



June 1973

Changing Urban Police: Practitioners' View

Robert E. Igleburger, John E. Angell, and Gary Pence

Suggested citation

Igleburger, Robert M.; Angell, John E.; & Pence, Gary. (1973). "Changing Urban Police: Practitioners' View." *Innovation in Law Enforcement*, pp. 76–114. Criminal Justice Monograph. U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

Summary

Police administrators are responsible for providing a police operation that serves the public needs. On the surface, this responsibility appears to be simple enough; however, the realities encountered in operationalizing it are enormously complex. It is the purpose of this paper to review and analyze urban policing and suggest methods that police administrators can use to improve the effectiveness of their police organizations.

Additional information

Originally presented as paper at Fourth National Symposium on Law Enforcement Science and Technology, Washington, DC, May 1-3, 1972, conducted by the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology, University of Maryland.

CRIMINAL
JUSTICE
MONOGRAPH



Innovation
in
Law Enforcement

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice

CRIMINAL JUSTICE MONOGRAPH

Innovation in Law Enforcement

This monograph consists of papers on related topics presented at the Fourth National Symposium on Law Enforcement Science and Technology, May 1-3, 1972 conducted by:

THE INSTITUTE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
AND CRIMINOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

The Symposium was supported by Contract Number J-LEAA-021-72 awarded by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in the papers are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

PROPERTY OF
SCHOOL OF JUSTICE

June 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	vii
CHANGING THE RHETORIC OF "PROFESSIONALISM"--Franklin G. Ashburn, Ph.D., Department of Sociology, Western Maryland College	1
POLITICAL FACTORS AFFECTING PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS CONSOLIDATION (Case Studies of Three Metropolitan Counties)--Paul I. Bortz, Research Economist, University of Denver Research Institute	12
THE CLIMATE FOR CHANGE IN THREE POLICE DEPARTMENTS: SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR ACTION (1)--Robert B. Duncan, Assistant Professor and Research Fellow in Public Administration, Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University.	31
OBSERVATIONS ON THE CHANGE PROCESS IN THE POLICE FIELD: AN EXTERNAL VIEW--Christopher F. Edley, The Ford Foundation	48
SCHEDULING POLICE MANPOWER BY COMPUTER--Nelson B. Heller, Project Director and Thomas McEwen, Assistant Director, Office of the Chief of Police, St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department; and William Stenzel, Graduate Student and Philip Zwart, Associate Professor, Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science, Washington University	57
CHANGING URBAN POLICE: PRACTITIONERS' VIEW--Robert M. Igleburger, Director, Department of Police, Dayton, Ohio; John E. Angell, Director, Criminal Justice Center, Dayton, Ohio; and Gary Pence, Associate Director, Pilot Cities Program, Community Research, Inc., Dayton, Ohio	76

CHANGING URBAN POLICE: PRACTITIONERS' VIEW--Robert M. Igleburger, Director, Department of Police, Dayton, Ohio; John E. Angell, Director, Criminal Justice Center, Dayton, Ohio; and Gary Pence, Associate Director, Pilot Cities Program, Community Research, Inc., Dayton, Ohio

CHANGING URBAN POLICE: PRACTITIONERS' VIEW--Robert M. Igleburger, Director, Department of Police, Dayton, Ohio; John E. Angell, Director, Criminal Justice Center, Dayton, Ohio; and Gary Pence, Associate Director, Pilot Cities Program, Community Research, Inc., Dayton, Ohio

	Page
DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS AS A STRATEGY FOR CHANGE (1)-- Catherine H. Milton, Assistant Director, Police Foundation, Washington, D. C.	115
DEVELOPMENT OF A MODEL POLICE CAREER PATH SYSTEM-- David I. Sheppard, Ph.D. and Albert S. Glickman, Ph.D., American Institutes for Research, Silver Spring, Maryland.	134
THE FOUR-DAY--FORTY HOUR WORKWEEK--Paul M. Whisenand, Ph.D., Department of Criminology, California State College at Long Beach; George M. Medak, M.S., Director, Public Safety Information System, Department of Administrative Management, City of Long Beach, California; and Bradley L. Gates, M.S., Lieutenant, Sheriff's Department, Orange County, California . .	143

INTRODUCTION

The Fourth National Symposium on Law Enforcement Science and Technology was held in Washington, D.C. on May 1-3, 1972. Like the three previous Symposia, it was sponsored by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The Fourth Symposium was conducted by the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology of the University of Maryland.

These Symposia are one of the means by which the National Institute strives to achieve the objective of strengthening criminal justice in this country through research and development. The Symposia bring into direct contact the research and development community with the operational personnel of the law enforcement systems. The most recent accomplishments of "science and technology" in the area of criminal justice are presented to operational agencies - law enforcement, courts, and corrections - in a series of workshops and plenary sessions. The give and take of the workshops, followed by informal discussions between the more formal gatherings, provide the scholar and researcher with the all important response and criticism of the practitioner, while the latter has the opportunity to hear the analyst and the planner present the newest suggestions, trends and prospects for the future. In the case of the Fourth Symposium, these opportunities were amply utilized by over 900 participants from across the country.

The specific theme of the Fourth Symposium was "Crime Prevention and Deterrence." The content and the work of the Symposium must be seen against the immediate background of the activities of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, which was appointed several months earlier and by the time of the Symposium was deeply involved in its mammoth task. Another major background factor was the National Conference on Corrections, held in Williamsburg shortly before. More generally, of course, the Symposium was one of many activities in the all-encompassing national effort to reduce crime embodied in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, and the subsequently established Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

A twelve-member Symposium committee made up of representatives of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology of the University of Maryland was responsible for planning and arranging the Program. The program, extending over three days, was organized around three daily subthemes which were highlighted in morning plenary sessions. These

subthemes were further explored in papers and discussions grouped around more specific topics in the afternoon workshops.

The first day was one of taking stock of recent accomplishments. Richard A. McGee, President of the American Justice Institute, reviewed the progress of the last five years, and Arthur J. Bilek, Chairman of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, addressed himself to criminal justice as a system, the progress made toward coordination, and the ills of a non-system. The six afternoon workshops of the first day dealt with recent accomplishments in prevention and deterrence of crime around residences, violence in correctional institutions, control of street crime, court delay, community involvement in crime prevention, and the reintegration of offenders into the community.

The subtheme of the second day was formulated as "The Management of Change - Putting Innovations to Work." This is a reference to the frequently noted fact that the findings of many research projects all too often do not result in operational implementation, in spite of the funds, energy and competence invested in them. New methods that are adopted often prematurely die on the vine, with the old routines winning out and continuing on as before. The objective of the Symposium sessions was to identify the obstacles to change and to explore ways of overcoming them. Thus two papers given in the morning plenary session by Robert B. Duncan of Northwestern University and John Gardiner of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice dealt, respectively, with attitudinal and political obstacles to change. The five afternoon workshops developed this theme further by discussing the change process within specific law enforcement and correctional settings. From there attention shifted to the role that public service groups play in the process of change, the pilot cities experience, and the diversion of juvenile offenders from the criminal justice system.

The third day of the Symposium was turned over to the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. The daily subtheme was listed as "Future Priorities." More particularly, however, this was a series of progress reports on the all important activities of the Commission, presented by the Executive Director, Thomas J. Madden, and representatives of the Commission's four Operational Task Forces on standards and goals for police, the courts, corrections, and community crime prevention.

Finally, there was a presentation on the management of change within the eight "Impact Cities" - a major program of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration - by Gerald P. Emmer, Chairman

of LEAA's Office of Inspection and Review.

By reproducing the contributed papers of the Symposium, the Proceedings admirably reflect the current intellectual climate of the criminal justice system in this country. It should be kept in mind that the majority of these papers present the results of research and demonstration projects - many of them experimental and exploratory - which have been funded by State and/or Federal agencies and private functions. Thus these papers do not only reflect the opinions of their authors, but are also indicative of the total climate of action, thought, and quest for new solutions regarding the crime problem in this country.

No reproduction of the papers of a professional meeting can fully reflect the flavor and the total contribution of the event. The questions and remarks from the meeting floor, the discussions in the workshops, the remarks exchanged in the corridors, over meals, or in the rooms of the participants often represent the major accomplishment of such a gathering. New face-to-face contacts and awareness of things done by others - both individuals and agencies - is often the most important byproduct the participant takes home with him. This Symposium was rich in all of this. Close to one thousand persons from all over the country, representing all component elements of the criminal justice system mingled together for three days under the aegis of a major Federal effort to do something about crime and delinquency, which have risen to unprecedented prominence over the last decade. The Symposium provided the needed national forum for all those engaged in the crime prevention and control effort.

Peter P. Lejins, Director
Institute of Criminal Justice and
Criminology
University of Maryland

CHANGING URBAN POLICE: PRACTITIONERS' VIEW

Robert M. Igleburger
Director
Department of Police
Dayton, Ohio

John E. Angell
Director
Criminal Justice Center
Dayton, Ohio

Gary Pence
Associate Director
Pilot Cities Program
Community Research, Inc.
Dayton, Ohio

Introduction

Police administrators are responsible for providing a police operation that serves the public needs. On the surface, this responsibility appears to be simple enough; however, the realities encountered in operationalizing it are enormously complex. It is the purpose of this paper to review and analyze urban policing and suggest methods that police administrators can use to improve the effectiveness of their police organizations.

If police organizations are to fully realize their objective of addressing community needs, we believe it is important that police administrators adopt a consumer-oriented philosophy and take steps to ensure that their organizations have sufficient exposure and flexibility to align themselves with the needs of their clientele.

Our experience indicates that an administrator should consider a number of measures in preparing his organization for change. First, he should take steps to neutralize and establish support for change among his subordinates. Among the techniques that can be utilized for reducing resistance are (1) rewards and threats, (2) rationality and indoctrination, (3) cooption and replacement, and (4) camouflage and diversionary tactics.

Second, he should take steps to structure his organization to facilitate consumer-oriented change. In developing a new structure, he should consider emphasizing the following: (1) opening the organization, (2) supporting tolerance, (3) reducing organizational rigidity, (4) improving communications, (5) reducing reliance on formal authority, and (6) establishing a Centralized-Decentralized Organizational Model.

Administrative actions to facilitate the development of dynamic police organizations will create difficult problems regardless of the approach utilized. The methods we suggest will be effective, but they will not provide a completely smooth transition from a traditional police bureaucracy to a new organizational design.

Why Change Police?

The basic purpose of public administration in American society is to fulfill those needs of the community that cannot be met through individual action or private enterprise. The definition of community needs is arrived at through a process referred to as politics. By responding to community needs, the government gains the consent of

those who are served. However, this consent is not dependent on providing satisfactory responses for all unfulfilled citizen needs; it is also gained by the government providing an arena for controversy and conflict (Appleby, 1965, p. 334). It is through citizen interaction in this arena that the citizens arrive at the necessary cohesion to require governmental action, and the power of public officials is limited.

While the role of the police is to some extent defined by custom, culture, and law, it is constantly being redefined through the political processes. Therefore, police administrators must be cognizant of their political environments and provide organizations that are capable of making appropriate adjustments in their operations.

Political Responsiveness

Police administrators must participate in political processes because of their responsibility for ensuring police services that satisfy communities' demands for services and security. However, police officials do not have sufficient responsibility nor authority to adequately fulfill the demands of all citizens for police service and security. They share responsibility and authority with a variety of other organizations, governmental agencies, and social institutions.

Unfortunately, there are many police chiefs who display a willingness to accept total responsibility for objectives over which they have little control, such as reducing crime. It would be far more realistic to admit that the community, other governmental agencies, and a variety of social organizations share this responsibility.

Such recognition would enable police administrators to legitimately involve a much broader reservoir of resources in the solution of their problems.

Aside from the preceding question of responsibility and authority, the police organizational hierarchy, which should be designed to receive and respond to community needs, has evolved to the point where the political environment has little impact on it (Tulloch, 1965, pp. 137-141). A police department must be capable of accurately receiving popular demands, injecting them with considerations of prudence, perspective, principle, and concern for individual rights, and responding to them. Therefore, the police organization cannot be evaluated solely on the efficiency with which it performs rote functions. It must be assessed by its ability to reconcile diverse community needs into a response that is tempered by concerns for the individual and legitimized by community support (Appleby, 1965, p. 335). Appropriate change within police organization will not come through piecemeal efforts designed strictly to improve operational efficiency. It will come through organizational techniques that provide continuous monitoring of the total environment of law enforcement.

The Community Environment

Over the past two decades, the urban environments within which police organizations exist have changed drastically. The changes in demographic characteristics alone have been profound enough to stagger ones imagination. For example, the racial composition of Dayton has

changed from 90 percent to 70 percent white. The average income of citizens has remained constant in a period of sharp inflation. The heterogeneity of our residents has increased.

The once powerful and stable middle class whites have been losing their power to a wide range of other groups. The carte blanche that was once given to the police to deal with social deviates has been withdrawn. The once illegitimate street people, radical groups, young people, and social deviates have become organized. These organized groups have been legitimized by such actions as the civil rights movement of the 60's, the increased attention to the demands of youth and minorities, and the reclassification of social behavior such as alcoholism and deviate sexual behavior among consenting adults as non-criminal.

Undoubtedly, the most significant influences that have changed the community environment for the police have been the Supreme Court and the educational system. For the first time in the history of society, a powerful government institution, the United States Supreme Court, actually took giant steps to guarantee both the political equality of men, as well as the subservient nature of government to men.

The educational system began to move in the same direction. Old authoritarian techniques and approaches have been replaced by individualized instruction that encourages self-motivation on the part of the student. Basic education has become universal, and continuous adult education has been accepted as a necessity. Schools have actually begun to deal with social information. They are recognizing the need to respond to

students who are questioning the concepts of universal righteousness of the "American system."

The changes in community environments have caused police administrators to question themselves as to their clients, goals, organizational arrangements, strategies, and procedures. Police officials who have previously enjoyed the luxury of dealing with a well-defined power group are faced with pressure from groups that only a few years ago could not have commanded recognition from a passing police patrolman.

Consumer Orientation

Given the circumstances that have been described, it is not surprising that many communities are demanding better and different services; what is surprising is the community's reaction to the lack of police responsiveness. Public law enforcement officials have for a number of years monopolized the service of security of persons and property. The monopoly is now being broken. In Dayton, we have experienced competition from the Republic of New Africa, a Black militant organization, which provides limited patrol service. Recently, a former Dayton policeman, who is now operating a private security agency, submitted a proposal to a Neighborhood Priority Board, formed under the auspices of the Model Cities Program, to develop a private, special police force for a white working-class area of our city.

Our experiences in Dayton are not significantly different from those of other cities. The police monopoly is being broken by volunteer citizens' groups and private police who are attempting to provide

service on a neighborhood basis. We, the police, have now been placed in a situation where we can no longer "not give a damn." No longer can we count on the protection provided us by our positions as a monopoly. We must compete for citizen support.

The change process has always been crisis oriented in Dayton. Dayton is noted for originating the City Manager form of government. However, it was not originated until after the great flood of 1913 and the threat of the NCR Company to relocate unless city government became more efficient. The destruction of the police monopoly may well generate the spark that ignites the demand for change within the internal structure of police organizations. If this occurs, police administrators may realistically be able to reorganize with the necessary support base to become consumer oriented instead of product oriented. What has been described as an occupational army may through market analysis become an agent for providing service.

Professional police administrators in the United States appear to have difficulty adopting a consumer orientation because of self-imposed collusion of ignorance. However, increasingly, chiefs are attempting to modify their approaches; and their efforts are resulting in their being heralded by community leaders, and at the same time, stifled by the internal structure of the police organization. The process of implementing change is always difficult; within police agencies, it appears to be an impossible dream. The agents of change have become anathema to most police agencies. The following are a few of the characteristics of the police sub-culture that stifle change.

Blind Chauvinism.--One of the areas of concern for progressive police administrators in law enforcement today is the blind chauvinism; i.e., that belief that the solution to the police problem is esprit de corps that permeates many police departments. Many of these chauvinistic individuals are more concerned about the length of a man's sideburns than the quality of his work. There appears to be an increasing hue and cry within some of these monolithic structures for more "spit and polish." The purpose of these comments are not to negate the importance of discipline but to place it in its proper perspective. Meaningful discipline and esprit de corps are the products of an organizational structure, which provides for the integration of the individual goals with the objectives of the organization. This does not mean the elimination of professional discretion or individuality.

We believe the level of chauvinism within a police department is directly related to the degree of authoritarianism present. Our value system is grounded in conservatism and dictates that crime be suppressed by whatever means necessary. Many police officers believe that the Constitution and civil liberties serve only to thwart their efforts. The work of William Vega indicated that most police officers see crime as the response of the individual, not associated with his environment. This value system of police conservatives enables them to disassociate the acts of individuals from society. Even well-read moderates find this value system difficult to accept.

A study performed by Smith, Locke, and Walker within the New York Police Department indicates that non-college police tend to be more

authoritarian than college-educated police. This provides a basis for assuming that the police would be more realistic if they had a broader base of experience. However, Vega has pointed out that even liberals are coopted by police organizations. Liberals within police departments either alter their beliefs to conform, drop out, or go underground. If this is the case, most police departments do not have a significant population of resident liberals. However, there is no more reason for all police officers to be liberal than there is for them all to be conservative; but police departments need employees who are representative of the communities they serve.

Many police officers, who work in urban areas, are removed from the problems that mandate change because they have spent most of their lives in environments and cultures removed from the lifestyles of modern urban citizens. They grew up in rural areas, small towns, or white middle-class neighborhoods. Their parents were blue-collar whites. After joining an urban police agency, they move to middle-class suburban communities where they do not have to confront the problems faced by the urban people they serve. They travel into the city to spend as much of their eight hours as possible isolated from their clients by a car, an office, and bureaucratic rules and status. They socialize mainly with other police; they fight for two-man cars which ensures they will be further re-enforced by a person with values like their own.

A police organization, in order to interact with a community, should have a diverse representation within its membership. If a rule-oriented police organization does not permit any officers to wear long

hair or beards, is it not saying that there is something wrong or distasteful about people who do? Will such an organization provide the same quality of service to members of the community who wear long hair and beards?

Management by Abdication.--Another symptomatic problem associated area is management by abdication (MBA). This consists of rule-oriented management personnel who attempt to implement change through fiat while simultaneously abdicating responsibility for it. A MBA organization is rule-oriented as opposed to goal-oriented and responsibility for service is difficult to identify because the emphasis is on procedure as opposed to results. The vast majority of police organizations are structured along para-military lines of command and control. This approach requires specialization and the development of functional responsibilities which facilitates management by abdication.

Responsibility for providing police service in specific geographic areas of a city is difficult to identify in highly specialized police departments. Field lieutenants are normally held responsible for eight-hour time periods. Captains are responsible for bureaus such as investigation, operations, or records. Beat patrolmen share responsibility for police service with many specialized technicians. The order maintenance function and crime control functions have become the responsibility of specialized public relations units and crime control teams respectively, in many police departments. The only person within this type of framework who can be held directly responsible for police service is the chief of police. Thus, there is little or no impetus within other areas of the organization for

change. This has culminated in a situation in most areas where the chief of police not only makes the decision to change, but quarterback- backs the entire process. Change that occurs through this type of process has been compared by McBride to hanging ornaments on a Christmas tree (1971, p. 20). These ornaments are normally removed when the Christmas season is over and change that occurs through this process has a life expectancy directly proportional to that of the chief of police. Productive change on the other hand, results from a spontaneous process which is ignited when the conditions are right for it.

The rule orientation of MBA is one of the primary defects within police management today. The vast majority of police agencies have become secure within the classical organizational structure that has been described. The operation of such an organization is mechanical. The duties of members are described in detail, and there are hard and fast rules along with a hierarchy of superior officers to make sure procedures are carried out according to rules. Such a structure was created to give and maintain status based upon an individual's ability to follow departmental rules and regulations which are in many cases of questionable value and often are not flexible enough to respond to the changing needs of a heterogenous community. This became painfully obvious to us in Dayton when two police officers decided that they could better deal with a disorderly group by removing their firearms and placing them in the trunk of their car. Many individuals within the department reacted to this act with tremendous hostility because of a departmental policy that required police officers to carry their weapons at all times, both on and off duty. This rule has since been

changed to give the individual officer the right to decide when he should not carry a weapon. The rule orientation of specialization has not only caused the police not to respond to the changing character of the community, but also in some cases to resist change which threatens the established status quo. If John Gardner (1965, p. 45) is correct in saying the last act of a dying organization is to produce a better and more comprehensive version of the rule book, then surely we are listening to the death gasp of many police organizations today.

Police chiefs are in the position of sitting on top of a giant pyramid. In this position, they are only able to cushion the police response not form it. The real power within the organization is at the operational level. The problem is that this level lacks the responsibility of direction and is not accountable to the community; therefore, it does not have to be responsive to it. The police chief, however, is normally in an appointed position and responsible to his community. The chief is in many cases attempting to direct change that operational personnel see no benefit in implementing. The change is usually goal-oriented as opposed to rule-oriented and therefore, threatening to the existing status quo and social relationships (Davis, 1968, p. 55).

The chief who attempts to bring about change is confronted by the phenomenon of MBA; i.e., rule-oriented management personnel who implement change through fiat while simultaneously abdicating responsibility for it. Change within this setting becomes damned as the child of the Ivy League Boys in Research and Development, who lack credibility and common sense, or of a starry-eyed chief, who has

somehow become misdirected.

Why does this situation exist? One reason is related to efforts to insulate police departments from the spoils system (Smith, 1960, pp. 316-317). This attempt to professionalize the police has at times backfired. If we look at James Q. Wilson's paper, "The Police and Their Problems: A Theory," we note that the professional model he describes involves a legalistic approach which strives to eliminate discretion. If this is taken in conjunction with the insulation of the police from the spoils system without any mechanism to realistically replace it, then the lack of police responsiveness to the community should be expected.

Role Confusion.--Role confusion is the symptom of another problem area within the police bureaucracy. Police officers at the line level have not been prepared to differentiate in response requirements. They are the product of a rule-oriented structure that provides "cookbook solutions" to problems (Fosdick, 1969, p. 313). Police officers are constantly confronted with demands from the community for varying types of service which they have not been trained to handle. This has resulted in a situation where police officers are threatened by the changing needs of the community. The status of police work is based upon law enforcement; the enforcement of the law has a certain aura of glamour associated with it. To be a public servant is to be less than an enforcer. Yet, police officers are confronted with a paradox since the community demands more service than law enforcement (Webster, 1970). Does a police officer enforce laws or provide service to the community? Since individual police officers have no direct responsibility to the

community, and little or no contact with the political process, they are, in effect, free agents.

Police officers respond to the community as enforcers of the law. If there is any conflict in values, they become confused and respond in the manner in which they have been trained. They enforce the law without regard for the consequences. Enforcement of the law, in many cases, such as in Detroit in 1967, may result in disorder. However, the rule-oriented structure allows for no variance in response. Priorities are left to the individual officer and are affected by each officer's bias and values. The result is periodic chaos and an inability to understand why. The line-level officers who provide the services receive only the gut-level dissatisfaction of the street people, "The man is a pig." Yet, the "man" did his job. He enforced the law. The individual officer has not been prepared to analyze his job but has been provided with an overabundance of defense mechanisms (Vega, p. 17).

The police bureaucracy has been too effective in insulating people below the chief administrator from the conflicting changes and competing demands of the public. Seldom does a police officer below the chief have to face the demands of legislative officials, pressure groups, and private citizens with which the chief must deal. This type of conflict is normally almost entirely handled by the chief executive because of his position at the apex of the classical hierarchical structure. Given the dynamic nature of modern society, the chief is constantly subject to pressure in this position. When the chief decides that he must modify his organization to respond to his citizens,

the members of the organization refuse to support him. Chiefs need not wonder why they are denied employee support; the chief has effectively insulated his subordinates, and they have not had to suffer through the confrontations and conflicts that have caused him to change. Ex post facto attempts by the chief to educate his subordinates to the reason for his deciding to change are usually not successful. The lower they are in the bureaucracy, the more insulated employees are from the problems faced by the chief and the less supportive they will be for significant changes that effect their behavior.

Conclusions

Obviously, without a well-defined approach to overcoming the restrictive aspects of the police sub-culture, a chief of police will not be able to ensure his citizens of an organization that will be responsive to their needs.

The characteristics of the police sub-culture and the characteristics of the police bureaucratic structure are basic reasons why the system is not satisfying community needs. An analysis of these factors suggests that the system, as it is currently arranged, will never be effective in identifying its goals and developing strategies for providing environmental security for urban peoples. The police structure itself must be changed; however, we need to recognize and admit to ourselves that speeding up the processes of justice, increasing the number of gimmicks, and improving the hardware available to the police will not produce the needed change. Such

modifications are frequently used by police administrators and planners to con their potential critics into believing that progress is being made. These changes are nothing more than camouflage to conceal the real problems and diversionary tactics to keep attention off the critical shortcomings of the present system.

Most well-meaning police administrators rely on this cosmetic approach simply because they feel hopelessly hamstrung and impotent. Our experience and education have prepared us to be a cog in the police bureaucracy and defend it against all suggestions of inadequacy. We usually are not familiar with even the most superficial information about changing social organizations. Although police administrators have tried to resist and be their own men, they have been indoctrinated with the basic axiom of a police bureaucracy, "Those who do nothing do not encounter trouble as often as those who take action frequently."

The closed police sub-culture, the closed personnel system, the ambiguous nature of the community demands, and the pressure of the members of the police bureaucracy are eventually sufficient to convince a police manager of the wisdom of following the party line. As Sayre and Kaufman pointed out after observing the New York City Police Department, "In the end, whatever the dash and determination at the beginning, the commissioners yield to the necessity of being merely a spokesman and the advocate rather than the leader and the innovator" (1960, p. 292). The police executive usually decides that his personal security and comfort will be seriously affected if he pushes organizational changes that are in the best interest of society. Administrators normally yield to the pressure and relax--confident

in the knowledge that they are supported by the bureaucracy and many powerful social groups.

It is imperative that we stop kidding ourselves and assume the risks associated with being change agents. We must focus on restructuring our organizations to achieve a stronger link between the environment, our constituency, and our employees. To do this, we need to evaluate the techniques available to us to obtain sufficient support from our personnel to establish an effective police organization.

Establishing Support for Change

The traditional assumption that a chief of police has the power to make changes because he also has the formal authority is invalid. As Bernard has pointed out, the power of an administrator is restricted by what his subordinates consider legitimate (1968). Subordinates who want to restrict a manager's authority have at their disposal such techniques as work slow-downs, speed-ups, "by-the-rules" activities, communication disruption, distortion, and actual sabotage. They have the ability to accumulate support outside the organization and to focus sufficient pressure or legal attention on the administrator to neutralize or remove his authority. Therefore, the administrator has to deal with the problem of keeping his personnel from denying him the power to operate. Although desirable, their support is not absolutely essential, but an administrator who does not have employee support must be able to neutralize large-scale employee attempts to deny him the power necessary to keep the organization open and flexible.

The administrator has a variety of methods, which should be considered in developing strategies to get support or to neutralize employees' resistance to change. These techniques include rationality and indoctrination; rewards and threats; cooption and replacement; and camouflage and diversionary tactics. The ability to use these methods successfully depends on the administrator, as well as the situation. However, before employing them, a chief needs to recognize that organizations are complex in interrelations. A movement intended to achieve one purpose will inevitably have repercussions. Each action taken by the chief will be accompanied by a reaction. The chief will often be surprised by the unanticipated changes he sets in motion, and he must be prepared to absorb the heat. However, this is an occupational hazard which a police administrator must constantly face.

Rewards and Threats.--These traditional tactics are used extensively by police officials, although one has to admit that the emphasis has always been on threats. From the first time a police recruit enters a training program until the day he retires from the police field, he is constantly told what will be done to him if he does not conform to the expectations of his supervisors and "superiors." This causes some people to suspect that police officers have become insensitive to other types of motivation.

The limited research available suggests that reward, particularly psychological rewards, are much more effective than threats (Argyris, 1965). Most police administrators have a variety of threatening units designed to identify undesirable organizational deviates and punish

them; however, there is a need for units and procedures designed to identify desirable deviates and reward them with praise and publicity.

Rationality and Indoctrination.--Police administrators have traditionally utilized indoctrination to change the behavior of their subordinates. The "training" which is designed for the indoctrination is structured to restrict criticism and questions from the "trainees" (Frost, 1959; Greenwood, 1972; Saunders, 1970). Trainees are required to submit to instructors who degrade and insult them in such a way as to damage their self-confidence. The indoctrination that is often carried out as police training is designed in a way that in many instances will destroy the individuality of police officers. This forces a new police officer to yield to being an unthinking member of a group that is dependent on its "superiors" for decisions and guidance. The counter-productiveness of this approach to change is increasingly apparent. People resist this type of indoctrination; they reject conclusions that are forced on them by authorities.

People who have low opinions of themselves tend to be more closed and suspicious than people with good self-concepts. People who are constantly approached as if they are mentally retarded tend to develop behaviors that resemble that of a mental incapacitated person. Therefore, while one-way indoctrination may have a short-term impact on changing behavior, it will probably be counterproductive in the long run.

Rational discussion of problems and alternatives by all people in the organization will be more likely to establish an adequate environment for change. This approach, however, does not give the orderly

appearance of efficient operations because it cannot be carried out without conflict (Cosser, 1964). People who have apprehensions and questions about the changes can express their feelings and fears. All ranks argue and debate; they negotiate and compromise; and they each can have an impact on any changes that occur. At the same time, their individuality and worth is reinforced; they learn that they are important and their opinions matter. Such self-confidence and security makes them more open to change.

Although both indoctrination and rational discussion can be used to obtain support for change, we believe rational discussion is far superior to the traditional indoctrination approaches.

Cooption and Replacement.--The chief administrator can consider using the two techniques of cooption and replacement to ensure that resistance to his authority does not damage his ability to keep the organization receptive to productive change. Cooption can be achieved by identifying the informal employee leaders who are critical of his efforts and placing them in positions where their responsibilities conflict with their rhetoric and actions. Once such a person is in a position where he has access to more information and is subjected to the pressures of responsibility, he will usually condition his behavior and attitudes. Even those people who are not completely coopted may have their effectiveness as critics neutralized because of their changed relationship to their peers.

Another approach that has been used often by traditional change agents involves replacing employees who have been inside the system

for a long period of time with professionals from outside the organization (Bennis, 1966). This approach is not to be confused with nepotism nor amicism that in the past has been utilized by well-meaning administrators. Replacement provides at least five advantages to the change oriented administrator: (1) it reduces the number of people who refuse to support an open viable system; (2) it provides people with greater competencies than are available within the organization; (3) it increases the status of the organization in the eyes of the public; (4) it opens windows into the organization to outsiders; and (5) it provides employees who have stronger loyalties to the chief than to departmental sub-culture and its politics. Obviously, unlike amicism and nepotism, this strategy involves more than simply bringing in an outsider who will support the programs of the chief administrator.

The persons who are selected as replacements must be extensively evaluated to ensure that they are professional enough to stay above the protective devices of the old-line police bureaucrats. They must be highly competent and have adequate credentials to guard against the possibility of being discredited by those resistant to change. They must be loyal to concepts of democracy and secure in their commitment to establishing consumer-oriented police organizations that address the needs of the community.

It is important that the replacements be given positions where they can provide support for the chief administrator. A replacement who is placed as an editor of reports or an accountant has little impact on the organization and provides little support for the chief; however, an administrative assistant or a bureau commander has much

more potential. It is also important to consider the organizational problems that such replacements will cause for the administrator. This approach involves changes of significant enough proportion that they may cause seriously damaging counter-reactions.

Once a replacement is within the organization, the administrator will have to support and protect him, because the bureaucracy will deal harshly with him. The old-line police bureaucrats are neither naive nor stupid; they will understand what is happening to their strength in the department, and they will attempt to discredit and destroy the interloper. The insiders have the advantages of knowing the existing system and the people who staff it; and they can use this knowledge to stifle the outsider. Insiders may deliberately complicate the paper work and restrict the channels of communication for the outsider so that many of his early efforts will have to be devoted to protecting himself rather than achieving organization goals. Therefore, while the chief administrator will reap benefits from the presence of the outsider, he must be prepared to devote considerable attention to protecting him, and accepting his advice over the objections of the tradition-bound insiders.

Camouflage and Diversionary Tactics.--It appears to us that informal consensual groups, such as exist in a police department subculture, usually cannot pursue several causes at the same time. Therefore, the chief who wishes to make changes that are likely to generate hostility among his employees can time the changes to occur at a time when the employees are already engaged in an emotional battle. For example, if the police are tied up in a

battle with a pressure group that is attempting to implement a police review board, the chief can take advantage of the situation and use it for cover while he strengthens internal control procedures and he may even be able to win internal support by attacking the police review board concepts as an evil conspiracy which will damage police.

Obviously, the techniques of camouflage and diversion should not be crudely manipulated in an unethical fashion. Our point is that they offer ways of using undesirable situations to the chief's advantage, but he certainly should not be identified as the instigator of the proposals which he uses to his own ends. In the past, whether intentionally or unwittingly, administrators have utilized these techniques to win support for themselves and their programs. Therefore, we have observed their effectiveness.

Conclusion

As with any management action, the preceding methods can be abused by an unethical administrator. Prior to a decision to use them, the chief should explore the ethical questions involved. However, they can be both effective and ethical approaches to winning support for organizational changes.

Such extensive efforts to obtain support for organizational change is probably unwise unless the chief administrator has a strong commitment to the need for making his organization more client-

oriented. In the following section, we will discuss our thoughts concerning the general direction of the change need in urban police organizations if they are to become truly consumer-oriented public agencies.

Structuring for Change

The police administrator who wants to develop a consumer-oriented police department and establish the potential for continuous change within his organization, cannot assume that once he obtains internal support for change that progress will automatically continue. Unmanaged change may be counterproductive. The world has pollution, wars, inhuman and inefficient governments, racism, and alienated people as stark testimony to the problems that can result from unmanaged change. However, at the same time, it is also important to recognize that in our society, no public administrator has the authority, power, or resources to completely control change (Katz and Kahn, 1967, pp. 390-452).

Due to past definitions of the responsibilities, roles, and boundaries of governmental agencies, a police chief constantly finds that he does not have sufficient direct control to force his department to receive and fulfill the needs and demands of the public. For example, most people are insisting that the police make their communities safe and secure places. However, community security can be more of a state of mind than a physical reality. The quality of a person's security is directly associated to his personal feelings of freedom from danger. A person who is thirsty, hungry, cold,

lonely, or paranoid may never feel that his community is a safe place. Although a police department can enter into cooperative arrangements with mental health and welfare agencies to solve some of these problems, it does not have the knowledge nor the resources to eliminate all of them. Therefore, a chief will usually have to be satisfied with a somewhat less than perfect solution to community needs.

The important point is that a police administrator has to approach the problems pragmatically rather than normatively. He should attempt to define and map the limitations imposed on him and his organization. If he cannot possibly work within these limitations, he should attempt to develop techniques and plans for their elimination. And, while he cannot possibly control his organization as precisely as he can aim a rifle, he can be expected to ensure that his department generally moves in the direction of identifying and responding to the needs of the citizens in his jurisdiction. Since he does not have complete control nor a perfectly defined set of objectives and priorities, he will have to rely on gross, trial and error efforts which result in rather disjointed, lurching change rather than a mechanically smooth operation. Initially, the chief should attempt to modify the philosophy and approach to organization and management, but eventually he will have to completely restructure his organization along different lines than have traditionally been utilized. The following are modifications that chiefs should be considering.

Opening the Organization.--The police sub-culture that we spoke of earlier appears to be the result of the closed, routinized nature

of police organizations and their operations (McNamara, 1967). The organizational and administrative incest that has developed because of this system has resulted in a like-minded group of employees in police departments. The chief administrator can facilitate change by initiating steps to open the police department to outsiders (Bennis, 1966, pp. 113-130). He should make certain that the outsiders are not restricted exclusively to low-level, non-policy making positions where they will be without influence. They should be built into the organization as fulfilled members, helpers, observers, and advisors. To be effective as change agents, they need to be utilized in such a manner that they can interject fresh points of view at all levels of the organization, challenge existing methods and activities, and provide the public with windows into the police department.

Such an opening of the system will serve to unfreeze many of the previously unchallenged notions and procedures, and it will facilitate re-establishing the police as a part of their communities.

Supporting Tolerance.--As we previously suggested, one of the major reasons why police personnel find it so difficult to change is their intolerance of deviation from what they have learned is normal (Gardner, 1965, pp. 67-75). Personnel in a bureaucracy have been taught to define their environment in simplistic terms of good or bad, black or white, right or wrong. In most police departments, they sorely need to be conditioned to accept and tolerate differences.

The chief can facilitate the conditioning of his personnel by removing the organizational obstacles to individuality such as hair policies, height requirements, clothing restrictions, etc. Assuming

the organization can tolerate more substantial pressure, he might go even further and deliberately select people for employment who do not meet the stereotypes of police employees that have developed. Police departments need liberals, conservatives, blacks, whites, young, old, fat, skinny, males, females, intelligent people, average people, and shades in between. A chief who recognizes the value of tolerating differences among people and establishes conditions for the spread of such tolerant attitudes establishes the conditions necessary for moving his organization toward an effective consumer-oriented department.

Reducing Organizational Rigidity.--The rules, values, habits, and customs of police organization make them stable, unyielding structures that have difficulty adopting a consumer orientation. In order for client-oriented organizational change to occur, this irrational rigidity must be loosened. Methods for modifying the restrictions that have created the problem have to be developed. By reducing the support for rigidity, police personnel can be conditioned to accept ambiguous situations (Watson, 1971, pp. 745-765). Such simple things as changes in physical layouts, procedures, rank structures, uniforms, color of equipment, and the systematic, periodic shuffling of personnel might be a part of the conditioning processes.

Sections of the rule book might be suspended. Policy-making groups consisting of representatives from all ranks of the organization and citizens could be set up to continuously up-date policies. Task forces can be utilized to handle temporary situations, and after they have completed their assignments, they could be returned to their normal assignments. Lower ranking officers or civilians could be

assigned to chair temporary study groups that have representatives from all ranks of the department. Exchanges of personnel with other agencies can also be used. Although no single action will break the rigidity of a police organization, the frequent use of a variety of these techniques will have a significant impact.

Improving Communications.--We have previously mentioned the communications problems in a police bureaucracy. These problems are caused by formal ranks and informal status differences, concerns for personal security, chains of command, complex communications methods, and many other reasons. However, regardless of the specific reason for the problems, a consumer-oriented organization needs numerous, open channels of communications. A chief administrator can facilitate the development of a dynamic organization by establishing new methods and channels for communications. Task forces, departmental ombudsmen, information specialists, departmental meetings, team efforts, personnel rotations, shortening the chain of command, decentralization, improved communications equipment, and less emphasis on authority and status in running the organization, are all techniques that can be used for improving communications and facilitating change.

Reducing Reliance on Formal Authority.--Close supervision and autocratic methods stifle consumer-inputs and change within a police organization. Top down pressure for change is not sufficient. Participation in decision-making and the use of persuasion and negotiation are more effective than authority in up-dating organizations.

A chief should take steps to increase the participation in organizational processes and decision-making. This would entail softening

his reliance on authority. He can utilize his personnel where they are competent to perform regardless of rank in supervisory and staff positions. He can systematically consult with departmental personnel of all ranks before making important decisions. He can encourage managers and supervisors to assume a teacher-student rather than a master-slave relationship with their subordinates.

Establishing a Centralized-Decentralized Organizational Model

Obviously, the preceding techniques can be implemented by making modifications in the existing classical organizational model used by the police. However, for a truly responsive client-oriented organization, these changes alone will not be sufficient. Eventually, police administrators must make relatively drastic changes in their organizational structures. We predict that if voluntary changes are not made by police administrators, the new power groups will force change on the police departments as they are currently attempting to do in Berkeley, California.

As we have pointed out elsewhere, American cities have changed most importantly with regards to attitudes, values, expectations, and power diffusion. The increased activism and power of minority groups emphasizes the impracticability of a police department establishing one set of priorities for an entire city. Different communities have different opinions about what actions police should take in fulfilling specialized needs. Aside from the problems caused by the insulated nature of the police operations and the inflexibility of the police bureaucracy, there is no rational reason why the police cannot respond

to the differences in communities within their jurisdiction.

Police agencies are governmental units. They have no sacred goals or priorities that cannot be changed if such a change better serves their citizens. Police agencies should be dedicated to the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number. It appears to us that a properly decentralized police structure with professionally oriented personnel would enable the police to provide a more responsive police service.

Proper decentralization does not entail turning over control of the police to an elected community board or commission. Obviously, this has not worked successfully in the past. We believe a need exists for a police structure, which has community participation in priority making and policy development and at the same time, is centrally coordinated to ensure a consistent quality of policing efforts throughout the jurisdiction. Centralized coordination is necessary to prevent abuses such as discrimination by the police in one community against people who live in another area and to guard against the disjointed fragmented approaches that are so common in many areas. This approach facilitates controlled decentralization through a Centralized-Decentralized Model.

This Centralized-Decentralized approach to organizing police involves centralizing all of the support and staff functions and decentralizing the operational or service delivery activities of the police. The support activities could be arranged to facilitate the efforts of the various decentralized operational activities without rigidly dictating operational priorities or policies. In order to be effective in

coordinating the field activities, the centralized support operations will need the authority to establish minimum reporting and communications standards as well as the obligation to compare the operational units that are assigned to various communities. In addition, the centralized support section could be given the responsibility for defining community needs, assigning operational personnel to the communities, providing information and intelligence to the operational teams, and assisting the community teams with training and personnel improvement.

The operational units would consist of teams of officers assigned to a well-defined geographic area with enough homogenous elements to be considered a community. Each team would be given the responsibility and authority to work closely with their community to define their problems and needs and to provide the appropriate police services. Obviously, the team would be required to observe the same ethical, legal, and financial limitations that would govern all teams. The teams would be staffed by people with complimentary skills to ensure that each team would be able to handle the variety of problems they would be expected to face. Hopefully, the members of each team would be generalists-specialists, in other words, every officer would be expected to perform all types of police work, but at the same time, have highly developed skills in one or two areas which would directly aid in eliminating problems in the specific geographical area to which he has been assigned.

Within well-defined boundaries, the internal management of each team could be left largely with the team. The procedures used by the teams could be left basically up to the members of the teams, who

would be required to work them out with the community. Even the work assignments of team members could be within the authority of the team rather than a central authority. The chief and his centralized staff could evaluate the teams on the extent to which each achieved its objectives rather than the extent to which its members follow universal, internal rules or standard operating procedures developed for the entire police organization.

This type of centralized-decentralized organizational arrangement can be considered analogous to the arrangement utilized in a hospital, except it makes provisions for community input that is not utilized in the hospital model. The chief and the support section is analogous to the hospital administrators and the support services of the hospital. The teams of police officers are analogous to medical and surgical teams that work in the hospital. The hospital administrator coordinates the surgical teams and provides them with support personnel and equipment, but he does not become involved in the actual operations. These operational activities are the responsibility of the medical and surgical groups. Similarly, we would leave all but the broadest priorities and methods of performing the police job up to the teams of police officers and their clients; and we would organize a professional staff of technicians to provide them with high-quality support and coordination.

Obviously, this approach depends on highly competent, sensitive employees who are dedicated to serving their citizens. However, we believe that this Centralized-Decentralized Model will result in a more effective and dynamic police operation. In Dayton, we have been

experimenting with this concept under an LEAA Grant. The initial evaluation of our efforts at decentralization indicates that the citizens in the Fifth District, the decentralized area, believe that their policemen are more responsive to their needs than citizens in other areas of the city. We have also found that the citizens in the Fifth District feel more secure with the police responses being provided at the community level than the citizens in our control group (Dayton, 1971). This has been accomplished while maintaining the same level of effectiveness in achieving our organizational objectives, as we have with the highly centralized operation in other areas of Dayton.

This approach seems to be the most effective in involving citizens and police officers in establishing objectives and priorities for police. The Centralized-Decentralized Model is dependent on community meetings and discussions between police officers and the citizens they serve. Through this type of interaction, an acceptable consensus concerning the police role and goals can be developed. Changes will be acceptable to the police because of their involvement in the process. Ultimately, this approach will provide a dynamic, professional, consumer-oriented police operation that will result in a higher level of service and greater security.

Conclusion

Police administrators are responsible for providing a police operation that serves the public needs. On the surface, this responsibility appears to be simple enough; however, the complexities involved in operationalizing it are enormous.

The democratic political process is an appropriate device for providing a police organization with information about public needs, but police organizations have become so removed and insulated from the political processes that the service they provide is at times almost totally unrelated to citizen problems. Even in those situations where the chief of police is sensitive to the problems and needs of his citizens, he alone cannot decipher sufficient information to determine the appropriate priorities for his organization to address. In addition, due to the inherent rigidity of a modern police bureaucracy, the chief's ability to initiate organizational change is severely limited.

If police organizations are to fully realize their objective of addressing community needs, it is essential that police administrators adopt a philosophy supporting a consumer orientation and take steps to ensure that their organizations have sufficient exposure and flexibility to align themselves with the needs of their clientele.

Our experience indicates that an administrator should consider a number of factors in preparing his organization for change. First, he should take steps to neutralize resistance and establish support for change among his subordinates. Among the techniques that can be utilized for reducing resistance are (1) rewards and threats, (2) rationality and indoctrination, (3) cooption and replacement, and (4) camouflage and diversionary tactics.

Second, he should take steps to structure his organization to facilitate consumer-oriented change. In developing a new structure, he should consider emphasizing the following: (1) opening the

organization, (2) supporting tolerance, (3) reducing organizational rigidity, (4) improving communications, (5) reducing reliance on formal authority, and (6) establishing a Centralized-Decentralized Organizational Model.

Administrative actions to facilitate the development of dynamic police organizations will create difficult problems regardless of the approach utilized. Outsiders may criticize the organization for its disjointed appearance. However, as John W. Gardner has pointed out, ". . . creative organizations or societies are rarely tidy. Some tolerance for inconsistencies, for profusion of purposes and strategies, and for conflict is the price of freedom and vitality" (1965, p. 70).

Although we believe the methods we have suggested will, in the long run, be most effective, they will not provide a completely smooth transition from a traditional police bureaucracy to a new organizational design. They will most likely cause frustration for police officers involved. Initially, officers will demand that they not be subjected to such threatening techniques; they will insist on stronger rules for personal security; they will plead low morale; and they may be disruptive to the organizational processes in an attempt to emphasize their dissatisfaction with the responsibilities they are asked to assume. However, we believe that the probability that these techniques will pay off in developing a more effective, consumer-oriented police department where police can achieve a higher level of work satisfaction and professionalism, makes it reasonable for administrators to assume the risks involved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Appleby, Paul H. "Public Administration and Democracy." Public Administration and Democracy. Roscoe D. Martin, (Ed.) Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1965.
- Angell, John E. "An Alternative to Classical Police Organizational Arrangements." Criminology, Vol. 9, No. 2 & 3, (Aug.-Nov., 1971), pp. 185-207.
- Argyris, Chris. Organization and Innovation. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1965.
- Baldwin, James. Nobody Knows My Name. New York: Dial Press, 1961.
- Bennis, Warren G. "A New Role for the Behavioral Sciences: Effecting Organizational Change." Administrative Science Quarterly (Sept., 1963).
- Bennis, Warren G. Changing Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.
- Bennis, Warren G., et al (Eds). The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Bordua, David J. The Police: Six Sociological Essays. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.
- Chapman, Samuel G. Police Patrol Readings. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1964, pp. 245-274.
- Coch, Lester and John R. P. French, Jr. "Overcoming Resistance to Change." Human Relations, Vol. 1, No. 4 (1948).
- Colin, J. M. "After X and Y Comes Z." Personnel Journal (January, 1971).
- Coser, Lewis A. The Functions of Social Conflict. Toronto, Ontario: Free Press, March, 1968.
- Davis, James A. "Authority--Flow Theory and the Impact of Chester Bernard." California Management Review, Vol. XIII, No. 1 (Fall, 1970).

- Lindblow, Charles E. The Policy-Making Process. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- March, James G. Handbook of Organizations. Rand McNally & Co., 1965.
- McNamara, John H. "Uncertainties in Police Work," in The Police New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967, edited by David J. Bordue, pp. 203-207.
- McBride, Thomas F. Speech given at the Management Institute of the National Association of Attorneys General. Denver, Colorado, November 6, 1971.
- National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Kerner Commission Report. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968.
- Rogers, David. The Management of Big Cities. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1971.
- Saunders, Charles B. Upgrading the American Police. The Brookings Institute, 1970.
- Schein, Edgar H. Organized Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Smith, Alexander B., Bernard Locke, and William F. Walker. "Authoritarianism in College and Non-College Oriented Police." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol. 58, No. 1.
- Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.
- Trojanowicz, Robert C. A Comparison of Behavior Styles of Policemen and Social Workers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.
- Tullock, Gordon. Politics of Bureaucracy. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1965.
- Vega, William. "The Liberal Policeman: A Contradiction in Terms?" Issues in Criminology, Vol. 4, No. 1.
- Webster, John A. "Police Task and Time Study." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science (March, 1970).
- Williams, Edgar G. "Changing Systems and Behavior." Business Horizons (August, 1969).
- Wilson, James Q. "The Police and Their Problems: A Theory." Public Policy XII. Carl J. Friedrich and Seymour E. Harris, (Eds.). Graduate School of Public Administration, Harvard University, 1963.

- Dayton/Montgomery County Pilot Cities Program: Evaluation of Community-Centered Team Policing. Dayton: Community Research, Inc., 1971.
- Downs, Anthony. Inside Bureaucracy. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.
- Elliott, J. F. and Thomas J. Surdino. Crime Control Team. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1971).
- Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Fosdick, Raymond B. American Police Systems. Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith Publishing, Rev. 1969.
- Gardner, John W. Self Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Gazell, James A. "Authority--Flow Theory and the Impact of Chester Bernard." California Management Review, Vol. XIII, No. 1 (Fall, 1970).
- Geneen, Harold S. "The Human Element in Communications." California Management Review (Winter, 1966).
- Golembiewski, Robert T. "The Laboratory Approach to Organization Change: Scheme of a Method." Public Administration Review (September, 1967).
- Golembiewski, Robert T. Men, Management, and Morality. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Goodwin, Watson. "Resistance to Change." American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 14, No. 5 (May-June, 1971), pp. 745-765.
- Greenwood, Noel. "Quiet Revolution Under Way in Police Training, Education." Oakland Police Department Information Bulletin. Reprinted from Los Angeles Times (1972).
- Judson, Arnold S. A Manager's Guide to Making Changes. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967, pp. 390-452.
- Leavitt, Harold J. Managerial Psychology. 2nd Ed. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

NOTES

1. We undertook this paper as three practitioners who have been heavily involved in attempts to improve urban policing. The material we have developed is based on both personal experiences and our interpretation of the implications of the research findings. Although we are indebted to many people who have reacted to the ideas expressed herein, we are particularly grateful to Mr. Edward A. Lettus, a Research Associate on the Dayton/Montgomery County Pilot Cities staff. Mr. Lettus devoted a tremendous amount of his time to collecting resource material, reacting to our ideas, and editing the various drafts of the paper. We sincerely appreciate his efforts.
2. Information concerning variations on the recommendations contained under this sub-heading can be found in Samual G. Chapman, Police Patrol Readings (Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1964), pp. 245-274; The President's Commission on Law Enforcement, Task Force Report: The Police (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 117-118; J. F. Elliott and Thomas J. Surdino, Crime Control Team (Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1971); and John E. Angell, "An Alternative to Classical Police Organizational Arrangements," Criminology (Vol. 9, No. 2 & 3, Aug.-Nov., 1971), pp. 185-207.