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ABSTRACT

When implementing new policies, police chiefs need to develop strategies to identify potential supporters and mobilize their assistance. Some critics question the feasibility of implementing community policing in traditional organizations. Advocates, on the other hand, suggest these issues can be overcome by such common techniques as planning and training. We use principal-agent theory to investigate police chiefs’ perception of support for community policing. Training and inclusion in planning are found to be associated with levels of support down through the rank structure. At the level of line officer, the picture is less clear.
Introduction

It takes more than good ideas to change organizations. Good ideas do not always become good programs. The process of implementation is an important, but often overlooked, aspect of public policy. Unless implementation is successful, the benefits of a program will not be realized. After developing programs, managers must nurture their policies until they become incorporated into organizational life.

Police managers use many strategies, both unique and routine, to attain acceptance of their policies. We examined whether inclusion in training or planning is perceived by police chiefs to affect police officers' levels of support for community policing. We employ principal-agent theory as the conceptual framework used for this research. As a tool for studying relations within hierarchical organizations, principal-agent models are appropriate for examining relationships within the bureaucratic structures.

Background

Though community policing appears to enjoy widespread support (Barr 1992, Moore and Trojanowicz 1988, Mott 1987, National Institute of Justice 1988-1993, Rosenbaum 1994, Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990), the recent history of law enforcement suggests the future of community policing is far from certain. Many believe community policing philosophies are incompatible with traditional police organizational practices and structures (McElroy, Cosgrove and Sadd 1993; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990). The failure of previous policy implementation attempts, such as team policing, lends legitimacy to concerns about the survival of community policing. To better understand the contradictions of community policing and traditional organizations, we need to reconceptualize the problem of control.

The Control Problem

Implementing policy is fundamentally a matter of control. Managers must induce employees to perform specific tasks in a proscribed manner. Public bureaucracies, such as the police, rely on organizational structure to control employees. The organizational trappings of the police—military rank, hierarchy, and discipline—give the appearance of a rigid command and control of subordinates. Police managers, however, may find that traditional structural constraints and control mechanisms have limited effect on the actions of officers.

The perils of implementation must be identified and appropriate responses must be carefully incorporated into policy design (Pressman and Wildavsky 1979). Policy implementation is a dynamic rather than mechanical process. Chiefs, who implement new policy, must convince or compel officers to adjust their behavior to conform to new guidelines. However, line-level police officers operate in an environment that affords considerable discretion in how they perform their daily activities (Goldstein 1977; Lipsky 1980; Manning 1979; Sparrow, Moore and Kennedy 1990). Police officers may use their discretion to undermine the traditional command and control mechanisms of police managers (Wilson 1963). To better understand this issue, we will recast control as a principal-agent problem.

The principal (police chief) with goals and objectives to accomplish, contracts the services of agents (officers) to perform specific or general tasks (Moe 1984). Each party has power over some aspects of the interaction. The more independent agents become from their principal, the more opportunity they have to deviate. (See Alchian and Demsetz 1972, Moe 1984). A principal-agent model predicts a reduction in compliance as control and goal congruency lessens. This suggests the more distance in the hierarchy increases between principal and agent, compliance will decrease. Applying this to the current study, we would expect to find a decline in the number of community policing policy supporters as we move to the lower levels of the rank structure. To thoroughly understand the difficulties police executives face, we need to more closely examine traditional police organizational structures.

Traditional Police Organizational Structure
icing philosophies are incompatible with traditional police organizational practices and structures (McElroy, Esgrove and Sadd 1993; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990). The failure of previous policy implementation attempts, such as team policing, lends legitimacy to concerns about the revival of community policing. To better understand the contradictions of community policing and traditional organizations, we need to re-conceptualize the problem of control.

The Control Problem

Implementing policy is fundamentally a matter of control. Managers must reduce employees to perform specific tasks in a proscribed manner. Public bureaucracies, such as the police, rely on organizational structure to control employees. The organizational mappings of the police—military rank, hierarchy, and discipline—give the appearance of a rigid command and control of subordinates. Police managers, however, may find that additional structural constraints and control mechanisms have limited effect on the actions of officers.

The perils of implementation must be identified and appropriate responses must be carefully incorporated into policy design (Pressman and Wildavsky 1979). Policy implementation is a dynamic rather than mechanical process. Chiefs, who implement new policy, must convince or compel officers to adjust their behavior to conform to new guidelines. However, line-level police officers operate in an environment that affords considerable discretion in how they perform their daily activities (Goldstein 1977; Lipsey 1980; Manning 1979; Sparrow, Moore and Kennedy 1990). Police officers may use their discretion to undermine the traditional command and control mechanisms of police managers (Wilson 1963). To better understand this issue, we will recast control as a principal-agent problem.

The principal (police chief) with goals and objectives to accomplish, contracts the services of agents (officers) to perform specific or general tasks (Moe 1984). Each party has power over some aspects of the interaction. The more independent agents become from their principal, the more opportunity they have to deviate. (See Alchian and Demsetz 1972, Moe 1984). A principal-agent model predicts a reduction in compliance as control and goal congruency lessens. This suggests that, as distance in the hierarchy increases between principal and agent, compliance will decrease. Applying this to the current study, we would expect to find a decline in the number of community policing policy supporters in the lower levels of the rank structure. To thoroughly understand the difficulties police executives face, we need to more closely examine traditional police organizational structure.

Traditional Police Organizational Structure

Role of Top Command

Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990) believe that support from the top command is crucial to implementing community policing. The support of top management is essential in conquering the “control and power problems” associated with implementing policy change (Moorhead and Griffin 1992). Oettemeier and Brown (1988) feel upper management must provide incentives and encouragement. Greene, Bergman and McLaughlin (1994) found evidence top command officers resist change in an attempt to cling to power. There is, however, little in the literature regarding the role of the top command staff in changing police organizations.

Role of Middle Management

Progress Era reforms and the adoption of Taylor’s scientific management theory expanded the numbers and scope of middle managers. Zubloff (1984) describes how middle managers became the repository of knowledge in organizations. This guardianship of organizational knowledge may allow middle managers to manipulate the flow and access to information and, as a result, gain power beyond that proscribed by their hierarchical position.

By controlling the organizational communication process, middle managers are able to control perception. Organizations develop technical vocabularies and classification schemes to facilitate communication (Perrow 1986). This
allows middle managers to define problems and acceptable solutions and to influence organizational actions. The support of middle managers is particularly important during the implementation of community policing (Clairmont 1991, Sparrow et al. 1990, Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990; Walker 1993). Middle managers separate knowledge from power, define work, control discretion by manipulating of the value system, and have routinely quashed new ideas (Sparrow et al. 1990). Community policing advocates tout participative management and decentralizing decision making to encourage more line-level decision-making. If middle managers perceive that participative management undermines their role, they will likely resist new policies (Buch and Spangler 1990, Lawler and Mohrman 1991, Meyer and Stott 1991, Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990).

Sherman (1986) blames middle managers for sabotaging the reform efforts of team policing. Sparrow (1988:6) says that middle management can become a “barrier to the dissemination of the new values” in organizations. “Successful implementation of community policing will depend on how well mid-level police managers, most of whom have based their careers on traditional policing, accept such change.” (Roberg 1994, Also see Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990) For community policing to survive, middle managers must embrace the change (Sparrow 1988, Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990).

On the other hand, Greene, Bergman and McLaughlin (1994) challenge the notion that middle managers are likely to resist policy change. They found middle managers the most likely to embrace community policing. They argue that middle managers are only moderately vested in the past, and they are likely to remain members of the organization long enough to reap future benefits.

**Role of First-Line Supervisors**

The first-line supervisor is an “integral part of the management” team and essential to the achievement of the police mission (Wilson 1963). They may, however, resist expanding the role of line officers. First-line supervisors may feel threatened by the expanding role of line officers (Clairmont 1991). The traditional role of first-line supervisors does not prepare them for the new freedom and independence community policing grants officers, and they may react by resisting or sabotaging programs (Goldstein 1990).

**Role of Line Officers**

Line officers link the organization to the community and are best positioned to understand community needs (Alpert and Dunham 1992, Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990). Nevertheless, many have found that line officers actively resist community policing (Greene et al. 1994, Trojanowicz 1982). Goldstein (1990) states that officers may be very possessive of their free patrol time, and they may challenge time management efforts to convert free patrol time to problem-solving activities. Even after ten years in New York and Houston, little support to their department's community policing efforts (Sadler and Grinc 1992).

Clairmont (1991:477) found that officers often “accept and sometimes welcome a larger investigative role but are quite reluctant to engage in proactive activity whether this be crime prevention, public education, or community problem-solving.” Officers accept role expansion when it conforms to the traditional image of policing; thus they resist more citizen-oriented tasks.

Some blame organizations' disciplinary systems for line officers' resistance. Traditional disciplinary systems stifle risk taking. If officers are to expose themselves to risk, “the department's management style and disciplinary system have to undergo radical transformation.” (Sparrow et al. 1990)

**Role of Training and Planning**

**Management Theory**

**Police Training**

From the time August Vollmer established the first police school (Carte and Carte 1975), training played an integral role
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Role of First-Line Supervisors

The first-line supervisor is an “integral part of the management” team and essential to the achievement of the police mission (Wilson 1963). They may, however, resist expanding the role of line officers. First-line supervisors may feel threatened by the expanding role of line officers (Clairmont 1991). The traditional role of first-line supervisors does not prepare them for the new freedom and independence community policing grants officers, and they may react by resisting or sabotaging programs (Goldstein 1990).

Role of Line Officers

Line officers link the organization to the community and are best positioned to understand community needs (Alpert and Dunham 1992, Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990). Nevertheless, many have found that line officers actively resist community policing (Greene et al. 1994, Trojanowicz 1982). Goldstein (1990) states that line officers may be very possessive of their free patrol time, and they may challenge time management efforts to convert free patrol time to problem-solving activities. Even after ten years, officers in New York and Houston gave little support to their department’s community policing efforts (Sadd and Grinc 1996).

Clairmont (1991:477) found that officers often “accept and sometimes welcome a larger investigative role; but are quite reluctant to engage in proactive activity whether this be crime prevention, public education or community problem-solving.” Officers accept role expansion when it conforms to the traditional image of policing, but they resist more citizen-oriented tasks.

Some blame organizations’ disciplinary systems for line officers’ resistance. Traditional disciplinary systems stifle risk taking. If officers are to expose themselves to risk, “the department’s management style and disciplinary system have to undergo radical transformation.” (Sparrow et al. 1990:210)

Role of Training and Planning in Management Theory

Police Training

From the time August Vollmer established the first police school in 1908 (Carte and Carte 1975), training has played an integral role in the professional image of the police. In reality though, police officers receive little training (Walker, Walker and McDavid 1993) and little attention is paid to the effectiveness of the training they do receive (Scarborough et al. 1998). Most often, the purpose of police training is to improve specific vocational skills (Hunt and Magenua 1993, Scarborough et al. 1998). Training is given a low priority and is frequently the first victim of financial cuts (Goldstein 1977).

Police training has many purposes. Aside from developing skills and proficiency, training is a vehicle for changing subordinates’ thinking, values or attitudes (Alpert and Dunham 1992, Goldstein 1977). Managers train employees to both increase employees’ levels of commitment and to reduce the organization’s civil liability (Mastrofski and Ritti 1996). Training has a role in shaping or structuring decisions (Gilbert 1977, Rourke 1984, Simon 1976). If subordinates fear what they do not understand, then managers can use training to overcome resistance (Inman 1994) and gain subordinates’ compliance (Bittner 1970). Finally, training helps to meet individuals’ need for achievement (Moorhead and Griffin 1992).

Planning requires the active participation of all officers engaged in implementing new programs (Sherman 1986).

Involving employees in planning makes it easier to implement programs (Kelling and Moore 1988) and facilitates more uniform and more committed implementation (Moorhead and Griffin 1992, Walton 1986). Inclusion lessens potential points of resistance. Officers in community policing agencies may become disenchanted if they feel excluded while the advice of civilians is being sought (Sadd and Grinc 1994).

Everyone involved in the implementing new policy should be included in the planning process (Oettmeier and Brown 1988, Peters and Waterman 1982). However, the support of middle managers is particularly important. Middle managers have a powerful influence on policy implementation (Sherman et al. 1973). Including them in planning encourages their support (Kelling and Bratton 1993). It motivates them to support new policies by acknowledging their self-interests (NIJ 1995b).

In summary, planning and training have both communicative and control functions. Including employees in planning and training supplements the organization’s communication networks. It provides an opportunity for the principal to ensure that agents understand policy goals.
Inclusion in planning and training supplements the organization’s communication networks. It provides an opportunity for the principal to ensure that agents understand policy goals. Returning to a principal-agent lexicon, inclusion in planning and training furnishes agents with information to clarify the principal’s intent. It may also help agents to more effectively manipulate events to their advantage. The effect of this additional information is not yet clear.

Methodology

Community Policing and the Principal-Agent Model

We examine agents’ (officers’) support for the policies of their principal (chief) along with their place in the rank structure. The model proposes that agents’ capacity to distance themselves from their principal increases opportunities to pursue their own interests as well as resist direction.

Training and participation in planning are mechanisms for controlling the behavior of employees. We explore their effect throughout the hierarchy. First, we investigate whether position in the hierarchy affects level of support or resistance. Hierarchy is a device to transmit information. It is designed to transmit relevant information to decision makers and filter extraneous information from the decision process. Agents, however, may use this filtering function and structural distance to further their personal interests or obscure their actions. If engaged in personal, rather than organizational pursuits, this behavior may be measurable as diminished support for a policy. We next examine whether the effects of hierarchy are alleviated through training and planning.

Research Design

This study is a secondary analysis of data from a national survey of police departments practicing community policing in the United States (See Trojanowicz et al. 1994). The original study examined the evolution of community policing in the U.S. using an extensive survey instrument asking 168 questions on a variety of community policing issues. Police chiefs were asked to identify supporters and resisters of community policing in their organizations. Each level of the rank structure was examined as were variables related to training and planning.

Study Population and Response Rate

At the time of the survey (late 1992-early 1993), there were nearly seventeen thousand (17,000) law enforcement agencies in the United States. Most were relatively small and employed few officers (Reaves 1992a, 1992b). To reduce some of the disparity between units of analysis, only larger departments were surveyed.

The study population was limited to police organizations with one hundred (100) or more officers or serving a population of more that fifty thousand (50,000) people. Approximately 4.2
percent of local police departments and 9.4 percent of all sheriffs departments employ one hundred (100) or more sworn officers (Reaves 1992a, 1992b). Furthermore, approximately 4.5 percent of all local police departments and 26.7 percent of all sheriffs departments served a population of fifty thousand (50,000) or more people (Reaves 1992a, 1992b). There are 686 police organizations meeting the specified criteria (identified by the Police Executive Research Forum). Data were collected by the National Center for Community Policing at Michigan State University in cooperation with the Behavioral Sciences Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Surveys were sent to the chiefs of all 686 police organizations meeting the size requirement. Five hundred fifty-five (555) surveys were returned for a return rate of 81%. Nine (9) of the surveys were unusable. Of the remaining 546 usable questionnaires, 222 reported to have implemented community policing. This study is based on the data from those 222 questionnaires.

Research Questions

Police chiefs were asked to identify community policing supporters within their organizations. The issue was addressed from two directions. First the survey sought to identify responses at each rank level (five ordinal options, enthusiastic to negative). Second, chiefs were asked to identify three groups expressing the greatest resistance to community policing from a list including top command, middle management, first-line supervision, motor patrol, dispatchers, civilians, special units, and others.

Next, we examined variables for training and planning. A scale was constructed for the level of training (four ordinal options, extensive to none) and a dummy variable for involvement in planning (1 = involved, 0 = not involved) for officers at each rank level. These responses were coded for use in logistic regression models. Support for community policing was the dependent variable and training and inclusion in planning at each rank level were independent variables.

Finally, we made an adjustment to overcome a flaw in the survey instrument. The question measuring the support of line officers was worded differently than the question for higher ranks. This made it impossible to make direct comparisons between line officers and officers from higher ranks. Nevertheless, a suitable question was found to measure the resistance of line officers. (Has the chief met resistance from motor patrol? [yes =1, no =0]) In addition, a question was found to measure levels of support of line officers on an ordinal scale (five ordinal options, great extent to not at all) and was suitable for chi-square analysis.

Results

An interesting pattern emerged: chiefs identified the groups expressing the greatest resistance to community policing. The rank structure was a useful predictor of levels of resistance. Chiefs reported that resistance increased as rank declined. In another section of our model, as the distance between the principal and agents increased, policy support diminished.

See Table 1

In another section of the survey, chiefs were asked their perception of support rather than resistance, for community policing at each rank level. Once again, chiefs perceived diminished support as rank level declined. An overwhelming majority of top command officers (87.7%) were supportive, as compared to 66.5% of middle managers and 60.2% of first line supervisors. Officers in upper ranks were more supportive than lower-ranking officers to community policing policies.

When the question was reworded to ask which officers did not support community policing, the same pattern emerged: A majority (70.8%) of top command officers offered no resistance to community policing, while only 40.3% of middle managers and 36.0% of line supervisors offered no resistance.

The data consistently supported an inverse association between support...
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Results

An interesting pattern emerged when chiefs identified the groups expressing the greatest resistance to community policing. The rank structure was a useful predictor of levels of resistance. Chiefs reported that resistance increased as rank declined. In terms of our model, as the distance between the principal and agents increased, policy support diminished.

See Table 1

In another section of the survey, chiefs were asked their perception of support, rather than resistance, for community policing at each rank level. Once again, chiefs perceived diminished support as rank level declined. An overwhelming majority of top command officers (87.7%) were supportive, as compared to 66.5% of middle managers and 60.2% of first-line supervisors. Officers in upper ranks were more supportive than lower-ranking officers to chiefs' community policing policy.

When the question was reworded to ask which officers did not resist community policing, the same pattern emerged. A majority (70.8%) of top command officers offered no resistance to community policing, while only 46.5% of middle managers and 36.0% of first-line supervisors offered no resistance. The data consistently support an inverse association between support for community policing and rank.

Training

Next we examined the effect of training. The variable for training was significantly associated with levels of support from top command officers. The goodness-of-fit statistic for the model (87.56%) was very good. The training variable for top command officers is an efficient predictor for determining levels of support for community policing.

Turning to lower ranks, training continues to be an effective, though less efficient, predictor of support for community policing. The goodness-of-fit statistics for these models are not as strong and the betas are smaller. The positive effects of training diminish as you move down the rank structure. At each descending step of the rank structure, more training is required before support is found.

See Table 2

Planning

Finally, we examined the planning models. At each rank level, officers' response to community policing was compared to participation in the planning process. The data is presented in the same format as the training data.

The planning models are very similar to the training models. Levels of training and involvement in planning are nearly
equally useful in predicting levels of support for community policing. Once again, the association diminishes as you move down the hierarchy. The planning variable was the most efficient predictor of support for top command officers and became less efficient in predicting support from lesser ranks, as indicated by smaller betas and goodness-of-fit statistics.

Creating a combined model, both training and planning, produced similar results. The pattern of diminishing effect was again observed. However, these bivariate models were not markedly superior to single variable models in predicting levels of support.

**Discussion**

Participation in training and planning are only partial remedies for the problems caused by hierarchical distance between the principal and agents. The association we found between levels of support for community policing and position in the hierarchy confirms levels of support decline as you descend the rank structure. Agents may be using hierarchical distance to resist policy initiatives and thwart the principal's desires. Subordinates may manipulate information and communication channels for their own benefit. Distance may foster an agent's opportunity to pursue his or her own interests over those of their principal.

Or, this may demonstrate decay in communications or control as hierarchical distances increase. Both command-and-control advocates and advocates of participatory management promote training as an effective management tool. The data supports an association between officers' responses and participating in training, and it is a useful predictor of support for community policing. The reason though remains unclear. Training may foster support or ameliorate resistance to community policing. It is unknown whether increased support stems from increased control or greater self-actualization.

Proponents of participatory management also tout inclusion in planning to improve performance. Again, without knowing if the mechanism is self-actualization or control, the data supports the belief that participating in planning can increase support for a policy.

Unfortunately, the association between inclusion in training and planning and support diminishes as you move down the hierarchy and significantly declines for line officer. Any effect is weak for line officers. This may mean that the hierarchical distance overpowers the positive effects of training and planning, or current efforts lack sufficient intensity or specificity. More research is needed, but it is clear much more training or involvement in planning are required to raise levels of support of officers in the lower ranks.

Lacking clear causal relationships, we can only speculate why training and planning are associated with policy support. Traditional management theories suggest it may derive from more efficient communication. Human relations management theory suggests support will increase as individuals develop skills and achieve self-actualization. Support may also result from one or a combination of factors: control, communication or co-optation. Before exploring each mechanism in greater detail, we emphasize the key appears to be inclusion. Including officers in the process of implementation, through planning or training, tends to increase levels of support. This is the finding policymakers and managers should take from this study.
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Participation in training and planning are only partial remedies for the problems caused by hierarchical distance between the principal and agents. The data we found between levels support for community policing and position in the hierarchy confirms levels support decline as you descend the rank structure. Agents may be using hierarchical distance to resist policy initiatives and thwart the principal’s wishes. Subordinates may manipulate formation and communication channels for their own benefit. Distance may foster an agent’s opportunity to pursue his or her own interests over those of their principal.

Unfortunately, the association between inclusion in training and planning and support diminishes as you move down the hierarchy and significantly declines for line officer. Any effect is weak for line officers. This may mean that the hierarchical distance overpowers the positive effects of training and planning, or current efforts lack sufficient intensity or specificity. More research is needed, but it is clear much more training or involvement in planning are required to raise levels of support of officers in the lower ranks.

Lacking clear causal relationships, we can only speculate why training and planning are associated with policy support. Traditional management theories suggest it may derive from more efficient communication. Human relations management theory suggests support will increase as individuals develop skills and achieve self-actualization. Support may also result from one or a combination of factors: control, communication or co-optation. Before exploring each mechanism in greater detail, we emphasize the key appears to be inclusion. Including officers in the process of implementation, through planning or training, tends to increase levels of support. This is the finding policymakers and managers should take from this study.

Inclusion may provide principals greater control of agents. Through training or participation in planning, agents may perceive their ability to manipulate actions and information is restricted. Roles may be more clearly defined and sanctions may appear more likely for deviating from proscribed roles. If principals can limit the options available to agents, they achieve greater compliance. This may explain why line-level officers (working with wide discretion and little supervision) are less affected by training and inclusion in planning than are other ranks.

Planning and training may merely fulfill their intended purpose and enhance the communication process. They may clarify the principal’s intent and better specify the role of agents. When roles and expectations are more clearly drawn, agents may become more confident of their role and feel less threatened by unknown forces. Feeling more secure, agents need to expend less energy and fewer personal resources to protect their interests. This explanation, though, does not reconcile the diminished effectiveness of training and planning for line officers.

Principals may co-opt the support of agents through the process of planning or training. As agents become more familiar with new policy, they may discover personal benefits (advancement, better working environment, status, independence, opportunities to shirk). Agents may decide to trade their current
prerogatives for potentially more satisfying opportunities. The new policy then becomes less threatening to agents who are transformed from resisters to supporters. Again, this explanation is left wanting because of the diminished effect on line officers. If discovering new benefits is a valid mechanism, then it appears that line officers find few potential advantages to community policing. Planning and training are, no doubt, factors in determining the level of resistance to program implementation, but other forces play important roles. We need to more closely examine program implementation to understand support for and resistance to change. Advocates should be cautious in presuming that inclusion in planning and training alone will propel community policing beyond the threshold of acceptance necessary to transform police organizations. This study demonstrates that the relationship is more complex and influenced by structural factors.

**Conclusion**

It is difficult to bring about meaningful change in complex organizations. Recent efforts to reform policing have achieved limited success. Attempts to change policing by altering structure (Bloch and Bell 1976; Sherman et al. 1973), procedure (Pate, Bowers and Parks 1976; Police Foundation 1981) or changing the characteristics of officers (Wycoff and Kelling 1978) fell short. Efforts to change police agencies often underestimated the interpersonal relationships in organizations and their effects on the success of policy. We have shown the limitations of tools police managers are likely to use. Participation in planning and training alleviates some of the problems associated with hierarchy but is less effective as hierarchical distance increases. Managers may need to adjust organizational structures and practices to achieve greater control. However until we more fully understand the internal dynamics of police organizations, restructuring is a haphazard prospect.

Many police managers have already begun the search for more effective management techniques. Cooperative management approaches (Barnard 1968), shaping information flow (Simon 1976), and management through values (Peters and Waterman 1982; Peters 1988) deserves close scrutiny. Each of these strategies can be incorporated into police training and planning. To be successful in the future, police supervisors may need to redefine structures, strategies, and their role as managers.
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Table 1 Rank Level & Resistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks &amp; Units</th>
<th>Reported Resistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Command</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Line Supervisors</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Patrol</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Training and Response in Rank Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.R.</th>
<th>Goodness of Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAINING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Command</td>
<td>3.928***</td>
<td>.8991</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.1425</td>
<td>.4140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers</td>
<td>2.3473***</td>
<td>.6462</td>
<td>67.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.3604</td>
<td>.3219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Line Supervisors</td>
<td>1.5816*</td>
<td>.6221</td>
<td>61.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.1947</td>
<td>.4015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Command</td>
<td>3.8529***</td>
<td>.6629</td>
<td>89.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.6931</td>
<td>.6124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers</td>
<td>1.6454***</td>
<td>.3798</td>
<td>72.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.5798</td>
<td>.3338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Line Supervisors</td>
<td>1.1120***</td>
<td>.3117</td>
<td>65.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.2296</td>
<td>.2406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAINING &amp; PLANNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Command Training</td>
<td>3.4783***</td>
<td>.9069</td>
<td>89.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Command Planning</td>
<td>2.5235***</td>
<td>.7063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.1049*</td>
<td>.7512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers Training</td>
<td>1.6798*</td>
<td>.6769</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers Planning</td>
<td>1.3244***</td>
<td>.3997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.8035***</td>
<td>.4165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Line Supervisor Training</td>
<td>1.0252*</td>
<td>.6723</td>
<td>65.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Line Supervisor Planning</td>
<td>0.8417*</td>
<td>.3469</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.4480</td>
<td>.3308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 3 Level of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Training</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Totals            | 100%

Table 4 Level of Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Planning</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Rank structure and job functions vary from study to study. 2 Collection of the data was directed as such by the Opinions expressed in this report necessarily reflect the views of the authors.
### Table 3 Line Officer Training and Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Support</th>
<th>Low Support</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Training</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Training</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Training</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 17.1972, p < .001$, Kendall Tau-$C = .1125$

### Table 4 Line Officer Planning and Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Support</th>
<th>Low Support</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Planning</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Planning</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Planning</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 11.92759, p < .001$, Kendall Tau-$C = .14543$

1. Ranks structure and job functions vary between police departments. For this study, top command refers to the ranks above captain; middle management refers to lieutenants and captains; and first-line supervisors to sergeants and corporals.

2. Collection of the data was directed and substantially funded by Dr. Robert C. Trojszewicz. Opinions expressed in this study are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the views of Dr. Trojszewicz.