From the Editor

Here we are enjoying the final, not-so lazy days of summer. I hope the current issue will add to your enjoyment, as you reflect on the service, research, and teaching you hope to accomplish in the coming months.

You probably noticed this issue was sent to you from a new editor. I extend sincere gratitude to the immediate-past editor Jeffrey Bumgarner. He continues to graciously assist as I begin my own editorship.

We've put together an interesting issue of *Police Forum* this summer. The spirit of actionable and relevant police research is the enduring focus of this outlet. It also happens to be the theme of the upcoming annual meeting in Kansas City—"Linking teaching, practice, and research." Brenda Bond and our newly-elected Vice Chair Stephen Morreale's article highlights this focus and theme. Their article explores the elements of police administrator decision-making to help us better understand how police organizations might implement and evaluate a more systematic change process.

Some exciting news—starting with the next issue, *Police Forum* will begin publishing a peer-reviewed section. The newsletter will still be known as *Police Forum* but will offer those seeking peer-reviewed publication on policing topics an alternate venue to larger journals with broader subject content. If anyone would like to volunteer to be an editorial board member/reviewer, please contact me (Michael.jenkins@scranton.edu). The executive committee and I will be putting together the editorial board. I encourage you to submit your policing articles for consideration, and also hope that you will continue to submit any police/policing-related announcements, essays, book reviews, white papers, job openings, etc. We have a varied and large readership that will benefit from your additions. See pages 25-27 for more information.

Thank you and happy reading!
Michael J. Jenkins
Editor, *Police Forum*

From the Chair

With this edition of *Police Forum* we find ourselves at one of the most important times in policing in the last 100 years. After the events of the past few years, which have literally caused a schism between large segments of the community and our police agencies, we find our field at an important crossroad. How do we shepherd policing forward and keep it from being a reactionary force? How can we as the scholars and practitioners who make up the police section of ACJS be a guiding voice and provide empirical information to the field about police training, best methods, operations and perhaps most important, legitimacy and procedural justice? After spending 34 years in uniform and retiring as a chief of police and now researching and teaching policing, the answers to these questions aren't simply theoretical to me. I know that what we do as an organization and our section specifically, is in a unique position to be a part of what happens to policing over the next ten years.

Police Section Panels
To that end, ACJS President, Lorenzo Boyd Has asked me to prepare a number of panels for the upcoming conference on policing and communities of color. We will be collaborating with the minorities and women section to develop those panels as well as working to produce panels on a broad range of policing topics. If anyone would like to volunteer to be a part of this planning and implementation committee, please contact me at jdecarlo@newhaven.edu or by cell at 203-627-5211.

If you have questions or want to discuss anything about the section or policing in general, please send me an email. The more people we can get actively involved in developing complete panels and contribution articles, the more effective we will be.

Thanks and enjoy the start of the academic year!
John
Chair, ACJS Police Section

Elements of Decision-Making in Police Organizations

Brenda J. Bond, Ph.D.
Suffolk University

Stephen A. Morreale, D.P.A.
Worcester State University/Walden University

Abstract

Executives and managers of police agencies are depended upon to deal with crisis and change in their environments and in their organizations. The decisions made by these leaders are distinct from those on the spot decisions often made by law enforcement officers, correctional officers or court personnel in field situations. In most instances, there is time to reflect, assess and collect data in order to make more informed decisions. Unlike line-level personnel, administrators are most often positioned to engage in strategic and long-term decision-making as opposed to crisis-driven decision-making. Engaging in a systematic decision-making process can be beneficial if the process includes collecting and evaluating information and data, giving other stakeholders the opportunity to review and provide input, and reviewing previous "best practices" in organizational decision-making.

The paper sets forth the findings of a limited exploratory, qualitative study aimed at identifying processes used in decision-making by police administrators. The paper also includes recommendations to enhance the decision-making processes used by police administrators. By police administrators, we are referring to those individuals who have the authority to make policy in a police organization versus managers who are situated between the street-level staff and the organization administrator.

The suggestion of strategic planning has overwhelming and negative connotations to many criminal justice practitioners. However, many of the tenants used for strategic planning have applicability to decision-making. By connecting the results of this exploration to theories of change and action, this paper identifies systematic approaches that can be used in the police administrator decision-making process.

Overview

There is no question that police organizations play a vital role in the quality of life of every community member. Police managers are required to make quick judgments and decisions that affect the lives and well-being of officers and citizens that they have a duty to protect. However, there are two levels of decision-making that present themselves in police organizations. These decisions fall into the domains of crisis management and strategic management.

This paper does not focus on the decision-making of the patrol officer in field situations who are required to make quick decisions based on the need for immediate action. Instead, the paper focuses on strategic management and change situations. Strategic decision-making as a context allows for deliberation and reflection. In this context, it is important to have a "systematic" process of information-gathering, discussion, review, consideration and weighing of alternatives, and ongoing assessment.

In a study, using the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), sworn officers were surveyed to identify those leadership traits or behaviors that contribute to job satisfaction and extra effort on the job. The research indicated strong support for the benefit of transformational leadership styles in law enforcement organizations. Sworn law enforcement officers who had managers practicing a transformational leadership style were significantly more satisfied with their jobs and were willing to exert extra effort in performing their job duties. Those who had a supervisor with a laissez-faire style of management were significantly less satisfied and therefore exerted less effort on the job. The exhibited behaviors and dimensions of a transformational leader include decisiveness, empowering, fair and consistent, communicative and trusting (Morreale, 2002).

This paper first discusses literature on decision-making. After this review, the paper reports on a limited qualitative exploratory study of decision-making processes utilized by police administrators. It then suggests the use of several decision-making models that may enhance the organizational decision-making processes in police agencies.

Very often, decisions are made based on limited information and an individual's intuition. While this is commonly viewed as effective on the street and certainly plays a role in parsing an issue, when considering the organizational level, there are additional steps or methods that should be considered. Intuition should not be underestimated for those with substantial experience levels (Burke & Miller, 1999). However, incorporating intuition into a more systematic process may strengthen the decision results.

Questions for consideration include: Is the administrator making decisions based on gut feelings or based on prior experience? Does the administrator seek alternatives and opposing points of view? Does the administrator include others in the decision-making process? Does the organization benefit from the lessons learned so that future decisions can be built upon the lessons learned? Does the entire command-level understand the processes of decision-making? Do they need to understand these processes, or be a part of them?

This exploratory research was conducted to identify thoughtful or systematic approaches or steps that police administrators have used in the decision-making processes, and to understand how lessons learned are or can be transferred to future decision-making. It is expected that this pilot will lead to more robust research in the field.

Existing Research

There is limited research available on criminal justice management decision-making, including the area of policing. Most of the focus of decision-making research has revolved around line-level officer decision-making and the use of discretion as an important tool. Further, in the latter part of the 20th century, there was a focus on the patrol officer as problem solver, which included the use of a problem-solving system. However, scant attention has been paid to law enforcement administrator decision-making processes and the elements of effective decision-making process. This aspect of policing is equally if not more important to the future of the policing industry.

The advent of community policing introducing the SARA Model (Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment) as a problem-solving model, mostly utilized by line-level personnel (Goldstein, 1990). The culmination of nearly 20 years of research, *problem-oriented policing* outlines the basic "systematic" elements of the problem-oriented approach to policing-in which police focus on the underlying causes of crime rather than just respond to calls for service. With the introduction of the S-A-R-A model of policing, officers were provided training in the use of this model, which focuses on the benefits of a process (Goldstein, 1990).

Goldstein (1990) indicates that there has been a preoccupation with means over ends, with operational methods, process and efficiency over effectiveness in dealing with the substantive policing issues. Goldstein feels that time and talent of rank and file officers has been squandered by ineffective police management in the past.

Problem oriented policing calls for adopting a proactive stance. Goldstein (1990) proposes strengthening the decision making processes and increasing accountability and problem identification along with considering alternative solutions. Although he was referring to line-level officers, there is a clear application to the administrator-level of the organization.

The advancement of a community policing philosophy, the most recent twentieth century model of policing (Greene, 2000), recognizes the importance of both internal and external stakeholders and decision-making. It appears, in many instances that many executives continue to rely on a reactive approach to the management of law enforcement agencies. Most of the work performed by law enforcement organizations is related to crisis management, focused on short-term results instead of a long-term problem-solving approach (Bayley, 1994). Unfortunately, the attention paid to strategic long-term development, problem solving and prevention in law enforcement organizations (Bayley, 1994; Greene, 2000) is limited. The existing literature provides little insight into models of manager decision-making in the law enforcement arena, which are needed at the administrator and organizational level of police agencies.

The SARA model is seen as a tool for systematic problem solving mostly geared towards the street officer. Greene (2000) suggests that the use at the organizational level would improve law enforcement operations by increasing understanding of problems, responses and effects. But, the use of such a model would require different ways of knowing such as the utilization and consideration of information available for assessment of strategy and operation (Greene, 2000).

The notion of information utilization has not been adequately examined in the public safety context. Although this information may be available, internally or externally, limited utilization of this knowledge, as an input and output for improved organizational efficiency, sometimes leads to poor management decisions. This presents significant implications for effective policing policy and program development (Juen & Al-Hawamdeh, 2001).

The various utilities of information and decision-making processes in the criminal justice context are unknown. But, systematic incorporation of data, research, experience, assessment and political, socio-economic factors are critical. Consider the following thoughts advanced by Pope (2001) regarding the current role of information in decisions:

> Decision makers must find specific research findings to be so compelling that they base changes in programs and policies directly on the research information. Research and data may influence a decision, as opposed to dictating change. Decision makers may use the data or research to help guide or clarify policy making.

> Decision makers may use the data and research to substantiate or legitimize a position or decision already arrived at, to refute or cast doubt on propositions advanced by others, to persuade or neutralize others, to buttress a request for funding, or similar purposes. (Pope, 2001)

This is common in many industries, and it is clear that information plays a significant role in decision-making. However, the challenge for researchers and practitioners is to identify what, if any, formal and systematic decision-making processes, including the utilization of data, are being used in police organizations, and then to evaluate their use and effectiveness.

The focus on police administrator decision-making is important and unique for several reasons. First, citizens and public officials are demanding more efficient and effective service for their investments. The privatization of policing services is not uncommon, which means that there is a growing market and demand for safety services, and increased dissatisfaction with public safety services could lead to a reduction of public dollars from public policing services. This requires a constant adaptation of organizational structures and processes to most effectively and efficiently serve the needs of the public.

As a result of the limitations of current literature, the focus of this exploration is on administrator decision-making regarding strategic management and change. The primary questions developed for this review included:

- What systematic processes do law enforcement administrators engage in when contemplating the development or implementation of policy or program changes?

- What criteria are included in this decision-making process?

- How are change efforts assessed or evaluated?

- What "patterns of criteria" in the decision-making process are identified in effective change efforts?

It was hypothesized that in many organizations, there would be no systematic process utilized by police administrators during an organizational change process, and that the inputs into decisions vary and are often made with incomplete data. An additional proposition is that there is no formal way of evaluating the change results, or for formally transferring lessons learned to future change processes (Maxwell, 1996).

The following sections describe the exploratory process employed to understand what processes police administrators engage in when making organizational change.

Methodology

This qualitative, exploratory study is limited in scope, yet provides significant insight into police administrator decision-making. Semi-structured interviews were conducted using the same interview guide, although the "change examples" varied. Of particular importance in this research is that the aim was not to generalize to the larger police administrator population, but to provide insight into organizational change decision-making processes, therefore, providing a first step in the generalization to theory (Yin, 1995).

Sample

The participants selected for this pilot study (n=3) were identified through professional association. Each of the law enforcement administrators is a member of a state Association of Chiefs of Police, and current agency administrators. Their tenure as administrator ranged from six to seventeen years.

The administrators participating in this study manage municipal law enforcement agencies in New England. Each of the interviewees is supervised by a City Manager, who then reports to a city council. Two of the communities selected were urban areas, and one was a suburban area, with a significant private industry base. Each agency has a labor union for patrol and command officers. This particular context requires significant knowledge of and bargaining of union contracts when engaging in management and change processes.

This study consisted of semi-structured interviews, designed to gather specific data to answer the research questions and gain an understanding of decision-making processes (Maxwell, 1996). An interview guide was constructed to serve as a roadmap for the interview. (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). Dependent upon the data revealed throughout the interview, flexibility was allowed in the interviews. The guide was developed so that it could be adapted to varied organizational contexts and change examples.

A key premise is that environmental forces often require an agency to adapt or change their policies and procedures, and that change takes place often. With this in mind and in order to focus the conversation, the participant was asked to select one change process that they had engaged in and use that as a context for the interview. Again, the exploratory study was designed to generalize to the decision-making process theory as opposed to the selected change examples (Yim, 1995).

Once a change example was selected, the questions probed the nature of the change, seeking out who may have been involved or considered, what information was brought in for consideration, what prompted the decision to change, what process was used to engage in that change, what were the results and how were those results evaluated. A final question was asked regarding the participant's reflection on the process. The purpose of this question was to identify what lessons had been learned during the change process and how those lessons could be (or had been) applied to future change processes.

Each of the interviews was taped and transcribed verbatim. Each interview lasted approximately 60 minutes. This process of transcription ensures that the description included in this report is valid (Maxwell, 1996).

Analysis and Discussion

The transcriptions were coded for specific themes and key words. This inductive process allowed for patterns or themes to emerge that helped to answer or speak to the research questions, and either confirmed or negated the research propositions (Lofland & Lofland, 1995).

This transcription process also allowed a full understanding of the context in which the change process was taking place, and allowed a more thoughtful identification of important and pointed aspects of the discussion. The themes were compared across interviews and connected to the research questions and propositions. The results of these analyses are presented below.

The analysis will be presented first, by introducing each of the participant's change process examples. Again, this is important to best understand the context. However, although the examples of change are different for each participant, the themes are similar (Yim, 1995) and can be discussed simultaneously.

Change examples

Participant 1: The change example discussed by the first participant was the process of achieving accreditation. For the policing industry, a law enforcement agency can achieve state and/or national accreditation. This administrator was engaging in the first step, which was to attain state accreditation. The process required to achieve accreditation is both lengthy, and time and resource consuming. This change example is certification focused.

Participant 2: This participant used an organizational structure change as an example. This administrator spoke of the decentralization of the investigative operations in the agency. Traditionally, special units within a law enforcement agency are centralized and fall under the command of a centralized supervisor, with the physical location most often situated in the headquarters of the agency.

Participant 3: This participant discussed a change in communication processes that had been embarked on within the agency at the onset of his appointment as administrator. This particular administrator was the only research participant who had been hired from outside of the agency, however, had been a law enforcement official in another public safety organization.

Question 1: What systematic processes do law enforcement administrators engage in when contemplating the development or implementation of policy or program changes?

Based on the analysis of the data, it appears as though law enforcement administrators do not engage in any "formal, systematic" process, but that similar themes are taken into consideration during the decision-making process. Participants did not refer to any written materials and provided information "from their memory". Although it is near impossible to develop and utilize a "standard, cookie-cutter" approach for engaging in organizational management and change, the ability to engage in a thoughtful systematic procedure is feasible. The data collected during this exploration confirmed this statement. The following themes were identified by each participant as elements considered during their decision-making process, systematization is possible. These themes were identified in the analysis and are in no particular order, nor were they ranked by participants.

- Inclusion of internal, department allies
- Assessment of labor union involvement and impact
- Specific change dictates who will be involved in the process – internally
- Prompts for change come to the administrator in various ways, but most often identified through error (or surfaced dysfunction) in procedures or operations
- Assessment of resources required for change
- Identification of models (programs, policies, individuals) in the field of policing
- Identification of change goals
- Consideration of political (municipal administration) climate and support
- Contemplation of internal support

Again, although the change examples used by administrators varied, there were common themes in their descriptions.

Question 2: What criterion is included in this decision-making process?

As the analysis progressed, it was found that this question might be similar to Question One. However, after reviewing the coded data there were several themes that can be reiterated.

Further, additional points surfaced. As indicated in the previous question analysis, political support, union and other personnel support, resources required, and socio-political climate are all important aspects considered when contemplating change.

In terms of interesting data culled from this question, only one participant explicitly mentioned consequences as something to be considered. Interestingly each had implied a review of other programs outside of their agency. Moreover, none of the participants spoke of exploring specific alternatives in this particular decision-making process. Only one participant had mentioned that he had learned from past "mistakes" and that he uses those experiences as ways to avoid future mistakes, although each mentioned some form of review from past problems. The administrators mentioned that they "live and learn" and this is what often helps them make it through change process. This implies that "trial and error" is a common theme in change efforts. Further, one administrator indicated that "we learn from other people's problems", illustrating that trial and error often include seeing how others deal with issues. This is a key finding as it certainly signifies some aspect of transferring lessons learned – but focuses on what not to do, as opposed to what works. Finally, it was clear that the input of key internal allies was important, and that input from others is often accepted but often depends on who is providing the input, as to whether the input is considered.

Question 3: How are change efforts assessed or evaluated?

The most salient theme identified in this analysis across the three cases was the institution of regularly scheduled staff meetings where problem solving took place. Each of the three participants spoke to the establishment of meetings to increase communication and problem-solve. However, this "tool" was not established as a part of any formal evaluation, rather, it was established to facilitate information flow. Each of the participants spoke extensively about the ongoing problem solving that took place to assess what was not working in their change effort. The discussions in these meetings often focused on what was not working and how to "fix it" as opposed to transferring what works.

Two participants indicated that the meetings were specifically established to address communication, and resolve problems regarding the change effort. One administrator stated that meetings were a place to probe "why something that was working in another area was not being adapted in other neighborhoods." Again, the focus seemed to be on corrective action, which was referred to often as a result of these meetings. This same administrator did not anticipate the need for such meetings, but when faced with implementation issues – or as he said "convulsions," meetings to correct unexpected problems were instituted. This problem-solving process is more in tune with process evaluation, although, was not established as such. This could clearly be incorporated into a formal or more systematic process since it was clearly an element of each change effort.

Each of the participants spoke of "decreases in error" as a key measure of success. Very little inference was made regarding the formal collection and analysis of data to evaluate change activities and successes. There was acknowledgement by one participant that the collection of data was an important part of the agency's change, but this seemed an after-thought.

Similarly, one of the participants mentioned that their agency does not collect traditional, crime-related measures of change effectiveness, but that anecdotal data is what tells him that the change has been a success. This participant later indicated that if he could do it again, he would include data as an important component of the change activity. It isn't too far afield to imagine that the collation of the anecdotal data and other agency data may result in a very different picture of the change outcomes.

Additional measures that participant noted were the increase in knowledge, and improvements in behavior among supervisory staff. Each participant spoke of improved problem-solving skills among these staff members. For example, one of the administrators spoke of the increased problem-solving skills among managers, particularly in the area of planning. This manager indicated, "manager's are now coming to the table with a list of accomplishments, as well as a list of their priorities for the coming year. The priorities and their needs are based on a review of what the previous year's needs and expenditures were, and how this information has informed the next year's priorities and resources." Additional measures included a decrease or the absence of complaints from customers or partners, implying that if citizens, officials and external colleagues are not complaining – it must be going well. Again, there was no reference to official or anecdotal data examined. Only one of the participants mentioned internal satisfaction as a measure of success. Finally, other references to success included the recognition that adversarial relations had decreased (which apparently was a desired result); increased coordination; decreased involvement of administrator in problem solving; increased modeling of desired behavior by supervisors; and increased and evident experiential learning among supervisory staff.

Although it was expected that there would be no formal evaluation process or assessment procedures, after reviewing and analyzing the data, it was clear that there are many informal measures being utilized by administrators, but these are not the "traditional" quantitative crime data that have been used in judging law enforcement effectiveness. An implication of this is that the measures identified informally in this study, as well as others, can be "formalized as part of a system" and used to inform success and future change.

This is an important implication for evaluation practice in the policing industry. There is some degree of movement in the criminal justice arena to examine non-traditional measures, but this finding adds to that examination and need, and opens up a new lens to public safety organizational change measurement. There is limited literature that speaks to this specifically, although again, some literature has acknowledged the need for non-traditional measures. The measurement literature that does exist concentrates mostly new measures for "community policing" and the outputs of law enforcement agencies employing a community policing philosophy, as opposed to measuring organizational change and change processes in policing contexts.

Question 4: What "patterns of criteria" in the decision-making process are identified in effective change processes?

This analysis proved quite complicated, particularly because each of the participants noted that the change effort success was measured primarily through minimization of error. However, an interesting aspect of the process was that the change took quite some time (up to 3 years or more) and that along the way, there was continuous problem solving. So in a way, each understood the importance of the "process evaluation" although they did not describe it that way. The administrators felt that they were being successful if they were progressing toward accomplishing the goals that they had set forth, even though there was no formal evaluation established and utilized. However, it should be noted that the ongoing problem-solving meetings might be a key element of a formal system. First, administrators are devoting resources (staff time) to meetings and recognizing the importance of these gatherings, and the participating individuals. Secondly, they are already engaging in reflection, which is a first step to learning. Both of these reasons are encouraging and signify a potential for formality.

Using each of the participants' measures of effectiveness allows for an analysis of the data. Key themes identified in this analysis included:

- Inclusion of key allies in both the decision-making and the ongoing problem-solving

- Ongoing consideration of sociopolitical context and adjustment to environmental changes

- Ongoing assessment of how change will help to minimize error and move agency towards change effort goal

- Establishing a mechanism for ongoing problem solving.

Research Propositions

The research propositions are more fully discussed ahead, in addition to the findings and themes related to the propositions:

Proposition 1: There is no systematic process utilized by police administrators during an organizational change process, and that the inputs into the decision to change vary, and are often incomplete.

The data supported this statement. However, found it to be more complex. The data indicated that inputs do vary, which is appropriate for an ever-changing environment and context. As discussed, although it may be inappropriate to standardize a process, it is certainly conceptually and operationally possible to "systematize" a process. This was confirmed in this analysis.

Proposition 2: There is no formal way of evaluating the change results, or for transferring lessons learned to future change processes.

Based on the analysis, there is no "formal" way of evaluating change results. One administrator did identify evaluation as a missing component upon reflection, but made not reference to initiating an evaluation at this point. Unexpectedly, the analysis found that there was a commitment to ongoing assessment of change efforts, but again, mostly focused on minimizing error, not on evaluation per se. But, for the purposes of this analysis, administrators used the term "minimization of error," as a measure of success.

To reiterate an important point, many of the measures of success identified by the administrators were not the traditional quantitative crime data, but could be used as measures that get to what really matters in the change process. When asked how effectiveness is measured, one administrator reported, "There are several different ways that we are able to make that determination. Hard numbers are not one of them. We have anecdotal information that there are certain types of crimes solved because of the change, which would not have been solved without the change." This administrator implied that clearance rates (a quantitative measure), as well as feedback from the community and district attorney's office provide insight into effectiveness. The implication here is that there is a need to explore the identification and use of different measures of success in public safety organizational change effectiveness.

Regarding the transference of lessons learned to future change efforts, little reference took place. It was described in a more "live and learn" concept, as opposed to conceptualizing how certain elements or aspects of a process could be tailored and transferred to other change efforts. One of the administrators did speak about how he "revamped the internal affairs department after re-tooling a reporting function in another department." This was an illustration of using what works and incorporating it into other organizational functions.

The subsequent reflection on the change process allowed for the administrators to think back on what could have been done differently in order to improve the process. Reported themes from the analysis included:

- Better planning with clear timelines
- Decision based on data, as well as other information, including anecdotal data
- Incorporating more systematic processes into change decisions and strategies
- Piloting change activities before making department-wide change
- Evaluating the process more formally.

The identification of these themes implies that the process was incomplete, or different aspects of the process were not fully realized. As one administrator stated, "I don't think we did the analyzing as well as we should have. But we're cops, no cops ever do. Cops scan a problem and then jump to a conclusion." This administrator went on to explain the importance of stepping back and being more thoughtful, and that brining in others and re-examining the process is critical, even if it risked altering or stopping the proposed change. This is a significant result of

this analysis, and points to the need and desire of administrators to adopt "systems" for managing change.

The analysis also identified similarities in the identification of themes the change decision, implementation and assessment, as well as in the reflection process. Coupled with the previous statements, this infers that a systematic process can be utilized across varied contexts and change efforts. The change examples in this study were different, yet there were significant common themes and potential universality indicating that these themes may be applied to other decision-making processes.

The intent was identify what worked in the change processes and use these lessons in future decision-making processes. This was not a concept formally articulated or recognized in this exploration.

Additional Findings

Outside of the question and proposition analyses, the interviews produced further data that was of interest regarding the decision-making processes of police administrators.

Beginning with administrator style, the language used during the interview revealed an interesting continuum or level of management style in decision-making. For example, one of the participants consistently indicated that he made the decision to do this, and he made the decision to do that, but that overall, "they" had made the change. A second participant depicting the process used "we" almost always. This participant acknowledged that one sometimes would override a decision, but generally referred to "we" in the decision-making process.

The final participant spoke of a truly inclusive process that always resulted in a group decision. It is assumed that these depictions were a true representation of the process. Regardless, their obvious style in "story-telling" seemed to have little effect on the recurring themes revealed.

The culture of policing and the strength of the union and their respective contracts was another attention-grabbing theme. Both seemed to be on the forefront of the minds of at least two participants, throughout the conversation. The culture of policing, and its reactive climate, was identified by one participant as a reason why more thought had not been put into the change process.

The limited reference to and use of research and data was not surprising and is consistent with the lack of research in the area of police organizational change. One administrator spoke of its importance, indicating that there was a review of the latest research, best practices and benchmarking across the country while the change processes was taking place. Again, the lack of a systematic process might account for the more patchy identification of process inputs. Further, process evaluation seems to be an important aspect of change, but is not identified, and likely not utilized as a more systematic evaluation tool.

The identification of models, (or more recently referred to as "best practices") both programs and individuals, was evident throughout the conversations. These practices were recognized as exemplary, but there was no mention of data to support their designation as a "best practice."

There is limited policing research available in the area of this study. From this limited exploratory study, interesting connections to current policing literature are:

- The reactive style of management is confirmed by the responses of administrators in the planning, implementation and evaluation of long-term activities (Bayley, 1994). This was identified in the analysis.

- Acknowledgement by administrators that more structure is needed, which includes planning and evaluation, with the example of SARA given by one participant. The use of SARA may be an appropriate tool for administrators in policing. (Greene, 2000)

- Utilization of research and data (internal and external) to substantiate decisions already made. (Pope, 2001) At least one administrator spoke of seeking out literature after the fact, but little reference to seeking it out during the decision-making process.

What this research confirmed was that there is significant need to understand what police administrators are doing regarding formal organizational changes process and how these processes can be improved. This limited study found that there are no formal or "systematic" processes but that there are common elements considered when engaging in change – implying that systematization is possible.

Policy Implications

The most important policy implications for these findings are that as citizens and officials demand more efficiency and effectiveness for their tax dollars, social institutions such as policing agencies, must identify systematic ways to implement and evaluate change. The themes identified here can inform that process. Along with the need for more systematic processes is the need for clearer, but possibly non-traditional measures of effectiveness. Moreover, the utilization of research and data in these processes is seriously lacking, which has implications for both practitioners and researchers. If research is being produced that practitioners are not using, then what is the point? Why does this happen? Further, if practitioners are providing what they define as effective services, why aren't researchers more in tuned with those practices or examining those practices for effectiveness? Also, what is the role of citizens and community officials in defining those measures, and how can these constituent groups participate in this process? Lastly, the operations and strategies of police organizations are fluid, so it behooves an agency to adopt a systematic change process that will ensure more effective outcomes in change.

Questions for future research

Even with this limited exploration and analysis, many questions remain. They are:

- How are change processes prioritized? How common are simultaneous change efforts? How does this affect the process?
- How do financial resources affect the change process?
- Does the size of the agency (those who have more financial and human resources) affect more change, or more complex change?
- What is the role of the community in organizational change?
- What measures can or should be used? Is an evaluation component built-in to the process?
- Does the process vary depending upon whether the result will be a new policy or a new program?
- Does the process vary if the change is voluntary versus mandated by law?
- What is the relationship between decision-making themes in a strategic versus a more pressing or crisis management context?
- Should outside accountability structures be established to evaluate effectiveness (given that is more clearly defined) given that the organization is publicly funded?

This exploration and the questions that remain point to the significant need to understand how police organizations can efficiently and effectively manage change. We propose the use of several change models that have been cited in the literature, but have not been explored in the criminal justice context and in particular, the policing discipline.

Conclusion

There are a number of decision-making models that should be considered for introduction into the law enforcement community. Janis (1989) recommends that managers seek and sift information before making decisions. Janis (1989) investigated the issues of groupthink and cautions others to avoid the circumstances in their future deliberations.

There are several decision-making models that have been set forth in recent past. There are two that merit consideration and analysis. Rajagopalan and Spreitzer (1996) propose an integrative framework for strategic change that brings together the strengths of the rational, learning and cognitive perspectives of change, incorporating the aspects of each model that contribute to effective change. The testing of the integrative model does not appear in the literature to date.

The integrative model provides a systematic framework to engage in change that considers many of the elements discussed in the exploratory study. The steps of this framework, originating or adapted from, the three change perspectives, are described below.

The first two steps require a consideration of the internal and external environments, which will inform, and often prompt, change. In the case of the administrators, each had identified a need to

engage in change prompted by their environment. This point was highlighted by one administrator who when speaking of the existence of issues and consideration of the conditions, stated, "When we laid the problems out, we could make a logical argument that this was the way to go."

A consideration of managerial cognitions and actions must also take place when formulating the change strategy. This was clear in the interview analysis as administrators spoke of individuals within the organization, including union officials who must be included in the change process. This is particularly important in an institution such as a police agency where culture and tradition has dictated how things take place. For example, at least two administrators spoke of it as an internal force. One indicated, "the longer things have been in place, the more difficult the change," while the second stated that "tradition is very important in a police agency, but it can also make change impossible – so we factored that into our change decisions."

Change agents must consider this as part of the internal environment and actors. Once change takes place, outcomes are identified, which may be planned or unexpected. For example, administrators may identify a goal for the particular change, but may also identify unexpected outcomes such as stronger team-based management. Manager action is likely to influence these outcomes as well as others. Individual action and interaction can have an impact on how change is implemented. Further, the outcomes are also likely to be influenced by the internal and external conditions in which the change takes place. Finally, the outcomes become an aspect of manager cognitions, which in turn influence actions and organizational conditions and changes (Rajagopalan & Spreitzer, 1996).

This model represents a process of surveying the environment; considering the internal context; developing needed change and strategy; examining outcomes; and identifying how those outcomes may influence knowledge and action. This model is comparable to the action-research model put forth by Kurt Lewin, a social psychologist focused on social management (research within social planning and action), and includes idea generation (based on environmental and organizational conditions), planning (change formulation and strategy), fact-finding and decision-making (consideration of environment and managerial cognitions), execution (strategy implementation), back to fact-finding (to evaluate action, learning, corrective action if necessary, modification of overall plan) (Lewin, 1997).

The models presented above show promise for creating a systematic process for organizational management of change. Neither of these models has been tested in a theory-building context. What this means is that action research has been identified in the researcher-practitioner context, but not as a tool for management of change.

Law enforcement administrators often make decisions based on intuition and experience, therefore, it is important to understand some of the other factors that go into the decision making process. A model that has been widely used in understanding how people make decisions is the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). The theory of reasoned action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980) has been tested in several studies dealing with a variety of decision-making topics such as smoking, seat-belt use, voting behavior, attending college, losing weight, dental

hygiene, contraception behavior, and ethical vs. unethical decision-making in the accounting and medical professions.

The theory of reasoned action assumes that human beings are quite rational and make systematic use of the information that is available to them. The theory has long been used as a model for predicting human behavior and/or intentions. It states that behavior is determined by intentions, a combination of personal attitudes towards the behavior, as well as the opinions of peers. According to the theory of reasoned action, the immediate determinant of behavior is the person's intention to perform. Behavioral intention, in turn depends upon (1) the attitude toward performing the behavior, and (2) the subjective norm. Attitude towards the behavior is based on a person's beliefs that if performing a behavior leads to a mostly favorable outcome, then a person will have a favorable attitude towards performing the behavior. On the other hand, if performing the behavior will lead to an unfavorable outcome, then the person will have an unfavorable attitude towards performing the behavior. Subjective norms are one's beliefs that if others who are important to him/her think he/she should perform the behavior, and then he/she will be motivated to comply with that belief and perform the behavior. If one believes that others who are important to him/her think he/she should not perform the behavior, then he/she will be motivated to comply with that belief, and not perform the behavior.

According to Morgan (2001), if there is a need for others to implement a decision, they should be involved in the process. One final question recommended by Drucker is to ask if the decision is really necessary.

The law enforcement executive needs to recognize the need for a balance between quick decisions without full-data or information and the problems that emanate from analysis paralysis. The manager needs to look at the upside of the potential decision and not always fall into a damage-control mode.

References

Ajzen, I. (1989).   Attitude structure and behavior. In H. Pratkanis, S.J. Breckler and A.G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Attitude Structure and Function*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ajzen, I. & M. Fishbein. (1980). *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*. (1st ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bayley, D. H., (1994). *Police for the future*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Burke, L. A. & Miller, M. K. (1999). Taking the mystery out of intuitive decision-making, *The Academy of Management Executive*s, November.

Coughlin, David. (2001). Insider action research projects: Implications for practicing managers, *Management Learning*, 32 (1).

Greene, J. R., (2000). Community policing in America: Changing the nature, structure, and function of the police". In *Policies, Processes, and Decisions of the Criminal Justice System*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem oriented policing*, McGraw Hill, New York.

Goldstein, H., (1993). The new policing: Confronting complexity. *Research in Brief*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Hammond, J. S., Keeney, R. L. & Raiffa, H., (1998). The hidden traps in decision making, Harvard Business Review.

Janis, I., (1989) *Crucial decisions: Leadership in policymaking and crisis management.* Free Press.

Juen, T. W. & Al-Hawamdeh, S., (2001). Knowledge management in the public sector: Principles and practices in police work, *Journal of Information Science*, 27 (5).

Lewin, Kurt (1997). *Resolving social conflicts and field theory in social science*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. H., (1995), Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis, Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Maxwell, J. A., (1996) Qualitative research design: An interactive approach, Sage Publications.

McConnell, C. R., (2000, June) The anatomy of a decision, The Health Care Manager, Gaithersburg, VA.

Morgan, N., (2001) Put your decision making to the test: Communicate, Harvard Management Communication Letter, Harvard Business School Publishing.

Morreale, Stephen A., (2002) Analysis of perceived leader behaviors in law enforcement agencies, doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University.

Nutt, P. C., (2002) Why decisions fail, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Pope, C, Lovell, R. & Brandl, S., (2001) Readings in criminal justice research, Wadsworth Thomson Learning.

Rajagopalan, N. & Spreitzer, G. M., (1996), Toward a theory of strategic change: A multi-lens perspective and integrative framework, Academy of Management Review Vol. 22. No. 1; 48-79.

Yin, R. X., (1994) Case Study Research: Design and Methods, Sage Publications.

Vroom, V. H., (1972, Spring) A new look at managerial decision-making, Organizational Dynamics, 66-80.

About the authors . . .

Brenda J. Bond, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor with Suffolk University. She received her doctoral degree from the Heller School for Social Policy and Management at Brandeis University. Previously, she served as Director of Research and Development with the Lowell, MA Police Department where she managed several state and federal initiatives including the Prisoner Reentry Initiative, Regional Community Policing Institute of New England, and the Massachusetts Police Leadership Institute. During her tenure, Dr. Bond co-authored and managed over $14 million dollars in grant programs, with a focus on development, implementation and evaluation of police-community programs. Brenda has served as an Evaluator for the Center for Family, Work and Community at the University of Massachusetts-Lowell and as a Research Associate at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. Her research interests include decision-making, organizational change, change management, and hot spot policing.

Stephen A. Morreale, D.P.A. is an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice and Business Administration at Worcester State College and an instructor at the Justice Systems Training and Research Institute at Roger Williams University. He also serves as a Faculty Mentor at Walden University. He is a 30-year veteran of law enforcement, having served in the U.S. Army Military Police Corps, the Dover, New Hampshire Police Department and as an agent and manager with the Drug Enforcement Administration and served as Assistant Special Agent in Charge for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Inspector General's Office, Office of Investigations. He has conducted many management assessments of police agencies, training and facilitation for law enforcement executives and agencies throughout New England. His research interests include management and leadership, ethics, organizational development, change management, ethics and health care fraud and compliance.

Meet Members of your Police Section Executive Board

This and the next issue will introduce you to the executive board of the Police Section. You will see that together they offer our group a diverse mix of practice, research, teaching, and service perspectives. Let us know if you'd like to join!

John DeCarlo, Chair

Dr. DeCarlo has 34 years of police experience and is a retired chief of police. He is also the co-founder of NexGen Public Safety Software Solutions and served as the director of research and development for the company. His current research centers on policing methodologies and their effect on crime, police system organization, eyewitness memory, policing efficacy and management strategies, organizational dysfunction and change, police unionism and environmental criminology. DeCarlo is currently conducting research in police contagion shooting and the antecedents to violence escalation and conducting action research in areas of police education and organizational change interventions and predictive policing and analysis. Dr. DeCarlo has been the recipient of several federal grants to study policing in the United States. Dr. DeCarlo is the founder of The Center for Advanced Policing at UNH and coordinated the Police Studies program at John Jay College of Criminal Justice.

He currently serves as the Chair of the Police section of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences and the deputy chair of the ACJS constitution and bylaws committee.

Stephen Morreale, Vice Chair

Steve Morreale serves as an Associate Professor and Chair of the Criminal Justice Department at Worcester State University (WSU). He is also affiliated with Walden University and Roger Williams University – Justice System Training and Research Institute.

Dr. Morreale served in law enforcement for 30 years, having retired as Assistant Special Agent in Charge for U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Investigations, Inspector General. He also served nearly 20 years with the DEA, the Dover, New Hampshire Police Department, and the U.S. Army Military Police Corps.

He is past-President of the Northeastern Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, a founder and past-President of the Massachusetts Association of Criminal Justice Education.

Dr. Morreale holds a doctoral degree from Nova Southeastern University in Fort Lauderdale. His area of expertise is in the area of the Scholarship of Teaching, policing, health care fraud, leadership, ethics, strategic planning, decision making and organizational change, and pracademics in criminal justice higher education. He was recently elected as his hometown Town Moderator.

Veronyka James, Secretary

Veronyka is an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at Shenandoah University. She received her Ph.D. and Master's in Criminology from Indiana University of Pennsylvania in 2010 and 2004 respectively, and her Bachelor of Arts in Forensic Sociology and Creative Writing from the Johnston Center for Integrative Learning at the University of Redlands (2002).

Her research interests are sexual assault victimization and reporting, stigma management, policing (particularly police misconduct), and "senseless" violence (e.g., serial killers and mass shooters). The *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* recently published an article from her dissertation research using data on sexual assault reporting. Moreover, she is currently revising a co-authored manuscript examining the narratives of serial killers and how they use techniques of neutralization to present normativity and manage stigma.

Veronyka received the SAGE Junior Faculty Professional Development Award for 2015 and 2016 and the 2015 Emerging Scholar Award from the Northeastern Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. She also serves as an executive counselor for the Victimology Section.

Carol Archbold, Executive Counselor

Carol A. Archbold is a Professor/Walter F. and Verna Gehrts Endowed Professor in the Department of Criminal Justice and Political Science at North Dakota State University in Fargo, ND. She has been at NDSU since 2005. She teaches graduate and undergraduate courses focused on policing, gender and race issues in the criminal justice system, and research methods. Her research interests include police accountability and liability, women in policing, and race and gender in the criminal justice system.

Dr. Archbold has published her research in a variety of peer-reviewed journals including: *Police Quarterly, Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, and the *Journal of Crime and Justice*. She is a member of the editorial boards for several journals including *Police Quarterly; Policing: An International Journal of Police*

Strategies and Management, and the *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*.

Carol conducted the first study of the use of risk management by police agencies in the United States. This study is featured in her book Police Accountability, Risk Management and Legal Advising, (LFB Scholarly Publishing, 2004). In 2011, Dr. Archbold co-authored the book Women and Policing in America: Classic and Contemporary Readings with Dr. Dorothy Schulz and Dr. Kimberly Hassell (Aspen Publishing). Dr. Archbold authored the text Policing: A Text/Reader (Sage Publications) in 2012. Most recently, she co-authored the second edition of the book, The New World of Police Accountability (with Dr. Samuel Walker, University of Nebraska-Omaha). This book was published by Sage Publications in 2013.

Call for Papers, Authors, Applicants?

If you are working on a project and need authors for book chapters or encyclopedia entries, let us know. We'll include that call in the *Police Forum* for free.

Or, if you are hosting a conference or seminar and need participants, let us know that too. We'll be happy to help spread the word <u>for free</u>.

Or, if you have a job opportunity—particularly of interest to those teaching or researching in areas related to policing—we'd love to help you announce that position…and yes, we'll do it **FOR FREE!**

Send any announcements that you would like to have included in the next issue of the *Police Forum* to Michael Jenkins via email at Michael.jenkins@scranton.edu

---

ARE YOU AN ACJS LIFETIME MEMBER?

Please remember that you still must pay the Police Section dues annually to remain a member of the Police Section. Membership is $37 per year and includes a subscription to *Police Quarterly*. Payment of dues is made to ACJS. Thanks!!!

Submission Guidelines for the *Police Forum*

Format Criteria

The format criteria for all submissions are as follows: reasonable length (less than 30 pages), double-spaced, and in a font similar to 12 pt Times New Roman. All submissions should be in Word format. All charts, graphs, pictures, etc. must be one page or smaller and contained within standard margins. Please attach these at the end of the submission as appendices. Due to formatting limitations all appendices must be in a Word, Excel or similar format - PDF's cannot be used.

Feature Articles

Feature Articles can be quantitative or qualitative. Tables, figures and charts should be kept to a minimum and should be inserted at the end of the document with an appropriate reference to placement location within the text. The page limits are flexible, however the editors reserve the right to edit excessively long manuscripts.

Practitioners Corner

Articles written from the perspective of persons currently or formerly working in the field, expressing personal observations or experiences concerning a particular area or issue. Page limits are flexible, however long articles may be edited for length.

Academic Pontification

Articles for this area should focus on making an argument, presenting a line of thought, or formulating a new conceptual idea in policing.

Point/Counterpoint

Authors are encouraged to work with another person to develop a point/ counterpoint piece. The initial argument should be between 2 and 5 pages. The initial argument should contain roughly 3 to 5 main points. Following exchange of articles between debating authors, a 1 to 3-page rejoinder/ rebuttal will be submitted.

Research Notes

Research notes should describe a work in progress, a thumbnail outline of a research project, a conceptual methodological piece, or any other article relating to research methods or research findings in policing.

Reviews

Book reviews on any work relating to policing. Reviews of Internet sites or subjects concerning policing on the Internet are also welcome.

Policing in the News

News items of interest to the police section are welcomed in any form.

Legal News in Policing

Reviews of court cases, legal issues, lawsuits, and legal liability in policing are welcomed submissions.

Letters to the Editor

Questions, comments or suggestions pertaining to a given Criminal Justice topic, article or research.

This Date in History

Submissions on prior hot topics, research or research methods in Criminal Justice from the past.

Good News

Submissions relating to professional and personal good news for our members - promotions, new jobs, marriages, etc.

How to Submit

Submissions may be made electronically by sending copy in a Word format to Michael.jenkins@scranton.edu.

Disclaimer

The editor(s) of this publication reserve the right to edit any submissions for length, clarity or other issues.

ACJS 54th Annual Meeting

"Linking Teaching, Practice, and Research"

March 21-March 25, 2017

Pre-Registration Deadline: January 15, 2017

After this date, all remaining registrations will be conducted onsite.

Annual meeting information, including the call for presentations and the conference program (when available), can be found at:
http://www.acjs.org/pubs/167_668_2915.cfm

Requested Submission Deadline: September 15, 2016
Final Submission Deadline: September 30, 2016

2017 Hotel Accommodations

The ACJS block of rooms is available at:

Kansas City Marriott Downtown
300 West 12th Street
Kansas City, MO 64105

The hotel group rate for the ACJS Annual Meeting will be:

Single Occupancy	$139.00 plus applicable taxes
Double Occupancy	$139.00 plus applicable taxes
Triple Occupancy	$149.00 plus applicable taxes
Quadruple Occupancy	$159.00 plus applicable taxes
Club Level	Add $30 per night

The above occupancy rates are available only until March 1, 2017, subject to available space in the ACJS room block.

It is preferred that you reserve your hotel accommodations through the online reservation system which provides more detailed information about the hotel. **Click here** to reserve your guest room.

Business Meeting Minutes

NOTE: The minutes below are to be considered and approved, with corrections, at the Police Section Business meeting in Kansas City, MO during the 2017 ACJS Annual Meeting.

**MINUTES
ACJS Police Section General Business Meeting
Denver, CO
April 1, 2016**

Meeting called to order at 1708. Approximately 30 in attendance.

The police section is the largest section in ACJS and we are going to aim to grow some this year. There was no quorum, but there was news from the executive board meeting about what will happen in the coming year and what happened in the previous year. Then the presentation of the O.W. Wilson award.

Jeff Bumgarner of the Forum is stepping down as editor. *The Forum* was able to publish 3 issues with 5 articles last year, and we will be soliciting for a new editor for Forum during next month to quickly choose one.

New exec board coming on, election results within next 10 days. New executive counselors, and vice-chair.

Two areas coming up: exploring with a couple publishers for a peer reviewed journal for police management and organization which is an area that is not necessarily explored in current journals. Give news within forum as it comes about. Talking with Barth and Lorenzo and have large carry-over in funds, want to explore starting series of research grants with practitioners and researchers (hopefully members) to explore areas of practical policing that are often overlooked.

Starting a mentorship program to link scholars with new student members.

Next year: Section will be sponsoring a series of roundtables and panels on policing see 15-20 panels/roundtables directly linked to section. There will be overarching theme in panels and will be soliciting opinions from the membership

Increase membership and revising by-laws. Section will be sponsoring a student paper competition and redoing Facebook page and start tweeting news.

Motion to accept minutes from 2015, seconded. Passed.

Honoring someone in field of policing with O.W. Wilson award.

O.W. Wilson Award winner: Dr. George Kelling. Michael Jenkins presented award to Dr. Kelling for many contributions to police research and practice. Dr. Kelling shaped the practice of police research and students and devoted 15 years of professional life to police research.

Dr. Kelling thanked section for being honored.

Adjourned at 1733.