**WE ARE THE CHAMPIONS: CHAMPIONING CHANGE AMONG COMMUNITY POLICING OFFICERS**

**ABSTRACT**

Community oriented policing is a philosophy based on police-public partnership and has faced significant challenges regarding implementation despite its popularity. In order to increase the chances for organizational change to succeed, it is important to ensure that the employees support it. The present study employs the Information-Motivation-Behavior skills (IMB) model (Fisher & Fisher, 1992) to determine whether adequate information in the form of training, along with and job autonomy, can develop change-related self-efficacy, which subsequently may affect positive change behaviors among employees. Based on a survey of 476 first-line officers in a large police department in Virginia, our results suggest that field training and job autonomy are directly and indirectly associated with change-championing behavior. The study makes a theoretical contribution to the IMB theory, and a practical contribution to HR practitioners that face the need to implement change programs in various organizations and wish to impact employee attitudes towards change.
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Reform in public sector organizations such as the police has been described as being akin to “bending granite” (Guyot, 1991). This resistance to change is mainly attributed to the rigid and militaristic structure and culture of police organizations which support status quo (Greene & Mastrofski, 1998). Yet, the increasing stakeholder expectations for improved police performance has led to a number of reforms in policing, and a particular one which has received considerable attention over the past quarter century is Community Oriented Policing (COP) (Skogan & Roth, 2004). COP is a philosophy which encourages the involvement of police with communities to establish social order and helps strengthen the legitimacy of police organizations by becoming more responsive to citizens’ needs (Lord & Friday, 2008; Moore & Hartley, 2008).

The implementation of COP strategies calls for major changes in the traditional model of policing, requiring major structural and functional changes (Mastrofski & Ritti, 1995; Moore & Stephens, 1992). Community policing differs from the traditional policing model based on a few key features (Adams et al, 2002). Firstly, in the traditional model, maintaining order is a mainly a role reserved for the police with very little public intervention whereas in community policing, order is achieved in collaboration with the public through regular interaction (Skogan & Hartnett, 1997). Secondly, the traditional model of policing is more reactive and based on responding to a crime after it has taken place, whereas community policing approach is more pro-active and based on crime prevention (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994). Lastly, the traditional model is based on a centralized model of control where decisions are made by top management and implemented by the first line officers. But community policing supports the idea of empowering the street level officer by allowing them a reasonable level of autonomy and flexibility to perform their duties (Eck & Rosenbaum, 1994).

The community policing approach therefore requires police organizations to not only make structural changes but also implement flexible management practices (Maguire & Mastrofski, 2000). The tasks are more challenging and unfamiliar in terms of the level of innovation and creative thinking employed to solve a broad range of community related problems, and strategies are usually adopted without consulting with those who are assigned to implement them (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994). A community policing officer is expected to go beyond the traditional policing functions and act as a community resource officer (Chappell & Lanza-Kaduce, 2004). Skogan (1994:167-168) provides an idea of the nature of tasks a community policing officer is expected to perform: “Opening small neighborhood substations, conducting surveys to identify local problems, organizing meetings and crime prevention seminars, publishing newletters, helping form Neighborhood Watch groups, establishing advisory panels to inform police commanders, organizing youth activities, conducting drug education projects and media campaigns, patrolling on horses amd bicycles, and working with municipal agnecies to enforce health and safety regulations”.

Although most police officers support the idea of community policing in principle, they generally have objections regarding its implementation within their departments (Lab, 2000: Schafer, 2002) because of organizational failure to provide a working environment conducive to change (Paoline et al. 2000). Officers are unable to fully grasp the philosophy and its inherent benefits and consider it excessively labor intensive, time consuming and akin to social work which they perceive to be an unsuitable task for a crime fighting police officer (Saad & Grinc, 2000). Anything beyond the traditional role of police officers is considered less exciting and fails to generate officer support (Mastrofski, Willis & Kochel, 2007).

In view of the aforesaid problems, community policing initiatives can prove difficult to implement unless police organizations equip their officers with the necessary information and autonomy to perform their new roles (Wilson & Bennett, 1994). It therefore becomes important to study the behaviors and attitudes of individual officers, to determine the factors that may lead to the success or failure of the COP initiative (Lord & Friday, 2008) as the program is unlikely to succeed without the support of officers (Schafer, 2002).

The focus of the present research are the first line officers, as they play an important role at the street level in the implementation and success of the decisions of the top management (Schafer, 2002). We employ the Information, Motivation, Behavioral skills model (IMB; Fisher & Fisher, 1992) and argue that adequate field training of officers along with the autonomy to perform their jobs leads to positive change-related behavior and this relationship is mediated by an officer’s perceived level of self-efficacy to deal with the change. In general, the purpose of the paper is to test the IMB model (Fisher & Fisher, 1992) in a police organization and to identify factors that lead to the successful implementation of the COP program by creating champions of change within the organization.

**THEORY AND HYPOTHESES**

Our model for the paper is described in Figure 1 which shows that the relationship between field training and job autonomy with change-related behavior is mediated by change related self-efficacy. We will first discuss how police officers react to community policing initiatives and then drawing upon the IMB model (Fisher & Fisher, 1992) we will explain how field training and job autonomy impact change-related behavior, with self-efficacy mediating the relationship.

------------------------------------

Insert Figure 1 about here
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**The Information, Motivation, Behavior Skill (IMB) Model**

The Information Motivation Behavioral skills model (IMB, Fisher & Fisher, 1992) suggests that with adequate information, motivation and skills, an individual is more likely to enact a targeted behavior. The model relies on two classic theories for predicting behavior in organizations - the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980) and the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1985; Ajzen & Fishbein, 2005), which identify variables that are likely to affect behavior. Based on these models Fisher and Fisher (1992) developed the information, motivation, and behavioral skills model for specifically developing behavioral change programs (Glasford, 2008). According to the model, the information possessed by the individual has to be sufficient, one needs to be motivated to perform the action based on personal conviction and social approval; and the individual needs to have the objective and perceived skills to engage in a specific behavioral outcome. Therefore, in the IMB framework the behavioral skills mediate the relationship between information, motivation and the desired behavior.

The IMB model has been used extensively to predict health related behaviors such as breast self-examination (Misovich, Martinez, Fisher, Bryan, & Catapano, 2003), reduction of risk associated with sexually transmitted diseases (Fisher, Williams, Fisher, & Malloy, 1999), taking HIV medication (Fisher et al., 2006), etc. It is only recently that the IMB model has found application to the analysis of behaviors outside health, such as voting (Glasford, 2008) and recycling behaviors (Seacat, 2010). In the current research, we utilize the IMB framework for understanding behavior change in organizational settings, as suggested by Glasford (2008).

Specifically, we use the IMB model in order to identify factors that can hinder or promote championing change behavior in the community policing context, and will subsequently try to make practical recommendations for community policing.

Based on the information-motivation-behavior model, we predict that to demonstrate the desired behavior, which is championing change, the police officers need sufficient information – practical training and knowledge regarding the benefits and implementation of community policing strategy. Secondly, we predict they also need to be motivated to perform their community policing related assignments and one way to provide this motivation is by empowering them through job autonomy or the freedom to make decisions and perform their jobs as they see fit. Both training and job autonomy are expected to lead to wholehearted behavioral support for the program through the development of perceived ability or self-efficacy to perform a task successfully. The IMB model will be discussed in more detail in the following sections.

**Change-related behavior**

The success of organizational change depends upon the wholehearted support of the employees towards the initiative and it is important to take effective measures to generate positive behavioral change at the individual employee level (Piderit, 2000; Porras & Robertson, 1992). In this regard Antoni (2004:198) argues that, “one has to change the beliefs of the organizational members, which shape their behavior, in order to support sustainable organizational change.”

One of the most important predecessors of behavioral change is commitment to change, which will eventually determine the effort exerted towards the success of change. In their general model of work place commitment, Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) have identified several behavioral outcomes of committing to a change program, namely active or passive resistance, compliance, cooperation or championing the change. Our present research focuses on championing behavior, which demonstrates “extreme enthusiasm for a change by going above and beyond what is formally required to ensure the success of the change and promoting the change to others” (Meyer, Srinivas, Lal, & Topolnytsky, 2007:194). Championing behavior is similar to organizational citizenship behavior or the extra effort by employees that leads to organizational survival and effectiveness in times of change (Katz, 1964; Organ & Ryan, 1995).

The development of championing behavior may be especially important when a new organizational change is being implemented as it requires the employees to be proactive in the adoption and support of change, despite the problems associated with it (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Kotter & Cohen, 2002). Cunningham (2006) also considers championing behavior to be the most desirable form of change related behavior which ensures the success of a change initiative. Empiric findings show that employees with lower levels of support for change are less satisfied with their jobs and are more likely to quit their jobs as a result (Wanberg and Banas, 2000).

**The impact of field training on change-related behavior**

The first component of the IMB model (Fisher & Fisher, 1992) is information. In order to develop skills that will lead to the desired behavior, adequate information is required. Community policing assignments are markedly different from traditional policing.

Since police officers are not traditionally expected to perform tasks such as conducting surveys, organizing community activities and leading community education projects, one of the central ways to develop employee flexibility to deal with the everchanging job requirements is training (Tennenbaum et al, 1991). But although community policing is different from traditional policing tasks, as the activities are based on specialized communication, diversity and problem-solving skills (Adams et al., 2002; Brody et al., 2002; Schafer, 2002; Wilson & Bennett, 1994), officers assigned to community policing go through the same formal police academy program without any additional formal training. This program is focused mainly on law enforcement (King & Lab, 2000), and while it includes some elements of community policing philosophy, it is introduced at the conceptual level without going into details due to time constraints, a lack of a common definition for community policing and a general view that considers it a philosophy rather than a set of practical skills and techniques (Buerger, 1998).

As the existing training programs for community policing training in the United States are generally focused on changing officers’ attitudes towards community policing but do not provide information and develop practical skills, the IMB model suggests that it hinders the likelihood of the desired behavioral outcome. Hence, the IMB model and the existing literature suggest that it would be expected that providing information and developing specific skills that are relevant to community policing (Wilkinson & Rosenbaum, 1994) will increase the support for change (Harr, 2001).

In order to address the gap between the lack of information in the academy training and the need to provide specialized training to develop community policing skills, police agencies have incorporated an apprenticeship style field training program upon entry into a police organization, following the completion of their academy training. Senior officers called Field Training Officers provide hands-on training to the new recruits, familiarizing them with the rules and procedures (Haberfield, 2002), which helps link academy training with practice and develop positive attitudes towards initiatives such as community policing (Harr, 2001). Based on this argument, we suggest the following hypotheses:

*H1: Field training is positively associated with championing change behavior.*

**Job autonomy as motivation and its impact on change related behavior**

The second component of IMB is motivation, which also contributes to promoting desired behavior. We suggest job autonomy, defined as “the degree to which employees believe that their job affords them discretion and independence” (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994:321) and which is an important element of community policing (Chappell, 2007) to represent the motivation component. First line officers who are responsible for public interactions are fully empowered through decentralized decision making during field operations while being administratively supported by their managers (Brody et al, 2002; Wycoff & Skogan). The feeling of being well equipped to perform a certain job creates a positive organizational climate and leads to acceptance towards community policing strategies. (Brody et al., 2002; Lord & Friday, 2008; Ford, Weissbein, & Plamondon, 2003) and these officers are involved in the community issues more proactively (Adams et al., 2002; Carter & Radelet, 1999)

For community policing officers, job autonomy provides a sense of achievement through positive public interactions, which in turn enhances their job involvement and support of community policing activities (Greene, 1989). This idea is in line with Herzberg’s theory of motivation (1968) in which he identified the importance, recognition and responsibility associated with work as sources of satisfaction in the work environment which lead to increased intrinsic motivation. Extending Herzberg’s theory, Hackman and Oldham (1976) further elaborated on job characteristics that lead to employee satisfaction through meaningful tasks offering a sense of responsibility. These characteristics include the ability to identify with the job and value its significance; the variety of skills offered by the job to avoid monotony; feedback by superiors and job autonomy to perform the job as the incumbent deems fit.

In terms of making organizational change a success, it is important that the employees be motivated intrinsically for them to view change as an opportunity rather than a threat and to perceive themselves as being in charge of the situation (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). The freedom to offer innovative solutions to geographically specific problems, personal development and meaningfulness of work subsequently improve job satisfaction (Brody et al, 2002; Elliot & Williams, 1995; Ford et al., 2003; Glisson & Durick, 1988; Hackman & Oldham, 1976). In view of the importance of job autonomy, we propose the following:

*H2: Job autonomy is positively associated with championing behavior.*

**The mediating role of change-related self-efficacy**

The IMB model poses skills as the mediator between the independent variables (information and motivation) and the behavioral outcome. Here we suggest that change reacted self-efficacy can represent the skills component, as it is the employee’s cognitive image of their skills and a skill by itself. In the context of Albert Bandura’s (1977) social learning theory, self-efficacy may be explained as the employees’ judgements of their abilities to perform their jobs (Riggs, and Knight, 1994). These abilities are context specific and Bandura (1977) suggests that adequate sources of information such as verbal persuasion, behavior modelling, and repeated performance can help develop such skills. In terms of organizational change wherein the employees must deal with the demands and uncertainty of a changing environment, change-related self-efficacy reflects employee's perceived ability to function well on the job (Wanberg & Banas, 2000).

Employees with high levels of change related self-efficacy persist in the face of uncertainty and are more supportive of the change process (Jimmieson et al, 2004). Studies suggest that self-efficacy can mediate the relationship between information and employee performance, such that when employees are provided with adequate and timely information regarding a planned change initiative, they perceive themselves capable of handling the demands of their job (Bell & Staw, 1989; Pond & Hay, 1989) and expecting positive outcomes of change instead of considering it a threat (Krueger & Dickson, 1993).

There is empiric evidence of training to be an important antecedent of self-efficacy (Latham, 1989) as it is related to individuals' openness to experimentation and trying out new ideas (Jones, 1986). Training may be viewed as a form of organizational investment in employees from a social exchange theory perspective leading to higher levels of organizational commitment (Farrell & Rusbult, 1981), and previous studies found that when the training meets the expectations of the employees it leads to perceptions of self-efficacy and positive post-training attitudes (Gist et al., 1989; Tennenbaum et al, 1991).

Prior literature on job autonomy suggests that employee empowerment increases confidence and self-efficacy along with readiness for change (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Armenakis et al, 1993). Given the mediating effect of change self-efficacy on employee support for change (Prochaska et al, 1977), employees who possess high levels of this variable are expected to persist in their efforts to manage the organizational change process (Cunningham et al, 2002; Jimmieson et al, 2004). This self-confidence is important as those lacking in it tend to be more resistant to change as they view themselves incapable of dealing with its demands (Armenakis et al, 1993). There is also empiric evidence that change-related self-efficacy buffers the negative effects of change-related stress on employee adjustment (Ashford, 1988). Based on the arguments above regarding change-related self-efficacy we propose the following hypotheses:

*H3:* *The relationship between field training and championing behavior is mediated by change related self-efficacy.*

*H4: The relationship between job autonomy and championing behavior is mediated by change related self-efficacy.*

**METHOD**

**Participants and Procedures**

*Study Site*

This study was a part of a larger project which involved a paper and pencil survey conducted at a large police department in Virginia, USA, from June to August 2013. The department serves one of the wealthiest and best educated populations in the United States and generally has a high level of resources available to it. The official website of the department attributes this success to its intelligence-led policing and its commitment to community policing. Community policing was adopted by the department in the early 1980s, but without a formal approach or structure. In the late 1990s efforts were made to formally adopt the community policing as the guiding principle by incorporating organizational structure in concert with the philosophy.

Incidents such as the 9/11 attacks in 2001, shifted the department’s focus from community policing to anti-terrorism, emergency response and intelligence analysis. During the economic recessions of 2008-2009, the agency was forced to cut budget for a number of programs resulting in manpower shortages, which adversely affected its community policing program. Although a number of programs and initiatives were implemented, the implementation of community policing at the organizational level was never completely realized.

*Survey and Sample*

The population of interest included all the sergeants and officers of the department. One of the authors administered the survey personally with the help of a department representative from the office of the chief of police during roll call. The author provided details of the survey and answered questions. An informed consent form was provided to the respondents. Self-addressed stamped survey packets were left for those absent. The packet consisted of an informed consent form and a voluntary, anonymous survey instrument consisting of 63 multiple choice items. The average time taken to complete the survey was ten minutes.

The survey was administered to the entire population (636) of sergeants and patrol officers of the department. 409 surveys were administered directly while 227 were left to be returned through mail. 79 mail surveys were received with a response rate of 35% for mail surveys only. A total of 488 surveys were received with an approximate response rate of 77%. 11 surveys were discarded on account of being left blank or partially filled. The total number of usable responses was 476 (approximately 75% usable surveys).

**Measures**

*Field training* was measured usingfive questions based on interpersonal, decision making, oral communication and decisiveness skills identified by Chappell (2007) were used. The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Sample items include “I am trained well enough to engage in a variety of problem solving activities” and I am trained well enough to communicate well with a wide variety of community groups “I am trained well enough to engage in a variety of problem-solving activities.” (α = .73)

*Job autonomy* was measured using four items by Lee and Jang (2012). The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Sample items were “First line officers are allowed the discretion to implement community policing as they see fit” and “Officers are encouraged to act as “managers” of their patrol areas” (α = .61)

*Change related self-efficacy* was measured using two items by Ashford (1988). The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Sample items included “I am sure I can handle the demands of community policing” and “I have reason to believe that I may not perform well in my job situation relating to community policing.” (α = .52)

*Championing behaviour* was measured using 6-item scale by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002). The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Sample items include “I encourage the participation of others in the COP initiative” and “I speak positively about COP to co-workers” (α = .83)

*Control variables.* We controlled for officers’ gender, level of education and tenure. There are mixed findings regarding the relationship between an officer’s gender and their attitude towards community policing. Some have found women to be more supportive of community policing initiatives (Novak et al., 2002; Paoline et al., 2000) while others found no relationship (Adams et al., 2002; O’Shea, 2001). Prior research suggests that college educated officers with greater problem solving and communication skills are not necessarily not open towards community policing strategies compared to officers without college degrees (Adams et al., 2002; Weisel & Eck, 1994). The influence of tenure on attitudes towards community policing has also been found to be inconsistent. Some studies (Adams et al., 2002; Weisel & Eck, 1994) have found senior officers to be less supportive of community policing while other studies (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994; Paoline et al., 2000) have found them to be more supportive of such initiatives.

**RESULTS**

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients for all variables. Multicollinearity does not seem to be an issue because of low to moderate correlations between the variables.

--------------------------------------

Insert Table 1 about here
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We tested our hypotheses with the Process macroform SPSS ([Hayes, 2013](#_ENREF_29)), which is based on ordinary least squares regression and uses the bootstrap method for inference. In all the analyses, we controlled for the effects of employee gender, tenure and education. Hypotheses 1 and 3 referred to the effects of information on behaviour (championing change). Hypothesis 1 proposed that field training is positively associated with championing change. Hypothesis 3 proposed that this positive relationship is mediated by self-efficacy. We tested both hypotheses simultaneously with a simple mediation model in the Process macro ([Hayes, 2013](#_ENREF_29)). The results are presented in Table 2 with detailed total effects, direct effects and indirect effects. The results indicate that field training had a significant positive effect on championing change (B= .355, LLCI =.236, ULCI =.475). The result is considered to be significant as the 95% bootstrap confidence intervals based on 5000 samples did not include zero. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported. The indirect effect via self-efficacy was significant positive (B= .172, LLCI = .104, ULCI =.254), which is consistent with Hypothesis 3, leading to full support for this Hypothesis. The direct effect was positive significant (B= .183, LLCI = .052, ULCI =.314), thus indicating partial mediation. --------------------------------------

Insert Table 2 about here

--------------------------------------

Hypotheses 2 and 4 referred to the effects of motivational factors on championing change. Hypothesis 2 proposed that job autonomy is positively associated with championing change. Hypothesis 4 proposed that this positive relationship is mediated by self-efficacy. We tested these hypotheses with a similar procedure using Process macro ([Hayes, 2013](#_ENREF_29)). Table 3 displays detailed total effects, direct effects and indirect effects. The results indicate that job autonomy had a significant positive effect on championing change (B=.278, LLCI = .181, ULCI =.374), supporting Hypothesis 2. The indirect effect via self-efficacy was significant positive (B= .085, LLCI = .048, ULCI =.135), which lends support for Hypothesis 4. The direct effect was positive significant (B= .192, LLCI = .097, ULCI = .287), thus indicating partial mediation.

--------------------------------------
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**DISCUSSION**

Implementing change in police organizations is considered difficult owing to the bureaucratic structure and style of operation. The introduction of strategies such as community policing, resulting from external demands for service, can be stressful for the entire organization, especially for the individual employee (Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005) and must take into account their impact on employees if they are to succeed (Elias, 2009). In this paper, we employed the IMB model (Fisher & Fisher, 1992) to predict community policing championing behavior. Our findings support the predicted relationships and demonstrate that field training and job autonomy have a positive impact on officer support for community policing and this relationship is mediated by the perception of change related self-efficacy.

The first hypothesis suggested a positive relationship between field training and championing behavior was supported. This result is consistent with literature in field training of police officers which suggests that providing field training related to community policing leads to positive attitudes towards community policing (Harr, 2001). Previous research found that officers are less supportive of community policing initiatives when they do not have enough information regarding its purpose and the impact on their jobs (Schafer, 2001; Wilson & Bennett, 1994) and that training and practical experience with community policing can help alleviate this skepticism (Schafer, 2002). While training at the police academy level is beneficial for introducing new concepts in policing to the recruits, Mastrofski and Ritti (1996) argue that this theoretical knowledge must be followed by practical field training and application to daily operations is it is to have the desired impact on first line officers. Our findings provide empiric support for this argument and demonstrate the value of such training.

The second hypothesis suggesting a positive relationship between job autonomy and change related behavior was also supported which is in line with previous studies (Brody et al, 2002; Glisson & Dick, 1988). Employees are expected to be more satisfied with their jobs and exert extra effort towards the success of organizational goals if they believe it would offer meaningful work and opportunities for career growth (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Herzberg, 1968). This notion can be further linked with the concept of intrinsic motivation – doing the task not for a reward but for internal needs, such as growth; therefore, internally motivated employees can recognize the inherent opportunities provided by organizational initiatives for change which increases the likelihood of supporting organizational initiatives (Elias, 2009). Since community policing philosophy is based primarily on the empowerment of first line officers to manage the problems of their own jurisdictions, it helps develop positive attitudes towards the philosophy by working closely and independently with the community on local issues (Brody et al, 2002).

Results of the third and fourth hypotheses support our predictions regarding the role of change related self-efficacy and show that it mediates the relationship of field training and motivation with change-championing behavior. For field training, these results are consistent with previous literature which suggests that training programs designed to develop specific skills and abilities of employees help improve their self-efficacy especially when new programs are being introduced in the organization (Eden & Avrim, 1993). In terms of the impact of job autonomy on change-self efficacy and the resulting championing behavior, we can draw upon Karasek’s (1979) description of active and passive jobs which differ by the degree of decision latitude and challenge. Active jobs provide motivation to engage in them through growth and learning opportunities for employees which in turn lead to the development of desirable behaviors by employees (Theorell & Karasek, 1996).

**Theoretical and practical implications**

Using the IMB framework for assessing community policing strategies allowed us to identify specific factors that play an important role in developing positive change related behaviors. The first theoretical implication is testing the IMB model outside of the health behavior context and showing its ability to predict a different type of behaviors in an organization. This implies that the model can be further used in various settings to predict behavior change. For example, it may be applied to predict future effectiveness of intervention programs, by stressing the importance of both information and motivation – the lack of one of the component might explain unsuccessful interventions. The second implication may develop the model itself. Our findings supported the hypothesized mediated relationships via change self-efficacy, but we also find significant direct relationships between field training and championing change and between job autonomy and championing change. As our findings are consistent with earlier studies that linked participating in field training and officers’ positive attitudes towards change strategy (Bradford and Pynes, 1999; Lurigio and Rosenbaum, 1994; Wilson and Bennett, 1994; Wycoff and Skogan, 1994), we propose a revised version of the conceptual model which includes direct paths as well (Figure 2).
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In terms of practical implications, our findings demonstrate the value of field training as complimentary to the traditional academy training, and as a factor that can significantly increase the chances for successful implementation of change. For field training to be effective, it is important that police organizations use androgogy, which would involve instructors drawing upon real experiences to teach new recruits to work out creative solutions to neighborhood problems and avoid militaristic style of training (Birzer and Tannehill 2001). This is also consistent with the recommendations that post-academy field training to incorporate feedback and reward mechanisms (Harr, 2001)

In addition, we found that the motivational component of the IMB model could be implemented as job autonomy which is an essential part of community policing. Future studies could identify additional factors of job design that can function as motivators. To sum up, an assessment of the level of training and job autonomy can help develop future strategies based on identifying informational and motivational deficits and maintaining adequate levels of both factors to ensure the success of community policing programs in police organizations.

**Limitations**

Because of the specific context, data collection was limited, as the participants while being willing to take part in the study could not dedicate much time to filling the survey. Therefore, the data could only be collected at a single point in time, and our findings are limited in predicting behaviors over time. The next steps should involve a longitudinal study that will allow separating the variables in time and perhaps follow the trajectory of behavior change over time to test the long-term and short-term effects.

In addition, our limited contact with the participants did not allow to use measures other than self-report. Since respondents tend to over-report positive behaviors and provide more socially acceptable responses, there is a threat of biases. It is recommended that future studies obtain multi-source data.

Finally, as data were collected from a single police department in the US, the results cannot be generalized to other organizations or even police departments in the US or abroad. Hence, in order to validate the current results, it is important to test the model with a larger sample including a representative sample of police departments across the US and in the future in other countries.

**Conclusion**

The results of the present study highlight the importance of developing confidence and self-efficacy among employees to accomplish change-related organizational goals. Although the present study is preliminary in nature and warrants caution for the interpretation of results, it has important theoretical and practical implications for police organizations. From a theoretical perspective, our results show that the IMB intervention approach can be successfully used to develop positive non-health behaviors, which in the present case is championing the cause of community related policing. From a practical standpoint, it indicates the importance of adopting specific field training measures as well as providing adequate autonomy to field officers to develop the skills required to successfully implement community policing programs in police organizations. The adoption of community policing would not only create a new and empowered generation of police officers but would also enhance organizational effectiveness through police-public partnerships.
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**Figure 1**: Conceptual model: field training and job autonomy effect on championing change
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**Figure 2**: Revised conceptual model
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | S.D. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1. Gender | 1.15 | 0.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Education | 3.89 | 1.68 | .151\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Tenure | 3.27 | 1.02 | -.162\*\* | -.103\* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Field training | 4.05 | 0.54 | .042 | -.004 | .036 | **(.733)** |  |  |  |
| 1. Job autonomy | 3.63 | 0.68 | .032 | .024 | -.146\*\* | .267\*\* | **(.613)** |  |  |
| 1. Change self-efficacy | 4.21 | 0.56 | .081 | .041 | .034 | .486\*\* | .258\*\* | **(.517)** |  |
| 1. Championing behavior | 3.33 | 0.68 | -.038 | -.073 | -.075 | .289\*\* | .288\*\* | .357\*\* | **(.826)** |

**Table 1:** Means, standard deviations and correlations among study variables

\*\* p < .01, \* p < .05

*Note*: N=462; List-wise deletion; values on the diagonal are alpha reliability estimates.

**Table 2**:   
Regression results for the impact of field training on championing behavior: Hypotheses 1, 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **B** | **t** | **p** | **LLCI** | **ULCI** |
| **Total effect**  *controlling for age, tenure, education* | .355 | 5.843 | .000 | .355 | .475 |
| **Direct effect**  *controlling for age, tenure, education* | .183 | 2.75 | .006 | .0522 | .3137 |
| **Indirect effect via self-efficacy**  *controlling for age, tenure, education* | .172 |  |  | .104 | .254 |

N= 454  
Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported.   
Bootstrap sample size = 5000 bias-corrected; LL=lower limit, CI=confidence intervals, UL=upper limit; level of confidence 95%

**Table 3**:   
Regression results for the impact of job autonomy on championing behavior: Hypotheses 2, 4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **B** | **t** | **p** | **LLCI** | **ULCI** |
| **Total effect**  *controlling for age, tenure, education* | .278 | 5.670 | .000 | .181 | .373 |
| **Direct effect**  *controlling for age, tenure, education* | .192 | 3.970 | .000 | .097 | .287 |
| **Indirect effect via self-efficacy**  *controlling for age, tenure, education* | .085 |  |  | .048 | .135 |

N= 454  
Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported.   
Bootstrap sample size = 5000 bias-corrected; LL=lower limit, CI=confidence intervals, UL=upper limit; level of confidence 95%