**

Organisational stress expectations and reality shock were entered at the second step of the third regression equation. Their effects on job satisfaction scores were assessed after the variance attributable to the control variables was accounted for (see Table 25). The same statistics are reported as for the first step, as well as the additional variance explained by the variables in the second step while controlling for those in the first step ($R^2$ change). $R$ was significantly different from zero, $F(1, 186) = 14.25, p < .001$. Combined with organisational stress expectations, reality shock explained 26.3% of the variance in job satisfaction scores, (Adjusted $R^2 = .263$). High scores on the RSS were related to low scores on the job satisfaction measure (Beta = -.51). Scores on the PSS were non-significant. Increasing age was again associated with low job satisfaction. Figure 4 illustrates the mediation of job satisfaction on organisational stress expectations by reality shock.
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Table 25

Regression of Job Satisfaction on Control Variables, Organisational Stress Expectations, and Reality Shock Showing Standardised Regression Coefficients (Beta), R, R², Adjusted R², and R² Change (N = 187)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Location</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Stress Expectations</strong></td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reality Shock</strong></td>
<td>-.51***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R²</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001
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Figure 4. Multiple regression testing mediation of job satisfaction on organisational stress expectations by reality shock. Coefficients outside brackets are standardised regression weights (Beta); the value within the bracket is the standardised regression weight when reality shock was added to the third equation.

Post-Hoc Analyses

Owing to the significant correlations between reality shock and all of the outcome variables, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine how much of the variance in reality shock could be explained by these outcome variables. The control variables that were significantly correlated with reality shock and the outcome variables were gender, background location, and wing.
membership. These variables were entered at the first step of the regression equation.

**Step 1**
The control variables were entered at the first step. Table 26 reports the standardised beta coefficient (Beta) and the total variance explained by the first step ($R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$). $R$ was significantly different from zero, $F (1, 186) = 5.08, p < .01$. The control variables explained 6.2% of the variance in reality shock (Adjusted $R^2 = .062$). All variables had beta weights significantly different from zero. Gender was related to reality shock (Beta = .19), with women being more likely to have high RSS scores than men. Background location was also related to reality shock (Beta = .15), with constables from rural locations being more likely to have high RSS scores than constables from urban locations. Wing membership was associated with reality shock (Beta = .14), with Wing 3 being more likely to have higher RSS scores than the remaining wings.

**Step 2**
Physical health, psychological distress, positive and negative affect, and job satisfaction were entered at the second step. Reality shock and the outcome variables shared 55% (Adjusted $R^2 = .554$) of their variance, $F (1, 186) = 31.80, p < .001$. High scores on the RSS were significantly associated with high scores on the HSCL-21 (Beta = .17), and the negative affect scale (Beta = .36), and low scores on the positive affect scale (Beta = -.21) and the single-item measure of job satisfaction (Beta = -.23).
Table 26

Multiple Regression of Reality Shock on Control Variables, Health Outcomes, and Job Satisfaction Showing Standardised Regression Coefficients (Beta), R, Adjusted $R^2$, and $R^2$ Change ($N = 187$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Location</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing Membership</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health single-item</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCL-21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple $R$</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$    ** $p < .01$    *** $p < .001$
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Summary of Hypotheses

The first hypothesis that changes in job content expectations would be positively correlated with reality shock symptoms was not supported.

The second hypothesis that changes in organisational expectations would be positively correlated with reality shock symptoms was not supported.

The third hypothesis that organisational stress expectation discrepancy scores would be positively correlated with reality shock symptoms was supported.

The fourth hypothesis that sexual harassment expectation discrepancy scores would be positively correlated with reality shock symptoms was not supported.

The fifth hypothesis that sexual discrimination expectation discrepancy scores would be positively correlated with reality shock symptoms was supported.

The sixth hypothesis that reality shock symptoms would be correlated with physical health, psychological distress, and affect was supported. Significant negative correlations were found between reality shock, physical health, and positive affect. Significant positive correlations were found between reality shock, psychological distress and negative affect.

The seventh hypothesis that there would be a negative relationship between reality shock and job satisfaction was supported.
The eighth hypothesis that reality shock would mediate the relationship between policing expectations, and health outcomes and job satisfaction was supported. Reality shock was found to mediate the relationship between organisational stress expectations and psychological distress, negative affect, and job satisfaction.
Chapter Eleven

DISCUSSION

Chapter Overview

The present chapter will discuss the results of the present study, a study that has investigated the relationships among job expectations, reality shock, health outcomes, and job satisfaction in a sample of New Zealand Police constables. These relationships were assessed with regard to a model predicting that reality shock mediates the relationship between job expectations and health outcomes and job satisfaction.

The discussion is presented in seven sections. The first section briefly outlines the results of the study with reference to the research goals. Section two addresses the relationships found between the recruits' personal characteristics and the study variables. The third section examines the hypotheses tested in the present study. Limitations of the study and suggestions for future research are outlined in the fourth and fifth sections. The sixth section highlights the theoretical and practical implications of the present study's results, and the final section presents the conclusions of the present study.
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**Comparison of Sample Across Time on Study Variables**

**Expectation Variables**

**Job content expectations**

The first research goal was to measure the extent to which job content expectations change over time in a sample of police recruits. Job content expectations generally became more accurate with time and experience working as a police constable. An examination of the tasks and situations considered to be frequently and infrequently encountered by police constables showed a pattern. Most recruits agreed that making inquiries was a frequent task and most agreed that firearms were discharged infrequently. The task or situation that showed the greatest average change in perceptions of frequency between the two survey administrations was ‘Doing watch-house duty’. After six months’ work experience, constables believed this task to be encountered less often than they initially thought during training. It is possible that recruits had distorted expectations regarding this item owing to the availability heuristic. This heuristic is used whenever a person judges the frequency of an occurrence in terms of how easy it is to generate examples of it (Tversky & Kahneman, 1973).

Before beginning police training, applicants are required to visit their local police station on a number of occasions, each time witnessing somebody working at the front desk (watch-house duty). It is likely that their watch-house duty frequency judgements were biased by how easily they were able to retrieve examples of this occurrence. When working as a constable, they would have quickly become aware of how infrequently constables are assigned to watch-house duty.

184
Organisational Expectations

The second research goal was to measure the extent to which organisational expectations change over time in a sample of police recruits. It is clear that participants' organisational expectations changed very little with time and work experience, suggesting that they were largely accurate during training. Two specific results show that organisational expectations were stable between Time 1 and Time 2. First, the average change in scores on the organisational expectations measure was very low (17.46 out of a possible range of 0 to 96). Second, 18 of the 24 personal styles changed 4% or less between the two survey administrations.

The styles judged desirable or undesirable in an ideal police officer were fairly interpretable between Time 1 and Time 2. The styles 'Practical/Realistic' and 'Focused/Convergent' received the strongest support as styles recommended in an ideal police officer. The present findings contradict those of Kunce and Anderson (1988). When police supervisors in their study were questioned as to the personal styles of the ideal police officer, they found these styles less desirable than participants in the present study. The styles 'Restless/Searching' and 'Strong-willed/Restive' elicited the greatest agreement as undesirable styles in an ideal police officer. Participants in Kunce and Anderson's study also found these styles undesirable. It is interesting to note that their analysis of the ideal police officer was conducted over a decade ago with only five American police department supervisors. Despite these time and cultural differences, there was some agreement between the results of the present study and those of Kunce
and Anderson. However, there were also many inconsistencies between the two studies' results.

**Organisational stress expectations**

The third research goal was to measure both the frequency of exposure, and expected frequency of exposure to organisational stressors in a sample of police constables. Constables encountered organisational stressors significantly more often than they had expected to, suggesting that the sample's organisational stress expectations were inaccurate.

In the present study, police officers agreed that the most frequently encountered police stressor was excessive paperwork. This finding is in accordance with a study by Kroes et al. (1974). Despite being conducted 26 years ago, their study discovered excessive paperwork to be the second most frequently mentioned administrative stressor. The second most frequently encountered organisational stressor in the present study was changing from day to night shift. Several studies have attested to the stressfulness of shiftwork (e.g., Biggam et al., 1997; Brown & Campbell, 1990; Gudjonsson & Adlam, 1985; Storch & Panzarella, 1996). Policing is characterised by shiftwork and it is unlikely that people joining the police would not expect to encounter many changing shifts. In fact, this item showed the least discrepancy between expectations and reality. The third most frequently encountered organisational stressor in the present study was court leniency with criminals. This finding is consistent with previous research in that many police officers complain of disagreeable court decisions (Brown &
Campbell, 1994), and court leniency with criminals (Davidson, 1979; Kroes et al., 1974; Stratton, 1986).

Interestingly, the least frequently encountered organisational stressors in the present study have been identified by several previous studies as particularly stressful. Although they may be salient police stressors, the results of the present study showed them to be encountered infrequently. The least frequently encountered organisational stressor in the present study was excessive or inappropriate discipline. A study by Violanti and Aron (1994) found this the fifth most highly ranked police stressor. Several other authors have noted the importance of this organisational stressor (e.g., Kroes, 1975; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Manolias, 1983; Martelli et al., 1989; Spielberger et al., 1981). The second least frequently encountered organisational stressor in the present study was inadequate support by supervisor. However, this factor has been recognised as a leading stressor by several other studies (e.g., Biggam et al., 1997; Kirkcaldy et al., 1995; Kroes et al., 1974; Manolias, 1983; Violanti & Aron, 1994). These inconsistencies between the present study’s results and those of previous studies may be attributable to sampling differences. Many of the studies cited above were conducted in the United States of America, which may have a police organisation and hierarchy different to that of New Zealand. Another possible explanation is that the police officers in the present study have yet to encounter these organisational stressors. It could be that certain organisational stressors are encountered more frequently or are perceived as more stressful by police officers with more work experience.
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It is interesting to note that expectations of court leniency with criminals were the most unrealistic. Police constables encountered this stressor approximately 15% more often than they had expected to encounter it. According to Brown and Campbell (1994), this would be classified as a specific stressor external to the police. It is unlikely that police constables would have been aware of these types of stressors prior to beginning work with the police. This is because interaction with the criminal justice system is something that the public rarely encounters; it is restricted to offenders or people in occupations associated with the criminal justice system.

Sexual harassment expectations

The fourth research goal was to measure both the frequency of exposure and expected frequency of exposure to sexual harassment. There were no significant differences between constables' exposure and expected exposure to sexual harassment. However, an examination of the results confirmed previous research findings that sexual harassment is a frequent occurrence within police organisations (e.g., J. M. Brown, 1998; Brown & Heidensohn, 1996; Heidensohn, 1994; Kroes, 1982; C. Martin, 1996; Prenzler, 1995). The mean score on this measure was 12.64 out of a range of 0 to 28. These findings suggest that female police constables were expecting to encounter some forms of sexual harassment, and did indeed encounter them.

The present study's findings can be directly compared to those of Brown et al. (1995), who constructed the sexual harassment measure. There were many similarities between the results of their study and those of the present study,
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despite differences between samples. Brown et al. surveyed policewomen of varying ranks and experience, while the present study surveyed only policewomen with six months' work experience. They found that policewomen had been exposed to all forms of sexual harassment included in the measure, as had policewomen in the present study, with the exception of serious sexual assault. This was probably due to the comparatively small sample used in the present study. Both studies showed that policewomen were most often exposed to comments about their own figure or appearance, other women's figures or appearance, or to suggestive stories or jokes about women in general. Of all the forms of sexual harassment, serious sexual assault was the least commonly encountered by policewomen in both studies.

The failure to find significant differences between female constables' expectations of exposure and actual exposure to sexual harassment, and the finding that they did encounter sexual harassment raises some important questions. Do women expect to encounter sexual harassment in any career they enter, or is it restricted to male-oriented professions? Furthermore, does experiencing sexual harassment in another facet of one's life bias one's expectations of sexual harassment in a new job? It is well documented that sexual harassment is more severe in male-oriented professions (Brown et al., 1995). However, future research should address whether expectations of sexual harassment are common across professions, and whether women who have previously worked in male-oriented professions have different expectations of sexual harassment than women who have not worked in these professions.
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Sexual discrimination expectations

The fifth research goal was to measure both the frequency of exposure and expected exposure to sexual discrimination. The present study did not find a significant difference between constables' exposure and expected exposure to sexual discrimination. Furthermore, the results showed that female police constables received the same deployments as their male colleagues, indicating that they were not exposed to sexual discrimination. This is in contrast to the findings of previous studies that show that women are often the subject of deployment differences within the police (e.g., J. M. Brown, 1998; Brown & Fielding, 1993; Holdaway & Parker, 1998). That there was no significant difference between constables' exposure and expected exposure to sexual discrimination suggests that they had expected to be treated equally to their colleagues and were in fact deployed equally.

Brown and Fielding (1993) and J. M. Brown (1998) found that policewomen were less likely than policemen to deal with violent offenders. The results of the present study confirmed this finding to some extent. Although women were not significantly more or less likely to encounter any deployment, the results of the present study did show trends similar to those of previous studies. Of all of the deployments measured, the one which policewomen were less likely encounter than policemen was dealing with violent offenders. In both of the previous studies, policewomen believed they were assigned to inside station duty more frequently than policemen. Likewise, of all the deployments measured, policewomen in the present study were more likely to be assigned inside station duty than policemen. Female constables in the above studies were also more
likely to deal with the victims of sexual abuse than male constables, while the present study's results indicated that male and female constables were exposed to sex offence victims relatively equally.

The present study's results are inconclusive and fail to show strong support for the findings of previous studies examining sexual discrimination within the police. The results show the same trends as those found by previous studies. However, the failure to find the degree of sexual discrimination found by other researchers is probably due to the small sample size used in the present study ($n = 44$), and their limited experience within the police organisation. It may be that female police officers are still in the honeymoon phase of reality shock, in which they have yet to see any negative aspects of their new job. Had participants been surveyed later, they may have reported more instances of sexual discrimination. Furthermore, it may be the case that sexual discrimination within the police is more prevalent as one's career progresses. It is also possible that the climate of sexual discrimination in British police forces indicated by Brown and Fielding (1993) and J. M. Brown (1998) differs from that found within the New Zealand Police. New Zealand is renowned for being the first country to allow women to vote in elections, suggesting that government organisations may endorse progressive attitudes toward women.

**Reality Shock**

After a six-month period, police constables were relatively unaffected by reality shock. The mean score on the Reality Shock Scale was considerably lower ($M = 57.04$) than that obtained by the sample of police constables tested during the
development of the Reality Shock Scale ($M = 66.56$, see Appendix C). However, the present sample differed from the sample used in the development of the reality shock measure in a number of ways. First, the sample used in the development of the reality shock measure was a lot smaller than the sample used in the present study. It comprised only one wing from the Royal New Zealand Police College, whereas the present sample comprised four wings. Second, the sample used in the development of the reality shock measure completed training over a year before the first wing surveyed in the present study had begun training. It is possible that both samples may have received slightly different training, thus accounting for differences in mean Reality Shock Scale scores.

The most likely explanation as to why police officers failed to report many symptoms of reality shock is that reality shock actually occurs after far more work experience. The wing used in the development of the Reality Shock Scale had approximately 13 months' work experience when they responded to the questionnaire, whereas the present sample had six months' work experience. The participants used in the development of the Reality Shock Scale had a higher mean score on this measure, so this suggests that reality shock is more severe after a year's work experience, rather than after six months' work experience.

Most police constables agreed that their home life had become very important. Several respondents noted on their questionnaire that their home life had always been important, and so gave this item a maximum rating. Further
developments of this measure could reword this item to ensure clarity. Surprisingly, few police constables agreed that they could learn a lot from their mistakes. One can only speculate why so few police constables believed this item to be true. Perhaps policing tasks and situations are often unique, making it difficult to apply common solutions. It is also possible that police training, or more experienced colleagues, emphasise that admitting mistakes is discouraged.

Health Outcome Variables
The sixth research goal was to measure health symptoms in a sample of New Zealand Police constables. Health symptoms were measured with the single-item measure of physical health, the HSCL-21, and the PANAS.

Physical health
Health ratings decreased significantly between Time 1 and Time 2. Recruits were in very good health during training, but their health decreased once they had six months’ work experience. The decrease in health ratings between Time 1 and Time 2 may reflect constables’ adjustments to shiftwork and long hours. These ratings are considerably better than those obtained by Stephens (1996), who found health ratings close to ‘Good’ in a sample of New Zealand Police constables with a great deal more work experience. Huddleston (2001) measured police recruits’ self-rated health during training and after six months’ work experience. During training, the sample’s self-rated health was higher than that of the present sample, with a mean rating reflecting very good health. This mean health rating decreased after six months’ work experience to a rating
comparable to that of the present sample. This is probably because recruits would have been at the peak of health and fitness during training. To be accepted for police recruit training, applicants are required to meet stringent health and physical standards.

**Psychological distress**
Participants' showed low psychological distress. This is consistent with the results of Huddleston (2001) who found a similar mean score on this measure when testing a sample of police constables who had approximately one year's work experience. The mean score on the HSCL-21 was lower than that found when a general New Zealand population was sampled (Deane & Chamberlain, 1992). That participants were not psychologically distressed is consistent with their very good physical health.

It is interesting to note that the symptoms that distressed participants the most were concerned with completing tasks thoroughly and accurately, while somatic symptoms were least distressing. This may have been due to the fact that constables in the present study were still relatively new to the job, and may have been conscious of completing jobs methodically to ensure accuracy and completeness.

**Affect**
During training, police recruits' positive affect was very high. Their positive affect decreased after six months' work experience, but was still higher than that yielded from a normative sample of undergraduate students used in the
development of the PANAS (Watson et al., 1988). Huddleston (2001) also found similarly high positive affect during training and decreased positive affect after a comparable period of work experience amongst a policing sample. Watson et al. (1988) state that high positive affect is characterised by “high energy, full concentration, and pleasurable engagement” (p. 1063), a description in accordance with how a recruit might expect to feel when beginning police training. Mean scores on individual items of the Positive Affect scale further support the notion that the increased positive affect during training was a product of the excitement associated with beginning a new career. The items ‘Active’ and ‘Excited’ were highly rated at Time 1 and less highly rated at Time 2.

Participants’ negative affect during training was slightly high, and comparable to that of the normative sample (Watson et al., 1988). This decreased with six months’ work experience to low negative affect. Huddleston (2001) also found a decrease in negative affect between training and work experience. However, while the mean Negative Affect score at Time 1 was comparable to that of the present study, it decreased below the mean Negative Affect score at Time 2 found in the present study. Watson et al. (1988) describe low negative affect as a “state of calmness and serenity” (p. 1063). It is likely that negative affect was high during training as the Negative Affect scale captured a lot of the nervousness and anxiety associated with beginning police recruit training. The mean scores obtained for individual items of the Negative Affect scale provide further evidence for this idea. The items ‘Jittery’ and ‘Scared’ were rated highly
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at Time 1 and less highly at Time 2. Likewise, the item 'Nervous' showed the greatest change, decreasing considerably between Time 1 and Time 2.

The high Positive and Negative Affect scores on the PANAS at Time 1 seem to have been due to the excitement and nervousness associated with beginning police recruit training. The decrease in these scales at Time 2 indicates that these feelings had waned to a more even level. After six months' experience settling into the policing role, police officers were no longer experiencing those extreme feelings of excitement and anxiety.

Job Satisfaction

The seventh research goal was to measure job satisfaction in a sample of New Zealand Police constables. Police constables' job satisfaction was relatively high. It is difficult to directly compare the present sample's level of job satisfaction with other samples, as few studies have used both the same measure of job satisfaction and the same rating scale used in the present study. It is especially difficult to compare the present sample's job satisfaction with other samples of police officers, as traditionally, little research has been conducted on the job satisfaction of police officers (O'Leary-Kelly & Griffin, 1995). However, there is some indication that the present sample's job satisfaction is comparable to that of other occupations. Using the same measure of job satisfaction used in the present study, Misener, Haddock, Gleaton, and Abu Ajamieh (1996) found 71% of nurses to be 'Satisfied' or 'Very satisfied' with their job in general; 74% of the present sample were similarly satisfied. Also using the single-item measure of job satisfaction, Mason (1995)
found comparable job satisfaction ratings for clerical staff, but slightly higher ratings for management staff (Mason, 1995).

**Personal Characteristics of the Sample**

**Personal Characteristics and Policing Expectations**

The individual characteristics of these recruits, in regard to gender, age, educational level, present station, background location, shiftwork experience, and wing membership, did affect or were related to the variables under investigation. Male recruits' job content expectations were more unrealistic than female recruits' job expectations, but became more accurate with time and experience. Participants with a lower level of education had unrealistic organisational expectations at the beginning of police training. Consequently, these expectations became more realistic with time and work experience, thus accounting for the larger change scores on the PSI.

Participants who had no shiftwork experience had more inaccurate organisational stress expectations than participants who had shiftwork experience. This is a surprising result, considering only one item on the Police Stress Survey pertained to shiftwork. It is possible that those participants with shiftwork experience had worked in a role similar to policing (e.g., security, armed forces, fire service, etc.), and therefore had realistic expectations regarding the organisational stressors they might encounter as a police constable. Future research should investigate whether work experience in certain areas aids in the development of realistic policing expectations.
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Constables posted to rural stations upon graduation had more inaccurate organisational stress expectations than constables posted to urban stations. There are two reasons why this might have occurred. First, rural stations are smaller and constables at these stations usually encounter a broader range of tasks and situations than their urban counterparts. Thus, while their expectations of organisational stress may have been similar to constables posted to urban stations, they may have been exposed to a greater range of organisational stressors, rendering their expectations unrealistic. Second, because rural stations are smaller than urban stations, they are likely to lack the human and material resources of urban stations. While their expectations of organisational stress may have been similar to constables posted to urban stations, they may have been more relevant to constables posted to rural as opposed to urban stations. That background location prior to entry to the police did not show any significant differences between urban and rural participants in terms of organisational stress expectations precludes the interpretation that people from rural backgrounds are less prepared for the organisational stressors associated with policing than people from urban backgrounds.

Personal Characteristics and Reality Shock

Female constables suffered from more reality shock than male constables. This result may be related to the finding that sexual discrimination expectations (measured only in females) were significantly related to reality shock.

Constables from rural backgrounds also suffered more reality shock than constables from urban backgrounds. This was possibly because many
constables from rural backgrounds were posted to urban stations. It is likely that constables from rural backgrounds were suffering greater reality shock than their urban counterparts as their policing expectations may have been based upon a rural rather than urban context. As outlined in Chapter one, individuals integrate information from a wide variety of sources in developing policing expectations. Constables from rural origins are likely to have based their policing expectations on examples of rural policing, as this would have been their frame of reference for policing. Likewise, constables from urban origins are likely to have based their policing expectations on examples of urban policing.

Personal Characteristics and Health Outcomes and Job Satisfaction

Members of the third wing surveyed exhibited significantly more psychological distress than members of the remaining wings. This may have been due to the change in study requirements mentioned earlier, introduced for the first time during the training period for Wing 3.

Males showed significantly higher positive affect than females. The mean score on this scale for males was slightly higher than the normative mean score (Watson et al., 1988), while the mean score for females was slightly lower than the normative mean score. This result is related to the findings that women showed more reality shock than men. An individual suffering from reality shock is not expected to be in good spirits and reporting high positive affect, owing to the negative symptoms associated with reality shock.
Older police constables also had lower job satisfaction than younger police constables. This finding provides strong support for several studies attesting to declining job satisfaction with age, when controlling for the confounding effect of work experience (Katz, 1978; Weaver, 1980). That there was a negative correlation between job satisfaction and age also refutes a plethora of research demonstrating a positive relationship between job satisfaction and age (Snyder & Mayo, 1991). It could be that several studies finding job satisfaction increasing with age failed to control for work experience. Additionally, it is possible that the type of job an individual is in moderates the relationship between job satisfaction and age. Further research should explore this issue.

**Hypothesis Testing**

Hypotheses one, two, and four were not supported. Police recruits exhibiting a greater change in job content or organisational expectations did not show greater reality shock than recruits exhibiting a small change in these expectations between Time 1 and Time 2. Female police constables exhibiting a greater discrepancy between frequency of exposure and expected frequency of exposure to sexual harassment did not show greater reality shock than constables exhibiting a lesser discrepancy between frequency of exposure and expected frequency of exposure.

There are several possible reasons why these hypotheses were not supported. One interpretation is that police recruits’ expectations were realistic, fulfilled, or both, as realistic expectations are more likely to be fulfilled than unrealistic expectations (Nelson et al., 1988). Although the accuracy of participants’ job
content expectations changed significantly between Time 1 and Time 2, the mean accuracy score on the Policing Expectations Scale was relatively high at Time 1. That there was no significant correlation between job content expectations and reality shock suggests that participants' expectations in this area were realistic prior to training, and were therefore fulfilled on the job. Owing to a low mean change score on the Personal Styles Inventory between Time 1 and Time 2, and a low discrepancy score on the sexual harassment measure, it is assumed that participants' expectations in these areas were also realistic and therefore fulfilled.

That police constables began work with realistic expectations in these areas is an encouraging finding, as several studies have attested to the inaccuracy of job content expectations prior to beginning a new job (New Zealand Police, 1998; Nicholson & Arnold, 1991). No empirical studies have investigated the accuracy of organisational and sexual harassment expectations before organisational entry. However, it was assumed that job content inaccuracy extended to these types of expectations.

Recruits' initial job content and organisational expectations may have been realistic for a number of reasons. The New Zealand Police encourage people interested in becoming police officers to complete a 'Scope' programme, in which they are required to work unpaid for 40 hours at their local police station. Typically, this involves the prospective recruit accompanying experienced general duties constables on their shift. Anecdotal evidence suggests that, historically, newcomers experienced a lot of the adventure and excitement
usually associated with being a police constable (B. Dewar, personal communication, 2nd May, 2001). Consequently, they were not exposed to the more mundane tasks or organisational climate typical of policing. However, in light of the present study's results, it is possible that potential recruits are now given a realistic impression of policing.

The reason why female police constables' sexual harassment expectations may have been realistic is clearer. The Policing Expectations Scale and Personal Styles Inventory were administered at Time 1 and Time 2, requiring participants to indicate their current thoughts and beliefs. In contrast, the sexual harassment measure was only administered at Time 2, and required constables to retrospectively indicate how often they had expected to be exposed to incidents of sexual harassment. Participants' memories may have been influenced by the biases typical of retrospective designs (Stone, Shiffman, & De Vries, 1999).

The time at which the second questionnaire was sent to police constables may also have affected the results. Participants received the questionnaire six months after graduation from the Royal New Zealand Police College. Louis (1980) suggests that the encounter stage of organisational socialisation occurs during the newcomer's first six to ten months' of work experience. It is during this stage that the police constables could have become aware that their expectations were not being met. Responses to the second questionnaire may have been different had it been sent to the police constables after approximately ten months' work experience. After only six months' experience in a policing role, their expectations could still be very similar to those they held.
during training, as they were yet to realise they were unrealistic. In fact, the constables could still have been in the honeymoon phase of reality shock, which was not assessed by the Reality Shock Scale. Future research should address the timing of expectation change by surveying participants at several points after organisational entry. It would be interesting to investigate whether different expectations change at different times following organisational entry.

The failure to find a significant correlation between job content expectations and reality shock may also be related to the composition of the sample at Time 2. A comparison of responders versus non-responders at Time 2 showed a significant difference between these two groups for job content expectations at Time 1. Specifically, responders at Time 2 had more realistic job content expectations at Time 1 than those of non-responders at Time 2. Because of this, it is likely that the Time 2 sample’s responses on the PES were not representative of police constables in general. This sample may not have included a number of people whose job content expectations were inaccurate, and who may have experienced greater reality shock.

**Sexual Discrimination Expectations and Reality Shock**

The fifth hypothesis that there would be a positive correlation between expectations of exposure to sexual discrimination and reality shock symptoms was supported. Female police constables exhibiting a greater discrepancy between frequency of exposure and expected frequency of exposure to sexual discrimination showed greater reality shock than constables exhibiting a lesser discrepancy.
Expectations of sexual discrimination have not previously been investigated with regards to reality shock. Although the correlation between these two variables was relatively small indicating only a weak effect, it is important because it suggests that sexual discrimination expectations may be an important antecedent of reality shock. The significant relationship between expectations of sexual discrimination and reality shock suggests that some female constables were unaware of the sexual discrimination they might experience within the police organisation, and consequently experienced reality shock in response to encountering sexual discrimination. Future research should seek to improve the measurement of sexual discrimination expectations to clearly elucidate the relationship between this variable and reality shock. This could be achieved by measuring both sexual discrimination expectations and reality shock over time, to minimise the disadvantages of employing a retrospective measure.

Organisational Stress Expectations and Reality Shock

The third hypothesis that there would be a positive correlation between expectations of exposure to organisational stressors and reality shock symptoms was supported. Although the size of this correlation was small, police constables exhibiting a greater discrepancy between frequency of exposure and expected frequency of exposure to organisational stressors tended to show greater reality shock than constables exhibiting a small discrepancy.

Of all the expectation variables measured in the present study, organisational stress expectations were the most significant contributor to the development of
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reality shock. People's expectations of organisational stress are a neglected research area and have not previously been measured before in relation to reality shock. However, the finding that organisational stress expectations were significantly related to reality shock is consistent with the results of Nelson and Sutton's (1991) study. They investigated the relationship between expectations of job stress and subsequent adjustment in organisational newcomers. The results indicated that new employees who underestimated stressors suffered more distress symptoms than new employees who overestimated these stressors. These findings are in accordance with those of the present study, which showed that constables underestimated organisational stressors. Nelson and Sutton highlight the notion that the underestimation of stressors may be more crucial in the development of distress symptoms than simply the misestimation of stressors.

Health Outcomes and Job Satisfaction and Reality Shock

The sixth hypothesis that there would be a correlation between reality shock symptoms and psychological and physical health symptoms at Time 2 was supported. Police constables who exhibited greater reality shock also showed more health symptoms in general.

The seventh hypothesis that there would be a negative correlation between reality shock symptoms and job satisfaction was also supported. Police constables who exhibited greater reality shock also generally showed lower job satisfaction.
The results of the present study showed that reality shock, physical health, psychological distress, positive affect and negative affect, and job satisfaction varied together. This finding supports the idea that reality shock is related to a number of physical and psychological symptoms and low job satisfaction. The literature has indicated poor psychological and physical health as likely consequences of reality shock. These consequences are supported by the present study, which found psychological distress and negative affect to be associated with reality shock. Kramer (1974) suggests that illness and excessive fatigue are correlates of reality shock. The results of the present study supported this idea by showing that ratings of physical health and positive affect were negatively related to reality shock. Low ratings of physical health indicate illness, while low scores on the PA scale indicate lethargy (Watson et al., 1988). The results of the present study also support the anecdotal notion that low job satisfaction is an immediate consequence of reality shock (Miceli, 1985; Wanous, 1980). The relationship between job satisfaction and reality shock has not been previously examined.

**Reality Shock as a Mediator between Expectations and Outcomes**

The eighth hypothesis was that reality shock would mediate the relationship between policing expectations, and health outcomes and job satisfaction. This hypothesis was supported for psychological distress, negative affect, and job satisfaction. Organisational stress expectations were not strongly related to psychological distress, negative affect, or job satisfaction. However, when the effects of reality shock were also taken into account, the percentage of variance explained in the dependent variables increased to between 26% and 33%.
When controlling for the effects of gender, age, background location, and wing membership, it was found that reality shock mediated the relationship between organisational stress expectations, psychological distress, negative affect, and job satisfaction. Organisational stress expectations were related to reality shock and each of these outcome variables. However, the relationship between organisational stress expectations and these outcome variables disappeared when reality shock was accounted for, indicating full mediation (Baron & Kenny, 1986). This suggests that reality shock accounts for the relationships between organisational stress expectations and psychological distress, negative affect, and low job satisfaction.

The finding that organisational stress expectations was the only expectation variable related to reality shock and an outcome variable is important. It supports several studies' findings suggesting organisational stressors, such as administrative policies, management practices, public criticism, community relations, and the criminal justice system are more bothersome to police officers than occupational stressors, such as witnessing trauma, the threat of danger, and dealing with offensive people (Band & Manuele, 1987; Brown & Campbell, 1990; Hart et al., 1993; Kroes et al., 1974; Reiser, 1974). Popular stereotypes of police work encompass the idea that police officers have to routinely face unpleasant and dangerous situations. Consequently, researchers have focussed on the stress associated with exposure to these threatening and unpleasant police tasks. It is also likely that these stereotypes of policing have biased the development of stress expectations within potential police recruits towards expectations of exposure to traumatic stress.
The present study found that reality shock mediated the relationship between organisational stress expectations and psychological distress, negative affect, and job satisfaction. However, it must be noted that this mediation process may be interpreted in one of four alternative ways (Evans & Lepore, 1997). First, it is possible that the dependent variables (i.e., psychological distress, negative affect scores, and job satisfaction) caused the mediator (i.e., reality shock), rather than the mediator causing the dependent variables (reverse causality). Second, the mediator and the dependent variables may have affected each other (reciprocal causality). Third, it is possible that the mediator affected the dependent variables, but this change caused the dependent variables to affect the independent variable (feedback). Finally, one has to consider the possibility that some untested variable affected the independent variable, the mediator and/or the dependent variables (spuriousness).

Of the above interpretations, it is least likely that the present study was affected by feedback and spuriousness. In the case of feedback, it is unlikely that health outcomes and job satisfaction affected the development and meeting of job expectations. In the present study, health outcomes and job satisfaction were consequences of work experience, and were measured at Time 2. Therefore, it is difficult for these variables to affect the development of job expectations, which were measured initially at Time 1. The possible effect of spuriousness was also reduced by measuring a number of demographic variables believed to be related to the independent variables, the mediator, and the dependent variables.
Reverse and reciprocal causality are of the greatest concern to the present study. To minimise the risk of misinterpreting mediation in this way, measuring the mediator and dependent variables before exposure to the independent variables is recommended (Evans & Lepore, 1997). However, this remedy would have been impossible to employ in the present study, owing to the life-long development of job expectations.

Accordingly, the possibility that psychological distress, negative affect, and job satisfaction caused reality shock must be considered. The measure of reality shock used in the present study was developed directly from theoretical definitions of reality shock. Reality shock has been theorised as an antecedent of negative health outcomes and low job satisfaction; these consequences arise in response to the realisation that one’s expectations of a new job and organisation are inaccurate. It is possible that these previous notions are incorrect and reality shock is actually a consequence of negative health outcomes and job satisfaction. It must also be considered that reality shock may merely be another measure of health. Investigating reality shock, health outcomes, and job satisfaction across time would help to clarify the causal relationships between these constructs, and eliminate the possibility of reverse and reciprocal causality. The next stage in investigating these relationships could include the measurement of reality shock at Time 2 followed by a third survey to track the development of reality shock and clarify its relationship to health outcomes and job satisfaction.
Limitations of the Present Study

Measurement Issues
One of the major causes of failure to find statistical evidence for theorised effects in field studies is poor measurement of the theorised constructs (Baron & Kenny, 1986). There are reliability and validity issues for at least five of the measures used in the present study. The following sub sections will highlight important issues concerning each of these measures.

The Policing Expectations Scale (PES)
The PES was developed specifically for the purposes of the present study and was an initial foray into the measurement of job content expectations. Little research has been conducted in the area of policing job content, especially within New Zealand. Although the New Zealand Police recently conducted a job analysis of police constable duties, they included activities irrelevant to the present study, such as “Seeing accurately at a distance”. While the PES had acceptable internal reliability, a number of issues in its development should be considered.

It is important to note that the PES was pilot tested on a range of sworn police staff. The sample included people from a variety of specialist divisions, including surveillance and dog handling. Including staff other than general duties constables could have distorted the accuracy of response to the PES, as a number of the respondents may never have worked as frontline police constables. This oversight was adjusted for by only retaining those items that elicited at least 70% agreement from the sample. However, further development
Discussion

of the PES should include its retesting on a sample of experienced general
duties police constables only.

Any refinements to the PES should also consider item and scale selection. The
limited variance in PES scores may be improved by adopting a wider focus for
investigation. Like the Police Stress Survey (PSS), the PES could be divided
into different scales, for example operational or administrative tasks and
situations. This would indicate whether job expectations in either sphere were
inaccurate. It may also be useful to get participants to suggest the frequency
with which a typical frontline police constable would encounter these tasks and
situations within a given time period. Rather than simply indicating ‘frequently’
or ‘infrequently’, participants could rate their choice using a scale similar to that
used with the PSS.

Overall, participants’ accuracy scores on the PES were high, indicating that they
held realistic expectations regarding the nature of policing. Perhaps accuracy of
job content expectations should not be gauged by the frequency with which
certain tasks and situation are encountered, but by some other measure. It may
be that the duration or tediousness of tasks and situations may better indicate
those areas in which recruits’ expectations are inaccurate. Future research
could address these areas by developing alternative scales on which to rate the
items.
The Personal Styles Inventory (PSI)

The PSI was used in the present study to measure organisational expectations. This measure has been used previously to compare the non-pathological personality styles of police officers with a composite "ideal" police officer profile. Similarly, participants in the present study were asked to rate each item of the PSI in terms of its importance to successful policing. It was assumed that the assessment of an ideal police officer's characteristics would give an indication of the police organisation's goals and values. While the Personal Styles Inventory did seem to successfully capture changes in organisational expectations, one concern is that it is an indirect way of measuring organisational expectations. For this reason, it is suggested that future research use a more direct means of assessing organisational expectations. It would probably be more valuable to adopt a measure specifically investigating issues such as organisational climate and culture, rather than an instrument designed to assess enduring personality characteristics.

Another concern is that the Personal Styles Inventory was scored differently from the other job expectation measures. Because the inventory does not produce an overall score, a true comparison between Time 1 and Time 2 was precluded. Consequently, the change in organisational expectations was assessed by calculating the sum of each item's discrepancy between Time 1 and Time 2.
Measures of sexual harassment and discrimination

The measure of sexual harassment developed by Brown et al. (1995) had good internal reliability. Despite only having seven items, it appeared to have good content validity, as the forms of sexual harassment that can occur between a policeman and a policewoman were well represented. This also aided construct validity; it was very clear what the questions were asking, with the exception of the first item. It seems that constables failed to fully comprehend the first question of this measure. Question one of the sexual harassment measure asked constables whether they had been subject to any unwanted or unreciprocated verbal or physical conduct that was sexual in nature from a policeman. Nearly 80% of the sample responded that they had not, yet indicated on the remaining items that they had encountered sexual harassment in some form. Refinements to the measure should address this issue.

The measure was modified for the present study to include an indication of participants' expectations of sexual harassment in the role of a female police constable. As this indication was retrospective, it is prone to the errors and biases associated with memory retrieval. While a prospective design would have remedied this limitation, it also has disadvantages. Namely, female constables would have had little information on which to base their expectations of sexual harassment before working in this role, and administering this measure at Time 1 may have manipulated the development of sexual harassment expectations.
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The measure of sexual discrimination used in the present study had low internal reliability. Including this measure increases the chances of a type II statistical error, and may have contributed to the failure to find a significant correlation between expectations of sexual discrimination and exposure to sexual discrimination. As the measure consists of only seven items and a three-point scale, it is limited in scope. This compromises its content validity, as several other deployment areas could have been included. Any development of this measure could look at the inclusion of other areas of deployment and specialist divisions.

Measuring job expectations

In the present study, expectations were assessed in a number of ways. Responses on the PES (job content expectations) were scored in terms of general accuracy. Responses on the PSI (organisational expectations) were scored in terms of change, with responses on the second administration assumed to be an accurate account of individual experience. Responses on the PSS (organisational stress expectations), and the sexual harassment and discrimination measures were scored in terms of the discrepancy between expectations and reality. However, participants were required to retrospectively consider their expectations. Future research in this area should maintain consistency in measuring job expectations. Perhaps the best way of measuring expectations was used in a study by Nelson and Sutton (1991). They asked participants before they began a new job to indicate the frequency with which they expected to encounter certain stressors. After six months’ work experience, they asked them to indicate the frequency with which they had
actually encountered the stressors. They used these measures as a gauge of overestimating and underestimating stressors.

**Generalisability**

Ninety-six percent of police recruits at the Royal New Zealand Police College completed the survey at Time 1, so responders were representative of police recruits completing training at this time. This sample's personal characteristics also reflected those of current New Zealand Police officers.

However, the decreased response rate at Time 2 led to differences between responders and non-responders in this sample, that may be attributed to other variables that were not measured in the present study. This limits the generalisability of the present study's results to other police populations. It must be noted that the sample at Time 1 differed significantly from the sample at Time 2 in terms of ethnicity, wing membership, and job content expectations. It is difficult to postulate why there were ethnic differences between responders and non-responders. Future studies sampling the New Zealand Police could assess any systematic cultural differences by ensuring these demographic groups are better represented and examined. The most likely reason why the last two wings surveyed were much less likely to return their second questionnaire than the first two wings surveyed is because they had a greater workload than the first two wings surveyed. Police recruits are required to complete a certain number of study modules and university papers within their first year of work after completing police training. The number of university papers that were to be completed within the year was recently increased, with
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Wing 3 being the first to be affected by this new policy. It is unclear why recruits with unrealistic job content expectations were less likely to return their second questionnaire than recruits with realistic job expectations. Police recruits with unrealistic policing expectations may have been made aware of the inaccuracy of their expectations when they began working as police constables. Consequently, they may have felt embarrassed returning their second questionnaire, knowing that the purpose of the present study was to measure job expectations in a sample of police constables.

Future Research

Longitudinal Studies

Any research undertaken in the field of expectations and reality shock necessitates a prospective longitudinal design, owing to the limitations of retrospective and cross-sectional designs and the importance of measuring the development of reality shock and associated outcomes over time. Although the present study found significant correlations between reality shock and all of the outcome variables, a limitation of the present study was that they were measured cross-sectionally. Any future research conducted in this area should measure these constructs over time.

Improvements to the present study’s design should include more than two measurement points for many reasons. This would help clarify the usual beginning and end points of reality shock, and the duration of this phenomenon. With a policing sample, it would be ideal to measure reality shock after ten months’ work experience, to gauge whether the intensity of reality shock
changes over time. This would ensure that police constables were still in the encounter stage of organisational socialisation (Louis, 1980), and presumably the shock or rejection phase of reality shock. While the present study showed that reality shock was occurring after six months’ work experience, it would be valuable to ascertain whether reality shock is more severe at other points in a police constable’s career.

Furthermore, little is known about the duration of reality shock, so continuing to measure this construct beyond six months’ work experience would provide insight into the length of reality shock. A measure could be constructed to assess the different phases of reality shock, and be administered at varying times to determine the validity of this phase model of reality shock. It would also highlight whether any other factors, such as individual difference variables, affect the length of reality shock. The subscales of the Reality Shock Scale (see Appendix C) could be further developed and refined for this purpose.

The failure to find significant relationships between job content, organisational, and sexual harassment expectations and reality shock may also be a function of measurement timing. Had these expectations been assessed at several points, they may have shown significant relationships with reality shock.

Job Expectations
Research is still required in the field of job expectations. A particularly neglected area is the formation of job expectations. Future research could focus on exactly how job expectations are formed from both cognitive and social
perspectives. Promising areas to examine would include the development of cognitive schemas for jobs and how they might influence one's expectations about different jobs. It would be interesting to investigate whether cognitive biases distort the development of schemas, and thus the accuracy of job expectations. Research into social stereotyping (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1981) could be applied to the examination of job expectation formation to determine whether people maintain similar stereotypes about jobs, and the tasks and situations routinely encountered in different jobs.

The present study explored five types of job expectations; job content, organisational, organisational stress, sexual harassment, and sexual discrimination. Organisational stress expectations were shown to be significant in the development of reality shock. Future research could examine this type of job expectation further, perhaps by exploring whether specific types of organisational stressors contribute more to reality shock. Other studies might consider the pertinence of other types of job expectations in the development of reality shock. For example, research could look at new employees' expectations regarding their conditions of work and contractual obligations, or their expectations concerning autonomy and responsibility.

Outcomes of Reality Shock

The present study focussed on the immediate consequences of reality shock; poor psychological and physical health and low job satisfaction. Future studies should examine the more chronic outcomes of reality shock, outlined in Chapter seven. Burnout, cynicism, absenteeism, and turnover are important long-term
reactions to reality shock that have scarcely been studied. Although time consuming, research conducted in this area would be a valuable contribution to the understanding of reality shock and its outcomes. Furthermore, it would be useful to measure a variety of job expectations, as in the present study, to see whether inaccurate expectations in a particular sphere are more likely to predict certain long-term outcomes of reality shock.

Another possible outcome of reality shock that has attracted a lot of research in the organisational literature is organisational commitment. Although related to both job satisfaction and turnover, organisational commitment has not yet been acknowledged as a likely consequence of reality shock. Any research examining long-term outcomes of reality shock should also include consideration of organisational commitment.

Other Populations
Although the present study was conducted with a sample of police constables, its applications to other populations cannot be ignored. Every occupation involves a period in which expectations are compared with reality. However, newcomers to certain professions such as nursing, medicine, and teaching have been recognised as vulnerable to reality shock. Researchers could explore whether members of other similar occupations are also prone to reality shock. One such study could examine the accuracy of job expectations among army personnel posted to peace-keeping duties overseas.
Future studies could apply a similar design to that used in the present study with these suggested populations. This would help determine whether people in different occupations experience reality shock at similar times, and whether inaccurate job expectations in particular spheres leads to reality shock among some occupations and not others.

Implications

The results of the present study have important implications at both the theoretical and practical level. Primarily, the present study has shown reality shock to be a crucial construct from which to view the relationship between job expectations, health outcomes, and job satisfaction. The literature had largely ignored reality shock, favouring other similar constructs, such as burnout. The present findings suggest that the utility of reality shock as a mediator of the relationship between expectations and outcomes should be further explored using the Reality Shock Scale (RSS).

The RSS was developed specifically for the purposes of the present study. Its utility as a sound measure of reality shock was demonstrated in two fundamental ways. First, the RSS showed good internal reliability and validity. Second, this measure was related to expectation and outcome variables that reality shock has been associated with in the organisational literature. For these reasons, the RSS is a valuable tool for both researchers and human resource personnel wishing to identify reality shock in policing populations.
The other measure specifically designed for the present study, the Policing Expectations Scale (PES), also highlights some important theoretical implications. The PES failed to yield significant associations with reality shock or outcome variables. However, this measure was likely the first to be investigating job content expectations in a policing context, and has established a good foundation from which further studies in this area can be based. The PES identified the areas in which expectations tended to be unrealistic, which is greatly beneficial to police organisations.

On a practical level, the results of the present study have shown the importance of having accurate job expectations when beginning a new job. The finding that constables whose organisational stress expectations were inaccurate subsequently suffered reality shock, poor physical and psychological symptoms, negative affect, and low job satisfaction should be of concern to the New Zealand Police. Previous research conducted by the New Zealand Police (1998) has determined that a substantial proportion of the people who disengaged from the police believed their expectations were not met during their careers. There are a number of interventions that can be taken to minimise the negative impact that inaccurate organisational stress expectations might have on wellbeing, satisfaction, and employee turnover.

First, the New Zealand Police can endeavour to eliminate inaccurate organisational stress expectations before the potential recruit is hired. This would best be done via a realistic job preview (RJP), in which both positive and negative information about a job is presented to applicants (Rynes, 1991).
Traditionally, individuals are given only favourable descriptions of a new organisation and job. RJP s are designed to scale down potential employees' job expectations to more realistic or even lower levels, thus increasing the chance that these expectations will be met on the job. A recent meta-analysis of the effects of RJP s on multiple organisational outcomes has suggested that the use of RJP s is associated with decreased attrition from the recruitment process, lower job expectations, and lower turnover (Phillips, 1998).

The New Zealand Police could implement the use of RJP s when recruiting people to join the policing organisation, in order to scale down any inaccurate organisational stress expectations. It is recommended that the “Scope” programme be altered to include as many facets of policing as possible, so that both the negative and positive aspects of policing are presented to potential recruits. In particular, it is suggested that people wanting to join the police are exposed to the mundane organisational stressors that they may have been unaware of.

Second, the New Zealand police should try to identify both the areas in which inaccurate organisational stress expectations are common, and those recruits and new constables with inaccurate expectations. The results of the present study have helped isolate those tasks and situations that show the greatest discrepancy between expectations and reality. This information should be used during police recruit training to scale down inaccurate expectations in these areas. Recruits and new constables with inaccurate organisational stress expectations could be identified through the use of the PSS or other similar
measures. Those people found to have inaccurate expectations could then be given accurate information in order to temper their expectations and reduce the risk of developing reality shock. Alternatively, the job of police constable should be changed so that organisational stress is kept to a minimum.

Summary of the Main Findings

Overall, police constables' job expectations changed with time and experience. Police recruits' job content expectations were fairly realistic, and continued to become more realistic over time. Their organisational expectations also changed with six months' work experience, and there was a marked discrepancy between expectations and reality regarding organisational stress. Female constables generally had realistic expectations regarding their exposure to sexual harassment and discrimination.

Of the five types of job expectations, organisational stress and sexual discrimination were the only expectations to be associated with reality shock. Furthermore, organisational stress expectations were the only expectation variable to be related to both reality shock and an outcome variable. Reality shock was found to mediate the relationship between organisational stress expectations and three outcome variables: psychological distress, negative affect, and job satisfaction.

The results of the present study are important for several reasons. However, there are two fundamental areas in which this study has made a significant contribution. Firstly, the present results highlight the need for police recruit
training that presents policing in a realistic light. In particular, it is recommended that police recruits are given an accurate briefing on the stressors common to the police organisation. Secondly, the present study’s results show the utility of the reality shock construct as an explanation for the negative symptoms that arise in response to having inaccurate job expectations. This study has further developed the theory of reality shock and has demonstrated it to be a pivotal construct warranting further definition and research.
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SUMMARY OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FOR EACH WING
Table A1

Demographic Data for Wing 1 at the Royal New Zealand Police College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N = 78</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Age</strong></td>
<td>27.79</td>
<td>70.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand European</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Maori</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No School Qualification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Certificate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form Certificate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Bursary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Professional Certificate or Diploma</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree/Diploma</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Familiarity with the Police</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shiftwork Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2

Demographic Data for Wing 2 at the Royal New Zealand Police College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Age</strong> 28.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong> 6.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand European</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Maori</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No School Qualification</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Certificate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form Certificate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Bursary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Professional Certificate or Diploma</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree/Diploma</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity with the Police</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shiftwork Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A3

Demographic Data for Wing 3 at the Royal New Zealand Police College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>28.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand European</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Maori</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No School Qualification</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Certificate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form Certificate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Bursary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Professional Certificate or Diploma</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree/Diploma</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with the Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiftwork Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A4

Demographic Data for Wing 4 at the Royal New Zealand Police College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Age = 28.62</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD = 5.45</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>81.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand European</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Maori</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No School Qualification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Certificate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form Certificate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Bursary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate or Diploma</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree/Diploma</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Familiarity with the Police</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>70.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shiftwork Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

POLICING EXPECTATIONS SCALE PILOT STUDY
Items for the Police Expectations Scale were generated in two phases. The first phase involved the generation of an initial item pool, while the second phase involved the testing of the initial item pool and the inclusion of additional items.

Phase One: 15th December 1998

Method

Participants

Two female and three male frontline police constables were approached by their Inspector to speak to the researcher about the tasks and situations encountered in their job. All participants were stationed at the Palmerston North Police Station, and had between one and seven and a half years' policing experience.

Procedure

Participants were interviewed as a group in the station's staff room for approximately one hour. The following issues were raised by the researcher during informal discussion:

1. The tasks or situations that are encountered frequently (i.e., at least once a week) on the job.

2. The tasks or situations that are encountered infrequently (i.e., less than once a week) on the job.

3. The tasks or situations that are encountered on the job that one never thought one would encounter.

4. The tasks or situations that are not encountered on the job that one thought one would encounter.

5. The tasks or situations that one wishes one would encounter on the job more frequently.
6. The tasks or situations that one wishes one would encounter on the job less frequently.

7. The public's perceptions of what the policing role involves.

The researcher recorded participants' responses during the discussion. Once all of the issues had been discussed at some length, the participants were thanked for their time.

**Results**

The informal discussion generated a number of tasks and situations that were collated to form the pilot questionnaire used in phase two of the pilot study. Each response was broken down into its simplest form so that it described only one task or situation. Each item was worded so that it began with the present participle of a verb (e.g., Attending shoplifting incidents) to maintain standardisation.

Forty-nine items were used. Twenty-one of those items outlined tasks or situations that the sample indicated were frequently encountered by frontline police constables. The remaining 28 items outlined tasks or situations that the sample indicated were infrequently encountered by frontline police constables. All items were randomly ordered to comprise the pilot questionnaire.
Phase Two: 1\textsuperscript{st} February 1999

Method

Participants
At the researcher's request, the New Zealand Police generated a random list of 200 names of New Zealand police officers with a minimum of one year's experience. Thirty female and 170 male police officers were sent the pilot questionnaire and an information sheet (see the questionnaire included at the end of this appendix. Please note that this is not the final version of the questionnaire).

Materials
The pilot version of the Police Expectations Scale and an information sheet were sent to 200 participants. They also received an addressed freepost envelope in which to return their completed questionnaires.

Procedure
The questionnaire was distributed to each participant via the New Zealand Police internal mailing system. An information sheet, detailing the purposes of the study, accompanied each survey. The information sheet also emphasised that any information given would be treated in the strictest confidence. If people were willing to participate, they were asked to complete the questionnaire and place it in the freepost envelope provided. This envelope was addressed to the researcher and could be returned by public post.
Results

One hundred and fourteen of the 200 participants responded to the questionnaire (57%). The following items received the strongest support for being frequently encountered tasks or situations:

19. Writing down notes in a notebook 98%
9. Making inquiries 97%
27. Preparing an incident file 91%
45. Duplicating information several times by hand 91%

The following items received the strongest support for being infrequently encountered tasks or situations:

31. Resuscitating people 0%
32. Raiding escort services 0%
41. Discharging a firearm 0%
44. Extinguishing small fires 0%

Changes to the Questionnaire

The results of the second phase of the pilot study led to a change in the wording of the questionnaire. The term “police constable” was deemed too broad. This term was extended to “frontline police constable” to distinguish between general duties and specialist police constables.
The random nature of the pilot sample resulted in the inclusion of respondents employed in specialist fields. Consequently, it is believed that some of these respondents may have completed the questionnaire as pertaining to their own job rather than to that of a police constable.

To allow for this variability in responding, items that elicited ‘frequently’ responses from less than 70% of the sample were omitted from the questionnaire. Similarly, items that elicited ‘infrequently’ responses from less than 70% of the sample were also omitted. Thus, the following items did not appear in the questionnaire:

3. Attending sudden deaths
8. Checking curfews of people on bail
14. Adapting to shiftwork easily
17. Stopping cars at checkpoints
18. Raiding known drug houses
20. Liaising with external support organisations
23. Looking for missing persons
24. Carrying out search warrants
37. Driving around aimlessly
39. Recovering stolen items
42. Fingerprinting at crime scenes
43. Checking on prisoners at the station
Participants were asked to list any tasks or situations that are frequently encountered that were not mentioned in the questionnaire. A variety of examples were provided, and those that were mentioned by at least ten respondents were added to the questionnaire. These items included:

- Dealing with drunk people
- Preparing a court file
- Providing information to public inquiries

Once these changes had been made, the final version of this questionnaire included 40 items. This measure was included in the initial questionnaire administered to four recruit intakes at the Royal New Zealand Police College in Porirua, and also in the second questionnaire administered to this sample after six months' work experience.
The following is a list of tasks or situations that a frontline police constable could find him/her self in. Some of these tasks or situations are encountered frequently, while others are encountered infrequently. Please tick the 'FREQ.' box if you think the task or situation is encountered FREQUENTLY (i.e., at least one a week) by a typical frontline police constable in New Zealand. Please tick the 'INFREQ.' box if you think the task or situation is encountered INFREQUENTLY (i.e., less than once a week) by a typical frontline police constable in New Zealand.

1. Being assaulted [ ] [ ]
2. Administering basic First Aid [ ] [ ]
3. Attending sudden deaths [ ] [ ]
4. Attending vehicle accidents [ ] [ ]
5. Transporting bodies to the mortuary [ ] [ ]
6. Photographing crime scenes [ ] [ ]
7. Stripping bodies [ ] [ ]
8. Checking curfews of people on bail [ ] [ ]
9. Making inquiries [ ] [ ]
10. Doing everything “by-the-book” [ ] [ ]
11. Photographing victims [ ] [ ]
12. Attending burglaries [ ] [ ]
13. Aiding customs officers [ ] [ ]
14. Adapting to shiftwork easily [ ] [ ]
15. Patrolling a particular area with a specific goal [ ] [ ]
16. Pursuing stolen cars at high speed [ ] [ ]
17. Stopping cars at checkpoints
18. Raiding known drug houses
19. Writing down notes in a notebook
20. Liaising with external support organisations, e.g., CYPFS
21. Attending rape incidents
22. Looking for missing persons
23. Carrying out search warrants
24. Attending domestic incidents
25. Being spat on
26. Preparing an incident file
27. Breath-testing people suspected of being drunk
28. Transporting prisoners from prison to appear in court
29. Making arrests
30. Resuscitating people
31. Raiding escort services
32. Preparing bodies for identification
33. Attending shoplifting incidents
34. Notifying relatives of a death
35. Pursuing wanted criminals at high speed
36. Driving around aimlessly
37. Patrolling alone
38. Recovering stolen items
39. Attending assault incidents
40. Discharging a firearm
41. Fingerprinting at crime scenes
42. Checking on prisoners at the station
43. Extinguishing small fires
44. Duplicating information several times by hand
45. Attending theft incidents
46. Clearing the scene where a suicide has occurred
47. Writing tickets for traffic violations
48. Raiding known gang houses
49. Attending large-scale public events

Can you think of any other tasks or situations that are FREQUENTLY performed by police officers in New Zealand that have not been mentioned above? Please list them in the spaces provided below.

Can you think of any other tasks or situations that are INFREQUENTLY performed by police officers in New Zealand, but the general public think are performed frequently? Please list them in the spaces provided below.

Thank you very much for your time and participation.
REALITY SHOCK SCALE PILOT STUDY
Aim

The aim of the present study was to develop a measure of ‘reality shock’ suitable for use within police organisations. A pilot survey was distributed to police constables to assess the appropriateness and reliability of the items.

Method

Participants

Fifty-four questionnaires were distributed to police constables who had been in one recruit wing at the Royal New Zealand Police College in Porirua. This wing had approximately 13 months’ policing experience at the time of the survey. Because the pilot survey concerned symptoms of reality shock, it was important to pilot the survey on constables that were still relatively new to the job.

Of the 54 questionnaires distributed, 29 questionnaires were returned (54%). While this response rate is low, it is encouraging when one considers reports that police staff are experiencing low morale and resentment at completing paperwork that is additional to that encountered in the job. The individual characteristics of this sample are unknown, as the survey did not include questions regarding demographic information. There is no reason to believe that responders differed from non-responders. The length of the survey was kept to a minimum to encourage a higher return rate.

Measures

Reality shock has been poorly defined in the literature. Consequently, this lack of empirical definition has lead to the inadequate measurement of this
phenomenon. In their study of reality shock and organisational commitment, Dean et al. (1988) used the difference scores between job expectations at Time One and Time Two to indicate reality shock. This method is simply assessing the antecedents of reality shock, and effectively ignoring the crucial psychological elements of reality shock itself.

Research conducted by M. S. Taylor (1988) employed several questions designed to assess reality shock in college students. Her study examined five facets of reality shock including conflict between work and school and with the status quo procedures, confidence in work preparation, anxiety, and job performance. While these sub-scales represent a more inclusive approach to measuring reality shock, it is important to note that many of the psychological elements of this phenomenon have still been overlooked.

In response to the inadequacy of previous measures of reality shock, a measure was constructed using the rational or deductive approach outlined by Jackson (1971). Twenty-eight items were developed directly from seminal descriptions of reality shock, and were adapted to be appropriate in a policing context. Once a number of items had been generated, reversals of those items were constructed where possible, to add to the item pool. The following items were those included in the preliminary survey:

1. Everything I learned at the Police College has been very useful on the job.

2. I believe that my former instructors at the Police College were 'in touch' with frontline policing.

3. I feel bitter toward the police organisation.
4. I am always alert.
5. I feel defeated when I am not successful.
6. I talk to people more and more about the problems with policing.
7. I criticise aspects of policing.
8. I am planning a future with the police.
9. I have asked myself “What am I doing?”
10. I feel overwhelmed.
11. I blame myself for every mistake.
12. I know I have made the right career decision.
13. I can learn a lot from my mistakes.
14. My home life has become very important.
15. I catch myself daydreaming.
16. I think that I am a failure.
17. I have contacted former instructors at the Police College for reassurance.
18. I have not been able to use much of what I was taught at the Police College.
19. I think about the past a lot.
20. I am sure of what I am doing.
21. I feel confused at work.
22. When things go wrong, it is never my fault.
23. I feel in control on the job.
24. I mistrust what my former instructors at the Police College told me.
25. I have been well-prepared for the job.
26. I do not talk to anyone about any problems with my job.
27. I feel that I am successful.
28. I am happy with aspects of policing.
Participants were asked to consider the degree to which each item reflected the way they had felt since beginning work as a police constable. They were required to respond to each of these items using a five-point rating scale, ranging from ‘Not True For Me’ to ‘Very True For Me’.

Procedure

The New Zealand Police provided the names and station addresses of police constables comprising one recruit wing from the Royal New Zealand Police College. An information sheet and questionnaire (see the end of this appendix) were sent to each participant in March 2000 via the New Zealand Police’s internal mailing system. Respondents were required to return their completed questionnaires in a free-post envelope, which was included.

Results

The alpha coefficient for the measure showed good internal reliability at .78. Many of the items also correlated well with the overall scale, with item-total correlations ranging from .02 to .69.

Reliability analyses suggested that the measure could be divided into three subscales, which accounted for 17 of the 28 items. One of the strongest subscales concerned constables’ bitterness with the police organisation. This subscale had an alpha coefficient of .78, and included the following items:

3. I feel bitter toward the police organisation.
6. I talk to people more and more about the problems with policing.
7. I criticise aspects of policing.

28. I am happy with aspects of policing.

Also with an alpha coefficient of .78, another subscale concerned constables’ intentions to continue a career in policing. This included the following items:

8. I am planning a future with the police.

9. I have asked myself “What am I doing?”

12. I know I have made the right career decision.

The third subscale revolved around constables’ sense of well-being and self-esteem. This subscale yielded an alpha coefficient of .76, and included these items:

4. I am always alert.

5. I feel defeated when I am not successful.

10. I feel overwhelmed.

11. I blame myself for every mistake.

13. I can learn a lot from my mistakes.

16. I think that I am a failure.

20. I am sure of what I am doing.

21. I feel confused at work.

23. I feel in control on the job.

27. I feel that I am successful.
Each subscale was low to moderately correlated with the others, with correlations ranging from 0.30 to 0.59. Furthermore, each subscale was fairly strongly correlated with the overall Reality Shock Scale, with statistically significant correlations ranging from 0.7 to 0.78 (see Table C1). This analysis of reliability indicated that none of the items should be omitted from the final version of the Reality Shock Scale. This measure was included in the second questionnaire administered to police recruits who had six months' work experience as police constables.

Table C1

*Pearson’s r Correlations between Subscales and with the Reality Shock Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Policing Career</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Bitterness With Policing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policing Career</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.59*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitterness With Policing</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality Shock Total</td>
<td>0.78*</td>
<td>0.75*</td>
<td>0.72*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < .05
ADJUSTMENT TO POLICING STUDY

My name is Tania Lithgow and I am currently undertaking research with Massey University and the New Zealand Police. I am particularly interested in how police recruits adjust to starting work as a police constable.

There is plenty of research to suggest that police recruits have quite unrealistic expectations as to what they will be doing when they start work as a police constable. When the reality of policing sinks in, many people are left feeling disillusioned and resentful of their new occupation. At present, I am developing a measure intended to give an indication of how well people make the transition from recruit to constable. I need to test this measure on police constables who are still relatively new to the job.

You would be making a tremendous contribution to our research by filling out this questionnaire. If you'd like to help us with this research, please complete the questionnaire, seal it in the envelope provided, and post it to me. All information you give is confidential, and will only be seen by myself and my supervisor. There is no way that you can be identified by your responses to the questionnaire.

Once you have completed the questionnaire, it would be appreciated if you could return it to me by April 10th at the latest. If you have any questions or ideas, please don't hesitate to contact me on (06) 350 5799 extn. 7907 (phone) or (06) 350 5673 (fax). Alternatively, you could contact my supervisor, Dr Christine Stephens on (06) 350 5799 extn. 2071.

Thank You For Your Time
The following items describe people's possible reactions to a new job. Please read each item and mark the appropriate number in the space next to the item. Indicate to what extent you have felt this way since you started your job as a police constable by using the following scale to show whether these statements are true or not true for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not True</td>
<td>Slightly True</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Somewhat True</td>
<td>Very True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Me</td>
<td>For Me</td>
<td>For Me</td>
<td>For Me</td>
<td>For Me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Everything I learned at the Police College has been very useful on the job. [ ]
2. I believe that my former instructors at the Police College were 'in touch' with frontline policing. [ ]
3. I feel bitter toward the police organisation. [ ]
4. I am always alert. [ ]
5. I feel defeated when I am not successful. [ ]
6. I talk to people more and more about problems with policing. [ ]
7. I criticise aspects of policing. [ ]
8. I am planning a future with the police. [ ]
9. I have asked myself “What am I doing?” [ ]
10. I feel overwhelmed. [ ]
11. I blame myself for every mistake. [ ]
12. I know I have made the right career decision. [ ]
13. I can learn a lot from my mistakes. [ ]
14. My home life has become very important. [ ]
15. I catch myself daydreaming. [ ]
16. I think that I am a failure. [ ]
17. I have contacted former instructors at the Police College for reassurance. [ ]
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18. I have not been able to use much of what was taught at the Police College.
19. I think about the past a lot.
20. I am sure of what I am doing.
21. I feel confused at work.
22. When things go wrong, it is never my fault.
23. I feel in control on the job.
24. I mistrust what my former instructors at the Police College told me.
25. I have been well-prepared for the job.
26. I do not talk to anyone about any problems with my job.
27. I feel that I am successful.
28. I am happy with aspects of policing.

Thank You For Your Participation
TIME 1 QUESTIONNAIRE
My name is Tania Lithgow and I'm currently undertaking research toward a Doctoral Degree in Psychology at Massey University. I am particularly interested in the job expectations that police recruits have prior to starting work as a police officer. I am investigating which tasks and situations police recruits expect to frequently find themselves in as a police officer. In addition, I am looking at what sort of person police recruits think a police officer is.

I would like to invite you to participate in this study. If you decide to participate, all you have to do is fill in the following questionnaire, which takes about five minutes to complete. If you agree to participate, you will be contacted via mail after six months work experience and invited to complete a final, brief questionnaire. In order to locate where you are working six months from now, you will be required to provide your Query Identification (QID) number.

It is assumed that filling in the questionnaire indicates your consent to participate. You do not have to fill in the questionnaire, or answer any questions that you do not want to.

Your rights as a participant:

- You have the right to decline to participate.
- You have the right to refuse to answer any particular questions.
- You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time.
- You have the right to ask any questions about the study at any time during participation.
- You may provide information on the understanding that all responses will be held in complete confidence by the researcher and her supervisor, to be
used only for the purposes of the research. It will not be possible to identify individuals in any reports of the results.

- You have the right to be given access to a summary of the findings of the study when it is completed.

All information you give will be completely confidential, and will only be seen by myself and my supervisor. There is no way that you can be identified by your responses to the questionnaire. I would like to emphasise that no employee of the New Zealand Police will ever view any individual’s responses to the questionnaire. Once the research has been completed, the New Zealand Police will receive a summary, in which individuals will not be identified.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me on (06) 356 9099 extn. 7907 (phone) or (06) 350 5673 (fax). Alternatively, you could contact my supervisor, Dr Christine Stephens on (06) 350 4146.

Thank you for your time
Please read the following instructions carefully:

- All information you provide is completely confidential, and will be used only for the purposes of the study.

- It is important that you give YOUR OWN ANSWERS. PLEASE DO NOT DISCUSS YOUR ANSWERS WITH OTHERS.

- Do not take long over each question; USUALLY YOUR FIRST RESPONSE IS BEST.

First we would like some general background information about you.

Please give the NUMBER for the answer that is best for you in the box provided.

1) What is your QID number?

Your QID number consists of:
* The first letter of your first name.
* The first letter of your last name.
* The letter and three numbers on your shoulder band.

2) What is your gender?

Male 1
Female 2

3) How old are you?

4) Which ethnic group do you identify with?

New Zealander of European descent 1
New Zealander of Maori descent 2
New Zealander of Pacific Island descent 3
Other, please specify 4
5) **What is your highest educational qualification?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No school qualification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School certificate passes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth form certificate passes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University bursary passes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/ Professional certificate of diploma</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree or diploma</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) **Has somebody that you have known well ever worked for the New Zealand Police?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) **Have you ever had a job in which you had to do shiftwork?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) **Compared to a person in excellent health, how would you rate your health at the present time?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrible</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and mark the appropriate number in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you have felt this way during the past few weeks. Use the following scale to record your answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very slightly or not at all</td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>extremely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

interested | | irritable | | proud | |
distressed | | alert | | afraid | |
excited | | ashamed | | enthusiastic | |
upset | | inspired | | active | |
strong | | nervous | | hostile | |
guilty | | determined | | jittery | |
scared | | attentive | | | |
10) What might the ideal frontline police constable in New Zealand be like? Please rate the importance of each personality description below in being a successful frontline police officer. Using the scale below, please write the number that best fits your opinion in the boxes provided. There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in what you think.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Necessary</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td>Helpful, but not Necessary</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Undesirable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideal frontline police constables would:

1. Seek out many exciting activities, participating actively in games, sports, lively parties, and so forth.
2. Seek out quiet and peaceful activities, getting so absorbed that they become quite unobservant.
3. Seek out social activities that are well-organized, actively supporting their rules and regulations.
4. Be sensitive and somewhat critical of people, being private and controlled in openly expressing their feelings.
5. Be very lively and open people, seeing the bright side of everything, even failures.
6. Be aggressive and forceful people, reacting quickly and strongly to events as they occur.
7. View events from a definite set of beliefs or ideas, tending to place much importance on opinions of experts.
8. View events in a common-sense way, tending to think of practical ways of doing a task.
9. Be very expressive and confident people, enjoying performing in public situations.
10. Seek out many activities that they can do alone, being quite comfortable working by themselves.
11. Be somewhat shy and self-conscious people, avoiding attention and being free of vanity and boastfulness.
12. Be somewhat unyielding and persistent people, becoming quite annoyed with demands made by others.

13. Seek out risky and dangerous activities, displaying bold and occasionally impulsive behaviour.

14. Seek out situations with few daily routines, becoming impatient with set schedules and timetables.

15. Be usually very calm and courteous people, holding back personal feelings to avoid offending others.

16. View events in conservative and accepting ways, tending to focus on certainties and stability.

17. View events in a questioning and unique way, tending to reevaluate and reexamine existing ideas.

18. Seek out and join many group activities, being a good team member and supporter.

19. View events from a wide variety of angles, tending to think up different or new ways of doing things.

20. View events in a systematic and organized way, using careful, well-planned, and precise procedures.

21. Seek security through order and control, guarding against unnecessary risks by being well-prepared.

22. View events in an analytic and logical way, tending to "try-it-themselves" before believing it.

23. Be tender and soft-hearted people, reacting emotionally in tune with the feelings of others.

24. View events in idealistic or artistic ways, tending to think in very broad and sometimes dramatic terms.
11) The following is a list of tasks or situations that a frontline police constable could find him/herself in. Some of these tasks or situations are encountered frequently, while others are encountered infrequently. Please tick the 'FREQ.' box if you think the task or situation is encountered FREQUENTLY (i.e., at least one a week) by a typical frontline police constable in New Zealand. Please tick the 'INFREQ.' box if you think the task or situation is encountered INFREQUENTLY (i.e., less than once a week) by a typical frontline police constable in New Zealand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREQ.</th>
<th>INFREQ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being assaulted</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administering basic First Aid</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attending vehicle accidents</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transporting bodies to the mortuary</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Answering public inquiries</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Photographing crime scenes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Making inquiries</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Doing everything “by-the-book”</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Attending burglaries</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Aiding customs officers</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Patrolling a particular area with a specific goal</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Pursuing stolen cars at high speed</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Writing down notes in a notebook</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Attending rape incidents</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Attending domestic incidents</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Being spat on</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Preparing an incident file</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Breath-testing people suspected of being drunk</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Transporting prisoners from prison to appear in court
20: Making arrests
21. Dealing with drunk people
22. Doing watch-house duty
23. Resuscitating people
24. Raiding escort services
25. Preparing bodies for identification
26. Attending shoplifting incidents
27. Notifying relatives of a death
28. Pursuing wanted criminals at high speed
29. Driving around aimlessly
30. Patrolling alone
31. Attending assault incidents
32. Discharging a firearm
33. Extinguishing small fires
34. Duplicating information several times by hand
35. Attending theft incidents
36. Clearing the scene where a suicide has occurred
37. Writing tickets for traffic violations
38. Raiding known gang houses
39. Attending large-scale public events
40. Preparing a court file

Thank you very much for your time and participation
Appendix E

MALE TIME 2 QUESTIONNAIRE
Hi everyone!

My name's Tania Lithgow and with a bit of luck you remember filling out a questionnaire for me during your first week of police training. I promised you I'd send another one after you'd had about six months' work experience......and here it is!

Just to refresh your memory....
I was particularly interested in the job expectations that police recruits have before starting work as a police constable. I was investigating which tasks and situations police recruits expect to frequently find themselves in as a police officer. In addition, I was looking at what sort of person police recruits think a police officer is.

I'm still interested in all of this, but now I'd like to see if your expectations have changed with time and experience.

Your rights as a participant:

- You have the right to decline to participate.
- You have the right to refuse to answer any particular questions.
- You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time.
- You have the right to ask any questions about the study at any time during participation.
- You may provide information on the understanding that all responses will be held in complete confidence by the researcher and her supervisor, to be used only for the purposes of the research. It will not be possible to identify individuals in any reports of the results.
- You have the right to be given access to a summary of the findings of the study when it is completed.
Should you agree to participate, I’d like to emphasise what a **HUGE** contribution you’d be making to both my research and to the New Zealand Police’s understanding of the transition from police recruit to constable. Should you decide not to complete this questionnaire, then I will be unable to use all of the great information you provided in the first questionnaire.

All information you give will be completely confidential, and will only be seen by my myself and my supervisor. There is no way that you can be identified by your responses to the questionnaire. I would like to emphasise that no employee of the New Zealand Police will ever view any individual's responses to the questionnaire. Once the research has been completed, the New Zealand Police will receive a summary, in which individuals will not be identified. In turn, this summary will be published in ‘Ten-One’, so keep an eye out for it!

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me on (06) 350 5799 extn. 7907 (phone) or (06) 350 5673 (fax). Alternatively, you could contact my supervisor, Dr Christine Stephens on (06) 350 5799 extn. 2071.

Thank you for your time!

Best of luck with your policing career

😊
POLICE CONSTABLES’ JOB EXPECTATIONS STUDY

Please read the following instructions carefully:

- All information you provide is completely confidential, and will be used only for the purposes of the study.

- It is important that you give YOUR OWN ANSWERS. PLEASE DO NOT DISCUSS YOUR ANSWERS WITH OTHERS.

- Do not take long over each question; USUALLY YOUR FIRST RESPONSE IS BEST.

First we would like some general background information about you.
Please give the NUMBER for the answer that is best for you in the box provided.

1) What is your QID number?

Your QID number consists of:
* The first letter of your first name.
* The first letter of your last name.
* The letter and three numbers on your shoulder band.

2) What type of station are you now working at?

Urban 1
Rural 2

3) What sort of area did you originally come from?

Urban 1
Rural 2

4) Compared to a person in excellent health, how would you rate your health at the present time?

Terrible 1
Very poor 2
Poor 3
Fair 4
Good 5
Very good 6
Excellent 7

5) How satisfied are you with your job in general?

Not satisfied 1
A little satisfied 2
Moderately satisfied 3
Very satisfied 4
Extremely satisfied 5
6) How have you felt during the past seven days including today? Use the following scale to describe how distressing you have found these things over this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not At All Distressing</strong></td>
<td><strong>A Little Distressing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quite A Bit Distressing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Extremely Distressing</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Difficulty in speaking when you are excited... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
2. Trouble remembering things... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
3. Worried about sloppiness or carelessness... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
4. Blaming yourself for things... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
5. Pains in the lower part of your back... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
6. Feeling lonely... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
7. Feeling blue... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
8. Your feelings being easily hurt... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
9. Feeling others do not understand you or are unsympathetic... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
10. Feeling that people are unfriendly or dislike you... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
11. Having to do things very slowly in order to be sure you are doing them right... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
12. Feeling inferior to others... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
13. Soreness of your muscles... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
14. Having to check and double-check what you do... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
15. Hot or cold spells... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
16. Your mind going blank... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
17. Numbness or tingling in parts of your body... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
18. A lump in your throat... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
19. Trouble concentrating... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
20. Weakness in parts of your body... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
21. Heavy feelings in your arms and legs... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ☐
The following items describe people's possible reactions to a new job. Please read each item and mark the appropriate number in the space next to the item. Indicate to what extent you have felt this way since you started your job as a police constable by using the following scale to show whether these statements are true or not true of you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not True For Me</th>
<th>Slightly True For Me</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat True For Me</th>
<th>Very True For Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Everything I learned at the Police College has been very useful on the job...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I believe that my former instructors at the Police College were 'in touch' with frontline policing...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I feel bitter toward the police organisation...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I am always alert...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I feel defeated when I am not successful...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I talk to people more and more about problems with policing...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I criticise aspects of policing...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I am planning a future with the police...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I have asked myself &quot;What am I doing?&quot;...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I feel overwhelmed...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I blame myself for every mistake...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I know I have made the right career decision...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I can learn a lot from my mistakes...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>My home life has become very important...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I catch myself daydreaming...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I think that I am a failure...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I have contacted former instructors at the Police College for reassurance...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I have not been able to use much of what was taught at the Police College...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I think about the past a lot...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I am sure of what I am doing...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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21. I feel confused at work... ... ... ... ... ... ...

22. When things go wrong, it is never my fault... ... ... ... ... ...

23. I feel in control on the job... ... ... ... ... ... ...

24. I mistrust what my former instructors at the Police College told me... ... ...

25. I have been well-prepared for the job... ... ... ... ... ...

26. I do not talk to anyone about any problems with my job... ... ...

27. I feel that I am successful... ... ... ... ... ...

28. I am happy with aspects of policing... ... ... ... ... ...

8) What might the ideal frontline police constable in New Zealand be like? Please rate the importance of each personality description below in being a **successful frontline police officer**. Using the scale below, please write the number that best fits your opinion in the boxes provided. There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in what you think.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Very Necessary</th>
<th>2 Necessary</th>
<th>3 Helpful, but not Necessary</th>
<th>4 Uncertain</th>
<th>5 Undesirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Ideal frontline police constables would:**

1. Seek out many exciting activities, participating actively in games, sports, lively parties, and so forth.

2. Seek out quiet and peaceful activities, getting so absorbed that they become quite unobservant.

3. Seek out social activities that are well-organised, actively supporting their rules and regulations.

4. Be sensitive and somewhat critical of people, being private and controlled in openly expressing their feelings.

5. Be very lively and open people, seeing the bright side of everything, even failures.

6. Be aggressive and forceful people, reacting quickly and strongly to events as they occur.

7. View events from a definite set of beliefs or ideas, tending to place much importance on opinions of experts.

8. View events in a common-sense way, tending to think of practical ways of doing a task.

9. Be very expressive and confident people, enjoying performing in public situations.

10. Seek out many activities that they can do alone, being quite comfortable working by themselves.
11. Be somewhat shy and self-conscious people, avoiding attention and being free of vanity and boastfulness.

12. Be somewhat unyielding and persistent people, becoming quite annoyed with demands made by others.

13. Seek out risky and dangerous activities, displaying bold and occasionally impulsive behaviour.

14. Seek out situations with few daily routines, becoming impatient with set schedules and timetables.

15. Be usually very calm and courteous people, holding back personal feelings to avoid offending others.

16. View events in conservative and accepting ways, tending to focus on certainties and stability.

17. View events in a questioning and unique way, tending to reevaluate and reexamine existing ideas.

18. Seek out and join many group activities, being a good team member and supporter.

19. View events from a wide variety of angles, tending to think up different or new ways of doing things.

20. View events in a systematic and organized way, using careful, well-planned, and precise procedures.

22. Seek security through order and control, guarding against unnecessary risks by being well-prepared.

22. View events in an analytic and logical way, tending to “try-it-themselves” before believing it.

23. Be tender and soft-hearted people, reacting emotionally in tune with the feelings of others.

24. View events in idealistic or artistic ways, tending to think in very broad and sometimes dramatic terms.
9) This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and mark the appropriate number in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you have felt this way during the past few weeks. Use the following scale to record your answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very slightly or not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guilty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1: very slightly or not at all
- 2: a little
- 3: moderately
- 4: quite a bit
- 5: extremely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guilty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10) The following is a list of tasks or situations that a frontline police constable could find him/herself in. Some of these tasks or situations are encountered frequently, while others are encountered infrequently. Please tick the 'FREQ.' Box if you think the task or situation is encountered FREQUENTLY (i.e., at least one a week) by a typical frontline police constable in New Zealand. Please tick the 'INFREQ.' box if you think the task or situation is encountered INFREQUENTLY (i.e., less than once a week) by a typical frontline police constable in New Zealand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>FREQ.</th>
<th>INFREQ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being assaulted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administering basic First Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attending vehicle accidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transporting bodies to the mortuary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Answering public inquiries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Photographing crime scenes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Making inquiries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Attending burglaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Aiding customs officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Patrolling a particular area with a specific goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Pursuing stolen cars at high speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Writing down notes in a notebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Attending rape incidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Attending domestic incidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Being spat on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Preparing an incident file</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Breath-testing people suspected of being drunk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Transporting prisoners from prison to appear in court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Making arrests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Dealing with drunk people...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Doing watch-house duty...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Resuscitating people...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Raiding escort services......</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Preparing bodies for identification...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Attending shoplifting incidents...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Notifying relatives of a death...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Pursuing wanted criminals at high speed...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Driving around aimlessly...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Patrolling alone...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Attending assault incidents...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Discharging a firearm...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Extinguishing small fires...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Duplicating information several times by hand...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Attending theft incidents...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Clearing the scene where a suicide has occurred...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Writing tickets for traffic violations...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Raiding known gang houses...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Attending large-scale public events...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Preparing a court file...</td>
<td>FREQ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This survey contains a list of job events that have been identified by police officers as stressful. Please read each event (item) and rate it on the following dimensions: a) **Frequency** of the occurrence of the event on your own experience during your work as a police constable; and b) The frequency with which you expected the event to occur.

For each event please circle the number in the appropriate column that **approximates** the number of times you have personally experienced the event during your work as a police constable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Event</th>
<th>Has Occurred</th>
<th>Was Expected to Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assignment of disagreeable duties</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
<td>10+ 0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Changing from day to night shift</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
<td>10+ 0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fellow officers not doing their job</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
<td>10+ 0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Court leniency with criminals</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
<td>10+ 0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Political pressure from within the department</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
<td>10+ 0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Political pressure from outside the department</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
<td>10+ 0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Inadequate support by supervisor</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
<td>10+ 0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Inadequate support by department</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
<td>10+ 0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Court appearances on day off or day following</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
<td>10+ 0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night shift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Periods of inactivity and boredom</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
<td>10+ 0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Experiencing negative attitudes toward police</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
<td>10+ 0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Public criticism of police</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
<td>10+ 0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Disagreeable departmental regulations</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
<td>10+ 0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Distorted or negative press accounts of police</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
<td>10+ 0 1-2 3-5 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Event</td>
<td>Has Occurred</td>
<td>Was Expected to Occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ineffectiveness of the correctional system</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Insufficient manpower to adequately handle a job</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lack of recognition for good work</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Excessive or inappropriate discipline</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Performing nonpolice tasks</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Inadequate or poor quality equipment</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Racial pressures or conflict</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Lack of participation in policy-making decisions</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Inadequate salary</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Demands for high moral standards</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Job conflict (by-the-book vs. by-the-situation)</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Court decisions unduly restricting police</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Public apathy toward the police</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Competition for advancement</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Poor or inadequate supervision</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Plea bargaining and technical rulings leading to case dismissal</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Excessive paperwork</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
<td>0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your time and participation
FEMALE TIME 2 QUESTIONNAIRE
The following questions relate to your experiences of sexual harassment within the police. Please read each event (item) and rate it on the following dimensions: a) **Frequency** of the occurrence of the event in your own experience during your work as a police constable; and b) The frequency with which you *expected* the event to occur.

For each event please circle the number in the appropriate column that approximates the number of times you have personally experienced the event during your work as a police constable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident</th>
<th>Has Occurred</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Been subjected to any unwanted and/or unreciprocated verbal or physical conduct that is sexual in nature or has a sexual dimension in the last 6 months from a policeman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Heard from them suggestive stories or jokes about women in general</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Heard comments about other women's figures or appearance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Heard suggestive comments or jokes about your own figure or appearance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Been subjected to persistent requests for dates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Been stroked, touched or pinched</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Been subject to a serious sexual assault</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compared to other male and female colleagues, how often do you encounter the following duties? Please read each duty (item) and rate it on the following dimensions: a) The frequency with which you have encountered each duty, compared to your male colleagues; and b) The frequency with which you expected to encounter each duty compared to your male colleagues.

For each event please circle the number in the appropriate column that approximates the number of times you have personally experienced the event during your work as a police constable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duty</th>
<th>Has Been Encountered</th>
<th>Was Expected to be Encountered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inside station duty</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Safe beats</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accompanied patrol</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Public order duty</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dealing with sex-offence victim</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dealing with young offenders</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dealing with violent offenders</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much for your time and participation.
PERSONALISED REMINDER LETTER
Hi

A few weeks ago I sent you out this questionnaire. I’m resending it to you because many questionnaires have yet to be returned to me, and it’s crucial to my research to get back as many questionnaires as possible.

It would be great if you could complete this questionnaire for me, as I will be unable to use all of the great information you provided in the first questionnaire if the second questionnaire is not completed. I need to do a before and after comparison with your data.

If you could take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire I would be very grateful. If you have any questions about the questionnaire or my research, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you for your time.

Tania Lithgow
Ph. (06) 350 5799 ext. 7907
Email: Tania.Lithgow.1@uni.massey.ac.nz
Appendix H

PERSONALISED REMINDER FACSIMILE
Dear Constable,

It's me again! Could I just ask you one last time if you would please send back my questionnaire “Police Constables’ Job Expectations Study”.

If you need another copy, please ring me on (06) 350 5799 extension 7907.

I realise you have a lot of paperwork to do, but it would be wonderful if you would do this for me as I need the questionnaire urgently.

Many thanks,

Tania Lithgow