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Executive Summary

This study examines the role of a changed organizational socialization process on supervisory adaptation. The research study is motivated by the central question: how do supervisors adapt in their role as supervisors when the initial organizational socialization process has changed. Literature on socialization in policing has focused almost exclusively on long-term job satisfaction, while literature on police supervisory adaptation centers on leadership approaches. Previous research on police socialization clearly indicates the process is a series of stages filled with ‘rite of passages’. There is no distinction between the socialization of a non-supervisor officer versus a supervisory officer. The literature is scant when it comes to determining how supervisors adapt in their role when the socialization process changes significantly. This study advances our understanding of what influences supervisory adaptation and how they adapt in their role. A constructivist grounded theory study was conducted by using a sample of thirty-two United States Border Patrol (USBP) supervisors. The findings from this research study illustrates the persuasiveness of the profession’s socialization process is on role adjustment. Research study participants described expectations and experiences developed at the basic training academy as foundational for role adaptation.

This report is a result of a doctoral dissertation developed, prepared, and defended at the University of Texas at El Paso in order to satisfy the requirements for a Doctor in Education degree within the program of Educational Leadership and Administration. The intent of this research was to provide a substantive theory that not only is relevant but useful to practitioners within law enforcement agencies. The effort was supported with residual research funds from the Center for Law & Human Behavior at the University of Texas at El Paso.

Study Design

Drawing on findings from existing organizational and law enforcement research literature on socialization and supervision, the survey instruments developed for this research project centered on the issues of socialization and supervision. The research study employed a dual method strategy for data collection that encompassed: (a) background information collected through the Supervisor Background Questionnaire; and (b) Semi-Structured Interviews (face-to-face/telephonically) with the study participants. The approach captured supervisor background information that provided contextual information to the perspectives of supervisors who participated in the semi-structured interview.

An inductive approach was utilized given the aim of the research was to identify, through their own perspectives and experiences, how supervisors adapted in their supervisory roles. Four primary areas of focus were explored during the course of each interview:

1. General basic academy experiences;
2. Purpose (formal/informal) of the basic training academy;
3. Personal perspective of the basic academy curriculum change that occurred on October 1, 2007; and
4. How supervisors adapted in their role as supervisors.
Selection of USBP supervisors was a purposive sampling that aimed to select individuals with resident experience and displayed variation of the phenomena researched. Only USBP supervisors who held a position of at least a first level supervisor on October 1, 2007 were considered for this research study. The Supervisor Background Questionnaire represented the first phase of data collection and was intended to collect demographic information on the pool of research study volunteers. The questionnaire aided in determining age groups, gender, ethnicity, education background, length of experience as a USBP agent and supervisor, USBP basic academy attendance (the agency has had multiple locations in the last three decades), and placement of the individual in a Spanish language group as a recruit. The motive was to obtain an accurate reflection\(^1\) of the general USBP supervisor workforce who were at least a first level supervisor on October 1, 2007. The questionnaire was focused on obtaining contextual information on the sample of semi-structured research study participants. A total of 48 research study volunteers participated in this phase of the study in which 32 supervisors subsequently agreed to participate in the semi-structured interviews.

The semi-structured interviews represented the second phase of data collection and were conducted both telephonically and in-person to accommodate the geographical diversity of the research study volunteers. The structure utilized in both the telephonic and in-person interviews was the same. Twenty-six of the interviews were conducted telephonically and 6 were conducted one-on-one. All interviews were audio recorded with the study volunteer’s permission, and each interview was between 40 to 55 minutes in length.

Thirty-two USBP supervisors participated in this research study. The composition of the sample included an average age of 48 years old and ensured supervisory diversity such as site location, age, supervisory experience, supervisory and, academy experiences, race, and gender. Study participants were assigned to the following southern border locations: San Diego, El Centro, Tucson, El Paso, Del Rio, and Rio Grande Valley. The northern border USBP supervisors were from Detroit, Buffalo, and Vermont locations. Research participants encompassed seven of the nine levels of supervision with the exception of the first level of supervision and the second level of supervision. Both levels of supervision were included in the solicitation for research volunteers, thus non-participation was by self-selection rather than by design. Collectively the group of
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supervisors averaged 24 years in the USBP in which 18 years of those were supervisory experience. The sample represented supervisory profiles with the requisite experiences and diversity to inform the central research study question.

**General Survey Responses**

Data generated through the research study participant’s interviews was the cornerstone for the development and examination of patterns and themes. Since the study participant’s experiences fostered the identification of connections and links between events grounded theory was an appropriate data analysis framework. In this case, the purpose was to understand the perceptions and experiences of USBP supervisors to learn how supervisors adapted in their role as supervisors when the initial organizational socialization process changed.

All 32 research study participants reflect diverse supervisory experiences from both southern and northern border sectors of the USBP. The supervisory diversity reflected in this research study is sufficient to inform the research study’s central question: how do supervisors adapt in their role as supervisors when the initial organizational socialization process has changed. The analysis of the research data clearly pointed out supervisor adaptation during a period of changing organizational socialization was significantly influenced by expectations based on previous experiences.

The findings of this study show supervisors did adapt in their role as supervisors when the basic training academy changed the initial organizational socialization process. Coding of this research study’s data resulted in the sorting of codes into two areas. First, influential constructs helped to understand how supervisors interpreted their experiences when confronted with initial organizational socialization change. The idea of a collective identity based on shared organizational experiences suggest supervisors role identity is strongly aligned with perceptions and expectations first developed in the socialization process. Based on the collective identity developed at the basic training academy organizational perceptions and expectations were established. It is these perceptions and expectations that were influential to an individual’s view on organizational changes and provided insight into the perceptions, by supervisors, of the socialization process change. The influential constructs for this study are:

1. Supervisory preparation
2. Supervisory challenges
3. Trainee preparedness

---


Second, the research study participants presented specific references on how they adapted in their supervisory role as supervisors when the initial organizational socialization process changed. Coding of this research study’s data resulted in the coding of four thematic areas of supervisory role adaptation. Research study participants adapted in their roles by:

1. Increased team building
2. Making assignments based on abilities
3. Managing and teaching more
4. Providing more mentorship

The data for this research study suggests the change in basic training academy procedures, perceived organizational values, and socialization triggered a need for role adjustment by supervisors. Supervisors in this study perceived the change in the basic training academy as a change in the socialization process and to a large degree a change in organizational values. The organizational value most often cited by the research study participants was the reduction of esprit de corps. Organizational esprit de corps was discussed by nearly all research study participants as a basis for learning and improving their occupational skills. Supervisory role adjustment was often predicated on how supervisors translated their experiences into organizational realities and perceptions.

Consideration
Organizational socialization is a directed process that establishes itself in formal and informal manners in early employment. The strength of the literature in police socialization centers on the notion of the impact on long-term job satisfaction and how newcomers are socialized into the organization. In addition, the studies generally focus on the basic training academy and field training officers. Supervisors, who are an organizational product of the formal and informal socialization process, are often examined in their role as an incumbent in a pre-existing and shared socialization process. This research study provides insight into how supervisors view their supervisory role as it relates to organizational values and expectations as an outcome to the socialization process. The findings suggest supervisor’s own organizational socialization experiences influences their role as supervisors. Future success of law enforcement training may rely on the ability of police organizations not only to recognize and factor formal training processes, but informal processes as well.

7 In this case, esprit de corps is defined as a feeling of pride and common loyalty shared by members of the United States Border Patrol resulting in a shared organizational identity.
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Introduction

The creation of the Department of Homeland Security was not only a massive restructuring of U.S. government agencies it also became the impetus for growth of federal law enforcement agencies with counterterrorism responsibilities\textsuperscript{10}. The personnel increases has not been more notable than the increase for the United States Border Patrol (USBP). The USBP doubled in size from 2007 through 2011 to over 21,000 Border Patrol Agents\textsuperscript{11}. The large investment of personnel resources, in the agency, is the centerpiece of the heightened awareness by the U.S. Congress on the country’s borders\textsuperscript{12}. Prompted by the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and a new focus on border security the growth of the agency brought a heightened focus on law enforcement training.

In order to accommodate the significant growth of individuals to be trained, beginning on October 1, 2007, the USBP made an organizational decision that would change basic academy training. The decision would also unintentionally change the initial organization socialization of the agency. First, the USBP’s basic academy had been an 81-day program consisting of 663 curriculum hours in six subject areas\textsuperscript{13}. To meet the Congressional mandate of doubling in size in a five year span the academy length was reduced to 58 days consisting of 475 curriculum hours. The reduction in time was the result of eliminating Spanish language training from the basic curriculum and provided the participants the opportunity to test out of the Spanish language program. The recruits who tested out of the language program departed the basic training academy upon completion of the 58-day program. For the recruits who required Spanish language training they would immediately attend and were required to successfully complete a 40-day language immersion course beyond the basic academy. The formal change not only marked an alteration of the curriculum but informally changed the way recruits were socialized into the organization\textsuperscript{14}.

Second, the USBP continued law and language training for the recruits after they had left the academy and terminated ten months from the first day at the basic academy. The extended training was referred to post-academy training and consisted of one day of instruction per week. Prior to the October 1, 2007 basic academy change, post-academy training was conducted as a cohort and at a centralized location\textsuperscript{15}. Post-academy training formally intended to provide continuous instruction to the recruits to prepare them for a ten-month examination consisting of law and the Spanish language. Failure of either the law or Spanish examination resulted in the termination of employment. The change to the length of the basic academy on October 1, 2007 also effected how post-academy training would be conducted. Post-academy training was converted to an on-line

delivery system to reduce the number of senior agents required to conduct the post-academy training. As a result, the recruits no longer met once a week as a cohort. The recruit now completed the post-academy online assignments independently during a regular assigned shift. The change impacted the informal intention of post-academy which was to strengthen cohort occupation solidarity by providing a peer support group.

The way individuals learn the culture, habits, and behavior of an organization are structured for them by others in the organization. Organizational socialization is viewed as the principal process by which people adapt to new jobs and organizational roles. In police organizations the structure begins with the basic training academy. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) contend the training process at the basic academy not only teach new members the skills necessary to perform the job, but also introduces the social knowledge of what is acceptable/unacceptable behavior in the organization. The process of developing social knowledge is the combined procedures of the organization’s formal and informal socialization process. Although a police agency’s organizational socialization goes beyond training, the basic police academy training program has become synonymous with socialization.

**Purpose of the Study**

The focus of this research inquiry is how supervisors adapt in their role as supervisors as a result of an organizational socialization change at the basic training academy. The organizational change is a demarcation in the sensemaking of the organization’s members at different levels and has caused tension and conflict. Literature on the topic of a changing organizational socialization process suggest a change in work procedures, organizational goals and values, or socialization may trigger a need for role adjustment by supervisors. A significant role of a supervisor, as viewed by upper levels of management, is to contend and successfully reduce the tension and conflict for the organization. Although police organizational socialization is widely researched to determine

---

16 Ibid.
long term effects on job satisfaction, very little has been done to study how supervisors adapt in their role due to a change in the socialization process.

Research Question
The central research question guiding this inquiry: How do supervisors in the United States Border Patrol adapt in their role as supervisors when the initial organizational socialization process has changed?

The University of Texas at El Paso’s (UTEP) Role
This research study was result of a dissertation proposal submitted for approval to a committee of UTEP research professors in order to satisfy the doctor of education graduation requirements for the author. As such, the dissertation development was overseen by the four committee members in order to ensure appropriate research protocols were adhered to include ethical research behavior with human subjects. This effort was supported by residual research funds of UTEP’s Center for Law & Human Behavior resulting in no cost to the Department of Homeland Security.

The development of the semi-structured interview survey instrument unfolded in an interactive process between the UTEP researcher and several supervisory personnel of the USBP. An initial meeting took place with four USBP supervisors who were asked to participate in a pilot study in order to improve the semi-structured interview guide. The pilot study sample consisted of four supervisors who represented the fourth (Deputy Patrol Agent in Charge), fifth (Patrol Agent in Charge), sixth (Assistant Chief Patrol Agent), and ninth (Chief Patrol Agent) level of supervisors in the United States Border Patrol. Table 1 reflects the supervisory levels of a typical USBP sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Title Acronym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Supervisory Border Patrol Agent</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Special Operations Supervisor</td>
<td>SOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Watch Commander</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Deputy Patrol Agent in Charge</td>
<td>DPAIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Patrol Agent in Charge</td>
<td>PAIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Assistant Chief Patrol Agent</td>
<td>ACPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Division Chief</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Patrol Agent</td>
<td>DCPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Chief Patrol Agent</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Customs and Border Protection (2016)

The supervisors interacted regularly with all nine levels of supervision and were supervisors on October 1, 2007. The pilot study participants were informed of the aim of the research study and
the research question of determining how supervisors adapt in their role as supervisors when the initial organizational socialization process has changed. All four supervisors were interviewed utilizing the initial semi-structured interview guide. Overall, the participants expressed a comfort with the interview process and flow of the interview. Additionally, the participants agreed the semi-structured interview guide contained relevant and applicable questions as it relates to the central research question of this study. The semi-structured interview guide and process was adjusted based on the feedback received. The author did not attempt to compare the pilot study group with the sample of supervisors participating in the research study. Figure 1 depicts how the semi-structured interview guide was developed.

![Figure 1 Development of the Semi-Structured Interview Questions](image)

**Methodology**

**Instrumentation**
The research study employed a dual method strategy for data collection encompassing: (a) background information collected through the *Supervisor Background Questionnaire*; and (b) *Semi-Structured Interviews* with the study participants. Utilizing a semi-structured interview format to elicit memories, reflections, and experiences from supervisors is an effective constructivist grounded theory approach. The methods captured supervisor background information that provided contextual information to the perspectives of supervisors who
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participated in the semi-structured interview. The goal was to understand how USBP supervisors adapted in their role as supervisors when the initial organizational socialization process changed.

**Supervisor Background Questionnaire**

The Supervisor Background Questionnaire was designed on the strength of the work of Lambruschini (2016)\(^{23}\), Colker (2008)\(^{24}\), and Rojek et al. (2017)\(^{25}\). The questionnaire was comprised of 16 questions and took approximately five to six minutes to complete. The Supervisor Background Questionnaire represented the first phase of data collection for the research study and was intended to collect demographic information on the pool of research study volunteers. The questionnaire aided in determining age groups, gender, ethnicity, length of experience as a supervisor, USBP Academy attendance (location), experience as an Academy instructor, and placement of the individual in a Spanish Language group while as a recruit. The motive was to obtain an accurate reflection of the general USBP supervisor workforce who were at least a first level supervisor on October 1, 2007. The categories in the questionnaire are grouped in such a manner that the data is indistinguishable to specific individuals. The questionnaire was focused on obtaining contextual information on the pool of the semi-structured interview participants. A total of 48 research study volunteers participated in this phase of the study. At the end of the Supervisor Background Questionnaire, study participants were asked to participate in a 60-minute semi-structured interview. If the participant elected to participate in the semi-structured interview they were asked to provide contact information (name and email or telephone number) so that an interview date and time could be scheduled.

**Semi-Structured Interviews with Supervisors**

Four primary areas of focus were explored during the course of each interview: general basic Border Patrol academy experiences, purpose (formal/informal) of the basic academy; personal perspective of the basic academy curriculum change that occurred on October 1, 2007; and how supervisors adapted in their role as supervisors due to the change at the basic training academy. To understand how supervisors adapted in their supervisory roles it was important to comprehend supervisor’s experiences, beliefs, attitudes, and values through recollections, stories, and basic academy events\(^{26}\). The aim was to understand the supervisor’s basic academy experiences and expectations and in subsequent coding, derive a process that may contribute to a theory of how supervisors adapt in their role. Understanding beliefs and values intricately connected to personal experiences\(^{27}\) help explain how supervisors react to and view a change in an organizational socialization process.

---
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The *Semi-Structured Interview Guide* (Appendix C) was developed as a guide to stimulate supervisor’s reflections, views, and experiences in regards to the impact on their job role due to the change in the initial organizational socialization process. The questionnaire consisted of 14 questions with 11 sub-questions or follow-up type questions. As expected, during the interview process the author did not always ask all the questions listed in the *Semi-Structured Interview* guide in order to further probe and ask clarifying questions\(^{28}\). The goal was to understand the experiences of the supervisors and to explore, through subsequent coding, the basic social processes and adaptations supervisors made because of the basic academy change.

The semi-structured interviews were conducted both telephonically and in-person to accommodate the geographical diversity of the research study volunteers. The structure utilized in both the telephonic and in-person interviews were the same. The only difference between the two formats was a loss of visual cues, but the data quality and richness did not appear to vary. Both formats are acceptable if the data quality does not vary significantly\(^{29}\). Twenty-six of the interviews were conducted telephonically and 6 were conducted one-on-one with the researcher. All interviews were audio recorded with the study volunteer’s permission, and each interview was between 40 to 55 minutes in length. All 32 semi-structured interview participants received their transcribed interviews and four of those research study participants chose to make minor grammatical revisions to their statements. This step in the process also served as a validation element\(^{30}\) of the data and is known as a member checking. Member checking is a process by which the researcher takes back the individual transcripts to the participants to determine if the participants feel they are accurate depictions.

**Recruiting Study Volunteers/Interviewees**

The recruitment of research study volunteers was conducted in three separate and distinct phases. Phase I is categorized as the general solicitation for research study volunteers. The selection of the research study participants was a purposive sampling\(^{31}\) that aimed to select individuals that displayed variation of the phenomena being researched. The goal was to ensure multiple levels of supervision were represented as well as a diversity of demographics. The diversity of demographics was important so the experiences of supervisors could be better understood in a detailed context\(^{32}\). Additionally, it was deliberate to attain a similar ratio of general characteristics (age, gender, race, educational level, length of service) of the general USBP supervisor workforce.


The solicitation was aimed at all nine levels of supervisors who were supervisors at any level on or after October 1, 2007.

The first phase began by contacting the Executive Director of the Border Patrol Supervisors’ Association and informing him of the nature of the research study and the need to interview volunteer research participants. The Border Patrol Supervisors’ Association is not a United States Government organization, but rather an association comprised exclusively of Border Patrol supervisors from the first level of supervision to the ninth level of supervision. The association is autonomous from the USBP organization, thus has its own policies and procedures. The association is comprised of over 500 members of the approximately 2,500 potential Border Patrol supervisors of the USBP from around the nation. The Executive Director placed a solicitation for volunteers from November 6, 2017 and removed it on December 28, 2017 (Appendix A) in the “Forum” section of the Border Patrol Supervisors’ Association website. The “Forum” section of the website is only open to members of the association.

The second phase of the recruitment for volunteers is characterized as those supervisors who were interested in participating in the research study. Those supervisors who were interested in participating in the study completed the Supervisory Background Questionnaire (Appendix B) and consent form. The aim of this phase was to have interested research study volunteers complete the Supervisory Background Questionnaire to have a greater understanding of the range of diversity of the potential volunteers. This phase of the recruitment strategy resulted in 48 individual surveys completed. Of the 48 surveys completed 34 individuals initially agreed to participate in a semi-structured interview.

The final phase for the recruitment of volunteers consisted of contacting the research study volunteers who agreed to participate in the semi-structured interview. Of the 34 semi-structured interview volunteers, two participants eventually declined. All 32 research study participant volunteers were selected because they ensured supervisory diversity such as site location, age, supervisory experience, supervisory rank, academy experiences, race, and gender. The semi-structured interview participants came from southern and northern border sectors, the Border Patrol Academy, and Border Patrol headquarters. Study participants were assigned to the following southern border sectors: San Diego, El Centro, Tucson, El Paso, Del Rio, and Rio Grande Valley. The northern border participants were from Detroit, Buffalo, and Swanton sectors. Research participants encompassed seven of the nine levels of supervision with the exception of the first level of supervision (Supervisory Border Patrol Agent) and the second level of supervision (Special Operations Supervisor). Both levels of supervision were included in the solicitation for research volunteers and would have had the same opportunity to participate. Collectively the group of supervisors averaged 18 years of supervisory experience in the USBP, and represented seven of the nine levels of supervision within the organization. The semi-structured interview participants have the supervisory profiles to inform the research study question. Table 2 provides the supervisory levels of participation in the study. Given the sample size of the research study participants and the need for anonymity, the levels of supervisors involved with the semi-structured interview are condensed.
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33 U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP). (2016)
Table 2 Supervisors Participating in the Semi-Structured Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Title Acronym</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors (n=32)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Supervisory Border Patrol Agent</td>
<td>SBPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Special Operations Supervisor</td>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Watch Commander</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Deputy Patrol Agent in Charge</td>
<td>DPAIC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Patrol Agent in Charge</td>
<td>PAIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Assistant Chief Patrol Agent</td>
<td>ACPA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Division Chief</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Patrol Agent</td>
<td>DCPA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth Level of Supervision</td>
<td>Chief Patrol Agent</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although U.S. Customs and Border Protection does not make a distinction in their public documents about supervisory demographics, the agency does report general USBP demographics. U.S. Customs and Border Protection (2015)\textsuperscript{34} reports 95% of the law enforcement workforce is male. In addition, the agency reports the race/ethnicity of the workforce is: 46.1% White, 49.8% Hispanic/Latino, and the remaining 4.1% of the workforce is comprised of American Indian, Asian, African American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders. The pool of research study participants does not include anyone other than White or Hispanic/Latino. All races/ethnicities had the same opportunity to participate in the study, and it is unknown why other race/ethnicity individuals did not participate in the study. Table 3 provides the personal characteristics of the 32 supervisors who participated in the semi-structured interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Number (n=32)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40 Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 45 Years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – 50 Years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 57 Years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School/GED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College but No Degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree (2 year degree)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree (4 year degree)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree or Higher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Service in the U.S. Border Patrol</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 25 Years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 30 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 + Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Border Patrol Supervisory Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 15 Years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 21 Years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 – 27 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis Procedures
A line-by-line coding technique was used to conduct open, axial, and selective coding which are procedures that are systematically used for developing grounded theory. Information collected from each participant interview was inputted into the Atlas.ti qualitative data analysis program (version 8). As data was reviewed, line-by-line sections of text were highlighted and coded. The codes chosen were selected to best reflect the research study participant’s emphasis in the text. A single research study participant could have multiple references to a single code during the same interview, which could reflect a high level of emphasis indicating importance. Throughout the analytical process, analytical interpretations were made of the data to refine categories and themes. During the final phase of coding (theoretical coding) four core constructs emerged around the central question of this research study. In addition, three constructs emerged as factors that influence how supervisors adapted in their role as supervisors.

Organization of Study Findings
Coding resulted in the sorting of codes into two areas of focus for this research study: influential constructs and supervisory adaptation constructs. Three constructs emerged as factors influencing how supervisors adapt in their role as supervisor. The “influential” constructs centered on the themes of: (1) supervisory preparation; (2) supervisory challenges; and (3) trainees preparedness. The “influential” constructs helped to understand how supervisors interpreted their experiences in adapting in their role as supervisors when the initial organizational socialization was changed. How supervisors adapted in their roles as supervisors are categorized in four thematic areas: (1) increased team building; (2) assignments based on abilities; (3) managing and teaching more; and (4) more mentorship.

UTEP’s Findings
The presentation of the findings are organized into two sections. The first section examines the influential constructs that impacted supervisory adaptation. This is followed by a review of how supervisors adapted in their supervisory role when the socialization process changed. Figure 2 depicts the influential and supervisory adaptation constructs.

---


Influential Constructs

All USBP supervisors referred to their basic training academy experiences as a foundational base for their own supervisory experiences. The experiences formed the internal (individual) and external (situational or occupational) variables that framed supervisor interpretations of their experiences. Goldstein (1991)\textsuperscript{37} found a strong relationship between the perceived value of training, due to personal experiences, and the reactions to subsequent changes in the same training. The more favorable the memory of the experience the stronger the reaction is negative to any change. Although the influential constructs did not explicitly describe supervisory adaptation, the constructs directly connected the supervisor’s own experiences to the initial organizational socialization change at the basic training academy. This study’s findings indicate the connections from previous experiences clearly helped shape supervisory role adaptation.

The influential constructs are categorized in three groups: supervisory preparation, supervisory challenges, and trainee preparedness. There are two sub-groups within the category of supervisory preparation: Supervisor selection and supervisor training. Three sub-groups emerged within the supervisory challenges category: resentment, heavier reliance/strain on supervisors, and reduced esprit de corps. Two sub-groups developed within trainee preparedness: trainee preparedness (Spanish language training) and trainee preparedness (Non-Spanish language training). Figure 3 depicts the categories that emerged in each of the groups within the influential constructs.

Supervisory Preparation

The category of supervisory preparation contained two sub-categories of codes: supervisor selection and supervisor training. Combined the two sub-categories made up the influential category of supervisory preparation. No direct questions were specifically developed for the semi-structured interview instrument addressing supervisory preparation, but the notion emerged as a re-occurring theme and seemingly important to supervisors interviewed. Supervisors who were at least a second level supervisor at the time of the organizational growth raised the topic. Research study participants discussed supervisor selection broadly as a reflection of the rapid growth the agency was experiencing, and the lack of having an enough experienced Border Patrol agents to promote to the first level of supervision. To some degree, all participants reinforced the importance of experience as a non-supervisory Border Patrol agent and various familiarities with certain job functions. A key element to this notion was that the individual should be more than just a good Border Patrol agent to be a good supervisor. Research study participants believed the agency had no other option than to promote less experienced agents to supervisors as long as they were considered good Border Patrol agents. Supervisors expressed a general sentiment that the USBP did not prepare supervisors for the changes at the basic training academy or the socialization outcomes that ensued from the change.

---

Supervisory Challenges
The influential construct category of supervisory challenges contained three sub-categories of codes: resentment, heavier reliance/strain on supervisors, and reduced esprit de corps. Combined the three sub-categories made up the influential category of supervisory challenges. Nearly all of the USBP supervisors made references to resentment formed by the more experienced agents who had graduated from the pre-October 1, 2007 style of the basic training academy. In this case, resentment is defined as dissatisfaction or animosity towards individuals of the same organization who went through a different socialization process. Many of the study participants were surprised at the level of resentment exhibited by the more experienced Border Patrol agents towards the newer agents and from cohorts to each other. Resentment by the more experienced agents appeared to have been based on the perception the basic training academy was not as vigorous as in the past. Supervisors described how the issue of resentment simply became an additional burden on their leadership responsibilities.

In addition to resentment, USBP supervisors described how the change in the basic training academy placed a heavier reliance and strain on supervisors. The point of emphasis was that the organizational change placed the burden on supervisors to correct any shortcomings of the trainee agents. Clearly expressed was the impact of the change at the basic training academy went beyond the trainees going through the academy. Supervisors who were now less experienced and less trained carried the burden of correcting any inadequacies the new trainees may have had to include those normally corrected at the basic training academy. The additional responsibility was in addition to an already overwhelmed supervisory workforce. Supervisors expressed the belief the organization altered the training program in order to hire more people in a compressed time frame without the necessary quality controls of the past.

The emphasis on teamwork and the value of shared experiences was significant throughout the semi-structured interviews. Supervisors described how the change in the process at the basic training academy altered the cohesiveness and esprit de corps that was necessary to maintain the organizational culture. Research study participants expressed the curriculum change and the ensuing alteration of the socialization process was contrary to the agency’s principles, history, and core values. Although supervisors did not understand the curriculum change, they found themselves defending the agency’s decision to the more experienced agents. Interestingly enough supervisors believed the alteration of the socialization process split the agency into an ‘old patrol’ vs. a ‘new patrol.’

Trainee Preparedness
The category of trainee preparedness was generally discussed and described as two categories: trainee preparedness (Spanish language) and trainee preparedness (Non-Spanish language). During the course of the semi-structured interviews research study participants frequently framed their responses as descriptions of trainee preparedness. It is clear by the number of references made, research study participants placed an importance on the theme. Supervisors believed the new recruit’s Spanish language abilities were reduced due to the program change and made the job of the supervisor difficult. A large number of agents simply could not communicate very well in the Spanish language and could not do all facets of the job of a Border Patrol agent. In addition, USBP supervisors noted other deficiencies not related to Spanish language training as a result of the reduced duration of the basic training academy program. Supervisors described the condensed
curriculum time frame as reducing the ability of trainee agents to grasp their full occupational authorities for immigration and nationality law and reduced physical conditioning.

**Supervisory Adaptation**

All 32 research study participants were asked the central research question, did you have to adapt in your role as a supervisor when the initial organizational socialization process at the basic training academy changed? Twenty-one study participants stated the role of supervisor immediately changed while eight noted or implied the effects of the basic training academy caused subsequent supervisory role adaptation. Although the research study participants referred to their supervisory role as changing, the supervisors generally described the change as changing supervisory dynamics. As one supervisor explained, the role of the supervisor changed but so did the entire supervisor dynamic. Supervisors were now more cognizant of informal factors that influenced employee job performance and job satisfaction. Due to the change in the basic training academy variables were introduced into the role of a supervisor never encountered before within the USBP. Supervisors were now concerned with the supervisory challenges of resentment, heavier strains and demands on supervisors, and reduced esprit de corps. The challenges combined with the notion the new trainees were not well prepared to do the job of a Border Patrol agent created a dynamic not previously seen with the United States Border Patrol.

It was clear previous basic training academy experiences had a strong influence in shaping the supervisor’s set of theories and assumptions about the agency’s realities and relationships. It is those same theories and assumptions that became the outline for expectations of new employees entering the organization. As the result of thematic coding, four categories emerged on how supervisors adapted in their role as supervisors with the initial organizational socialization changed.

**Increased Team Building**

In the USBP the idea of esprit de corps has long been built on agents, cohorts of 50, having a shared identity formed during the socialization process at the basic training academy. The cohorts are divided into two sections, A and B, and march in sections to their classes, lunch, and other daily activities as a group. The symbolism and passage of rites are highly ceremonial and designed to promote team work and develop a peer support network. The basic training academy instructors, who are incumbents of this process, not only teach the formal curriculum but often reiterate and place a heavy emphasis on teamwork and helping classmates through the academy.

Prior to the October 1, 2007 curriculum change, the emphasis for teamwork was focused on Spanish language training. All members of the cohort proceeded through the same curriculum and completed the basic training academy at the same time. Fluent speaking Spanish speakers were teamed up with non-fluent Spanish speakers intentionally in order to help the non-fluent speakers. Basic training academy instructors expected and informed fluent Spanish speakers they were
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39 Supervisory adaptation for the purpose of this study is singularly focused on supervisory role functions as it pertains to the duties and functions of a supervisor while at their place of employment. Role adaptation of research study participants in this study does not include any role or personal behavior adjustment not directly related to their supervisory role.


41 Ibid.
expected to help members of their cohort with the Spanish language. The emphasis of teamwork and esprit de corps with a focus on Spanish language training continued throughout the academy and post-academy training.

After the change on October 1, 2007 those recruits who could ‘test out’ of the Spanish language were allowed to graduate and leave the basic training academy for their duty stations to start the field training portion phase of their training. Those recruits who completed the same portion of the academy as their cohorts, but who did not ‘test out’ of the Spanish language would return their newly given badge and remain at the basic academy for an additional 40 days of language training. The organizational socialization that once relied on the strength of the cohort was now divided, in order, to process more recruits through the basic training academy. Supervisors not only noted a separation between cohorts, but also between the cohort and agents who graduated from the basic training academy prior to October 1, 2007.

Supervisors described having to devote more time from their duties to the idea of team building as a result of the reduced esprit de corps. Although reduced esprit de corps was discussed within the influential constructs, supervisors felt the job of building esprit de corps was now left for supervisors to build. Supervisors described how, previously, individuals graduating from the basic training academy would arrive at Border Patrol stations with a certain level of cohesiveness and esprit de corps. Generally, the level of cohesiveness was described as very high, strong among the cohort, and a source of pride. The cohesiveness of the cohort would later become the foundation for team building with other Border Patrol agents due to the shared experiences and expectations. Supervisors now believed they had a new role, which was to build esprit de corps. The idea of building esprit de corps at the station level was in contrast to supervisor’s own experiences and expectations. Supervisors felt it was their responsibility to build esprit de corps and the effort was part of how they adapted in their role.

Assignments Based on Abilities
The USBP reported that 97.2% percent of all individuals arrested by Border Patrol agents only speak the Spanish language, thus language abilities is a key function of an agent’s job. Supervisors described how Border Patrol agents had always had a varying level of Spanish language abilities, but previous to the basic training academy change they consistently shared a baseline understanding of the grammatical rules. An understanding of the Spanish language grammatical rules allowed non-fluent speakers to formulate investigatory questions and understand the Spanish responses. This level of understanding allowed agents to perform all functions of the position. Research study participants believed the basic training academy curriculum change did not emphasize a firm understanding of the Spanish language grammatical rules. In fact, supervisors were informed by field training officers that the new agents were simply taught to memorize terms and phrases.

Previous to the curriculum change at the basic training academy, supervisors rarely considered Spanish language abilities when making daily assignments for agents. Subsequent to the curriculum change research study participants described having to be cognizant of the Spanish

language abilities of agents while making daily job assignments. Supervisors described the awareness as a wariness because they found themselves having to adapt to the language deficiencies of the new agents. Adaptation by supervisors occurred because they believed the Spanish language deficiencies precluded some agents from performing certain job requirements. Many supervisors questioned if agents purposely did not initiate a consensual encounter simply because they lacked the Spanish language skills. Supervisors doubted to what degree they could count on an agent to do critical parts of the job based on the language skills. The concern for language abilities was so alarming supervisors’ assigned non-fluent Spanish speakers to assignments that they were unlikely to process or contact someone.

Study participants described how there are no formal occupational consequences from the agency if an agent is not proficient in the Spanish language. In this regard, they believed they were now responsible for agents who could not perform certain basic job functions. As a response, supervisors explained part of their supervisory role adjustment included acting as Spanish language instructors and sought language learning opportunities for their agents. As an indirect consequence supervisors not only made daily assignment adjustments based on Spanish language abilities, but they inadvertently placed a heavier reliance on fluent Spanish speaking agents to conduct investigatory interviews, execute arrest reports, and obtain booking type of information. Supervisors felt they were placed in a position to adapt on how they determined assignments. In addition, supervisors found themselves explaining to a fluent Spanish speaking workforce why non-fluent Spanish speakers were not expected to maintain the same occupational standards.

Managing and Teaching More
Supervisors generally referred to managing as leading, motivating, encouraging and influencing the Border Patrol agents they supervised. The increased management of the agents was viewed as a greater burden on supervisors who were already adapting in their roles due to the lack of Spanish language skills and cohesiveness of the new agents. Supervisors believed the increased management of agents was a result of the curriculum change reducing the number of days for new agents at the basic training academy. The change also reduced the time for agents to refine newly acquired skills developed at the basic training academy. Supervisors described having to teach the newer agents skills they believed should have been taught at the basic training academy. Study participants explained managing the mixture of experienced and newer agents as a supervisory dynamic that challenged traditional supervisory roles. They also suggested the socialization process was so divergent between Border Patrol agents that a supervisor’s management style had to evolve. Several study respondents noted supervisors could no longer take a “cookie cutter” approach to mentoring, coaching, or leading and felt forced to adapt. Increased managing of agents also extended to a large portion of the experienced agents. There was a belief that not only did the curriculum change have a negative impact on the new agents, but for the rank and file in the field as well. The agents who had entered the agency under a different basic training academy questioned their supervisors and challenged the organization regarding the change. The integration of the new agents into the workforce not only forced supervisors to adapt and view their role differently, but the experienced agents also had to adapt. Supervisors described non-supervisory adaptation as re-educating the more experienced agents. The term re-education was a general reference on supervisor attempts to remind the more experienced agents the culture of the organization was to help socialize and teach the job to the newer agents. Generally,
supervisors understood the agency abbreviated the basic training academy, so they simply lowered their expectations for the new agents based on their experiences and expectations.

Supervisors emphasized the belief they expected to get trainee agents from the basic training academy ready to perform basic essential job functions. They suggested they did not receive new agents ready to perform basic functions, but rather had to be trained. Study participants described how they were now playing the role of a field training officer to instruct new agents’ on the basic functions of the job. In order to improve trainee agents basic occupational skills supervisors developed individual training regimens for the new agents. Research study participants explained traditionally supervisors had always taken the time to teach and create opportunities for learning. The challenge was there were more people who needed more guidance to be taught the essentials of the job than there were experienced agents and supervisors. Supervisors expressed they had to be more hands on, spend more time, more energy, and more manpower managing and teaching agents.

More Mentorship Required
Research study participants believed more people needed more attention in comparison to the agents previous to the curriculum change. The attention was not simply teaching job skills, but also extended to mentorship. In this case, mentorship was defined as a mutually beneficial relationship in which knowledge and skill from an experienced agent provided insight, guidance, and developed opportunities to a lesser skilled and experienced agent\(^{43}\). Supervisors generally emphasized the speed of the agents graduating from the academy and the lack of their skills placed a heavier workload on supervisors. Although supervisors raised the sentiment, they wanted to make it clear that mentoring had always been part of a supervisor’s job. The sheer number of agents resulted in more mentoring on a more frequent basis. Supervisors described a significant portion of their role was akin to a big brother when it came to processing arrestees and basic law enforcement techniques. In addition, the mentorship extended beyond occupational issues. The study participants indicated a large number of new agents who were not prepared maturity wise for a law enforcement position. Supervisors described the need to provide mentorship as a sense of obligation.

Supervisors indicated they had to provide more detailed explanations as to why certain things had to be done and how to do them. Although supervisors believed mentorship was part of their duties, there was an expectation trainee agents would strive to improve. The level of commitment to self-develop by the trainee agents did not meet supervisor experiences and expectations. The increased mentorship caused a dependency by trainee agents on supervisors. Study participants expected USBP agents to make decisions and be able to operate on their own without constantly having a supervisor providing immediate oversight and they contend that was not the case.

Discussion of the Findings
The purpose of this study was to determine how supervisors adapted in their role as supervisors when the initial organizational socialization process changed. The findings demonstrate

\(^{43}\) Supervisors described the goals for a mentoring relationship surrounded the following themes: (1) promotion of professional growth; (2) inspire personal motivation; and (3) enhance effectiveness of the United States Border Patrol.
supervisors did adapt in their role as supervisors when the initial organizational socialization process was altered. Coding of the study’s data resulted in the sorting of codes into two areas.

First, influential constructs helped to understand how supervisors interpreted their experiences when confronted with the organizational socialization change. The data suggest supervisor’s role identity is strongly aligned with perceptions and expectations first developed in the socialization process forming a collective identity. Based on the collective identity, developed at the basic training academy, supervisors developed organizational perceptions and expectations. It was these perceptions and expectations that were influential to the supervisor’s view on organizational changes and helped frame role adaptation. The influential constructs of supervisory preparation, supervisory challenges, and trainee preparedness do not explain how supervisors adapted in their supervisory role, but they do help explain why they felt they needed to adapt.

Second, coding of this research study’s data resulted in four thematic areas of supervisory role adaptation. Research study participants adapted in their roles by: increasing team building, making assignments based on abilities, managing and teaching more, and providing more mentorship. Data for this research study suggests the change in basic training academy procedures, perceived organizational values, and socialization triggered a need for role adjustment by supervisors. Role adaptation occurred due to supervisors applying and using their own socialization experiences. Supervisors in this study perceived the change in the basic training academy as a change in the socialization process and to a large degree a change in organizational values. The organizational value most often cited by the research study participants was the reduction of esprit de corps. Organizational esprit de corps was discussed by nearly all research study participants as a basis for learning and improving their occupational skills. It is clear supervisory role adjustment was predicated on how supervisors translated their experiences into organizational perceptions and expectations.

Generally, almost every agent in the organization share common experiences of having worked in the field upon graduation from the basic training academy. More specifically, these same experiences provide the influential frameworks on how they view their occupational role. The frameworks are further impacted by the internal organizational dimensions of ecology, milieu, culture, and organizational structure which form individual and organizational behavior constructs. In this research study, not only did the constructs shape the formal and informal behavior of an individual but they helped frame organizational views and experiences. As a result, supervisors framed role adaptation based on their own set of theories and assumptions about the organizational realities and relationships. The theories and assumptions then became the outlines of expectations with certain ranges of acceptability which provided meaning. In periods of change, uncertainty, ambiguity and organizational growth individuals, in this case supervisors, adapted
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in their roles when there was a divergence from their expectations. Supervisors adapted in their role based on the lessons and culture learned in their previous occupational roles.

A central concept that emerged from this study is the collective identity of the supervisor-employee relationship, based on the initial socialization process, may be stronger than the literature suggests. The supervisor-employee relationship in policing is described as one demarcated by a top-down approach suggesting little room for informal supervisory influence. The demarcation is generally described as a clear and separate layer of responsibilities. This study suggests supervisor and employees, within the same organization and who share the same socialization experiences, have stronger informal bonds than those supervisors and employees who do not share the same experiences. Supervisors closely identified with employees with the same socialization background as one group, while others who had a different socialization experience as a separate group. A splintered socialization process influenced how supervisors adapted in their role as supervisors, and how they aligned themselves with the workforce. The variation of alignment in this study indicates supervisory adaptation influenced by their own experiences in the organization’s socialization process is stronger than previous studies indicate.

Supervisors placed a heavy emphasis on their socialization experiences at the basic training academy as the foundation for supervisory expectations and their subsequent role adaptation. Generally, supervisors viewed the formal purpose of the basic training academy as providing the skills and job knowledge to perform the day-to-day job functions. The curriculum change was viewed as diminishing language skills training and the basic training experience. Although supervisors believed the responsibility of the language training rested with the basic training academy, supervisors adjusted in their role to compensate for the perceived weaknesses. The informal purpose of the basic training academy was described by supervisors as the method to inform new employees the culture, habits, and accepted behavior by the organization. Supervisors firmly believed learning in the informal portion of the basic training academy should result in a strong sense of esprit de corps. It is the emphasis placed on esprit de corps by supervisors that provided the framework for supervisory role adaptation.

Literature in policing and the findings in this study clearly demonstrate that police supervisors must demonstrate a unique set of competencies and attributes to manage police operations. Research study participants discussed the ideas of team building, managing and teaching more, and providing more mentorship to those they supervise. Supervisors clearly expressed the professional development of others and preparing their subordinates for the future was not only important, but a supervisor’s responsibility. The organizational change that resulted in the change of the initial socialization process presented supervisors with a unique and complex challenge. Nearly all the research study participants described how they adapted in their supervisory role, but not one single supervisor described or implied the organization prepared them for the change. In some cases, supervisors doubted the effectiveness of the role adaptation. In many cases, study participants described how the organization was surprised at the impact of the informal consequences to the socialization change.

Conclusion

Organizational socialization is a directed process that establishes itself in formal and informal manners in early employment. The strength of the literature in police socialization centers on the notion of the impact on long-term job satisfaction and how newcomers are socialized into the organization. In addition, the studies generally focus on the basic training academy and field training officers. Supervisors, who are an organizational product of the formal and informal socialization process, are often examined in their role as an incumbent in a pre-existing and shared socialization process. This research study provides insight into how supervisors view their supervisory role as it relates to organizational values and expectations as an outcome to the socialization process. The findings suggest supervisor’s own organizational socialization experiences influences their role as supervisors. The results of this research study has led to multiple observations that directly apply to supervisors of the USBP.

Alignment of Organizational Values and Supervisory Experiences

The commitment and passion for the esprit de corps described by the research study participants is persuasive and unified by the supervisors interviewed. It is apparent how supervisors applied and used their own socialization experiences as part of their own role adjustment within the organization. Role adjustment was primarily predicated on experiences developed at the basic training academy. The idea of sense-making by supervisors played a significant role on how supervisors interpreted organizational change. The themes of esprit de corps, cohesiveness, and teamwork by organizational team members at all levels was an emphasis by the research study participants and important to the collective identity of the organization. The organizational change at the basic training academy appears to have fractured the collective identity of the organization. In case of future agency growth, the USBP or other law enforcement agencies should emphasize the practice of those behaviors, valued by the organization, at the basic training academy. In addition, those organizational values should be consistent throughout all levels of the organization. Given the importance of organizational values and supervisory experiences are to the interpretation of organizational change, organizations should develop strategic training plans that include the impact of the organizational socialization process on supervisors.

Van Maanen (1978) argued a shared organizational socialization process and resulting experiences are the drivers for employee motivation, behavior, and role adjustment. Strong socialization processes that are consistent throughout an employee’s career creates a collective organizational identity. Organizations with a consistent collective organizational identity are more likely to have employees who maintain a strong association through esprit de corps, cohesiveness, and teamwork. The sense of shared common values has a significant impact how supervisors view their role and adapt to change. Leaders in the USBP and in the broader sense of law enforcement organizations should strive to create consistent experiences and expectations that

are rooted in the collective identity of the organizational values. Consistency may reduce supervisory uncertainty in role adaptation and improve role efficiency.

**Supervisory Role Adaptation With or Without Organizational Assistance**

Literature in policing and in this study clearly demonstrate that supervisors must demonstrate a unique set of competencies and attributes to manage operations. Research study participants discussed the ideas of team building, managing and teaching more, and providing more mentorship to those they supervise. Supervisors clearly expressed the professional development of others and preparing their subordinates for the future was not only important, but a supervisor’s responsibility. The organizational change that resulted in the change of the initial socialization process presented supervisors with a unique and complex challenge. Nearly all the research study participants described how they adapted in their supervisory role, but not one single supervisor described or implied the organization prepared them for the change. In some cases, supervisors doubted the effectiveness of the role adaptation. In many cases, study participants described how the organization was surprised at the informal consequences to the socialization change.

The professional development of others by supervisors, in this case, did not appear to have much influence by higher level leaders and management of the organization. The literature suggests supervisors will adapt in their role with or without organizational assistance. Considering the level of public scrutiny on law enforcement it appears that leadership in police agencies place their organizations at high risk for failure by not shaping supervisory role behavior or adaptation through training. Study participants described a process in which they were allowed a high level of latitude to address new employee shortcomings independently with or without training or much guidance. The USBP must integrate the impact of organizational changes into supervisory training as a core strategy for supervisory professional development. In confronting organizational issues the USBP and other police organizations must help supervisors develop organizational wide solutions for the most complex issues. Developing a supervisory leadership program that reduces role ambiguity through training would allow supervisors to adjust to organizational change quickly and effectively. In addition, police organizations would be in a better position to shape and inform supervisory role adaptation.

---

Appendix A: Request for Volunteers

Border Patrol Supervisors:

My name is Victor M. Manjarrez, Jr., and I am a doctoral student at the University of Texas at El Paso, in the Educational Leadership and Administration Program, College of Education. I am seeking individuals who are Border Patrol supervisors to volunteer to be part of my research study aimed at better understanding how supervisors adapt in their role as a supervisor based on policy changes. My particular interest are supervisors who supervised Border Patrol Agents who graduated from the Academy from October 1, 2007 through September 30, 2015. The U.S. Border Patrol on October 1, 2007 altered the curriculum of the basic academy allowing for training agents to “test out” of the Spanish language. The curriculum changes not only changed the structure of the academy but it also changed the initial organizational socialization of the U.S. Border Patrol. Organizational socialization changes as it relates to supervisory experiences have largely been ignored in police literature and in particular federal law enforcement. Law enforcement organizations are embracing the idea that organizational socialization impacts more than just job satisfaction; however not much is known of the impacts on supervisors. The results of this research could help law enforcement organizations shape and form future supervisory professional development courses.

I am seeking officer-corps supervisors, at various levels of supervision and duty stations, who have been a supervisor since November 1, 2007, at any level. Participation in the research study must be voluntary. In addition, the identity of participating supervisors, during data collection (survey and interviews) and in the final report, will be kept confidential by not using names or any identifiers that can be linked to any individual. Each participant will be asked to complete a short online background questionnaire (approximately 5 to 6 minutes) and to participate in an interview, which will take approximately one (1) hour. You will be given the opportunity to read the final section of the report that relates to your interview to ensure that the information for the final report accurately portrays your perspective. You will also receive a copy of the final report.

If you are willing to participate in this research study, click on the link below:

<Border Patrol Supervisor Research Project Link>
Appendix B: Supervisor Background Questionnaire

Supervisor Background Questionnaire

CONSENT FORM

DESCRIPTION:
I am interested in exploring the experiences of Border Patrol supervisors who are responsible for leading Border Patrol Agents who have graduated from the USBP basic academy after October 1, 2007. While there is a significant body of literature on organizational socialization in policing, there is a paucity of research on police organizations who have significantly altered their basic police academy and the effects on supervisory staff. The purpose of this research is to better understand supervisory experiences and how they adapt to changes. This research project will occur in two stages:

- During the first stage you will complete a web-based questionnaire, which is being used to gather background information about your supervisory and academy experiences. The first stage will take about 5 to 6 minutes of your time.
- During the second stage you will participate in will be a face-to-face interview, which will be about 60 minutes. I will audio tape the interview.

Your responses will not be linked to your name or other personal identifiers in any written or verbal report of this research project. To ensure data collected during the interview accurately reflects the study participant’s perceptions, the section of the final report, which summarizes data collected from you, will be sent you for review, further input, corrections, and clarification.

You are being asked to be in the study because you are, at a minimum, a Supervisory Border Patrol Agent and have been since November 1, 2007. The number of anticipated study participants who will be part of both the survey and interview phases is expected to be between 25 to 30 individuals.

CONFIDENTIALITY:
If you elect to participate in the semi-structured interview you will be asked to provide contact information (name and email or telephone number) so that an interview date and time can be scheduled. The contact information is in essence a ‘referral system’ for the researcher to schedule the interview and is disconnected from the data analysis. Once the interview is scheduled, the contact information will be erased. Given there are approximately 2,600 Border Patrol supervisors in the nation, no specific identifying information will be used as part of the data analysis (i.e. name, DOB, employee number), and the findings will be reported in aggregate, there is no possibility of directly or indirectly identifying you.

The data collected from both the background questionnaire and the interview will be compiled into a report and your identity will not be revealed. I will use pseudonyms during coding and in the final report to insure confidentiality. I will be the only person to have access to the raw data (surveys and interview data). All personally identifying information will be removed. Any information that I will use for my research dissertation will not identify you. The digital audio files will be kept on an external hard drive that is password protected and in a locked file cabinet within a locked office. The audio files will not be
used for any other purpose without your written consent. At the conclusion of this study, the audio files will be kept in a locked filing cabinet up to 30 days after I successfully defend the research dissertation. The files will be erased, by me, after the expired time period.

This signed consent form will be stored in a non-shared office and in a locked file that is only accessible by me.

**BENEFITS:**
Although there are no known benefits to you for participating in this project, possible benefits include contributing to a greater understanding of supervisor experiences. This information could assist law enforcement organizations plan and provide better supervisory professional development opportunities.

**RISKS:**
There are no known risks to you for participating in this project.

**CONTACT PEOPLE:**
If you have any questions about this project, please contact me at the number listed above. This research report will be submitted as a final project for my dissertation at the University of Texas at El Paso. My advising professor for this research project is Rodolfo Rincones, Ph.D. and he can be reached at (915) 747-7614 or at rrincones@utep.edu. A copy of this consent form will be sent to your e-mail address.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a subject in this study, you may contact the University of Texas at El Paso’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) at either (915) 747-7693 or irb.orsp@utep.edu.

**SIGNATURE:**
Your signature on this consent form indicates that you have read the information in this letter and have decided to participate in this study. Your participation in this research project is voluntary. If you do not wish to participate, or would like to end your participation in this project, there will be no penalty or loss of benefits to you which you are otherwise entitled. In other words, you are free to make your own choice about being part of this project or not, and may quit at any time without penalty. Please notify me verbally or in writing if you decide to withdraw from this study.

Victor M. Manjarrez, Jr.
Doctoral Student
The University of Texas at El Paso
(915) 747-7812
vmmanjarrez@utep.edu

☐ Yes, I have read and understand the information in the letter and have decided to participate in this study.

☐ No, I do not wish to participate at this time.
Q1 Where you, at least, a Supervisory Border Patrol Agent on November 1, 2007?
   ☐ Yes, please continue.
   ☐ No, this will end the survey. Thank-you for your time and consideration.

Q2 How long have you been in the U.S. Border Patrol?
   ☐ 10 -15 Years   ☐ 16 - 20 Years   ☐ 21 - 25 Years
   ☐ 26 - 30 Years   ☐ 30+ Years

Q3 When did you first become a Supervisory Border Patrol Agent?

Q4 In what Sector did you first become a Supervisory Border Patrol Agent?
   ☐ San Diego   ☐ El Centro   ☐ Yuma   ☐ Tucson
   ☐ El Paso   ☐ Big Bend   ☐ Del Rio   ☐ Laredo
   ☐ Rio Grande Valley   ☐ New Orleans   ☐ Miami   ☐ Ramey
   ☐ Blaine   ☐ Spokane   ☐ Havre   ☐ Grand Forks
   ☐ Detroit   ☐ Buffalo   ☐ Swanton   ☐ Houlton
   ☐ U.S.B.P. Academy   ☐ Other

Q5 Where did you attend the basic U.S. Border Patrol Academy upon entering on duty (EOD)?
   ☐ Glynco, GA (Brunswick)   ☐ Charleston, SC   ☐ McClellan, AL
   ☐ Artesia, NM   ☐ Other
Q6 What Spanish Language group were you assigned while at the U.S. Border Patrol Academy as a trainee?

- Group 1 (Fluent in the Spanish Language)
- Group 2 (Mostly fluent in the Spanish Language)
- Group 3 (Some fluency/knowledge of the Spanish Language)
- Group 4 (No fluency/knowledge of the Spanish Language)
- Other

Q7 In what Sector did you first enter on duty (EOD) for the United States Border Patrol?

- San Diego
- El Centro
- Yuma
- Tucson
- El Paso
- Big Bend
- Del Rio
- Laredo
- Rio Grande Valley
- New Orleans
- Miami
- Ramey

Q8 Current Sector/Location

- San Diego
- El Centro
- Yuma
- Tucson
- El Paso
- Big Bend
- Del Rio
- Laredo
- Rio Grande Valley
- New Orleans
- Miami
- Ramey
- Blaine
- Spokane
- Havre
- Grand Forks
- Detroit
- Buffalo
- Swanton
- Houlton
- U.S.B.P. Academy
- Other
Q9 What is your current level of supervision?

- Supervisory Border Patrol Agent
- Field Operations Supervisor
- Watch Commander
- Deputy Patrol Agent in Charge
- Deputy Patrol Agent in Charge or Patrol Agent in Charge
- Operations Officer, Assistant Chief Patrol Agent, or Division Chief
- Deputy Chief or Chief Patrol Agent

Q10 Have you ever been permanently assigned to any other sector or Border Patrol Headquarters element other than your current assignment?

- Yes
- No

Q11 Have you ever been detailed or permanently assigned to the U.S. Border Patrol Academy?

- Yes
- No

Q12 Have you ever served in the U.S. military?

- Yes
- No

Q13 What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

Q14 What is your current age?

- 21-25
- 26-30
- 31-35
- 36-40
- 41-45
- 46-50
- 51-57

Q15 With which of the race/ethnicity do you most identify?

- White/Caucasian
- African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Other (please specify):
Q16 What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

- Less than high school degree
- High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent including GED)
- Some college but no degree
- Associate degree in college (2-year)
- Bachelor’s degree in college (4-year)
- Master’s degree
- Doctoral degree
- Professional degree (JD, MD)

If you would like to participate in the second portion of the research study, semi-structured interview, please provide contact information (name and telephone number or email). The contact information will be used solely by Victor M. Manjarrez, Jr. to contact you to arrange for an interview. The contact information will be disconnected (deleted) from the study data and not used in any of the analysis.

- ____________________________________________________________________________

If you do not want to participate in the second portion of the research study, semi-structured interview, please select “no” and no further attempt will be made to contact you.

Thank-you for participating in this portion of the research study.

- No, I do not want to participate any further in this study.

End of Block: Default Question Block
Appendix C: Supervisor Semi-Structured Interview

**INTERVIEW PROTOCOL AND QUESTIONS**

**Introductory Protocol (Script)**

Thank you for agreeing to meet with me today.

To facilitate my note-taking, I would like to audio tape our conversation today.

Do you agree to allow me to tape-record this interview?
* (If NO, I will turn off the audio recorder then will ask for permission to take notes and continue with the interview protocol; If YES, I will proceed with the interview).

For your information, I will only be privy to the tapes which will be eventually destroyed after they are transcribed. In addition, you must sign a form devised to meet our human subject requirements. Essentially, this document states that: (1) all information will be held confidential, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) I do not intend to inflict any harm. Once again, thank you for agreeing to participate and if the conditions are satisfactory please sign the release form.

What you share in this interview will be kept confidential. You may be identified in the study report in a way that will not reveal your individual identity such as, “a supervisor said”, so please tell me what you really think and feel. Your open thoughts will be helpful in understanding the experiences of Border Patrol supervisors.

I have planned this interview to last no longer than one hour. During this time, I have several questions that I would like to cover. If time begins to run short, it may be necessary to interrupt you in order to push ahead and complete this line of questioning.

**Interview Information**

Date of Interview: 
Time: From_______ To________

**Interview Questions**

1. How long have you been with the agency?
   a. By any chance do you remember your class session number and class motto?

2. How long have you been in your present position?

3. What did you do before joining the U.S. Border Patrol?
a. What made you decide to apply for the U.S. Border Patrol?

4. What were your views of the agency before you joined?
   a. What surprised you?

5. How would you describe your experiences as a trainee at the basic Border Patrol Academy?
   a. What did you like the most from your time as a trainee at the academy? Why?
   b. What did you like the least from your time as a trainee at the academy? Why?

6. Would you have changed anything from your basic academy experience? If so, what and why?

7. What do YOU believe is the formal purpose of basic training at the academy?
   a. Has your beliefs changed over time? How so?

8. What do YOU believe is the informal purpose of basic training at the academy?
   a. Has your beliefs changed over time? How so?

9. On October 1, 2007 the U.S. Border Patrol Academy changed its curriculum allowing trainee agents to test out of Spanish language training. What do you believe were the consequences of the academy change?
   a. Did you have to adapt in your role as a supervisor to supervise the new agents? If so, how?

10. What results or consequences of the academy decision surprised you the most? Why?

11. What do you believe were the biggest surprises for the U.S. Border Patrol when the curriculum changed?

12. How would you describe the supervisory oversight and mentorship required for those trainees that were part of the classes who could test out of the Spanish language?
   a. Did you have to adapt? If so, how?
   b. How have your experiences changed over time?
   c. What have been the biggest surprises to you?

13. How do these experiences compare to the experiences of supervising individuals who went to the basic academy before the ability to test out of Spanish was implemented?

14. Is there anything else you would like to add or is there something I should have asked but did not?
Closing the Interview

Thank-you very much for your participation. I will be transcribing this interview and providing you a summary of the interview for clarification and/or further input. Would you prefer that I provide your copy?

1. Via e-mail?
2. Postal mail?
3. Or both?

If you have any further thoughts before you receive the summary, please feel free to email me at vmanjarrez@utep.edu or call me at (915) 747-7812.

Researcher’s Interview Notes

1. Comments about the tone and progression of the interview.
   - Was the participant comfortable and forthcoming, restrained, hostile, etc.? 
   - Were there interruptions that changed the pace or effectiveness of the interview?
   - What are my feelings & perceptions about the person I interviewed and the interview tone and progression?
   - What else occurred/emerged as a result of this interview?

2. Comments on Interview Protocol
   - Problems encountered, anything I would possibly change before I use this protocol again?
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