Chapter 1

The Law Enforcement Organization

Good organizations are living bodies that grow new muscles to meet challenges.

Robert Townsend, corporate consultant

Do You Know?

- How law enforcement agencies were traditionally organized?
- What three eras of policing have been identified?
- What should drive an organization?
- How goals differ from objectives and work plans? From policies and procedures?
- What line and staff personnel are?
- What advantages and disadvantages are associated with specialization?
- What the chain of command does?
- What authority should be coupled with?
- What type of organization law enforcement managers should recognize?
- What management tools help coordination?
- What the emerging law enforcement agency looks like?
- What needs to be reexamined in light of the challenges facing law enforcement and our country?

Can You Define?

accountability  
admirative services  
authority  
bifurcated society  
chain of command  
channels of communication  
community era  
coordination  
delegation  
empowered  
field services  
flat organization  
formal organization  
generalists  
goals  
guiding philosophy  
hierarchy  
incident command  
informal organization  
key result areas  
line personnel  
mission  
mission statement  
objectives  
organization  
organizational chart  
paradigm  
paradigm shift  
political era  
professional model  
pyramid of authority  
reform era  
responsibility  
scuttlebutt  
span of control  
specialists  
spoils system  
staff personnel  
stakeholders  
unified command  
unity of command  
values  
work plans
Introduction

An organization is an artificial structure created to coordinate either people or groups and resources to achieve a mission or goal. Organizations exist for many different reasons. One important reason is that a group can accomplish things an individual could never do alone. For example, no single individual could have put a person on the moon, but an organization—NASA—was successful.

The need for organizing has been recognized for centuries. Since recorded time people have banded together into societies. Within these societies they have sought ways to protect themselves from nature and from those who would harm them or their possessions. They made rules, set up ways to enforce these rules, and provided swift punishment to those who did not obey. Modern-day law enforcement agencies are an outgrowth of this need for “law and order.”

To understand the present, it is often helpful to look at the past—where traditions and the status quo originated. Therefore, this chapter begins with a brief history of the development of law enforcement agencies and the typical military, pyramid-style structure that evolved during the three eras of policing. This is followed by a description of the models of policing that have developed, individual influences on the development of police management, and the influence of technology on management and supervision.

The chapter next looks at the mission of law enforcement agencies and the functions they serve. The effect of this mission on an organization’s goals, objectives, work plans, and policies and procedures is then described. Then the discussion focuses on the formal and informal organization within a department and the importance of coordination. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the emerging law enforcement organization and the importance of unified and incident command.

The Evolution of Law Enforcement Organizations

Most agencies have a rich tradition dating back to seventeenth-century England, when the Industrial Revolution changed that country from a rural to an urban society. Accompanying this urbanization were the problems of unemployment, poverty, and crime, conditions that ultimately led to the formation of the London Metropolitan Police in 1829. The fundamental principles on which this police force rested were set forth by Sir Robert Peel, often called the “Father of Modern Policing,” and included the following:

- Police must be stable, efficient, and organized militarily.
- Police must be under governmental control.
- The deployment of police strength by both time and area is essential.
- Public security demands that every police officer be given a number.
- Police headquarters should be centrally located and easily accessible.
- The duty of the police is to prevent crime and disorder.
- The power of the police to fulfill these duties is dependent on public approval and on their ability to secure and maintain public respect.
- The police should strive to maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police.
- The test of police effectiveness is the absence of crime and disorder, not the visible evidence of police activity in dealing with these problems.
The first five principles were embraced almost immediately in the United States, and its cities developed police departments modeled after the London Metropolitan Police. The last four principles, however, were not fully accepted until the advent of community policing, discussed in Chapter 3.

New York City established the first modern American city police force in 1844, modeled after London’s Metropolitan Police Department.

In 1874 the Texas Rangers were commissioned as police officers and became the first agency similar to our present-day state police. Federal agencies were also established; the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) was created in 1908. In addition to these, many jurisdictions established county law enforcement agencies. These early organizations were modeled after the military, with ranks, levels of command, and uniforms. Just as the military has a commander in chief, law enforcement agencies also have chiefs (or sheriffs). Likewise, just as the commander in chief is ultimately responsible to the citizens of the United States, law enforcement chiefs are ultimately responsible to the citizens of the political entity their department serves.
The Traditional Law Enforcement Organization

Law enforcement agencies provide their services to the political entity from which they derive their authority and responsibility. Providing services is their sole reason for existence. It is highly likely that newly created municipalities would expect someone to respond to their needs for the many services provided by police. Americans have come to expect and demand reasonably safe communities, so they demand law enforcement organizations. As such organizations develop, they resemble those already in existence in other communities because tradition and experience are enduring.

Further, most present-day law enforcement managers inherited their organizations when they assumed their positions. Many have perpetuated the traditional organization, diagrammed in Figure 1.1, because it has worked.

Pre–World War II law enforcement agencies followed the industry pattern by placing maximum emphasis on the job and minimum attention on the human interrelationships of people filling the positions. Rigid rules and regulations were used excessively, along with frequent use and abuse of the threat of job loss. Individual needs were almost totally ignored. Early law enforcement management was characterized by the general attitude of, “If you don’t like the job, plenty of others want it.”
Law enforcement organizations were simple. The typical pyramid of authority predominated with its hierarchy of authoritative management. Command officers and supervisors had complete authority over subordinates, and there was little opportunity for departmental appeal except through the courts. Communication flowed downward. Little or no specialization existed, and training was nonexistent or minimal. Selection was based largely on physical qualifications, and most applicants had military experience.

The majority of personnel were assigned to foot patrol. Police radio communications systems and other technology were virtually nonexistent. University- or college-level training, training programs, and even courses were unheard of. Ten-hour days and six-day weeks were common, accompanied by extremely low salaries. Flexibility was nonexistent, and fringe benefits were few.

**The Three Eras of Policing**

Policing has evolved in the way it views itself, its responsibilities, and the most effective means of meeting those responsibilities. Some writers look at the changes by decade. Kelling (2003), for example, describes scientific policing of the 1930s, consolidation of reforms from 1940 to 1960, shocks and change during the 1960s, the implementation of research during the 1970s and 1980s, and contemporary policing. Another way to view the evolution of policing is to consider three distinct eras.

Three distinct eras of policing have been identified: the political era, the reform era, and the community era.

**The Political Era (1840–1930)**

In the political era, policing was characterized by police authority coming from politicians and the law, a broad social service function, decentralized organization, an intimate relationship with the community, and extensive use of foot patrol. Because of the close tie between police authority and politics during this era, corruption was common. One factor underlying this corruption was the prevalent spoils system, whose motto, “To the victor go the spoils,” resulted in political interference with policing. The prevailing party believed its members should be immune from arrest and receive other special privileges. Furthermore, the spoils system enabled politicians to give their friends key positions in police departments. A major step toward reducing corruption within police departments occurred when, in 1883, Congress passed the Pendleton Act, creating the civil service system by which job applicants were tested and awarded employment based on their test scores. Promotions were to be based on merit, not politics. The act also made it unlawful to fire or demote a government employee for political reasons.

During the political era police served a broad social service function, with some even running soup lines. Police were also close to their community, with foot patrol bringing beat officers into contact with the people. However, Prohibition changed this relationship.

**Prohibition** The Prohibition movement (1920–1933) resulted from passage of the Eighteenth Amendment in 1919; this amendment outlawed the manufacture, sale, or transportation, including importing and exporting, of intoxicating liquor.
beverages within the United States and its territories. Prohibition placed the police organization in opposition to large segments of respectable citizens in their communities. The enforcement of Prohibition laws created hostility toward the police and made contacts between the police and the public increasingly adversarial.

Prohibition ended in 1933 with ratification of the Twenty-First Amendment repealing the Eighteenth Amendment. The inability of the police to control consumption of alcoholic beverages might be likened to the contemporary challenge of controlling use of illegal drugs. The rise of crime during this period resulted in the formation of the Wickersham Commission.

The Wickersham Commission In 1929 President Herbert Hoover appointed the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement to examine the American criminal justice system. The commission, named after chairman George Wickersham, devoted two reports to the police. Report 1, Lawlessness in Law Enforcement, described the problem of police brutality, concluding that “the third degree—the inflicting of pain, physical or mental, to extract confessions or statements—is extensively practiced.” Report 14, The Police, focused on police administration and called for expert leadership, centralized administrative control, and higher personnel standards. In other words, Report 14 called for police professionalism, which led to the second era.

The Reform Era (1930–1980)

The reform era developed in reaction to the political era. The reform era was characterized by police authority coming from the law and professionalism, crime control as the primary function, a centralized and efficient organization, professional remoteness from the community and an emphasis on preventive motorized patrol and rapid response to crime. J. Edgar Hoover (1895–1972) was director of the FBI from 1924 to 1972 and placed the agency’s emphasis on catching criminals.

As early as the 1920s, August Vollmer, often called the father or dean of modern police administration, was calling for reforms in policing. Vollmer was first town marshal and then police chief for Berkeley, California, from 1905 until 1932. Vollmer introduced the latest advancements in criminalistics, the first juvenile unit, and psychological screening for police applicants and was first to emphasize the importance of college education for police officers.

His department was the first in the nation to use automobiles for patrol and the first to hire a full-time forensic scientist. Vollmer developed the first degree-granting program in law enforcement at San Jose State College. He also advocated that police officers serve as social service workers and that police act to prevent crime by intervening in the lives of potential criminals, especially juveniles.

During the 1930s use of the radio and motorized patrol and the collection of crime statistics through the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reports added to the professionalism of the police. As stated by the National Commission of Law Observance and Enforcement (1931): “With the advent of the radio-equipped car a new era has come.”

A Vollmer protégé, O. W. Wilson, became the main architect of this new era and the style of policing known as the professional model. Wilson accepted a professorship at the University of California, Berkeley, and in 1947 he founded the first professional school of criminology. Like his mentor, Wilson advocated efficiency within the police bureaucracy through scientific techniques. He became
police chief in Wichita, Kansas, and conducted the first systematic study of the
effectiveness of using one-officer squad cars. Wilson’s classic text, *Police Admin-
istration*, set forth specific ways to use one-officer patrol cars to deploy personnel
and to discipline officers.

Wilson (1950, pp.17–18) decried political influence on the police: “When the
police department is controlled by the machine, political influence begins with
the appointment of the recruit, rallies to save him from discipline, helps him to
secure unearned wages or disability benefits, grants him unusual leaves of ab-
scence, secures an unwarranted promotion for him, or gives him a soft job. In
countless ways the creeping paralysis of political favoritism spreads and fastens it-
self upon the force to sap its vitality and destroy its morale for the benefit of the
party, at the expense of both the public and of the police force itself.”

Wilson (p.388) also called for cooperation with the public: “Public coopera-
tion is essential to the successful accomplishment of the police purpose. Public
support assists in many ways; it is necessary in the enforcement of major laws as
well as of minor regulations, and with it arrests are made and convictions ob-
tained that otherwise would not be possible.”

The reformers sought to disassociate policing from politics. They were to be-
come professionals whose charge was to enforce the law, fairly and impartially.
The social service function became of lesser importance or even nonexistent in
some departments as police mounted an all-out war on crime. Two keys to this
war were preventive patrol in automobiles and rapid response to calls. This is the
style of policing with which most Americans are familiar and have come to expect.

Unfortunately, the war on crime was being lost. Crime escalated, and other
problems arose as well. In the 1960s violent ghetto riots, most triggered by incidents
in which white officers were policing in black ghetto areas, caused millions of dol-
ars in damages, thousands of injuries, and many deaths. In addition, civil rights
and anti–Vietnam War demonstrations and riots began to pit the police against
middle- and upper-class Americans, similar to the situation during Prohibition.
During these confrontations police often used force—sometimes excessive—and
became viewed as an armed force who maintained order at the expense of justice.

Kerlikowske (2004, p.7) points out:

“The [professional] model was neat and orderly, especially internally, and
completely unprepared to deal with the social change, upheaval and the over-
whelming demographic challenge of the 1960s. The thin blue line that had
won wars abroad could not win peace or even calm in the neighborhoods
wracked by exploding crime rates and deep social unrest. Forgotten in the
professional model was the familiarity that existed between officers and the
community in the earlier era, when residents saw officers as neighborhood
problem solvers and when their efforts attracted some level of community
support. Instead, professional officers were viewed as an occupying army.”

As a result, several blue-ribbon commissions were established.

**Blue-Ribbon Commissions** Kelling (p.14) describes five national commissions
that resulted from the turmoil in U.S. cities and controversy surrounding police
practices in the 1960s and early 1970s:

- The President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Jus-
tice, which published its reports in 1967 and 1968, was influenced by urban
racial turmoil. Among the outgrowths of its work were the Safe Streets Act of 1968 and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, which provided significant funding for police-related programs.

- The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (popularly known as the Kerner Commission) was similarly inspired by riots and other disorders occurring in many U.S. cities during the summer of 1967. Its report (1968) examined patterns of disorder and prescribed responses by the federal government, the criminal justice system, and local governments. The comprehensive, scathing report placed much of the blame on racism in society and severe underrepresentation of blacks in police departments.

- The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence was established after the 1968 assassinations of Martin Luther King, Jr., and Robert Kennedy. Its report, To Establish Justice, To Insure Domestic Tranquility, was published in 1969.

- The President’s Commission on Campus Unrest was established following student deaths related to protests at Kent State and Jackson State universities in 1970.

- The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals issued six reports in 1973 in an attempt to develop standards and recommendations for police crime control efforts.

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (1968) established the National Institute of Justice as a research and development agency to prevent and reduce crime and to improve the criminal justice system. Among the institute’s mandates were that it sponsor special projects and research and development programs to improve and strengthen the criminal justice system, conduct national demonstration projects that employed innovative or promising approaches for improving criminal justice, develop new technologies to fight crime and improve criminal justice, evaluate the effectiveness of criminal justice programs, and identify those that promised to be successful if continued or repeated.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Act Directly influencing police hiring practices was passage of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act (EEOA) in 1973. The Equal Employment Opportunity Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, race, color, religion, or national origin in employment of any kind, public or private, local, state, or federal.

The effect of this act on police departments today is discussed in Chapter 15. Despite the commissions and legislation, reforms that had begun during the 1930s and thrived during the 1950s and 1960s began to erode during the 1970s. Once again the professional model began to be challenged.

Increasing Challenges to the Professional Model One event in 1972 had a great impact on eroding the reform strategy. The classic Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment called into question the effectiveness of preventive patrol and rapid response—the two central strategies of the reform era.

Other challenges facing the professional model include the breakdown of the family unit, the inability of “traditional” police approaches to decrease crime; the rapidly escalating drug problem; the pressing problems associated with the deinstitutionalization of thousands of mentally ill people, many of whom became homeless; and dealing with thousands of immigrants, some legal, some illegal, many speaking no English.

8 Section I: Management and Supervision: An Overview
Many began asserting that the police and the criminal justice system could not control crime and violence alone because they have no control over the factors contributing to crime such as inequality, poverty, lack of opportunity and the like. This realization made the time ripe for the current era, the community era.

**The Community Era (1980–Present)**

Following changes occurring in corporate America, many police departments became customer-oriented, viewing citizens as consumers of police services. Policing during the **community era** is characterized by police authority coming from community support, law, and professionalism; provision of a broad range of services, including crime control; decentralized organization with greater authority given to patrol officers; an intimate relationship with the community; and the use of foot patrol and a problem-solving approach.

Community policing is discussed in depth in Chapter 3 and throughout the remainder of the text, because it affects all aspects of the contemporary police organization and function in most departments throughout the country. Table 1.1 summarizes the distinguishing characteristics of the three eras of policing.

### Current Models of Policing

Sharp (2005, p.88) describes four models of policing that have evolved: professional (also known as paramilitary), community, CompStat, and a hybrid model. His study found that law enforcement agency administrators are constantly assessing the models in place in their jurisdictions and changing the model if they see a need. He reports that 51 percent had switched from one model to another recently. His survey did find “an escalating trend from traditional models to community policing.”

Sharp (p.89) reports that of his respondents, 56 percent used the COP model, 26 percent used a hybrid model, 12 percent used the professional model and 6 percent used CompStat. According to Sharp (p.89), the model selected was not only based on the top administrator’s preference but also was influenced by civilian administrators and rank-and-file preferences; the community’s diversity; recommendations from professional organizations; the agency’s history, mission, goals, and objectives; and the opinions of the citizens.
Sharp (p.97) stresses: “A resounding 84% of the respondents said they believe that the efficient delivery of customer service is more important than which model a police department operates under.” Whichever model a department uses, other influences have also affected how policing has evolved.

**Individual Influences on the Evolution of Police Management**

Management principles evolving in the business world have directly influenced how police executives have managed their forces. Such changes have taken police management and leadership philosophies from a strict control approach to an approach that delegates increased responsibility to the line officer.

**Max Weber**

Max Weber (1864–1920), a German sociologist and economist, helped establish the foundations of modern sociology. He considered bureaucracy to be the most important feature of modern society. Weber believed that business was conducted from a desk or office by preparing and dispatching written documents through an elaborate hierarchical division of labor directed by explicit rules impersonally applied. These rules were meant to design and regulate the whole organization on the basis of technical knowledge with the aim of achieving maximum efficiency.

According to Weber: “Bureaucratic administration means fundamentally the exercise of control on the basis of knowledge” (“Bureaucracy,” 2005). One of the most fundamental features of bureaucracy according to Weber was a highly developed division of labor and specialization of tasks. This was achieved by a precise, detailed definition of the duties and responsibilities of each position. Bureaucracy was (and is) important in the organization of police departments.

**Frederick W. Taylor**

Also influential and living in the same time period was Frederick W. Taylor (1865–1915), an American industrial engineer, sometimes referred to as the father of scientific management. Taylor suggested that production efficiency in a shop or factory could be greatly enhanced by observing individual workers and eliminating wasted time and motion. The impact of his time and motion studies on mass production was immense, but they fostered resentment and opposition from labor (“Taylor, Frederick W.,” 2005).

Taylor’s book *The Principles of Scientific Management* (1911) called for a small span of control, a clear chain of command, a tall organizational hierarchy, and centralized decision making modeled after the military. This method of management style became standard in police organizations during the reform era.

**Peter Drucker**

During the 1940s, American economist, management specialist, and consultant Peter Drucker (1909–2005) became influential, asserting that productivity was the result of self-starting, self-directed workers who accepted responsibility. He advocated a shift from traditional production lines to flexible production methods. Among his most quoted statements are the following:

- Efficiency is doing better what is already being done.
- There is nothing so useless as doing efficiently that which should not be done at all.
- Today knowledge has power. It controls access to opportunity and advancement.
Management is doing things right; leadership is doing the right things.

The individual is the central, rarest, most precious capital resource of our society.

Drucker’s ideas were influential in the shift in management styles discussed in the next chapter.

The Influence of Technology on Management

As noted, the introduction of the police radio and motorized patrol revolutionized how policing was done. This was just the beginning. Consider establishment of the National Crime Information Center (1967), automated fingerprint systems, DNA analysis, computer-aided dispatch, computerized records management systems, bar codes in evidence rooms, digitized photographic lineups, CompStat—the list goes on and on. Most of the technologic advances have greatly improved the delivery of police services and helped managers and supervisors be more efficient, but they have also posed challenges as police administrators struggle to implement the latest technology with shrinking budgets.

As Cowper observes: “Policing is a human endeavor and people are the most important aspect of what we do. Human relationships and interactions are what solve problems between and among people, not technology” (Stephens, 2005, p.15). The impact of advances in technology, particularly information technology (IT), are described throughout the text.

Although police departments have changed substantially since their early beginnings in this country, from their very beginnings police departments have had a mission, stated or unstated.

The Law Enforcement Mission

Stephens (2003, p.33) contends: “Rather than beginning with externally mandated objectives and then figuring out how to achieve them, police executives are beginning with the question of mission.” The primary purpose of most law enforcement agencies has become less clear over the past decades. Traditionally, as the name implies, the mission was to enforce the law, that is, to fight crime. In the twenty-first century, however, many departments have changed their focus to providing services while other departments seek a combination of the two. It is important for departments to clearly articulate their mission or overriding purpose in writing.

A mission statement is the driving force of an organization, including a law enforcement agency, and provides a focus for its energy.

Mission statements articulate the rationale for an organization’s existence. A mission statement can be the most powerful underlying influence in law enforcement, affecting organizational and individual attitudes, conduct, and performance. Mission statements are best developed by an appointed committee, representative of but not too large for individual participation. Developing the statement is only the first step. It must then be distributed, explained, understood, and accepted by all department members. A mission statement is not automatically implemented or effective. It must be practiced in everyday actions and decision making by management and field personnel.
The mission statement of a law enforcement agency should be believable, worthy of support, widely known, shared, and exciting to key stakeholders. Stakeholders are those affected by the organization and those in a position to affect it. In a law enforcement organization, stakeholders include everyone in the jurisdiction. Two key questions to answer are (1) what do the stakeholders want? and (2) what do the stakeholders need? What people want and what they need are not necessarily the same. Stakeholders should, however, have input into what is provided for them.

An example of an effective mission statement is that of the Charlotte (North Carolina) Police Department:

The Charlotte Police Department is committed to fairness, compassion and excellence while providing police services in accordance with the law and sensitive to the priorities and needs of the people.

A mission statement such as this can both guide and drive an organization. Mission statements are usually part of an organization’s overall guiding philosophy.

An Organization’s Guiding Philosophy and Values

A guiding philosophy consists of an organization’s mission statement and its basic values, the beliefs, principles, or standards considered worthwhile or desirable. Consider, for example, the values set forth by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP):

Some readers may be thinking that mission statements and value statements are fine, but that they are simply words. How do such words get translated into action?

Our Declaration of Independence was a statement of the guiding philosophy of our country, but it did not establish how the United States should be structured or governed. This was accomplished through our Constitution and Bill of Rights. A statement of philosophy is meaningless without a plan or blueprint for accomplishing it. Goals, objectives, work plans and policies and procedures provide this blueprint.

Goals, Objectives, Work Plans and Policies and Procedures

Goals, objectives and work plans are interdependent. All three are needed to carry out an organization’s mission.

**Goals** are broad, general, desired outcomes. Objectives are specific, measurable ways to accomplish the goals. Work plans are the precise activities that contribute to accomplishing objectives. Policies and procedures specify how the activities are to be carried out.

**Goals**

Goals are visionary, projected achievements. They provide guidelines for planning efforts. They are what in business would be called the key result areas. Goals provide the foundation for objectives and ultimately for work plans. Among the commonly agreed-upon goals of most law enforcement agencies are to enforce laws, prevent crime, preserve the peace, protect civil rights and civil liberties, provide services, and solve problems.

Few people would argue about the value of these goals. The disagreements arise over which are most important and how resources should be apportioned. For example, providing how much service and of what kind, compared with how much enforcing of laws? It is also often difficult to determine which objectives might accomplish the goals.

**Objectives**

Objectives are needed before work plans can be developed. They are much more specific than goals and usually have a timeline. Objectives are critical to planning, assigning tasks, and evaluating performance. For example, one objective might be to reduce traffic accidents by 20 percent by the end of the year.

Good objectives are clear and understandable, especially to those who will be responsible for carrying them out. They are also practical; that is, they are realistic and achievable. Personnel must have the knowledge, skill, and resources to accomplish their objectives. Effective objectives deal with important matters. They should motivate and energize each person to perform not only at a high level individually but also as a team member. Good objectives provide the basis for a department’s work plans.

**Work Plans**

Work plans, sometimes called tactical and strategic plans, are the detailed steps needed to accomplish objectives. They are tied to a timeline and are an effective
way to evaluate an organization’s performance. To accomplish the objective of reducing traffic accidents, a department might establish the following work plans (in January):

- Analyze where accidents are happening to determine their cause by July 1.
- Based on this analysis, take steps to correct identified problems by December 1.
- Conduct ten educational meetings regarding traffic safety for the public by June 1.
- Design and display five educational billboards regarding drinking and driving by April 1.

**Policies and Procedures**

Policies and procedures are usually contained in a manual distributed to all personnel within the department. Sharp (2004, p.75) contends that the true test of a policies and procedures manual is not how professional it looks but how up-to-date it is. He suggests that while such manuals may have been low priority in the past, that can no longer be the case: “Currently, they are the first thing that opposing counsel asks for when something bad happens.” Sharp (p.74) suggests that the primary emphasis in the policies and procedures manuals should be on legal and liability issues.

In addition to addressing these issues, Delattre and Behan (2003, p.612) state that policies and procedures need to incorporate the values of the department: “To successfully incorporate worthwhile values into the policies and practices of their departments, police managers must simultaneously be both realists and idealists.” Realistic idealism recognizes what is possible given the existing situation while aspiring to high principles and a worthwhile mission. The importance of policies and procedures is discussed further in Chapter 10.

After a law enforcement agency has determined its goals and objectives, developed work plans, and established policies and procedures, these must be put into action by people organized to do so.

**The Formal Organization**

The formal organization is put together by design and rational plan. The essential elements of a formal organization are:

- A clear statement of mission, goals, objectives, and values (as discussed previously).
- A division of labor among specialists.
- A rational organization or design.
- A hierarchy of authority and responsibility.

**Typical Divisions in Law Enforcement Agencies**

Law enforcement agencies typically are divided into field and administrative services, with personnel designated as line and staff personnel.

Field services using line personnel directly help accomplish the goals of the department. Administrative services using staff personnel support the line organization.

Field services’ main division is the uniformed patrol. Larger agencies may have other divisions as well, such as investigations, narcotics, vice and juvenile. Line personnel fulfill the goals and objectives of the organization. This is what most people think of as law enforcement—the uniformed police officer on the street.
Field service divisions are typically further broken into shifts to provide service within a framework of geographical space and extended time. Continuity of service must be provided between areas and shifts. Larger departments may divide the political entity they serve into distinct precincts or district stations, the geographical areas served by a given portion of the officers, essentially forming a number of smaller organizations subject to overall administration and operational command. Time is typically divided into three eight-hour shifts so that service can be provided continuously. Officers frequently rotate through these shifts. Personnel assigned to specific divisions and shifts vary depending on the community’s size and service needs.

Administrative services, which are usually centralized, include recruitment and training, records and communications, planning and research, and technical services. Staff personnel assist line personnel, including supervisors. The laboratory staff, for example, assists line personnel, acting as liaisons, specialists, or advisory personnel. They are technical experts who provide specialized information. Legal staff (city, county, or district attorneys) act as legal advisors to all members of the agency.

Conflicts can and do arise between line and staff, particularly when staff attempts to act in a capacity beyond advisory or informational. Both line and staff are necessary components of the law enforcement organization. They must, however, be coordinated and controlled to achieve department goals.

Stephens (2003, p.52) describes a frequent problem that occurs when support functions are placed in a line division that does not serve the entire department. For example, the records section (a support function) often reports to the head of investigations (a line function). But officers in other divisions and the public may also need access to these records, and in this scenario the records are more difficult for them to obtain than if records and other support functions were in the same area.

**Division of Labor: Generalists and Specialists** Law enforcement agencies, despite their organizational hierarchy, are basically decentralized units, with most decisions made at the level of the patrol, detective, juvenile, and narcotics officers and that of the first-line supervisor. Even the authority to arrest is made at the lowest level of the organization. Most arrests are made by patrol officers, detectives, and juvenile officers.

Law enforcement agencies cannot function without division of work and, often, specialization. Neither can they function without maximum coordination of these *generalists* and *specialists*. As the organization grows in size, specialization develops to meet the community’s needs. The extent of specialization is a management decision.

Specialization occurs when the organizational structure is divided into units with specific tasks to perform. The patrol unit is assigned the majority of personnel and provides the greatest variety of tasks and services. Even though specialized units are formed, the patrol division often still performs some of these units’ tasks.

For example, patrol officers may investigate a crime scene up to the point at which they must leave their shift or area to continue the investigation. Or they may investigate only to the point of protecting the scene and keeping witnesses present or immediately arresting a suspect. At this point they may complete their report on tasks performed relating to the specific crime and either turn it over to another shift of patrol officers or to the investigative unit. Regardless of the division of tasks performed by generalist or specialist units, close communication about cases must occur or problems develop.
Specialization creates a potential for substantially increased levels of expertise, creativity, and innovation. The more completely an employee can perform a task or set of tasks, the more job satisfaction the employee will experience. When specialization is not practical, people must understand why the division of labor is necessary. It must also be clear where patrol’s responsibility ends and that of the investigative unit begins.

The greater the specialization, necessary as it is, the greater the difficulties of coordination, communication, control, and employee relationships. Conflicts and jealousies may arise, including an attitude of “Let the expert do it if he or she is going to get the credit.”

Officers in a small agency must perform all tasks. They cannot afford the luxury of specialization. However, with more standardized training requirements and accreditation, all officers have similar backgrounds for performing tasks, regardless of the size of the agency. The major difference is the frequency of opportunity.

Specialization can enhance a department’s effectiveness and efficiency, but overspecialization can impede the organizational purpose.

Overspecialization fragments the opportunity to achieve the organizational purpose of providing courteous, competent, expeditious law enforcement services. The more specialized an agency becomes, the more attention must be paid to interrelationships and coordination.

**Rational Organization and Hierarchy of Authority**

The structure of most police departments, as noted, has traditionally been a semi-military, pyramid-shaped hierarchy with authority flowing from the narrow apex down to the broad base. This hierarchical pyramid is often graphically represented in an organizational chart.

**The Organizational Chart** An organizational chart visually depicts how personnel are organized within an agency and might also illustrate how the agency fits into the community’s political structure. Figure 1.2 shows the organization of the Boulder City (Nevada) Police Department. This is typical of how police departments are organized in smaller cities. The figure also shows how the police department fits into the city’s organizational structure.

This formal organization is generally supported in writing by rules and regulations, department operational manuals, and job descriptions. All provide control and a foundation from which actions can be taken.

The larger the agency and the jurisdiction it serves, the more complex the organization and the chart depicting it. Figure 1.3, a chart of the Minneapolis Police Department, shows how a large police department is organized.

**Chain of Command** The chain of command is the order of authority. It begins at the top of the pyramid with the chief or sheriff and flows downward through the commissioned ranks in the agency—from deputy chief to captain to lieutenant to sergeant and finally to the patrol officer.

The chain of command establishes definite lines of authority and channels of communication.

Each level must forward communications to the next higher or lower level. **Channels of communication** are the official paths through which orders flow...
from management to workers. Most companies set up these channels carefully and for good reasons. They are the "highways" for orders and communications to follow and keep everyone aware of events. They coordinate the organization into a whole unit instead of a series of parts. When an individual leaves these channels and takes a shortcut, he or she is apt to run into problems. For example, a patrol officer who takes a complaint directly to the chief rather than to the sergeant would probably fall out of favor in the department.

Sometimes in law enforcement work, however, emergencies exist that cannot wait for information to be sent through the expected channels. This is one of the challenges of police work.

Another important part of the organizational design is unity of command. **Unity of command** means that every individual in the organization has only one immediate superior or supervisor. Unity of command is extremely important and needs to be ensured in most instances. Each individual, unit, and situation should be under the control of one—and only one—person.

Yet another factor in most law enforcement organizations is the number of people one individual manages or supervises. The **span of control** refers to the number of people or units supervised by one manager. The span of control depends on the department’s size, the supervisors’ and subordinates’ abilities, crime rates, community expectations, and the political environment. Often the greater the span of control, the less effective the management or supervision.

However, technological advances involving communications with personnel in the field, higher levels of education and training, and the extent of the empowerment and flattening of the organization may allow managers to increase their span of control and remain effective. Do not confuse span of control with how many people one person has authority over. The chief, for example, has authority over everyone in the department, but the chief’s span of control extends to only those who report directly to him or her.

**Figure 1.2** A Typical Small Police Department Organizational Chart

Source: Courtesy of the Boulder City Police Department, Boulder City, Nevada.
Figure 1.3  A Typical Large Police Department Organizational Chart

Source: Courtesy of the Minneapolis (Minnesota) Police Department.
The span of control must be realistic. If too few people report to a manager, that manager is not earning his or her salary. If too many people report to a manager, that manager cannot do a good job with all of them. Within a law enforcement agency, the more levels in the pyramid, the smaller the span of control. A number of factors must be considered:

- Distance in space and time between manager and subordinate
- Difficulty of tasks performed
- Types of assistance available to the manager
- Amount of direction subordinates need
- Extent of subordinates’ skill and experience

Each factor must be considered as personnel are assigned. Other important considerations are who has authority, who has responsibility, and what can be delegated.

**Authority, Responsibility and Delegation**

Authority, responsibility and delegation are key factors in any organization. Without them organizations could not exist.

**Authority** is the power to enforce laws, exact obedience, and command. **Responsibility** means being answerable, liable, or accountable. Thus, managers have the authority to give commands, and subordinates have the responsibility of carrying out the commands. This is very much in keeping with the militaristic model.

The third concept, **delegation**, is also crucial in any organization. Organizations exist because they can accomplish what no one person can accomplish. That single person, the chief, must be able to assign (delegate) tasks to others, who may, in turn, further delegate.

When authority is delegated, it should be coupled with responsibility.

Delegation is discussed in Chapter 2. The concept is key for all managers, at whatever their level within the police organization, for this is how **accountability** can be ensured. Accountability makes people responsible for tasks assigned to them. Accountability is needed because all tasks specified in the agency’s work plans must be accomplished by someone if the organization is to fulfill its mission. As important as the formal organization of a police department is, as in any group, an informal structure also exists.

The formal organization groups people by task and responsibility and clearly delineates the chain of command and channels of communication. The informal organization exists side-by-side with this formal organization and may in fact be a truer representation of the way the department actually functions.

**The Informal Organization**

Within any organization some people may emerge as leaders, regardless of whether they are in a leadership position. In addition, within any organization people will form their own groups—people who enjoy being together and perhaps working together.

Managers should recognize the informal organization that exists within any law enforcement agency.
The informal organization operates without official sanctions, but it influences the agency’s performance. It may help or harm the agency’s goals, and it may support the organization or cause dissention.

Inasmuch as informal organizations are going to exist regardless of whether the supervisor likes them, it might be wise to view them as a positive force and use them to facilitate the department’s work. This can be done by thinking of the informal leader not as a ringleader but as a person “in on things,” one whose talents can benefit the whole group.

One aspect of the informal organization is scuttlebutt, that is, gossip or rumors. Scuttlebutt can undermine morale and reduce productivity. This important aspect of internal communication is discussed in Chapter 4. Successful managers are able to coordinate the efforts of both the formal and the informal organization.

Coordinating efforts should be a part of an agency’s work plan. Coordination is especially important in departments that are changing their focus from crime fighting to community policing and problem solving.

**Coordinating Efforts**

Coordinating efforts should be a part of an agency’s work plan. Coordination is especially important in departments that are changing their focus from crime fighting to community policing and problem solving.

**The Emerging Law Enforcement Organization**

Business and industry are undergoing sweeping changes in organization and management styles to remain competitive. Law enforcement agencies are also facing the need for change to meet the competition of private policing. Harr and Hess (2005, p.72) report that private security has become a “major player” in safeguarding Americans and their property. They suggest that as our elderly and business populations continue to occupy high-rise condominiums and office buildings, the reliance on private security will also increase. Law enforcement cannot practically be expected to patrol such structures.

Police departments and other law enforcement agencies not only must compete with private police but also must compete for the bright, young college graduates entering the work force. No longer will law enforcement agencies be recruiting a majority of candidates with a military background. Instead they will be recruiting college graduates who will not accept authority blindly. Other changes are also evident in police departments across the country.
The emerging law enforcement agency has a flattened organization, is decentralized, and empowers its employees.

**A Flattened Organization**

Like businesses, for the sake of efficiency, many police departments are turning to a flat organization, one with fewer lieutenants and captains, fewer staff departments, fewer staff assistants, more sergeants, and more patrol officers. Typical pyramid organization charts will have the top pushed down and the sides expanded at the base. Some police departments are beginning to experiment with alternative organization designs. One example of such experimentation places the patrol officers at the top with everyone under them playing a supporting role (Figure 1.4).

Top-heavy organizational structures are no longer tolerated in business. Progressive firms are flattening their structure, restructuring top-heavy organizations, and pushing authority and decision making as low as possible. Accompanying this change in organizational structure is decentralization.

**A Decentralized Organization**

Decentralization generally refers to a department’s organizational structure and operations: It encourages flattening of the organization and places decision making at the level where information is plentiful, usually at the level of the patrol officer. Flattened, decentralized organizations empower line personnel.

Successful businesses concentrate on soliciting ideas from everyone in their organizations about every facet of their operations. This approach should be applied to policing, especially in larger departments.
Stephens (2003, p.52) says departments with centralized control tend to create very steep vertical organizations with many levels of middle managers. Centralized control requires officers to look to higher levels of the organization to act. Stephens (p.53) states: “In a decentralized organization, individuals have much greater freedom to make decisions about what work should be done to contribute to the overall objectives of the organization and about how it should be done.”

Stephens cites three advantages of decentralization: (1) It frees managers from having to spend all their time and intellectual energy on day-to-day operational matters, allowing them to concentrate more time on strategies that will improve the organization’s capabilities to perform; (2) it improves operational decisions because they are made by those closest to the facts of a situation; and (3) it challenges more people to be creative and take responsibility for the problems in their area. A likely result of decentralization is that officers will feel empowered.

Empowered Officers

“Empowerment,” according to Weiss and Davis (2004, p.70), “is the act of giving line supervisors and officers the power to take the initiative, make decisions, and take appropriate action during incidents and times of crisis without waiting for administrative approval—and without finger pointing or blame.” They (p.72) stress that, when empowered, people will make mistakes but that this comes with freedom to problem solve and be creative.

Empowered officers are given legal authority to act on one’s own discretion. According to Weiss and Davis (p.71): “Empowerment is not a specific program; it is a departmental philosophy. Department heads must believe in it and trust their staff. Above all, they must remember not to expect perfection; mistakes will be made; everyone should learn from mistakes.” They (p.73) conclude: “The goal of the philosophy of empowerment is to give the police staff the authority to take the appropriate action to solve a problem with confidence. . . . Empowerment shows that police administrators believe in those they command.”

If officer retention is to be maintained and loyalty and morale preserved and heightened, officers should be empowered. This change is discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

Why the Need to Change?

Some readers may be thinking, “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it. What’s wrong with the way the law enforcement agencies are organized? They have worked fine for the past 200 years.”

However, law enforcement must now deal with disruptive social, demographic, and technological changes. America is becoming increasingly diverse, with more minorities and more elderly people. Immigrants, legal and illegal, are streaming into our country. People with disabilities are entering into mainstream America after the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and thousands of mentally ill people have been released from institutions, often becoming homeless. In addition, America is becoming a bifurcated society with more wealth, more poverty, and a shrinking middle class. The gap between the “haves” and the “have nots” is widening. Other social and cultural changes include the weakening influence of family, church, and school.

Technology is also forcing policing to change. Technology has revolutionized law enforcement, affecting everything from crime scene investigations to law enforcement gear, weapons, and police vehicles.
In addition, as Morreale and Ortmeier (2004, p.89) note: “Since the Vietnam War era, even the military model has changed dramatically and many departments have failed to keep pace, electing to retain an antiquated, hierarchical structure in which all decision making is reserved for command staff.”

Finally, the inability of law enforcement to win the “wars” on drugs and terrorism has shown that the police cannot fight crime and disorder by themselves. They need the help of the citizens within their jurisdiction. This need has become even greater after the tragic events of September 11, 2001. The fear of terrorism affects all Americans. Combating this heightened threat to our national security requires a combined effort.

The challenges facing not only law enforcement but also our entire country necessitate reexamining our public organizations, including law enforcement.

These changes may require a **paradigm shift**, a dramatic change in how some basic structure is viewed. A **paradigm** is a model, theory or frame of reference.

For example, in the early beginnings of our country, we were an agricultural society. The Industrial Revolution dramatically changed how we viewed our society. We have since shifted to an information-based society. Likewise, law enforcement appears to be undergoing a paradigm shift from an emphasis on crime fighting to an emphasis on order maintenance and peace keeping.

It is important that law enforcement managers at all levels re-examine past assumptions, consider future projections, and think very carefully about the future of policing, law enforcement, and the entire criminal justice system, including the move toward community involvement in every aspect of policing, courts, and corrections.

Thus far, the discussion has focused on the organization of local law enforcement. However, local agencies do not operate in a vacuum. They need to communicate and corroborate with other local jurisdictions; county, state and federal agencies; and other stakeholders, depending on the situation. To effectively do so, it is important to understand the concepts of unified and incident command.

**Incident and Unified Command**

Incident and unified command are related yet distinct concepts. **Incident command** is an organizational structure designed to aid in managing resources during incidents. The Incident Command System (ICS) is a standardized on-scene emergency management construct that integrates facilities, equipment, personnel, procedures, and communications operations. ICS reflects the complexity and demands of single or multiple incidents, without being hindered by jurisdictional boundaries. It is used for all kinds of emergencies and applies to small as well as large, complex incidents (*National Incident Management System*, 2004, p.130).

Several states have adopted ICS as their standard for emergency management, and others are considering adopting ICS. As ICS gains wider use, there is a need to provide training for those who are not first responders (i.e., law enforcement, fire, or emergency medical services personnel) who may be called upon to function in an ICS environment.

To ensure coordination during incidents involving multiple jurisdictions or agencies, a single jurisdiction with multiagency involvement, or multiple jurisdictions with multiagency involvement, the principle of unified command applies. **Unified command** allows agencies with different legal, geographic and functional authorities and responsibilities to work together effectively without affecting individual agency authority, responsibility or accountability.
functional authorities and responsibilities to work together effectively without affecting individual agency authority, responsibility or accountability (*National Incident Management System*, pp.11–12). Unified command not only coordinates the efforts of many jurisdictions, but provides for and assures joint decisions on objectives, strategies, plans, priorities, and public communications.

**Summary**

Managers need to understand the organizational structure within which most law enforcement agencies function. The traditional organizational design is that of a pyramid-shaped hierarchy based on a military model. This model has evolved through three distinct eras of policing: the political era, the reform era, and the community era.

The mission statement should be the driving force of any organization, including law enforcement agencies. This mission statement can direct the development of meaningful goals and objectives and realistic work plans. Goals are broad, general, desired outcomes. Objectives are specific, measurable ways to accomplish the goals. Work plans are the precise activities that contribute to accomplishing objectives. Along with a mission statement, goals, objectives, and work plans, a formal organization of personnel is mandatory to accomplish the tasks.

One aspect of an agency’s organizational structure is division into field services with line personnel and administrative services with staff personnel. Line personnel directly help accomplish the goals of the department. Staff personnel support the line organization.

An organization typically relies on a chain of command and set channels of communication. The chain of command establishes definite lines of authority and channels of communication. These organizational features are necessary to ensure the efficient delegation of tasks. The delegation of authority should go hand-in-hand with responsibility.

As agencies become larger, they often become specialized. Specialization can enhance an agency’s effectiveness and efficiency, but overspecialization can impede the organizational purpose. Specialization also requires a higher degree of coordination, although coordination is critical for any department, large or small, specialized or not. In addition to the formal organization depicted in an organizational chart, any law enforcement agency also has an informal organization that managers should recognize. The informal organization can help or hinder accomplishment of the agency’s mission.

Management tools for coordination include a clear chain of command and unity of command; clear channels of communication and strict adherence to them; clear, specific job descriptions; clear, specific goals, objectives, and work plans; standard operating procedures for routine tasks; an agency regulation guidebook; meetings and roll calls; and informational bulletins, newsletters, and memos. The emerging law enforcement agency has a flattened organization, is decentralized, and empowers its employees.

**Challenge One**

You are the new chief of the Greenfield Police Department. After 30 years of iron-fisted control, Chief Slaughter has retired. Slaughter believed in the military model of police management and a traditional crime-fighting policing strategy. He was fully entrenched in the war on crime and ran his department like an army unit. His book of rules and regulations was a foot thick, and he demanded absolute compliance. Decisions were made in the chief's office and passed down to the officers through layers of captains, lieutenants and sergeants. At Chief Slaughter's retirement ceremony, the mayor slaps you on the back and says, "You’ve got some big shoes to fill, son. That guy knew how to fight..."
crime, and his officers never stepped out of line. Our crime rate was below the national average every year he was here." The City Council presents Slaughter the Meritorious Service Award for 30 years of crime fighting.

As a student of police history you realize that most police departments battle complex social problems and seldom march off to war. You know that crime rates are minimally influenced by crime fighting and are a poor indication of policing success. You also know that traditional organizational structures and policing strategies are slow to change and often are out of sync with one another. Most of your questions to the captains about department operations have generated the same response: “Because that’s the way we’ve always done it. If it ain’t broke, why fix it?”

You decide to visit with members of the community. A homeowner tells you that Chief Slaughter’s officers do a great job of patrolling her neighborhood, but she’s worried about the future impact of the deteriorating apartment complex across the street. She realizes it’s not a police problem. The manager of a senior citizens’ residence tells you that there hasn’t been a crime reported in their neighborhood in over a year, but the residents are afraid to go out at night. He thinks it’s the rumors that spread from crime reports on the television news. The business owners in the shopping center complain that customers are being driven away by kids skateboarding in the parking lot. They understand that the police have more urgent crime problems to fight. The high school principal praises the police department’s stringent traffic enforcement before and after school. He wishes he could resolve the growing truancy problem as efficiently as the police handle traffic. None of the people you talk to is personally acquainted with a Greenfield police officer.

It appears the Greenfield Police Department is trapped in the reform era. They rely on preventive patrolling and rapid response as their primary policing strategies and seldom interact with the community. You review their mission statement and find it emphasizes the professional model of crime fighting.

1. Suggest a mission statement that emphasizes the community era rather than the reform era.
2. What process would you use to develop a new mission statement? Who would you include in the process? Is it wise to order officers to accept a mission statement?
3. What changes would you introduce in policing strategies?
4. What changes would you make in the organizational structure to enable the new strategy?
5. Identify some quality-of-life issues that are not being addressed by the crime-fighting strategy of Chief Slaughter.

**Discussion Questions**

1. Who is a law enforcement manager?
2. Is there a difference between the terms *pyramidal structure* and *hierarchy*?
3. What is the difference between unity of command and chain of command?
4. What are staff positions in a typical police department?
5. What is the purpose of law enforcement management?
7. What does an organizational chart indicate?
8. How could you reorganize to force decision making downward? Is this desirable?
9. What is an informal organization?
10. What changes do you foresee in law enforcement agencies in the twenty-first century?

**References**


**Book-Specific Web Site**

Go to the Management and Supervision in Law Enforcement Web site at www.thomsonedu.com/criminaljustice/bennett for student and instructor resources, including Internet Assignments and Case Studies.
The Role of Management and Leadership in Law Enforcement

The watchwords of the new leadership paradigm are coach, inspire, gain commitment, empower, affirm, flexibility, responsibility, self-management, shared power, autonomous teams and entrepreneurial units.

Donald C. Witham, Chief, FBI Strategic Planning Unit

Do You Know?

- How authority and power are alike? How they differ?
- What basic management skills are important?
- What four tools successful managers use?
- What management by objectives (MBO) involves?
- What management style is best suited for law enforcement work?
- What typical levels of management exist in law enforcement?
- What essential functions chief executives perform?
- How strategic and tactical planning differ?
- With whom law enforcement chief executives typically interact?
- What basic difference exists between managers and leaders?
- What theories of leadership have been researched?
- What leadership styles have been identified and their main characteristics?
- What constitutes effective leadership training?
- What the attributes of a high-performing team are?

Can You Define?

- autocratic leadership
- consideration structure
- consultative leadership
- democratic leadership
- dispersed leadership
- facilitators
- free-rein leadership
- holistic management/leadership
- initiating structure interactors
- interfaces
- laissez-faire leadership
- management by objectives (MBO)
- mechanistic model
- organic model
- participative leadership
- seagull management
- situational leadership
- SMART goals and objectives
- strategic planning
- supervision
- synergism
- tactical planning
- total quality management (TQM)
- trait theorists
- transformational leadership
- Wallenda Effect
Introduction

The organizational chart discussed in the preceding chapter is inanimate, like a house without people. The form and foundation exist and are necessary, but the structure is in no sense vital or exciting. Vitality and excitement come when the boxes in the chart are filled with people, men and women patrol officers, investigators, sergeants, lieutenants, captains and chiefs, interacting and working together to accomplish their mission—"to serve and protect." The organization accomplishes its mission through management directing and guiding employees and resources, both internal and external to the organization.

Managers in law enforcement face unique problems because of the continuous need for service, 24/7, 365 days a year. The chief executive officer (CEO) of the law enforcement agency obviously cannot be physically present for this extended period and must therefore rely on the organizational structure to permit other members to perform administrative and operational functions. In addition, challenges facing today's law enforcement administrators are enormous, including strained budgets and cutbacks, greater citizen demands and expectations for service and an increasingly diverse society.

This chapter examines the complex role of the law enforcement manager, the challenges presented by management and the relationship between authority and power. This is followed by an overview of the basic skills and tools required of an effective manager. Contributions to management from the business world, including management by objectives and total quality management, are the next area of discussion, followed by an analysis of the various management styles. The chapter then examines the levels of management typically found within law enforcement agencies, responsibilities at each level, management challenges most commonly encountered and law enforcement management as a career. Next is a discussion of the differences between managing and leading and a review of key characteristics of leaders. This is followed by a review of research on and theories related to leadership, the various leadership styles and the apparent need for change within law enforcement agencies. Next is a discussion of leadership training and development, the new skills required and guidelines for effective leadership. The chapter concludes with a discussion of holistic management and a team approach to law enforcement.

Managers and Management

Manage means to control and direct, to administer, to take charge of. Management is the process of using resources to achieve organizational goals. Law enforcement management is a process of deciding goals and objectives, adopting a work plan to accomplish them, obtaining and wisely using resources and making decisions that result in a high level of performance and productivity. Those who undertake these activities are called managers.

Managers and supervisors control and direct people and operations to achieve organizational objectives. Managers and supervisors are also jointly involved in planning, organizing, staffing and budgeting. In fact, many gray areas exist in the duties of managers and supervisors. This is increasingly true in organizations that have been "flattened" by eliminating some middle-management positions and empowering employees at the lowest level.
Managers must also support the development of individual responsibility, permitting all employees to achieve maximum potential while simultaneously supporting organizational needs. The sum total of individual member energy is transferred to the organizational energy needed for success.

**Authority and Power**

Authority, responsibility and accountability were discussed in the preceding chapter. Consider now the relationship between the authority and the power of police managers.

*Authority* is the legal right to get things done through others by influencing behavior. Just as an agency has a formal and an informal organization, it also relies on formal and informal authority. Formal authority comes from rank or credentials. Informal authority comes from friendships or alignments with others.

*Power* is the ability to get things done with or without a legal right. Authority is generally granted by law or an order. Power is the influence of a person or group without benefit of law or order. U.S. National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice has said of the goal of power: “Power is nothing unless you can turn it into influence” (Aldrich, 2003, p.35).

Authority and power both imply the ability to coercize compliance, that is, to make subordinates carry out orders. Both are important to managers at all levels. However, authority relies on a law or order, whereas power relies on persuasion.

In a democracy authority and power are not always regarded as desirable. Even though managers may use both, and employees recognize management’s right to use both, a limitation exists in the employees’ mindset as to how much is acceptable. They expect some freedom of choice.

Managers should never manipulate employees and should avoid seagull management. According to management guru Ken Blanchard: “[Seagull managers] hear something’s wrong, so they fly in, make a lot of noise, crap on everybody and fly away.”

Managers need authority and power, but they should also share this authority and power. Aldrich (p.36) suggests that power grabbers do not realize that each time they miss a chance to help a group complete the right work, their power actually ebbs: “Power grabbers may grow increasingly manipulative trying to overcompensate for a lack of results.” To share authority and power, managers must learn to delegate effectively.

**Delegation**

Transferring authority, or delegating, is a necessary and often difficult aspect of management, because it requires placing trust in others to do the job as well as, or better than, the manager would do it. As discussed in Chapter 1, it is also a form of empowerment. Theodore Roosevelt once said: “The best executive is the one who has enough sense to pick good people to do what he wants done, and self-restraint enough to keep from meddling with them while they do it.” Yet many managers fail to delegate effectively because they believe “If you want something done right, you have to do it yourself.”

Delegation is not passing the buck, shirking personal responsibility, or dumping on someone. It is the way managers and supervisors free up time to get their
work done while avoiding getting tied up in “administrivia.” Managers can put their minds at ease when they delegate important tasks by carefully selecting the right person, thoroughly defining the task and specifying the qualifications for doing it well. The results, standards and deadlines should be clearly defined. Managers should also decide how much authority, support and time the officer will need (“Prepare before You Delegate,” 2003, p.10).

Managers who find themselves wondering why their officers cannot take more responsibility or who feel they must drop every detail of every project into their officers’ laps may not be delegating effectively (“Management by Delegation,” 2003, p.4). Key points to remember are:

1. Stress results, not details. What is important is the final outcome, not the day-to-day details.
2. Do not be drawn in by giving solutions to employees’ problems. Help them learn to solve their own problems, which will save managers time in the long run.
3. Turn the questions around; ask for possible answers.
4. Establish measurable and concrete objectives.
5. Develop reporting systems.
6. Set strict and realistic deadlines.
7. Keep a delegation log to monitor progress of tasks that have been delegated.
8. Recognize employees’ talents and personalities.

It is not enough to delegate a task. The employee also needs the necessary authority to get the task done (“Delegate with the Right Level of Authority,” 2003, p.1). To avoid problems, managers need to match tasks with one of three levels of authority:

1. Recommending: When facing a decision a manager must make because of its importance, the manager might assign an employee to research the available options and present them with a recommendation of the best choice.
2. Informing and implementing: When facing an important decision that an employee assisting a manager can make, the manager should be able to assign the employee to research and choose the best option, inform him or her and be ready to implement it.
3. Acting: If a manager is confident an employee can handle a task independently, the authority to act should be given.

In addition to knowing how to delegate effectively, managers need several other basic management skills and tools.

**Basic Management Skills and Tools**

To be effective, managers at all levels must be skilled at planning, organizing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting. Equally critical, however, are people skills such as communicating, motivating and leading, as will be discussed throughout the text.

Basic management skills include technical skills, administrative skills, conceptual skills and people skills.

**Technical skills** include all the procedures necessary to be a “good cop”: interviewing and interrogating, searching, arresting, gathering evidence and so on. Police officers often become sergeants because of their technical skills.
Administrative skills include organizing, delegating and directing the work of others. They also include writing proposals, formulating work plans, establishing policies and procedures and developing budgets.

Conceptual skills include the ability to problem solve, plan and see the big picture and how all the pieces within it fit. Managers must be able to think in terms of the future; synthesize great amounts of data; make decisions on complex matters; and have broad, even national, perspectives. They must see the organization as a whole, yet existing within society. They must also have a sensitivity to the spirit—not just the letter—of the law.

People skills include being able to communicate clearly, to motivate, to discipline appropriately and to inspire. People skills also include working effectively with managers up the chain of command, as well as with the general public. The higher the management position, the more important people skills become.

Basic Tools
According to Blanchard (1988, p.14): “Successful managers use four tools to accomplish their goals.”

Successful managers have:

- Clear goals.
- A commitment to excellence.
- Feedback.
- Support.

“Good performance,” says Blanchard, “starts with clear goals.” The importance of goals cannot be overemphasized. Just as important, however, are the objectives developed to meet the goals. According to Blanchard, SMART goals and objectives are specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and trackable.

The Role of Self-Confidence
Most police supervisors and managers have been promoted into their positions because they possessed or had learned the necessary skills and tools. But with the excitement and pride of promotion often comes an instinctive tinge of self-doubt. Taking on a new level of management is a major challenge and involves risk. Though initially daunting, change can serve as a catalyst for growth.

Change often requires that a person use already acquired skills in a new context, which can be threatening. Asking a person to walk across a six-inch wide board on the ground poses no threat. Put it 40 feet in the air, and the person is unlikely to take even the first step. To maintain self-confidence, seek the support of your peers, set goals for yourself in mastering the skills you need and get feedback.

A lack of self-confidence can lead to failure and other dire consequences, a situation sometimes referred to as the Wallenda Effect. In 1968 tightrope aerialist Karl Wallenda said: “Being on the tightrope is living; everything else is waiting.” He loved his work and had total confidence in himself. Ten years later he fell to his death. His wife, also an aerialist, said that he had recently been worried about falling. This was in total contrast to his earlier years, when all his energy was focused on succeeding.
Lessons Learned from Business

Just as the development of the law enforcement organization has been influenced by business, law enforcement management has followed the lead of business in some important ways, including management by objectives (MBO) and Total Quality Management (TQM).

Management by Objectives

Management theorist Peter Drucker, introduced in Chapter 1, is credited with first using the term management by objectives (MBO) in the early 1950s. It has been popular for over 50 years.

Management by objectives (MBO) involves managers and subordinates setting goals and objectives together and then tracking performance to ensure that the objectives are met.

Drucker’s theory can be summed up as “Expect to get the right things done.” Drucker also says: “Intelligence, imagination, and knowledge are essential resources, but only effectiveness converts them into results.” The key to the MBO system is to get workers to participate in deciding and setting goals, both individually and in work groups. The performance achieved is then compared to these agreed-upon goals.

Total Quality Management

The pioneer in total quality management (TQM) was W. Edwards Deming (1900–1993), a management expert who assisted Japanese businesses in recovering and prospering following the end of World War II. In the 1980s Deming’s ideas were taken up by American corporations as they sought to compete more effectively against foreign manufacturers. His quality-control methods focused on systematically tallying product defects, analyzing their causes, correcting those causes and then recording the effects of the corrections on subsequent product quality (“Deming, W. Edwards,” 2005). The watchword of TQM is zero defects.

Although Deming’s famous “14 Points” were originally aimed at business, several are applicable to the public sector as well—including law enforcement:

- Create constancy of purpose for improvement of product and service.
- Adopt the new philosophy.
- Improve constantly.
- Institute modern methods of training on the job.
- Institute modern methods of supervision.
- Drive fear from the workplace.
- Break down barriers between staff areas.
- Eliminate numerical goals for the work force.
- Remove barriers that rob people of pride of workmanship.
- Institute a vigorous program of education and training.

Dahl (2004, p.16) questions the effectiveness of TQM, suggesting that “zero defects” may stifle innovation: “Innovation, change and experimentation are all loaded with potential defects.” Yet as has been noted previously, progress often demands risk taking and mistakes. Dahl suggests: “Most of us would like to strive for a positive number—but that would be ‘on the other side’ of zero. That’s where you find innovation, change and good ol’ Yankee ingenuity.” TQM may work well in manufacturing, but its value to those in the service industries may not be as great.
Management Styles

Just as different managers use different types of authority and power, they also have varied personalities and management styles. Managers at any level may be sociable and friendly, firm and hard driving, or analytical and detail oriented. Several theories regarding management style have been developed, including those of McGregor, Likert, Argyris and Blake and Mouton. Within each theory "pure" or ideal types are described, but in reality management style should be viewed as a continuum, with "pure" types at the opposing ends. Table 2.1 summarizes the four theories about management style.

Which Management Style to Select?

It was once thought that fist-pounding, authoritarian managers were the greatest achievers. People now believe that many styles of management or combinations of several can be effective. The management style selected depends on the individuals involved, the tasks to be accomplished and any emergency the organization is facing, such as a hostage incident, a multiple-alarm fire, or an officer down.

Management styles might be depicted as falling along a continuum, with the task on one end, the people on the other end, and the time available to accomplish a goal determining where on that continuum the management style falls. If the task requires a great deal of time and will involve working with the same group of people throughout the duration, it is important to cater to group morale and manage more from the people side of the continuum. Take care of the people, and they will take care of the task/goal. In contrast, if time is short and the task will be over before morale becomes a factor, manage more from the task side of the continuum. Battles are won by task-oriented managers; wars are won by people-oriented managers.

No one management style is more apt than another to achieve the agency’s mission. The selected style must match individual personalities and situations.

Next consider some specific functions performed at the three basic levels of management, beginning with the first-line, supervisory level.

Levels of Managers

Management typically has three levels:

- The top level or CEO (chief, sheriff)
- The middle level (captains, lieutenants)
- The first-line level (sergeants)

First-Line Supervisors

Most first-line managers or supervisors are sergeants, who are responsible to the next highest rank in the organization unless their positions are specialized. Management consultant Drucker says: “Supervisors are, so to speak, the ligaments, the tendons and sinews of an organization. They provide the articulation. Without them, no joint can move.”

The transition to first-line supervisor is one of the most difficult in law enforcement, for it is here that they begin to make decisions that separate them from their
### Table 2.1 Four Theories about Management Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory and Originator</th>
<th>Basic Premise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory X/Theory Y</strong>—Douglas McGregor</td>
<td>Managers act toward subordinates in relation to the views they have of them. Theory X views employees as lazy and motivated by pay. The average worker has an aversion to work and does not want responsibility. Management’s responsibility is to provide constant employee supervision and control workers through coercion, threats and punishment. Management makes all decisions and directs employees to carry them out. Theory X might have worked in the past, but with better-educated workers, it could create hostility. Theory Y views employees as committed and motivated by growth and development. They are willing workers who can be trusted to do a good job and given reasonable goals to accomplish. Employees should share in decision making. The humanistic approach reflected in Theory Y is more effective in today’s work world. Management should encourage self-motivation and fewer outside controls. Decisions could be delegated. Employees would be responsive to management’s goals if management set the proper environment for work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four-System Approach</strong>—Rensis Likert</td>
<td>System 1, similar to McGregor’s Theory X, is the traditional, dictatorial approach to managing people. This system generally exploits employees and uses coercion and a few economic rewards. Communication flows downward from the top, and there is little to no feedback. System 2 is similar to System 1, except that economic rewards replace coercion. Some information on organizational development is permitted but not in opposition to management’s control. System 3 is more liberal, uses employee initiative and gives employees more responsibility. System 4 is participative management (the complete opposite of System 1). Final decisions are made by management but only after employees have added their input. Communication flows back freely through the organization, and there is much feedback. Also includes team management, which is widely used today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mature Employee Theory</strong>—Chris Argyris</td>
<td>Organizations and individuals exist for a purpose. Both are interdependent: Organizations provide jobs and people perform them. As individuals develop, they mature from passive to active and from dependent to interdependent. Individuals and organizations need to develop together in much the same way. They need to grow and mature together to be of mutual benefit. The work force has energy to be released if management recognizes it. An organization that restricts individuals and keeps employees dependent, subordinate and restrained will engender a work climate of frustration, failure, short-term perspective and conflict and will hinder employees from achieving the organization’s mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managerial/Leadership Grid Theory</strong>—Dr. Robert R. Blake and Dr. Jane S. Mouton</td>
<td>Describes five management styles as falling on a grid—the vertical (Y) axis measures “concern for people” (low to high) and the horizontal (X) axis measures “concern for results” (low to high). Lower right corner (high concern for results; low concern for people): Authority–Compliance Management style, the early autocratic, authoritarian approach. The manager is a no-nonsense taskmaster. Concern is for manager authority, status and operation of the organization. Employees have little say and less influence, and production is the only concern. This is also known as Task Management. Upper left corner (low concern for results; high concern for people): Country Club Management style. Managers are overly concerned with keeping employees happy at the expense of reasonable productivity. The work atmosphere is friendly and comfortable. Concern for employees is utmost; concern for productivity is limited. Lower left corner (low concern for results; low concern for people): the Impoverished Management style, which permits workers to do just enough to get by. Managers and employees put in their time and look ahead to retirement. Little real concern exists for employees or management. Little is expected and little is given. Minimal effort is made. The prevailing attitude: ignore problems and they will go away. In the center (moderate concern for results; moderate concern for people): Middle-of-the-Road Management style, with the manager showing some concern for both employees and management but in a low-key manner that is not really productive. The manager is a fence straddler, appeasing both sides, avoiding conflict and satisfying no one. Upper right corner (high concern for results; high concern for people): Team Management approach, suggested as the ideal. The manager works with employees as a team, providing information, caring about their feelings and concern, assisting, advising and coaching. Managers encourage employees to be creative and share suggestions for improvement. Employees are committed to their jobs and organization through a mutual relationship of trust and respect. Goals are achieved as a team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fellow officers (Hale, 2005, p.34). The conversion from law enforcement functions to supervisor functions is difficult. Supervisors may not have the same camaraderie they enjoyed with members of the rank and file. They are now management and will not always be liked, as they may have to make unpopular decisions (Johnson, 2005, p.24).

Supervisors' fundamental responsibility is to ensure that what needs to be accomplished during any given shift is accomplished effectively and legally. They are concerned with supervision of the day-to-day concerns of law enforcement officers—that is, overseeing the activities of all nonranking employees in the agency. Among their functions are:

- Managing line personnel in the field.
- Supervising patrol activities.
- Conducting inspections.
- Maintaining discipline.
- Enforcing rules and regulations.
- Conducting roll call.
- Managing field operations.

New supervisors soon learn they are only as good as their officers and that their officers’ performance often directly reflects on the supervisor’s abilities (Hale, p.33). Weak supervisors spend a lot of time trying to cover up anything negative that happened on their watch; strong supervisors, in contrast, spend their energy finding out what went wrong and making sure it doesn’t happen again (Weiss and Davis, 2004, p.73).

The sergeant is the first stop in line for almost everything in police work: the first supervisor to most scenes, the first one to know when an officer needs something, the first to yell when an officer makes a mistake, the first to talk to angry citizens who have been stopped for speeding, the first one officers run to when they are in trouble and the first one to jump to his or her officers' defense against the “brass” (Oldham, 2005c, p.30). It is "absolutely crucial" for sergeants to know their officers so that they can spot those who are in trouble and those who are teetering on the edge of self-destructive behavior (Oldham, 2005a, p.28). Sometimes all that is needed is to listen.

A sergeant’s first priority is to bring his or her officers home alive at the end of their shift. Sergeants must therefore strictly enforce officer safety practices and follow them themselves. If they teach that backup guns and body armor save lives, they should be wearing theirs: “Let them see you out there doing the same job they do in the way you are telling them it should be done. No one has more impact than someone who is leading from the front” (Oldham, 2005e, p.16). There is a good reason it is called leading from the front: “A sergeant who is in the trenches and on the calls with his or her officers, enduring the same hardships and same long hours, it is relatively easy for that sergeant to pull the officers forward” (Oldham, 2005b, p.32). Officers would much rather hear “follow me” than “go do such and such.”

As noted, a sergeant is likely to be the first commander on the scene to deal with any incident. In chaotic situations, sergeants need to command, but calmly: “One lone, calm voice is capable of staving off chaos” (Oldham, 2005d, p.26). Sergeants are expected to step up and take charge when the shift needs it and to step back and allow their officers to run the show and grow in their capabilities when they do not need that firm, calming hand.

A National Institute of Justice (NIJ) study, “Identifying Characteristics of Exemplary Baltimore Police Department First Line Supervisors,” identified sergeants considered exemplary and those considered less so. Among the vital traits identified by
the focus group were character and integrity, knowledge of the job, management skills, communication skills, interpersonal skills, ability to develop entry-level officers, problem-solving and critical-thinking skills, effectiveness as a role model and as a disciplinarian and the ability to be proactive. The greatest difference between the exemplary sergeants and their less exemplary peers was in moral reasoning: “They could solve police-related moral issues far better than their peers. . . . They came up with more solutions and solutions that were more complete and of better quality.” Interestingly, exemplary sergeants, on top of other attributes, took less sick leave (“Good, Better, Best,” 2003, pp.1, 6).

Another NIJ study identified four distinct supervisory styles—traditional, innovative, supportive and active—and found the quality, or style, of field supervision more significantly influenced patrol officer behavior than did the quantity of supervision (How Police Supervisory Styles Influence Patrol Officers’ Behavior, 2003, p.1). According to the study, traditional supervisors expect aggressive enforcement from officers, are highly task oriented and expect officers to produce measurable outcomes, especially arrests and citations. Innovative supervisors tend to form relationships with their officers, to have a low level of task orientation and to hold more positive views of subordinates. They embrace community policing and problem solving and encourage their officers to embrace new philosophies and methods of policing.

Supportive supervisors protect subordinates from discipline or punishment perceived as “unfair” and provide “inspirational motivation.” They are less concerned with enforcing rules and regulations and paperwork. They encourage officers through praise and recognition. Active supervisors embrace a philosophy of leading by example. They are heavily involved in the field alongside subordinates while controlling patrol officer behavior. In effect, they perform the dual function of street officer and supervisor. Officers with active supervisors spent more time on self-initiated activities, community policing activities and problem solving. The study concluded: “An ‘active’ supervisory style—involving leading by example—seems to be the most influential despite potential drawbacks. Indeed, active supervisors appear to be crucial to the implementation of organizational goals.”

Supervisors frequently are not trained in the new skills they need. Initial training should concentrate on the “people activities” performed by supervisors, with particular emphasis on motivating others. As General George Patton wrote in his battle journal: “Don’t tell people what to do. Tell them what you want done and let them surprise you with their ingenuity.” Training is discussed later in the chapter.

**Middle Management**

Middle management usually includes captains and lieutenants. Captains have authority over all officers of the agency below the chief or sheriff and are responsible only to the chief or sheriff. Lieutenants are second in rank to captains. They are in charge of sergeants and all officers within their assigned responsibility, and they report to captains. Captains and lieutenants may perform the following functions:

- Inspecting assigned operations
- Reviewing and making recommendations on reports
- Helping develop plans
- Preparing work schedules
- Overseeing records and equipment

Mulder (2003, p.94) asserts: “Middle managers are the elite corps of an organization. They can either make or break a leader’s agenda and career. It is the middle
manager who should have a finger on the pulse of the organization and who can offer consultative advice to the leader on how his initiatives are being implemented and responded to by the department.” According to Mulder, the middle manager champions the leader’s agenda to the troops. It is also middle management that bears the responsibility of developing newly promoted sergeants.

In larger departments one of the most demanding middle management positions is that of patrol district commander, which Fuller (2003, p.113) describes as a “killer management responsibility.” He notes that in effect such a manager is essentially the chief of police in their own geographic area of operations. Fuller (pp.113–115) offers three basic boilerplate axioms as managerial guideposts:
1. You have to keep crime down. This is the bottom line.
2. You have to control your officers.
3. You have to get along with the political and community leadership in your district.

**The Top Level—The Executive Manager**

The executive manager, or the chief executive officer (CEO), is the top official in any law enforcement agency. The title may be chief of police, director, superintendent, or sheriff, but the authority and responsibility of the position are similar. The executive manager is either elected or appointed by the city council, the county commission or the city manager, subject to approval of the city council.

Executive managers have full authority and responsibility as provided by the charter provisions of their local jurisdictions. People appointed to this position are to enforce the applicable laws of the United States as well as state and local jurisdiction and all rules and regulations established by local government or the civil service commission.

Executive managers are responsible for planning, organizing and managing the agency’s resources, including its employees. They are responsible for preserving the peace and enforcing laws and ordinances. The duties and responsibilities of executive managers often include:
- Developing a mission statement.
- Formulating goals and objectives.
- Preparing an annual budget.
- Preparing and periodically reviewing agency rules and regulations and general and specific agency orders.
- Developing strategic long-term and tactical short-term plans for organizational operations.
- Attending designated meetings of the city council or other organizations.
- Preparing required reports for the governing authority or person.
- Coordinating with other law enforcement agencies.
- Participating in emergency preparedness plans and operations.
- Developing public relations liaisons with the press.
- Administering ongoing, operational financial processes.
- Developing training programs to meet local needs.
- Acting as a liaison with community agencies.

Texts on management often convey the image of an executive working at an uncluttered desk in a spacious office. The executive is rationally planning, organizing, coordinating and controlling the organization. After careful analysis the
executive makes critical decisions and has competent, motivated subordinates readily available to offer insightful input. The executive has a full schedule but no unexpected interruptions. Timelines are met without problem.

Several studies, however, indicate that this is not a realistic portrayal. In fact, most executives work at an unrelenting pace, are frequently interrupted and are often more oriented to reacting to crises than to planning and executing.

In *The Effective Executive* (1993), Drucker describes Sune Carlson’s 1951 study on executive behavior, which Drucker says is the one study of top management in large corporations that actually recorded the time use of senior executives. In this study, even the most effective executives found most of their time tied up with the demands of others and for purposes that added little if anything to their effectiveness.

The study concluded that the executive’s time seemed to belong to everyone but the executive. If one were to define an executive operationally, that is, through his activities, one would have to define him as a captive of the organization. Everybody can move in on his time and everybody does. According to Drucker: “Executives might well be defined as people who normally have no time of their own because their time is always pre-empted by matters of importance to someone else.” As one top level manager said in 2005 of this situation: “Ironically, that is how I feel. I dread any time I hear someone say, ‘Sir, do you have a minute?’ Inevitably that means they need at least half an hour. Some things haven’t changed in 50 years for some chief executives.” This challenge is discussed in Chapter 6.

The executive manager’s roles in law enforcement may differ from other levels of managers. Executive managers are responsible for the big picture, for not only accomplishing the department’s mission through goals and objectives but also for interacting with the community, its leaders, organizations and individual citizens, as well as the entire criminal justice system.

**Essential Functions of Law Enforcement Executives**

Acting in a *managerial* capacity, law enforcement executives serve as:

- Planners.
- Facilitators.
- Interfacers.
- Interactors.

**Planners** Law enforcement managers must possess basic skills for planning—that is, the ability to set goals and objectives and to develop work plans to meet them. Whether managers personally formulate these goals and objectives or seek assistance from their staff, plans are essential. As Garrett (2005, p.6) says, goals are like New Year’s Resolutions. We all set them, but few of us accomplish them. Why? We fail to plan how to accomplish them. As the saying goes: Most people don’t plan to fail, they fail to plan. Law enforcement organizations cannot function efficiently without tactical and strategic planning.

**Tactical planning** is short-term planning. **Strategic planning** is long-term planning.

Tactical planning includes the year’s work plans. Strategic planning, on the other hand, is futuristic planning.
Some people may use the term *tactical* in an operational or military sense to refer to unusual situations in which combat might be expected. In law enforcement this might include serving warrants, conducting drug raids, dealing with hostage situations and the like. In this context tactical planning would mean planning designed to carry out a tactical operation.

Tactical planning is most often necessary to provide the flexibility needed for change; determine personnel needs; determine objectives and provide organizational control; and handle large incidents such as drug raids and special events such as sports competitions, popular concerts, large conventions and parades.

A meeting of line and staff personnel can determine the events for which tactical planning is necessary. Special problems can then be resolved and personnel needs assessed and assigned. A review of similar past events may require assistance from other police agencies in the area or state or federal aid. Tactical planning should be flexible because of changing conditions such as the number of people involved. Tactical plans are sometimes cast in the form of an action plan such as that shown in Figure 2.1.

### Figure 2.1  Action Plan Sample Worksheet

| OBJECTIVE: | \[ | STRATEGY: | \[ |
| --- | --- |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT IS KNOWN ABOUT THE SITUATION (+’s and –’s):</th>
<th>[</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What will be done (Tasks)</th>
<th>Who will do it (People)</th>
<th>When it will be done</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Evidence of accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[</td>
<td>[</td>
<td>[</td>
<td>[</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic plans, in contrast, focus on the future and on setting priorities. Strategic planning is important because, as Drucker says: "Long-range planning does not deal with future decisions, but with the future of present decisions."

A department might decide to place more emphasis on the use of technological advances, including communications and technology training. It might decide to continue the same emphasis on the level of recruitment and in-service training for sworn personnel and to place less emphasis on the use of sworn personnel for nonsworn duties. In addition it might identify new activities such as developing accurate job descriptions and career paths for all employees and eliminating other activities such as free services that most agencies charge for (e.g., fingerprinting, alarms and computer entry).

Glensor and Peak (2005, p.31) suggest that strategic planning provides several benefits, including clarifying future directions, establishing priorities, making decisions in light of their future consequences, developing a coherent and defensible basis for decision-making, solving major organizational problems, improving organizational performance and building teamwork and expertise. In addition to planning, managers must be facilitators of those plans.

**Facilitators** Facilitators assist others in performing their duties. Law enforcement managers at any level do not personally bring the agency goals, objectives and work plans to fruition. This is accomplished through a joint agency effort, as well as with the assistance of others external to the agency.

Rules, regulations, personal rapport, communications, standards, guidelines, logic, basic principles and direction all assist others in performing their duties. After managers have directed subordinates on what to do and how, they should let people carry out their duties independently. Trust, honesty and integrity are important in the manager-subordinate work relationship.

Operating within this environment is constant change. All levels of management must recognize change and be flexible enough to adapt to its demands.

**Interactors** Law enforcement managers also must be interactors who communicate with other groups and agencies: the press, other local government departments, the business community, schools and numerous community committees and organizations.

Figure 2.2 illustrates the interactions of a typical law enforcement executive and, to some extent, all law enforcement managers. This diagram shows that only one-fifth of the executive manager’s role is with the law enforcement organization. Executive managers have political, community, interorganizational and media roles as well.

Each organization with whom the executive interacts sees the importance and conduct of the position from different viewpoints. Law enforcement managers
must determine these varied expectations and develop goals and work plans to
meet them effectively.

Law enforcement executives typically interact with politicians, community
groups, the media, and executives of other law enforcement organizations, as well as individuals
and groups within the agency itself.

Attendance at intergovernmental staff meetings is mandatory. Law enforce-
ment agencies need services and information exchange from engineering, finance,
planning, building inspections and other departments, just as other departments
need the police department’s services.

Although media communications have some undesirable aspects, if reporters
and law enforcement personnel establish honest, forthright rapport, they can es-

tablish generally good working relationships. Law enforcement needs the media as
much as the media need it. (Dealing effectively with the media is discussed in
Chapter 4.) Personal contact with representatives of all groups develops an atmos-
phere of trust, integrity and respect for each other’s duties and responsibilities.

On Becoming an Executive Manager Robert Frost once said: “By working
faithfully eight hours a day, you may eventually get to be boss and work twelve
hours a day!” Benson (2004, p.92) comments: “Police chiefs have the only posi-
tion without a peer group within their organizations; they are truly alone at the
top of the organization. Often they hold the only position in the organization without job protections, yet they are asked to lead, to discipline, to take professional risks, and to create positive change."

When a person first becomes a chief of police, whether selected from within the department or as an outsider, many rumors concerning the appointment will precede the new chief’s first day on the job. New chiefs should call a department meeting as soon as possible. At this meeting they should openly state that they understand the officers’ concerns and past loyalties but expect to earn their respect. They should also describe the working relationships they seek. Such an open meeting will help allay fears, squelch rumors, decrease suspicions and establish an early rapport with the staff and line personnel.

A chief’s management style should be adjusted to the department’s needs. Some important changes should be made as soon as possible, but lesser changes should be instituted slowly. Change is stressful for an organization as well as individuals. People will have different opinions about the need for change. A participative approach that invites input from all employees usually works best, as discussed later in the chapter. Decisions should be based on what is good for the community and the department, not on what pleases specific individuals or interest groups.

Whether the department is small or large, the chief of police holds a powerful position in the governmental structure and in the community. The position is also challenging, exciting and filled with barriers and pitfalls. Chiefs should allow time for contemplation, innovation and creative thinking. They must be both managers and leaders. Their responsibilities are heavy, but their rewards are great.

If chiefs adopt a coequal management approach with the department’s formal and informal leaders, they may find that their organizational philosophy will be accepted more readily, thus enabling the organizational changes to occur with less resistance.

A major goal of chief executive officers should be to establish an environment in which success is expected and excellence is desired. Ideally, the chief of police is also a leader within the community, particularly in interactions with the city council and the city manager.

Politics Benson (p. 93) surveyed police chiefs from 50 larger municipal police departments and reported that the chiefs listed their most discouraging, dissatisfying aspect of their job as the frustration of working in the political environment and dealing with politicians.

With a clear mission, goals and objectives, a department’s day-to-day operations should not be influenced by politics. However, chiefs must recognize that politics can influence how much funding the department receives. In addition, Stucky (2005, p. 140) reports: “Research both old and new suggests that local politics can influence criminal justice outcomes generally and policing specifically.”

Trautman (2003, p. 104) points out that political interference is a major cause of corruption in law enforcement. He describes six different types of interference: interference with hiring standards, promotions and transfers, discipline, adequate budget, fair enforcement of laws and work environment.

Gray (2005, p. 132) advises: “Be political but do not play politics. Being responsive to the community, the council and the mayor is part of chief’s political reality because the chief works for them.” He contends that effective politics means effective relationships: “Chiefs who are not political do not last long and those who play political games have even shorter careers.”
The political nature of police administrative positions also requires chiefs to keep abreast of changes in legislation. Police administrators must become proactive in the legislative process to effectively serve their departments and communities. Police chiefs have a duty to ensure that the laws enacted are sensible and allow law enforcement agencies to successfully overcome the challenges confronting them and to effectively protect the citizens and communities they serve (Polisar, 2004a, p.6).

**Law Enforcement Management as a Career**

Deciding to become a law enforcement officer is an exciting career choice, but becoming a manager in law enforcement is even more challenging. It is an opportunity to develop personally and a responsibility to develop others. You can become a successful law enforcement manager in many ways.

*Prepare and develop yourself for promotion.* Study, attend training programs, take correspondence courses, read trade journals, attend academic courses, use the public library and the law enforcement agency’s library and listen to contemporaries. Be ready when opportunity arises.

*Be available.* Once prepared, you become a valuable resource to the law enforcement organization. Assert yourself at appropriate times. Support your organization’s goals and objectives. Participate in work programs. Volunteer to do more than others. Become so valuable to the organization’s future that it cannot do without you. Become an information source who is willing to selflessly share information.

*Support your manager.* An old adage advises: “If you want your manager’s job, praise and support him or her because soon that person will move up the ladder. Be derogatory to your manager and he or she will be there forever.” Complaining, continually finding fault and being negative or nonsupportive are fast tracks to organizational oblivion. You may accomplish a short-term goal, but in the long run you will destroy your career. Be supportive; if you criticize, make it constructive criticism. Be positive. Praise the good things happening.

*Select an advisor or mentor.* These are people within or outside the police organization who can assist and counsel you. Advisors can point you in the right direction. They can be a sounding board.

*Be positive at and toward work.* Either like what you do or change to another job. Rarely can you excel at something you hate. Work longer, more diligently and more competently than anyone else in the organization. Before you know it, you will be an expert.

*Nurture interpersonal relationships.* Management is getting things done through others. This is impossible to do without treating others as important. Working with others is one of the keys to success. Working alone is a long, hard road. Develop your interpersonal relationships. Combine their strengths with your weaknesses and their weaknesses with your strengths.

**Leadership**

Leadership has been defined as “working with and through individuals and groups to accomplish organizational goals” (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977). Reintzell (2003, p.36) says, “Leadership is inspiration, backed by perspiration and intellect. It is a potent force that overcomes inertia and begets action.” Leadership generates an emotional connection between the leader and the led.
Centuries ago, Lao Tzu observed: “The good leader is he who the people re-
vere. The great leader is he whose people say, ‘We did it ourselves.’” President and
World War II Commanding General Dwight Eisenhower defined leadership like
this: “Leadership: The art of getting someone else to do something you want done,
because he wants to do it.”

Collins, author of the bestselling *Good to Great (2001)*, contends: “Good is the
enemy of great.” To make the transition to great, good leaders recognize that com-
placency can set in when things are going well. Great leaders have what Collins
calls BHAGs, Big Hairy Audacious Goals. He gives as examples Abraham Lincoln’s
goal of ending slavery and John F. Kennedy’s goal of putting a man on the moon
(Edelson, 2004, p.3).

**Characteristics of Leaders**

A leader in the purest sense influences others by example. This characteristic of
leadership was recognized in the sixth century B.C. by Chinese philosopher Lao
Tzu when he wrote:

```
The superior leader gets things done
With very little motion.
He imparts instruction not through many words
But through a few deeds.
He keeps informed about everything
But interferes hardly at all.
He is a catalyst,
And although things wouldn’t get done as well
If he weren’t there,
When they succeed he takes no credit.
```
And because he takes no credit
Credit never leaves him.

Right Management Consultants asked 570 white-collar workers what they considered to be the most important trait or attribute for a leader to possess. The top five traits were honesty, integrity/morals/ethics, caring/compassion, fairness and good relationships with employees (including approachability and listening skills) (“In Search of an Honest Manager,” 2003, p.6).

Vernon (2004, pp.60–61) defines leaders with five statements: (1) the ability to clearly understand and articulate the goal, (2) the confidence to be out in front and show the way to the goal, (3) the ability to convince people to follow as an act of their free choice, (4) the desire and ability to help people develop and pursue excellence and (5) the capability to inspire people to achieve their full potential. Research conducted over the past 10 years has identified four highly valued traits in leaders: (1) being a good listener, (2) admitting when they’re wrong, (3) giving recognition and (4) keeping commitments (Vernon, 2005, p.57).

Other desired attributes of leaders are (1) a lively, intellectual curiosity—an interest in everything; (2) a genuine interest in what other people think and why they think the way they do; (3) a feeling of responsibility for envisioning a future that is different from a straight-line projection of the present; (4) the attitude that risks are not to be avoided, but to be taken; (5) the feeling that crisis is normal, tensions can be promising, and complexity is fun; (6) the realization that paranoia and self-pity are reserved for people who don’t want to take the lead; (7) the quality of unwarranted optimism; and (7) a sense of personal responsibility for the general outcome of his or her efforts (Zemke, 2003, p.10).

One of the most important qualities a leader possesses is being visionary: “A leader sees more than others see (quantity); farther than others see (distance); before others see (timing); and helps others see what the leader sees” (Sokolove and Field, 2003, p.75). The only way leaders can ever make their vision clear and concise is by spending a great deal of time with the vision. Lack of vision results in poor focus, little coordination and haphazard planning (Sokolove and Field, p.75).

Leadership creates a special bond that has to be earned. To build and maintain credibility, it is necessary to clarify values, identify the wishes of the community and employees, build a consensus, communicate shared values, stand up for beliefs and lead by example.

A good leader knows being the boss does not mean bossing. Rather it means giving employees the resources, training and coaching they need and providing them with information so they can see their organization’s mission.

It is apparent that authorities on leadership vary in what they perceive to be the most important characteristics of leaders. George (2003, p.78) offers the following for consideration: “[Leadership is] not about your style, your persona, your characteristics or your skills. Authentic leadership is about being yourself, developing your character and becoming the kind of person who people want to follow.” Parachin (2003, p.112) likewise stresses the importance of character and integrity, quoting Ralph Waldo Emerson’s statement: “What lies behind us and what lies before us are tiny matters compared to what lies within us.” He (p.114) advises that leaders pay attention to the “small stuff,” despite many experts’ advice to the contrary, citing the wisdom of Lao Tzu: “Deal with the difficult while it is still easy. Solve large problems when they are still small.”
Leading versus Managing

More than 20 years ago Drucker conducted a study of the Los Angeles Police Department requested by the chief. Among Drucker’s findings was: “You police are so concerned with doing things right that you fail to do the right things.” In other words, the administration was so concerned with managing that they failed to lead. He also said: “Police are so concerned with doing things right [that] you promote for the absence of wrongdoing rather than for the presence of initiative, innovation and leadership.” Recall Drucker’s quote: “Managers do things right; leaders do the right thing.” Table 2.2 highlights several other differences between managers and leaders.

A basic difference between managers and leaders is that managers focus on tasks, whereas leaders focus on people. Manage things; lead people.

A manager operates in the status quo, but a leader takes risks. Police administrators must be both skilled managers and effective leaders. Leaders solve problems, maximize potential with competent associates, take safe risks, take responsibility, move forward, lead by example and have vision. Managers may or may not be leaders, and leaders do not have to be managers. A true leader has the potential to influence from any position in the organization, formal or informal.

In the twenty-first century, most people resist being managed. They seek leadership. However, if management is defined as the administrative ordering of

---

**Table 2.2 Management versus Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the thing right</td>
<td>Does the right thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible</td>
<td>Intangible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referee</td>
<td>Cheerleader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directs</td>
<td>Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What you do</td>
<td>How you do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronounces</td>
<td>Facilitates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a view of the mission</td>
<td>Has vision of mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views world from inside</td>
<td>Views world from outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chateau leadership</td>
<td>Front-line leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What you say</td>
<td>How you say it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No gut stake in enterprise</td>
<td>Gut stake in enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving life</td>
<td>Passion for life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driven by constraints</td>
<td>Driven by goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks for things done wrong</td>
<td>Looks for things done right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runs a cost center</td>
<td>Runs an effort center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates programs</td>
<td>Initiates an ongoing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops programs</td>
<td>Develops people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned with programs</td>
<td>Concerned with people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned with efficiency</td>
<td>Concerned with efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes plays the hero</td>
<td>Plays the hero no more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

things—with written plans, clear organization charts, well-documented objectives, detailed and precise job descriptions, and regular evaluation of performance—few would deny that competent management is essential to any law enforcement agency. To be truly effective, those in positions of authority combine managerial and leadership skills. All leadership and no management would be as serious a problem as the current imbalance in the other direction in many organizations.

Research on and Theories Related to Leadership

Leadership has been studied over the past several decades from many different perspectives.

Theories about leadership include the study of traits, the classic studies conducted at Michigan State and Ohio State Universities, the Managerial/Leadership Grid and situational leadership.

Trait Theorists

The first group of leadership researchers, the trait theorists, examined the individual. They looked at leaders in industry and government to determine what special characteristics or traits these people possessed. According to Haberfeld (2006, p.211), early trait theory, also called the “Great Man” theory, leadership characteristics were “innate, fixed, and relative to all situations.” He notes that in the nineteenth century leadership traits included physical characteristics such as height.

Bennis and Nanus (1985, p.27) identified four leadership traits that can be learned:

1. Attention through vision: Leaders have an agenda and are result oriented.
2. Meaning through communication: Leaders have the capacity to project/articulate meaning.
3. Trust through positioning: Leaders operate with integrity and buy into their own ideals.
4. Deployment of self through positive self-regard: Leaders project acceptance, respect and trust.

Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) modernized trait theory by stating that certain leadership traits—drive, the desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, cognitive ability, and knowledge of the business—are simply preconditions and do not guarantee success, but without them, a person is unlikely to become an effective leader. With these traits, however, all that is needed is skills, vision and implementation.

Although many leadership traits have been identified, none dominate. Leadership trait theory was highly popular because it simplified the process of selecting leaders. Guaranteed leadership through possession of specific traits, however, was never fully realized because of the number of traits identified and the fact that no single person possessed them all. No criteria determined which traits were more desirable than others. Even possession of all the traits did not guarantee leadership success.

After many studies and experiments, trait theorists could not empirically document leadership characteristics. Researchers in the 1940s and 1950s turned their attention to the situations in which leaders actually functioned.
The Michigan State and Ohio State Universities Studies

Research conducted at Michigan State University and Ohio State University also provides insights into effective leadership. These studies determined that leaders must provide an environment that motivates employees to accomplish organizational goals.

The Michigan State study looked at how leaders motivated individuals or groups to achieve organizational goals. It determined that leaders must have a sense of the task to be accomplished and the most favorable work environment. Three principles of leadership behavior emerged from the Michigan State study:

- Leaders must give task direction to their followers.
- Closeness of supervision directly affects employee production. High-producing units had less direct supervision; highly supervised units had lower production. Conclusion: Employees need some freedom to make choices. Given this, they produce at a higher rate.
- Leaders must be employee oriented. It is the leader’s responsibility to facilitate employees’ accomplishment of goals.

The Ohio State study on leadership behavior used similar methods. This research focused on two dimensions: initiating structure and consideration structure.

Initiating structure looked at the leader’s behavior in assigning tasks. It focused on leaders who assigned employees to specific tasks and asked them to follow standard rules and regulations. Consideration structure looked at establishing the relationship between the group and the leader. It focused on leaders who found time to listen to employees, were willing to make changes and were friendly and approachable.

The Ohio study used these two variables—focus on task and focus on relationships—to develop a management quadrant describing leadership behavior.

The Managerial Grid from a Leadership Perspective

Blake and Mouton developed their Managerial Grid from the studies done at Ohio State University and the Group Dynamics Leadership studies. Their classic Managerial Grid has been further developed into the Management/Leadership Grid, as summarized in Table 2.1. Hersey and Blanchard (p.96) summarized the attitudinal preferences of each management style in several areas, including their basic production/people beliefs, guiding slogans, decision making, conflict with superiors and peers, conflict with subordinates, creativity and promotion of creative effort (Table 2.3).

Situational Leadership

Hersey and Blanchard took existing leadership theory a step further. They viewed leadership as an interplay between the amount of direction (task behavior) a leader gives, combined with the amount of relationship behavior a leader provides (the Managerial/Leadership Grid) and the readiness level that followers exhibit on a specific task the leader is attempting to accomplish through the individual or group (Hersey and Blanchard).
### Table 2.3 Attitudinal Preferences of Various Management Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority–Compliance Management</th>
<th>Country Club Management</th>
<th>Middle-of-the-Road Management</th>
<th>Impoverished Management</th>
<th>Team Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Production–People Beliefs</strong></td>
<td>Sees good relationships as incidental to high production. Supervisors achieve production goals by planning, directing and controlling all work.</td>
<td>Sees production as incidental to good relations. Supervisors establish a pleasant work atmosphere and harmonious relationship between people.</td>
<td>Seeks a balance between high production and good human relations. Supervisors find middle ground so a reasonable degree of production can be achieved without destroying morale.</td>
<td>Sees production resulting from integrating task and human requirements. Good relationships and high production are both attainable. Supervisors get effective production through participation and involvement of people and their ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guiding Slogans</strong></td>
<td>Produce or perish.</td>
<td>Try to win friends and influence people.</td>
<td>Don’t rock the boat.</td>
<td>Be firm but fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Making</strong></td>
<td>Inner-directed, depending on own skills, knowledge, attitudes and beliefs in approaching problems and making decisions.</td>
<td>Other-directed, eager to find solutions that reflect the ideas and opinions of others so that solutions are accepted.</td>
<td>Avoids problems or defers them to others.</td>
<td>Samples opinions, manipulates participation, compromises, and then sells the final solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict with Superiors and Peers</strong></td>
<td>Takes a win-lose approach, fighting to win its own points as often as possible.</td>
<td>Avoids conflict by conforming to the thinking of the boss or peers.</td>
<td>Keeps its mouth shut and does not express dissent.</td>
<td>Expresses opinions and then tries to find reasonable compromises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict with Subordinates</strong></td>
<td>Suppresses conflict through authority.</td>
<td>Smooths over and tries to release tension by appeals to the “goodness of people.”</td>
<td>Does not get involved with conflict. It usually avoids issues that might give rise to conflict by simply not discussing them with subordinates.</td>
<td>Deals with surface tensions and symptoms only, letting conflict situations “cool off” for a while, working for a blending of different positions so a somewhat acceptable solution is reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creativity</strong></td>
<td>Considers ideas the responsibility of the few, not expected of the majority.</td>
<td>Expects no one to be creative, but a creative person is congratulated.</td>
<td>Sometimes has good ideas “pop up,” but ideas are usually unrelated to company goals or morale.</td>
<td>Values creativity and seeks it from everyone, usually under nonthreatening conditions that will not disturb staff or the authority structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion of Creative Effort</strong></td>
<td>Promotes innovation by rewards and promotions. When a conflict of ideas arises, it is “survival of the fittest.”</td>
<td>Encourages innovations by accepting all ideas uncritically. Ideas that will generate conflicts are side-stepped.</td>
<td>Discourages creativity. Ideas are not discussed on the job, so conflicts are unlikely.</td>
<td>Encourages innovation under controlled conditions. Brainstorming and “idea of the month” campaigns are used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Hersey and Blanchard (1977).
and simultaneously increase their relationship behavior. This would be the leaders’ strategy until individuals or groups reach a moderate level of task-readiness. As followers or groups move into an above-average level of readiness, leaders would decrease both their task behavior and their relationship behavior. At this point followers would be ready not only from the task point of view but also from the amount of relationship behavior they need. Once a follower or group reaches this level of readiness, close supervision is reduced and delegation is increased, indicating the leader’s trust and confidence.

Transformational Leadership

The most recent form of leadership to be recognized is transformational leadership, which treats employees as the organization’s most valuable asset. It is employee-centered and focused on empowerment.

An important aspect of transformational leadership is its employee orientation. Transformational leadership seeks to empower people to make the fullest possible contribution to the organization. What is often lacking, however, is a model for effective followership. A leader cannot simply tell people they are empowered and expect them to instantly know how to perform. Employees need training, resources and authority if they are to be empowered.

According to the Center for Leadership Studies (CLS): “Transformational leaders set high standards of conduct and become role models, gaining trust, respect, and confidence from others; articulate the future desired state and a plan to achieve it; question the status quo and [are] continuously innovative, even at the peak of success; and energize people to achieve their full potential and performance” (Morreale and Ortmeier, 2004, p.89).

The focus on leadership rather than management complements the move toward community-oriented, problem-solving policing because it stresses resolving problems and not simply reacting to incidents. It encourages experimenting with new ways and allows honest mistakes to encourage creativity.

Leadership Styles

Management literature has identified many leadership styles, several of which can be found in police organizations.

Leadership styles include autocratic, democratic or participative and laissez-faire.

Autocratic leadership is most frequently mentioned in connection with the past. Many early leaders inherited their positions. They were members of the aristocracy, and through the centuries positions of leadership were passed down to family members.

In early industrial production efforts, the boss was often a domineering figure. He (bosses were invariably men) was specifically chosen because he displayed traits associated with autocratic leadership. His authority was uncontested, and employees did what they were told out of fear. This style of management emerged in response to the demands of the Industrial Revolution, when masses of illiterate workers used expensive machinery and needed to follow explicit orders.

Managers who used autocratic leadership made decisions without participant input. They were completely authoritative and showed little or no concern for subordinates. Rules were rules, without exception. This mechanistic model of...
management derived from the theories of Frederick Taylor, introduced in Chapter 1, divides jobs into highly specialized tasks where employees can become experts in their task. Certain circumstances may call for autocratic leadership.

**Consultative, Democratic or Participative Leadership**

Consultative, democratic or participative leadership has been evolving since the 1930s and 1940s. Democratic leadership does not mean that every decision is made only after discussion and a vote. It means rather that management welcomes employees’ ideas and input. Employees are encouraged to be innovative. Management development of a strong sense of individual achievement and responsibility is a necessary ingredient of participative or consultative leadership.

Democratic or participative managers are interested in their subordinates and their problems and welfare. Management still makes the final decisions but takes into account the input from employees. This leadership style is a good fit with the organic model of management: The model is flexible, participatory, democratic and science-based, and accommodates change. In contrast to the mechanistic model, which focuses on efficiency and productivity, the organic model focuses on worker satisfaction, flexibility and personal growth.

**Laissez-Faire Leadership**

Laissez-faire leadership implies nonintervention and is almost a contradiction in terms. The idea is to let everything run itself without direction from the leader, who exerts little or no control. This style arises from the concept that employees are adults, should know as well as the manager what is right and wrong and will automatically do what is right for themselves and the organization.

Laissez-faire leaders want employees to be happy and believe that if employees are happy, they will be more productive. Employees should feel comfortable and good about their work, but this should be because they participate. Even when they participate, employees must still do the job and meet the organization’s goals and objectives. Leaderless management, sometimes called free-rein leadership, may result in low morale, inefficiency, lack of discipline and low productivity. Figure 2.3 shows the continuum of leadership styles.

**Common Sense Leadership**

Another style that has been advocated, though not as frequently discussed, is common sense leadership. Cottringer (2005, p.164), author of *You Can Have Your Cheese and Eat It Too*, says that leaders need to return to “sweating the small stuff” that they have been “prematurely” advised to dismiss and to refocus on using common sense as the best way to handle the current information overload. “Common sense always represents the action that gets the best results, with the least cost or side-effects” (Cottringer, 2004, p.110).

**Implications**

Research on leaders and leadership is abundant. Each theory offers something to the law enforcement manager. However, no one type of leader or leadership style will suffice in all situations.

Leaders must often be autocratic in one situation and democratic or participatory in another. They must know when to make an immediate decision and when to make a decision only after input, discussion and consideration.
Emergency situations rarely permit the opportunity for democratic or participatory decision making. Employees in nonemergency situations rarely respond well to autocratic leadership for routine task performance over the long term.

Leaders know what to do, how to do it, when to do it and with what type of employee, according to the demands of the individual situation. Internationally, leaders have been recognized because of the leadership abilities they displayed for a particular time, place and need. Put into another situation and time, they might not have become leaders. Regardless of the situation or time, most leaders have adhered to several adages, listed in Table 2.4.

Section II of this text presents many of these adages in the context of management and supervision.

**Leadership—A Call for Change**

Managers must pay attention to the new ideas and trends emerging from America's businesses: a commitment to people, the development of a people-oriented workplace and the belief that leadership can and does make a difference. Leadership in
Table 2.4  Leadership Adages

1. Move your organization up the “wisdom pyramid.” If you can assist your organization in moving from a focus on data and information to a concentration on knowledge, understanding and wisdom, better decisions for both the short term and the long term will be reached.

2. Don't postpone joy. If there is something to celebrate do it now. Don't wait until next week, next month or next year to publicly congratulate those who have just accomplished something extraordinary.

3. Use your wit to amuse not abuse. Laughing at others is hurtful. On the other hand, laughing at yourself is healing for you and others. Humor used well is wonderful for you and those around you. He who laughs, lasts.

4. Polish your negotiation skills. People often ask me, “What is Colin Powell's greatest talent?” I explain how he brings together people, often who are very angry with each other. By using humor and the spirit of cooperation and compromise, he finds workable solutions that everyone can support.

5. Beware of clever, manipulative subordinates. This was the major leadership failure at CNN during the nerve gas debacle in 1998. The CEO of CNN not only got snookered by some clever subordinates, but it also took him much too long to hold a few top people accountable for their unethical behavior in the production of CNN's “Valley of Death” special.

6. Don't neglect the intangibles. Too many leaders focus all their attention on what they can measure—sales numbers, quarterly reports, cash flow, stock price, etc. These leaders often neglect such vital intangibles as morale and esprit de corps.

7. Practice forgiveness. Be willing to forgive those who make honest mistakes. Also, be sure to forgive yourself after you acknowledge the fact that you have made an error. Self-flagellation is not a good quality for a leader.

8. Scan the environment widely. Too many bosses are unwilling to look outside their own organization for fresh ideas. For instance, I have learned in the fifteen years since I retired from the military that there is much that corporations can learn from the military and vice versa.

9. Don't spend too much time with malcontents. It only encourages them. Spend most of your time with those who are seriously contributing to the accomplishment of the mission.

10. Enjoy your work and your people. Working for a boss with a furrowed brow or an angry scowl is no fun, nor does it inspire people to do their very best. If you are obviously enjoying your work, most people will be captured by your enthusiasm and joy and will enjoy their work also.

11. Acknowledge mistakes quickly and completely. Be willing to fully air your dirty linen. The best leaders acknowledge their mistakes quickly, and take corrective actions to reduce the possibility of a similar mistake in the future. Good news may improve with age, bad news does not.

12. Don't overconcentrate on the details. No amount of genius can overcome a preoccupation with detail. This was the fundamental mistake of the Carter presidency. A man of compassion and intellect failed because he was unable to empower subordinates and to think and act strategically.

13. Never roll the ball over. Leaders should remind themselves often that when they play sports, the object is not to win but to compete with total integrity. Many people play fast and loose with the game of golf—they cheat—yet they somehow justify their conduct (Bill Clinton uses the term “a do over” to explain the 30 or so Mulligans he uses during his golf rounds).

14. Anticipate impending crises. The best leaders have the ability to look around corners and anticipate problems and impending crises. When you see a crisis headed your way, take some quick actions to end the crisis and to minimize the damage.

15. Don't use “I don't trust you” phrases. Be very careful about using the following phrases: “I never want to be surprised,” “Before you start anything, check with me first,” and “When I am on the road, I will call in every morning for an update.” All of these phrases send strong messages to subordinates that you want to keep them on a close leash and, even worse, that you do not trust them.

16. Welcome criticism. All leaders should fully understand that criticism and loyalty are mutually supporting. When subordinates quit complaining, that can be very bad news. It means that they are either afraid to complain or have given up on making things better within the organization. Both are deadly.

17. Don't set unreasonable deadlines. There is an expression in the Pentagon, “If you want it bad you will get it bad.” Try to give your folks enough time to put together a solution that you can be proud of.

18. Expect exceptional performance. Although perfectionism in a leader can be deadly in any organization, leaders must not let the pendulum swing too far in the other direction. If leaders don't ask for exceptional performance from their associates, they are not likely to get it.

19. Don’t allow yourself to become a wind chime. If your primary skill is blowing with the wind by being politically agile, you will not be respected by those you lead. Have a backbone and exercise your strength of character by taking strong positions on important issues.

20. Fight the temptations to get even. If someone does something to you that is mean spirited, think of it as his or her problem—not your problem.

21. Focus on goals, not process. It is important to be clear about the job to be done but to be very flexible about the way you do the job.

22. Be a blame acceptor. If something goes wrong within the organization you lead, you must be willing to accept the blame even though you personally may be only a tiny part of the failure. Too many bosses try to blame others, especially their subordinates. By doing so they often lose the respect of their people and their bosses.
23. **Establish self-reinforcing relationships.** Praise and support those who can move smoothly from competition to cooperation. Encourage those who find solutions that reconcile the opposites. The French have it right in their national motto: liberty, equality and **fraternity**.

24. **Be a leader developer.** A big part of leadership is mentorship. Helping people to develop their leadership skills can be immensely rewarding. Also, leaders should help subordinates think like them and like their bosses. When these subordinates get promoted they will then be ready to take on the big job.

25. **Never try to get even.** Trying to get even seldom works, lacks dignity and makes you look petty and mean-spirited. You can never get ahead by getting even.

26. **Find an anchor and hold on to it in the tough times.** I have been blessed with a number of wonderful anchors. My wife of more than 42 years has lifted me up when I was down and eased me down when I was sky high. My two adult children have been very helpful, especially when I was dealing with issues of integrity. A few other close friends have helped so many times when I was in great need of advice, comfort, solace or support.

27. **Leverage opportunities.** The best leaders leverage their time, their talents, their technology and their friends. In fact, if you use leverage, many things you do will become easier and quicker. Let me give two personal examples. I am a terrible typist but I have a fast computer with an excellent spelling checker that allows me to crank out written material quickly. Also, I am blessed with the talent of speed reading. It has allowed me to get through my “in box” quickly and get out with the troops as well as maintain a regular reading program of about four books per month.

28. **Be a servant leader.** Too many leaders serve their ambitions or their egos rather than their people. As I reflect on the marvelous leadership opportunities I have enjoyed, I realize that I spent most of my time serving the people who worked for me. Whenever they reached out to me for assistance, I tried to help them.

Source: Perry M. Smith is the author of *Rules and Tools for Leaders*, Assignment Pentagon and *A Hero Among Heroes: Jimmie Dyess and the 4th Marine Division*. In June 1998, he resigned his position as military analyst to CNN. He now serves as military correspondent for CBS radio.

---

Law enforcement historically depended on a strong, authoritarian chief. However, this style of leadership neglects everything known about people and their behavior. Coercion discourages creativity and risk taking and often causes people to rebel. President Eisenhower used to demonstrate this aspect of leadership with a simple piece of string. He would put the string on a table and say, “Pull it and it’ll follow wherever you wish. Push it and it’ll go nowhere at all.” It is the same with people.

Managers must shift from telling and controlling the people they work with to developing and enhancing them. They must ask for their input before making critical decisions that affect them. They must also listen to their customers—the citizens—in new and more open ways. Managers must stop reacting to incidents and begin solving problems. They must permit risk taking and tolerate honest mistakes to encourage creativity and achieve innovation. To better understand this change in leadership style, compare the key concepts from each, summarized in Table 2.5.

Changing from autocratic management to any other style is a slow, evolutionary process. Developing a new corporate culture for an organization can take years. Part of the challenge is the bureaucracy within most law enforcement agencies, as discussed previously.

**Leadership Training and Development**

An appointment to fill a position on an organizational chart does not automatically make one a leader. By the same token, relatively few leaders are able to simply step into the role without needing to develop and refine their leadership skills and abilities. Covey (2003, p.128) observes: “The challenge before today’s police administrators is not how to manage and control their people more effectively, but how to develop all their people as principle-centered leaders who embody the character that the profession demands.”
The trend in the twenty-first century is to not tie leadership to rank, but rather to instill leadership qualities throughout the department, referred to as dispersed leadership. The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), through a grant from the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), has developed two leadership bulletins. “Leadership in Police Organizations Training Bulletin 1” (2005, p.3) states: “The bottom line is that today’s police leaders cannot do their jobs alone. They must develop leaders at all levels of their department by practicing dispersed leadership.” “Leadership in Police Organizations Training Bulletin 2” (2005, p.1) describes the essentials of dispersed leadership:

- Shared understanding of what leadership means
- Commitment to shared goals and values
- Leaders at all levels of the organization
- Leaders leading differently at different organizational levels
- A way to develop leadership knowledge and skills throughout the organization
- A way to determine where you are as an organization and as individual leaders

According to the second training bulletin (p.2): “It is paramount to understand that there is no silver bullet or vaccination for leadership. All leaders are developed; they are not born.” The leader is developed through learned professional values, training, and job experience over time. This leadership development perpetuates the mission, values and goals of the agency. The bulletin cites as a quick answer to leader development the simplicity of the U.S. Army’s “Be, Know, Do.” In other words, leadership training must develop character, technical skills and leadership knowledge and provide the chance to express this knowledge in ethically sound leadership behaviors. Figure 2.4 illustrates this leadership development system. Polisar (2004b, p.6) says of the IACP model: “The IACP model reflects documented best practices in the public and private sectors, the military, and the justice system. It is rooted in community oriented policing theory and addresses leadership as an agency-wide concept reaching all ranks and positions.”

Vernon (2005, p.54) observes: “When you become a police officer, you must accept the mantle of leadership that comes with the job, regardless of rank.” In other words, all officers at all ranks are leaders at one time or another and need to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.5 Authoritarian and Participatory Leadership Styles Compared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoritarian (Mechanistic) Style</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual effort and competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go by the “book”; decisions by emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss as patriarch and order giver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain status quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control and watch employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on scientific investigation and technology rather than people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When things go wrong, blame employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization is closed to outsiders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

dispersed leadership • the twenty-first century trend to not tie leadership to rank, but rather to instill leadership qualities throughout the department.
have the appropriate skills. As the most visible form of government, people look to police for leadership. Every time a police officer puts on a uniform and goes into the field, people look to him or her for leadership (Stainbrook, 2004, p.8). Moreover, line-level officers need leadership skills to address the community-based policing challenges they face (Morreale and Ortmeier, p.89).

Also of importance is developing new sergeants into leaders: “Guiding that neophyte supervisor through the transition to the rank of sergeant is a crucial responsibility” (Johnson, p.24). They must be guided through the conversion from a law enforcement function to the role of supervisor and must learn to command as well as to delegate.

Leaders who have adopted a specific leadership style can change that style through training. They can turn their weaknesses into strengths through studying, working with mentors or observing other leaders in action. Leaders are not born; they are developed. Task-oriented leaders can become people-oriented leaders.

Leadership training before appointment is highly desirable. If that is not possible, it should happen soon after appointment. Each leader must be an individual, not a mirror image of the predecessor.

Leadership can be developed through comprehensive training programs, including participative management and team-building theory, motivational theory, communications and decision making.

Table 2.6 summarizes the skill layers for law enforcement managers/leaders.

**Guidelines for Effective Management/Leadership**

Several guidelines have been developed for effective management and leadership:

- Know your work and those you manage.
- Know how to get and maintain cooperation.
- Learn as much as possible about decision making.
- Learn as much as possible about how to be a leader.
- Learn how to give praise and constructive criticism.
- Learn to think positively; create rather than destroy.
- Learn to handle bad situations as well as good ones.
- Know when to discipline and when to be authoritarian or democratic/participatory.
- Help your employees improve themselves. Doing so will in turn improve you. Give them responsibility, tell them your expectations and provide instructions.
- Be honest with yourself and your officers. Expect honesty from them. Maintain integrity in yourself and demand it in others.
- Use your employees’ abilities. They can provide new approaches to problems. Establish two-way communication to capture the vast amount of information contained within the group. Use participation to achieve more acceptance of decisions.
- Do not oversupervise. Employees do not like managers constantly breathing down their necks.
- Remember that you are part of management, and never downgrade management or managers. If a problem exists, help solve it rather than creating a worse one.
- Keep your perception of your leadership abilities in line with subordinates’ perceptions. Ask them what you can do better for them.
- If you call a meeting, make it worthwhile. Excessive meetings that provide a façade of participation are worse than no meetings. Every meeting should produce a result.
- Treat employees’ mistakes as a teaching responsibility, not a punitive opportunity.
- Develop officers who differ with you, rather than clones. Develop officers who can compensate for your weaknesses. The tendency is to do the opposite.
- Listen. Lead by example.
- Develop people skills.
- Be a risk taker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.6</th>
<th>Skill Layers for Managers/Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When used alone, these skills are suited to a rigidly traditional workplace.</td>
<td>Combined with the skills in column A, the skills below are needed in today’s progressive workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get people to understand ideas.</td>
<td>Get people to generate ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage one-to-one.</td>
<td>Encourage teamwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize the department’s performance.</td>
<td>Build relationships with other departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement changes from above.</td>
<td>Initiate changes within the department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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When considering what it takes to be a great manager and leader, it is also important to remember that every officer is also an individual and should be treated as such. This principle is at the heart of holistic management.

**Holistic Management/Leadership**

The holistic management/leadership approach recognizes that both management and leadership skills are required for an agency to accomplish its mission. It recognizes the importance of teamwork, but it also recognizes that all those within the organization are individuals who have answered a special calling. Police officers feel a high sense of peer identification—no call has higher priority than a fellow officer in danger. Police officers also receive an ego boost by the fact that they are readily identified by their uniforms and have certain powers above and beyond those of the average citizen.

The police manager/leader is responsible for ensuring that the officer does not lose this feeling of ego satisfaction (e.g., after a citizen has flashed an obscene gesture to the officer) and continues to develop this sense of belonging to a unique profession geared toward helping one’s fellow human beings. The holistic management/leadership approach views law enforcement officers and support personnel as total individuals who make up a team.

**The Team Approach**

Sanow (2004, p.4) contends: “Team building is critical for the success of any endeavor, even policing.” He believes team building is the ultimate act of leadership. A team consists of two or more people who must coordinate their activities regularly to accomplish a common task. The team approach builds on the concept of synergism, that the group can channel individual energies to accomplish together what no individual could possibly accomplish alone—that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.

Synergism is all around. Athletics provides countless examples of how a team, working together, can defeat a “superstar.” Examples of synergism also come from the music world. Consider the power and energy produced by a top-notch marching band or symphony orchestra. Every musician must know his or her part. Individual players may have solos, but ultimately what is important is how it all sounds together. Anthropologist Margaret Mead has said of the value of collective efforts: “Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has” (Delinger, 2004, p.110).

The Wilson Learning Corporation has identified eight attributes of high-performing teams (Buchholz and Roth, 1987, p.14).

- **Participative leadership**—creating interdependency by empowering, freeing up and serving others.
- **Shared responsibility**—establishing an environment in which all team members feel as responsible as the manager for the work unit’s performance.
- **Aligned on purpose**—having a sense of common purpose about why the team exists and the function it serves.
High communication—creating a climate of trust and open, honest communication.
Future focused—seeing change as an opportunity for growth.
Focused on task—keeping meetings focused on results.
Creative talents—applying individual talents and creativity.
Rapid response—identifying and acting on opportunities.

Although Buchholz and Roth were speaking of teams in the business world, the same eight attributes are likely to be present in a high-performing law enforcement agency.

True leaders are not intimidated by outstanding team members. They do not fear for their jobs. They develop followers who will surpass them. Athletes, for example, will become coaches and train other athletes who will break their records.

One way to initiate action is to encourage employees at the lowest level to work together to solve their problems, with or without manager involvement. These are not highly organized, trained teams but rather groups of employees with a common problem who band together. They are organized informally from anywhere in the organization to focus on a specific problem or project. They are usually self-formed, self-managed and highly productive. When they have met the need, the group dissolves.

**Multiagency Teams and Task Forces**

Multiagency teams are an important element of current-day policing. Gehl (2004, p.145) describes the leadership challenges in multiagency teams: “The cultural norms that define police organizations and influence organizational behavior generally do not support the process of forming teams for interagency partnerships.” Among the cultural norms that impede interagency teams are case ownership, secrecy, organizational isolation, and valuing individuals above the team (pp.147–148).

Seven systemic issues interfering with multiagency teams, in order of significance, are (1) lack of common database systems, (2) paramilitary structuring, (3) politics and regionalization, (4) organized labor issues, (5) lack of common case management systems, (6) resource issues and (7) policy differences (Gehl, pp.148–149). Despite these barriers, Gehl (p.150) contends: “There is no question that multiagency teams are essential to the future of policing.”

He suggests communication protocols are the first necessity to overcome the barriers. What is needed is communications that drive timely decision making to form the team, communications that ensure the team can function as an independent unit, and communications that satisfy the contributing organizations’ need to be kept informed at appropriate levels. According to Gehl (p.153): “The leadership challenge to create effective multiagency teams will no doubt continue to be a concern for police agencies.”

Domash (2004, p.42) describes four task forces established by the U.S. Marshals Service to assist local law enforcement with tracking and apprehending fugitives, including terrorists. Each task force is operated by marshals and local, state and federal authorities. The four task forces are the New York/New Jersey Task Force, the California Task Force, the Chicago Task Force and the Georgia Task Force.

One of the most analyzed and publicized is the multijurisdictional DC sniper investigation, a case that involved more than twenty local, two state and at least...
ten federal law enforcement agencies. During the three-week investigation, law enforcement executives as well as government leaders at the local, state and national levels grappled with questions about leadership and its role in solving crimes and addressing community fear (Murphy and Wexler, 2004, p.19).

The Sniper Task Force vested leadership with three individuals: Montgomery County Police Chief Charles Moose, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Special Agent in Charge (SAC) Gary Bald and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) SAC Michael Bouchard. These leaders were responsible not only for leading the main task force but also for five task forces within the jurisdictions affected as the case unfolded—the counties of Montgomery, Spotsylvania, Prince William, Fairfax and Central Virginia (Murphy and Wexler, pp.21–22). Chief Ramsey of the Metropolitan Police Department (p.24) recommends: “Don’t manage the other task forces. Rather, make certain that every task force leader knows his or her obligations, which are to manage information, keep chiefs informed and follow up on leads.” He (p.29) also observes: “Chiefs have to be willing to give up some control. Admittedly, this is difficult for chiefs, sheriffs and SACs, but unless it is done, the investigation won’t succeed.”

Murphy and Wexler (pp.31–33) report several lessons learned regarding leadership in a multijurisdictional task force, including the following:

- Executives should clearly establish who is in charge as well as the scope and nature of their authority.
- Multi-agency task force leaders should always speak with one voice.
- Task force leaders have to ensure that communication and meaningful information flow both into and out of the task force. Executives must swiftly determine their roles and responsibilities and focus on addressing six immediate tasks: (1) Make order out of chaos, (2) remain flexible and help others to be adaptable, (3) focus on the entire agency, (4) let a competent workforce do its job, (5) provide personnel with the resources they need and (6) work with external stakeholders.
- Executives should push responsibilities down and give personnel the resources they need to do their job.

The importance of cooperation and collaboration among local, state and federal agencies is discussed further in the next chapter.

Summary

Managers have authority and power, which both imply the ability to coerce compliance—that is, to make subordinates carry out orders. Both are important to managers at all levels. However, authority relies on force or on some law or order, whereas power relies on persuasion and lacks the support of law and rule.

Basic management skills include technical skills, administrative skills, conceptual skills and people skills. Successful managers have clear goals and a commitment to excellence, feedback and support. Management by objectives (MBO) involves managers and subordinates setting goals and objectives together and then tracking performance to ensure that the objectives are met. Several management theories have evolved over time, yet no one style is more apt to achieve the department’s mission than another. The selected style must be matched to individual personalities.

Management typically has three levels: the top level (chief, sheriff), the middle level (captains, lieutenants) and the first-line level (sergeants).
Law enforcement executives are planners, facilitators, interfacers and interactors. They are responsible for both tactical and strategic planning. **Tactical planning** is short-term planning. **Strategic planning** is long-term planning. In addition to these roles and responsibilities, law enforcement executives typically interact with politicians, community groups, the media and executives of other law enforcement organizations and individuals and groups within the law enforcement agency itself.

Three important management challenges for law enforcement are administering the budget; maintaining effective community relations; and establishing and administering personnel systems and procedures, including recruitment, selection, training and discipline of key employees.

The basic difference between managers and leaders is that managers focus on tasks, whereas leaders focus on people. A leader in the purest sense influences others by example. Theories about leadership include the study of traits, the classic studies conducted at Michigan State and Ohio State universities, the Managerial Grid, situational leadership and transformational leadership.

Trait theorists identified characteristics leaders possessed. The Michigan and Ohio studies determined that leaders must provide an environment that motivates employees to accomplish organizational goals. Situational leadership specifies that initially workers need support and direction. As they mature they need less direction and more support, up to the point where even support can be reduced. Transformational leadership treats employees as the organization’s most valuable asset. It is employee centered and focused on empowerment. Research has also identified several leadership styles, including autocratic, consultative, democratic or participative and laissez-faire.

Leadership can be developed through comprehensive training programs, including participative management and team-building theory, communications and decision making.

Attributes of high-performing teams are participative leadership, shared responsibility, aligned on purpose, high communication, future focused, focused on task, creative talents and rapid response. Leaders must balance the need for synergism and the need for survival of the organization.

### Challenge Two

After five years as an officer, you were recently promoted to the rank of patrol sergeant by the new chief of the Greenfield Police Department. The chief tells you he is expanding the authority and responsibility of sergeants and is looking for strong leadership at the supervisor level. Many of the officers you are now supervising, including your old partner, have considerably more experience than you. Your old partner is a 20-year veteran and trained you as a rookie. You consider him a mentor and a good friend. You confided in each other when you had problems.

You were a popular officer and often attended social gatherings after your shift. You’ve declined several invitations since your promotion. Some officers are greeting you less cordially, and you hear talk that your promotion has changed you. Others openly wonder why your old partner was passed by for the promotion. Your old partner seems less friendly and sometimes questions your decisions at roll call. He often brings up things you did in the past and openly criticizes management.

1. The transition from officer to supervisor is difficult and sometimes isolating. Discuss some issues that complicate the transition.
2. What should you do as a new sergeant to prove to your officers that you haven’t changed? Should you use your new authority to demand compliance and establish your position of authority over your old peers?
3. What is the best style of leadership for a new sergeant?
4. Do different style of leadership need different levels of direction and support?

Discussion Questions

1. Who should be responsible for law enforcement planning? How should it be accomplished?
2. Why is coordination important? What are some examples?
3. What are the main problem areas of the different levels of law enforcement managers?
4. How do you develop yourself to be a law enforcement manager?
5. What is your definition of leadership?
6. What traits do you attribute to successful law enforcement leaders? If you had to select one most important characteristic of a law enforcement leader, which would you select?
7. Which style of leadership do you prefer? Which style do you perceive you use most of the time?
8. What are the merits of the holistic approach to leadership?
9. What direction should law enforcement leaders take for the future?
10. What leadership traits do you possess? What leadership traits do you need to develop?

References

“Delegate with the Right Level of Authority.” The Manager’s Intelligence Report, November 2003, p.1.
“In Search of an Honest Manager.” The Manager’s Intelligence Report, April 2003, p.6.
“Prepare before You Delegate.” The Manager’s Intelligence Report, September 2003, p.10.

**Book-Specific Web Site**

Go to the Management and Supervision in Law Enforcement Web site at www.thomsonedu.com/criminaljustice/bennett for student and instructor resources, including Internet Assignments and Case Studies.
Chapter 3

Community Policing

The police are the public and the public are the police.

Sir Robert Peel

Do You Know?

- What community policing is?
- What four essential dimensions of community policing are?
- What three generations of community policing have been identified?
- How traditional and community policing differ?
- What the majority of police actions have to do with?
- What demographics includes?
- What role organizations and institutions play within a community?
- What the broken window phenomenon refers to?
- How citizens have become involved in and educated about what police do?
- What the two critical key elements of community policing are?
- What the core components of a successful partnership are?
- Who might be key collaborators in community policing?
- What problem solving requires of the police?
- What changes implementing community policing requires of a department?
- Which may be more important, targeting a “critical mass” of individuals or mobilizing the community at large?
- How implementing community policing may affect the core functions of law enforcement?
- What benefits of implementing community policing might be expected?

Can You Define?

bifurcated society  critical mass  911 policing
broken-window  demographics  proactive
phenomenon  heterogeneous  problem-oriented
incivilities  integrated patrol  working in “silos”
call management  homogenous  policing
incident
call reduction

call stacking
**Introduction**

Rosenthal et al. (2003, p.34) assert: “Community policing is one of the most significant trends in policing history.” Police departments, and to a lesser extent, sheriff’s offices, throughout the United States report that they are involved in community policing. Sixty-eight percent of local police departments and 55 percent of sheriff’s offices had a community policing plan in 2000. Two thirds of all police departments (Hickman and Reaves, 2003a, pp.14–15) and nearly two thirds (62 percent) of sheriff’s offices were using full-time community policing officers (Hickman and Reaves, 2003b, pp.14–15).

Wuestewald (2004, p.22) points out: “Certainly, our communities expect much more from a police officer today than when I first pinned on the badge. It’s not as simple as putting the bad guys in jail anymore. Citizens expect us to communicate and collaborate. They expect openness and access. They expect us to solve problems and form partnerships. Police work always has involved much more than enforcing the law. But, today, the social aspects of policing are center stage.”

This chapter on community policing has been added because the ramifications of the change from a professional model to a community-oriented model affect all aspects of police operations. The chapter begins with an overview of community policing and a comparison of traditional and community policing. Next is a discussion of the importance of community and how citizens can be involved and educated. This is followed by a discussion of the importance of partnerships as well as problem-oriented policing. Then a discussion of implementing community policing and its effects is provided. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the challenges to community policing and the benefits that might be expected.

**Community Policing—An Overview**

Community policing is viewed in many different ways. A starting point is to look at the varying definitions of community policing.

**Community Policing Defined**

Although numerous definitions of community policing exist, watch for the common thread that runs through them as you consider the following definitions of community policing:

- “Community policing is a philosophy or orientation that emphasizes working with citizens to solve crime-related problems and prevent crime” (Miller and Hess, 2005, p.483).
- “Community policing is a philosophy of full-service, personalized policing where the same officer patrols and works in the area on a permanent basis from a decentralized place, working in a proactive partnership with citizens to identify and solve problems” (Allendar, 2004, pp.18–19).

Community policing is an organization-wide philosophy and management approach that promotes (1) community, government and police partnerships; (2) proactive problem solving to prevent crime; and (3) community engagement to address the causes of crime, fear of crime and other community issues.
Kelling (2003, p.17) notes that although definitions of community policing vary, a “broad consensus” exists that it includes common elements.

**Common Elements of Community Policing**

Among the common elements of community policing are the following:

- A focus on problems
- A recognition of citizen and neighborhood concerns
- Increased focus on crime prevention compared with reactive case processing
- Increased emphasis on collaboration with criminal justice and other governmental agencies, private sector agencies and services, the faith community, and citizen and community groups
- An understanding that in a democratic society citizens must, at minimum, obey police and, at best, be partners with them (Kelling, p.17)

These basic elements will be discussed in different contexts within this chapter and throughout the text. Also consider what many believe to be the goals of community policing.

**The Goals of Community Policing**

Fridell (2004a, p.4) states: “The goals of community policing are to reduce crime and disorder, promote citizens’ quality of life in communities, reduce fear of crime and improve police-citizen relations.” Three essential efforts are required to achieve these goals: (1) community engagement, (2) problem solving, and (3) organizational transformation (Fridell, 2004a, p.4).

Rosenbaum (2004, p.96) expands on these three efforts. *Community engagement* should be designed to stimulate and empower community residents in preventing crime and disorder. *Problem solving* should be based on the real concerns and problems expressed by neighborhood residents rather than police priorities. *Organizational changes* should encourage a closer relationship between police officers and the neighborhoods they service such as decentralization of authority, attendance at community meetings, and foot and bike patrols. Each of these efforts is discussed in this chapter.

**The Dimensions of Community Policing**

Cordner (1999, p.137) provides a framework consisting of four dimensions for viewing community policing and determining whether the essential elements are in place.

Four dimensions of community policing are the philosophical dimension, the strategic dimension, the tactical dimension and the organizational dimension.

**The Philosophical Dimension** Many advocates of community policing stress that it is a philosophy rather than a program. And it does have that important dimension. The three important elements within this dimension are citizen input, a broadened function and personalized service. Cordner (p.138) contends that citizen input meshes well with an agency that “is part of a government ‘of the people, for the people, and by the people.’” A broadened police function means expanding responsibility into areas such as order maintenance and social services, as well as protecting and enhancing the lives of our most vulnerable citizens: juveniles, the
The personal service element supports tailored policing based on local norms and values as well as on individual needs.

**The Strategic Dimension** A philosophy without means of putting it into practice is an empty shell. This is where the strategic dimension comes in. This dimension “includes the key operational concepts that translate philosophy into action” (p.139). The three strategic elements of community policing are reoriented operations, a geographic focus and a prevention emphasis.

The reorientation in operations shifts reliance on the squad car to emphasis on face-to-face interactions. It may also include differential calls for service. The geographic focus changes patrol officers’ basic unit of accountability from time of day to location. Officers are given permanent assignments so they can get to know the citizens within their area. Finally, the prevention emphasis is proactive, seeking to raise the status of prevention/patrol officers to the level traditionally enjoyed by detectives.

**The Tactical Dimension** The tactical dimension translates the philosophical and strategic dimensions into concrete programs and practices. The most important tactical elements, according to Cordner, are positive interactions, partnerships and problem solving. Officers are encouraged to get out of their vehicles and initiate positive interactions with the citizens within their beat. They are also encouraged to seek out opportunities to partner with organizations and agencies and to mediate between those with conflicting interests—for example, landlords and tenants, adults and juveniles. The third essential element, problem solving rather than responding to isolated incidents, is the focus of Chapter 5.

**The Organizational Dimension** Cordner’s fourth dimension, the organizational dimension, was discussed in Chapter 1.

**The Three Generations of Community Policing**

Oliver (2000, p.367) contends that community policing has become the “paradigm of contemporary policing, evolving significantly over the past 20 years.” He (p.367) notes: “That which was called community policing in the late 1970s and early 1980s only somewhat resembles community policing as it is practiced today.” Oliver describes three generations of community policing.

**First Generation: Innovation (1979–1986)** The innovation generation also marked the beginning of the community era previously described. Influences on this first generation were Goldstein’s focus on problem solving coupled with Wilson and Kelling’s “broken window” theory. Says Oliver (p.375): “The innovation stage of community policing was primarily characterized by a few isolated experiments in a small number of major metropolitan areas across the United States that were testing specific methods of community policing, generally in a small number of urban neighborhoods.”

**Second Generation: Diffusion (1987–1994)** As the experiments in community policing showed indications of success, the concepts and philosophy of community policing began to spread among American police departments. According
to Oliver (p.376): “Community policing during the diffusion generation was largely organized through various programs that consisted of newly created units or extensions of previously existing organizational units.” A good example of such programs was the COPE (Citizen Oriented Police Enforcement) program in Baltimore County, Maryland.

**Third Generation: Institutionalization (1995 to Present)** Says Oliver (p.378): “This specific term [institutionalization] is used to denote the fact that community policing has seen widespread implementation across the United States and has become the most common form of organizing police services.” In September 1994, President Clinton signed into law the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, allocating almost $9 billion to hire, equip and train 100,000 police officers in community policing. The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) was created and began funneling grant money to state and local law enforcement agencies. The COPS Web site, http://www.usdoj.gov/cops, houses information on COPS initiatives plus details about training and technical assistance, as well as resources to implement community policing. Through the already existing community Policing Consortium and newly created Regional Community Policing Institutes (RCPIs), training on community policing became available for agencies throughout the country.

**Traditional and Community Policing Compared**

Traditional police departments are insular organizations that respond to calls for service from behind the blue curtain. This insular, professional approach began to change in many agencies in the late 1970s and early 1980s. According to Allendar (p.19): “Law enforcement professionals, equipped with lessons learned during the problem-laden traditional policing period and the failed team policing initiative, realized the need to work with the various communities they served to identify issues viewed by each neighborhood as significant.” This is a basic difference between traditional and community policing. Table 3.1 summarizes the differences between these two approaches to policing.

**Reactive versus Proactive**

Where traditionally policing has been reactive, responding to calls for service, community policing is proactive, identifying problems and seeking solutions to them. The term proactive is taking on an expanded definition. Not only is it taking on the meaning of identifying problems, but it also means choosing a response rather than reacting the same way each time a similar situation occurs. Police are learning that they do not obtain different results by applying the same methods. In other words, to get different results, different tactics are needed.

Reactive policing has a long-standing tradition. Hoover (2005, p.19) points to the guiding principle of O. W. Wilson: “When the phone rings, we will come.” He notes: “Bashing O. W. Wilson has become a rite of passage into the inner circle of
community policing.” Hoover suggests that such bashing is “misplaced at best and just plain ignorant at worst.” He contends that this guiding principle is the ultimate democratic process in policing premised on the equality of the citizens and equal protection of the law. Community policing does not imply that officers will not respond to calls, just that they may respond differently.

**Crime Fighting versus Service and Problem Solving**

Police departments are often divided on whether their emphasis should be proactive or reactive. Every department will have officers who are incident oriented (reactive) and believe their mission is to do 911 policing. As noted, they are incident driven—reactive—and may speak disparagingly of the community-policing officers as social workers.

Is the best police officer the one who catches the most “bad guys”? Certainly police departments will continue to apprehend the “bad guys.” The crimes they target may, however, contribute to negative police-community relations. The police usually focus on certain kinds of crime, particularly common crimes such as burglary, robbery, assault and auto theft. The police expect that offenders who commit these crimes might flee or try to avoid arrest in some other way. Police may need to use force to bring offenders to justice.

### Table 3.1 Comparison of Traditional Policing and Community Policing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Traditional Policing</th>
<th>Community Policing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who are the police?</td>
<td>A government agency principally responsible for law enforcement.</td>
<td>Police are the public and the public are the police; the police officers are those who are paid to give full-time attention to the duties of every citizen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship of the police force to public service departments?</td>
<td>Priorities often conflict.</td>
<td>The police are one department among many responsible for improving the quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of the police?</td>
<td>Focusing on solving crimes.</td>
<td>A broader problem-solving approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is police efficiency measured?</td>
<td>By detection and arrest rates.</td>
<td>By the absence of crime and disorder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the highest priorities?</td>
<td>Crimes that are high value (e.g., bank robberies) and those involving violence.</td>
<td>Whatever problems disturb the community most.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What determines the effectiveness of police?</td>
<td>Response times.</td>
<td>Public cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What view do police take of service calls?</td>
<td>Deal with them only if there is no real police work to do.</td>
<td>Vital function and great opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is police professionalism?</td>
<td>Swift, effective response to serious crime.</td>
<td>Keeping close to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of intelligence is most important?</td>
<td>Crime intelligence (study of particular crimes or series of crimes).</td>
<td>Criminal intelligence (information about the activities of individuals or groups).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the essential nature of police accountability?</td>
<td>Highly centralized; governed by rules, regulations and policy directives; accountable to the law.</td>
<td>Emphasis on local accountability to community needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of headquarters?</td>
<td>To provide the necessary rules and policy directives.</td>
<td>To preach organizational values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of the press liaison department?</td>
<td>To keep the “heat” off operational officers so they can get on with the job.</td>
<td>To coordinate an essential channel of communication with the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do the police regard prosecutions?</td>
<td>As an important goal.</td>
<td>As one tool among many.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Klockars (1985, p.57) notes, since the police officers’ domain is the streets, “Those people who spend their time on the street will receive a disproportionate amount of police attention. . . particularly people who are too poor to have backyards, country clubs, summer homes, automobiles, air conditioning, or other advantages that are likely to take them out of the patrolman’s sight.”

These facts contribute to the impression that the police are focused solely on the kind of crime poor people and minorities commit—hence the impression that they are hostile to those who are poor or members of minority groups. This negative impression does little to foster good community relations.

Police work involves much more than catching criminals. It is a complex, demanding job requiring a wide range of abilities. Studies suggest that 80 percent of police officers’ time is spent on nonenforcement activities. The vast majority of the problems police attend to are in response to citizen requests for service.

The majority of police actions have nothing to do with criminal law enforcement but involve service to the community.

A key strategy of community policing is linking policing to the delivery of city services. Community service translates into customer service. If policing is viewed as a business, its product is service, and its customers are the citizens, businesses, organizations and agencies within its jurisdiction.

Taking a page from the business world, “customer oriented” means providing the best service possible; being courteous, honest, open and fair; treating each person as an individual, not as an inconvenience; listening and being responsive to what each person wants; keeping promises; knowing who to refer people to; and thanking people when they are helpful. Police officers should be “consumer friendly” as they serve and protect.

Police departments may provide a wide variety of services, including giving information, directions and advice; counseling and referring; licensing and registering services such as giving information, working with neglected and abused children, and providing community education programs on crime prevention, drug abuse, safety and the like. Here, an Austin, Texas, police officer distributes anti-drug literature to kids.
vehicles; intervening in domestic arguments; working with neglected and abused children; rendering emergency medical or rescue services; dealing with alcoholics and the mentally ill; finding lost children; dealing with stray animals; controlling crowds; and providing community education programs on crime prevention, drug abuse, safety and the like.

Community-policing officers are frequently advised to treat citizens as customers because these officers have both protector and servant roles.

**Responsibility for Crime**

One distinguishing element of community policing is its emphasis on partnerships. As Stephens (2003, p.42) contends: “The police cannot succeed in their efforts without an effective partnership with the communities they serve. Indeed, the community itself is in the best position to control both crime and fear.” Partnerships are discussed later in the chapter. Consider first the importance of the community as a whole.

**The Importance of Community**

Community has many definitions. It has been defined as a group of people living in an area under the same government. It can refer to a social group or class having common interests. Community may even refer to society as a whole—the public. This text uses a specific, admittedly simplistic, meaning for community. Community refers to the specific geographic area served by a police department or law enforcement agency and the individuals, organizations and agencies within that area.

Police officers must understand and be a part of this defined community if they are to fulfill their mission. The community may cover a very small area with a limited number of citizens, organizations and agencies, perhaps policed by a single officer. Or the community may cover a vast area and have thousands of individuals and hundreds of organizations and agencies and be policed by several hundred officers. And while police jurisdiction and delivery of services are based on geographic boundaries, a community is much more than a group of neighborhoods administered by a local government. The schools, businesses, public and private agencies, churches and social groups are vital community elements. Also of importance are the individual values, concerns and cultural principles of the people living and working in the community and the common interests they share with neighbors.

Community also refers to a feeling of belonging—a sense of integration, shared values and “we-ness.” Where integrated communities exist, people share a sense of ownership and pride in their environment. They also have a sense of what is acceptable behavior, which makes policing in such a community much easier. Research strongly suggests that a sense of community is the “glue” that binds communities to maintain order and provides the foundation for effective community action. Bucqueroux (2004, p.81) notes that a sense of community can be developed by providing people a chance to create something new, to relate with one another and to donate to something bigger than themselves. Whether this sense of community can be developed often depends on the community’s demographics.

**Community Demographics**

Demographics refer to the characteristics of the individuals who live in a community.
Demographics include a population’s size; distribution; growth; density; employment rate; ethnic makeup; and vital statistics such as average age, education and income.

Although people generally assume that the smaller the population of a community, the easier policing becomes, this is not necessarily true. Small communities generally have fewer resources. It is also difficult to be the sole law enforcement person and therefore being, in effect, on call 24 hours a day. A major advantage of a smaller community is that people know each other. A sense of community is likely to be greater in such communities than in large cities such as Chicago or New York.

When assessing law enforcement’s ability to police an area, density of population is an important variable. Studies have shown that as population becomes denser, people become more aggressive. In densely populated areas, people become more territorial and argue more frequently about “turf.” Rapid population growth can invigorate a community, or it can drain its limited resources.

The community’s vital statistics are extremely important from a police-community partnership perspective. What is the average age of individuals within the community? Are there more young or elderly individuals? How many single-parent families are there? What is the divorce rate? What is the common level of education? What is the school dropout rate? Are there gangs operating in the community? How does the education of those in law enforcement compare? What is the percentage of latchkey children? Such children may pose a significant challenge for police.

Income and income distribution are also important. Do great disparities exist? Would the community be described as affluent, moderately well-off or poor? How does the income of those in law enforcement compare? Closely related to income is the level of employment. What is the ratio of blue-collar to professional workers? How much unemployment exists? How do those who are unemployed support themselves and their families? Are they on welfare? Do they commit crimes to survive? Are they homeless?

The ethnic makeup of the community is another consideration. Is the community basically homogeneous? A homogeneous community is one in which people are all of a similar ethnicity. A heterogeneous community, in contrast, is one in which individuals are of different ethnicities. Establishing and maintaining good relations among the various subgroups making up the community is a challenge. Usually one ethnic subgroup will have the most power and control. Consider the consequences if a majority of police officers are also members of this ethnic subgroup.

A Rapidly Changing Population Communities have been undergoing tremendous changes in the past half century. In 1950 the white population made up 87 percent of the population. The white population declined from 80 percent in 1980 to 69 percent in 2000.

The greatest growth has been in the Hispanic population, growing from 6 percent in 1980 to double that in 2000. The black population grew by 1 percent.

In addition to a change in ethnic makeup, the United States is also experiencing a widening of the gap between those with wealth and those living in poverty. The middle class is shrinking, and the gap between the “haves” and the “have nots” is widening, resulting in a bifurcated society.
The following trends in the United States are likely to continue: The minority population will increase, and white dominance will end; the number of legal and illegal immigrants will increase; and the elderly population will increase.

**Organizations and Institutions**

In addition to understanding the demographics of the community and being able to relate to a great variety of individuals, community policing officers must also be familiar with the various organizations and institutions within the community and establish effective relationships with them. A strong network of community organizations and institutions fosters cohesiveness and shared intolerance of criminal behavior and encourages citizens to cooperate in controlling crime, thereby increasing the likelihood that illegal acts will be detected and reported. These networks and partnerships are essential, for no single organization or group is able to address all the problems and concerns of a community alone. And all the organizations and groups working beyond their individual capacity are unable to do more than apply localized, specific band-aid solutions to the total community problems.

Organizations and institutions play a key role in enhancing community safety and quality of life.

Operating within each community is a power structure that can enhance or endanger police–community relations. The formal power structure includes those with wealth and political influence: federal, state and local agencies and governments; commissions; regulatory agencies; and power groups. The informal power structure includes religious groups, wealthy subgroups, ethnic groups, political groups and public-interest groups.

Organizations and institutions police officers should interact effectively with include the Department of Human Services, health care providers, emergency services providers and any agencies working with youths. Communities may also have libraries, museums and zoos that would welcome a good relationship with the police. Such cooperation often poses problems, however, as Wilson and Kelling (1989, p.52) note:

The problem of interagency cooperation may, in the long run, be the most difficult of all. The police can bring problems to the attention of other city agencies, but the system is not always organized to respond. In his book Neighborhood Services, John Mudd calls it the “rat problem”: “If a rat is found in an apartment, it is a housing inspection responsibility; if it runs into a restaurant, the health department has jurisdiction; if it goes outside and dies in an alley, public works takes over.” A police officer who takes public complaints about rats seriously will go crazy trying to figure out what agency in the city has responsibility for rat control and then inducing it to kill the rats.

In other words, if responsibility is fragmented, little gets accomplished. This is a part of the concept of social capital.

**Social Capital**

Communities might also be looked at in terms of their social capital, which Coleman (1990, p.302), who developed this concept, defined as: "A variety of different
entities having two characteristics in common: They all consist of some aspect of a social structure, and they facilitate certain actions of individuals who are within the structure.” Coleman saw the two most important elements in social capital as being (1) trustworthiness, that is, citizens’ trust of each other and their public institutions and (2) obligations, that is, expectation that service to each other will be reciprocated.

Social capital exists at two levels: local and public. Local social capital is the bond among family members and their immediate, informal groups. Public social capital refers to the networks tying individuals to broader community institutions such as schools, civic organizations, churches and the like, as well as to networks linking individuals to various levels of government—including the police.

**Community Factors Affecting Social Capital** If citizens perceive low levels of physical disorder, they will feel safer. If citizens feel safe and trust one another, social capital is heightened. The higher levels of public social capital, the higher the levels of collective action will be. It is likely that adequate levels of social capital are required for community policing to work. Unfortunately, the communities that most need community policing are often the ones with the lowest levels of social capital.

Sociologists have been describing for decades either the loss or the breakdown of “community” in modern, technological, industrial, urban societies such as ours. Proponents of community policing in some areas may be missing a major sociological reality—the absence of “community”—in the midst of all the optimism about police playing a greater role in encouraging it.

**Lack of Community**

Community implies a group of people with a common history and understandings, a sense of themselves as “us” and outsiders as “them.” In reality, many communities lack this “we-ness.” In such areas, the police and public have a “them-versus-us” relationship. Areas requiring the most police attention are usually those with the least shared values and limited sense of community. When citizens cannot maintain social control, the result is social disorganization.

All entities within a community—individuals as well as organizations and agencies—must work together to keep that community healthy. Such partnerships are vital, for a community cannot be healthy if unemployment and poverty are widespread; people are hungry; health care is inadequate; prejudice separates people; preschool children lack proper care and nutrition; senior citizens are allowed to atrophy; schools remain isolated and remote; social services are fragmented and disproportionate; and government lacks responsibility and accountability.

**Broken Windows** In unhealthy communities, disorder and crime may flourish. In a classic article, “Broken Windows,” Wilson and Kelling (1982, p.31) contend:

Social psychologists and police officers tend to agree that if a window in a building is broken and is left unrepaired, all the rest of the windows will soon be broken. This is as true in nice neighborhoods as in run-down ones. Window-breaking does not necessarily occur on a large scale because some areas are inhabited by determined window-breakers whereas others are populated by window-lovers; rather, one unrepaired broken window is a signal that no one cares, and so breaking more windows costs nothing. (It has always been fun.)
The broken-window phenomenon suggests that if it appears “no one cares,” disorder and crime will thrive.

Broken windows and smashed cars are very visible signs of people not caring about their community. Other more subtle signs include unmowed lawns, piles of accumulated trash, litter, graffiti, abandoned buildings, rowdiness, drunkenness, fighting and prostitution, often referred to as incivilities. Incivilities and social disorder occur when social control mechanisms have eroded. Increases in incivilities may increase the fear of crime and reduce citizens’ sense of safety. They may physically or psychologically withdraw, isolating themselves from their neighbors. Or increased incivilities and disorder may bring people together to “take back the neighborhood.”

One way to promote community policing is by involving citizens and educating them about what police do.

Involving and Educating Citizens

O. W. Wilson wrote in Police Administration (1950, p.420): “The active interest and participation of individual citizens and groups is so vital to the success of most police programs that the police should deliberately seek to arouse, promote and maintain an active public concern in their affairs.”

Community members often have great interest in their local police departments and have been involved in a variety of ways for many years. This involvement, while it accomplishes important contacts, should not be mistaken for community policing. It usually does not involve the partnerships and problem solving activities of community policing.

Citizen involvement in the law enforcement community and in understanding policing has taken the form of civilian review boards, citizen patrols, citizen police academies, ride-alongs and similar programs.

Civilian Review Boards

The movement for citizen review has been a major political struggle for more than 40 years and remains one of the most controversial issues in police work today. As Farrow (2003, p.22) explains: “Basically, the concept is defined as a procedure under which law enforcement conduct is reviewed at some point by persons who are not sworn officers.” He (p.24) reports that three fourths of the largest cities in the United States have established some form of citizen review.

Supporters of civilian review boards believe it is impossible for the police to objectively review actions of their colleagues and emphasize that the police culture demands police officers support each other, even if they know something illegal has occurred. Opponents of civilian review boards stress that civilians cannot possibly understand the complexities of the policing profession and that it is demeaning to be reviewed by an external source.

Successful resolution of this issue requires that the concerns of both the community and the police be addressed. The desired outcome would be that the police maintain the ability to perform their duties without the fear that they will be second-guessed, disciplined or sued by those who do not understand the difficulties of their job. Farrow (p.26) suggests that no perfect review system exists, so jurisdictions should pick and choose from among a wide range of alternatives to design their own review system.
Citizen Patrols

Community policing is rooted in law enforcement’s dependence on the public’s eyes, ears, information and influence to exert social control.

Citizen patrols are not new. The sheriffs’ posses that handled law enforcement in America’s Wild West have evolved to present-day citizen patrols, reserve police programs and neighborhood watch groups. Many of the citizen patrols established throughout the country focus on the drug problem. Some citizen groups have exchange programs to reduce the chance of retribution by local drug retailers. Such exchange programs provide nearby neighborhoods with additional patrols while reducing the danger. Local dealers were less likely to recognize a vigilkeeper who lived in another neighborhood.

Citizen Police Academies

Another type of community involvement is through citizens’ police academies designed to familiarize citizens with law enforcement and to keep the department in touch with the community.

The first recorded U.S. citizen police academy (CPA) began in 1985 in Orlando, Florida. This program was modeled after a citizen police academy in England, which began in 1977.

Weiss and Davis (2004, p.60) describe current police academies as a series of classes where the general public can learn more about its local police department and how it operates. The goals are fairly universal: to give citizens a better understanding and appreciation of police work through education, to encourage greater cooperation between residents and the police and to acquaint citizens with law enforcement’s role in the criminal justice system. They (p.62) cite as favorite classes the K-9 and SWAT demonstrations, the hands-on discussion of the weapons of the Emergency Response team, the FATS Demonstration (Firearms Training System—a video-operated shoot/don’t shoot scenario that puts them in the shoes of an officer) and the uniform demonstration.

Rahtz (2005, p.51) states: “Properly structured and targeted programs can become a powerful teaching tool increasing community understanding of force issues and helping to bridge the racial divide between police and minority citizens. The time and effort spent in a well-designed CPA may be one of the best investments police leaders may make.”

Citizen police academies are not without limitations. First, even if attendees sign hold-harmless waivers, the agency may still be sued if a participant is injured or killed while attending the academy. Second, officers and administrators may resist an academy, feeling law enforcement activities should not be open to the public. Third, an agency may feel its resources could be better used.

Ride-Along Programs

Ride-along programs are a popular, yet controversial, means to improve police-community relations and get citizens involved in the efforts of the department and its officers. These programs are designed to give local citizens a close-up look at the realities of policing and what police work entails while giving officers a chance to connect with citizens in a positive way.

Many ride-along programs permit any responsible juvenile or adult to participate, but other programs have restrictions and may limit ridership. Participation...
by officers in a ride-along program is usually voluntary. Whether riders are al-
lowed to use still or video cameras during a ride-along varies from department to
department. Many departments also require their riders to dress appropriately.

Despite the numerous benefits of ride-along programs, some departments do
not get involved for legitimate reasons such as insurance costs, liability and con-
cerns about the public's safety. Some departments ask participants to sign a waiver
exempting the officer, the department and the city from liability.

CAUTION: Citizen involvement in understanding and helping to police their
communities is very important, but it, in itself, is NOT community policy. At the
heart of the community policing philosophy is an emphasis on partnerships and
on problem solving.

The two critical key elements of community policing are partnerships and problem
solving.

**Partnerships**

Partnerships are a cornerstone of community policing. Sprafka (2004, p.25)
stresses that partnerships are essential to a community’s well-being. Officers and
their departments may team up with citizens, businesses, private policing enter-
prises and other law enforcement agencies to achieve their community policing
objectives.

Police/public partnerships exist on two levels. On a more passive level, the
community assumes a compliant role and shows support for law and order by
what they don’t do—they don’t interfere with routine police activities and they
don’t, themselves, engage in conduct that disrupts the public peace.

On an active level, citizens step beyond their daily law-abiding lives and get di-
rectly involved in projects, programs and other specific efforts to enhance their
community’s safety. Such participation may include neighborhood block watches,
citizen crime patrols and youth-oriented educational and recreational programs.
Citizens may respond independently or form groups, perhaps collaborating with
the local police department.

Traditional policing expected the community members to remain in the back-
ground. Crime and disorder were viewed as police matters, best left to profes-
ionals. That meant most citizen–police interactions were negative contacts. After
all, people do not call the police when things are going well. Their only opportu-
nity to interact with officers was either when they were victims of crime or were
involved in some other emergency situation or were the subject of some enforce-
ment action, such as receiving traffic tickets.

Some people wonder why the police would consult the public about setting
police priorities and why they would ask them to work with them to solve neigh-
borhood problems. Some feel that the police are paid to deal with crime and dis-
order and should not expect communities to take any responsibility or do their
job for them. Others feel that until something is done about the “whole laundry
list of community woes that social scientists tell us are the causes of crime
(poverty, teen pregnancy, racism, homelessness, single-parent families, lousy
schools, no jobs) the crime problem will never go away” (Rahtz, 2001, pp.35–36).

To this Rahtz says: “They are flat-out wrong. Beat cops, working with the peo-
ple in their neighborhoods, have proven that crime and community disorder can
be reduced without waiting for the underlying problems to be solved. I am not saying that poverty, teen pregnancy, etc., are not important issues and do not deserve attention. But if we, as police officers and citizens, sit back in the belief that we are impotent in the face of crime until the problems are solved, we are doing a grave disservice to ourselves and our neighborhoods.” Rahtz (p.35) calls partnerships “the glue of community policing.”

Partnerships are often referred to as collaboration. Rinehart et al. (2001, p.7) explain: “Collaboration occurs when a number of agencies and individuals make a commitment to work together and contribute resources to obtain a common, long-term goal.” When it works correctly, a successful problem-solving collaboration that results in a workable solution tends to be a positive experience for everyone involved.

Rinehart et al. (p.7) suggest: “Not all law enforcement relationships must be collaborative, nor should they strive to be. Under some circumstances it may be appropriate for law enforcement personnel just to establish a good communication plan. Under other circumstances cooperation between two individuals may be sufficient. Perhaps coordination between two agencies to avoid duplication of effort is all that is required. Collaboration is, however, critical for many community policing endeavors.” They (p.6) cite the following reasons for developing law enforcement/community partnerships:

- Accomplishing what individuals alone cannot
- Preventing duplicating of individual or organizational efforts
- Enhancing the power of advocacy and resource development for the initiative
- Creating more public recognition and visibility for the community policing initiative
- Providing a more systematic, comprehensive approach to addressing community or school-based crime and disorder problems
- Providing more opportunities for new community policing projects

To accomplish these results, several components of a partnership or collaboration are necessary.

The core components of effective community partnerships are:

- Stakeholders with a vested interest in the collaboration.
- Trusting relationships among and between the partners.
- A shared vision and common goals for the collaboration.
- Expertise.
- Teamwork strategies.
- Open communication.
- Motivated partners.
- Means to implement and sustain the collaborative effort.
- An action plan (Rinehart et al., p.6).

Figure 3.1 illustrates these core components.

**Partnerships with Local Businesses**

Grogan and Belsky (2004, pp.83–84) contend that for departments seeking meaningful, productive alliances with their communities, highly capable neighborhood
partners in the form of community development corporations (CDCs) are ready to transform philosophy into reality. They (p.85) suggest that enduring, stable partnerships between CDCs and the police are central to community policing. They (p.90) also report that most major cities now have “thriving networks of CDCs.”

The community benefits from partnerships by a commitment to crime prevention, public scrutiny of police operations, accountability to the public, customized police service and involvement of community organizations. The police benefit by greater citizen support and increased respect, shared responsibility and greater job satisfaction.

In addition to partnerships with a community’s citizenry and private sector businesses, police departments are increasingly partnering with the schools.

**School/Law Enforcement/Community Partnerships**

Deane et al. (2005, p.130) observe: “Safety in our nation’s schools is an issue of paramount importance. With school violence examples such as Columbine, more recently Red Lake High School in Minnesota and the tragedy in Beslan, Russia, cooperation between schools and law enforcement agencies are at an all time high.” One popular approach to enhancing school safety is to have a school resource officer (SRO) assigned to a school.
Section I: Management and Supervision: An Overview

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 defines a school resource officer as "a career law enforcement officer, with sworn authority, deployed in community-oriented policing, and assigned by the employing police department or agency to work in collaboration with school and community-based organizations." As public safety specialists, SROs contribute daily to the safety and security of the schools in which they work. Experience has taught that the presence of an SRO can deter illegal and disruptive behavior.

The COPS Office has awarded over $715 million to more than 2,600 law enforcement agencies to fund more than 6,000 school resource officers through their COPS in Schools (CIS) Program. In addition, COPS has dedicated approximately $21 million to training COPS-funded SROs and the school administrator in the partnering school(s) or school district(s) to work more collaboratively through the CIS Program (Cops in Schools, 2003, p.1). The differences between traditional policing in the schools and community policing in the schools is summarized in Table 3.2.

Other Key Partnerships/Collaborators

In addition to local businesses and schools, other key partnerships/collaborators include prosecutors, the courts, corrections, other government agencies, private security professionals and the media.

Prosecutors As community policing evolves, new collaborations continue to emerge. Just as the police are the gatekeepers to the criminal justice process, prosecutors are the gatekeepers to the judicial system. Without their assistance, cases seldom move forward. Including the prosecutor as a partner is one collaboration gaining popularity, and for good reason.

Community members' concerns are often not murder or robbery but the types of things that contribute to neighborhood decline and fear of crime; things like abandoned buildings, heavy neighborhood traffic or street drug dealing. These

---

**Table 3.2** Comparison between Traditional and Community Policing in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Policing in Schools</th>
<th>Community Policing in Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactive response to 911 calls</td>
<td>Law enforcement officer assigned to the school “community”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident driven</td>
<td>Problem oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum school–law enforcement interaction, often characterized by</td>
<td>Ongoing school–law enforcement partnership to address problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an “us vs. them” mentality</td>
<td>of concern to educators, students, and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police role limited to law enforcement</td>
<td>Police role extended beyond law enforcement to include prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and early intervention activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police viewed as source of the solution</td>
<td>Educators, students, and parents are active partners in developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators and law enforcement officers reluctant to share information</td>
<td>Partners value information sharing as an important problem-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>solving tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal incidents subject to inadequate response; criminal</td>
<td>Consistent responses to incidents is ensured—administrative and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequences imposed only when incidents reported to police</td>
<td>criminal, as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law enforcement presence viewed as taking a positive, proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>step to create orderly, safe, and secure schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement presence viewed as indicator failure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police effectiveness measured by arrest rates, response times,</td>
<td>Policing effectiveness measured by the absence of crime and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calls for service, etc.</td>
<td>disorder.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

neighborhood stability issues are frequently addressed by police, but prosecutors tend to see them as low priority or not important.

Goldkamp et al. (2003, p.xi) state: “Community prosecution strategies signal a major milestone in changing the culture and role of the prosecutor by developing partnerships and collaborative, problem-solving approaches with the community to improve the quality of life and safety of citizens.”

When prosecutors become involved as partners in community policing, they attend neighborhood meetings, ride with officers on their beats and get a completely different view of the kinds of things that devastate communities and that breed more crime and disorder. Community prosecution is gaining in popularity throughout the country. This trend can also be seen in the judicial system.

The Courts A recent alternative to the traditional courtroom is the community court. Most community courts are specialized, for example, domestic violence courts, gun courts, drug courts and youth courts. Such courts focus on identifying underlying causes of criminal behavior and treatment for the offenders. A discussion of such courts is beyond the scope of this text, but the community is usually frequently involved in the dispositions handed down. The third component of the criminal justice system, corrections, also is an often overlooked partner in the community policing effort.

Corrections As noted by Wrobleski and Hess (2006, p.445): “Community corrections includes any activities in the community aimed at helping offenders become law-abiding citizens and request a complicated interplay among judicial and correctional personnel from related public and private agencies, citizen volunteers and civic groups.”

One important partnership that has proven successful is that between a patrol officer and a probation officer in the same neighborhood. Probation officers who ride along with patrol officers can often spot probationees violating a condition of their probation, and the officer can make an immediate arrest. Or the probation officer can talk with the offending probationee, letting him or her know that the illegal activities will no longer go unnoticed.

Other Government Agencies Criminal justice agencies are not the only local government agencies responsible for responding to community problems. Partnering with other city and county departments and agencies is important to problem-solving success. Sometimes described as working in “silos,” local government agencies and departments have traditionally worked quite independently of each other. Under community policing, appropriate government departments and agencies are called on and recognized for their abilities to respond to and address crime and social disorder issues. Fire departments, building inspections, health departments, street departments, parks and recreation departments and child welfare frequently are appropriate and necessary stakeholders in problem-solving initiatives.

State and federal agencies may also be of assistance, including the FBI, the DEA, the U.S. Attorney in the region, the state’s attorney, the state criminal investigative agency, the state highway department, and so forth. Another important collaborator is private security providers.

Private Security Providers Interestingly, one of the private-sector businesses that public law enforcement has begun forging partnerships with is private security. In
years past, much competition and animosity existed between public and private police. Public law enforcement officers regarded private security personnel as police “wanna-be’s,” and those in the private sector considered public police officers trigger-happy, ego-inflated crime fighters who often held themselves to be above the law. Recently, however, these two groups have put aside their differences to focus on their common goal of ensuring public safety.

One such partnership is the Private Sector Liaison Committee (PSLC), founded by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) in 1986. The committee’s stated mission is to “develop and implement cooperative strategies for the enhancement of public law enforcement and private sector relationships in the interest of the public good.”

Studies on private security force staffing indicate there may be as many as 10,000 private security agencies employing slightly less than 2 million private security officers in the United States. Clearly, if these numbers are accurate, then private security officers are a vast potential resource that can assist law enforcement agencies in fulfilling their mission.

**Partnerships with the Media**

The media can be a powerful ally or a formidable opponent in implementing the community policing philosophy. Positive publicity can enhance both the image and the efforts of a department. Conversely, negative publicity can be extremely damaging. Therefore, police agencies can and should make every effort to build positive working partnerships with the media. The police and members of the media share the common goal of serving the public. They also have a symbiotic relationship in that they are mutually dependent on each other.

Rosenthal (2003, p.3) suggests that the media can be law enforcement’s “single biggest force multiplier, and a genuine asset in time of need.” Says Rosenthal: “Cops can truly win with the media if they only had the will to win and a little training on how to make that happen.”

However, conflict often exists. While such conflict may arise from a variety of sources, perhaps the most basic are competing objectives and contradictory approaches to dangerous situations. A fundamental source of conflict is the competing objectives of the press and the police. The First Amendment guarantee of freedom of the press is often incompatible with the Sixth Amendment guarantee of the right to a fair trial and protection of the defendant’s rights. This leads to a basic conflict between the public’s right to know and the individual’s right to privacy and a fair trial. Police may need to withhold information from the media until next of kin are notified, in the interest of public safety or to protect the integrity of an investigation.

Another source of conflict between law enforcement and the media is the danger members of the media may expose themselves to in getting a story and the police’s obligation to protect them. While most reporters and photographers will not cross yellow police tape lines, many are willing to risk a degree of personal safety to get close to the action.

Having looked at the first of the essential components of community policing—partnerships—consider next the other essential component—problem solving.
Community Policing and Problem Solving

Problem-oriented policing and community-oriented policing are sometimes equated. In fact, however, problem solving is an essential component of community policing. Its focus is on determining the underlying causes of problems, including crime, and identifying solutions.

Community policing or variations of it that rely on problem solving are known by several names: Community Oriented Policing and Problem Solving (COPPS), Neighborhood Oriented Policing (NOP), Problem Oriented Policing (POP), Community Based Policing and the like. Eck and Spelman’s classic, Problem-Solving: Problem Oriented Policing in Newport News (1987) defines problem-oriented policing as “a departmental-wide strategy aimed at solving persistent community problems. Police identify, analyze and respond to the underlying circumstances that create incidents.” Regardless of differences in name, all of these use a problem-solving approach to crime and disorder. Throughout this text references to community policing infer that problem solving is involved.

Many practitioners equate community policing and problem solving. As Wilson and Kelling (1989, p.49) note: “Community-oriented policing means changing the daily work of the police to include investigating problems as well as incidents. It means defining as a problem whatever a significant body of public opinion regards as a threat to community order. It means working with the good guys, and not just against the bad guys.” Wilson and Kelling suggest that community policing requires the police mission to be redefined “to help the police become accustomed to fixing broken windows as well as arresting window-breakers.”

Goldstein (1990, p.20), who is credited with originating problem-oriented policing (POP) and coined the term, was among the first to criticize the professional model of policing as being incident driven: “In the vast majority of police departments, the telephone, more than any policy decision by the community or by management, continues to dictate how police resources will be used.” The primary work unit in the professional model is the incident, that is, an isolated event that requires a police response. The institution of 911 has greatly increased the demand for police services and the public’s expectation that the police will respond quickly.

Goldstein (p.33) also asserts: “Most policing is limited to ameliorating the overt, offensive symptoms of a problem.” He suggests that police are more productive if they respond to incidents as symptoms of underlying community problems. He (p. 66) defines a problem as “a cluster of similar, related, or recurring incidents rather than a single incident, a substantive community concern, and a unit of police business.” Once the problems in a community are identified, police efforts can focus on addressing the possible causes of such problems.

Problem solving requires police to group incidents and, thereby, identify underlying causes of problems in the community.

Although problem solving may be the ideal, law enforcement cannot ignore specific incidents. When calls come in, most police departments respond as soon as possible. Problem solving has a dual focus. First, it requires that incidents be linked to problems. Second, time devoted to “preventive” patrol must be spent proactively, determining community problems and their underlying causes.
Eck and Spelman (p.2) explain that problem-oriented policing is the result of 20 years of research into police operations converging on three main themes:

1. **Increased effectiveness** by attacking underlying problems that give rise to incidents that consume patrol and detective time.
2. **Reliance on the expertise and creativity of line officers** to study problems carefully and develop innovative solutions.
3. **Closer involvement with the public** to make sure that the police are addressing the needs of citizens.

Specific skills needed for effective problem solving are discussed in Chapter 5.

**Implementing Community Policing**

Rosenthal et al. (2003) report on a National Institute of Justice survey that listed a number of lessons learned while implementing community policing. The most frequently mentioned lesson is that it takes time to prepare for adopting community policing as well as time to implement it. Respondents recommend that community policing be adopted agency-wide rather than by special units only. These same recommendations are made by Aragon (2004, pp.67–68), who says that community policing should be implemented incrementally and slowly and that it should evolve into a department-wide and city-wide approach, with all officers being guided by the community policing philosophy.

**Factors Supporting Implementing Community Policing**

Aragon (p.67) describes the crime problem and why police are “behind the power curve.” Two thirds of crime occurs inside, out of view of the police. Most serious crimes are perpetrated in a short time; for example, the average armed robbery takes about 90 seconds. Patrol officers intercept fewer than 1 percent of street crimes, and fewer than 4 percent of offenders are caught when police are notified of an on-going criminal activity. In addition, 6 percent of criminals commit 70 percent of all crime; the same 10 percent of locations within a jurisdiction generate about 65 percent of that jurisdiction’s total calls for service.

Aragon concludes that law enforcement must work on preventing crime, stating: “Less successful agencies shoot where the target was. Average agencies shoot where the target is at now. Successful agencies shoot where the target is going.”

**Required Changes**

In addition to focusing on community engagement, partnerships and problem solving, implementing community policing will require a change in management/leadership style and departmental organization.

The focus on community engagement, partnerships and problem solving has been described. The other two basic changes, change in management/leadership style and in departmental organization, were introduced in Chapters 1 and 2 and are briefly reviewed here.

**Changes in Management/Leadership Style** Community policing usually requires a different management style. The traditional autocratic style effective during the industrial age will not have the same effect in the twenty-first century. One
viable alternative to the autocratic style of management is participatory leadership, introduced in Chapter 2. A roadmap for making the change to community policing and the leadership qualities required is provided in Table 3.3.

**Organizational Changes** He et al. (2005, p.295) report: “Community-oriented policing has become a dominant force impelling organizational change in U.S. policing since the early 1980s.” Changes in the organization usually include the following:

- The bureaucracy is flattened and decentralized.
- Roles of those in management positions take on the additional roles of leaders and mentors.
- Patrol officers are given new responsibilities and empowered to make decisions and problem solve with their community partners.
- Permanent shifts and areas are assigned.
- Despecialization reduces the number of specialized units, channeling more resources toward the direct delivery of police services to the public.
- Teams improve efficiency and effectiveness by pooling officer resources in groups.
- Civilianization replaces sworn personnel with nonsworn personnel to maximize cost effectiveness; sworn personnel are then reassigned to where they are most needed.

In addition to these organizational changes, the needs of the community must be assessed.

**Analyzing the Community**

At the heart of the community policing philosophy is the recognition that the police can no longer go it alone—if they ever could. They must use the eyes, ears and voices of law-abiding citizens. A starting point is to analyze the community’s demographics as described earlier in the chapter. How much social capital is available for community policing efforts?

Police must develop a comprehensive picture of their community. They can do this by surveys and direct interaction with citizens. How community members respond when asked what problems they think the police should focus on and what solutions they would suggest can help the department meet the community’s needs. Surveys ask for input from everyone instead of just the few citizens who are the most involved. A survey sends a message to community stakeholders that their opinions matter.

Weiss and Davis (2005, p.46) suggest that a survey can act as a citizen’s report card, giving the public a chance to accurately acknowledge the value of the police department. Police managers can use survey responses to set departmental goals and objectives, guiding the agency to return maximum value to the citizens who invest in them.

While conducting needs assessments, attention should be paid to who might be community leaders to enlist in the community policing initiative. The number of citizens actively engaged in community policing activities may not be as important as the character of those participating. A given number of individuals with high levels of participation may be more effective in problem solving than many people with low levels of participation. In physics, the smallest amount of a fissionable material that will sustain a nuclear chain reaction is called a critical mass.
### Table 3.3 Community Policing: A Road Map for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Monitoring and Revision</th>
<th>Institutionalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roles and Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Action Items/ Benchmark Recommendations</td>
<td>New Knowledge and Implementation</td>
<td>Movement and Impact Data</td>
<td>Examples of Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Baltimore, MD</strong>—Over the past decade, the agency has evolved from specialized community policing units with a rather narrow focus to a department-wide community policing mandate. Every facet of the agency is geared toward meeting the goals of community policing. Relationships throughout the department have been restructured to allow information, guidance, and authority to flow through the organization without supervisory barriers or traditional “chain-of-command” restraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Rapids, MI</strong>—One centralized agency is in the process of moving into five district areas. Officers are responsible for a geographical area within their district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lansing, MI</strong>—Decentralized the department in top problem solving areas and made officers accountable for a specific area. Two new precincts were created to decentralize services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>St. Petersburg, FL</strong>—The city was divided into geographic regions and all employees are accountable for activities in the area to which they are assigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sagamore Hills, OH</strong>—An agency serving a rural community initiated their change to community policing by surveying residents. Based on survey, strategies for decreasing residents’ fear of crime were developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Organizational Accountability to Community</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expand measures beyond crime statistics and response times to include citizen perceptions of safety and security (quality of life).</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Send customer satisfaction survey following interaction with department to obtain feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review other best practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Survey citizen perceptions of safety and quality of life in neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Develop systems for community input, suggestions, and feedback (e.g., toll-free line, Web page, surveys, suggestion box)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the context of community policing efforts, a **critical mass** is the smallest number of citizens/organizations needed to support and sustain the community policing initiative.

It may be more important for COP-oriented police agencies to target this “critical mass” of individuals than to try to mobilize the community at large.

Once the needs assessment has been conducted, the next step is to develop a blueprint— that is, to do some strategic planning.

**Strategic Planning**

Recall that strategic planning is long-term, large-scale, future-oriented planning. It begins with the vision and mission statement already discussed. It is grounded in those statements and guided by the findings of the needs assessment. From here, specific goals and objectives and an accompanying implementation strategy and timeline are developed. What looks like a straightforward process can turn extremely difficult as dilemmas arise and threaten the plan.

Departments don’t successfully implement community policing in a year or two. It takes time—years for most departments—to fully implement it. Again, all interested parties should be allowed input into the strategic plan, and it should be realistic.

In addition to having a realistic timeline, the strategic plan must also be tied to the agency’s budget. Without the resources to implement the activities outlined in the long-range plan, they are not likely to be accomplished. Again, the transition will take time and, in some instances, additional resources. The Community Policing Consortium cautions:

Don’t get lost in the process. . . . The plan can become an end in itself. The project manager, the planning group, draft papers, lengthy dialogue, revised drafts, additional papers, circulated memoranda, further discussion, establishing working groups or sub-committees—this is the stuff that bureaucracies are made of. Some people actually enjoy it. The strategic plan and the planning process are only a means to an end—delivering the future organization built on core values, agreed goals and an effective implementation process.

The strategic plan lays the foundation for the strategies that are to be used in implementing the community policing philosophy.

**Developing Strategies** Hundreds of strategies have been developed to implement community policing. Among the most common are use of foot, bike and horse patrol; block watches; newsletters; community surveys; citizen volunteer programs; storefronts; special task units; and educational programs. Another common strategy is to assign officers to permanent beats and teach them community organizing and problem-solving skills. Some communities help train landlords in how to keep their properties crime free. Many communities encourage the development of neighborhood organizations, and some have formed teams (partnerships); for example, code and safety violations might be corrected by a team consisting of police, code enforcers, fire officials and building code officers. Other communities have turned to the Internet to connect with their citizens.
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Cordner (2004, p.61) provides the following snapshot of the most frequently used community policing strategies, used by at least 75 percent of the responding agencies:

- **Citizens** attend police-community meetings, participate in neighborhood watch, help police identify and resolve problems, serve as volunteers within the police agency, and attend citizen police-academies.
- **Police** hold regularly scheduled meetings with community groups, have interagency involvement in problem solving, have youth programs, have victim assistance programs, use regulatory codes in problem solving, and work with building code enforcement.
- **Agencies** use fixed assignments to specific beats or areas, give special recognition for good community policing work by employees, classify and prioritize calls, do geographically based crime analysis, and use permanent neighborhood-based offices or stations.

The most important consideration in selecting strategies to implement community policing is to ensure that the strategies fit a community’s unique needs and resources. Wycoff (2004, p.20) contends that strategies or programs that are “best for a particular community” have three common characteristics. They will be (1) responsive to community needs; (2) capable of implementation with available (or accessible) resources; and (3) supported by citizens, police and other partnering agencies. Implementing community policing also affects hiring and promoting policies of a department.

Training The Community Policing Consortium recommends that departments embark on a training program for all personnel at all levels to explain the change process and reduce fear and resistance. Training should also explore the community policing philosophy and the planning process and encourage all stakeholders
to participate. The consortium advises, however, “DON’T make training the spearhead of change.”

The consortium says that many efforts have been made to place training at the leading edge of change in both the public and private sector. Much time and energy are expended in such efforts, but, no matter how effective the training, they will be neutralized if what is learned is at variance with practices and procedures occurring in the department. The consortium stresses: “Unless the culture, structure and management of the organization are in harmony with the training, then the impact of the latter will be minimized. . . . What is needed is the agreed vision, values, goals, and objectives to drive the organization and affect every aspect of policing—not expecting a training program to be a short cut to acceptance.” Training is discussed in Chapter 7.

It should be clear from the preceding discussions that community policing is labor intensive. Without time to participate in community policing strategies and problem-solving endeavors, implementation is unlikely to succeed.

### Making Time for Partnering and Problem Solving: Call Management

In most departments, calls for service determine what police officers do from minute to minute on a shift. People call the police to report crime, ask for assistance, ask questions, get advice and many other often unrelated requests. Police departments try to respond as quickly as possible, and must have a policy of sending an officer whenever it is requested. Departments might free up time for partnerships without expense through effective call management or call reduction.

In call management or call reduction, departments look at which calls for service must have an officer(s) respond and, regardless of past practice, which do not. In call management calls are prioritized based on the department's judgment about the emergency nature of the call (e.g., imminent harm to a person or a crime in progress), response time, need for back up and other local factors. Priority schemes vary across the country, but many have four or five levels. Table 3.4 presents a typical call priority scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>Immediate; lights and siren; exceed speed limit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Immediate; lights and siren; maintain speed limit</td>
<td>2, if requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>Delay up to one hour; routine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TRU</td>
<td>Delay up to two hours</td>
<td>TRU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


McEwen et al. (2003, p.50) stress: “In a police organization committed to community policing, the community should play a role in setting and reviewing
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Police call priorities and response policies. The community has a vested interest in how quickly officers are dispatched, the extent to which police expedite through neighborhoods, the extent to which multiple units are dispatched or stay at the scene, whether calls are handled by alternative means and related issues.

Call management usually involves call stacking, a process a computer-aided dispatch system performs in which nonemergency, lower priority calls are ranked and held or "stacked" so the higher priorities are continually dispatched first. According to McEwen et al. (p.35): “The objective of call stacking is to reduce cross-beat dispatches and allow the unit in the area of responsibility to handle as many calls in that area as possible. This has significant advantages for community policing, which in the majority of departments involves assigning patrol officers to specific geographic areas such as beats or neighborhoods. As officers spend more time in their beats, they gain opportunities to become familiar with conditions, problems and resources in those areas. Cross-beat dispatches reduce those opportunities by taking officers out of their assigned areas, as well as adding to the time required to respond to calls." Using an officer to take telephone reports of nonemergency, low priority calls is one change that has helped.

Similar results can be obtained by taking reports by appointment. Many people find this agreeable. Certain kinds of reports can be made on an agency’s Web page, by mail or by fax. Figure 3.2 illustrates the type of intake and response common in call management. Call management may also involve having civilians handle certain calls such as calls not involving dangerous situations, suspects, or follow-up; traffic accidents (no injury), traffic control,
parking issues, and abandoned vehicles; vehicle lockouts; building checks; burglary, theft and lost and found property; vandalism and criminal mischief; runaways; paperwork relays and services, subpoena service and funeral escorts; animal complaints; bicycle stops; and part patrol (McEwen et al., p.39). However, police unions may take issue with such an approach unless reserve officers are used.

Call management may also involve dealing with the 911 system. The 911 system was set up for emergency calls for assistance. But, as noted by McEwen et al. (p.7): “In one sense, 911 became too successful. It resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of non-emergency calls coming in to the police.” Large numbers of callers use 911 to ask for information or to report nonemergency situations. Most agencies field hundreds or even thousands of phone calls a year from citizens seeking information, often unrelated to police services. Keeping the public informed in other ways such as on a Web site or through newspapers and newsletters with information about city policies, services, procedures and when and when not to call police can reduce the volume of calls.

People call the police for nonpolice matters for a variety of reasons, including because they don’t know who can help; because they believe the police know or should know the answers to all questions; because they know the phone number (911); and because, no matter what day of week or time of day it is, they know the phones will be answered. Large cities have begun to implement 311 lines to divert nonemergency calls from 911.

Police nonemergency lines are nothing new, but since the advent of 911, most callers use it for all calls to the police because they don’t have to look up a nonemergency phone number. The hope is with an easy-to-remember number for nonemergency matters, people will reserve 911 for emergencies.

The 311 number also has the potential to benefit community policing in other ways. For example, it can alert other agencies to citizen problems for which they, rather than the police, have mandates to assume primary responsibility. It can also improve accountability for follow-up by providing callers with a “tracking number” so they can check on the status of their service request. It might also coordinate city services.

Managers/leaders should be aware of other challenges facing implementing community policing as well.

**Challenges to Community Policing**

Despite the many advantages and benefits of community policing, its implementation is not without challenges. Critics and skeptics exist both internally, among officers and police managers, and externally, in the community at large. Furthermore, even when the community policing philosophy has the support of the department and the public, our increasingly diverse population presents an ever-expanding challenge to community policing efforts.

Many officers have difficulty accepting or appreciating the community-oriented policing philosophy. Some wonder whether officers will or should readily accept the increased accountability that accompanies greater decision-making responsibilities. Others question the willingness of police administrators to embrace decentralization, to “loosen the reins” and empower officers with greater authority, responsibility and decision-making capabilities. These organizational impediments are some of the chief barriers to implementation.
Other challenges to implementation include community resistance, a concern that community policing is "soft" on crime and structural impediments involved with making the change from a reactive to a proactive policing mission. The impediment of limited resources is also a reality: how to simultaneously respond to calls for service, solve crimes and conduct activities involved with community policing. Another large obstacle is the difficulty of changing the police culture. Hill (2005, p.46) cautions: "Community policing isn’t static, it’s an ongoing process. The work of building a community police culture doesn’t end and requires continual rededication."

The perception that community policing goes against aggressive law enforcement practices is perhaps one of the most difficult impediments to overcome. No agency wishes to be perceived as “softies,” and no community wants to place crime control and safety in the hands of “pushovers.” However, the goals of community policing and aggressive enforcement are not mutually exclusive. The combination of these two elements has been termed integrated patrol. As has been stressed, law enforcement agencies are expected to continue their efforts to combat crime but are also being asked to look at causes for problems existing within communities and address them as well. In doing so, many impediments must be faced.

Miller and Hess (2005, p.128) list the following impediments to COP:

- Organizational impediments—resistance from middle management, line officers and unions; confusion about what COP is; problems in line-level accountability; officers’ concern that COP is “soft” on crime; and lack of COP training
- Union impediments—resistance to change, fear of losing control to community, resistance to increased officer responsibility and accountability, fear that COP will lead to civilian review boards
- Community impediments—community resistance, community’s concern that COP is “soft” on crime, civil service rules, pressure to demonstrate COP reduces crime and lack of support from local government
- Transition impediments—balancing increased foot patrol activities while maintaining emergency response time

A Change in Core Functions?

Researchers Zhao et al. (2003) examined changes in law enforcement organizational priorities related to three core functions of policing—crime control, the maintenance of order and the provision of services—during the era of community policing. They analyzed the changes by using data from three national surveys of more than 200 municipal police departments conducted in 1993, 1996 and 2000. They found that police core-function priorities remained largely unchanged, but that the systematic implementation of COP programs reflects an all-out effort to address all three core functions at a higher level of achievement. They (p.716) conclude: “Our analysis showed that the extent of implementation of COP is a statistically significant predictor of all core functions of policing. On the basis of the analysis presented here, we argue that COP can be characterized as a comprehensive effort by local police simultaneously to control crime, to reduce social disorder and to provide services to the citizenry.” A basic difference, however, is that they no longer seek to do it alone, but rather through partnerships and problem solving.
In most departments implementing community policing, the core functions remain, with the difference being that police no longer seek to accomplish these functions alone.

**The Benefits of Implementing Community Policing**

Flynn (2004, p.25) states the benefits of community succinctly: “Community policing reduces crimes, helps minimize fear of crime and enhances the quality of life in communities nationwide.” An independent study by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that COPS grants have consistently contributed between 10 and 13 percent to the yearly reductions in violent crime at the height of their funding (“GAO Reports,” 2005, p.1). Fridell (2004b, p.45) looked at survey results conducted by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) in 1992, 1997 and 2002. In all three surveys more than 90 percent reported:

- Improved cooperation between citizens and police.
- Increased involvement of citizens.
- Increased information from citizens to police.
- Improved citizens’ attitudes toward police.
- Reduced citizens’ fear of crime.

Community policing may result in decreases in crime and fear of crime as well as citizen involvement in preventing crime.

To help overcome doubts and misperceptions about the strength and virtue of the community policing philosophy, it is valuable to note studies that demonstrate that community policing benefits not only the community, but the participating officers as well.

**Benefits of Community Policing to Officers**

Hanson (2004, p.155) references the PERF 2002 survey and notes that one effect of implementing community policing is officers’ increased job satisfaction. The data show that more than 80 percent of respondents reported that officers had increased job satisfaction to some extent; just over 10 percent reported a great increase in job satisfaction and only about 5 percent indicated no increase in officer job satisfaction.

Implementing community policing is likely to increase officers’ job satisfaction.

Officers engaging in community policing have job enrichment, get to know the citizens with whom they work, have greater responsibility and authority, and can build their problem-solving skills. Such benefits are vitally important for community policing officers faced with serving and protecting an increasingly diverse population.

**Beyond Community**

Although the focus in this chapter is on community efforts and partnerships, such efforts and partnerships can greatly benefit by going beyond community to partner with state and federal agencies. Delattre (2003, p.87) observes: “The question of effective partnerships has deserved our attention for at least half a century, and it demands our attention now.” As a member of the Long Island (New York) gang
task force put it: “We decide back and forth, whether it is the U.S. Attorney or the
district attorney’s office, what charges will get the bigger bang. We want to put the
bad people away in jail for a long time. So if they will get more time on the state
or the federal charges that’s the way it will go” (Domash, 2004, p.25).

Russell-Einhorn (2003) suggests that collaborations between federal and local
law enforcement agencies, rare until the 1980s, are now common, are generally
considered successful, and are likely to expand. For local police, collaboration
with federal agencies can provide greater access to national criminal information,
more powerful investigative techniques and tougher penalties under federal laws.
He (p.3) lists the following “powerful advantages” of prosecution under federal
criminal statutes:

- Federal grand jury. This jury can be called at any time, can be kept in action for
  as long as three years, can hear hearsay evidence and is armed with national
  subpoena power. State grand juries have a shorter duration, “no hearsay” rules
  and limited subpoena power.
- Immunity. Limited immunity for a grand jury witness conferred by federal
  prosecutors does not impede later prosecution of the witness for perjury, ob-
  struction of justice, or contempt.
- Search warrants. Federal standards for obtaining a search warrant are generally
  lower than those of most states.
- Preventive detention. The federal bail statute provides for preventive detention
  in a range of circumstances. State laws do not have such provisions.
- Electronic surveillance. Most states require a higher burden of proof for wire-
  taps than the federal government.
- Witness protection. In contrast to the well-developed Federal Witness Protec-
  tion Program, most states do not have such a program.
- Accomplice testimony. Federal rules permit conviction on the basis of an ac-
  complice’s uncorroborated testimony. State rules generally do not.
- Discovery. Federal rules provide that a statement by a government witness
  need not be made available to the defense until the witness has testified at
  trial. Also, the defense has no entitlement to a witness list before trial or to in-
  terview government witnesses prior to trial. Most state rules provide otherwise.

Russell-Einhorn’s study concludes that federal–local collaborations to combat
drugs, illegal weapons and gangs have been largely successful and mutually ben-
ficial to both parties involved. Such collaborations have become even more im-
portant since 9-11.

The September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on America, while unquestionably
horific and devastating, had a positive effect by bringing even the most diverse,
fragmented communities together in ways rarely seen before. The government’s
appeal to the nation’s public to become “soldiers” in the effort to preserve our
American way of life and to be increasingly vigilant about activities occurring in
their neighborhoods is a direct application of the community policing philoso-
phy. Everyone is made to feel they have a part to play, an implicit responsibility,
in keeping themselves, their communities and their country safe from harm.

than ever in a profession that was unable to fire a single shot to stop the events of 9-
11.” Although terrorists may “think globally,” they “act locally” (Flynn, 2004, p.33).
Savelli (2004, p.40) contends that community policing has a big advantage over
other aspects of policing in uncovering terrorists: “A community police officer, when deploying correctly, becomes very familiar with local citizens and merchants.” These citizens know what is going on and can provide an abundance of information to police. He (p.41) points out that terrorists live and operate in communities and that, no matter how much they try to blend in, they are likely to be noticed by someone: “Block watchers, busybodies, alert citizens, retired law enforcement, military personnel, or regular citizens, are monitoring each other, purposely or inadvertently.”

Giannone and Wilson (2003, p.37) describe one community policing effort in the fight against terrorism, the Community Anti-Terrorism Training Initiative, or CAT Eyes, program: “The CAT Eyes program was designed to help local communities combat terrorism by enhancing neighborhood security, heightening the community’s powers of observation and encouraging mutual assistance and concern among neighbors. It has the following purposes:

- Watch for terrorist indicators, not peoples’ race or religion.
- Teach average citizens about terrorism.
- Educate and empower citizens.
- Set up a national neighborhood block watch program.
- Educate school children.”

Scrivner (2004, p.185) questions whether law enforcement can maintain the advance in community policing in light of the post 9-11 demands to secure the homeland. She (pp.188–189) suggests the following to maintain the balance between community policing and combating terrorism:

- Keep the core business of policing—crime control—front and center. The primary mission of law enforcement is maintaining public safety, not going to war.
- Reinforce that gathering and sharing timely information depends on strong partnerships between residents and police. Defeating criminals and terrorists is not an either-or situation.
- Apply the lessons learned from history related to citizens’ rights.
- Enlist rank-and-file officers and middle managers in decision making on how to maintain the balance between community policing and homeland security.

Partnerships at the local, state and federal level are crucial to successful community policing efforts, not only to combat crime and disorder, but also in the fight against terrorism. In effect, homeland security begins with hometown security.

Summary

Community policing is an organization-wide philosophy and management approach that promotes (1) community, government and police partnerships; (2) proactive problem solving to prevent crime; and (3) community engagement to address the causes of crime, fear of crime, and other community issues. Four dimensions of community policing have been identified: the philosophical dimension, the strategic dimension, the tactical dimension and the organizational dimension. Three generations of community policing have also been described: innovation, diffusion and institutionalization.

Community policing differs from community policing in several important ways. Traditional policing is reactive; community policing is proactive; traditional policing focuses on fighting crime and measures effectiveness by arrest rates; community policing focuses on community problems and measures effectiveness on the absence of crime and
disorder; traditional policing believes crime is a police problem; community policing believes crime is everyone’s problem. The majority of police actions have nothing to do with criminal law enforcement but involve service to the community.

An understanding of community is essential to successfully implementing community policing. Such understanding begins with demographics. Demographics include a population’s size; distribution; growth; density; employment rate; ethnic makeup; and vital statistics such as average age, education and income. Organizations and institutions also can play a key role in enhancing community safety and quality of life. The broken-window phenomenon suggests that if it appears no one cares, disorder and crime will thrive.

Citizen involvement in the law enforcement community and in understanding policing has taken the form of civilian review boards, citizen patrols, citizen police academies, ride-alongs and similar programs. Such involvement is important, but community policing requires more. Two critical elements of community policing are partnerships and problem solving.

The core components of effective community partnerships are stakeholders with a vested interest in the collaboration, trusting relationships among and between the partners, a shared vision and common goals for the collaboration, expertise, teamwork strategies, open communication, motivated partners, means to implement and sustain the collaborative effort and an action plan. In addition to local businesses and schools, other key partnerships/collaborators include prosecutors, the courts, corrections, other government agencies, private security professionals and the media.

Problem-oriented policing requires that police move beyond a law enforcement perspective in seeking solutions to problems. Implementing community policing will require a change in management style, mission statement and departmental organization. It may be more important for COP-oriented police agencies to target this “critical mass” of individuals than to try to mobilize the community at large.

In most departments implementing community policing, the core functions remain, with the difference being that police no longer seek to accomplish these functions alone. Community policing may result in decreases in crime and fear of crime as well as citizen involvement in preventing crime. Implementing community policing also is likely to increase officers’ job satisfaction.

### Challenge Three

The Greenfield Police Department’s new mission statement emphasizes a community policing philosophy. The new chief has increased the authority and the responsibility of sergeants to identify and solve problems affecting the quality of life in Greenfield. You are the evening shift supervisor and have learned that the residents of the Senior Citizens’ Center are reluctant to venture out after dark. The Center is located in a low-crime neighborhood adjacent to a public park with walking paths. Evening walks in the park used to be a popular activity for the seniors, but no one uses the park now. The Center’s owner tells you the residents are worried about all the crime they see on the news and read about in the paper. They are also concerned about thefts from their cars in the parking lot. He says rumors of criminal activity spread quickly through the Center. The owner provides classes every month on how to avoid being a crime victim. He also installed new security doors and cameras. Nothing seems to work.

You gather the officers on your shift to discuss the situation. They tell you there is no crime problem in the area of the Center. The crime statistics support the officers. There has been one car window broken in the Center’s parking lot during the last year, and a few kids have been told not to skateboard through the lot on their way to the park. An officer
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Discussion Questions

1. What community services are available in your community? Which are most important? Which might be frivolous? Are any necessary services not provided?
2. What do you feel are the greatest strengths of community policing?
3. What is the relationship of problem-oriented policing to community policing?
4. Might community policing dilute the power and authority of the police?
5. Are community policing and problem solving important in your police department?
6. What do you see as the greatest impediment to implementing community policing?
7. What do you see as the greatest benefit of community policing?
8. If you had to prioritize the changes needed to convert to community policing, what would your priorities be?
9. Why might citizens not want to become involved in community policing efforts?
10. Select a community problem you feel is important and describe the partners who might collaborate to address the problem.
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