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ABSTRACT

The Structural Dimensions of Community Oriented Police Departments

by

Stavros S. Anthony

Dr. James H. Frey, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Sociology
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

With the beginning of the twentieth century, police departments throughout the nation, during what has been called the reform movement, changed their organizational structure to that of a bureaucracy. This structural change occurred to deal with the problems of political patronage and corruption in police departments. The result, over time, was the development of municipal police departments into ridged, formalized, and centralized structures that were not responsive to the communities they served. Police officers became professional crime-fighters, who sought little community input.

For the past 20 years, pressures from police professionals, local communities and governmental forces have caused police executives to rethink the police mission. Police departments have been told to partner with the community and become community problem solvers, not crime fighters. Police officers have been directed to become innovative general practitioners in the community, who solve problems with
community members to reduce both crime and the fear of crime, therefore enhancing quality of life.

With this community oriented policing movement, police departments are being told to de-bureaucratize by becoming less complex, less formalized and less centralized in their structural form. This structural change should enhance the police-community partnership, and focus police efforts on problem solving. Due to these pressures, it would be expected that police departments have become isomorphic, or structurally similar, moving away from the Weberian notion of bureaucracy.

This study examines measures of central tendency and variability in a sample of twenty municipal police departments throughout the nation, with between 200 and 2000 police officers, considered the leaders in community oriented policing. This sample was compared to a control group of eight municipal police departments that are not considered community oriented police departments.

The structural dimensions measured in this study were complexity, formalization, centralization, occupational differentiation, administrative density, and size. This research indicates that successful community oriented police departments are structured differently than their counterparts, and for the most part, have developed a structure that is less complex, less centralized in authority and decision making, more occupationally differentiated, and less administratively dense. These patterns are what the literature has recommended for successful community oriented police departments. As a result of these similar patterns, a structural model has been developed to assist police departments when implementing a community oriented policing philosophy.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Like many social institutions, American police departments are responding to rapid social change and emerging problems by rethinking their basic law enforcement strategies. In response to problems such as crime, drugs, fear and urban decay, the police have begun experimenting with new approaches to their tasks. Among the most prominent approaches is the concept of "community oriented policing". Viewed from one perspective, it is not a new concept: the principles can be traced back to some of policing's oldest traditions.

What is new is the idea that community oriented policing is not a particular program within a department, but instead should become the dominant philosophy throughout the organization. To be effective, community oriented policing must become a department-wide philosophy, and the police executive must shift the organization from a more traditional approach to a community oriented policing approach.

According to Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990), community oriented policing has supplanted the old police mission of traditional policing. Instead of police officers writing citations and making arrests as their sole function, police officers are to address the fear of crime and community areas that are run-down. Instead of police officers handling single incidents, they are to look at issues as problems and work to solve them. Under the traditional model, police organizations were not interested in input from the community. Community oriented policing demands that police departments reach out to the entire community for support and
assistance, and decisions that effect crime and quality of life should be made at the lowest level, not from a centralized location at the top of the organization.

The foundations for a successful community oriented policing strategy are the close, mutually beneficial ties between police and community members. Community oriented policing consists of two complementary core components: community partnership and problem solving. To develop community partnership, police must develop positive relationships with the community, must invite the community in the quest for better crime control and prevention, and must pool their resources with those of the community to address the most urgent concerns of community members. Problem solving is the process through which the specific concerns of the community are identified and through which the most appropriate remedies to abate these problems are found.

Community oriented policing does not imply that police are no longer in authority or that the primary duty of preserving law and order is subordinated. However, tapping into the expertise and resources that exist within communities will relieve police of some of the burdens. Local government officials, social agencies, schools, church groups, business people - all those who work and live in the community and have a stake in its development - will share responsibility for finding workable solutions to problems that detract from the safety and security of the community.

Eck and Spelman (1987) claim that the goal of community oriented policing is to reduce crime and disorder by carefully examining the characteristics of problems in neighborhoods and then applying appropriate problem oriented policing remedies. The theory behind problem oriented policing is that underlying conditions create problems, which may generate one or more incidents. These incidents, while stemming from a common source, may appear to be different. For example, social
and physical conditions in a deteriorating apartment complex may generate
burglaries, acts of vandalism, intimidation of pedestrians by rowdy teenagers, and
other incidents. These incidents, some of which come to police attention, are
symptoms of the underlying problem. The incidents will continue so long as the
problem that creates them persists.

In the community oriented policing philosophy, patrol officers will provide
the bulk of the police service with extensive contact with community members. Patrol
officers will be assisted by supervisors, specialized units, and other government
agencies and social services. The command staff of the agency will continually work
to support the efforts of the patrol officer in reducing crime, the fear of crime, and
solving problems in the community (Community Policing Consortium 1994).

The Traditional Police Model

"The proper role of police in society has been the subject of debate for many
years, but little doubt that the job of controlling crime is the highest priority of the
police under the traditional model. The traditional methods used to fight crime
include deterrence, incapacitation and rehabilitation" (Rosenbaum 1998:8). The
police priority under the traditional model was to respond rapidly to calls-for-service,
and quickly deal with the issue so time could be spent on routine patrol. Follow-up
investigations were done later by detectives, sometimes days after the incident. Police
were evaluated on the number of arrests made and the number of citations issued.

Several major studies have questioned the effectiveness of these general
strategies for controlling or preventing crime (Blumstein, Cohen and Nagin 1978;
Blumstein et al. 1986; Sechrest, White and Brown 1979). Further research on the
police in particular has failed to support the hypothesis that random patrols, rapid
response, and follow-up investigations - practices at the core of traditional policing -
will produce more arrests and less crime (Greenwood, Petersilia and Chaiken 1977; Kelling, Pate, Dieckman and Brown 1974; Spelman and Brown 1984). Nevertheless, police fully adopt the image of "crime fighter" under the traditional approach.

Rosenbaum (1998) argues that the traditional police functions have not been discontinued under community oriented policing. What have changed are the priorities the organization holds important and those new functions have been added to the mission. The function of crime fighting remains a focus of the police organization under community oriented policing; however, a greater emphasis has been placed on activities that are non-emergency related -- solving long term problems, working with the community on social ills, etc.

This reprioritization is justified on several grounds. First, the crime control and emergency functions constitute a small proportion of the total demand for police services, and thus, it is argued, should not be the hub of the police departments organizational structure and response system. Researchers in the 1970's and the 1980's found that police spent a great deal of time on efforts unrelated to law enforcement, such as peacekeeping and a range of diverse human problems (Kelling and Stewart 1991).

Second, prior research by Blumstein, Cohen and Nagin (1978), Blumstein et al. (1986), and Sechrest, White and Brown (1979) suggests that the police have not been very effective in reducing crime using traditional methods. Third, non-criminal, non-emergency problems represent the most frequent concern of neighborhood residents (Skogan 1990; Skogan and Hartnett 1997).

Moore (1992) has identified several weaknesses in the traditional method of policing: 1) a weakness in operation methods, 2) the limitations of reactivity, 3) insufficient preventiveness, 4) citizens' demands for police services, 5) incomplete professionalization, and 6) the growth of private self-defense. He concludes that
problem solving and community oriented policing are alternatives to the traditional strategy and must define the general approaches to policing in America.

In the seminal article on problem oriented policing, Goldstein (1979) reacted to what he perceived as an excessive concentration by police administrators on internal issues, to the exclusion of external matters. He challenged police executives to shift their attention to the end products of policing - namely, how police officers were addressing the persistent crime and crime-related problems they encountered. Pointing out that there was little evidence that the traditional methods were enabling police to achieve their legitimate, long-standing goals, Goldstein argued that unquestionable adherence to traditional methods was irresponsible.

Within this organizational environment, police officers must be encouraged to use problem oriented policing methods when dealing with issues in the community. According to Bieck, Spelman and Sweeney (1991) there must be incentives and guidance within the police organization that allow police officers to engage in creative searches for effective, often non-traditional solutions to problems. Police officers must be involved in both the planning and implementation of solutions to problems that plague neighborhoods. This planning should be both short and long-term.

Effective community oriented policing and problem solving will require the mastery of new responsibilities and the adoption of a flexible style of management. Community oriented policing emphasizes the value of the patrol function and the patrol officer as an individual. Patrol officers have traditionally been accorded low statues despite the scope and sensitivity of the tasks performed. Community oriented policing requires the shifting of initiative, decision making, and responsibility downward within the police organization. Under community oriented policing, Braiden (1992) argues that patrol officers should be given broader freedom to decide
what should be done and how it should be done in their communities; they assume
managerial responsibilities for the delivery of police services to their assigned area.
Police officers must have greater communication between divisions and with the
chief of police in implementing community oriented policing. Objectives must be
established and implemented through values and principles, not rules and regulations
(Sparrow 1988).

Maguire (1997) depicts the community oriented policing philosophy gaining a
tremendous amount of momentum throughout the country, in both small and large
police organizations. Those groups and individuals with a stake in law enforcement
see community oriented policing as the new partnership that will reduce crime and
increase neighborhood quality of life. National police conferences, as well as local
community efforts, are urging police executives to implement the community
oriented police mission in their organization. Those that are not embracing
community oriented policing are seen as out of touch with the community.

Community oriented policing and problem oriented policing have gained a
tremendous amount of national attention. This nation-wide movement comes from the
endorsement of national police organizations as well as the most recent United States
Presidents. The 1994 Crime Act passed by the United States Congress allocated $8.8
billion to community oriented policing efforts throughout the country, primarily to
hire new police officers (Maguire 1997). Maguire (1997) identifies one study which
found that 91 percent of the United States police departments involved in community
oriented policing.

The Evolution of Community Oriented Policing

Maguire (1997) points out that police departments under community oriented
policing must virtually redesign the organization, from the goals to police operations,
to ensure it is responding less to traditional methods and more to problem solving
divities. Police officers must be empowered to make decisions outside the military
model of only following orders. Police officers under community oriented policing
must be placed in a position to work with the community without the constant
centralization of authority from headquarters.

Kelling and Moore (1988) provide a concise framework in the evolution of
American policing in society by looking at three primary eras: political, reform, and
community oriented policing. Each has had an impact on both the mission and the
organizational structure.

In the mid-nineteenth century, the police began having a more prominent
organizational presence in the cities. This presence was fed by the immigration of
young Europeans who created a mosaic of ethnic neighborhoods under the control of
the political patronage system. In the 1920's, political "spoils" were pervasive and
corruption in government - including the police - was commonplace.

Fueled by organized crime during Prohibition and the rewards of political
success through the patronage system, abuses of political authority were becoming
increasingly obvious. The police were controlled by both the political machine and by
organized crime, thus did not respond the concerns of the average community
member. In the policing arena, the increases in crime and corruption stood as symbols
that reform had to occur or democratic values would become dangerously threatened
(Radelet and Carter 1992).

In 1931, the voluminous report of the National Commission on Law
Observance and Enforcement - known as the Wickersham Commission, after the
commission's chairman, Attorney General George Wickersham - was presented to
President Herbert Hoover. It recommended many reforms in dealing with crime and
disorder problems, such as putting the police under civil service rule and focusing on
the scientific support for evidentiary analysis in criminal investigations for better prosecutions.

One of the first outcomes of this reform movement was the transformation of police organizations into legalistic and technocratic bureaucracies, whose members were committed to norms of subordination and service, setting police departments apart from the community that they policed (Bordua and Reiss 1966). Police departments adopted the elements of bureaucracy: strict hierarchies of authority, centralized decision making, formalized rules and regulations, and increased specialization.

This structural change was a crucial step for several reasons. It was a way to hold police accountable to bureaucratic rather than political authority. Bureaucratization was a means of insulating the appointment and promotion of police officers from political patronage by requiring standards of merit. Additionally, it gradually substituted the rational allocation of police service for its allocation in response to political demands (Reiss 1992). Bureaucracy became an important organizational model for police departments as well as other structures throughout the United States.

The Weberian bureaucratic model that gained ascendancy at the turn of the century was a consequence of reform inspired by Fredrick Taylor's scientific management movement (1911) which emphasized managerial efficiency and standardization of work practices. According to Price (1997), the bureaucratic model changed police departments by ridding them of control by the local city council and mayor and moving them toward a model more focused on dealing with crime, using acceptable standards. In his discussion of police reform at the turn of the century, August Vollmer (1936), an early professionalization-oriented reformer, blamed the commonplace inefficiency of police practices on political interference and forcibly
argued that the police role in American society should be mainly that of crime control.

Vollmer viewed the successful bureaucratization of police departments as a major prerequisite for beneficial organizational change. Furthermore, research that public administration theorists accumulated from the 1920's to the 1930's provided much of the necessary information required to change police organizational structure during this reform era. The bureaucratic model emphasized the values of neutrality, conformity, impersonality and crime control (Zhao 1996). Based on Burns and Stalker's (1968) models of "mechanistic" and "organic" organizations, Kuykendall and Roberg (1982) summarized four basic features of the bureaucratic model's organizational structure: a high degree of specialized tasks, a hierarchical structure, a top-down flow of authority, a high degree of rule-oriented conduct, and centralization of decision making at the top of the organization.

By the end of the 1930's, the bureaucratic model had become the organizational theme for American police departments (Fogelson 1977). The publication of O. W. Wilson's book, Police Administration (1950), reflected quite clearly American law enforcement's widespread acceptance of the bureaucratic model. In particular, Wilson's book justified direct coordination between bureaucratic structure and operational activities. Skolnick (1966) later noted that the bureaucratic organizational structure appeared well developed and widely adopted by American police agencies, large and small alike, throughout the United States.

Thus, for most of the 20th century, police organizations have been bureaucratizing. Mastrofski (1998) depicts police departments as territorially centralized; their workload is managed centrally; the number of special bureaus and specialists employees has grown tremendously; personnel matters and operational policies are governed by myriad of rules; they are hierarchically elaborate as the
number of mid-level supervisors and administrators has grown; and their operations are buffered from political interference by lengthy chains of accountability that make it difficult for outsiders to penetrate the organization.

Community oriented policing reformers have examined these trends, considering them dysfunctional and impediments to the accomplishment of the new police mission. Centralization has put key decision making in the organization out of touch with its clientele. Administrative personnel decide how the bulk of the departments resources are committed, rather than line personnel who may have the greatest insight into community problems. Heavy reliance on specialist units makes the organization less flexible and creates inter-unit turf problems. Obsession with formality and rules is counterproductive and is thought to decrease moral. The elaborate hierarchy contributes little to productivity, and obstructs any innovation from the lower level (Greene, Bergman and McLaughlin 1994; Robinette 1989).

George L. Kelling, in his forward to Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990), describes how in the model of August Vollmer and O. W. Wilson, who recommended changes in the police organizational structure to accommodate traditional policing, leaders today were demanding organizational change to accommodate the new community oriented policing philosophy. The organization must be structured in such a way that the strategies used to complete the mission must be successful.

Organizational Structure

Maguire (1997) points out that the community oriented policing reform has included a great deal of discussion on the need for organizational change when implementing this new mission. Community oriented police departments should show structural differences from traditional or bureaucratic police departments. McGuire (1997) argues that community oriented policing activities cannot be supported
without the necessary organizational structural changes, and that the philosophy will ultimately fail if the organization does not adopt a less bureaucratic model.

Weber's (1947) conceptualization of bureaucracy has become the dominant structural form for police organizations throughout the nation. Reformers have written that police organizations need to de-bureaucratize the organizational structure as a means to successfully implement community oriented policing. According to Maguire (1997), these bureaucratic structural changes include less centralization, less specialization, a reduction in the hierarchy of authority and formal policies and procedures, and an increase in the use of civilians.

Weber's (1947) conceptualization of bureaucracy has generated extensive discussion and has stimulated many authors to test empirically the degree of association among structural attributes. The leading reports are those of Hagen and Aiken (1967), Udy (1959), Pugh et al. (1968), Hall (1962, 1963), Hall and Tittle (1966), Blau, Heydebrand and Stauffer (1966), Lawrence and Lorsch (1967), Brewer (1971), Perrow (1967), and Blau and Schoenherr (1971). In general, these attempts to study bureaucracy, either as a total phenomenon, or by analyzing its constitutive dimensions, have yielded a rather healthy empirical basis for developing a systematic theory of bureaucracy.

Interest in and need for comparative studies of formal organizations have been predominant characteristics of organizational research and examination since Weber's formulation of the ideal type bureaucracy. Indeed, the ideal type has provided both the impetus for and the basis of most of the studies of organizational structure in recent years. Udy (1965) conceives a comparative analysis of organizations as any attempt to establish general principles about organizations from the simultaneous study of several organizations. His analysis is concerned with exploring the types of questions researchers have tried to answer through the comparative study of
organizations, describing the general approaches and methods they have used, and generally summarizing the results they have obtained.

Research Purpose

The purpose of this research is to answer three questions that concern the structural dimensions of community oriented police departments: 1) Are community oriented police departments structured differently than traditional police departments? 2) Given a structural change has occurred, are community oriented police departments becoming structurally similar in identifiable dimensions? 3) Can a structural model be developed to assist police departments as they transition to a community oriented policing philosophy?

This study has an interest in the comparative analysis of successful community oriented police departments and traditional police departments in terms of identifiable structural dimensions. A sample of twenty successful community oriented police departments throughout the United States, with between 200 and 2000 officers, was developed. This sample was compared to eight municipal police departments that are not considered community oriented police departments.

An exploratory analysis these twenty community oriented police departments and eight traditional police departments, in terms of identifiable structural dimensions as they relate to bureaucracy, was conducted using a questionnaire. Measures of central tendency (mode, medium and mean) and measures of variability (standard deviation) were calculated in order to determine similarities and degrees of distribution. According to institutional theory, organizational structure, specifically community police departments, should become isomorphic, or structurally similar.

From an examination of the literature on organizations, six bureaucratic structural dimensions of organizations were defined: 1) Complexity which
encompasses specialization, horizontal differentiation and vertical differentiation (Blau and Schoenherr 1971; Hage and Aiken 1970); 2) Formalization which is the degree to which rules and regulations are written (Blau and Schoenherr 1971; Pugh et al. 1968); 3) Centralization which has to do with the locus of authority to make decisions affecting the organization (Pugh et al. 1968); 4) Administrative density, which is the extent to which an organization allocates resources to the management of its output (Blau 1973); 5) Occupational differentiation which is the degree of "civilianization" in police departments (Langworthy 1986); and 6) Size which is the scale of operations in an organization (Price 1972).

The results of this study indicate that successful community oriented police departments are structured differently than traditional police departments in identifiable dimensions, and that community oriented police departments have integrated the structural philosophy that community oriented policing reformers have been advocating. In addition, community oriented police departments are becoming structurally similar, or isomorphic, when compared to traditional police departments.

By studying the leading community oriented police departments throughout the nation in terms of identifiable structural dimensions, and comparing them to a control group of traditional police departments, a model community oriented policing structure has been empirically identified. This model can then be used by police agencies throughout the nation when structuring to implement the community oriented policing philosophy.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

By formal organizational structure we mean "the distribution, along various lines, of people among social positions that influence the role relations among these people" (Blau 1974:12). Organizational structure serves three basic functions. First and foremost, structures are intended to produce organizational outputs and to achieve organizational goals. Second, structures are designed to minimize or at least regulate the influence of individual variations on the organization. Structures are imposed to ensure that individuals conform to requirements of organizations and not vice versa. Third, structures are settings in which power is exercised, in which decisions are made and in which organizational activities are carried out - structure is the arena for organizational activities (Hall 1972).

There are two major categories of factors impacting structure. The first is the context in which organizations operate. Contextual factors include organizational size, technology, internal culture, the environment and national cultural factors. Context here means the situation in which an organization is operating. This situation is simultaneously within and beyond an organization's control.

The second category of explanations of structure is design. By design we mean the choices made in an organization about how the organization is to be structured. The major approaches here are strategic choice and institutional models of structure. Any consideration of design must consider the fact that not all actors within an organization will have the same judgment in regard to the design of organizational structure (Hall 1972).
Scientific Management

Henri Fayol, a French executive engineer, was the first to develop a comprehensive theory of organizing and managing an organization's structure. Fayol suggests that all activities to which industrial undertakings give rise to can be divided into the following six groups: 1) technical activities such as production, manufacture, adaptation, 2) commercial activities such as buying, selling, exchange, 3) financial activities such as the search for and optimal use of capital, 4) security activities such as protection of property and persons, 5) accounting activities such as stockholding, balance sheets, costs and statistics, and 6) managerial activities such as planning, organizing, commanding, coordination and control.

Fayol's (1916) primary interest and emphasis was on his final principle - management. The core of his contribution is his definition of management as comprising five elements: to forecast and plan; to organize; to command; to coordinate; and to control. His contributions to the discussion of management include the idea of a division of labor, strict command and direction from management, the individual is not as important as the overall mission of the organization, and the concept that authority moves up and down the organization.

Frederick W. Taylor (1911) is considered the founder of the movement known as "scientific management". Taylor pioneered the development of time-motion studies, originally under the name of "Taylorism," or the "Taylor system". Scientific management is not a single invention but rather a series of methods and organizational arrangements designed by Taylor and his associates to increase the efficiency and speed of machine-shop production. Premised on the notion that there was one best way to accomplish any given task, Taylor's scientific management sought to increase output by discovering the fastest, most efficient and least fatiguing production methods.
Taylor concludes by writing, "it is now clear that even in the case of the most elemental form of labor that is known, there is a science, and that when the man best suited to this class of work has been carefully selected, when the science of doing the work has been developed and when the carefully selected man has been trained to work in accordance with this science, the results obtained must of necessity be overwhelmingly greater than those which are possible under the [old plan]" (Taylor 1911:65). Taylor's ideas led to wide-spread use and bitter controversy over the alleged inhumanity of his system, which was said to reduce workers to the level of efficiently functioning machines. In fairness to Taylor, it must be said that his principles were often inadequately understood.

**Bureaucracy**

Max Weber's analysis of bureaucracy continues to provide the single, most influential statement on the structural rational of contemporary organizations. His concept of bureaucracy was based on six principles: 1) there are "fixed and official jurisdictional areas which are generally ordered by rules", 2) organizations have a strict hierarchical system of authority, 3) administration is based on written documents, known as files, 4) management "presupposes thorough and expert training", 5) bureaucratic activity is a full-time occupation, and 6) the management of the bureaucracy "follows general rules, which are more or less stable, more or less exhaustive, and which can be learned" (Gerth and Mills 1946). According to Weber, these six principles defined a system of administrative structure that could be applied to a greater or lesser extent in any work organization, irrespective of the particular goals the organization was designed to achieve.

The application of rules in bureaucracies, Weber argued, extends to the definition of specialized official roles, to their hierarchical ordering, to the recording
of information in written form, and to the distribution within the organization of authority and resources sufficient for the performance of designated duties. A relationship between the distribution of authority and the control of its use by the establishment of rules was explicitly posited: "The authority to give the commands required for the discharge of these [official] duties is distributed in a stable way and is strictly delimited by the rules concerning coercive means...which may be placed at the disposal of officials" (Gerth and Mills 1946:196)

The central theme in Weber's bureaucratic model is standardization. The behavior of people in bureaucracies is predetermined by a standardized structure. Weber's model stipulates a hierarchal concept where each level is supervised by the next level up. Each of these offices is differentiated horizontally by a division of labor which creates specialized units and defined responsibilities of unit members. All the while, written rules and regulations describe what members can and cannot do. This imposition of structure and function provides a high level of specialization and standardization so the organization can dictate individual behavior (Perrow 1967).

Organizational structure is a key element in achieving rationality. Weber theorized two essential dimensions concerning organizational structure. The vertical dimension establishes the relationship of people working in a formal organization as a "firmly ordered system of super - and subordination" (Weber 1947:196). Authority is based on positions within a hierarchical order. The horizontal dimension involves the distribution of special functions in an organization. Weber (1947) used the concept of "specialized office of management" and "administrative task" performed by trained experts to outline an organization's functions. Overall, Weber believed that the organization's structure would become more complicated and differentiated.

Many organization theorists apply Weber's general conceptualization of the bureaucratic model in their inquires into organizational structure and behavior. Burns
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and Stalker (1968) studied twenty English and Scottish industrial firms to determine how organizational structure and managerial practice might differ based on different environmental conditions. What they found was that the organizational structure that existed in rapidly changing and dynamic environments was significantly different from that in organizations with stable environments. Burns and Stalker labeled the two structures as organic and mechanistic, respectively.

Mechanistic structures were characterized by a high degree of complexity, formalization, and centralization. They performed routine tasks, relied heavily on programmed behaviors, and were relatively slow in responding to the unfamiliar. Organic structures were relatively flexible and adaptive, with emphasis on lateral rather than vertical communication; influence based on expertise and knowledge rather than on authority of position; loosely defined responsibilities rather than rigidly logged definitions; and there was an emphasis on exchanging information rather than giving direction.

A framework proposed by Mintzberg (1979) suggests that every organization has five parts. The "strategic apex" is located at the top of the organization and consists of the top management. "Middle management" is at the intermediate levels, and the "operating core" are the individuals who are at the lowest level of the organization. The "technical staff" and the "support staff" provide indirect services and include the clerical, maintenance and mail room employees. The five parts of the organization vary in size and importance depending upon the overall environment, strategy and technology.

Mintzberg proposed that these five organizational parts could fit together in five basic configurations, in which environment, goals, power, structure, formalization, technology and size hang together in identifiable clusters. In addition, each of the five parts exerts a "pull" upon the organization. When conditions favor
one part over the others, the organization is drawn to one of the five configurations or designs. This framework defines key organizational variables and tells the managers the appropriate configuration for specific strategies.

The first structure, identified by Mintzberg, is the "simple structure", also referred to as the entrepreneurial structure. Here the strongest pull is by the strategic apex towards centralization. Coordination is by direct supervision, downwards, where the power is in top management. There is little technical and administrative support, as the organization does not utilize formal planning, training or similar procedures. Employees have little discretion, although work conditions are typically informal. This structure is suited to a dynamic environment where it can maneuver quickly and adapt successfully.

The "machine bureaucracy" describes the typical Weberian bureaucratic structure. This organization is typically large, technology routine, there is extensive specialization and formalization, and key decisions are made at the top. Here, the chief executive has a large span of control to centralize decision making within his office. The strongest pull is from the large technology support staff of planners, financial controllers and production schedulers. Here, the environment is simple and stable because this organization is not adaptable. Machine bureaucracies are often criticized for the lack of control by lower employees, lack of innovation, a weak culture and an alienated work force, but are suited to a large, stable environment.

The "professional bureaucracy" has a pull from the operating core composed of professions such as those found in hospitals, universities and consulting firms. While the organization is bureaucratic, people within the operating core have autonomy. Extensive training and experience encourage localized control and a strong culture, thereby reducing the need for bureaucratic control mechanisms. These organizations often provide services rather than tangible products. Administrative
support staff is much more important, and larger, than any technical support staff that is provided.

Fourth, Mintzberg describes the "divisional form", which are organizations that are typically large and sub-divided into product or market groups. Each division is relatively self-sufficient with its own marketing, purchasing and service. These make for a powerful, middle line of managers. Each division is somewhat autonomous, with its own subculture, with a headquarters staff retaining some functions such as planning and research.

Last, there is the "adhocracy". This organization develops to survive in a complex, dynamic environment. The technology is sophisticated, typically with young to middle-aged workers in a rapidly changing environment. The key here is the support staff in research and development, who work closely with the operating core. A team-based structure typically emerges with many horizontal linkages and empowered employees. The adhocracy is almost opposite of the machine bureaucracy in terms of structure and power relations.

Institutional Theory

Institutional theory is the bases for this study on organizations. Institutional theory has its basis in the writings of German phenomenologists such as Dilthey and Husserl, and more recently by sociologist Peter Berger. The most complete and influential statement of Berger's ideas on institutionalization are found in his work with Luckmann (Berger and Luckmann 1967). They argue that social reality is a human construction, being created in social interaction. The process by which actions are repeated and given meaning by self and others is defined as institutionalization.

These ideas concerning the social construction of reality were first introduced into organizational analysis at the micro or social psychology level by researchers
working in the symbolic interactionist and ethnomethodological traditions. While the former is an attempt to negotiate social order, the latter is an attempt to negotiate social reality: "The ethnomethodologists are interested in the way in which actors make evident and persuade each other that events and activities in which they are involved are coherent and consistent" (Burrell and Morgan 1979:250). The empirical work of this group shows that much has been conducted within organizational settings (Cicourel 1968; Zimmerman 1970). At a more macro level, Berger, Berger and Kellner (1973) have argued that the very conception of bureaucracy is a meta-institution, which depicts in a generalized manner a portrait of orderliness, predictability, and an emphasis on formalization of relations.

Perhaps the most influential application of institutional ideas to the analysis of organizations is that of Meyer and Rowan (1977), who argue that modern societies contain complexes of institutionalized rules and patterns - products of professional groups, the state, and public opinion. These social realities provide a framework for the creation and elaboration of formal organizations. According to Meyer and Rowan, in modern societies, these institutions are likely to take the form of "rationalized myths". They are myths because they are widely held beliefs that cannot be objectively tested: they are true because they are believed. They are rationalized because they take the form of rules specifying procedures necessary to accomplish a given end. "Many of the positions, policies, programs, and procedures of modern organizations are enforced by public opinion, by the views of important constituents, by knowledge through the educational system, by social prestige, by the laws, and by the definitions of negligence and prudence used by the courts. Such elements of formal structure are manifestation of powerful institutional rules which function as highly rationalized myths that are binding on particular organizations" (Meyer and Rowan 1977:343).
Institutional Isomorphism

Central to this study is that a sample of municipal community oriented police departments across the United States should show structural dimensions that are similar in nature, and thus serve as a model for all police departments when shaping their structure to fit this new form of policing. The theoretical model to consider here is the institutional model. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) argue that "institutional isomorphism" is now the dominant reason why such organizations assume the forms that they have. According to DiMaggio and Powell, Weber's (1952, 1968) original analysis for the driving force behind the move toward rationalization and bureaucratization was based on a capitalistic market economy, with bureaucratization an "iron cage" in which humanity was bound since the process of bureaucratization was irreversible.

DiMaggio and Powell (1983) believe that major social changes have altered this situation to such a large extent that an alternative explanation is needed. Their analysis is based on the assumption that organizations exist in "fields" of other, similar organizations. According to this perspective, organizations are increasingly homogenous within fields. Thus, public universities acquire a sameness, as do department stores, airlines, professional football teams, motor vehicle bureaus, and so on.

DiMaggio and Powell (1983) cite three reasons for this isomorphism among organizations in a field. First, there are coercive forces (coercive isomorphism) in the environment, such as government regulations and community expectations, which can impose standardization on organizations. Organizations take forms that become institutionalized and legitimized by governmental authority (Meyer and Rowan 1977). For example, DiMaggio (1983) reported how the National Endowment for the
Arts, a federal program established to support artistic endeavors, followed a grants policy that encouraged states and then individual communities to establish arts councils that played a substantial role in determining what groups would receive funds. In this manner, a relatively disorganized field became rather highly structured.

Second, DiMaggio and Powell (1983) note that organizations mimic or model each other (mimetic isomorphism). This occurs as organizations face uncertainty and look for answers in the ways in which other organizations in their fields have faced similar uncertainties. As organizations in this dilemma examine each other in these uncertain times, they tend to take on characteristics that make them similar.

A third source of institutional isomorphism comes from normative pressures (normative isomorphism) as the work force, and especially management, becomes more professionalized. Both professional training, and the growth and elaboration of professional networks within organizational fields, lead to a situation in which the managerial personnel in organizations in the same field are barely indistinguishable from one another. As people participate in trade and professional associations, their ideas tend to homogenize. Professionals seek to impose their own normative standards on the organizations in which they operate - encouraging them to embrace their definitions of the problems, their standards, and their solutions. Thus by choice and by coercion, organizations frequently exhibit structural isomorphism as a mechanism for adoption to their institutional environments.

The institutional perspective thus views organizational design as a process of both external and internal pressures that lead organizations in a field to resemble each other over time. These pressures can be found in the field of police organizations, as they move from traditional policing to community oriented policing, which is the basis of this research. First, police departments have come under considerable pressure (coercive isomorphism) from the federal government and communities at
large to implement a community oriented policing model to reduce crime, the fear of crime and bridge the police-community partnership. Second, there is an uncertainty as to the future direction of policing in America, with police departments looking to each other (mimetic isomorphism) for answers as to structure and output.

Third, policing in America has tried to develop a professional model (normative isomorphism) to adhere to, developing several national professional associations and training programs. These associations include the Police Executive Research Forum, the Police Foundation, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives. National training programs include the Southern Police Institute at the University of Louisville, Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy and Northwestern University Traffic Institute. Police managers throughout the nation attend these institutions where community oriented policing ideas are shared and eventually exposed to the police departments they return to.

**Human Relations Theory**

Prior to a move to a closer understanding of the dimensions of organizational structure, it is important to examine the research interested in the behavior of people in organizations. Human Relations theories, begun around the 1940's, addressed the basic assumptions about the relationship between organizations and people. According to Argyris (1970), those organizations that see through the lens of the Human Relations perspective focus on people, groups, and relations among them. Because the Human Relations perspective places a high value on humans as individuals, things typically are done in a very open and honest environment, providing employees with maximum amounts of accurate information so they can make informed decisions with free-will about the future.
Human Relations theory draws on a body of research and theory built around the following assumptions: 1) organizations exist to serve human needs, 2) organizations and people need each other, 3) when the fit between individuals and the organization is poor, one or both will suffer, and 4) a good fit between individuals and the organization benefits both with human beings finding meaningful and satisfying work, and organizations getting the human energy and talent they need (Bolman and Deal 1991).

One of the most significant works in the Human Relations area of organizations was the multi-year study by the Elton Mayo team (1933) at the Hawthorn Plant of the Western Electric Company. According to Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939), the Hawthorn experiments showed that complex, interactional variables make a difference in motivating people. Factors such as attention to workers as individuals, worker control over their own work, differences between individual's needs, management's willingness to listen, group norms, and direct feedback all had an impact in motivating employees.

Barnard (1938) sought to create a comprehensive theory of behavior in organizations that was centered on the need for people in organizations to cooperate. In Barnard's view, cooperation holds an organization together. Thus, the responsibility of an executive is to 1) create and maintain a sense of purpose and moral code for the organization - a set of ethical visions of what is right and wrong, 2) establish formal and informal communications, and 3) ensure the willingness of people to cooperate.

Selznick (1948) asserted that while it is possible to describe and design organizations in a purely rational manner, such efforts could never cope with the non-rational aspects of organizational behavior. In contrast with the classical theorists, Selznick maintained that organizations consist of individuals whose goals and
aspirations might not necessarily coincide with the formal goals of the organization, rather they consist of simply a number of positions for management to control. Selznick (1952) emphasized the contradictions imposed by individual commitments and that these same processes could be a source of organizational strength. In some cases, participants come to share a common set of commitments and a unity of purpose that creates a formidable weapon.

Police Organizational Theory

The analysis of organizational forms moved a step further when Hage (1965) noted that structural characteristics, such as complexity, formalization and centralization vary in their presence from high to low. These characteristics model the Weberian characteristics found in bureaucracies, which is the foundation for the structural aspects of police organizations. These characteristics, or dimensions, serve as the basis for the analysis in this study. They have all been empirically identified through previous research in the structure of organizations.

Maguire (1997) cites the works of Kelling and Moore (1988) and Reiss (1992) as early studies that found an increase in police corruption, as well as societal changes in the twentieth century caused police organizations to change dramatically. Police departments became more centralized in decision-making; there was an increase in specialization to handle specific issues; and formal policies and procedures increased in frequency to deal with more complex issues. As a result, Maguire describes how police organizations became much more bureaucratic in structural form.

Organizational structure, including those of police organizations, can be operationalized using six dimensions. These dimensions include, 1) Complexity, which encompasses specialization, horizontal differentiation, and vertical differentiation, 2) Formalization, which is the degree to which rules and regulations
are written, 3) Centralization, which has to do with the locus of authority to make
decisions affecting the organization, 4) Administrative density, which is the extent to
which an organization allocates resources to the management of its output, 5)  
Occupational differentiation, which is the degree of “civilianization” in the police
department, and 6) Size, which is the scale of operations in the organization. These
dimensions will be used in the analysis of community oriented police departments,
and will serve as the foundation for this study.

Complexity

Complexity is one of the first structural dimension a person experiences when
entering any organization beyond those of the simplest forms: division of labor, job
titles, multiple divisions, and hierarchical levels are usually immediately evident.
Complexity is the degree of formal structural differentiation within an organization
(Blau and Schoenherr 1971). A highly complex organization is characterized by many
occupational roles, sub-units (divisions and departments), and levels of authority. The
word “formal” in the definition signifies that this differentiation is officially
established by the organization.

Horizontal and vertical differentiation are commonly distinguished
dimensions of complexity. Occupational roles and sub-units illustrate horizontal
complexity, while levels of authority are vertical complexity. Discussions under the
following labels usually contain information pertinent to horizontal complexity:
division of labor, specialization, functional specialization, and horizontal
differentiation. Material relevant to vertical complexity is also found in discussions of
flatness-tallness and vertical differentiation.

Complexity is frequently regarded as a major characteristic of modern
organizations and also as an important determinant of other structural features.
Complexity of relationships and of activities may have its source both in a high
degree of differentiation between roles and functions (Hage and Aiken 1970).
Complexity is likely to generate administrative problems of coordination and control.
One of the ways in which such problems may be met is through increased
formalization; that is, by the elaboration of controls in the form of standard rules,
procedures and systems, and by the use of documentation and records (Hage and
Aiken 1967). Hall and Tittle (1966) studied twenty-five bureaucratic organizations
and concluded that if an organization scored high in the complexity scales they would
be viewed among the most highly bureaucratized. Child (1972) substantiated in his
research the commonly held assumption that large complex organizations are
bureaucracies.

Using the definition of complexity as “the number of structural components
that are formally distinguished" by an organization (Blau and Schoenherr 1971:302),
three dimensions of complexity are distinguished: specialization, horizontal
differentiation and vertical differentiation.

Blau and Schoenherr (1971) measured the first dimension, specialization, as
the number of official job titles used in an agency, not counting different grades
within one job title (these authors referred to this unit of analysis as a division of
labor). Specialization is viewed as "the degree of differentiation of a given work
segment into separate specialization's or categories of work, usually referred to as
jobs" (Samuel and Mannheim 1970:219).

Hage (1965) viewed specialization in an organization as the number of
occupational specialties. The greater the number of occupations, the more complex
and bureaucratic the organization since coordination and communication becomes
much more difficult. Thus, one can specify between various jobs within an
organization, and count their total numbers. Maguire (1997) cites Reiss (1992) and
Moore (1992) in describing how police departments have become more specialized over time.

Horizontal differentiation is the second organizational dimension measured under complexity. Horizontal differentiation is the degree to which an organizations tasks are broken down into functionally distant units (Langworthy 1986). Blau and Schoenherr (1971) define this dimension as a "division", which is the number of "major sub-units" whose head reports to the director or his deputy; with a division having at least five people. Thus for Blau and Schoenherr (1971), complexity of the formal structure is indicated by the number of different major sub-units of various sorts in the organization to which employees are allocated. According to Hall (1972), using this measure, we would find the U.S. Army to be very complex, with its vast array of commands, battalions, brigades, companies, and so on. Organizations low in the complexity scale would be a local telephone company or an auto dealership.

According to Moore and Stephens (1991), a complex functional structure can promote parochialism and competition within the organization. It can make coordination across functional lines difficult. It can create artificial boundaries between divisions. It can encourage managers to think of themselves as technical experts rather than people whose special skills lie in getting others to work together.

As in specialization, police organizations have become horizontally differentiated during the twentieth century. Under community oriented policing, police organizations are encouraged to reduce this differentiation and place problem solving into the hands of front line officers. Maguire (1997) cites Moore (1992) in describing how specialization in one area can lead to the rest of the department distancing themselves of this responsibility.

The third dimension of complexity in organizational structure is vertical differentiation. Henderson and Parsons (1947) describe the Weberian concept of
supervisory, or hierarchical levels, which refers to the layers in an organizational pyramid. Here there is a clear line of authority from top to bottom, and the supervisory positions very identifiable. Fayol (1916) identifies the same concept, however calls it a scalar chain principle.

Vertical differentiation is a less complicated matter than horizontal differentiation. Research into vertical dimension has used straightforward indicators of the depth of the hierarchy. Here, Blau and Schoenherr (1971) measure the number of hierarchical levels by the longest chain of command found in the organization. Meyer (1968) uses the "proliferation of supervisory levels" as the measure of the depth of an organization. Vertical dimension can be measured by "a count of the number of job positions between the chief executive and the employees working the output" (Pugh et al. 1968:78).

Many argue that hierarchical control impedes innovation. Burns and Stalker (1968) suggest that hierarchical structure was much more suitable for "mechanistic" organizations engaged in routine processes of mass production than for "organic" organizations that must be able to change to survive. Subsequent studies generally support the assumption that hierarchical organizational structure has a negative impact on innovation adoption (Hage and Aiken 1967; Kimberly and Evanisko 1981; Damanpour 1991), which is explicit in the problem-oriented policing concept. Furthermore, the more hierarchical levels an organization employees, the more complex and difficult communication becomes. As a result, valuable information concerning timely innovations may be lost or misinterpreted through the communication channels (Hull and Hage 1982; Courtright, Fairhurst and Rodgers 1989).

departments have taken on the military model of organizational structure, which tend
to make organizations more rigged and hierarchical. The organization is thus unable
to make innovative changes and better adapt to an ever changing environment, which
is necessary under community oriented policing. Both horizontal and vertical
differentiation present organizations with problems of control, communication and
coordination, with the greater the differentiation, the greater the potential for
difficulties (Stevenson, 1990).

Formalization

Formalization is the degree to which the norms of an organization are
explicitly formulated (Hall 1972). Formalization has been defined as "a measure of
the extent to which rules, procedures, instructions and communications are written"
(Litterer 1963:331). The formalization of an organization can be measured by the
extent to which rules and regulations are written down in policy manuals, procedural
manuals, employment contracts, and employment position knowledge, skills, and
ability documentation.

Formalization is not a neutral subject. Indeed, the degree to which an
organization is formalized is an indication of the perspective of its decision-makers in
regard to organizational members. If the members are thought to be capable of
exercising excellent judgment and self-control, formalization will be low; if they are
viewed as incapable of making their own decisions and requiring a large number of
rules to guide their behavior, formalization will be high. Formalization involves
organizational control over the individual and thus has an ethical and political
meaning in addition to being a structural component (Clegg and Dunkerley 1980).

Organizations have at their disposal a number of techniques by which they can
bring about a degree of formalization. One method is through the use of rules,
procedures and policies. Rules are explicit statements that tell an employee what he or
she ought or ought not due. Procedures are established to ensure standardization of work processes. Policies provide greater leeway than rules do. Rather than specifying a particular and specific behavior, policies allow employees to use discretion but within limited boundaries. The discretion is created by including judgmental terms.

Blau and Schoenherr (1971) define formalization in their study of state employment security agencies as the amount of rules and regulations that an organization has pertaining to the employment of its personnel. The reference here is made to the written regulation. The extent of formalization was calculated by utilizing the "Personnel Rules and Procedures Manual" which contains the written rules governing appointment, probation, promotion, and the policies and procedures for all employees in the organization. The score was obtained by counting the average number of words per page for a sample of pages and multiplying by the number of total pages.

A critique of the bureaucratic model, and a major empirical contribution toward identifying the dimensions of organizational structure is found in the work of Pugh and his colleagues at the University of Aston. The result of their study of work organizations in the English Midlands was presented in Pugh et al. (1968) and Hickson, Pugh and Pheysey (1969). Here, formalization is defined as "...the extent to which rules, procedures, instructions, and communications are written" (Pugh et al. 1968:75). This aspect of formalization is concerned with "Formalization of Role Definition....the documents grouped together to constitute items on the sub-scale of formalization of role definition were all designed primarily as prescriptions of behavior; for example, written terms of reference, job descriptions, and manuals of procedure" (Pugh et al. 1968:76). Items incorporated in this scale were the presence of written contracts of employment, employee handbooks, organizational charts, written manuals of procedure or standing orders, and written policies.
Inkson, Pugh and Hickson (1970) developed a questionnaire and an interview process with an executive of the organization to collect data on the availability of particular documents. The documents they requested included contracts of employment, information booklets, organization charts, operation instructions, job descriptions, manual of procedures, and statement of policies. Thus for both this study and the British Aston Group, if these documents were present and provided to employees, the organization would get a high score on formalization.

Holdaway et al. (1975) used a modified version of the Inkson et al. (1970) form to study formalization in twenty-three colleges and technological institutes in Alberta and British Columbia. They define formalization as the number of documents in the institution used to specify roles. Formalization of role specification was measured by requesting and obtaining copies of written contracts of employment, organizational charts, written job descriptions, manuals of procedure, written statements of policy, and written schedules. Reimann (1973) also developed a similar scale in a comparative study of nineteen United States manufacturing organizations.

Centralization

Centralization is the most problematic of the dimensions of structure. Most theorist concur that the term refers to the degree to which decision making is concentrated at a single point in the organization. The definitions of centralization usually place an emphasis on the distribution of power. Hall (1982) defines centralization as the degree to which power is differentially distributed within an organization. The maximum degree of centralization would exist if a single individual exercised all the power in an organization; a minimum degree of centralization would exist if all members of the organization shared equally in the exercise of power. Most organizations, of course, fall somewhere between these two.
Centralization can be defined as "the level and variety of participation in strategic decisions by groups relative to the number of groups in the organization" (Hage 1980:65). The greater the level of participation by a greater number of groups in an organization, the less centralization. Centralization has been defined as "the locus of decisions making authority within an organization" (Van de Ven and Ferry 1980:399). When most decisions are made hierarchically, an organizational unit is considered to be centralized; a decentralized unit generally implies that the major source of decision making has been delegated by managers to subordinate personnel.

The idea that Weber's bureaucratization and centralization go hand in hand is found in most social science literature. Crozier (1964) suggests that the key to organizational analysis is the study of the distribution of power. Tannenbaum and Massarik (1950) and Worthy (1950), have pointed out how important the allocation of power is in an organization, and have suggested that one implication of decentralized power structure for organizations is higher moral. In his discussion of bureaucracy, Weber (1947) suggested that a strict hierarchy of authority, here considered as one aspect of centralization, leads to greater efficiency.

Burns and Stalker's (1968) two models make a statement not only about centralization, but also formalization. The mechanistic model is described as "the precise definition of rights and obligations and technical methods attached to each functional role [high formalization]", and a "hierarchical structure of control, authority and communication [high centralization]". The organic model is characterized by "the adjustment and continual redefinition of individual tasks [low formalization], and a network structure of control, authority and communication [low centralization]" (Burns and Stalker 1961:119-125). Findings on the relationship between centralization and innovation appear to support the conclusion that centralization has a negative impact on innovation, and that substantial
decentralization of authority is necessary for adaptation to innovations (Aiken and Hage 1971; Damanpour 1991).

There have been several institutional approaches to the measurement of centralization in organizations. Samuel and Mannheim (1970), Reimann (1973), and Blau (1967, 1970), Pugh et al. (1968) used the levels of hierarchy of authority (as presented under vertical differentiation) to measure centralization. The larger the hierarchy, the greater the centralization.

Span of control - the number of subordinates that a superior directly controls- is one of the building blocks of hierarchy and centralization of power. If each superior controls few people - has a narrow span of control - there will be many levels in the organization; if the superior controls many, there will be fewer levels in the organization. Embedded in this discussion is the assumption that if a manager has many people under him, he cannot supervise them closely, thus they would have more autonomy (Whyte 1962).

This assumption was furthered in research done at Sears Roebuck, which described how morale and efficiency improved when the number of levels in the organization was reduced. Worthy (1950) discovered several disadvantages to a narrow span of control: 1) it increased the hierarchical level, 2) the close supervision exercised by having few subordinates impeded performance, 3) it created a dependence on superiors and their decisions. Thus, with span of control, the narrower the span of control, the greater the centralization of decision making.

Pugh et al. (1968) used several other measures to define centralization (referred to as span of control or structural control): 1) The chief executives span of control - the number of subordinates who report directly to the chief executive with no intervening level, irrespective of the statues of the subordinate [the larger the number, the greater the centralization of power]; 2) Subordinate ratio - the number of
production workers per first line supervisor. This is also known as the span of control [the smaller the number, the greater centralization of power], and 3) Number of superordinates - this indicates the total number of employees to supervisors [the smaller the number, the greater the centralization of power].

Centralization of decision making can also be measured by the level of participation in organizational committees that make recommendations to the chief executive, and the level of participation in strategic planning by the organization. The lower the level of participation, the more decentralized the structure.

Many critics of the traditional model of American policing have pointed out the inhibitory nature of paramilitary organizational structure represented by centralization, where strict rank and firm managerial control clearly outline the relationship among employees, and where obedience is a special "virtue". (Sandler and Mintz 1974; Cordner 1987). Police departments have organized like the military - with unified command authority, strict hierarchies, and many organizational levels. One of the aims of such organizational structures is to ensure effective discipline and control through very close supervision, which creates centralized decision making (Moore and Stephens 1991). Centralized control tends to create steep, vertical organizations with many levels of middle managers. It requires officers look to higher levels of the organization for the authorization to act.

A decentralized organization is defined as one in which initiative, decisions, and responsibility rest at the lowest level possible. In a decentralized organization, individuals have much greater freedom to make decisions about what work should be done to contribute to the overall objectives of the organization and how it should be done. Decentralization pushes initiative downward in the organization and challenges people to be more creative. Such a relationship fits with a community oriented policing reform model, which emphasizes substantial contributions from rank-and-
file officers, and innovative means of problem solving in the community (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990).

Occupational Differentiation

MaGuire (1997) cites Langworthy (1986) in defining occupational differentiation as the ratio of total commissioned personnel to civilian personnel in the police organization (Crank 1989; Lutz and Morgan 1974). Maguire (1997) describes how community oriented policing proponents see civilianization as a way to deploy police officers where they can be the most effective, and as a result reduce the budget of the department by hiring lesser paid civilians. Many police officer positions on a police department can be considered "desk jobs", which can be more appropriately staffed by civilians. The civilianization of these positions can allow an agency to put more police officers in the field working with the community.

Administrative density

Administrative density is the extent to which an organization allocates resources to the management of its output (Blau 1973). Key management activities are making decisions, coordinating the work of others, and ensuring compliance with organizational directives. Management activities are contrasted with production activities, which involve direct work on an organizational output. Administrative density must be linked to the work of Weber and his bureaucracy; the more people employed in administration, the fewer the people doing the actual core work of the organization (Maguire 1997).

Blau and Schoenherr (1971) refer to the difference between those who manage and those who actually produce items in an organization when defining administration, and detail how management is more closely tied to administration.
Data for the relative magnitude of the administrative component may come from organizational records. The measure used by Blau and Schoenherr (1971) was the "supervisory ratio" - the total number of personnel divided by the sum of all supervisory personnel. Reimann (1973) defined "administrative intensity" as the ratio of supervisors and managers to the total number of employees.

**Structural Size**

Size is the scale of operations in an organization (Price 1972). Some analysis treat size as a dimension of organizational structure like formalization or centralization - one of several structural properties of an organization that may be seen to co-vary (Hall and Tittle 1966). Size of an organization has often been cited as the attribute having the greatest single influence on the extent to which organizations develop bureaucratic forms of organizational structure.

Many studies have found consistent positive relationships between organizational size and structural complexity (Blau 1970; Blau and Schoenherr 1971; Child 1971; Hsu et al. 1983; Terrien and Mills 1955). Weber commented on the "role of sheer quantity as a leverage for the bureaucratization of a social structure" (Gerth and Mills 1946:211). "Size causes [bureaucratic] structuring through its effects on intervening variables such as the frequency of decisions and social control" (Pugh, Hickson and Hinings 1969:112).

In contrast, others such as Woodward (1965), Thompson (1967) and Aldrich (1972) have argued on theoretical and empirical grounds that the tasks and technology of an organization are more salient influences on structure than is its size. Hall (1972) has reviewed this debate, of which his own research has contributed, and he takes a very qualified view on the role of size. He argues that other organizational concepts, besides size, will have much more impact on what the organization.
Kimberly (1976) notes that researchers have employed several different indicators of organizational size, each measuring a somewhat different aspect of size (square footage of floor space, number of hospital beds, sales volume, number of clients). Most studies of the relationship between organization size and structure have used the number of participants (employees) as an indicator of size.

With the reform era, police departments developed into bureaucratic structures as a means to professionalize, and rid police departments of corruption and political control. Police departments became complex, centralized and formalized structures that separated from the community as police officers took on the role of professional crime fighter. These reforms were successful in that they accomplished the goals they set out to achieve.

Community oriented policing reformers have argued that these structural dimensions have outlived their usefulness, and serve as impediments for the successful transition to community oriented policing. Community oriented police departments need to develop new structural characteristics that will assist in the successful transition from the traditional model to a community oriented policing model. The police departments of today must be less complex, less centralized, less formalized, less administratively dense, and more occupationally differentiated, if community oriented policing is to be successful.

The remaining chapters will examine this study's research design and method, the data results and analysis, as well as the conclusions drawn, when the structural dimensions of a sample of community oriented police departments is compared to a control group of traditional police departments. What should be expected is that successful community oriented police departments are structurally similar, with the
new structural changes reformers have argued for, and a structural model can be
developed to assist police departments in the transition from the traditional approach
to a community oriented policing approach.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD

The research design for this study will be both descriptive and exploratory. It will be descriptive in that it will attempt to define and portray the characteristics of a sample of organizations and examine their association with one another (making sense of a body of data). It is oriented toward the assessment and categorization of previously defined organizational characteristics. It will be exploratory in that it will provide information about specific aspects of organizational phenomena, vis-à-vis municipal community oriented police departments about which we have little knowledge.

This study will be a comparative analysis of similar kinds of organizations at one point in time. According to Blau and Schoenherr (1971), a comparative analysis of organizations is one that looks at the structure of a large sample of organizations, with a review to what is similar and what is different. This analysis provides the information from which inferences about actual influences can be made. Quantitative analysis of data collected in a survey of organizations will explore organizational dimensions as they relate to Weberian bureaucratic variables.

The research methodology used in this study will follow the principles that have made organizational research more sophisticated (Donaldson 1996). First, increasing attention will be paid to the operational definitions of concepts (Child 1974). Second, unlike earlier studies that used single item measures that may yield low reliability, multiple item measures will be used, for example the Aston Group (Pugh et al. 1968).
The unit of analysis for this study is the formal organization, which is defined by Etzioni (1964) as a number of individuals, who each have a certain role, and together work to achieve the goals of the organization. The model and theory used to examine dimensions of the formal organization is the bureaucratic model (Weber 1947) as well as institutional isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell 1983). The sample for this study is a group of twenty municipal community oriented police departments, throughout the United States, with between 200 and 2000 commissioned police officers.

According to the National Directory of Law Enforcement Administrators (Cywinski 1998) there are 187 municipal police departments with between 200 and 2000 police officers. A population of community oriented police departments was created by contacting representatives from six organizations that represent the leading law enforcement associations, governmental agencies and educational institutions that have an interest in community policing. These six organizations are: Michigan State University, National Center for Community Policing; Police Executive Research Forum; United States Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services; International Association of Chiefs of Police; Community Policing Consortium; and Institute of Law and Justice (Appendix III).

These representatives were asked to recommend municipal police departments, with between 200 and 2000 police officers that are considered leaders in community oriented policing. From the 187 municipal police departments, fifty-seven received between one and six community oriented policing recommendations. Those police departments that received between two recommendations and six recommendations were selected for this study, which created a sample of twenty municipal police departments. These twenty community oriented municipal police departments were divided into two groups: ten police departments that received
between four and six recommendations, and ten police departments that received either two or three recommendations.

This research design involves the systematic comparison of a large number of organizations. The sample of twenty community oriented police departments was taken from a total population of fifty-seven municipal police departments that employee between 200 and 2000 commissioned police officers. This study is in relation to other organizational studies of its kind which have utilized a sample size of twenty-five (Hall and Tittle 1966), thirty (Samuel and Mannheim 1970), forty-five (Grinyer and Yasai-Ardekani 1980), ten (Pennings 1973), sixteen (Hage and Aiken 1967), nineteen (Reimann 1973), twenty-three (Holdaway et al. 1975), and thirty-one (Hickson et al. 1969).

A second sample, which served as a control group, of ten municipal police departments was created from the 130 police departments that did not receive a community oriented policing recommendation. This control group was selected using a simple random sampling method. This simple random sample was constructed by means of a table of random numbers (Levin and Fox 1994). The data from this control group will be compared to the twenty municipal community oriented police departments that received between two and six recommendations.

A review of the major empirical studies indicates that many investigators (Blau 1967; Pugh et al. 1968; Samuel and Mannheim 1970; Child 1972; Reimann 1973; Inkson et al. 1970) have relied on organizational charts, documents and interviews with key spokespersons of the organization in order to measure various dimensions. This may be referred to as the institutional approach to measurement.

An examination of institutional measures commonly used (e.g., the chief executive's span of control, worker/supervisory ratios, degree to which rules and procedures are written, distribution of employees across functional areas) indicates
that these measures generally tap the formal or design structure. The questionnaire measure, where responses of a sample of organizational members are aggregated to obtain measures of organizational structure, on the other hand, tend to reflect the degree of structure experienced by organizational members in work-related activities on a day-to-day basis and, to the extent that such information is not biased, describes the emergent structure. The term emergent structure is used to refer to the behavior of organizational members as it relates to dimensions of structure (Sathe 1978).

Design structure is preferred here rather than emergent structure because it is believed to more clearly reflect managerial choice regarding organizational design. Mansfield (1973) argues that an emergent structure approach that uses a questionnaire is much too subjective and does not get to real form. A better approach to studying organizations is to identify those factors that impact form, and extrapolate data from their examination.

The data was gathered by developing a questionnaire that identified the information needed from the police organizations in the sample. This approach sought to objectively gather documents and factual information from the sample of police organizations. The questionnaire served as a guide for a key employee, selected by the chief of police, in obtaining specific information such as department charts, documents, manuals and other information needed to compute the institutional measures. The questionnaire requested specific documents for analysis and did not ask questions that would elicit an opinion on a variable, thus none of the data was attitudinal. Information obtained from respondents was pooled to reflect specific properties, and how they relate to one another in the aggregate.

The method for data collection began with the development of a questionnaire that specifically requested the documents necessary for analysis. The questionnaire was pre-tested with three police departments that were not part of the sample. The
The purpose of a pre-test is to determine if the questionnaire is understandable, if the data is available from the agency, and whether or not it will be an overburdensome process for the respondent. Once the pre-test was administered, appropriate changes were made to the questionnaire before administration to the sample.

A request was made for the assistance of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) chief executive in making the initial contact with the 30 police departments (Appendix II). Organizations were first contacted by a letter sent from the chief executive of the LVMPD, to the chief executive of the sample police department, providing a brief explanation of the study, introducing the researcher, eliciting support in gathering the data, and requesting the assignment of a key middle to upper-middle manager to the study, who has global knowledge and access to the organization. Attached to this letter was a second letter to the key employee, as well as the survey instrument (Appendix I).

Within one week, each chief executive was contacted by phone to determine who this key employee was and answer any questions about the study. The key employee was then be contacted by phone and given details of the study to elicit support. The key employee was asked to complete and return the questionnaire within one month of receipt. A questionnaire should suffice in obtaining the data required, since the factual information will either be known to the respondent or obtained from records with management's permission (Blau and Schoenherr 1971). A follow-up phone call was made to several agencies either reminding the key employee that the survey was due, to clarify any of the information that was provided, or request any information that was missing.

Once the deadline for the return of the questionnaire expired, twenty-eight of the thirty police department questionnaires had been received. The twenty questionnaires mailed to the community oriented police departments were all...
returned. The traditional police departments returned eight of ten questionnaires. The
two samples where then created for analysis and comparison.

Once the data was gathered, it was constructed in order to operationalize the
variables being studied. Measures of central tendency and measures of variability
were calculated for each variable. The measure of central tendency includes the
mode, the medium, and the mean. By far, the most commonly used measure of central
tendency, the arithmetic mean, is the sum of a set of scores divided by the total
number of scores in the set. The mean can be regarded as the “center of gravity” of a
distribution. When employed alone, however, measures of central tendency yield only
an incomplete picture of a set of data and, therefore, can mislead or distort as well as
clarify (Levin and Fox 1994).

The measure of variability, an index of how the scores are scattered around
the center of a distribution, was also be calculated. According to Levin and Fox
(1994) the standard deviation, a measure calculated from the variance, is more
interpretable than the variance because it is in the correct unit of measurement.
Calculating the standard deviation begins with the normal distribution of data, which
means that most of the data are close to the middle, while relatively few tend to one
extreme or the other. Normally distributed data will have something of a "bell curve".

The standard deviation is a statistic that tells how tightly all the various data
are clustered around the mean. When the data are tightly bunched together and the
bell shape curve is steep, the standard deviation is small. When the data are spread
apart and the bell shaped curve is relatively flat, there is a large deviation. Thus, the
greater the variability around the mean of distribution, the larger the standard
deviation. The tighter the data for each variable, the smaller the standard deviation,
the more similar the organizations will be within the various research variables
(isomorphic).
This study chose to examine structural variables. A major issue for this research design is to translate the major variables/dimensions used in the theoretical analysis of formal organizations into quantitative variables for empirical investigation. For example, an important characteristic of formal organizations is the hierarchy of authority, and Weber emphasizes its significance in his theoretical discussion, but he does not tell us in which respects hierarchies vary, let alone how to measure such variations. Here, dimensions of organizational structure are distinguished and operational terms constructed using previous quantitative studies.

Weber heavily influenced the structural variables chosen for this study. They were operationalized for empirical studies primarily through the work of Pugh et al. (1968, 1969) and Blau and Schoenherr (1971), with other studies interspersed. Measures of central tendency and variability were calculated for each dimension. The following are the dimensions chosen for study and comparison: complexity, formalization, centralization, occupational differentiation, administrative density and structural size.

Complexity of the organization was operationalized by measuring four variables. Specialization, which operationalized the first two variables, was measured by the number of official job titles for commissioned police officers and for civilian employees in the agency, not counting different grades within one job title. This data came from personnel records provided by the agency. Second, horizontal differentiation was measured by the number of "divisions", defined as the number of "major sub-units" whose head reports to the director or his deputy, with a division having at least five people. This data came from organizational charts provided by the agency. Third, vertical differentiation was measured by the number of supervisory ranks, from police officer to the chief executive. This data came from personnel records. Scores were summed with the larger the score, the greater the complexity.
Formalization was operationalized using four different measures. First, data was obtained by counting the average number of words per page for a sample of five pages in the agencies policy and procedural manual, and multiplying by the total number of pages (Blau and Schoenherr 1971). Second, the questionnaire collected data on the presence of certain documents in the agency (Inkson et al. 1970), to include contracts of employment, information manuals, and written job descriptions. Scores were summed, with the larger the score, the greater the formalization.

Centralization was operationalized using six different measures. First, vertical differentiation or the hierarchy of authority was again measured for the purpose of analyzing centralization. Here, the larger the number, the greater the degree of centralization in the organization (Samuel and Mannheim 1970; Reimann 1973). The second measurement was the chief executives span of control, which is the number of subordinates who report directly to he chief executive with no intervening level, irrespective of the statuses of the subordinate. Data was collected from organizational charts and questionnaire information. Here, the larger the number, the greater the degree of centralization in the organization.

Third, measures were taken on the subordinate ratio (span of control) which is the number of police officers per first line supervisor at the production level. Production level here was defined as those officers who are actively engage in a law enforcement function that places them in contact with the public (patrol officers). This data was collected from organizational charts and workflow schedules. Here, the smaller the number, the greater the degree of centralization in the organization.

Fourth, measures were taken on workflow superordinates, which is the number of commissioned supervisors to police officers for the entire department. This data was collected from organizational charts and workflow schedules. The smaller the number, the greater the degree of centralization in the organization (Pugh et al. 1968).
Fifth, the level of participation in organizational decision making was measured for those agencies that have implemented a strategic plan. Data was collected on the lowest level of participation by department employees in the strategic planning process. This data was collected from the strategic plan. The lower the level of participation in the strategic planning process, the lesser the degree of centralization in the organization. Sixth, measures were taken on the level of participation in standing committees within the organization. Standing committees are those committees that meet regularly and make recommendations to command staff. Data was collected from committee membership rosters. The lower the level of participation in these committees, the lesser the degree of centralization in the organization.

Occupational differentiation was operationalized as the ratio of police officers to civilian employees. Data was collected from personnel records, with the smaller the ratio of commissioned to civilian employees, the greater the degree of occupational differentiation. Community policing reformers have argued for the civilianization of those positions in the organization that do not need to be filled by commissioned employees.

Administrative density was operationalized as the ratio of supervisors to total number of employees (Reimann 1973). Here, the larger the ratio, the less the degree of administrative density. The last variable operationalized was size which was measured as the number of full-time commissioned officers, as well as the total number of employees in the agency (Langworthy 1986).

The research design and method for this study followed the principles found in other comparative analysis of organizational structure. Once the dimensions were identified for analysis (complexity, formalization, centralization, occupational differentiation, administrative density, and size), a design structure methodology was
developed that obtained data from a questionnaire completed by twenty-eight of the thirty police departments selected for this study. The data was operationalized into measures of central tendency and variability, allowing for the comparative analysis of the community oriented police departments and the traditional police departments. The result of this analysis is that community oriented police departments have become isomorphic, or similar in most of the structural dimensions, with the structural changes recommended by community policing reformers.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter will describe the administration of the survey, the data gathered on each dimension measured, and an analysis of the data. The questionnaire, and the two cover letters, were mailed to each of the thirty police departments selected for this study. Of those thirty questionnaires, twenty-eight were returned with the requested data. All twenty community oriented police departments returned the questionnaires, while eight were returned from the ten traditional police departments selected for this study. The twenty-eight police departments who participated are identified in alphabetical order in Appendix II.

The twenty-eight participating police departments were divided into three groups. Group one consists of ten police departments, each of which received between four and six community oriented policing recommendations from the recommending agencies listed in Appendix III. Group two consists of ten police departments, each of which received between two and three community oriented policing recommendations. Group three consists of eight police departments (the control group), which received no community oriented policing recommendations.

The data for this study came from the survey questionnaire, and from documentation provided by police departments, which consisted of organizational charts, policy manuals, personnel records, strategic plans, employee contracts, informational manuals, and committee reports. The data for each variable was entered into a database to determine the mode, median, mean, and standard deviation for each group. The mode, median and mean measurements will be used to identify the center.
of the distribution. Each will be listed in this study, however the mean will be the primary point of central tendency analysis.

The standard deviation (STDV) will be utilized to determine the variation in organizational structure for each variable, or the deviation that is occurring from the mean within the structural variable. The higher the standard deviation, the more the data is spread along the axis, the more dissimilar the variable is among the police departments within the selected group. As the three groups are compared, an analysis will occur as to what the mean or center point is for each group, and the extent of isomorphism (as measured by the STDV) that has occurred within the community oriented policing groups, as compared to the control group.

The data has been organized into tables for easier analysis of each dimension. Group I, the community oriented police departments that received between four and six community oriented policing recommendations, has been labeled COP I in these tables. Group II, the community oriented police departments that received between two and three community oriented policing recommendations, has been labeled COP II. Group III, the police departments that received no community oriented policing recommendations, has been labeled Non-COP. Data combined from Group I and Group II has been labeled COP I / II.

Complexity

The complexity of the organization is operationalized using four different measures. The first and second measurements are the extent of commissioned and civilian specialization within the surveyed police departments. Studies indicate that community oriented police departments should be less specialized as they move toward a "uniform generalist", and away from the increasing specialization that has occurred for both commissioned and civilian personnel during the twentieth century.
The data in Table 1 were derived by counting the number of specialized commissioned positions, other than patrol officer, within the police department. The data here indicates that community oriented police departments have a lower rate of specialization, and thus complexity, than the traditional police departments, as indicated by the mean.

The standard deviation for the community oriented police departments is lower than the standard deviation for the traditional police departments, indicating a higher degree of isomorphism in the community oriented police departments. As would be expected, the community oriented police departments are less specialized and are becoming similar in this structural dimension.

The data for Table 2 were derived by counting the total number of civilian classifications used in the agency, not counting different grades within job titles. The data here indicates the community oriented police departments have a lower rate of civilian specialization, and thus complexity, than the traditional police departments. The standard deviation for the community oriented police departments is lower than the standard deviation for the traditional police departments, which indicates a level of isomorphism in the community oriented police departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I / II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of specialized positions
Table 2  Civilian Specialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I / II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third variable, horizontal differentiation, is defined as the degree to which an organization's tasks are broken down into functionally distinct "major sub-units". The greater the number of major sub-units, the greater the horizontal differentiation, and complexity, of the organization. Here, community-oriented police departments have been encouraged to reduce horizontal differentiation and place more emphasis on patrol as the major sub-unit.

Table 3  Horizontal Differentiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I / II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data in Table 3, the community-oriented police departments have a lower degree of horizontal differentiation than the traditional police.
departments. Community oriented police departments have become less complex in this structural dimension. In addition, according to the standard deviation, there is a greater degree of isomorphism, or similarity, in the community oriented police departments, when compared to the traditional police departments.

The fourth variable of complexity is vertical differentiation, which is measured by the number of supervisory ranks, beginning with police officer and ending with the chief executive. This is also commonly known as the levels of hierarchy or the layers in the organizational pyramid. Community oriented policing reformers have suggest that police departments need to flatten their layers of command.

Table 4  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I / II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels in the hierarchy

According to the data in Table 4, community oriented police departments have a lower vertical differentiation than the traditional police departments. In addition, the standard deviation is lower for the community oriented police departments, as compared to the traditional police departments, indicating a level of isomorphism.

The four dimensions for complexity indicate that community oriented police departments have re-structured by reducing the level of specialization for both
commissioned and civilian positions, reducing the number of major sub-units, and reducing the levels of hierarchy in the organization. Community oriented police departments are also becoming structurally similar in these four variables.

**Formalization**

Formalization is the degree to which the norms of an organization are explicitly formulated. It has been argued that formalization within police departments does not allow for a problem oriented policing philosophy that is encouraged in a community police department (Maguire 1997; Mastrofski 1994). Successful community oriented police departments should be less formalized than their counterparts in order to perpetuate a problem-solving philosophy among the police.

Formalization has been operationalized using four different measures. The first is Blau and Schoenherr’s (1971) method of determining the size of the agency's policy and procedure manual. Here, each department’s policy and procedure manual was collected using the survey instrument. Five pages were randomly selected from the policy and procedure manual, with the number of words counted per page. The average number of words per page was multiplied by the total number of pages in determining the extent of formalization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Policy and Procedure Manual Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COP I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>146.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of words in the policy and procedure manual (1000’s)
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The formalization dimension, as measured in Table 5, has several discrepancies which does not allow for a clear conclusion. The mean for the community oriented police departments in COP I is lower than the mean for traditional police departments, indicating a smaller policy and procedure manual. In addition, the standard deviation for the community oriented police departments in COP I is lower than the standard deviation for the traditional police departments. It appears the community oriented police departments in COP I are becoming less formalized in this dimension, when compared to the traditional police departments.

When the community oriented police departments in COP II are compared to the traditional police departments, the data indicates that community oriented police departments are more formalized. When the community oriented police departments in both groups are compared to the traditional police departments, the formalization level is similar for the community oriented police departments.

The second measurement of formalization comes from Inkson et al. (1970). Here, the presence and number of department contracts of employment, employment informational manuals, and job descriptions were used to determine the level of formalization. The survey instrument gathered data on whether contracts and informational manuals were present, how many of each, and whether job descriptions were on file for employment classifications within the police departments. Tables 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 provide the data for these formalization variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Does the Police Department have Employment Contracts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COP I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in Table 6 indicates no substantial difference in the three police department groups. It is just as likely to find contracts of employment in community oriented police departments as in traditional police departments. For this measurement of formalization, there is no structural difference when comparing community oriented police departments to traditional police departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
<th>Number of Employment Contracts for those Agencies Answering Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COP I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 7 indicates the community oriented police departments have more contracts of employment than do the traditional police departments. As a result, the traditional police departments have a lower level of formalization than the community oriented police departments. The traditional police departments also have a standard deviation that is lower than community oriented police departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8</th>
<th>Does the Police Department Have Informational Manuals?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COP I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The presence of informational manuals for police departments, as illustrated in Table 8, is substantially similar for both the community oriented police departments and the traditional police departments. This measurement of formalization is virtually the same for both types of police departments.

Table 9  Number of Informational Manuals for Agencies Answering Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I / II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of informational manuals for those agencies that indicated they were present in the police department is found in Table 9. Here, the community oriented police departments and traditional police departments are virtually identical in the number of information manuals present in the agency. This measurement for formalization is similar for both community oriented and traditional departments.

Table 10  Does the Police Department Have Written Job Descriptions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I / II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The community oriented police departments and the traditional police departments in this study, as indicated by Table 10, all have written job descriptions on file, for both civilian and commissioned positions. Thus, this measurement for the formalization dimension is similar for both community oriented police departments and traditional police departments.

The formalization of police departments, according to the four measurements used in this study, is virtually identical for community oriented police departments and traditional police departments. The size of the policy and procedural manual is smaller for the one group of community oriented police departments, when compared to traditional police departments. However, when all community oriented police departments are compared to traditional police departments, formalization is virtually identical.

Community oriented police departments and traditional police departments are just as likely to have agency informational manuals, contracts of employment, and written job descriptions. When these documents are found in the agency, they are present in the same numbers. An analysis of why community oriented police departments and traditional police departments are still formalized structures, and why this may not change, will occur in the next chapter.

Centralization

Centralization is most commonly referred to as the degree to which decision making is concentrated in the organization. A maximum degree of centralization would exist if all power in the organization were exercised by one individual. A minimum degree of centralization would exist if all members of the organization shared equally in the exercise of power. Most organizations, of course, fall somewhere between the two.
A decentralized organization is defined as one in which initiative, decision making, and responsibility rest at the lowest level possible. Decentralization pushes initiative downward in the organization, challenges people to be more creative, and to solve problems without a bureaucratic level of higher decision making responsibility. Police departments have been criticized for centralizing authority at the highest level and expecting officers to “follow orders”. Community oriented policing reformers emphasize that patrol officers and other line personnel must be allowed to contribute substantially to problem solving efforts as they arise, without the constant request for approval before action is taken.

Centralization has been operationalized in this study by using data from the survey instrument to calculate six different measures. The first, vertical differentiation, was previously discussed under complexity (Table 4), and is relevant to the study of centralization. The larger the vertical differentiation, the more centralized the organization, as there are more levels that need to be part of the decision making process.

According to Table 4, the community oriented police departments have a lower level of vertical differentiation when compared to the traditional police departments, thus there is a lower level of centralization. In addition, the standard deviation is lower for the community oriented police departments when compared to the traditional police departments, thus there is similarity in this structural dimension for community oriented police departments.

The second measure is the chief executive span of control, which is the number of subordinates who report directly to the chief executive with no intervening level, irrespective of the statues of the employee. Chief executives of organizations can increase their centralization of authority over the organization by increasing the number of individuals who report directly to them. Here, the greater the number of
individuals who report to the chief executive, the higher the level of centralization. The lower the chief executive span of control, the less centralized the organization. The data in Table 11 describes the chief executive span of control for this study.

Table 11  Chief Executive Span of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I/II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of subordinates reporting to the chief executive

According to the data in Table 11, centralization is lower for the community oriented police departments, when compared to the traditional police departments. Chief executives for community oriented police departments have reduced their span of control. In addition the standard deviation is lower for the community oriented police departments, when compared to the traditional police departments, which indicates community oriented police departments are becoming similar in this structural dimension.

The third measure of centralization is the subordinate ratio (span of control) at the production level. Since community oriented policing is based on supporting the efforts of the “generalists” patrol officer, the span of control here refers to the number of patrol officers per first line supervisor. Community oriented policing reformers have argued that an increase in the span of control at the patrol officer level is necessary for reducing centralization, and thus increasing the problem solving capabilities of patrol officers.
Data for this third measure of centralization, as found in Table 12, was
gathered from the survey instrument by determining the number of officers per first
line supervisor in the patrol division. Here, the higher the number of patrol officers
per first line supervisor, the lower the centralization of authority.

Table 12  Patrol First Line Supervisor Span of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I / II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of officers per first line supervisor in patrol

There are discrepancies in the span of control measurement for centralization
in Table 12. When comparing the community oriented police departments in COP I to
the traditional police departments, there is a higher level of centralization in the
community oriented police departments. In addition, the standard deviation for the
community oriented police departments is lower than the standard deviation for the
traditional police departments, indicating the community oriented police departments
have isomorphised around a patrol span of control of 7.7, which is a higher level of
centralization.

When all the community oriented police departments are compared to the
traditional police departments, there is little difference in the mean or the standard
deviation. Indications here are that all police departments are operating under a patrol
span of control of eight to nine officers per first line supervisor, which may be a way
of placing more centralization of authority in the patrol division.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The fourth measure of centralization is the ratio of commissioned police officers to commissioned supervisors for the entire police department. Community oriented policing advocates have argued that the supervisory ranks of police departments should be reduced to decrease the centralization of authority, and allow for an increase in the number of officers who work at the production level with the community. For this measure, the lower the ratio of officers to supervisors, the greater the degree of centralization, as officers are more closely supervised.

Table 13  Total Commissioned Officer to Commissioned Supervisor Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I / II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 13 indicates a lower degree of centralization for the community oriented police departments, when compared to the traditional police departments, as there are more commissioned officers per commissioned supervisor for the entire department. In addition, the standard deviation is smaller for the community oriented police departments, when compared to the traditional police departments, indicating a level of isomorphism among the community oriented police departments.

Fifth, many police departments throughout the nation have developed strategic plans. Strategic planning is the process of examining the organization's environment, internally and externally, to determine the critical factors and best alternative strategies for achieving the goals and, therefore, the mission (Grimshaw 1990). The
data in Table 14 indicates that community oriented police departments have a higher level of strategic planning when compared to traditional police departments.

Table 14  Does the Police Department Have a Strategic Plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I / II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those departments that have developed a strategic plan, data was ascertained as to whether first level police officers participated in its development. The level of participation in formulating the strategic plan can be an indicator of centralization of authority and decision making. If only the top level of the hierarchy is involved in the decision making process for strategic planning, then the police department is centralized. The lower the level of participation in the development of a strategic plan, the lower the level of centralization.

Table 15  Does the First Level Officer Participate in Strategic Planning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I / II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 15, community oriented police departments are less centralized than traditional police departments. All of the community oriented police departments in COP I allowed participation from first level police officers in the strategic planning process. The community oriented police departments in COP II
where more likely to involve first level police officers in the strategic planning process. The traditional police departments were not as likely to include first level police officers in the strategic planning process.

The sixth and final measure of centralization concerns the presence of committees within the police organization that make recommendations to command staff, and the level of participation on those committees. Data was obtained on whether committees are present within the organization that made recommendations to command staff (Table 16), and whether first level police officers participated in these recommending committees (Table 17).

Table 16  
**Presence of Committees that Make Recommendations to Staff?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I / II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 16, the presence of committees that make policy recommendations to the command staff of police departments is similar in all three groups. Thus, it is just as likely that the community oriented police departments and the traditional police departments will have recommending committees.

Table 17  
**Participation of First Level Officers in Recommending Committees?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I / II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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According to Table 17, all the community oriented police departments have first level police officers on committees that make recommendations to command staff. The traditional police departments were less likely to have first level police officers on these recommending committees. This data would indicate that community oriented police departments are becoming less centralized and structurally similar as first level officers are allowed to participate in policy development.

Centralization of authority and decision making is an important structural dimension found in all organizations. Traditional police departments, during the reform era, re-structured so that decision making could be centralized in the hands of supervisors, and at the highest level possible. Police officers were expected to follow orders and rarely participated in policy-making decisions effecting the organization. This bureaucratic structural dimension became an important element in creating barriers between the police and the community.

Community oriented policing reformers have argued that police departments need to de-centralize, and allow first level police and civilian employees into the decision making process. This will allow for problem solving at the lowest level possible, where the police and the community meet to reduce crime and the fear of crime, increasing the quality of life. Patrol officers need to be given the authority to make decisions without obtaining prior approval from command staff.

According to the data in this study, community oriented police departments are decentralizing when compared to traditional police departments. Of the six measurements taken to operationalized centralization in police departments, five indicate that community oriented police departments are moving to a less centralized structure, and are becoming similar in this structural dimension. Community oriented police departments are reducing the levels of hierarchy, increasing the supervisor's span of control, and allowing the participation of first level officers in policy-making.
Occupational Differentiation

Advocates of community oriented policing see civilians taking on positions within the police department who will not need to be staffed by officers. This personnel practice not only puts police officers on the front line but can cut costs (Maguire 1997). Occupational differentiation (Table 18) has been operationalized as the ratio of sworn officers to civilian personnel. The lower the number, the greater the degree of occupational differentiation, which should be found in community oriented police departments.

Table 18  Occupational Differentiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I / II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio of police officers to civilian personnel

According to Table 18, occupational differentiation is higher for the community oriented police departments, when compared to the traditional police departments, since the ratio of officers to civilian personnel is smaller. In addition, the standard deviation is smaller for the community oriented police departments, when compared to the traditional police departments, indicating community oriented police departments are becoming structurally similar in this dimension.

It is evident that community oriented police departments are becoming occupationally differentiated as they civilianize those positions in the organization that need not to be staffed by commissioned personnel. Community oriented policing
reformers have argued for this structural change as a way to put more officers on the front line, where they can work with community members to solve problems. Occupational differentiation should not be a threat to police officers, but a positive addition to the workforce.

Administrative Density

Administrative density, the fifth organizational dimension, is the extent to which an organization allocates resources to the management of its output. Administrative density must be linked to the work of Weber and his bureaucracy; the more people employed in administration, the fewer the people doing the actual core work of the organization.

Administrative density has been operationalized as the ratio of employees to supervisors for the entire organization. The smaller the ratio, the greater the degree of administrative density. It would be expected that community oriented police departments would have a lower degree of administrative density, when compared to traditional police departments, as they move to reduce the supervisory ranks and allow for more front line employees to work with community members.

Table 19 Administrative Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
<th>COP I / II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDV</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio of employees to supervisors
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According to Table 19, administrative density is lower for the community oriented police departments, when compared to the traditional police departments, as there are more employees per supervisor. In addition, the standard deviation for the community oriented policing departments is smaller than the standard deviation for the traditional police departments, indicating community oriented police departments are becoming isomorphic, or structurally similar in this dimension.

Community oriented policing reformers have argued that police departments need to decrease their administrative density, thereby increasing the number of line police officers who can work with the community. Traditional police departments have been attacked as top heavy organizations, with an abundance of administrative personnel who do not respond to community needs. It appears administrative density is smaller in police departments considered leaders in community policing.

Structural Size

Size is the scale of operations in an organization. According to a review of the organizational literature, there is debate on the usefulness and relevance of size to other structural dimensions. On one hand, size has been cited as an influencing factor on other bureaucratic organizational structures. Some researchers treat size as a dimension of organizational structure, like formalization, or centralization. "There are no 'laws' regarding size and other organizational characteristics....Size, while related to some important characteristics, is not as important as other factors in understanding the form organizations take" (Hall 1972:139).

Size, as a structural dimension, has been operationalized using two methods: the total number of commissioned police officers (Table 20), and the total number of commissioned police officers and civilian employees (Table 21). It is primarily provided as a description of the police departments used in this study to gather data. It
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is interesting, however, to note that the police departments chosen by the recommending agencies as leaders in community oriented policing have a smaller mean than the traditional police departments that were randomly selected. Nevertheless, it is difficult to draw any conclusions based on this data.

Table 20  Total Commissioned Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001 - 499</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 - 1499</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 - 2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>866</strong></td>
<td><strong>868</strong></td>
<td><strong>1106</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21  Total Commissioned and Civilian Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>COP I</th>
<th>COP II</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001 - 999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 - 1999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 - 3000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>1179</strong></td>
<td><strong>1172</strong></td>
<td><strong>1428</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study has examined six structural dimensions of community oriented police departments and traditional police departments to determine if police departments are structuring vis-à-vis a community oriented policing philosophy, and whether community oriented police departments are becoming structurally similar. The results indicate that community oriented police departments are developing
structural dimensions that are different than what has evolved in traditional police departments, and community oriented police departments are becoming similar.

Community oriented police departments have become less complex as they decrease the number of specialized commissioned and civilian positions, and move towards a more patrol generalist. Community oriented police departments have reduced the number of major sub-units and the levels of hierarchy, thereby reducing the complexity of the organization.

Community oriented police departments are de-centralizing the organization’s authority and decision making by reducing the chief executive span of control; by increasing the ratio of police officer to commissioned supervisors; by allowing first level officers to participate in strategic planning; and by allowing the participation of first level officers in policy and procedural recommendations.

Community oriented police departments have become occupationally differentiated as they increase the civilian workforce, allowing police officers to work in the field with community members to solve problems. Community oriented police departments have reduced the administrative density of the organization, allowing for a reduction in supervisors and an increase in police officers who can do the actual core work.

It is evident that structural changes are occurring in police departments throughout the nation, as one way to successfully implement the community oriented policing philosophy. Structural changes to the traditional model of bureaucratic organization are important to the successful implementation of community oriented policing, however is not the only change that must occur. Police departments must also look to other aspects of the organization for change. Leadership, culture, and the community’s involvement will be discussed further in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The research for this paper has examined three issues concerning organizational structure as they relate to municipal police departments. First, this research compared the structural dimensions of community oriented police departments to traditional police departments. As a result, community oriented police departments were found to be structured differently than traditional police departments, with community oriented police departments developing structural characteristics more conducive to a community oriented policing philosophy.

Second, this research indicates that community oriented police departments have become similar or isomorphic in structural characteristics such as complexity, centralization, occupational differentiation, and administrative density. Third, a model has been developed that identifies the structural characteristics of successful community oriented police departments. This model, described in Table 22, can be used by a municipal police department to structure the organization as it implements a community oriented policing philosophy.

This chapter will summarize the findings of the research in these three areas. The structural dimensions of complexity, formalization, centralization, occupational differentiation, and administrative density will be examined. In addition, contextual factors, in contrast to design factors, will be examined as they relate to the successful implementation of a community oriented policing philosophy. Contextual factors include technology, the internal culture, and the social and physical environment.
Table 22  Structural Description of a Community Oriented Police Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>COP</th>
<th>Non-COP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complexity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioned Specialization - # of classifications</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Specialization - # of classifications</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Differentiation - # of major sub-units</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Differentiation - # of levels in the hierarchy</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formalization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Procedure Manual - # of words (in 1000’s)</td>
<td>146.8</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Employment Contracts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Informational Manuals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Written Job Descriptions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centralization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Span of Control</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol First Line Supervisor Span of Control</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Officers to Commissioned Supervisors</td>
<td>6:1</td>
<td>5.3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Strategic Planning by First Level Officers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Internal Recommending Committees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Committees by First Level Officers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Differentiation – officers to civilians</td>
<td>2.7:1</td>
<td>4.8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Density – subordinates to supervisors</td>
<td>6.5:1</td>
<td>6:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Complexity

The first structural dimension operationalized is complexity, which has four measures. The first variable, commissioned specialization, is lower in community oriented police departments. This would be expected since community oriented police departments should have reduced the number of commissioned specialized positions in order to concentrate on the patrol generalist. Community oriented police departments are also becoming similar in this structural variable. The number of specialized commissioned positions for community oriented police departments is 23.7.

The second variable for complexity, civilian specialization, is also lower for the community oriented police departments, which would be expected since community oriented police departments need to reduce the number of civilian classifications. Community oriented police departments are also becoming similar in this structural dimension. The number of civilian classifications for community oriented police departments is 27.4.

The third structural variable for complexity, horizontal differentiation, is lower for community oriented police departments, as would be expected. Community oriented police departments have a lower number of major divisions in order to reduce the complexity of the organization. Community oriented police departments are also becoming similar in this structural variable. The number of major sub-units found in community oriented police departments is 19.

The fourth variable of complexity, vertical differentiation, is lower for community oriented police departments. As would be expected, community oriented police departments have reduced the levels of hierarchy in the organization. Community oriented police departments are becoming similar in this structural variable, with 6.4 levels in the hierarchy, from police officer to the chief executive.
According to this research, community oriented police departments have become less complex, and are becoming structurally similar in this dimension. The literature indicates community oriented police departments need to become less complex in order to be successful. Organizational complexity has been reduced in community oriented police when compared to traditional police departments.

**Formalization**

Formalization is the second structural dimension operationalized. Data was analyzed concerning the size of the police department's policy and procedure manual, and the presence of documents such as employment contracts, informational manuals, and written job descriptions. The analysis here indicates there is no difference in the formalization dimension when comparing community oriented police departments to traditional police departments. Police departments are all formalized structures, and in some cases, community oriented police departments are more formalized.

The community oriented police departments and the traditional police departments in this study both have extensive policy and procedural manuals. Community oriented police departments and traditional police departments are likely to have employment contracts, informational manuals, and written job descriptions on file. As a result, this research indicates that community oriented police departments and traditional police departments have remained formalized structures.

The reason why police departments have remained formalized structures may lie in the litigious society of today. Police departments are sued regularly, whether a community oriented police department or a traditional police department. When police departments are sued, the first document that is requested by attorneys from both sides is the policy and procedure that is relevant to the actions a police officer took. If no document is present, it becomes a point within the litigation process.
If a police department has well documented policies and procedures, that are correct for that particular situation, it can be of tremendous help for the police department during litigation. As a result, police departments have learned that proper documentation of the actions of employees, in a policy and procedure manual, will assist in future litigation. In addition, contracts of employment clarify the relationship between management and employees. Written job descriptions document the duties and responsibilities for each classification, and clarifies what tasks the position must accomplish.

Formalization of police organizational structure will not change in the future. According to this study, formalization has no impact on the successful implementation of community oriented policing. Formalization is prevalent in both community oriented police departments and traditional police departments. Police organizations today must support operations by a well-documented policy and procedure manual that instructs employees on the proper behavior while in the organization. In policing, “If it is not documented, it didn’t happen”.

Centralization

The third dimension operationalized is centralization. Five measurements were derived and studied to determine the extent of centralization in police departments, and the extent of isomorphism in community oriented police departments. The first measurement for centralization, vertical differentiation, is lower for community oriented police departments, thus centralization of decision making and authority has been reduced when compared to traditional police departments. Community oriented police departments have become similar in the number of levels in the hierarchy. Community oriented police departments have flattened to 6.4 levels.
The second variable measured for centralization is the chief executive span of control. Centralization here is lower for community oriented police departments, as the chief executive span of control has been reduced to 7. According to this variable, authority has expanded from the chief’s office to lower levels in the organization. In addition, community oriented police departments are becoming structurally similar in this variable when compared to traditional police departments.

The third variable measured for centralization is the patrol first line supervisor’s span of control. Centralization for this variable is actually higher for community oriented police departments when compared to traditional police departments. Community oriented police departments have 7.7 officers per supervisor in patrol, while traditional police departments have 8.4 officers per supervisor. This indicates that successful community oriented police departments still want a smaller span of control for the first line supervisor in patrol.

The fourth measure of centralization is the ratio of police officers to commissioned supervisors for the entire department. The literature argues that community oriented police departments must reduce centralization by increasing the number of police officers to commissioned supervisors. Centralization is lower for community oriented police departments according to this variable. Community oriented police departments are similar in this structural variable, with six officers for every commissioned supervisor.

The fifth measure for centralization is the participation of first level police officers in strategic planning. According to this variable, community oriented police departments are less centralized than traditional police departments. Community oriented police departments are more likely to have a strategic plan that will guide the organization into the future, and more importantly, a strategic plan that was developed with the participation of first level police officers.
The sixth and final measure of centralization is the variable concerning the presence of committees within the organization that make recommendations to command staff, and the participation of first level police officers on these committees. This research indicates that community oriented police departments and traditional police departments are just as likely to have recommending committees in the organization, however the community oriented police departments have a greater likelihood of first level police officer participation. This indicates there is less centralization for community oriented police departments.

According to this research, community oriented police departments are less centralized in structure than traditional police departments. The levels in the hierarchy are less than traditional police departments, the chief executive is de-centralizing his/her authority, there are less commissioned supervisors, and first level police officers have been brought into the policy-making process. Community oriented policing reformers have argued that police departments must de-centralize authority and decision making, allowing police officers to problem solve with community members in reducing crime and the fear of crime.

Occupational Differentiation

Occupational differentiation is the structural dimension concerned with the move toward civilianization in police departments. Community oriented policing proponents urge the civilianization of those positions in the department that do not need to be filled by a police officer. Civilianization will allow for more police officers doing police work. This study found a higher level of occupational differentiation in community oriented police departments, when compared to traditional police departments. Community oriented police departments are becoming structurally similar in this variable, with a ratio of 2.7 officers per civilian employee.
Administrative Density

Administrative density, the final structural dimension, is operationalized as the ratio of all employees to supervisory personnel. Community oriented policing proponents have argued that administrative density needs to be reduced by increasing the ratio of employees to supervisors. According to this research, community oriented police departments have less administrative density than traditional police departments. Community oriented police departments are becoming similar in this structural dimension, with a ratio of 6.5 employees to supervisors.

Structural Description

This research indicates that successful community oriented police departments are structured differently when compared to traditional police departments, and have a structure that is less complex, is not as centralized in authority and decision-making, has more occupational differentiation, and less administrative density. Given the data compiled from the questionnaire used in this study, it is now possible to describe how a successful community oriented police department is structured, in terms of identifiable dimensions. Table 22 provides a descriptive analysis of how successful community oriented police departments are structured. It has been developed from the mean for each variable.

The law enforcement philosophy sweeping the nation is community oriented policing. The traditional approach has its shortcomings, while community oriented policing provides a way to bring the police and community back in a partnership to solve problems and increase the quality of life, through a reduction in crime. A successful community oriented police department must adopt this philosophy, communicate it to the organization and the community, practice the art of problem-solving, and allow it to flourish throughout the entire organization.
Once the vision of community oriented policing is adopted, proponents argue the organization must be re-structured so the philosophy can succeed. Table 22 describes how a police department should be structured as part of the process of becoming a successful community oriented policing organization. The organization must be less complex, less centralized, have a higher degree of occupational differentiation and a lower degree of administrative density. This study provides a foundation for how these terms can be defined and operationalized in the organization.

Conclusion

Organizational structure is analogous to a building structure. Buildings have structures in the form of beams, interior walls, passageways, roofs, and so on. The structure of a building is a major determinant of the movements and activities of the people within it. Buildings are suppose to have structures that fit the activities that go on within them. They are designed, and re-designed to accommodate the activities of the people within, as dictated by the philosophy of purpose.

Community oriented police departments must be redesigned to fit this new common purpose. Today, successful community oriented police departments are structuring the organization differently when compared to traditional police departments. Organizational structures, however, are continually changing as they are influenced by successive waves of members, interactions among members, and incessant environmental pressures. At the same time, the emergent nature of structure is such that there is a strong tendency toward isomorphism, as the change continues and develops.

The isomorphism of police organizations into community oriented policing departments comes from three sources. First, there are the coercive forces from the
environment such as governmental regulations and community members. Second, there are the mimic forces when organizations face uncertainty and thus look to other organizations in their field that have faced similar uncertainty. The third source of institutional isomorphism comes from normative pressures as the work force, especially management, becomes more professionalized. As people participate in trade and professional associations, their ideas tend to homogenize, as was suggested by the work of DiMaggio and Powell (1983).

According to Hall (1996), there is no single explanation for the forms of organizations. Rather, multiple explanations are needed to understand organizational structure. There are two major categories of factors affecting organizational structure. The first category of explanations of structure is design. By design we mean the choices made in an organization about how the organization is structured.

The research in this study has been primarily occupied with the design of the organization as it relates to community oriented policing. There is a problem in these types of studies that needs to be considered, which involves the measurements (Price and Muellar 1986). Data come from organizational documents and records. Documents may tell us one thing, but informants in the organization another. Research is beginning to show us, however, that there are measures which can be used across a set of organizations, but as yet we do not have universal measures. The problem is raised to indicate that the analysis to be considered is itself in process, as researchers seek to develop a cumulative and integrated set of findings.

The second major factor affecting organizational structure is the context in which organizations operate. Contextual factors include organizational size, technology, internal culture and the environment. Context here means the situation in which an organization is operating. This situation is simultaneously within and beyond an organizations control (Hall 1999). These contextual factors where not
considered as part of this research into the structural characteristics of community oriented police departments, as it would have gone beyond the scope of a design study.

The organizational structure of police departments is impacted by contextual factors as municipal police departments transition to community oriented policing. The size of the organization may be a contextual factor to the success of community oriented policing within an organization. The police departments in this research study tended to be smaller for successful community oriented police departments than for traditional police departments. This begs the question of size as a factor: Does community oriented policing fit better in small organizations rather than large organizations?

The relationship between technology and organizational structure is a factor, albeit one that is difficult to understand. Interest in technology as a major component of organizational analysis was sparked by the work of Woodward (1958, 1965), Thompson (1967), and Perrow (1967). Woodward’s work is particularly interesting, where her findings indicate that the nature of the technology vitally affects the management’s structure of the organization. Levels in the hierarchy, the span of control of the first line supervisor, and the ratio of managers to employees are all affected by technology according to Woodward. Police departments throughout the nation are affected by technological advancements. What effects will these advancements have on the structure of organizations as the transition to community oriented policing occurs?

The importance of the internal culture factor has received varying degrees of attention by organizational scholars and practitioners. It received prominence in Barnard’s (1938) important analysis of the functions of the executive. One of the major functions of the executive was to “set the tone” for the entire organization.
Peters and Waterman (1982) sought a culture of “excellence”. Community oriented policing cannot thrive in an organization without the true belief that it will work. The culture must be deeply seated in community oriented policing for the structure to work properly.

Organizational structure is affected by environmental factors, primarily the social environment of organizations; but the physical environment, such as climate or geography can also be important. In terms of geography, it is interesting to note that community oriented police departments selected by the recommending agencies in this study tended to be from the western United States. It may be much more difficult to structure for community oriented policing in departments found in the northeast and mid-west, where there is a strong cultural history of structure, and where unions have greater input. Western United States police departments are a younger group, where a cultural transition to a structured community oriented policing philosophy may be easier for the executive to pursue.

Environmental characteristics also refer to the socioeconomic infrastructure in which organizations are located. Demographics, including factors such as the racial and ethnic mixes present, constrain organizations as do the institutionalized values surrounding the organization. One study found that the administrative complexity of school districts is related to the environmental complexity each of the districts face. If schools receive federal funds, the administration is more complex and fragmented, because of the numerous reporting requirements (Meyer, Scott and Strang 1987).

Another way of looking at environments is whether or not they are “hostile” or “friendly” (Khandwalla 1972). A friendly environment is supportive, providing funds and value support. A hostile environment is a situation in which the very underpinnings of the organization are being threatened. Khandwalla suggests that in a friendly environment, organizations will be structurally differentiated, with
committees and ad hoc coordinating groups. If the environment turns hostile, the organization will "tighten up" the organizational structure by centralizing and standardizing its operations.

Organizations do not take form automatically. They do so because of decisions that are made within the organization as to the structural dimensions, to include complexity, formalization, centralization, occupational differentiation and administrative density. These decisions are made within contextual factors. The most important contextual factor guiding municipal policing departments today is the philosophy of community oriented policing.

Within the confines of this study, the research indicates that the philosophy of community oriented policing is having an impact on the structural dimensions of municipal police departments. Successful community oriented police departments possess structural characteristics that are less complex, less centralized, more occupationally differentiated, and less administratively dense. Formalization of police organizations remains a dimension that has not changed due to environmental factors such as lawsuits.

These structural changes are sought by community oriented policing reformers as desirable if the philosophy of community oriented policing is to expand. The police executives of today must take into account many factors for the proper evolution of community oriented policing. One is design structure, with this study a step in advancing the understanding of how police departments should be structured when partnering with community members in reducing crime and the fear of crime. The foundation for community oriented policing includes an organizational structure that fits the philosophy. This study takes us in that direction.
APPENDIX I

LETTER AND SURVEY
Dear Chief of Police

I would like to introduce to you Lt. Stavros S. Anthony of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. Lt. Anthony is a doctoral candidate in Sociology at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas and is currently writing his dissertation. The title of his study is *The Structural Dimensions of Community Policing Departments.* Through a random sample, your department has been selected as one of thirty police departments throughout the nation in order to study particular structural dimensions such as span of control, levels of hierarchy, and specialization. Once the data has been gathered, Lt. Anthony will develop a model police departments can use when structuring a successful community-policing department.

The data gathered on your department will be strictly confidential; thus specific data from the survey on your department will not be identifiable. The only person to see the data as it relates to your department will be Lt. Anthony. Your support and participation will be acknowledged in this study, but all data will be examined in the aggregate.

The data gathered on all the police departments in this study are strictly objective. Data will be analyzed from policy manuals, organizational charts and job classifications. The attached survey lists all the information Lt. Anthony needs from your department to successfully complete the study.

I am asking for your support in the completion of this survey. Please feel free to assign one of your staff personnel to complete the attached survey, who has a global understanding of your organization and who knows how to obtain the necessary documentation. Once you examine the survey, you will see that no opinions will be asked of the person you assign this project. Lt. Anthony will contact your office within one week of receipt of this letter to determine who your liaison person will be. This study has been designed to minimize the burden on your organization and your liaison person.

Thank you for your support of this study, which I believe, will assist departments throughout the nation who are implementing a community policing philosophy. If you have any further questions reference this study you can contact Lt. Anthony at 702-229-3911 or e-mail him at s2197a@LVMPD.com. A copy of the results will be mailed to you.

Sincerely

Jerry Keller, Sheriff
To: Department Liaison Representative

I would like to thank you for your assistance in the completion of the attached survey. I will be contacting you within the week to introduce myself and answer any questions you may have about this study. I believe the data I obtain from your department will assist police departments throughout the nation who are implementing community policing.

I would like to again stress that the data you provide me will be strictly confidential. I will acknowledge your departments support in this study only as a participating agency. I would also like to acknowledge your individual support in this study, unless you indicate otherwise.

Once you examine the survey, you will see that I am not requesting any statements of opinion from you about your agency. I need your support in gathering the necessary documentation and information concerning your agency. I have tried to be as least burdensome as possible as I know you are busy. I am asking that all the information be sent to me as a package, and within one month of this letter.

I will be at your disposal for any questions or comments you may have. I look forward to speaking with you and I will call you within a week of your Chief assigning you to this study. Thank you again for your support. I can be reached at 702-229-3911 or e-mailed at s2197a@lvmpd.com.

Sincerely,

Jerry Keller, Sheriff

By: Stavros S. Anthony, Lieutenant
Please answer the following questions and provide the requested documentation. Again, all answers and information will be strictly confidential.

A) PERSONNEL

1) For a typical patrol squad, what is the number of officers per first line supervisor?
   - Day shift _____________
   - Swing shift _____________
   - Graveyard shift _____________

2) What is the most current total number of commissioned/sworn officers on the department?
   _____________

2a) What is the most current total number of supervisory/commissioned/sworn officers on the department, beginning with the first line supervisor?
   _____________

3) What is the most current total number of commissioned/sworn officers in the patrol division?
   _____________

3a) What is the most current total number of supervisory/commissioned/sworn officers in the patrol division, beginning with the first line supervisor?
   _____________

4) What is the most current total number of civilian personnel on the department?
   _____________

4a) What is the most current total number of supervisory civilian personnel on the department, beginning with the first line supervisor?
   _____________
5) What is the most current total number of employees who report directly to the chief executive (police chief, superintendent, etc.), with no intervening level?

6) Please forward a copy of the most current organizational chart of the entire police department?

C) POLICY / PROCEDURE MANUALS

7) Please forward the most current copy of your department policy and procedure manual.

8) Does your agency have employment contracts (union, association contracts, FOP etc.)?  
   Yes - please forward all of the most current contracts.  
   No

9) Does your agency have department-wide information manuals for employee use?  
   (Information manuals cover a general topic or topics, such as employment conditions and safety. It is not specific to a job, but to a topic.)  
   Yes - please forward all information manuals.  
   No

D) JOB DESCRIPTIONS

10) Please forward the most current documentation that will identify all commissioned police officer classifications / specialization's other than "patrol officer" (special assignments such as vice, gangs, field training officer, etc.).

11) Please forward the most current documentation that will identify all the classifications for civilian positions.
12) Please identify each commissioned rank from police officer to the chief of police. For example: police officer, sergeant, .......chief.


13) Does your department have a written job description on file for each civilian and commissioned classification / specialization?

Yes
No

E) OTHER

14) Does your agency have a Strategic Plan?

Yes - please forward a copy of the Strategic Plan.
No

15) Does your agency have internal standing committees (meet regularly) that make recommendations to executive staff?

Yes - please forward documentation that identifies each committee.
No

Please mail this survey and all supporting documentation to:

Lieutenant Stavros S. Anthony
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Criminalistics Bureau
6759 W. Charleston Blvd.
Las Vegas, NV 89146

AGAIN, THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY
APPENDIX II

PARTICIPATING POLICE DEPARTMENTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atlanta Police Department</th>
<th>Mobile, Alabama Police Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque Police Department</td>
<td>Nashville Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora, Colorado Police Department</td>
<td>Newark Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Texas Police Department</td>
<td>Newport News Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department</td>
<td>Norfolk, Virginia Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Police Department</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Police Department</td>
<td>Portland Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs Police Department</td>
<td>San Antonio Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno Police Department</td>
<td>Savanna, Georgia Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis Police Department</td>
<td>San Diego Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas Metro Police Department</td>
<td>Seattle Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville Police Department</td>
<td>Spokane Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Police Department</td>
<td>St. Petersburg police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison, Wisconsin Police Department</td>
<td>Tempe, Arizona Police Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICE DEPARTMENT 
RECOMMENDING AGENCIES
Michigan State University
School of Criminal Justice
The National Center for Community Policing
113 Angell Blvd.
East Lansing, MI 48824
1-800-892-9051
http://www.ssc.msu.edu/~cj/cp/cptoc.html

Police Executive Research Forum (PERF)
1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 930
Washington, D. C. 20036
1-202-466-7820
http://www.policeforum.org/home/about.html

U. S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
1100 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, D. C. 20530
1-202-514-2058
http://www.usdoj.gov/cops/

International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP)
515 N. Washington St.
Alexandria, VA 22314-2357
1-703-836-6767
http://www.theiacp.org/

Community Policing Consortium
1726 M St. N. W., Suite 801
Washington, D. C. 20036
1-800-833-3058
http://www.communitypolicing.org/aboutI.html

Institute for Law and Justice
1018 Duke St.
Alexandria, VA 22314
36 Regional Community Policing Institutes
1-703-684-5300
http://www.ilj.org
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