Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects   Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects

1977

A Role Analysis of Police Chiefs in Contemporary Departments

Thomas Wolf
College of William & Mary - Arts & Sciences

A ROLE ANALYSIS OF POLICE CHIEFS

IN CONTEMPORARY DEPARTMENTS

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Sociology

The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

---

by

Thomas Wolf

1977

A ROLE ANALYSIS OF POLICE CHIEFS

IN CONTEMPORARY DEPARTMENTS

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Thomas Wolf
Author

Approved, January 1977

Gary A. Kreps
Gary A. Kreps

Satoshi Ito
Satoshi Ito

Jon Kerner
Jon Kerner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of the contemporary police chief and any changes that have resulted from the recent professionalization of the field of law enforcement.

The data were collected in an investigation of organizational changes due to professionalization. A role theory framework was used to analyze the changes that the chief of police has undergone because of the changes in the organization he heads.

The results suggest that the role of the chief has changed. The position is becoming more stable than in the past as indicated by an increase in the average length of tenure. Two distinct types of chief are evident, and these two types differ in several ways. Traditional police chiefs are generally less educated and have a less professional orientation to police work. The newer type of chief is generally more educated with a more professional approach to law enforcement. In addition, the newer type of chief possess characteristics which enable them to operate the complex organization that modern police departments have become. These administrative skills are necessary due to the integration of each department in a larger law enforcement network.

INTRODUCTION

The role of the chief of police is in the process of change as
police departments become more professionalized. The chief is no
longer a man with twenty or more years experience on the force in one
department whose basic qualification for the position is an adeptness
at apprehending criminals (Gourley & Jarrell, 1975). The police chief
of today is a person with more education than his predecessors, and
his skills are reflecting the different responsibilities and demands
that have to be met by the administrative head of the modern police
department. Coordinating the activities of an organization the size
of many contemporary police departments makes the job of police chief
similar to that of the executive of a medium- to large-size corpora-
tion. He has the responsibility of efficiently managing the resources
of the department, which can be extremely large in the case of many
urban departments. The chief is also responsible to the public, his
superiors in local government, and others for the effective control of
criminal activity within his jurisdiction, in addition to the manage-
ment of other phenomena such as traffic control and public safety.
This efficiency-effectiveness orientation to the position of the police
chief is the type that is utilized in choosing and evaluating business
executives (Barnard, 1968; Bender, 1950; Kienzle & Dare, 1950; Selznick,
1957). The modern, professional police department is now being thought
of as a business which must have the most efficient and effective

2

leadership if it is to be successful in fulfilling its duties (Gourley & Jarrell, 1975).

The literature that is available on police chiefs is very limited, but that which does exist reflects the changing role of the chief. His duties, functions, and the skills needed to fulfill these duties are coming to be more and more similar to those of business executives, with, of course, the special requirements each field demands of its executives. In addition, the literature reflects the adaptation to a more profession- alized mode of operation.

In March 1958, an article appeared in The Police Chief by Edward J. Allen, who was then chief of the Santa Ana, California Police Department. Chief Allen described the attributes that "The Police Chief of Tomorrow" would have to possess in order to successfully head what was becoming a more professionalized organization. The chief of the future would have to possess an education which would provide him with a knowledge of the origins and purpose of man, as well as a knowledge of causes of criminal activity. This education would include the liberal arts, social sciences, and advanced literature. In addition, the chief would have to know the scientific, technical, and mechanical phases of police work. He would be a community leader with a specific attention paid to the problems of youth, as well as "the welfare of humankind" (Allen, 1958, p. 8). While the chief would still be a public servant, Chief Allen predicted that there would be less political domination than in the past, but that this increased freedom would also result in an in- crease in the responsibility falling directly on the chief himself. A final aspect of the changing role of the chief of the future would be the necessity of keeping up with new developments in the field of police

work, from the utilization of new equipment to the psychology of the criminal. Allen forsaw that this would probably entail enrollment of the chief in college courses, at least for the acquisition of some of the new knowledge (Allen, 1958).

Chief Allen's description of the police chief of the future predicted a change in the role of the police chief that is just becoming evident at the present time. The changing role is a reaction to the increasing pro-fessionalization in the field of police work. Role theory, as expounded by Bruce Biddle and Edwin Thomas (1966), provides an excellent framework within which to analyze the present position of the police chief and how it is affected by the professionalization of modern police departments. The police chief is a person in a specific position in relation to an entire network of relationships, responsibilities, and behaviors and role theory provides a means to understand the changes that are coming about as a result of the changes within the organization over which the chief presides. The basic research problem will therefore be conceptualized in terms of the "role theory" framework.

CHAPTER I

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

The role of the chief of police can be analyzed using the
classificatory system of Thomas and Biddle as expounded in their work,
Role Theory: Concepts and Research (Thomas & Biddle, 1966). The role
concept is formulated into three "conceptual formulations" (Thomas &
Biddle, 1966, p. 23): (a) analytic partitions of phenomenal referents,
(b) relations of these analytic partitions, and (c) combinations of
these analytic partitions.

There are three sets of phenomenal referents which can be placed
into different categories; behaviors, persons, and persons and their
behaviors. By analyzing the role of the police chief in terms of these
three referents and the three conceptual formulations, an accurate pic-
ture can be drawn of what the police chief does and what are the factors
which influence him to behave in a certain manner.

There are several terms which apply to persons who affect the role
under consideration. Thomas and Biddle mention "ego," "alter," "self,"
"other," "reference group," "actor," and "group." It is much more than
a simple distinction between the focus of attention and all others who
exist in the environment of influence. The police chief is the subject
in this particular instance and all others are non-subjects, but each
person can at some point be an actor, ego, and self as well as other,
member of a reference group, or alter.

There are four basic analytic partitions which are used to classify persons: persons studies (which was discussed above), behaving persons, number of persons, and particularized persons. Behaving persons are distinguished by the terms "behaver" and "target," the behaver being the one who exhibits the behavior and the target being one who may or may not be affected by the behavior of the behaver. In situations of rapid interaction, persons may alternate between being behaver and target and then behaver again. There may be some confusion because as Thomas and Biddle point out, there is often no distinction made between the partitions of persons studied and behaving persons with the resulting ambiguity of automatically classifying all behavers as subjects and all targets as non-subjects.

The number of persons is another partition which can be very important to any study of role. The three categories in this partition are the "individual" or a single person, an "aggregate" or more than one person, and "every person" or all persons. The affects on role of behavior is much different dependent on the numeric magnitude of the behavers and targets.

The final partition is that of particularized persons, within which four forms of generic or specific classification can differentiate a person or persons from all others. The first form is characterized by the person or aggregate being particularized by their behavier (e.g., "the rapist," "the fish eater," "the baby sitter") (Thomas & Biddle, 1966, p. 24). The second form of particularization is derived from the positional designation of the person; for example, the teacher, the father, or the police chief. The third form is simply a means to designate a first person, second person, etc. The three above forms of

particularization are all generic. The fourth form is specific, that is it is used to designate specific persons such as the Philadelphia Phillies, United States Senators, or faculty of Harvard University; or a specific person such as Ms. Ann Smith or Mr. Tom Jones.

Behaviors may also be partitioned according to the following schema of five types of behavior; action, description, evaluation, prescription, and sanction. These five concepts of behavior are useful when analyzing the behavior of a police chief in response to the behaviors of those around him.

The first type of behavior is termed "action," and behaviors are classified as actions on the basis of having been previously learned by the actor, directed toward some goal, and apparently voluntary on the part of the actor. Overt behavior of this sort is called "performance" while the covert inclination to behave in a certain manner is termed "motive." Performance can be categorized into several different types of action but these distinctions are arbitrary. They can be used to clarify a point in a specific situation or investigation but cannot be applied across situations. Examples of this arbitrary classification are work-performance, sex-role behavior, and task-performance, each being useful but only in a very restricted sense.

Prescription is the second partition of behavior, and as the name implies, those behaviors which should be performed are classified as prescriptions. A distinction needs to be made between covert and overt prescriptions and Thomas and Biddle make such a distinction (Thomas & Biddle, 1966, p. 26). Overt prescriptive behavior is referred to as "demands" while "norm" is the term given to covert prescription. The

term role itself is often used in a prescriptive sense, and the topic of prescriptions has received much attention because of the influence they have on all aspects of human life. But taken within the larger concept of behaviors as a portion of role theory, prescriptions can be dealt with to an appropriate degree. Prescriptions may be positive as well as negative, depending on whether they permit or forbid a certain behavior from occurring.

Evaluation is the third partition of behavior. These types of behavior are primarily concerned with approval or disapproval. Such terms as preference, value, affect, esteem, and reward are used to refer to evaluative behavior. Covert evaluation is referred to by the term "value" while overt evaluation is termed "assessment" (Thomas & Biddle, 1966, p. 27).

The fourth partition of behavior is description and behaviors which represent events, phenomena, and processes without any hint of evaluation are placed in this category. A covertly held description is referred to as a "conception" which is similar to the ordinary English word idea. Overt descriptions are referred to as "statements" which usually take the form of verbal descriptions.

The final form of behavior is placed in the partition referred to as sanction. This partition is characterized by behaviors which are intended to change the behavior of another, usually so that the other's behavior will more closely conform to prevailing prescriptions. Sanctions can be both covert and overt, but Thomas and Biddle do not have special terms for each instance. Behaviors that sanction can also be both positive and negative. Positive sanctions usually reward the appropriate behavior while negative sanctions are those behaviors which punish undesirable behavior.

Thomas and Biddle point out that these five categories of behavior are not totally independent. Only prescription, evaluation, and description are exclusive to the point where behaviors classified as one of these three types cannot be placed in any other partition. There can become ambiguity when behaviors which are sanctions and actions are involved in an analysis of some role. For this reason, these partitions cannot be thought of as an ultimate and final classification system for behaviors but only a guide to be used so that the complexity of behaviors which influence all aspects of a role can be dealt with.

The third set of phenomenal referents which can be partitioned consists of persons and their behaviors. This category of phenomena is a special one in which concepts which pertain to both behavior and persons are combined to form one unifed concept, having particular aspects from both the person and behavior sets of referents. Thomas and Biddle illustrate the behavior-person set of referents by the utilization of a matrix in which all possible combinations of the types of behaviors and persons stated above are represented by a position corresponding to a specific value for each variable. For example, a single person's covert action is represented by the term "individual motive" (Thomas & Biddle, 1966, p. 32).

The notion of position has a special place in role theory, for as Thomas and Biddle point out, ever since Linton (1936) a role has usually been defined in relation to a specific position. There are many other terms which are used to designate what is referred to by the word position (niche, status, office, etc.), each of which is useful when used in a specific context, for example, an analysis of social ranking. A position can be a category of individuals such as an

occupational grouping, but there has almost always been the assumption of some type of common behavior which was characteristic of the group of persons categorized together. Thomas and Biddle give the following definition as the one which can be taken as a concensus from the literature on role, "Position is a collectively recognized category of persons for whom the basis for such differentiation is their common attribute, their common behavior, or the common reactions of others toward them" (Thomas & Biddle, 1966, p. 29).

The other major concept in this set of phenomenal referents is the term "role" itself. There is a great deal of disagreement on what exactly a role is, but the concensus is that it refers to the behaviors of specific persons. A role is the "set of prescriptions defining what the behavior of a position member should be" (Thomas & Biddle, 1966 p. 29). It is because of the confusion and dissensus that such a detailed schema of the factors of role theory are needed. The above discussion outlines some of the concepts which are incorporated and combined to create a picture of what a specific role is. The persons, behaviors, and the persons and their behaviors are the concrete elements of what makes up a role. Also influential are the relationships between the persons and behaviors which constitute a role.

The criterion of similarity is the major one which is used to relate behaviors to one another. If two behaviors are similar enough to not be discernibly different, then they can be considered "similar." If two behaviors are discernibly different, they can be said to be "differentiated." "Concensus" exists when there is agreement among persons on a given topic. There must be something about which the various persons involved agree for concensus to exist. When there is

disagreement between persons on a given topic, concensus does not exist.
Polarized disagreement is referred to as "conflict" while disagreement
which is not characterized by polarization is referred to as "dissensus"
(Thomas & Biddle, 1966, p. 33).

The criterion of similarity only pertains to four of the five
partitions of behavior. When action is being considered, the term "con-
formity" is used to refer to a similarity among actions. Specialization
is another term which is used in special circumstances. It is used to
describe the amount of behavior engaged in by the individual or aggre-
gate and the number of different behaviors for a given domain of
behavior. A definition of specialization must be restricted to one
particular area of behavior in order for the categories to have any
meaning. If this is not done, each person becomes a specialist be-
cause each person's totality of actions are unique.

Concensus, uniformity, and specialization are ach concepts which
can be used to describe commonalities of behavior among specific
persons. They differ as to the aspect of behavior that is being compared
with other behaviors. Concensus and uniformity restrict the range of
behavior while comparing many persons according to the behaviors.
Specialization involves few or many persons who are compared over a
much broader range of behaviors.

Consistency is another aspect of role which must be taken into
account, particularly if the role is undergoing change. Consistency
refers to the compatibility of behaviors; if two behaviors imply the
converse or impossibility of each other, then they are considered
"inconsistent." There are two forms of consistency, and thus, also
inconsistency. The first is "logical consistency," which exists when

two similar behavioral partitions are existed by the same person. "Cognitive consistency" exists when two behaviors imply events which are not denied by either behavior. An example of cognitive inconsistency would be a doctor who was also an undertaker. The two behaviors are certainly logically possible, and even physically possible, but there is a cognitive element which tends to disallow a person from participating in both behaviors.

Determination is another concept which is involved in role theory. When phenomena are interdependent, that is they exist together for some reason, there is a causal or determining relationship between them. Thomas and Biddle illustrate two types of determining relationships. The first occurs when one phenomenon behaviorally hinders or facilitates another. The second type involves rewards and costs which the person exhibiting the behavior experiences as a result of the behavior. The terms function, competition, and cooperation all describe forms of interdependence, the difference being in what specific form the interaction occurs (Thomas & Biddle, 1966, pp. 36-38).

When criteria of similarity and determination are applied to relationships between the basic concepts of role theory, the combination produces useful terms which can be utilized to better analyze a particular role. Conformity is the outcome when uniform behavior results from influences of a norm or demand. The prescription for the appropriate behavior is the force which produces a consistent form of behavior from one or more individuals. Adjustment is the term which is used to describe the situation where the actions determine the expectations. This situation is the reverse of conformity, and is illustrated by a person who has been unsuccessful in some endeavor

changing his aspirations to accommodate the fact of failure by setting

lower or different goals. When descriptions are compared with the actual

events which were predicted and the predictions were found to be correct,

then "accuracy" is said to exist. The concept of accuracy is most

familar in the behavioral sciences where the prediction of behavior

plays a major part.

The final operation which can be performed on the concepts that

have been discussed above is combination. For example, when a specific

set of persons and a particular specialization of behaviors have been

designated, a division of labor can be established. The topic of

division of labor has received a great deal of attention as something

of value to be studied as a separate subject, but it can also be used

to further understand the role that a particular subject population

assumes. A role set is another combination of concepts which can be

used to better understand the role a specific person or aggregate takes,

but it should not be confused with the role itself. The role is the

set of specializations that a particular behaver assumes (Thomas &

Biddle, 1966, p. 40).

The chief of a police department is an individual who occupies

a specific position in an organization and because of that position,

there are many behavioral expectations placed on him. It is logical

to assume that as an organization changes, these behavioral expecta-

tions will also change. In today's world of police work where the

department is very dependent upon outside sources for funding, the

chief is removed from his customary role as a behaver and becomes a

target. The actions of another force, such as the federal government,

determines a great deal of what a chief is able to do. How the chief

deals with this situation is an extremely important aspect of his job. In addition, the autocratic rule of a police chief has become an outmoded method of operation. The chief must be able to respond to the members of his department, and as these personnel become more professionalized, the need for two-way communication should become evident.

The actions of a police chief are bound to change as his responsibilities change. Chiefs are evaluated on the basis of their performance of their duties and their effectiveness in dealing with the problems of their communities. Police departments have become professionalized as a response to changes in the environment in which they operate so it is natural to assume that the specific actions of the chief will also change. The new responsibilities brought about by professionalization will dictate that the chief of the present will act much different than his predecessors. Both the performance and the motives of the chief will have to be adapted to the new nature of his occupation if he is to retain his position.

The demands that a chief in a professionalized department will have to meet will be determined by the new responsibilities that he faces. The norms for behavior for a chief will probably not alter to any great extent. He will probably continue to have the same general characteristics such as honesty that persons in positions of power and responsibility are expected to have, but the specific skills will change as the jobs he is expected to do change.

Those things which a chief values will probably differ as the manner in which he does his job changes. The police chief of previous times valued physical strength, equipment to control criminal activity, and other things because it was these tools that he used in his job.

But as police departments become professionalized and their mode of operation changes, it is natural that the chief will adapt his values and assessments to reflect those tools which he is now using.

The classificatory system of role theory that Thomas and Biddle organized does not produce any specific expectations for change in any role, but there are general reactions to changes in the factors that influence a role that can be predicted. As the chief at times becomes a target for the behavior of various agencies, particularly funding agencies, his behavior can be expected to change. The size and complexity of the organization he deals with will also affect the role the chief has to take in order to be a successful leader.

A review of the limited literature that is available on police chiefs should provide a general guide as to whether the prediction of changes in the actions, prescriptions, and evaluations of the modern police chief are true. The literature should indicate if the chief is becoming less autocratic in his leadership, if his skills are changing in response to new responsibilities, and if other changes are occurring in the role of the chief in professionalized police departments.

The description that Edward Allen gave of the police chief of the future is consistent with other recent literature in the area. Another description of the type of person that was desired to fill the role of police chief appeared in The Police Chief of June 1972. Claremont, California was searching for a person to fill the vacant position and this description gives a good example of the change that had occurred in police administration. The chief would have to be cognizant of the changes that had been occurring in law enforcement and respond flexibly

to them. In the perspective of the future of law enforcement, the chief would have to initiate and implement changes on his own. An understanding of the political situation was seen as important, for it is the political system that the chief must deal with. In many cases, the chief's position as chief is dependent upon this relationship (Hollady, 1962). Chief Allen's prediction notwithstanding, it is fact that political pressure is a very influential aspect of a police chief's life. The chief must be able to operate in spite of or in response to the demands placed on him by the politicians of the area. The chief would also have to balance the rights of the individual with the rights of society, and take his cues for this balance by responding appropriately to the norms of the community. This responsiveness to the community is a key element affecting the effectiveness of the chief (Angell, 1966; Linenberger, 1972; Hollady, 1962).

Linenberger also points out that the chief would have to be able to deal objectively with criticism and act to correct any faults which he might have. Also important was an intellectual understanding of the court systems, the law, and the role of the police in the criminal justice system. He would have to understand the role of the press and how to correctly and effectively utilize it. Finally, the chief must understand "the interchange of law and morality and how the two of them travel on an evolutionary path" (Linenberger, 1972, p. 24).

As police departments were becoming professionalized, it was necessary for the chief to possess new skills which were reflective of and commensurate with the professional orientation of the department. It was necessary for the chief to successfully manage personnel who were more educated than before, and thus less likely to be satisfied

with authoritarian command from a chief who quite possibly had less education than themselves (Rhodes, 1970). These managerial skills were much different from the means that chiefs of earlier times had used to control and command their officers. Linenberger, for one, points out the managerial skills that a chief of a modern, professional department must possess. He should have command experience of some sort which would give him a coolness under pressure, and a confidence in the decisions that are made. Experience with the situations that a police officer encounters is essential, and that can only be gained as a police officer. Here, Linenberger points out the importance of recruiting chiefs from the ranks of police officers.

The chief must recognize the needs of his line officers but always act on behalf of his city. Thus, while it is important for interdepartmental loyalty to extend to the chief's office, his ultimate responsibility and loyalty must be to his employers, the citizens of his city. Rhodes points out the importance of two-way communication within the department as it affects the effectiveness of the line officers. Authoritative supervision reduces the effectiveness of the line officers because it reduces their satisfaction with the system under which they are functioning. Using Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Rhodes claims that in departments where the leadership is of the authoritarian type, only the first two needs are met, these being physical and social needs. However, if the leadership is of the participant type, then the third and fourth needs of ego and self-fulfillment will also be met (Rhodes, 1970).

The chief must also be able to match the goals of the individual police officer with the philosophy of the department (Angell, 1969).

And what this philosophy is can to a great extent determine the
effectiveness of the department. Angell contrasts what he calls the
classical approach to police administration with a less rigid, and in
most cases, more successful orientation. There are rules for planning,
organizing, and directing materials, techniques, and personnel for the
greatest efficiency of the organization. In a society such as the
United States where the police must respond to the pressures from
several, sometimes conflicting, authorities, this type of management is
not as effective in the prevention of what Angell calls social disorder.
He asserts that the department, particularly the chief, must be respon-
sive to the various forces in the community in order for the police to
have any success in fulfilling its duties.

Angell claims that there are at least four entities or bodies
which influence the police and that the chief must exhibit behavior
which at least appears to be responsive to each of these influences.
The four forces are the judiciary, the public, the legislature, and the
organizational influences in the community. He asserts that respon-
siveness involves "actions necessitated by environmental influences,
either latent or overt. The action necessary may or may not be a legal,
or even a formal responsibility of the administrator" (Angell, 1969,
p. 22). The prescriptions, both overt and covert, which originate
from each force must be dealt with by the chief in the manner which is
least disruptive to the department and the community.

In his relationship with the judicial system the police chief
should maintain a good communication with all segments of the judiciary,
including the attorneys, baliffs, clerks, and of course, the judges. A
constantliaison between the police department and the courts should be

maintained, even if the chief must assign an officer whose full-time position would be as liaison. It is also important that the department consult with the local judicial personnel before any policy decisions are made which could eventually involve the courts. These policies should give the maximum assistance possible to the attorneys without favoritism, because to alienate any members of the judicial system would be to the disadvantage of the police department. While the department should honor and respect any and all decisions made by the courts, the chief should support the courts by being intolerant of any illegal or unethical behavior by any member of his department. A final criterion for the cooperation and responsiveness between the police and the courts is that the police department should never intentionally create tension or hostility by blaming the courts for mistakes which are made by police officers (Angell, 1969).

Public influences are very strong as well and the chief must be able to react to them with the same expertise with which he deals with the judiciary if he is to be successful. He must be flexible in his dealings with the public, both in the decisions he makes and in the timing of these decisions, so it is important for the chief to remain aware of the prevailing norms of the community. He should always react calmly and rationally after he has gathered all the pertinent information, because emotional reactions always result in negative consequences. The chief should limit himself to issues which concern the public and are public, not the controversies which arise concerning the department. These matters can best be handled by some other member of the department. Since one of the best ways to solve problems is to avoid them in the first place, the chief should constantly reassess the policies and

position of the department on all issues so that he might keep them in
line with the norms and demands of the community. His decisions should
reflect the "mores and culture" of the community rather than his per-
sonal views on how law enforcement should be carried out.

"Loyalty to a code of ethics that supports equality and justice is
paramount to a professional police administrator" (Angell, 1969, p. 24).
While Angell states that absolute equality and justice are not possible,
he asserts that the police chief should attempt to achieve it.

Legislative influences are very important to the police chief
because it is from these sources that in many cases he derives his
position and power. In order to survive in his position as police chief,
he must be able to convince the members of the legislature that he is
handling the police organization in the most effective and efficient
manner possible and that he is carrying out their wishes on how to
manage the police department. It is his duty to keep the legislature
aware and informed of the nature of the problems his department faces.
In addition, the problems that the legislature is faced with such as
dissatisfied citizens must be dealt with in an ethical manner, and
with as much expediency as possible. In the interest of the welfare
of the department, the chief must become acquainted with the legis-
lators so that he may know their motivations and values which influence
them to make decisions which could affect the department. He should
attempt to initiate legislation which would benefit the department and
increase its effectiveness, and while he does not have to support all
proposals of the legislature, once they are passed and become law, he
is bound to enforce them regardless of personal opinion (Angell, 1969).

Finally, organizational influences on the police chief are also extremely strong and must be dealt with effectively if the chief is to be successful in his job. In a rigid hierarchy, each level is responsible and accountable to the next higher level. This is not a completely accurate description of the relationships within the hierarchy that concerns the police chief because there are many points at which the hierarchy is not rigidly defined and discrenible. It is to these points that the chief must attend. He must be aware of exactly how much power he has and from what sources within the community he draws his support. Without this knowledge, it would be all too easy for the chief to overstep his authority and be left without any base of power. He should also be aware of the attitude toward the department of those in power, both those who support him and those who do not. In the same manner in which he should know the views of the legislators, he should also know those of the mayor or city manager so that he may be able to anticipate the actions of those to whom he must answer. Their attitudes toward his department as well as toward other departments in the city can provide valuable information. Lastly, there are organizations within the police department such as fraternal orders, unions, and others which the chief must be acquainted with if he is to deal effectively with his own personnel (Angell, 1969).

These actions that a police chief should take to be more effective and successful in his job are reflective of the managerial approach that has begun to be more evident in police administration. Gourley and Jarrell presented a managerial profile of the police chief in the April 1975 issue of The Police Chief in which they take the principles by which executives of business operate and apply them to police

executives, the chiefs. Below is a list of qualities which Gourley and

Jarrell assert a police chief should have:

> He should be objective and completely without prejudice.
> He should be a generalist (and not a specialist).
> He should possess the highest degree of integrity.
> He should be completely honest, sincere, and emphatic.
> He should have the equivalent of a bachelor's degree.
> He should be of a business-oriented background.
> He should be intelligent and emotionally stable.
> He should have military experience.
> He should be financially solvent.
> He should be able to pass a complete background investigation.
> He should have tact, sound judgment, and physical courage.
> He should be conversant with the entire government structure,
>   the court, and their philosophies.
> He should be well-grounded in sociology and human relations.
> He should have an understanding of what makes people react
>   and a knowledge of the impact his actions will have on them.
>   (Gourley & Jarrell, 1975, pp. 20-21)

These qualities are almost identical to those mentioned by Allen,

Linenberger, and others and they are a far cry from the basic requirement

of several years ago, that being skilled at apprehending criminals. What

was being looked for in police chiefs gives a clear indication of the

orientation which was becoming prevalent as the field became more pro-

fessionalized.

Gourley and Jarrell also include a list of managerial skills which

they deem necessary for the modern police chief. These are decision

making, motivation, discipline, controlling, organizing, hiring,

directing research, advancing the professional technology of the police

profession, understanding long-and short-term planning, and delegating

responsibility commensurate with authority. The effective police chief

as described by Gourley and Jarrell also must recognize the importance

of good communication, as was pointed out in previous literature. The

size of the department influences the types of functions that can be

accommodated and it is up to the chief to recognize the needs and

limitations dependent on size. The chief's training of personnel within

his own staff is another measure of managerial expertise. If he is

assured that each member is as effective as possible, that the members

are exposed to all facets of the department, and could effectively re-

place him in an emergency, then he may be considered to have the mana-

gerial skills necessary to be a good police chief in a professional

department. The department must be run like a business, therefore, the

executive of the department should have the skills and abilities of a

business executive (Gourley & Jarrell, 1975).

The relationship of a chief to his staff is very important to the

success which a chief can achieve. If he does not have a good working

understanding with his staff of how things are going to be done, then

complications could arise. This is not to say that a chief must be a

despot who only sends down orders to his subordinates. Linenberger,

Gourley and Jarrell, and others have illustrated the importance of two-

way communication to effective organizational work. But the position

of chief does place some imperatives on the person occupying that

position. Gourley discussed "Decision Making and Policy in the Chief's

Office" in the October 1973 The Police Chief. The chief is the deci-

sion maker in the department and his is the final and ultimate

responsibility for all the actions and decisions of his department.

He is the only member of the department who can create new policy.

While all members of the department can have opinions on how things

should be done and what changes should be made, the chief is the only

one who can implement these changes. The purpose of his staff is to

present him with alternatives and various courses of action directed

toward a specific goal. Once the chief has made a decision, it is

the responsibility of the staff to see that the policies of the chief
are carried out by the line personnel. But the staff of the chief does
not serve as an instrument of control within the department. That func-
tion should fall to another section of the department. Each section of
the department has its own functions, and these functions must be under-
stood by all in order for effective delegation of policy decisions to
occur (Gourley, 1973).

As far back as 1941, there were beginnings of the professionaliza-
tion of police departments as reflected by the different approaches to
find police chiefs for vacant positions. In The American City of August
1941, an article appeared showing that there was some awareness of the
fact that it was not always beneficial for a department to restrict its
search for a chief to its own ranks. There was a nation-wide competition
in which candidates participated in both written and oral examinations.
The top finalists were interviewed by members of the city government and
a final decision was then made. In this way, the city was attempting
to get the best person for the job. The residency requirement that had
been in affect up to that time was rescinded. Most cities have removed
the residency requirement but there are still some localities where this
rule has hampered the search for the best qualified person for vacant
positions (Gourley & Jarrell, 1975). The administrators of this city
were looking for someone with administrative abilities and a knowledge
of modern police administration. They felt that their selection pro-
cess would be more successful in finding such a person than previous
methods (The American City, August 1941, p. 79).

With the increase in the professionalization of police departments,
there have been new problems which have confronted the police chief.

"The Police Chief in a World of Research" by R. S. Clark illustrates one
of the newer problems (Clark, 1975). The police chief, in order to
understand and function with the enormous amount of scientific and tech-
nical research that is now coming out, must be a scientifically trained
manager. He must have enough knowledge to distinguish between data and
data indices, opinions and observable behavior, and to discern findings
from conclusions and recommendations. In order to do this, the chief
must have more than a rudimentary knowledge of research techniques and
forms. He must be able to discern if a value judgment is implicit in
an arbitrary scaling procedure. This knowledge is of the type such that
it would not have been likely picked up through normal experience on the
force. It is this specialized type of knowledge which is more likely to
be learned in courses designed to acquaint police personnel with
research methodology. The most practical reason why the chief must
have this knowledge, besides being able to keep up with the latest
developments in all aspects of police work, is that to a great degree,
the funding that a department receives, particularly from the federal
government, is determined by research of this type (Clark, 1975).

This factor is illustrated directly by K. J. Peak in the April 1975
issue of The Police Chief. His article, entitled "Grantsmanship: A
Necessary Addendum to the Police Administrator's Workload," illustrates
that scientific research is a great determinant of federal funding for
municipal police departments. It is to the great disadvantage of a
department if it does not have at least one person who knows a sub-
stantial amount of research methodology and statistics in order to be
able to compete for funds. Having such a person does not give a
department an advantage, but merely places it on an equal level with

almost every other department. Peak points out that not only does a member of the department have to be able to read the scientific reports, but he also has to be adept at preparing requests for funding. It is not necessarily the chief who must have this expertise at grantsmanship, but someone in the department has to serve this function. And if the chief is totally ignorant of this aspect of his job, it is likely that he would not remain in his position for long. Some degree of understanding in this area on the part of the chief is essential, and the more knowledge he has the better he will be able to serve his department (Peak, 1975).

The mobility of police chiefs is another aspect of the job which deserves some consideration, and has received a small amount in the literature. In a 1958 study of police chiefs in Iowa, it was found that the average tenure was only 4.3 years (Lunden, 1958). Although this study is almost twenty years old, it shows the precariousness of the position, at least at that time. Lunden points out that there are negative aspects to both long- and short-term tenures for police chiefs. A department which has rapid and frequent turnover of its chiefs is likely operating under a political system similar to the "bossism" of some large cities where the position of police chief is a political favor, and one that is granted with each new election. On the other hand, if a chief has remained in his position for an extremely long period of time, he may be something of a dictator who runs the department as he sees fit, with no interference from any outside influences. Lunden found the following results in his Iowa study:

Percentage of Chiefs	Length of Tenure
47 %	Less than 2 years
32 %	2 to 5 years
13 %	6 to 10 years
4.5%	11 to 15 years
2.5%	16 to 20 years
.5%	21 to 25 years
1.5%	More than 25 years

As the results show, the vast majority of chiefs remained at their position for less than five years while almost half left after less than two years. Lunden investigated the reasons that were given by the chiefs for leaving their positions and found the following:

Percentage of Chiefs	Reason for Leaving
30%	Change in city administration
17%	Resignation
16%	Retirement
10%	Removal
8%	Moved to another position
19%	Unknown

As can be seen from the above data, political influence accounted for a substantial percentage of the changes in police chiefs. Of the 19 percent not accounted for, Lunden could not determine the cause because of vague or complex reasons being given. He did estimate that the percentage of politically motivated changes could be as high as 55-60 percent, but that in any case, the position of police chief was overly controlled and determined by political influence of one form or another (Lunden, 1958).

P. J. Snead, in an article in The Police Chief of January 1974, discussed another aspect, or orientation, to the command of a police department. He asserts that a chief of a department must have a humanistic perspective in order to be successful. He defines humanism as the study of man in the "grand perspective." Not only must the chief know

the technical side of police work, but he must also know the principles, structure, and operation of government. In addition, he must be aware of the state of the nation and the political, economic, and sociological aspects which are important to the overall condition of the state. Snead holds that the key to learning about these areas is not the study of empirical works, but rather, the study of literature on these topics. The topics that should be read include character, society, command, communication, normality, and imagination (Snead, 1974). He asserts that much more can be gained by reading literary works in these areas than by studying specific instructional texts on each subject. Whether his contention is correct or not, the areas he emphasizes are similar to those subject areas which many others hold that modern police chiefs should be acquainted with if they are to successfully head the contemporary, professionalized police departments now becoming more prevalent.

As the previously cited literature has illustrated, the role of the police chief in present-day departments has taken on the attributes of the business executive. The efficiency-effectiveness orientation, as well as the new areas of knowledge which the contemporary chief must possess make the position truly an administrative one, and much more than simply the highest-ranked criminal catcher of previous years. The prescriptions for the position of police chief have changed over the years, and the persons who now occupy the positions have had to respond to the changes and influences in order to retain their positions.

There has been very little empirical research done on the police chief, particularly in recent years when the role has undergone a change. There are some data available on the police chief which could provide some indications as to whether the role described in the recent

literature is an accurate reflection of what is actually occurring in modern police departments. Professors Gary A. Kreps and Jack M. Weller conducted a study of police departments which was concerned with the organizational changes that have occurred as a result of the recent professionalization in the field of law enforcement (Kreps & Weller, 1975). A portion of their data is on the chief, and by analyzing it some of the questions that have been raised by the literature may be answered.

Lunden found that the length of tenure of police chiefs in 1958 was very short. The data collected by Kreps and Weller can provide a 1975 comparison to the 1958 figure. Several sources in the literature have shown that the old-fashioned method of promoting to chief a member of the same department is now becoming less common. The search for quali- fied personnel from outside the department can be interpreted as a reflection of a more professional orientation on the part of the depart- ment. The data of the 1975 study of police departments can provide an indication on how widespread this practice is in modern departments.

Kreps and Weller have shown that there has been an increase in the educational level of police officers. There should be a great deal of pressure on present-day chiefs to keep up with this increasing educa- tional level, for if they do not, there is a strong possibility that they could be replaced by someone who more closely reflects the educa- tional achievement of department personnel. As departments become more professionalized, will the chiefs keep up with the changes and adapt to the new mode of law enforcement or will they hold onto their old methods and eventually be replaced by individuals who reflect the modern approach? What affect will the intrusion into the field of

highly trained and educated persons have on their departments? Will

there be any difference between chiefs of the old mold and those who

possess the newer skills and orientations in terms of their attitudes

toward the various influences on their departments?

It is characteristic of professional organizations to use from what-

ever sources available all the assistance possible to increase their

efficiency and effectiveness. If the chief does not hold this attitude,

then it can be assumed that he is not making the adjustment to profes-

sionalization that the literature indicates should be made. The eval-

uation of the chief of various sources of information can provide a

measure of this aspect of the role.

By studying the data that Kreps and Weller have collected, empiri-

cal evidence can be compiled to either support or refute the indications

of the literature, that is that the role of the police chief is under-

going change as a result of the professionalization of the field of law

enforcement. Even though the data are limited, they do provide more

information on the police chief than has been collected in recent years,

and a careful analysis can give an indication as to whether the changes

that have occurred in law enforcement have reached up as far as the

chief's office. The literature indicates that the role of the chief

should be changing, he should be becoming more of an administrator to

better handle what is becoming a more complex organization, the pro-

fessional police department. Are chiefs becoming more professional and

instituting changes and improvements in their departments, or are they

resisting the changes that are occurring and holding onto their former

methods of police administration? Investigation of the data will hope-

fully answer these questions.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY AND MEASUREMENT

The findings of this research are based on the data collected by
Kreps and Weller in their 1975 study of professionalization within
police departments. Their research was a total population survey of
police departments in the United States from cities with populations
of at least 50,000 (N = 374). A questionnaire (see Appendix A) and
cover letter (see Appendix B) explaining the research was sent to the
chief of each department, with a resulting response rate of 37.2 per-
cent for a sample N of 139. Though the sample is slightly skewed
toward larger departments (cities of 100,000 and above) with 77 of the
total 139 responding departments being located in larger cities, the
data collected can be accepted as an excellent basis from which to
analyze contemporary police departments.

While the major emphasis of the original research was on the
organizational aspects of professionalization, included in the question-
naire were some items that referred specifically to the chief. It is
these items, in conjunction with the findings of Kreps and Weller that
relate to the chief and his role within the department, that form the
data base with which I will investigate the role of the police chief
in the contemporary departments.

Several methods of analysis were done of the data after it had been
coded and placed on an IBM system tape, using the Statistical Package

31

for the Social Sciences (SPSS). A marginal distribution was done of the chief's demographic variables (years of service, years in present department, years as chief, and age) with the results presented in Table 1. A marginal distribution was also done on the variable which measured the chief's level of education (see Table 2). A comprehensive correlation matrix was derived from the chief's demographic variables and a ten-item scale measuring the attitude of the chief toward innovations in police work. This correlation matrix is presented in Table 3. Table 4 shows the results of a factor analysis done on the ten-item attitude scale. A principle components analysis with varimax orthogonal rotation was employed, with a lower limit eigen value set at 1.000 to determine extraction of the factors for rotation. Finally, a marginal distribution was employed for another scale constructed from the chief's responses. He was asked to rank ten sources of information and assistance and the marginals of this scale are presented in Table 5.

The results of the above measures indicated certain relationships among the various variables. In an attempt to gain more insight into the role of the chief, and determine more exactly what the relationships were among the variables, multiple regression analysis was employed. Several precautions were taken to insure the validity of the findings. Measurement error has been reduced by using the mean value of a variable if that particular variable was missing for any case. In addition, multi-collinearity problems have been reduced by omitting some of the possible independent variables. The following is a list of all independent variables in the regression analysis:

SIZE - Number of sworn personnel in department
DEGRSIZE - Ratio of officers with college degrees to all sworn
personnel in department

```
TRPERSIZ - Ratio of training personnel to all sworn personnel
              in department
EDREQ - Minimum education requirement for recruits
SUBSCAL - Guttman scale of topics included in training
PROMSCAL - Ordinal scale of promotional evaluation procedures
AMTGRANT - Amount of L. E. A. A. discretionary funding, 1969-1974
CONFER - Number of officers attending conferences, 1973-74
SITE - Number of officers making site visits, 1973-74
YRDEPT - Years in present department
YRCHIEF - Years as chief
LEVED - Chief's level of education
MANCOUR - Presence/absence of management courses
NOEDPRO - Number of executive development programs
LIKSCAL - Likert scale of attitude scale (VO01 to VO10)
NACONF - National conferences
PD - Other police departments
PERS - Personnel in department
FEDAGEN - Federal agencies
REFCONF - Regional conferences
LOCORG - Local organizations
STAGEN - State agencies
SALARY - Salary paid to first-year officers
```

Ten of the variables (SIZE through SITE, SALARY) were found by Kreps and Weller to be indicative of various aspects of a police department. They were chosen to be included in the regressions because they are representative measures of these factors. Conference attendance, site visits, and discretionary funding are measures of the interorganizational field linkage of a department. PROMSCAL, SUBSCAL, ratio of personnel with degrees, training personnel ration, and educational requirement were found to be indicative of the level of professionalization of a department. Size of the department and salary are measures of the organizational wealth and size of a department.

Years in the department and years as chief were chosen while age and years of service were omitted to eliminate multi-collinearity problems. The other demographic variables which were included are also representative of the data. A Likert scale was constructed of the ten-item attitude scale by adding the response on each item. Because of

the inverse coding used on this item, a high score indicates a higher level of disagreement on the benefits of the new law enforcement agencies. The sources of information were also inversely coded, so that the lower the score, the higher the preference for that source of information. Only seven of the ten sources are included in the regression analysis, again to eliminate problems of multi-collinearity.

The criterion that was used for inclusion of any Beta coefficient was that it had to be at least twice its standard error. Each one of the chief's demographic variables was regressed on the independent variables listed above. In addition, the variable LIKSCAL as well as the seven sources of information listed above were all placed into regression analysis as independent variables. A correlation matrix of all variables in the regression analysis is presented in the findings section (see Table 6).

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

A series of questions was asked of the chief which gives a picture

of the type of person who occupies this position in modern departments.

An analysis of the marginal distribution of these variables reveals

that there has not been as much change among chiefs of police as the

literature would indicate, at least that can be seen from these charac-

teristics (see Table 1). The average age of the chiefs in the sample

was 50.46 years, and an investigation of the distribution of ages

reveals that only a small minority (6.0%) are less than forty years

old. More than half of the chiefs are over 50 years of age and almost

30 percent are at least 55 years old. Review of the other variables

also shows that the intimation contained in the literature of a radi-

cal change in police chief personnel has not occurred.

Most of the chiefs in this sample have quite extensive experience

as police officers (M = 25.6 years) with less than 20 percent having

served less than 20 years on the force. There are no chiefs with less

than eleven years experience as a police officer while nearly a fourth

had over 30 years of service. These figures reflect the reality that

in spite of changes in police department as far as the other personnel

are concerned, it is still necessary to put in quite a few years if

one expects to eventually rise to the position of chief. While there

may be a few examples of rapid promotion due to education or

TABLE 1

MARGINAL DISTRIBUTION OF CHIEF'S
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

	MEAN	S. D.	MIN	MAX	N
YRSERV	25.620	6.522	11.000	47.000	121
YRDEPT	19.857	11.101	0.000	42.000	119
YRCHIEF	5.669	6.850	0.000	32.000	118
AGE	50.462	7.334	34.000	71.000	117

YRSERV - Number of years of service as a police officer
YRDEPT - Number of years of service in present department
YRCHIEF - Number of years as chief
AGE - Number of years of age

administrative ability, the experience as a police officer is still held in great value as a prime requisite for the position as chief.

A characteristic of police departments prior to the period of professionalization was the police of promoting to the position of chief a member who had served in that department for many years. Partly responsible for this policy was the residency requirement for city employees that many localities operated under. The present research shows that while this practice is not as strictly adhered to as it was in the past, it is still the prevalent method of filling a vacant position. The mean number of years a chief has served in the department he heads is almost twenty (19.86). This statistic, coupled with the fact that the average tenure of the chiefs is less than six years tends to support the contention that in most cases, the chief was promoted to his position from within the same department. Only 20 percent of the chiefs responding had been in their present department for less than 6 years.

Lunden found the average tenure of police chiefs in Iowa in 1958 was only 4.3 years. The study of 1975 reveals that the mean value for years as chief has risen only a small amount, to 5.7 years. But the trend of the lengthening of tenure as police chief is supported, not only by this small increase in overall tenure, but in other statistics as well. Lunden found that nearly half (47%) had terms as chief of less than two years. Kreps and Weller found the corresponding figure to be 20 percent having served as chief for less than two years. In contrast to the 1958 study, 47 percent of the 1975 sample had been chief for at least three years. Where Lunden found 79 percent serving less than five years, the figure for 1975 shows a drop to 60 percent with less than 5 years as chief. These figures show that the trend,

however slight, is toward a lengthening and therefore a stabilization of the position of police chief.

An important aspect of the increasing professionalization of police departments has been the increase in the education of police personnel. An analysis of the level of education reported by the chiefs in this sample indicate that the chiefs are responding to this trend. As can be seen from the distribution of the chiefs' level of education (see Table 2), the chief of today's departments equals, if not surpasses, the educational level of other personnel in his department. Kreps and Weller found that on the average, 19 percent of the personnel in each department had college degrees. Nearly 40 percent of the chiefs had at least 2-year degrees and almost 33 percent had at least a 4-year degree. Fully 10 percent of the responding chiefs had Master's degrees and there was even one Ph.D. The only measure where the chiefs did not equal the other members of their department was in the category of those having taken college courses for credit. Only 75 percent of the chiefs have taken college courses while on the average, over 76 percent of the personnel in each department have taken them. It can be seen from these figures that police chiefs have more than kept up with the increasing level of education in contemporary police departments.

As a reflection of the business orientation as well as the increasing educational level, the participation of the chiefs in management and executive development courses supports the contention that chiefs are responding to the changes in their departments. Of the 121 chiefs who responded to whether or not they had taken any Administration/Management courses, 117 or 96.7 percent responded that they had. While the specific question of how many courses of this type they had taken was

TABLE 2

MARGINAL DISTRIBUTION OF CHIEF'S
LEVEL OF EDUCATION

	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY
H. S. DIPLOMA	2	31	26.1%	26.1%
H. S. PLUS	3	40	33.6%	59.7%
2 YR. DEGREE	4	9	7.6%	67.2%
4 YR. DEGREE	5	25	21.0%	88.2%
M. A.	6	13	10.9%	99.2%
PH. D.	7	1	0.8%	100.0%
		119	100.0%	

	MEAN	S. D.	MIN	MAX	N
LEVED	3.597	1.398	2.000	7.000	119

LEVED – Highest level of education achieved by chief

not asked, those who volunteered the number (N = 83) averaged almost eight courses. The affirmative response rate dropped significantly on the question of whether they had participated in any Executive Development Programs. Only 75 (61.7%) of the 120 chiefs who responded to this question had participated in such programs. However, the overall impression from the responses to these questions is that police chiefs of today are interested in keeping up with the managerial aspects of their position, whether the motivation is self-improvement or self-preservation.

A correlation matrix is presented (see Table 3) which provides some further information on the persons who occupy the position of police chief. As can be expected, age, years of service, years as a police chief, and years in the same department are all highly interrelated. The weakest correlation among these four variables is that between years in the same department and years as chief, but this is a fairly strong relationship. This could indicate that there has been some weakening of the policy of always promoting to chief a member from within a department.

When the variable of level of education is introduced and compared with the previous four variables, some marked differences result. There is a strong inverse relationship between education and three of the four demographic variables; age, years of service, and years in the department, but only a very weak, and non-significant, negative correlation with years as chief. This would indicate that it is the newer chiefs who possess the higher levels of education. These newer chiefs are also younger, thus a differentiation among chiefs may be said to exist. There are the older, less educated chiefs who have served for many years in their present department and there are the younger, more

TABLE 3

CORRELATION MATRIX OF CHIEF'S
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WITH
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND ATTITUDE SCALE

	YRSERV	YRDEPT	YRCHIEF	AGE	LEVED	EXDEVPRO
YRSERV	1.0000 (121) S=0.001	0.5239 (119) S=0.001	0.3223 (118) S=0.001	0.9030 (117) S=0.001	-0.2323 (119) S=0.006	-0.2339 (120) S=0.005
YRDEPT		1.0000 (119) S=0.001	0.2243 (117) S=0.008	0.5335 (115) S=0.001	-0.4962 (117) S=0.001	-0.1396 (118) S=0.066
YRCHIEF			1.0000 (118) S=0.001	0.3289 (114) S=0.001	-0.0530 (116) S=0.286	-0.0234 (117) S=0.006
AGE				1.0000 (117) S=0.001	-0.3031 (115) S=0.001	-0.2711 (116) S=0.002
LEVED					1.0000 (119) S=0.001	0.2019 (118) S=0.014
EXCEVPRO						1.0000 (120) S=0.001
MANCOUR	0.0461 (121) S=0.308	0.0651 (119) S=0.241	0.0733 (118) S=0.215	0.0699 (117) S=0.227	0.0799 (119) S=0.194	0.2355 (120) S=0.005
NOCOUR	-0.0294 (82) S=0.397	-0.0782 (81) S=0.244	-0.0325 (81) S=0.387	-0.0597 (81) S=0.298	0.2714 (81) S=0.007	0.1953 (81) S=0.040

(Coefficient / (Cases) / Significance)

TABLE 3, Cont.

	YRSERV	YRDEPT	YRCHIEF	AGE	LEVED	EXDEVPRO
NOEDPRO	-0.2109 (104) S=0.016	-0.1719 (102) S=0.042	-0.2185 (101) S=0.014	-0.2404 (103) S=0.007	0.2331 (102) S=0.009	0.6985 (104) S=0.001
V001	0.0521 (119) S=0.287	0.0428 (117) S=0.323	0.0026 (116) S=0.489	0.0363 (115) S=0.350	-0.1352 (117) S=0.073	-0.0541 (118) S=0.280
V002	0.0290 (119) S=0.377	-0.0627 (117) S=0.251	0.1827 (116) S=0.025	0.0069 (115) S=0.471	0.2043 (117) S=0.014	-0.0908 (118) S=0.164
V003	0.0068 (120) S=0.471	-0.1358 (118) S=0.071	-0.0114 (117) S=0.452	-0.0702 (116) S=0.227	0.1182 (118) S=0.101	0.1347 (119) S=0.072
V004	0.1439 (120) S=0.058	0.1674 (118) S=0.035	-0.0202 (117) S=0.414	0.1552 (116) S=0.048	-0.1328 (118) S=0.076	0.1357 (119) S=0.071
V005	0.1377 (121) S=0.066	0.1022 (119) S=0.134	0.1643 (118) S=0.038	0.1682 (117) S=0.035	-0.0100 (119) S=0.457	-0.1088 (120) S=0.118
V006	0.0530 (121) S=0.282	0.1628 (119) S=0.038	0.1446 (118) S=0.059	0.0236 (117) S=0.400	0.0121 (119) S=0.448	-0.0009 (120) S=0.496
V007	-0.0293 (120) S=0.376	0.1422 (118) S=0.062	0.2294 (117) S=0.006	0.0245 (116) S=0.397	-0.0902 (118) S=0.166	0.0439 (119) S=0.318
V008	0.0248 (121) S=0.394	0.0215 (119) S=0.408	0.1085 (118) S=0.121	0.0272 (117) S=0.385	0.0292 (119) S=0.376	0.0047 (120) S=0.480
V009	0.1021 (120) S=0.134	0.0316 (118) S=0.367	0.1908 (117) S=0.020	0.0517 (116) S=0.291	-0.0795 (118) S=0.196	-0.0267 (119) S=0.387
V010	0.1292 (119) S=0.081	0.1017 (117) S=0.138	0.2211 (116) S=0.009	0.0901 (115) S=0.169	-0.0932 (117) S=0.159	-0.0952 (118) S=0.152

(Coefficient / (Cases) / Significance)

TABLE 3, Cont.

NOCOUR – Number of Administration/Management courses taken
MANCOUR – Presence/absence of Administration/Management courses
EXDEVPRO – Participation in Executive Development Programs
NOEDPRO – Number of Executive Development Programs
VOO1 – Attitude toward recruit training
VOO2 – Attitude toward crime investigation procedure
VOO3 – Attitude toward patrol practices
VOO4 – Attitude toward in-service training
VOO5 – Attitude toward data processing procedures
VOO6 – Attitude toward equipment
VOO7 – Attitude toward community relations programs
VOO8 – Attitude toward community crime prevention programs
VOO9 – Attitude toward emergency planning
VO10 – Attitude toward general planning and program development

educated chiefs. The question that arises is are there any differences

between the two types of chief in their approach to police work. Fortu-

nately, there are several measures in the data that can provide additional

information with which to investigate this question.

A series of questions was asked of the chiefs concerning their

attitudes toward the effect of new federal, state, and local law enforce-

ment agencies on various aspects of police work in their departments.

These ten items (see Table 3) provide a measure of the orientation of

police chiefs toward involvement of new agencies whose goal has been

the expansion and professionalization of law enforcement. For the corre-

lation matrix presented in Table 3, the responses were recoded so that

a distinction was made between the two positive responses (Very favor-

able and Favorable) and the other three possible responses (Undecided,

Unfavorable, and Very unfavorable). As the matrix shows, there are

only a small number of significant correlations. The data do show that

the length of tenure of the chief is an important determinant of atti-

tudes toward a number of police practices. The correlations reveal

that the longer a chief has been in that position, the less favorable

he tends to be toward the interference in his department by outside

agencies when it comes to crime investigation procedures (V002), data

processing (V005), community relations programs (V007), emergency

planning (V009), and general planning and program development (V010).

Though these few correlations are not totally indicative of the atti-

tudes of police chiefs, they tend to indicate that the newer chiefs

are more open to what are supposedly the more efficient and professional

practices of the new agencies in law enforcement. The chief who has

held that position for some time does not mind the interference if it

comes in the form of patrol practices, equipment, training, or crime prevention programs, but he does not approve of outside intervention in other aspects of his department. Guttman scaling techniques were used in an attempt to assess the attitude scale of the chiefs, but the results were inconclusive.

The results of the factor analysis are presented in Table 4. As the data show, the attitudes that the chiefs have on various aspects of police work can be analyzed and broken down into two factors. Factor 1 represents various practices of the department (recruit training, crime investigation, and patrol practices) and the planning aspect of police work (emergency planning and general planning). Factor 2 can be interpreted as containing those variables which pertain to hardward (data processing and equipment) and the community (community relations and community crime prevention). Though only 46.2 percent of the variance was explained by the factor analysis, the clarity and distinctiveness of the two factors legitimize the findings. It will be the purpose of the regression analysis to discover whether the type of chief a department has is an important factor in the operation of a police force and whether it is the chief who conforms to the department or the department that changes to match the orientation of the chief.

The chief of each department was asked to rank ten potential sources of information that his department used when attempting to solve a problem. When the marginal distribution of the rank ordering is analyzed (see Table 5), an interesting pattern is easily discernable. Taking the mean rank given to each information source, a definite pattern of comparative to normative reference (Evan, 1966) can be seen. Those sources which the chiefs ranked highest are, in order, personnel

TABLE 4

FACTOR ANALYSIS:
CHIEF'S ATTITUDE SCALE

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	h^2
VOO1	0.25063	0.00611	0.41645
VOO2	0.29195	-0.01009	0.39002
VOO3	0.31134	-0.06187	0.49886
VOO4	0.18885	0.18880	0.48009
VOO5	-0.07229	0.29559	0.36121
VOO6	-0.07788	0.25689	0.54220
VOO7	-0.08177	0.36362	0.55861
VOO8	-0.06958	0.34793	0.52620
VOO9	0.26729	-0.11483	0.30003
VO10	0.35301	-0.13009	0.54726
Variance:	31.4%	14.8%	
Total Variance:	46.2%		

VOO1 - Recruit training
VOO2 - Crime investigation procedures
VOO3 - Patrol practices
VOO4 - In-service training
VOO5 - Data processing procedures
VOO6 - Equipment
VOO7 - Community relations programs
VOO8 - Community crime prevention programs
VOO9 - Emergency planning
VO10 - General planning and program development

TABLE 5

MARGINAL DISTRIBUTION OF SOURCES
OF INFORMATION

	MEAN	S. D.	MIN	MAX	N
PERS	2.319	1.858	1.000	9.000	113
PD	4.018	2.387	1.000	11.000	114
REGCONF	4.133	2.115	1.000	9.000	113
NACONF	4.821	2.669	1.000	11.000	112
JOURNALS	5.509	2.563	1.000	11.000	114
FEDAGEN	5.852	2.382	1.000	11.000	110
STAGEN	6.082	2.516	1.000	10.000	110
LOCORG	6.855	2.616	1.000	11.000	110
CONSULT	7.793	2.870	1.000	11.000	111
IND	8.432	1.812	2.000	11.000	111

PERS - Personnel in own department
PD - Other individual police departments
REGCONF - Regional conferences, seminars and workshops
NACONF - National conferences, seminars and workshops
JOURNALS - Professional and technical journals
FEDAGEN - Federal law enforcement agencies
STAGEN - State law enforcement agencies
LOCORG - Local organizations
CONSULT - Private consultants
IND - Industry representatives and advertisements

in his own department, other police departments, conferences, and journals. Each one of the sources can be classified as a comparative reference, that is, the department seeking assistance in no way accepts the values of the source, but rather, thinks of itself as being on an equal basis with the source. It is a sharing of information among equals. The personnel are members of the department, and other departments are similar organizations with the same goals. Conferences and journals are sources where similar organizations exchange information. In comparison, those sources which were ranked lower by the chiefs are examples of normative contacts. Industry representatives, private consultants, and local, state, and federal agencies are different organizations than a police department, and there is pressure placed on the department to accept the values of these types of sources. The relationship is one of a superior or more knowledgeable force helping a less qualified organization solve its problems. This is a particularly interesting situation because it is from a normative reference, the federal government, that police departments must acquire a great deal of the funding that they need to operate.

This research attempts to discover the relationship between the chief of police and the department he heads. Of the regressions done on the chief's demographic variables (years in department, years as chief, level of education, management courses, executive development programs), only three of the five proved significant. In the cases of years in department and years as chief as dependent variables, less than 10 percent of the variance was explained by all the independent variables and only one met the criterion stated in the methodology section. The analysis of the educational variables produced much better results (see Table 7).

TABLE 6

CORRELATION MATRIX OF
REGRESSION VARIABLES

	SIZE	DEGRSIZE	TRPERSIZ	EDREQ	SUBSCAL
SIZE	1.00000	-0.03712	-0.03566	-0.04405	0.11384
DEGRSIZE		1.00000	0.08461	0.29959	0.13681
TRPERSIZ			1.00000	-0.12333	0.02806
EDREQ				1.00000	0.20941
SUBSCAL					1.00000
SALARY	0.21810	0.35162	-0.07501	0.15755	-0.01789
AMTGRANT	0.41548	-0.04676	0.00124	-0.02487	-0.10393
PROMSCAL	0.06961	0.16961	-0.02029	0.10643	0.19148
CONFER	0.22219	0.06737	0.03495	0.00751	0.11228
SITE	0.14378	0.11186	-0.00351	0.03960	0.10608
YRDEPT	0.17550	-0.14894	-0.10921	-0.05196	-0.03954
YRCHIEF	-0.06750	0.15439	0.06152	0.03463	-0.10915
LEVED	0.05862	0.28716	0.01842	0.04814	-0.01019
MANCOUR	0.05435	0.12155	-0.19991	0.02813	-0.07817
NOEDPRO	0.05363	0.08076	-0.01944	-0.10726	-0.00837
LIKSCAL	-0.05863	0.03475	-0.07993	0.04186	-0.08874
NACONF	-0.08109	0.11943	-0.17267	0.01191	-0.01732
PD	0.08421	0.19144	-0.05185	0.23905	0.26364
PERS	-0.12808	-0.02289	0.09720	-0.19386	-0.00929
FEDAGEN	-0.01177	-0.03111	-0.03146	-0.01415	0.02825
REGCONF	0.10937	-0.13544	0.09727	-0.03278	0.07815
LOCORG	0.03648	-0.06936	0.11857	-0.15409	-0.02964
STAGEN	-0.09599	-0.04678	-0.14771	0.11069	-0.02907

	SALARY	AMTGRANT	PROMSCAL	CONFER	SITE
SALARY	1.00000	0.18287	0.08847	0.07032	0.04630
AMTGRANT		1.00000	0.09369	0.33256	0.08885
PROMSCAL			1.00000	-0.01545	0.04961
CONFER				1.00000	0.18136
SITE					1.00000
YRDEPT	-0.02327	0.04401	-0.11889	0.09863	-0.02853
YRCHIEF	-0.02299	-0.11209	-0.03300	-0.13107	-0.12676
LEVED	0.30846	0.24970	0.14197	0.14671	0.02913

TABLE 6, Cont.

	SALARY	AMTGRANT	PROMSCAL	CONFER	SITE
MANCOUR	0.23021	0.06196	-0.06142	0.11714	-0.03639
NOEDPRO	0.04232	0.00732	0.09612	0.19503	0.27785
LIKSCAL	-0.11857	-0.17210	-0.24935	-0.04577	-0.04590
NACONF	0.10170	-0.16101	0.12144	-0.19095	-0.06871
PD	0.00575	0.05856	0.00957	0.07168	0.15886
PERS	-0.21800	0.01149	-0.14329	-0.13006	-0.02664
FEDAGEN	0.14582	0.09221	0.04479	0.18989	-0.05089
REGCONF	-0.10267	0.13506	0.06701	-0.03388	-0.03270
LOCORG	-0.08503	0.01631	-0.16666	0.01405	-0.02143
STAGEN	0.05734	0.02559	0.15325	0.19692	-0.09753

	YRDEPT	YRCHIEF	LEVED	MANCOUR	NOEDPRO
YRDEPT	1.00000	0.22237	-0.49538	0.06374	-0.17475
YRCHIEF		1.00000	-0.03456	0.07230	-0.17798
LEVED			1.00000	0.08207	0.20103
MANCOUR				1.00000	0.15232
NOEDPRO					1.00000
LIKSCAL	0.14259	0.16512	-0.03463	-0.04905	-0.09043
NACONF	0.01753	0.03930	-0.00758	0.10770	-0.06534
PD	-0.09383	-0.04920	0.08335	-0.03668	0.16231
PERS	-0.25126	-0.10082	0.06791	-0.09063	-0.04585
FEDAGEN	0.04573	0.04482	0.18442	0.10139	0.12757
REGCONF	0.07742	-0.04234	-0.10420	-0.15492	-0.08561
LOCORG	-0.12867	0.03086	-0.00829	0.12924	0.10490
STAGEN	-0.01362	-0.04673	0.06251	0.11098	0.14693

	LIKSCAL	NACONF	PD	PERS	FEDAGEN
LIKSCAL	1.00000	-0.10915	0.08341	0.05785	0.05706
NACONF		1.00000	-0.17555	0.02175	0.00352
PD			1.00000	0.08090	0.04700
PERS				1.00000	-0.04801
FEDAGEN					1.00000
REGCONF	-0.18928	0.20630	-0.08004	-0.05965	-0.16020
LOCORG	-0.04736	-0.03104	-0.15732	0.04353	-0.09324
STAGEN	0.03164	-0.18994	0.05697	-0.17803	0.44802

	REGCONF	LOCORG	STAGEN
REGCONF	1.00000	-0.01117	-0.20096
LOCORG		1.00000	-0.00726
STAGEN			1.00000

TABLE 7

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR
CHIEF'S EDUCATIONAL VARIABLES

Chief's Level of Education (LEVED)

Independent Variable	R Square	Standardized Beta
YRDEPT	0.24540	-0.52043
SALARY	0.08822	0.20414
AMTGRANT	0.04878	0.20743
CONFER	0.00905	0.13008
YRCHIEF	0.00976	0.10331
SITE	0.00139	-0.03809

Variance = .40260

MANAGEMENT COURSES (MANCOUR)

SALARY	0.05300	0.18887
CONFER	0.01182	0.12931
YRCHIEF	0.01084	0.07321
PROMSCAL	0.00623	-0.07359
SUBSCAL	0.00334	-0.06005
SITE	0.00319	-0.05853
YRDEPT	0.00022	0.01588

Variance = .08864

TABLE 7, Cont.

Number of Executive Development Programs (NOEDPRO)

Independent Variable	R Square	Standardized Beta
SITE	0.07720	0.23045
YRDEPT	0.02785	-0.15782
CONFER	0.02743	0.16820
YRCHIEF	0.00656	-0.10215
PROMSCAL	0.00605	0.08074
AMTGRANT	0.00041	-0.02654
SIZE	0.00010	0.01140

Variance = .14620

All Betas are at least twice the standard error

As the data show, the primary determinant of a chief's level of
education is the number of years he has been in his present department.
There is a highly negative Beta (-0.52043) which indicates that the
longer a chief has been in his present department, the lower his level of
education is likely to be. His length of tenure as chief is slightly
positive which indicates that it is chiefs who are recruited externally
who possess the higher levels of education. The baseline salary of
officers and the amount of funding that the department receives from
L. E. A. A. together account for over 12 percent of the variance in the
level of education. From these data it cannot be determined if the more
educated chief is responsible for the higher salaries and greater federal
funding in a department or the departments which exhibit these charac-
teristics require that their chiefs have a higher level of education.
The probable relationship is one of reciprocal causation, which supports
the assertion of Clark (1975) and Peak (1975) that in the contemporary
environment of police work, the chief must be able to understand re-
search in order to be able to acquire funds for his department.

Management courses have been taken by almost all of the chiefs in
the sample (96.7%) and so it is logical that only 9 percent of the
variance of this variable was explained in the regression analysis.
Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this measurement is that the
highest Beta, that of the ratio of training personnel to all sworn
members of a department, was excluded because the standard error was
greater than that allowed. This measure, being an indicant of the pro-
fessionalization of a department, is influential in whether a chief has
taken managerial courses but because professionalization is a multi-
dimensional property, there were a great many errors. This indicates

that there is not always a direct link between the chief, his orientation and ideas, and the policies that are instituted in a department.

In the analysis of the influential variables affecting the number of executive development programs that the chief has participated in, the one accounting for the most variance is site visits. Thus, the inter-organizational field linkage variables (site visits, conference attendance, and amount of federal funding) play an important role in influencing the involvement of the chief in activities which will improve his leadership capabilities. The contact of his department with outside organizations are probably the result of the chief's participation in such programs, but again, this is another example of reciprocal causation.

These three regressions illustrate the effect that a chief's educational experience probably has on his department. In all three, the influence of measures of professionalization and the contact with other organizations are clearly evident. While the direction of influence is certainly two-way, the affect of the chiefs with higher levels of education are also clearly evident. Their departments tend to be more professional and have greater contact with other law enforcement organizations. Though the chiefs show a marked preference for comparative reference contacts in their ranking of sources of information, these regressions show that they also acknowledge the necessity of contact with organizations of the normative type, particularly L. E. A. A. from which they receive important funding. The more educated chiefs recognize this necessity and in addition, because of their educational advantage, are able to more readily acquire the funding.

A Likert scale of the ten-item attitude scale was regressed against the independent variables and the results revealed certain characteristics which can be used to differentiate the chiefs who generally approve of the new agencies from those who are less favorable to the interference from outside their own department. The data (see Table 8) show that the more professional chiefs are generally more favorable toward the assistance offered to them by these new agencies while chiefs who score lower on the variables which measure professionalization and whose departments score lower on measures of professionalization in general are less favorable toward these new agencies. The regression table, which only included those variables meeting the criterion of having Betas of at least twice the standard error, reflects this conclusion. It should be remembered that inverse coding was used, thus a negative Beta indicates a positive response.

The four variables which satisfied the criterion all react in the expected direction. Federal funding, salary, and department size are all indicators of professionalization, and each of these three variables has a negative Beta. While the variance explained by these four variables is only 3.4 percent of the total variance, an investigation of the entire regression results supports the pattern stated above. Measures of professionalization (promotional scale, training personnel ratio, and training topics scale) all have negative Betas, and though the standard error for each of these variables is above the allowed, the pattern of the more professional police chiefs being more favorable toward the new agencies is supported. The other variables in the regression also support the contention, though there is some minor discrepancy among some of the variables. Explaining so little

TABLE 8

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS
OF THE LIKERT SCALE OF
CHIEF'S ATTITUDES

Scale of Chief's Attitudes (LIKSCAL)

Independent Variable	R Square	Standardized Beta
AMTGRANT	0.01769	-0.17368
YRDEPT	0.00669	0.17429
SALARY	0.00865	-0.15297
SIZE	0.00161	-0.04914

Variance = 0.03464

Items included in Likert Scale

Recruit training
Crime investigation procedures
Patrol practices
In-service training
Data processing procedures
Equipment
Community relations programs
Community crime prevention programs
Emergency planning
General planning and program development

variance does not undeniably confirm the contention concerning police chief attitudes, but the pattern is easily discernible and follows logically from the literature.

As was shown in Table 5, the sources of information that the chiefs were asked to rank order resulted in a clear comparative to normative reference pattern. Regression analysis of these same variables supports this finding (see Table 9). Personnel in their own department were ranked as the most important source and this variable also resulted in the most difinitive findings in regression analysis. Over 16 percent of the variance was explained by the variables which met the criterion, and these variables not only the traditional reliance on one's own · personnel gained through experience in that department (YRDEPT) but also the professional orientation characteristic of the more educated chiefs. The higher salary, improved promotional guidelines, and higher educational requirements for recruits are examples of the more professional attitude and the chief who heads such a department will have more confidence in the members of his own department.

The regression of other police departments (PD) revealed that the only important factor was the professional orientation of a department. Because inverse coding was used on these variables, the high negative Beta for the Guttman scale of training topics, which is a measure of professionalization, indicates that departments which had higher levels of professionalization had chiefs who tended to rank other departments lower on their scale of sources of information. The effect of other variables which measured network linkages indicates further the preference for normative rather than comparative reference contacts by the more professional departments, and their chiefs.

TABLE 9

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS
OF SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Personnel in Department (PERS)

Independent Variable	R Square	Standardized Beta
YRDEPT	0.06313	-0.22760
SALARY	0.05014	-0.22714
PROMSCAL	0.01979	-0.17186
AMTGRANT	0.00748	0.15535
CONFER	0.01247	-0.14334
YRCHIEF	0.00735	-0.08942
SIZE	0.00278	-0.07420

Variance = 0.16314

Other Police Departments (PD)

SUBSCAL	0.06951	0.22156
AMTGRANT	0.00776	0.09583
SALARY	0.00643	-0.09144
SITE	0.00408	0.05906
YRDEPT	0.00202	-0.05514
SIZE	0.00266	0.06190
CONFER	0.00086	-0.03197

Variance = 0.09332

TABLE 9, Cont.

Local Law Enforcement Organizations (LOCORG)

Independent Variable	R Square	Standardized Beta
PROMSCAL	0.02778	-0.16510
YRDEPT	0.02237	-0.23286
SALARY	0.00707	-0.06983
SIZE	0.00744	0.08349
YRCHIEF	0.00525	0.08791
AMTGRANT	0.00111	0.04349
SITE	0.00101	-0.03359

Variance = 0.07007

State Law Enforcement Agencies (STAGEN)

CONFER	0.03878	0.25386
PROMSCAL	0.02443	0.18147
SIZE	0.02417	-0.15145
SITE	0.01670	-0.15257
SALARY	0.00622	0.07647
AMTGRANT	0.00097	-0.03692

Variance = 0.11127

TABLE 9, Cont.

National Conferences (NACONF)

Independent Variable	R Square	Standardized Beta
CONFER	0.03646	-0.14549
AMTGRANT	0.00898	-0.12811
SALARY	0.00377	0.07008
YRDEPT	0.00097	0.04545
SIZE	0.00099	-0.02903

Variance = 0.05117

Federal Law Enforcement Agencies (FEDAGEN)

CONFER	0.03606	0.16524
YRDEPT	0.01627	0.14210
SALARY	0.01026	0.15189
SIZE	0.01373	-0.12712
SITE	0.00687	-0.08434
YRCHIEF	0.00474	0.08220

Variance = 0.08793

All Betas are at least twice the standard error

Local law enforcement organizations ranked toward the normative reference end of the scale of information sources, but because they are local, the chief may perceive of them as being similar to his department and thus somewhat comparative in nature. The regression analysis of this variable revealed that very little of the variance could be explained, but that again it was the measures of professionalization which were influential in the relatively high ranking of this source. The fact that years in the present department also has a negative Beta which indicates a preference for this source can be explained by the fact that a chief who has remained in the same department for a long time has probably worked with the local organizations on many occasions and eventually comes to think of them as being valuable.

State law enforcement organizations are normative reference contacts but a regression analysis of this variable does not reveal any definitive pattern of influence. Two measures of interorganizational field linkage operate strongly on these agencies but in opposite directions. Conference attendance carries a positive Beta while site visits has a negative Beta. The other variables affecting state agencies are also ambiguous in their meaning. When only 10 percent of the variance is explained and there is no discernible pattern, the findings can only be classified as inconclusive.

A regression analysis of national conferences as a source of information results in no startling discoveries but only some logical conclusions. The most influential independent variable is conference attendance by members of a department. If a chief sends many of his personnel to conferences, then it follows that he will rank them (conferences) high on his scale of sources of information. The size

of a department has been shown to correlate highly with the amount of
funding that it receives from L. E. A. A. and it is logical for chiefs of
larger departments to rank national conferences high because it is at
these conventions that important contacts are made. Conversely, chiefs
who have remained in the same department for a long period of time are
likely to be less educated, have a less professional orientation, and
thus, prefer comparative instead of normative reference contacts.

The final regression of the study was of federal law enforcement
agencies. The pattern that has been established for previous sources of
information is continued in this variable, but with some interesting
differences. Conference attendance and site visits, which are both
measures of interorganizational field linkage, operate in opposite
directions on federal agencies. The overall conclusion is that the
professional orientation of a department influences the chief toward a
preference toward normative reference contacts but the chief is perhaps
a bit skeptical of these groups, particularly federal agencies. This
is reflected in the positive Betas (which mean a lower ranking) for
years as chief and years in the same department. The chief must deal
with these agencies, particularly L. E. A. A., if he is to acquire the
funding his department needs.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the police chief,
to discover if his role within the department has changed any as a
result of the recent professionalization of the field of law enforcement.
The literature indicated that the chief was indeed, becoming a different
type of leader, and the findings of this research seem to bear this out.
With the professionalization of the field, new responsibilities fell to
the person occupying the position of head of the modern police depart-
ment. A corresponding situation that has accompanied professionaliza-
tion has been the integration of each police department with an entire
network of other police departments, as well as local, state, and
federal law enforcement agencies. The chief is no longer an autonomous
authority who can run the department as he sees fit, but rather, a
member of a larger law enforcement network. This has necessarily
changed the role of the contemporary police chief.

A review of the findings gives a good overall impression of how
the police chief of the present is reacting to the changes in his
occupation. The position of police chief has become more stable in
that the average length of tenure has risen slightly over the last
twenty years. There will probably be positions of chief in certain
locales which will be political favors where the job of chief will re-
main a tenuous one. There will also be police chiefs who remain in one
department as chief for twenty, thirty, or forty years, but these two

extremes are becoming a rarity. With the increasing stability of the position, the chiefs of the future will have to worry less about keeping their jobs and will be able to concentrate on doing the best job they can.

The data indicate that there is an increasing trend to search for qualified personnel from all sources and not to restrict the position of chief to members of the department which has the vacancy.

With the increasing level of education of police personnel, the chief has had to respond by increasing his own level of education, not only to keep up with the personnel in his own department, but with all aspects of police work. Today's chief is better educated than his predecessors, and his is paying particular attention to the managerial portion of his education. Because the process of professionalization is a recent development, the influx of the highly educated chiefs has resulted in there now being two types of police chiefs. The traditional chief has spent many years in one department and eventually risen through the ranks to the position of chief. The newer chiefs are younger, more educated, and more easily adaptable to the professional orientation of modern police work. In many instances, they are trained for exactly the type of police work that the traditional chief has to add to his previous attributes. Police chiefs must still rise through the ranks, but the rise may be much quicker than it used to be.

The newer type of chief is more professional than his traditional counterpart, but they do share some common values. Both types of chief prefer comparative types of reference contacts if they need assistance, but each for his own reasons. The traditional chief dislikes interference in the manner in which he runs his department from outside sources, particularly the federal government. The newer type of chief

is also more favorable than the traditional chief toward the effects of
agencies that have attempted to increase the level of professionalization
among police officers.

The professional police chief in contemporary departments is
affected by the type of department he enters at the same time he is
affecting that department. There is a process of reciprocal causation
occurring by which the chief has to fit the department he enters in terms
of its approach to police work, but once he has assumed the position as
chief, he can then bring about change himself. The interaction between
a chief and his department is important because if the two are dissimi-
lar, for instance in their approach to law enforcement, than conflict
will most surely arise. With the professionalization of the entire
field, it is unlikely that any chief now entering that position will be
anything but the professional type of chief.

The classificatory system of Thomas and Biddle produced no specific
expectations for change in the role of the police chief, but the expec-
tation of some change as a result of the organizational changes has
been supported. The chief has become more of an administrator because
of the growing complexity of the organization he heads. His specific
behaviors have changed so that he may run the modern, professional
department. The contemporary chief has changed from a person who only
values more personnel and better equipment to someone who is concerned
with the totality of the environment which he is to police. He has
responded to the demands of the organization he heads, the position he
occupies, and the norms of the community to which he is responsible.

It may be possible to analyze the role of the contemporary police
chief using another theory of roles, for instance, conflict theory, and

thereby produce a predictive model. The use of Thomas and Biddle was merely to provide a framework so that the role of the police chief could be understood. At this point in the investigation of professional police chiefs, it is more important to discover what changes were occurring in the role of the chief rather than developing a theoretical model to explain those changes.

There is currently underway a much more extensive study of police chiefs under the direction of the Los Angeles chief of police. This project was undertaken by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in an attempt to discover what changes have taken place in the chief's office as a result of the recent changes in the field of law enforcement. It will be interesting to see if the results of that study reflect the same findings that the present study has.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTERS

Dear Chief:

The Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center operates the Pilot City
Program in Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth and Virginia Beach, Virginia.
Established in September, 1971, the Center is a research and program
planning and development component of the College of William and Mary in
Williamsburg, Virginia. The Center's Pilot City Program is one of eight
throughout the nation funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Adminis-
tration of the U. S. Department of Justice. The basic purpose of each
Pilot City project is to assist local jurisdictions in the design and
establishment of various programs, often highly innovative and experi-
mental in nature, which will contribute over a period of years to the
development of a model criminal justice system. Each Pilot City team is
also responsible for assuring comprehensive evaluation of such programs,
for assisting the development of improved criminal justice planning
ability within the host jurisdictions, and for providing technical
assistance to various local agencies when requested. Since its incep-
tion, the Center has concentrated its efforts on the various issues
involved in modern policing.

Our work indicates that police departments continue to face new
challenges and problems in a rapidly changing society. It is also
apparent that law enforcement agencies are actively responding to these
challenges, seeking solutions to the problems that confront them. As
a result, the police profession is one of the most rapidly changing
American institutions.

Although policing has received increased attention, both locally
and nationally, we believe that more systematic study is needed about the
effects of that attention. We realize that these change efforts, and
research and evaluation of them, have greatly added to the already
heavy burden of police administrators. But as you know, the gathering
of objective information is basic to research and program development.
Mindful of your many obligations, we ask for your cooperation in our
research of police professionalization, education, training, and other
innovations and changes made by departments in the past few years.

To gain as much data as feasible about these topics, we have
developed the two enclosed questionnaires: a very brief one for your
own opinions and perceptions, and a second designed to gather specific
information about your department. We expect that much of the latter
information can be obtained from organizational records. Two addressed,
stamped envelopes are provided so that the two questionnaires can be
filled out and returned separately.

The first questionnaire, "Police Problems and Sources of Solutions",
asks you to indicate problems you consider to be most pressing in your
department, possible sources of solutions to these problems, and fin-
ally, your opinions about the developments of your department and the
profession. Given the importance of problem-solving efforts, the per-
ceptions and opinions of police chiefs are an essential source of
information.

The second questionnaire, "Selected Police Innovations and Characteristics", is divided into four parts and concerns such matters as the educational background and training of police personnel, possible innovations made by your department in the past few years, and selected background information about your department. The latter background information will enable us to see how changes, problems, and attempted solutions are associated with different organizational characteristics.

Under our supervision, this research is being conducted as part of the police research being undertaken by the Pilot City Program. We are faculty members at the College of William and Mary and the University of Kansas, respectively, and have both done previous research in cooperation with several police departments throughout the United States.

We have made every effort to conserve your valuable time by making the questionnaire as straightforward as possible. Again, we recognize that police departments face difficult problems. Research such as this should be very helpful in determining the effects of recent attention to police problems. We, therefore, will share our results with police departments both through the Center's report series and through publication in an appropriate police professional journal.

However, it should be stressed that your responses are confidential. At no time or place will a particular police organization or respondent be identified. Your department was selected as part of a random sample of all U. S. departments of large size. Our results will be reported only in general terms concerning trends and patterns for such departments.

We thank you in advance for the assistance you are able to provide us in this study.

Dear Chief:

Your department is part of a randomly selected sample of U. S. police departments. Several weeks ago we mailed the enclosed letter, questionnaires, and stamped return envelopes to the police organizations in our sample. A substantial number of departments have favorably responded to our request for information.

However, the validity of our research will be considerably enhanced if we can persuade some departments that have not responded yet to do so. On the chance that our original mailing has not reached you, we have enclosed another set of questionnaires and return envelopes.

We fully appreciate that studies like this involve an investment of your time and resources. We are also confident that knowledge gained through research will more than compensate this investment. We thank you for whatever assistance you are able to provide.

Sincerely,

Gary A. Kreps, Ph.D.

Jack M. Weller, Ph.D.

GAK/ph

enclosures

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRES

Name of Dept. _____

POLICE PROBLEMS AND SOURCES OF SOLUTIONS (Chief's Quest.)

(1) We would like to know what you as a police chief consider the most important problems facing your department. Please list the most pressing current problems or future needs as you see them.

     1.   3.   5.
     2.   4.

(2) We also wish to know what sources of information you use in seeking solutions for these types of problems. Please rank the following potential sources of solutions from that which is presently most important (1) to that which is least important (11).

___ National conferences, seminars and workshops
                              (esp:_____)
___ Other individual police departments
                              (esp:_____)
___ Personnel in your own department
___ Industry representatives and advertisements
___ Federal law enforcement agencies
                              (Please specify:_____)
___ Professional and technical journals
___ Regional conferences, seminars and workshops
                              (esp:_____)
___ Other local organizations
                              (Please specify:_____)
___ State law enforcement agencies
                              (Please specify:_____)
___ Private consultants   (Please specify:_____)
___ Other   (Please specify:_____)

(3) A great deal of public attention has recently been given to police work, as evidenced by federal law enforcement legislation and expenditures since the late 1960's. As a result of this legislation many new national, state, and local agencies and programs have been created with the goal of expanding law enforcement capabilities. We would like your opinion as to the effects of these efforts on your own department. For each of the following areas of police work, please check the term which most closely represents your opinion as to whether there have been favorable or unfavorable effects on your department. If you choose to comment, room is provided.

A. Recruit training

     ___ Very favorable   Comment:
     ___ Favorable
     ___ Undecided
     ___ Unfavorable
     ___ Very unfavorable

B. Crime investigation procedures

    ___Very favorable   Comment:
    ___Favorable
    ___Undecided
    ___Unfavorable
    ___Very unfavorable

C. Patrol practices

    ___Very favorable   Comment:
    ___Favorable
    ___Undecided
    ___Unfavorable
    ___Very unfavorable

D. In-service training

    ___Very favorable   Comment:
    ___Favorable
    ___Undecided
    ___Unfavorable
    ___Very unfavorable

E. Data processing procedures (record keeping, administration)

    ___Very favorable   Comment:
    ___Favorable
    ___Undecided
    ___Unfavorable
    ___Very unfavorable

F. Equipment (e.g., communications equipment, special vehicles,
        standard personnel equipment)

    ___Very favorable   Comment:
    ___Favorable
    ___Undecided
    ___Unfavorable
    ___Very unfavorable

G. Community relations programs

    ___Very favorable   Comment:
    ___Favorable
    ___Undecided
    ___Unfavorable
    ___Very unfavorable

H. Community crime prevention programs

___Very favorable   Comment:
___Favorable
___Undecided
___Unfavorable
___Very unfavorable

I. Emergency planning (natural disasters, civil disturbances)

___Very favorable   Comment:
___Favorable
___Undecided
___Unfavorable
___Very unfavorable

J. General planning and program development

___Very favorable   Comment:
___Favorable
___Undecided
___Unfavorable
___Very unfavorable

(4) In general, have recent expenditures, new agencies, and programs enhanced "professionalism" in law enforcement?

___To a substantial degree   Comment:
___To a moderate degree
___Very little
___Not at all

(5) Finally, would you please provide the following background on yourself as a police officer.

a. How long have you worked as a police officer?_____
b. How long have you been in your present department?_____
c. How long have you held your current position as chief?_____
d. What is your age?_____
e. What is the highest level of education you have achieved?_____
f. Have you taken courses in Administration/Management? Yes_____
                                     No _____
g. Have you or are you currently participating in any executive development programs? Yes_____, No_____
    If yes, How many?_____

SELECTED POLICE INNOVATIONS AND CHARACTERISTICS

Part I EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND TRAINING

(1) How many hours of recruit training does your state mandate?_____

(2) How many hours of recruit training does your department require?___

(3) How many hours of in-service training per month or year (please specify) does your state mandate?_____

(4) How many hours of in-service training per month or year (please specify) does your department require?_____

(5) Please indicate the number of full-time personnel whose primary function is police training. _____

(6) Does your department maintain its own library? ____Yes ____No.

    a. If "Yes", how many volumes (approximately) does your library contain?_____

(7) How many officers in your department have college degrees?_____

(8) How many officers have taken college courses for credit?_____

(9) How many officers are presently enrolled in college courses?_____

(10) We recognize that your training program includes important and basic police practices. We would also like to know if any of the following topics are included as well. Please check the following topics that you include in training.

	Number of Hours
___Family crisis intervention	_____
___First aid	_____
___Alcohol related problems	_____
___Drug abuse	_____
___History of law enforcement	_____
___Role of police in modern society	_____
___Minority groups	_____
___Juvenile delinquency	_____

(11) Is your training program coordinated with a local college or university? ___Yes ___No. If "yes", please briefly describe the nature of the relationship. _____

_____

(12) Which of the following outside resources are employed in your recruit training program? (please check)

    ___Guest speakers
    ___Field trips
    ___Films
    ___Police technical journals, reports, books, etc.
    ___Social science journals, reports, books, etc.
    ___Other (Please list) _____

(13) What are the minimal educational requirements for your recruits?

_____

(14) Have these requirements increased in the past 10 years?
___Yes ___No.

    a. If "yes", what was the standard 10 years ago? _____

    b. 5 years ago? _____

(15) Please check which of the following testing procedures your department employs for promotion purposes.

___Oral exams
___Written exams
___Formal evaluation of work performance
___Length of service
___Educational achievement
___Other (Please specify) _____

(16) Does your department have formal minimum qualifications for all training personnel? ___Yes ___No.
If "yes", please list these qualifications.

Part II CIVIL DISTURBANCE RELATED INNOVATIONS AND SUBSEQUENT

    MODIFICATIONS

(17) Below is a checklist of innovations sometimes adopted by police departments between 1965 and 1970. Please indicate first whether your department did adopt each. If adopted, then please indicate what has happened to this innovation since 1970. Has it been discontinued, or continued, and if continued, at a reduced level or at the same or higher level as in 1970?

INNOVATION	(1965 - 1970)	
	NOT ADOPTED	ADOPTED
Written civil dist. plan	___	___
Mass arrest procedures	___	___
Crowd control training	___	___
Community relations training	___	___
Emergency operations center	___	___
Mobile command and communications facilities	___	___
Special effort to recruit minority police officers	___	___

	(Since 1970)		
	DISCONTINUED	CONTINUED:	
			SAME OR
		LOWER	HIGHER
INNOVATION		LEVEL	LEVEL
Written civil dist. plan	___	___	___
Mass arrest procedures	___	___	___
Crowd control training	___	___	___
Community relations training	___	___	___
Emergency operations center	___	___	___
Mobile command and communications facilities	___	___	___
Special effort to recruit minority police officers	___	___	___

Part III ADDITIONAL POLICE DEPARTMENT INNOVATIONS

(18) Please indicate whether in the last 10 years your police department has made substantial changes in the areas listed below (or any other areas).

___Automatic data processing for general organizational records
___Automatic data processing for crime and arrest information
___Automatic data processing for personnel deployment
___Automatic data processing for research and development
___Program evaluation methods (e.g. effectiveness assessment, cost-benefit analysis)
___Promotional evaluation procedures
___Equipment
___Recruitment procedures
___Recruit training   .
___In-service training
___Team policing
___Alcohol and drug abuse programs
___Family crisis intervention programs
___Other community crime prevention programs (please specify)

___Other innovations (please specify)_____

Part IV BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

(19) How many sworn personnel does your department employ?_____

(20) How many clerical personnel does your department employ?_____

(21) What is the number of precincts in your department?_____

(22) What is the total number of bureaus (or divisions) listed at the top of your department's organization chart?_____

(23) Please list the names of these major bureaus or divisions and if possible, the number of personnel within them.

Name of Bureau   Number of Personnel

(24) What is the total number of subunits (within bureaus or divisions) listed in your department's organization chart?_____

(25) What is your department's annual operating budget?_____

(26) What is the starting annual salary of new sworn police personnel in your department?_____

(27) Under what auspices does your department operate (e.g. commission, safety director)?_____

(28) How many non-retirement resignations did your department have in 1973?_____

(29) How many new recruits did your department accept in 1973?_____

(30) How many 1973 recruits either resigned or were screened out during their probationary period?_____

(31) In the space below, please list each rank in your chain of command and the number of police officers in each rank.

1.   4.   7.
2.   5.   8.
3.   6.   9.

(32) Does your department have a formal community relations program?
____Yes ____No.

(33) Does your department have a subunit whose primary task is community relations? ____Yes ____No. If "yes", how many full-time employees are members of your community relations subunit?_____

(34) Does your department have a written plan for operation in natural disasters?____Yes ____No.

(35) Do you have a written plan for operations in civil disturbances?
____Yes, as part of the disaster plan, ____Yes, a separate plan,
____No.

(36) Does your department have written plans governing your relations with local organizations (other than police) for civil disturbances?
____Yes ____No.

(37) Does your department have written plans governing your relations with local organizations (other than police) for natural disasters?
____Yes ____No.

(38) Do your department and the local prosecutor have any arrangement for developing policies, standards or procedures on matters affecting both offices (e.g. guidelines for the decision to arrest or to charge, procedure for filing charges, etc)?___Yes ___No. If "yes", since when _____? Do other agencies partici- pate?___Yes ___No. Do citizen representatives?___Yes ___No.

(39) Please estimate the number of officers who attended regional and national police conferences, training seminars and conventions in 1973._____

(40) Does your department have a mailing list of other police depart- ments for the purpose of exchanging information about police practices and problems?___Yes ___No. If "yes", about how many departments are on the mailing list?_____

(41) Please estimate the number of your police personnel who were sent to other police departments (site visits) to obtain information about police practices in 1973._____

(42) Please list any LEAA discretionary grants your department has received since 1968.

Grant Title   Amount

(43) For the purpose of LEAA state level planning, how many jurisdic- tions are in your regional planning district?_____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, E. J.
    1958   "The Police Chief of Tomorrow." The Police Chief 25(March):
            8-10.

Angell, J. E.
    1966   "Responsiveness: An Obligation and a Technique of the Police
            Administrator." The Police Chief 36(March): 22-26.

Barnard, C.
    1968   The Function of the Executive. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard
            University Press.

Becker, H. K. and G. T. Felkenes
    1968   Law Enforcement - A Selected Bibliography. Metuchen, N. J.:
            The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Bender, J. F.
    1950   The Techniques of Executive Leadership. New York: McGraw-
            Hill Book Company, Inc.

Berkley, G. E.
    1969   The Democratic Policeman. Boston: Beacon Press.

Clark, R. S.
    1975   "The Police Administrator in a World of Research." The
            Police Chief 42(December): 50-52.

Culver, D. C.
    1934   Bibliography of Crime and Criminal Justice. New York: The
            H. W. Wilson Company.

    1939   Bibliography of Crime and Criminal Justice. New York: The
            H. W. Wilson Company.

Evan, W.
    1966   "The Organization-Set: Toward a Theory of Interorganiza-
            tional Relations." Pp. 326-340 in M. B. Brinkerhoff and
            P. R. Kunz (eds), Complex Organizations and Their Environ-
            ments. Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown.

Gourley, D. D.
    1973   "Decision Making and Policy in the Chief's Office." The
            Police Chief 40(October): 17.

Gourley, D. D. and J. T. Jarrell
1975   "Management: Profile of a Police Executive." The Police Chief
        42(April): 20-22.

Graper, E. D.
1921   American Police Administration. New York: The MacMillan
        Company.

Greer, S.
1936   A. Bibliography of Police Administration and Police Science.
        New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia
        University.

Hewitt, W. H. and C. H. Ibele, Jr.
1967   A Bibliography of Police Administration, Public Safety, and
        Criminology. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas.

Hollady, R. E.
1962   "The Police Administrator - A Politician." The Journal of
        Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science 53(December):
        526-529.

Kienzle, G. J. and E. H. Dare
1950   Climbing the Executive Ladder. New York: McGraw-Hill Book
        Company, Inc.

Kreps, G. A. and J. M. Weller
1975   "A Comparative Analysis of Police Organizations."

Linenberger, O. J.
1972   "The Police Chief From Another Perspective - A Notable Job
        Description." The Police Chief 39(June): 22-24.

Lunden, W. A.
1958   "The Mobility of Chiefs of Police." The Journal of Criminal
        Law, Criminology, and Police Science 49(July-August): 178-183.

McGehee, A. L.
1970   Police Literature - An Annotated Bibliography. Athens, Ga.:
        Institute of Government, University of Georgia.

Peak, K. J.
1974   "Grantsmanship: A Necessary Addendum to the Police Adminis-
        trator's Workload." The Police Chief 42(April): 52-53.

Prostano, H. T. and M. L. Piccirillo
1974   Law Enforcement - A Selected Bibliography. Littleton,
        Colorage: Libraries Unlimited, Inc.

Rhodes, W. R.
1970   "A Behavioral Science Application to Police Management."
        The Police Chief 37(May): 46-50.

Selznick, P.
  1957   Leadership in Administration - A Sociological Interpretation.
            New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Snead, P. J.
  1974   "The Humanism of Command." The Police Chief 41(January):
            26-28.

• • • • • • • •
  1941   "Searching For Able Men to Fill Police Chief Positions." The
            American City 41(August): 79.

Thomas, E. J. and B. J. Biddle
  1966   Role Theory: Concepts and Research. New York: John Wiley &
            Sons, Inc.

Velde, R.
  1975   "Law Enforcement Assistance Administration - Programs to Aid
            State and Local Programs." The Police Chief 42(July): 18.

Wilson, O. W.
  1950   Police Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company,
            Inc.

VITA

Thomas Wolf

Born in Washington, D. C., March 30, 1952. Graduated from Hampton Roads Academy in Newport News, Virginia in June 1970. B. A. Case Western Reserve University, 1974. Entered the College of William and Mary in September 1974 as a graduate assistant in the Department of Sociology.

In September 1976 entered Temple University as a graduate assistant in the Department of Sociology.