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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a qualitative study on the strategic decision processes in law enforcement by examining the reasons why law enforcement executives in the United States choose to either participate or not to participate in national police accreditation, known as CALEA (Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies), for their agencies. Police accreditation was introduced into the United States as part of an overall strategy to raise the professional status of law enforcement agencies by standardizing operating procedures. In 1979, through support from the U.S. Department of Justice four major professional police associations, the International Chiefs of Police Association (IACP), the National Association of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), the National Sheriffs' Association (NSA), and the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), created a national accrediting body for the police, CALEA. CALEA subsequently established national police standards for law enforcement agencies in the United States which have continually evolved over the years.
After almost forty years, however, only a small percentage of law enforcement agencies in the United States are nationally accredited. In the meantime, research on accreditation in general as well as on police performance and effectiveness suggests that there are few measurable differences between accredited and non-accredited organizations in performance and resource allocation while these studies have provided limited impact on organizational cultures and informal structures. Nonetheless, accreditation’s symbolic value of professionalism as a means to maintain legitimacy and stability for the organization and its leaders in police circles is difficult to quantify and should not be underestimated. There may be hidden benefits with accreditation that are difficult to measure. Thus, they have not yet been realized.

This study assesses the role of choices and accountability qualitatively through intensive interviews with twenty-eight law enforcement leaders from both accredited and non-accredited law enforcement agencies of various sizes and type. These are drawn from five geographic areas in the United States and include local police departments, sheriffs’ offices, primary state authorities, transportation police, and campus law enforcement. This study uses an abductive approach to identify and analyze the variables involved in the decisions made about accreditation. The data developed are used to test three relevant theories of organization concerning the relationship between agency and structure in order to provide a more cogent explanation for organizational choices and direction.
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INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem and Research Questions

The establishment of accreditation within institutional fields as a management strategy for professionalizing an organization has gradually increased over the last forty years and continues to spread. This development has been fueled by the notion in public administration that professionalism can be achieved through the diffusion of contemporary ideas and innovative practices. Accreditation requires an organization to voluntarily adopt formal policies and procedures or industry standards authorized independently by outside organizations and governing bodies. These accrediting bodies normally audit the organization periodically or require that a specific set of criteria be achieved within a specified timeframe in order to ensure compliance with established standards. Proponents of accreditation assert that it improves organizational procedures and results in the introduction of innovative and more effective practices. More importantly, they argue that accreditation ostensibly instills a culture of professionalism within the organization.

National police accreditation was controversial at the very outset when in the 1970’s the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), the National Sheriff’s Association (NSA), the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), and the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) began the process of establishing national policing standards and, as a result, formed the
Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA). The four founding organizations initially produced over 900 professional standards; created a process of self-assessment of policies and procedures, as well as standards concerning equipment and facilities; required an on-site assessment, annual reporting, and maintenance of accreditation through periodic on-site assessments; and established an independent commission to oversee the standards and process (Cordner and Hartley, 2010).

Law enforcement accreditation in the United States, however, has always been a voluntary process since its inception. Although professional licenses and credentials are critical elements for professions, a surprisingly small number of American law enforcement agencies are nationally accredited. Despite the fact that additional law enforcement agencies are accredited independently through state accrediting bodies, the majority of American law enforcement agencies are not accredited. After almost forty years the participation rate in CALEA in 2010 is under five percent, or approximately one-thousand agencies nationwide.¹ This low rate of acceptance for CALEA is somewhat misleading, however, in that it doesn’t reflect the number of agencies who choose to skip CALEA in favor of local and state accreditation processes, while the Bureau of Justice Statistics, which reports the number of police agencies in the United States, broadly defines them simply as having at least one full-time or equivalent in part-time officers.

Still, it seems unusual that more agencies choose not to participate in accreditation in that the police are highly institutionalized and operate in a value-laden environment that is embraced by myth, ceremony and ritual for its survival. Since the public is often cynical about the competency level, professionalism and motives of its government and public safety agencies, police accreditation would appear to demonstrate on the surface a powerful means of providing evidence that an agency is operating according to professional standards and best practices which is verified by an external national accrediting body (Cordner and Hartley, 2010:1). Moreover, laws enforcement agencies are subject to external normative and coercive pressures to adopt practices judged as “innovative” from professional police associations and organizations while their leadership are also members of these powerful and influential groups that pressure agencies to conform to standardized practices. Consequently, through their cohesive social networks the communication and adoption of other organizational innovations, such as community policing and the data-driven operational strategies of Compstat (computer statistics/crime analysis), have been widely embraced by a variety of law enforcement agencies in the United States in some shape or form. This has been the case despite geographical distances, as well as distinctions in agency size and mission, and authority, and the absence of extensive data analysis of its benefits and results.

Widespread acceptance cannot be said for police accreditation, however. It may be that prior studies on accreditation strongly suggest that it does not
provide a substantial impact on performance and results for the organization while placing greater emphasis on process. Though accreditation is an attempt by proponents to address the concept of professionalism by introducing universal standards to a highly decentralized policing field and may have some concealed benefits for an agency, how is it that leaders are able to reject it in the face of normative and coercive pressures? Are there conflicting pressures within the environment, such as union or political issues that deter leaders from seeking accreditation? Consequently, it is critical that we understand the nature and context of these decisions to either choose or reject the process of becoming nationally accredited. It would be beneficial to understand the need to understand the innovations and diffusion processes around “best” practices within a highly decentralized field.

Overall, there has been a lack of extensive research on police accreditation since its inception in 1979, unlike the numerous studies that were conducted on community policing and other police initiatives over the last thirty years. This limited research has also failed to provide any in-depth analysis as to why law enforcement leaders have not adopted it or embraced the idea of accreditation as they did with community policing or even Compstat. With the possible exception of Manuel Theodora’s 2006 study, which argued that chief executive officers acted as bureaucratic entrepreneurs who implemented accreditation as a strategy of improving status for job mobility, prior research on accreditation for police or other professions and institutions has been mainly quasi-experimental and focused
mostly on accreditation's effect to either processes in organizational operations and performance or output and results.

This research therefore looks to fill the gap in the literature with a sociological and managerial analysis of accreditation. Overall, it seeks to understand why some leaders of law enforcement agencies participate in accreditation while others choose not to. These leaders are subject to competing expectations of accreditation as a source of professionalization and legitimacy, while on the other hand they suspect or are convinced that there are little measurable differences in performance and results between accredited and non-accredited agencies. This research seeks to identify the variations in institutional pressures and isomorphic processes, that is to say the environmental conditions that affect executive decisions and organizational direction in policing. The study asks three questions:

1. How decisions are made by law enforcement leaders with regards to participating or rejecting national police accreditation;
2. Why are these decisions made and what is the context in which they are made; and
3. What is the relationship between the strategic choice or purposive action and the environmental influences and culture in the structure of organizational decisions?

The study will identify and explain these independent variables through an abductive analysis at the individual-level of three competing organizational
theories. Resource Dependency, Institutional Theory, and Strategic Choice and Contingency analysis to test which one(s) offer the more germane answers to these questions. The comparison of the three organizational theories through the abductive analysis will provide an ancillary benefit by addressing some of their limitations in evaluating the role of both agency and determinism with regard to adaptation and change. Specifically, institutional theory recognizes that while the individual, organizational and organizational field dynamics are interconnected the majority of research on institutional work has focused on the organizational level and the organizational field level, which has undermined actors' agency in social phenomena or change at the macro-level.

In response, Zucker (1991), Hirsch and Lounsbury (1997), and Battilana and D'Aunno (2009) have indicated that the ambiguity over actors' agency in institutional theory undermines the ability of researchers to explain macro-level phenomena and institutionalizing processes. Consequently, Battilana and D'Aunno (2009) have identified a need for research on institutional work at the individual-level which this study is focused on. Likewise, resource dependency is an economic approach that is largely deterministic and asserts that organizations attempt to adapt and manage constraints and uncertainty because of their need to acquire resources from the environment. Yet it does not address the various cooptive strategies organizations will implement or how the use of these strategies vary over time. Both Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) have conceded that the theory does not account for everything about organizations. Meanwhile, strategic choice
and contingency analysis recognizes that rational actor models tend to disregard the environmental influences on actors’ decisions (Battilana and D’Aunno, 2009). Consequently, it focuses on the role of managers in influencing conditions and processes both outside and within the organization. It draws upon the social action approach within sociology following the ideas of Weber, Berger and Luckman, Bourdieu, and Giddens, and strategic management theory, in order to advance the view that not all executive decisions are predetermined, but that managerial action can impact performance (Child, 1997). Overall, an abductive analysis approach to the data using the three organizational theories may provide the framework for the construction of a new or hybrid theory (Timmermans and Tavory, 2012).

**Data and Methods**

Through a purposive, non-probability sampling method, twenty-eight intensive interviews from preset questions were conducted for several months beginning in the summer of 2014. These involved CEOs and law enforcement leaders from both accredited agencies and non-accredited agencies of various sizes within five specified regions in the United States: Northeast; South; Midwest; Mountain; and Pacific. It included local police departments, sheriffs’ offices, primary state authorities, transportation police, and campus law enforcement. The interviews were conducted either in-person or by telephone due to geographic distances. All interviews were recorded, transcribed and coded in order to triangulate the variables involved in the executive decisions and organizational
choices to either participate or not participate in national police accreditation within their respective institutional environment. The coding, triangulation and analysis of the variables was facilitated by QSR International’s NVivo 11.

An abductive analysis of the qualitative data was used to identify and measure the relevant merits of the organizational theories of resource dependency, institutional and strategic choice and contingency analysis in order to generate the theoretical explanations for the interaction of agency and structure with decisions regarding accreditation. The abduction approach was chosen as an innovative inferential process designed to assist in analyzing the variables in an effort to provide a relevant explanation as well as to possibly construct a new or hybrid hypothesis or theory based on some of the unexpected research evidence. While traditional grounded theory is a generally preferred method of inductive research, it also inhibits theory development because of its primary focus on induction. On the other hand, since abductive analysis of this research begins with a theoretical foundation of resource dependency, institutional and strategic choice and contingency analysis, and is reiterative which allowed for both inductive and deductive forms of reasoning (Timmermans and Tavory, 2012).

**Summary of Empirical Findings**

The abductive analysis of the data revealed the following empirical findings. Statements, or responses, by the participants, as well and the themes that surfaced during the interviews, which supported a particular organizational
perspective, were coded accordingly to the characteristics of each theory. This resulted in the following order of coded references from the participants: First, institutional theory with 51.3% of coded references; secondly, strategic choice and contingency analysis with 33.3% of coded references; and lastly, resource dependency which had 15.4% of the coded references. The lack of coded variables to support a resource dependence perspective when compared to the other two could have possibly been the result that institutional and strategic choice were more suited for this individual-level study on policing as opposed to resource dependency’s economic approach that is more suited at the macro level. Nonetheless, in twenty-seven out of the twenty-eight interviews, the respondents’ statements reinforced the characteristics, or variables, of all three organizational theories at some point during the interviews.

Generally, the three models overlapped and were interchangeable because of the polysemic themes generated in the interviews over choice, power, strategy and structure. The participants exposed the difficulty in defining the role and mission of police work.\(^2\) The interviews also presented evidence that the modern era of policing operates in a neo-Weberian state since it still retains much of its classical bureaucratic and socio-political structure and process despite progressive managerial and operational modifications to policing over the years (Stone and Rizova, 2014).

\(^2\) The complexity in defining the role and mission of police work as seen in the “nuanced” responses by the participants suggested some interesting parallels with current interpretations of the definition of meaning among social enterprises as shown in Caring Capitalism: The Meaning and Measure of Social Value, 2016: Cambridge University Press, by Professor Emily Barman, Boston University.
Law enforcement CEOs and executives from accredited organizations cited several fundamental reasons for pursuing police accreditation. Accreditation was believed to be an effective management tool that assisted their agencies in standardizing policies and operations, codifying practices and procedures, modernizing equipment and facilities, and improving their efficiency and services that, in the end, resulted in positive relations with the community. They also endorsed it as an effective means in managing and minimizing risks largely because of the requirements of the standards and the documentation required to support and maintain accreditation. Law enforcement CEOs and executives from accredited departments had a fair amount of power and influence as well as community support, while their agencies were well positioned within their institutional network. Community support sprang from a positive perception to the benefits of accreditation. The managers acknowledged, however, that there were law enforcement leaders who could be described as “bureaucratic entrepreneurs” in that they engaged in accreditation as a way of raising their professional status and improving their job mobility. Additionally, they recognized that police organizations were politically compelled during volatile times to pursue accreditation as a mechanism to reestablish public trust that had eroded because of internal conflict or overall community dissatisfaction with their departments.

On the other hand, law enforcement CEOs and executives who did not participate in police accreditation thought that it was overly time-consuming and placed an unwarranted strain on their critical resources. They stressed that it
amplified the bureaucratic nature of the police and that it was a redundant process since the mandatory accreditation standards were already in place or required by statute and practiced by both accredited and non-accredited departments. These participants also reported a lack of community support and enthusiasm for police accreditation due to budgetary constraints and concerns or familiarity with the process. Some of them conceded that while internal organizational conflict can be a positive mechanism for change, internal politics within their organizations effectively inhibited planning or implementation of accreditation because of union struggles with management, such as union concerns and resistance to changes in their work environment.

Overall, the data revealed that whether or not their organizations were accredited the participants believed that their organizations were able to function effectively even in a volatile and politically challenging environment because they maintained some control over their resources. The data also showed that the dissemination of policing strategy, such as police accreditation, was linked to politics, agency size, geographic location, and variations in the personal development of their executives. Police accreditation was widely perceived as a strategy conceived and formulated by police organizations and governmental bodies from the “northeast corridor” of the United States with the assistance from the Federal government and powerful criminal justice professional and fraternal organizations. Law enforcement executives who were exposed to police accreditation during their career development were more likely to pursue it.
Meanwhile, those from agencies, especially the larger ones, or from departments in particular regions, such as the west coast, were more likely not to engage in the accreditation process, rather used different mechanisms in order to improve their operations and maintain a standard level of professionalism.

**Organization of Dissertation**

This study examines the reasons why law enforcement executives in the United States choose to either participate or not participate in police accreditation for their agencies through a qualitative research design of twenty-eight interviews with CEOs and leaders from various law enforcement agencies around the country. It utilizes an abductive approach to identify and analyze the variables involved in the decisions made about accreditation by using the data to test three relevant theories about organization exploring the relationship between agency and structure in order to provide a more relevant explanation for organizational choices and direction. To accomplish this end, the study has been organized in four sections: 1) Chapter 1 provides the background and context with a historical look at the police since it was established and the development of a professional police model that emerged during that time. This eventually led to the establishment of national police accreditation, evolving strategies in policing, reinforcement of the bureaucratic nature of public administration and the pursuit of professionalism. The chapter also incorporates a literature review of previous studies on accreditation; 2) Chapter 2 presents the theoretical framework and
methodology for the study. It explains the abductive analysis, the research design for the study and the data results facilitated by QSR International’s NVivo 11. The third part, chapters 3, 4 and 5, are discussions of the empirical findings focused on resource-dependency, institutional theory and strategic choice and contingency analysis respectively. The final section, chapter 6, concludes with a neo-Weberian analysis of modern policing.
CHAPTER 1: ARE PROFESSIONS CONSPIRACIES AGAINST THE LAITY?

In order to uncover or develop any new sociological or managerial paradigm, theory or hybrid theory with regard to executive decisions and organizational choices made in policing, or to police accreditation, it is critical to understand the background and context in which they are made. First, what is the role and institutional environment of the police in the United States? Secondly, is policing a profession that can achieve a social status and industry standard as in other professions, such as in medicine, law or education? Third, what does it mean to be professional? Finally, what is the concept of accreditation and how and why did police accreditation develop? Chapter one provides the background and context with the development of American policing beginning in the mid-nineteenth century and its development of a professional policing model as part of the expansion of bureaucracy in public administration in the United States which generated into evolving strategies in policing. The chapter later describes the concept and development of accreditation in the United States that began with institutional higher education which eventually led to policing. The chapter concludes with a literature review on research on accreditation in the United States and police accreditation.

The Development of the American Police

Throughout its history, the American police have been multifaceted and performed a number of social functions and services. Municipal policing was
established in the United States during the middle part of the nineteenth century replacing an old night watch system used by local communities that had arguably began in Boston, Massachusetts in 1635. The establishment of the municipal police was a significant innovation from the old night watch system in that the police were uniformed and operated under a central command structure, signifying both their authority and the bureaucratic basis for it (Hunt and Magenau, 1993). The American police model was significantly influenced by the paramilitary design of the Metropolitan Police in London, England, which was established with the first Metropolitan Police Act in 1829 under England’s Home Secretary, Sir Robert Peel. In general, Peel is credited as being the architect of modern policing. Similar to the transformation in public safety in the United States, the Metropolitan Police superseded the local watch in London at that time. Since its inception, the American police have evolved into the most radically decentralized and localized law enforcement system in the world.

There have been three distinct epochs in the history of American policing since its establishment in the middle nineteenth century, commonly identified as the Political Era, the Reform or Professional Era and the Community Policing Era (Henry, 2003). During the Political Era, which extended to the early twentieth century when municipal governments were establishing police organizations, police agencies had a broad mandate and were “welfare-oriented” (Monkkonen, 3

3 “A Brief History of the Boston Police Department,” City of Boston Police Department (accessed December 3, 2009)

in that they were involved in many social services and regulatory functions in the absence of other specific municipal agencies. For instance, in addition to their public safety function, they supervised homeless shelters, performed building inspections and issued permits for the municipality. They were also known for their brutality, racism, inefficiency, and corruption. The American police were “enforcers of the status quo” (Niederhoffer and Blumberg, 1976) manipulated by local political interests. They were also highly decentralized and mismanaged because of their close relationships with local political organizations and role as “adjuncts of the political machine” (Fogelson, 1997). These local political organizations were mostly a decentralized group of loosely associated and mostly autonomous ward organizations from all political party affiliations that controlled the delivery of all municipal services (Fogelson, 1997). Police officers, meanwhile, were hired on “ward-based patronage” (Kelling and Coles, 1998); thus, their loyalty to local politicians was assured. Gratuities, extortion, corruption, and the lack of enforcement of unpopular vice and alcohol laws were core elements of the American police culture at the time.

Something was needed in order to free local police agencies from the clutches of local political power and parallel corruption scandals. Thus, the professional police model was developed and would provide a much needed role in the evolution of policing strategy because of the rapid transformation of internal and external pressures. The advancement in the late nineteenth century from the established practice of the police as an adjunct of the local political power to an
ideal design that promised to be an efficient, non-partisan, and impartial municipal government agency was an ideological accomplishment that brought American policing under a professional model. The Progressive Movement in the United States bureaucratized and rationalized the operations of the uniformed police and altered the balance of power and control relationships (Hunt and Magenau, 1993).

The Professional Police Model

At the turn of the twentieth century American society became restless with the country’s status quo and progressive individuals called for social, political, and economic reform. One of the critical goals of the Progressive Movement was to solidify the social position of the upper-middle and upper-classes by reforming urban institutions, such as the schools, the courts and the police. As part of the reform movement during the Progressive Era in American politics, the Professional Model in American policing surfaced against widespread public dissatisfaction with the conduct of police officers and corrupt practices of police agencies during the Political Era. Consequently, the early proponents of reform promoted a centralized and fairly autonomous bureaucratic agency structure which would be free from direct political control. The initiative to reform and professionalize the police was started by a handful of institutional entrepreneurs who were highly influential chiefs and police theorists that challenged the role and mission of the police at the time. They sought to protect police from corrupt political influences and interference, and redefine the role and identity of the police in developing effective and efficient ways
to reduce and prevent crime since other municipal agencies were being formed to handle most of the social services they were previously tasked to perform (Henry, 2003).

The professional police movement’s leaders valued technological advancement and emphasized public safety and crime fighting over social services to the community. They were also educated and influenced by the dominant management theories and practices of their day, which included insights derived from the writings of Frederick Taylor, Max Weber, Kurt Lewin, Vilfredo Pareto, and Chester Barnard. Their writings suggested a bureaucratic structure that had the potential for greater efficiency, control and accountability of personnel, and cost-effectiveness. More specifically, the principles of scientific management called for the standardization and specialization necessitating the development of written policies and procedures that would deal with every task or function officers could possibly be required to perform. These procedures would be accompanied with a corresponding specialized form or report. Scientific management complimented the principles of Weberian bureaucracy since they both shared an ideal view of organizations that emphasized efficiency and effectiveness, and offered practicable management models for directing and controlling the activities of personnel. These management and organization theories were appealing to police reformers and eventually shaped the organizational structures of police agencies as well as models for administrative public management. They then developed a
new police paradigm that came to be known as the *Professional Police Model* (Henry, 2003).

The professional police model evolved after the Second World War with the introduction of innovative tactics and technology, and progressively became the traditional method in policing. Consequently, by way of its single-minded devotion to crime, the performance of the American police was, for the most part, measured by the crime rate, arrest numbers, case clearance rates, number of traffic tickets issued, and rapid response to a service call. However, this method of evaluating the role and mission of the police in relation to crime and public safety would eventually prove to be flawed. Subsequent research and analyses on policing in America during the latter part of the twentieth century revealed that the separation of the police from the community went too far while current policing strategy was ineffective in reducing crime or controlling criminal behavior. For example, the 1967 President’s Crime Commission report raised serious questions about the effectiveness of law enforcement’s ability to impact crime. These reports, as well as internal scandals, fostered negative beliefs for many years that the larger police departments were dishonest and the police overall had little potential to impact crime or control criminal behavior (McDonald, 2002). A number of policing strategies and innovative practices would surface over the next forty years in response to the increasing crime rate, especially in violent crimes, and the resulting public dissatisfaction and they continued to emerge along with older ideas that have been refined or all too often reinvented.
**Evolving Strategies and Diffusion of Innovation**

American policing has experienced considerable changes over the last forty years. Within a short historical timeframe, the police reevaluated their fundamental mission, the quality and rationale of their core strategies of policing, and the nature of their relationships with their communities. The period of sudden and swift innovation in policing in recent decades were the result of a crisis that emerged since the late 1960s and did not occur behind the closed doors of police departments or other government offices. These critical philosophical changes in the nature and role in policing and transformations in their practices and operational procedures have been highly publicized in American newspapers, magazines and television. Some innovations, such as *community policing*, would come to be identified by its benefactor, The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, which had been a large federal agency that was created under the Violent Crime and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. Meanwhile, other new initiatives, such as *broken windows policing*, would be publicly debated and was hotly contested by a number of skeptics who felt it was zero-tolerance policing and order-maintenance that was leveled at disadvantaged people and minority neighborhoods. Overall, this period of variation has been dramatic and its significance rivals the radical reforms that established the municipal police in the nineteenth century as well as the professionalization of policing in the twentieth century, especially after the Second World War (Weisburd and Braga, 2006).
Community policing represented the first attempt to address some of the negative aspects of the Professional Police Model and make an attempt to recover the public legitimacy the American police lost during the urban riots of the 1960s and 1970s that accompanied the corruption scandals afflicting many of its large city departments. Community policing emerged from the work and research of scholars which was publicly supported by professional organizations such as the Police Foundation and the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP). In 1982, the Atlantic Monthly published an article about crime and policing strategy entitled, Broken Windows, which was written by James Q. Wilson and George L. Kelling. Wilson and Kelling’s argument was based on a 1981 Police Foundation study named the Newark Foot Patrol Experiment. In the article, the authors reasoned that there was a link between social disorder and crime and as such the police needed to return to foot patrols and focus their attention on maintaining order and reducing low-level social disorders that were traditionally seen as peripheral to the police function (Weisburd and Braga, 2006).

Broken Windows would radically influence the operational strategies of police departments in the United States in that it was instrumental in the development and diffusion of order maintenance policing and community policing as an innovative approach in policing. The “beat officer” was reintegrated into the neighborhoods and an “order maintenance” role replaced the “crime fighting” mission. Police abandoned their stance on neutrality and tried to address community disorder, the fear of crime and the quality of life issues through
collective action and communal ties. During this period there were conceptual confusions between order maintenance policing and community policing. Order maintenance policing, which was utilized by NYPD in the nineties, was a strategy whereby the police addressed community problems by managing minor offenses and neighborhood disorders, but was also criticized for its focus on low-income and minority neighborhoods. On the other hand, community policing sought to build community capacity to engage in informal social control in partnership with the police.

Police practices related to community policing have been diverse and have often been modified over time. For instance, the community policing principle that officers assigned to foot patrol within neighborhoods in the role of “community watchman” superseded the random patrol conducted by police vehicles in order to reconnect with the community, although it has fallen out of favor and not been a core piece of more recent community policing initiatives. Community policing has also been closely linked with other strategies, such as problem-oriented policing (POP), hence making the core components of community policing indistinguishable from those of other innovations that developed during this period (Weisburd and Braga, 2006).

Community policing is now more times than not referred to as community orientated policing (COP), which is said to structure organizational design and policing strategy to community involvement in order to address the issues of crime and social disorder. However, since COP has been criticized for being reactive, it
has been coupled with another initiative, *problem oriented policing* (POP), developed by the late police science academic, Herman Goldstein, from the University of Wisconsin—Madison. Goldstein rationalized that the police would be more effective in reducing or preventing crime if they analyzed and engaged in the behavioral problems that arose in the community since crime itself was mainly symptomatic of those social problems. *Pulling-levers policing* and *third-party policing*, meanwhile, were strategies that derived from Goldstein’s solution that the “tool box” of police strategies should be expanded. *Pulling-levers policing* adopted a problem-oriented approach and sought to develop a variety of “levers” to prevent offenders from continuing their criminal activities through criminal sanctions, social services and the exhaustion of community resources. *Third-party policing*, on the other hand, merged criminal law with the expansion of civil processes such as restitution and seizures, which were once considered exclusively covered by criminal statutes (Weisburd and Braga, 2006).

In the same way, *hot-spots policing*, surfaced after studies were conducted in Minneapolis, Minnesota in 1988, which focused police efforts to the areas and residences that generated the largest number of calls for service while *Compstat*, which is an operational approach based on supervisory accountability for crime statistics, expanded the strategy by shifting emphasis to the nature of the police organization itself. Likewise, *evidence-based policing* asserted that police strategy should be flexible and tied to scientific research (Weisburd and Braga, 2006). Overall, these new ideas and approaches surfaced usually in the aftermath of a
study on the police, hence their designation. Still, despite the fact that the policing strategies tend to be repetitive its terminology continues to swell, such as the most recent concepts of intelligence-led policing, predictive policing and community-based counterterrorism policing. Community policing and Compstat, to a lesser degree, appear to be the preferred language and approach for current operational strategy in policing.

Nonetheless, in spite of the rapid revisions of policing philosophy and strategy the professional police model’s bureaucratic doctrine of professionalizing the police through rigid control of its operations and personnel continues to remain a resilient influence in law enforcement’s management practices today in the United States. Police administrators never intended to hand over the reins of the department to the rank and file despite community policing’s canon of a flattened organizational structure in favor of a hierarchal one so that information flows both upward and downward so that the police agency becomes a learning organization. Thus, bureaucratic structures of police agencies persevere and the primary police patrol technology has remained largely intact for decades. Even the early involvement with the information technology revolution has not yet profoundly changed or improved policing structures and processes (Mastrofski and Willis, 2010). Police administrative practices remain primarily focused on internal operations of policies and procedures, budgeting, staffing, and internal affairs and complaints. Even though CALEA Police Accreditation was introduced during this period of rapid innovation, it has an unmistakable adherence to the professional
model (Cordner and Williams, 1999). While much seems to have changed over the last forty years one can easily argue that nothing has fundamentally changed since the era of the Professional Police Model.

**Bureaucracy and Public Administration**

Bureaucracy was generally regarded as the most efficient organizational form during most of the twentieth century since it instilled technical rationality into organizations. Max Weber (1922) is credited with establishing the origins of classical organizational theory within government, business and public administration. According to Weber, the bureaucratic organization was a rational solution to the modern complexities of industrialization. Bureaucratic society represented the domination of formalistic and substantive rationality. He suggested that the *ideal-type* of bureaucracy and bureaucratic administration was a more rational and efficient form of organization than the power and authority structures of *traditional authority* or *charismatic authority* that preceded it. Modern bureaucracy was representative of the social relations of modern society as well as a type of administrative structure developed in concert with a *rational-legal* mode of *authority* (Gerth and Mills, 1946; Scott, 2003). Bureaucratic administration, meanwhile, represented the fundamental exercise of control on the basis of knowledge, public legitimacy and legal authority. Power and status within organizations surfaced through hierarchal position and control.
Although the words bureaucracy or administration do not appear in the U.S. Constitution, the Founding Fathers anticipated the necessity of public administration since they themselves had been government officials or legislators within their respective states prior to 1787 and assumed that government functioned more efficiently under a bureaucratic structure. However, the early bureaucratic government organizations were not sophisticated. Larger, more complex government agencies with hierarchal authority and a division of labor of specially trained employees assigned to specialized offices began mostly after the Civil War. These bureaucratic institutions were created in order to perform tasks, such as professionalizing the army and diplomatic corps, collecting sufficient taxes through customs duties, distributing western lands that would also be accessible, as well as, constructing streets, water systems, sewer systems, post offices, police departments, and fire brigades within the emergent cities and towns (Goodsell, 2004).

The concept of public administration during the Progressive movement at the end of the nineteenth century was in response to concerns of inefficiency and corruption in government as well as by desire to provide a foundation for a prosperous business enterprise (Goodsell, 2004). The bureaucratic nature of organizations and government agencies broke out in the middle third of the twentieth century in the United States when the government was forced to deal with such cataclysmic events as the Great Depression in the 1930s and the Second World War in the 1940s, and sought to improve the country’s infrastructure
such as the Interstate Highway System in the 1950s. Other goals were to achieve
civil rights, end poverty, improve consumer safety, and protect the environment in
1960s (Goodsell, 2004). The professionalization of public administration in
governance has steadily progressed since the Progressive Era. During the time
of the Great Society Legislation in the 1960s, as well as in recent years, it has
accelerated considerably and appears to be applying even more pressure on
institutions and professions as the demand to legitimizing standards of
performance intensifies (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Mastrofski and Willis, 2010).

Professional Powers

Personality and patterns of behavior of individual members within an
organizational field can be the result of factors in the organizational field’s
structure. As individual norms and sentiments cultivate in a bureaucracy, an
emotional dependence on bureaucratic symbols and status influences perceptions
of competence, authority and moral legitimacy (Merton, 1940). Similarly,
specialized knowledge and skills have become fundamental elements of
professions in the modern world. Professionals validate their qualifications or
credentials with certificates, diplomas and licenses through specialized education
and examinations that verify imitation. Licensing is an official governmental
process commonly managed in association with the relevant professional interests
while accreditation is a nongovernmental professional-sponsored process
designed to create standards for the industry (Scott et al, 2000).
Professionals are sanctioned by an external group of expert colleagues and follow the standards established by their associations and governing bodies (Abbot, 1998). A network of peers within these professional associations exchange ideas, practices and procedures that facilitate the diffusion of innovation (Strang and Meyer, 1993). Norms, behaviors and practices are codified as professionalism (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991) and professional logics are established not only in the field but within the organization (Scott et al, 2000; Thornton, 2004 and 2012). In a professional organization, individual credentials complement accreditation for the agency (Teodoro and Hughes, 2012). Accreditation can be a critical process for an organization in order to reach professional status and preserve its legitimacy. Although the term professionalism is somewhat ambiguous, the rhetoric of professionalism itself is an ideal defense mechanism against outside pressure and control (Hunt and Magenau, 1993).

Overall, the nature of providing credentials, such as in testing procedures for licensing involves formal acknowledgement that a professional, profession or an organization conforms to standards established by an external authority. Although standards are necessarily minimal at best in order to encourage participation and make it practicable, credentialing still makes a significant contribution to the maintenance of a profession or organization (Freidson, 1988). On one level, the professionalization of policing through accreditation can be viewed as “organized autonomy” (Freidson, 1988) signifying a “license and mandate” (Hughes, 1963) to control its environment (McDonald, 1995). However,
the move to professional status can also have detrimental effects. It may become problematic when professionals become part of an overly bureaucratic organization in the process of establishing a profession or becoming professionalized within an occupation. Individuals may encounter conflicting decisions between maintaining standards required by a professional body or following policies and procedures specific to a certain culture and imposed by the organization (Etzioni, 1975; Baker, 1995) as well as by competing values and norms. Mills (1956) warned earlier that professions were progressively being drawn into administrative machines while professionals were becoming simply managers because of the dominance of bureaucracy.

Nonetheless, professionalism is often considered crucial for the protection of legitimacy by specialists or organizations in a complex, value-laden environment. Professional control over the environment requires some control over institutional actors. It presupposes a patriarchal relationship whereby the professional determines for the most part the needs of the constituents and the manner and methods in which those needs will be met. On the other hand, there are powerful sovereigns with vested interest who are in the position to define their own needs and problems, and expect the professionals to service them. The critical variable to recognize then is the relative power of both (Freidson, 1988).
Professionalizing the American Police

The development of institutional pressures toward rationalization in the United States along with the growth in the size and scope of police organizations have collectively moved internal managerial interests and external political reform objectives to regulating police activities and reducing discretion. The bureaucratization and professionalization of police work are competing processes which reflect the conflicting demands between the production systems of organizations and their institutional environment (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). The craft-like and discretionay nature of police work draws its operations toward a decentralized variation of professionalization while at the same time institutional norms of rationality are moving toward efficiently centralized bureaucratic structures (Hunt and Magenau, 1993). The police department as a professional bureaucracy is in continuous structural tension in that it seeks to accommodate to tenacious countervailing internal and external organizational pressures as seen in Figure 1.1 below.
The language of professionals and professionalization represents a variety of interpretations among individuals who also have different motives for supporting its application in police settings and situations. For instance, Sherman (1978) observed that elevating the social status of police work was a primary concern for police administrators and their supporters over the years. Consequently, police organizations, such as fraternal associations and unions advocate professionalization as a means of status enhancement similar to the fields of law.
and medicine for the police profession (Hughes, 1963). The rhetoric of professionalism also helps protect police organizations from external scrutiny and maintain overall control of their mandate (Hughes, 1963; Freidson, 1988; Hunt and Magenau, 1993; MacDonald, 1995).

By and large the police are faced with a mandate that drives them to pursue ambiguous ends that for the most part are beyond their reach. The volatility of their environment along with nature of their problems does not allow them to develop anything approaching a solution for their predicament. Even though they have attempted to introduce a number of innovative tactics throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, and have made attempts to develop an applicable theoretical understanding of the nature of crime and social disorder through numerous studies on policing, the current legal protection of individual rights in the United States, together with the conflicting demand for public safety makes it difficult for them to manage this dilemma. In response, the police have attempted to manage public opinion through language that describes their conduct and purpose as “professional,” in order to present a safe and sound public appearance instead of educating the public about the limits of their capacity. The ambiguous nature of the terms professional and professionalization helps to conceal the struggle, diversity and contradictory nature of their role and mission. The rhetoric of professionalism has become the principal strategy used to defend the mandate of the police, which enables them to develop and maintain self-esteem, organizational autonomy and occupational solidarity. Professionalization
of the police replicates the efforts of other motivated and progressive occupational
groups, but with more social significance because of its direct involvement in the
adversarial relationship between public safety and individual rights (Manning,
1979).

Police professionalism is an ideology and for the most part inseparable from
the bureaucratic model exemplified in modern police practice that is clearly
expressed today. Whereas medicine and law became professions that developed
outside the framework of bureaucracy, policing has always been performed in a
bureaucratic manner during the modern era. The bureaucratic model provides the
means for acquiring a commitment from organizational personnel to occupational
norms. One of the principal benefits of bureaucracy is that it provides a variety of
ways to structure work in order to achieve a level of competence (Weber, 1922;
Mastrofski and Willis, 2010). The strategies employed by police to deal with the
public’s perception of them arise from their adaptation of the bureaucratic model.
It includes the utilization of technology, official law enforcement statistics and
methods of patrol procedures that attempt to accommodate and adjust to the public
demands while allowing them to focus on bureaucratic procedures and
confidentiality. This is simply a means of controlling the public’s response to their
operations. It also allows them to maintain a symbolic relationship with the criminal
justice system that can help to restrict public knowledge of some significant flaws
in policing itself. These include policing strategies that target underprivileged
individuals and minority neighborhoods, as well as, the racial and socioeconomic disparities in arrests and sentencing practices (Manning, 1979).

Once again, the development of American policing during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries created a profession with a highly fragmented structure (McCabe, 2000). During the Progressive Movement in early twentieth century American politics, law enforcement executives and government officials sought to professionalize their officers and agencies with the support of federal money and research. Commissions, such as the 1929 National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement (the Wickersham Commission), were established to explore ways in which to separate the police from corruptive influence and political interference that continued to plague them since the nineteenth century, as well as to provide better services and value to their communities. The Wickersham Commission, for instance, cited the need for the police to use more highly educated personnel. Early leaders in the police reform movement like August Vollmer, the Chief of Police in Berkeley, California between 1905 and 1932, and O. W. Wilson, a Superintendent in the Chicago Police Department from 1925 to 1967, sought to professionalize their respective agencies through management techniques and policing strategies that were considered revolutionary at the time (Staufenberger, 1977; Baker, 1995; Henry, 2003).

---

5 According to “State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies Census 2008,” published by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (DOJ), there were approximately 17,985 state and local law enforcement agencies with at least one full-time or equivalent in part-time officers, including: 1) 12,501 police departments; 2) 3,063 sheriffs’ offices; 3) 50 primary state law enforcement agencies; 4) 1,733 special jurisdiction agencies; and 5) 683 other agencies, primarily county constable offices in Texas. Meanwhile, there are currently approximately 760,000 police officers in this country, according to the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP).
Nonetheless, the early interest in such ideas, such as mandatory college education requirements and the creation of a national police force similar to the European model, were not widely accepted. While police work did not begin to attract college-educated recruits until the latter part of twentieth century, the concept of a national police force was anathema to an America society with a passion for local autonomy complemented by the fear of big government.\(^6\) Subsequent commissions, such as the President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967), and the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973), also advocated college degrees for police officers. Nonetheless, they were unsuccessful in influencing most police departments since those commissions lacked the capacity to impose compliance on police administrators and local governments. In addition, their commission reports dealt mostly with improving police operationally rather than outlining a conventional definition for professionalization (Staufenberger, 1977; Baker, 1995).

The law enforcement profession has sought to raise its social status since the turn of the twentieth century. The professionalization of policing through CALEA police accreditation is part of the pressure generated to legitimize the profession and policing practices in the eyes of the public by law enforcement and

---

\(^6\) The French political sociologist, Alexis de Tocqueville, who authored Democracy in America, was an early advocate for decentralized government because of its administrative value and civic dimension in creating citizens’ interest in public affairs. Meanwhile, the decentralist movement in the United States, which occurred in the early twentieth century, attracted American citizens like the Southern Agrarian and novelist, Robert Penn Warren, and was the result of many citizens’ fear over the centralization of wealth and political power in the country at the time, (Stone and Mennell, 1980).
government officials. Formal education and legitimation is used as a cognitive foundation produced by “specialists,” in conjunction with the growth and elaboration of professional networks to reach organizations and create new models which can diffuse rapidly. Higher education and professional training institutions are the essential links for the development of organizational norms among professional managers and their staff. Professional and trade associations are another means for defining and promulgating normative rules regarding organizational and professional behavior. These mechanisms generate a pool of interchangeable individuals who occupy similar positions across a variety of organizations, yet possess a shared orientation and disposition that, in the end, overrides variations in tradition and control that might otherwise shape organizational behavior. The same can be said for the individuals who occupy key positions in police professional associations, as seen in the IACP, PERF and CALEA.

Utilizing accreditation as a management strategy to legitimize an organization also has the potential to obstruct intelligence and commonsense through additional bureaucratic standards that have little effect on organizational culture. Cordner and Williams (1999) have looked at the potential for accreditation to become a bureaucratic ritual (Merton, 1968) but counter that organizations need structure and boundaries and that it is the degree of rigidity in which an administrative system is created and managed that produces an inflexible bureaucracy.
Accreditation and the Police in the United States

The concept of accreditation began in the United States in 1787 with the creation of the New York State Regents who were charged with ensuring that colleges and universities within the state met minimum standards. Afterwards, accreditation was applied by colleges as a way to assess the quality in high schools so that higher education institutions could be confident that secondary school candidates met acceptable standards for admission. Colleges also began to participate in accreditation themselves in order to confirm that transfer credits between education institutions were acceptable. Accreditation eventually evolved into both public and private, non-governmental, self-regulated evaluation systems for colleges and universities (Schray, 2006).

The accreditation system in education began to adjust in response to the growth in federal student aid after the Second World War. The federal government started to utilize the non-governmental accreditation system in order to assess the eligibility of higher-education institutions who received federal funds that included student financial assistance (Schray, 2006). During this time, hospitals around the country that were mandated to meet established standards in public health and hospital services began to participate in accreditation as well. Over time, accreditation has evolved into a large and complex public-private system for many educational and health care institutions.
institutions and professions in the United States. This includes the veterinary profession (1960), corrections (1974), law enforcement (1979), parks and recreation (1993), firefighting and emergency services (1996), and public health (2011).

During the twentieth century only a number of states created agencies to establish training requirements and grant licenses to become police officers. California established a Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and by 1977, 45 states had followed California’s model and created similar training councils (Staufenberger, 1977). Still, not all the states in the country established training councils which led to complaints by law enforcement administrators of significant inconsistencies in officers’ skills from state to state. Hence, law enforcement and government officials began to explore standardization in police services as a means to professionalize the occupation. In 1979, with grant money provided by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), which at the time was a federal agency under the direction of the U.S. Department of Justice (USDOJ), the representatives from the IACP, NOBLE, NSA, and PERF, convened in order to develop national standards for police services and procedures for accreditation.

CALEA was created in 1979 as a result of this meeting. CALEA later issued a standards manual and invited local and state police agencies to voluntarily begin the process of meeting nationally established standards. In 1982 the Mount Dora, Florida Police Department became the first CALEA accredited law enforcement
agency in the nation and by June, 1986, 29 other police agencies were nationally accredited while another 186 were in the process of accreditation (Mastrofski, 1986; Baker, 1995). CALEA is currently funded through the U.S. Department of Justice (Mastrofski, 1986) and continues to receive strong support through the four founding and powerful law enforcement professional associations, IACP, NOBLE, NSA, and PERF.

Initially, the majority of nationally accredited police agencies or agencies entering the accreditation process were larger departments that employed in excess of one hundred police officers. Smaller departments eventually followed suit in an organizational process of mimetic isomorphism, where all police agencies appeared similarly in structure and in operational procedures. The diffusion pattern of police accreditation during this time was consistent with other organizational changes and innovation in the law enforcement community (Weiss, 1997; McCabe, 2000). As of 2017 there are 596 nationally accredited law enforcement agencies in the United States and another 178 law enforcement agencies scheduled to be nationally accredited within the next few years for a total of 774 law enforcement agencies; or, 4.3% among police departments if one accepts the Bureau of Justice Statistics definition of a law enforcement agency as having at least one full or part-time officer. While national accreditation continues to attract medium to larger agencies, there are several law enforcement agencies nationally accredited that employ no more than 10 full-time officers, according to
Stephen Mitchell, CALEA Regional Program Manager for the Northeast and Southwest.⁸

These relatively small numbers, however, do not reflect the number of law enforcement agencies nationwide that have pursued state accreditation over CALEA accreditation as well as special jurisdiction police accreditation, specifically campus law enforcement through the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators, (IACALEA). Since the establishment of CALEA, a number of states have offered their own accreditation process as an alternative to the national program. State representatives and local law enforcement executives and associations assert that state accreditation bodies provide a comparable and less expensive option to the national process. They also argue that they are better able to meet the needs of smaller local agencies while addressing state specific issues that may not be applicable at the national level (McCabe, 2000).⁹

IACALEA, meanwhile, which is a professional association for public safety administrators at educational institutions, offers an accreditation process strictly designed for campus public safety and related interests.

**Police Accreditation Standards**

Police accreditation is a voluntary, internal process in that law enforcement agencies verify, through their written policies and procedures, as well as from

---

⁹ See Appendix – A
outside periodic inspections, the quality of their operations as prescribed by the governing body of CALEA. This involves some 480 measures. Though these organizations voluntarily enter the accreditation process, either nationally through CALEA or locally through state sponsored bodies, such as MPAC, accreditation goes beyond the practice of simply including the mandatory standards through a “written directive” in an agency’s policy and procedure manual. CALEA’s 5th Edition Standards Manual states that a “written directive presumes functional compliance with the directive. The integrity vested in agencies participating in the program as well as the large number of standards dictates that the Commission initially presumes that the agency operates in compliance with their written directives,” prior to their first on-site inspection since an agency is allowed up to three years to prepare. 10 Accreditation thus provides the governing bodies a means to ensure that a police department has satisfied all the requirements operationally as outlined by a 21 member commission board recruited from public and private sectors (Mastrofski, 1986).

The primary goal during the twentieth century police reforms has always been about having greater control in order to improve the standard for individual officers and, in turn, create public value by providing better police services to the community (McCabe, 2000). Since one of the goals in the police accreditation process is to professionalize the police in a manner that reflects the Professional

---

Police Model that was strongly influenced by the rational-irrationality of Weber’s bureaucratic ideal-type, the noticeable direction of the standards is toward greater formalization. Conversely, dysfunction is a natural feature of bureaucratic organizations. The concern over rules and regulations are part of a bureaucratic ritual that can debilitate organizational performance by obstructing individual creativity and innovation (Merton, 1940 and 1968). It stands to follow then that police accreditation standards do not mandate anything controversial since they are directed on process rather than outcome.

For instance, innovative practices, such as education, hiring and promotion, are not mandatory standards, but optional (Mastrofski, 1986). Mastrofski also points out some additional deficiencies regarding the characteristics of the standards. First, they are principally administrative in nature that does not attempt to focus on the problems of making moral judgments while exercising officer discretion. Rather, they address administrative concerns, such as organizational structure, resource allocation, supervision, equipment, clerical procedures and the documentation of activities, which have little direct impact on the daily decisions made by line officers. Secondly, the standards do not stipulate performance measures, such as statistical analysis relating to crime reduction, arrests, clearances, response time, and accidents.

Instead, the standards concentrate on the means that will most likely result in suitable ends. Third, even though the standards do not explicitly outline a
specific role for law enforcement agencies, it clearly favors law enforcement and crime fighting functions over crime prevention and order maintenance services in those standards on patrol procedures. Such report writing and criminal investigations, heavily outweighs standards on higher-frequency non-criminal service calls. Fourth, the majority of the standards simply require that a written directive or policy statement be presented on any given area or topic, but do not provide specific guidance on procedures. Overall, a systematic evaluation of the standards reveals that they are a “mixed pattern, ranging from strongly progressive to a deafening silence on critical issues,” (Mastrofski, 1986:52).

Cordner and Williams (1995 and 1999) add that the accreditation standards support a traditional formal approach to police administration, but do not specifically require more hierarchy, centralization or specialization. They state that since accreditation is associated with the Professional Police Model the standards focus by design mostly on administrative efficiency. Moreover, the standards neither provide strong support nor do they conflict with the objectives of community policing since they are predominantly process-oriented. The majority of them are directed to administration instead of operations, thus internal organizational matters supersede substantive problems in the community. Since the standards do not focus more directly on the delivery of police services, it is difficult to assess their actual impact or value for the community.
Research on Accreditation

Despite the fact that there has been a large amount of general literature on accreditation within public agencies there have been little empirical research or evaluations on the effects of accreditation on process, such as changes in organizational behavior and culture (Johnson, 2013) and essentially no research as to why organizations participate in it. For example, Greenfield and Braithwaite (2008) reported that, of the 3,000 books and articles that they researched on accreditation within the healthcare industry, only 66 studies empirically evaluated the effects of accreditation on an organization or its employees. Meanwhile, Manuel Teodoro (2006) thus far has offered the only empirical study that looks at the reasons for pursuing police accreditation. He asserted that some chief executive officers were bureaucratic entrepreneurs, who implemented accreditation as a strategy of raising their status and improving their job mobility.

A number of other studies on accreditation for now have examined output, such as organizational results or performance. Their conclusions have been mixed at best and have consistently revealed little statistical differences between accredited and non-accredited agencies. For instance, Gingerich and Russell (2006) indicated that officers from accredited agencies were notably more receptive to community policing strategies than officers from non-accredited departments. Giblin (2006) reported that accredited agencies were more likely to employ crime analysis units while Burlingame and Baro (2005) discovered that accredited agencies had a higher percentage of female employees. On the other
hand, Baker (1995) showed that there were no significant statistical differences between accredited and non-accredited agencies in the education level of their employees or in how they recruited officers and promoted personnel. Similarly, Doerner and Doerner (1997) found no differences in clearance rates of criminal investigations between accredited and non-accredited Florida police departments and, once again (2012), in clearance rates for violent and property crime offenses. Meanwhile, McCabe and Fajardo (2001) indicated that accredited and non-accredited agencies were similar in field training hours, education level and drug testing of their employees, while Alpert and MacDonald (2001) discovered no variations in the frequency of police use of force between accredited and non-accredited departments. Similarly, in healthcare, Miller et al (2005) revealed that there were no discrepancies in patient safety between accredited and non-accredited healthcare agencies, while Sack et al (2010) discovered that there was no link between accreditation and patient satisfaction.

Survey studies of the potential benefits of accreditation among chief executive officers, however, have provided different results. Williams (1998) and Hoagland (2004) revealed that executives felt that their department improved its professional status after accreditation. Crowder (1998) observed that chief executives believed that there was a better understanding of national standards and accountability within their departments because of accreditation. Carter and Sapp (1994) discovered that the majority of police leaders believed that accreditation allowed them to modernize their policies and procedures. Dupont
(1993) surveyed 228 chief executive officers from nationally accredited agencies in the United States through a single mail questionnaire to determine whether they believed it was first, practical to remain accredited through CALEA; or secondly, if they planned to seek an alternative state accrediting body; or third, if they were foregoing any accreditation process in the future. He found that even though they had problems with accreditation, there was overwhelming support for the process in general and for CALEA specifically. Mastrofski et al. (2007) reported that chief executives felt that accreditation assisted in the implementation of community-oriented-policing (COP), although Cordner and Williams (1995 and 1999) indicated in an earlier study that it neither supported nor obstructed community policing objectives even though the standards clearly emphasized formalization.

These surveys, nevertheless, have been problematic since they are mostly anecdotal and difficult to quantify. Perceptions from these chief executive officers lack empirical evidence or support (Johnson, 2013). Teodoro and Hughes (2012) have argued that many of these studies have methodological limitations and have not provided a causal link between accreditation and professionalism. They countered that research on accreditation as a management strategy has been unable to determine whether accreditation fosters a culture of professionalism within an organization or if professionalism eventually drives an agency towards accreditation. For instance, Teodoro and Hughes found no relationship between accreditation and officers’ attitude towards work at the micro-level in two of their
studies. Likewise, Johnson (2013) found that agency accreditation did not affect officers work behavior with regard to community-oriented policing (COP) leading him to suggest that it does not change the organizational practices of the rank-and-file. He argued that there was a gap in the literature regarding the effects of accreditation on the ability to create true organizational change within criminal justice agencies. Greenfield and Braithwaite (2008) discovered ambiguous results regarding accreditation standards effect on employee attitude or quality measures between accredited and non-accredited agencies with a meta-analysis.

In corrections, Loughran (1998) discovered that the introduction of American Correctional Association (ACA) accreditation standards in prisons had no effect on the rehabilitation of criminal offenders. Paoline et al. (2006) concluded that although ACA accreditation was associated with decreases in employee stress and increases in job satisfaction in correctional settings, it was more closely linked to informal structures such as cohesion among peers. In studies of accreditation in higher education, Brittingham (2009) concluded that university accreditation standards had no effect on how faculty members taught in the classrooms. Schray (2006) indicated that the effect of accreditation on higher education was being influenced by changes in the delivery of higher education that allowed institutions to operate on a national and global scale from distance learning. Furthermore, Cret (2010) found that universities utilized accreditation mainly as a strategy to consolidate the institutional positions of their deans.
Overall, there has been a lack of research with regard to the impact of accreditation on normative and behavioral changes in frontline employees or rank and file officers in police agencies as well as its effect on organizational behavior in significant social areas. This includes racial disparities in healthcare services, higher education, or excessive use of force in corrections and policing. Moreover, leadership studies examining whether or not to participate in accreditation in the context of the institutional environment of the police are scarce at best.

CALEA police accreditation emerged in the twentieth century as a normative process to standardize norms and practices, yet has not been widely accepted over the last thirty years. Studies of the organizational responses to normative changes, such as new government regulations or accreditation, indicate that both institutional and technical factors influence their responses (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Johnson, 2013). Institutional environments are also subject to change resulting from the interests of organizational and individual actors (Casile and Davis-Blake, 2002; Scott, 1987, 1991; Lawrence et al., 2009; Johnson, 2013). Therefore, it is valuable to understand how these organizational and individual interests affect decisions made on CALEA police accreditation.

Summary

This chapter provided the background to the role and mission of the police in the United States and the introduction of national police accreditation in the context of professionalism and the institutional environment of the police.
Uniformed police forces were established in the United States in the mid-nineteenth century, replacing the old night watch system that had been in effect since the seventeenth century. The history the American police evolved through three distinct epochs in their brief history: The Political Era; The Reform or Progressive Era; and The Community Police Era. During The Progressive Movement in American politics, The Professional Police Model was established in response to widespread public dissatisfaction with police corruption and substandard performance. Despite numerous changes of policing strategies over half a century, the American police continued to pursue professional status and improve its services and image in response to public pressure. CALEA police accreditation was established by four powerful professional police associations, IACP, PERF, NOBLE, and NSA, and was funded by the federal government. Over the last thirty years, however, accreditation has not been widely accepted because of its controversial connections to The Professional Police Model and fears of increased oversight and bureaucratic rigidity. Meanwhile, research on accreditation on the police and crime in general has suggested that there are no significant statistical differences between accredited and non-accredited organizations, while accreditation standards appears to have little or no effect on organizational behavior or culture.
CHAPTER 2: THEORY AND METHODS

In order to understand how and why chief executive decisions on whether
to participate or not in police accreditation are controlled by both agency and
structure an individual-level abductive analysis of the data will test three competing
organizational theories, resource-dependency, institutional and strategic choice
and contingency analysis. This is to provide a more relevant explanation for
executive decisions and organizational designs. The first part of this chapter will
provide a theoretical explanation of formal bureaucracy, structural contingency and
cultural-cognitive perspectives as well as the three specific organizational theories
being evaluated. The second part, meanwhile, will offer an explanation of the
research methods that includes the use of abductive analysis and the design of
the research. Finally, the third part will deliver the data results.

Part I: Theory

Organizational theories in general look outside of the organization and focus
more on the relationship between organizations and how they affect the distribution
of power and privilege within society. Internally, organization theory concentrates
on relationships, dynamics and functions. The central question and concern in the
end is the organizational form since the ability of societies to respond to social and
economic environments is contingent upon the availability of a variety of
differentiated structures (Greenwood, 2006).
Formal bureaucratic structure was generally regarded as the most efficient organizational form prior to 1960s since it instilled technical rationality into organizations. Max Weber (1864—1920) established the origins of classical organization theory while he along with Emile Durkheim (1858—1917) and Karl Marx (1818—1883) are generally considered to be the three forefathers of sociology. Weber’s theories regarding the formal structure of organizations focus on the characteristics and growth along with the consequences of bureaucracy. According to Weber, the bureaucratic organization was a rational solution to the modern complexities of industrialization. In addition, bureaucratic society represents the domination of formalistic and substantive rationality. Weber described an ideal-type of bureaucracy and bureaucratic administration as a more rational and efficient form of organization than the power and authority structures that preceded it. He identified the previous structures as traditional authority and charismatic authority. Traditional authority was based on tradition or custom, such as the status and power of elders in certain social groups or the traditional authority and loyalty given to monarchs. Charismatic authority, meanwhile, was engendered by the appeal and allegiance to individuals who displayed extraordinary personalities and influence. On the other hand, modern bureaucracy was representative of the social relations of modern society as well as a type of administrative structure developed in concert with a rational-legal mode of authority (Gerth and Mills, 1946; Scott, 2003).
Weber considered states that controlled policy and police functions as ecclesiastical communities that administered to large populations of believers, economies that distributed goods and coordinated functions, the modern agency, the military, and the judiciary as six basic types of bureaucratic structures. Bureaucratic administration was the fundamental exercise of control on the basis of knowledge, public legitimacy and legal authority. Power and status within organizations surfaced through position and control. Weber differentiated power and authority by characterizing the former as any relationship where one individual can impose his will over another under any circumstances, whereas the latter was rooted in the belief in the legitimacy of that power. Status within organizations was created by positions based on knowledge and credentials.

Although Weber developed the ideal-type for comparative purposes, his analysis of bureaucracy he has been faulted for predominately focusing on the concepts of the ideal organization. Nonetheless, he recognized that in reality modern bureaucracy was not as effective as his ideal-type model. Weber's analysis of bureaucracy differs from some modern conceptions which suggest that the bureaucratic organization is slow, rigid, inefficient, and unresponsive to its environment. Modern studies of bureaucratic organizations have indicated that vertical hierarchies of authority can produce inefficient communication, corruption, nepotism, political infighting, and lack of accountability. Moreover, many modern organizations and political structures lean more towards oligarchy than meritocracy.
The bureaucratic model of organizations has provided a foundation for contemporary research and management perspectives. A number series of studies beginning in the late 1950s revealed that the applicability of Weber’s ideal type of bureaucracy was contingent upon the level of task uncertainty, complexity and size of the organization. For instance, Robert Merton, who was interested in dysfunctional organizational learning, looked at Weber’s ideal bureaucratic structure of authority, office, official action, rules, formality, and meritocracy, and concluded that in the end the effectiveness of social structure ultimately relied upon the introduction of “group participants with appropriate attitudes and sentiments” (Merton, 1940:562).

Structural contingency perspectives, such as contingency, resource dependency and strategic choice theories were three early models that surfaced from new research on A Behavioral Theory of the Firm (Cyert and March, 1963). Structural contingency examines the alignment between the shape of the organization and its environmental context as a means to identify which forms are more effective and efficient and in which context. Organizational forms depend on situational contingencies, such as size, environment, strategy, technical, and economics. Meanwhile, the behavioral theory of the firm, or strategic choice theory, challenges the idea that executives have limited discretion making organizational decisions because organizations are shaped mainly by their contingencies (Greenwood, 2006).
More recently, new institutional theories, such as institutional, institutional logics and institutional work, have presented new opportunities for additional insight by introducing cultural-cognitive variables into decision-making processes. The cultural-cognitive perspective is concerned with the intersection between cognitive and social structures, such as symbolic interaction and processes as well as knowledge and constraints.

Overall, these new perspectives can offer insight and understanding of how executives and organizations respond to their environments. Figure 2.1 outlines the development of organizational theories over the years from the economic, managerial and sociological perspectives.
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Resource Dependency

Resource dependency (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978) surfaced as an alternative viewpoint to economic theories on mergers in order to investigate the type of inter-organizational relations that were fundamental in market failures. According to the resource-dependency perspective, all organizations are reliant on the environment for their survival. The model leans heavily towards environmental determinism at the expense of actor’s agency in that it maintains that external control is not only possible but inevitable. The outcome and survivability of an organization is affected by the context in which the organization is embedded. Organizations are embedded in networks of interdependence and social relationships. The need for critical financial and physical resources as well as for information which derives from the environment makes organizations dependent for resources from external sources. These dependencies are often reciprocal, albeit they are sometimes indirect. The organizations’ dependency on the environment for survival and success isn’t necessarily problematic, especially if stable supplies are guaranteed. However, because of the changing landscape in environment that includes changes in supplies and competition, organizations are faced with the situation of either becoming extinct or adapting their activities in response to variations in environmental conditions. Organizations can respond to uncertainty by either trying to change their environments through political means or forming inter-organizational relationships.
Organizations that have the ability to control the most critical resources and who are able to reduce their uncertainty about other organizations in a competitive environment possess the power to alter their organizational strategies and behavior. Consequently, they are the most likely to survive. Possession of and access to resources produces relationships among organizations to be asymmetrical. Whenever there is asymmetrical dependence between organizations or individuals there is a difference in the level of power. Power is also contingent on whether critical resources can be acquired through multiple resources. The concentration of resource control caused by monopolies, such as the environments that exist in industries such as utilities and energy, restrict and control the availability of resources.

Organizational behavior, meanwhile, is seen as the end result of external influence. “It is the fact of the organization’s dependence on the environment that makes the external constraint and control of organizational behavior both possible and almost inevitable” (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978:108). The task of organizational management, therefore, is problematic because of the reality of competing and conflicting demands. The organizations interdependence with other participants outside its boundaries exists because organizations are not self-contained entities and have a need for activities that are not within their control. For example, studies of Israeli and U.S. firms suggest that organizations that are more dependent on their government for resources are more amenable and tend to conform to governmental demands, requirements or regulations.
Resource dependency theorizes that all organizational outcomes are based on interdependent causes or agents. Interdependence is the result of an open systems environment in that organizations must transact with elements in the environment to obtain the resources necessary for their survival. “The organization ends and the environment begin at the point where the organization’s control over activities diminishes and the control of other organizations or individuals begins” (ibid, 1978:113). The increase in interdependence parallels the increase in specialization and division of labor within organizations. Interdependence is relative to the availability of resources, the demand and the number of transactions, or resource exchange, within the same environment. Interdependence causes uncertainty for the organization while actions taken to reduce the number of organizations in the network, such as locating another supplier, can affect other organizations. Organizations typically increase behavioral interdependence, such as improved coordination or mutual control, as a means to combat outcome interdependence. For instance, they can avoid control through cooptation, such as the formation of a Board of Directors, joint-ventures, mergers, or acquisitions. The forms that organizational adaptations adopt are contingent on the environment along with the nature and amount of interdependence confronted by the organization.

Resource dependency’s open system perspective is delineated with three different environments: the enacted environment; the negotiated environment; and the created environment. Organizational actions are determined by an
enacted environment in that the organization responds to its perceptions and beliefs about the environment. The enacted environment is largely determined by the existing organizational structures and processes of information. Organizations also establish collective structures of inter-organizational action to reduce interdependence and uncertainty in a negotiated environment. In the created environment, organizations act to control interdependence through the economic, social and political arena as well as through symbolic structures of status and legitimacy.

Because resource dependency focuses primarily on transactional interdependence, however, it overlooks other important environmental effects on organizations. More specifically, it ignores social class and does not explore the formation, reproduction and reaffirmation of class relations within an organization. It also suggests that chief executives have little or no discretion in organizational choices since strategy is dictated mostly by the environment. By and large, resource dependence appears suitable for investigating both profit and nonprofit organizations because of the emphasis on environmental constraints or control on organizational behavior and strategy as well as the recognition of the organization’s ability to adapt.

Law enforcement agencies are especially dependent on the government and community for their resources and maintenance of their legitimacy. Since this relationship is asymmetrical they are more amenable to outside demands, requirements and regulations. The task of managing police operations and
services also becomes problematic because of the reality of competing and conflicting demands, such as crime prevention, crime reduction and public safety as opposed to ensuring civil liberties. The police organization’s interdependence with other participants outside its boundaries exists because they are not self-contained entities which have a need for activities that are not within their control. Because police organizations are not autonomous they are compelled to make use of transactions with the environment as a condition to their survival. The need for resources creates dependencies between them and other social entities, such as regulatory agencies, professional police associations, accrediting groups, and the socio-political environment.

The external control over a law enforcement agency is clearly visible in the institutional environment of the police. The police are regulated by governmental sources, such as local, state and federal authorities, and influenced by non-governmental sources, such as local community groups and associations, media, IACP, NOBLE, NSA, PERF, and to some degree, CALEA if they participate in police accreditation. The outcome and sustainability for the police is affected by the context in which they are embedded. Their need for resources, such as financial and physical support along with information for decision processes, all of which is obtained from the environment, makes the police especially dependent on external sources. These dependencies are often reciprocal, even if they are sometimes indirect. A law enforcement agency’s dependency on the environment for their survival and success, however, is not necessarily problematic, especially
if resources are stable. However, because of their complex, value-laden environment, police organizations can be coerced into adapting their activities in response to variations in environmental conditions. In general, one of the reasons police executives may not feel the need to pursue accreditation is if their resources are stable or they are not being coerced into becoming accredited because of organizational and environmental conflict.

**Institutional Theory**

The institutional perspective has benefited from a long history since the turn of the nineteenth century when important research in this field began. Economic, political and sociological studies stimulated the application of institutional theory which, in turn, generated a broader spectrum of theories based on this perspective. The arguments are centered on the desire to understand the basis for stability of social forms and the meanings attached to them in shaping organizations. New institutional approaches emphasize the role of cultural-cognitive controls as formulated by Berger and Luckmann (1967) and Geertz (1973).

associations and non-governmental bodies, provide an expanding collection of beliefs and rules that fuels organizational expansion and amplification. According to these new institutional theorists, social life is being rationalized through the creation of means-end formulas around which behavior can become regular, formalized and organized. While the institutional framework treats organizations as open systems in that they are greatly influenced by their environments, it contends that competitive and efficiency-based forces are not the only variables in play since socially constructed beliefs and rule systems also exert control over organizational behavior.

The perspective challenges earlier functional theories and extends the meaning of the environment with a cultural tone. Meyer and Rowan (1977) observed that organizations within any given industry follow prescribed social conventions, thus follow organizational forms that are alike. Organizations practice institutional isomorphism in order to obtain social legitimacy and develop their prospects for survival. Organizations, therefore, are cultural and social systems embedded within an institutional context that includes the state, professions, interests groups, and public perceptions. The notion of organizational imprinting disputes the logic of structural contingency theories. More importantly, the perspective indicates that organizational forms do not derive from simply production and fixed laws of markets, rather result from socially constructed and institutionalized conventions (Greenwood, 2006). Institutional theory highlights the role of cultural-cognitive processes in social life as a basis for organizational
analysis. Theorists utilizing this model hyphenate concepts in order to stress mental constructs as well as common symbolic systems and shared meanings.

Phenomenologists, such as Berger and Luckmann (1967) assert that social life is only possible and perceived to the extent that individuals interact to create common cognitive frameworks and recognition that supports collective action. The social process whereby actions are repeated and given similar meanings by participants is defined as institutionalization. In essence, institutionalization is the process where social reality is constructed (Greenwood, 2006). New institutional theorists argue that the modern concept of rationality is both a social and cultural construction in that socially it is realized collectively as an enforced agreement that becomes formalized and pursued. Scott cites Dobbin (1994) who earlier stated that “rationalized organizational practices are essentially cultural and very much at the core of modern culture precisely because modern culture is organized around instrumental rationality” (Scott, 2003:138).

The most influential application for new institutional models to the analysis of organizations is found at the macro level. Meyer and Rowan underline the significance of cultural rules in larger institutional environments. They declare that modern societies contain an intricacy of institutionalized rules and patterns created by professional groups, the state and nongovernmental associations who they identify as sovereigns. These socially constructed realities provide a framework for the creation and amplification of formal organizations. In modern society, these institutions most likely adopt the form of rationalized myths. Modern organizations
can be seen as myths because they are based on collective rather than individual beliefs and for all practical purposes, myths are seen as “true.” They are rationalized because they also take the form of rules specifying procedures necessary to accomplish a given end (Scott, 2003).

Meyer and Rowan assert that formal organizational structures surface in highly institutionalized contexts. Professions, policies and programs are fashioned along with the products and services that are identified as producing rationality. Organizations increase their legitimacy and survivability in society, independent of the immediate impact on efficacy, from acquired practices and procedures. Institutionalized products, services, techniques, policies, and programs operate as powerful myths which are ceremonially adopted by many organizations. Conforming to institutionalized rules, however, sometimes conflicts with efficiency. Equally, coordinating and controlling activity in order to perfect efficiency undermines the organization’s ceremonial conformity that can undermine its support and legitimacy. Thus, in order to maintain ceremonial conformity, organizations are required to mirror institutional rules that tend to safeguard their formal structures from the uncertainties of technical activities.

Organizations become loosely coupled which create gaps between their formal structures and actual work activities, as a result. Institutionalization is defined by Meyer and Rowan as the means by which social processes, obligations or actualities achieve a status in social thought and action. Institutional rules affect organizational structures and their implementation in actual technical work is
differentiated from effects generated by networks of social behavior and relationships which collect and surround a given organization. They proclaim that while institutionalism suggests an open-systems model, institutional theories go beyond their environmental interrelations and define organizations as dramatic enactments of the rationalized myths saturating modern societies rather than as units involved in exchange, despite the complexity with their environments, such as suggested in resource dependency theory.

Meyer and Rowan suggest that myths that bring about formal organizational structures possess two key properties. First, they are rationalized and impersonal prescriptions for identification of various social purposes as technical properties and stipulate the appropriate means to pursue these technical purposes rationally. Second, myths are highly institutionalized and in some measure displace individual and organizational discretion. Consequently, they are accepted as legitimate, apart from evaluations of their impact on work results. They state that “myths generated by particular organizational practices and diffused through relational networks have legitimacy based on the supposition that they are rationally effective” (Meyer and Rowan, 1977:48).

Isomorphism within environmentally dependent institutions has critical consequences for organizations. First, it assimilates elements which are legitimated externally rather than in terms of internal efficiency. Second, it exercises external or ceremonial assessment criteria to define the value of structural elements. Third, the organization’s dependence on externally
established institutions reduces turmoil and maintains stability. On the whole, institutional isomorphism fosters the short-term success and survival of organizations. Incorporating externally legitimated formal structures intensifies the commitment of internal participants and external constituents. For example, when organizations like police agencies utilize external assessment criteria, such as the practice of community policing instead of an independent system or combination of strategies that could prove to be more effective in the end, they will still be socially identified as successful or competent and legitimate by the public.

DiMaggio and Powell, meanwhile, argue that the causes of bureaucratization and rationalization have changed since Weber reasoned that the rationalist order had become an “iron cage” in which humanity—except for the possibility of prophetic revival—was irreversibly imprisoned by its efficiency criteria. While organizations have become more homogeneous and bureaucratic, structural change in organizations is the result of processes that make them more similar and not necessarily more efficient as opposed to change sparked by competition or resource dependence. Strategies that are rational for a specific organization may not be rational if adopted by an entire field of organizations as suggested in some studies on community policing or Compstat. Nonetheless, because they are normatively endorsed by society increases their likelihood of being adopted.

Isomorphism is a restrictive social process that compels one unit in a population to resemble other units that encounter similar environmental conditions.
In biology, isomorphism is defined as a similarity in form or appearance between organisms of different ancestry or between different stages in the life cycle of the same organism. In organizational analysis, isomorphism can be generated from either competition or institutional processes. DiMaggio and Powell identify three mechanisms through which institutional isomorphic change surfaces: (1) **Coercive Isomorphism** that develops from political influence and difficulties of legitimacy; (2) **Mimetic Isomorphism** as a consequence from customary responses to uncertainty; and (3) **Normative Isomorphism** that is associated with professionalization (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983:67).

Professionalization is a critical source of isomorphism. Formal education and legitimation as a cognitive foundation produced by "specialists" together with the growth and elaboration of professional networks that reach organizations create new models which diffuse rapidly. Higher education and professional training institutions are essential locations for the development of organizational norms among professional managers and their staff. Professional and trade associations are another means for defining and promulgating normative rules regarding organizational and professional behavior. These mechanisms generate a pool of interchangeable individuals who occupy similar positions across a variety of organizations, yet possess a similarity of orientation and disposition that in the end overrides variation in tradition and control that might otherwise shape organizational behavior. Professionalization, on the other hand, has the potential to obstruct intelligence and commonsense as lamented by Irish playwright, George
Bernard Shaw (1905) who declared in *Major Barbara* that “all professions are a conspiracy against the laity.”

By the same token, Paul Hirsch examines the diffusion of hostile takeovers and the problematic contests for control of large American corporations. Hirsch highlights the relationship between the transformations of business practices and the American business culture. He contends that the normative framing of hostile takeovers promoted their diffusion and legitimation which aided in the preservation of order despite the turmoil provoked by these takeovers. Hirsch identifies three periods in the diffusion of a business tactic that was initially considered a deviant innovation. Each period is differentiated by language and idiom that serve to moderate the status loss by acquired executives. Hirsch’s theory suggests that the process of diffusion is characterized as: “(1) the acceptance, (2) over a period of time, (3) of a specific idea or practice, (4) by individuals, groups, or other adopting units, that is linked (5) to specific means of communication, (6) to a social structure, and (7) to a specific system of values and culture” (Hirsch, 1986:809).

The institutionalization of the hostile takeover is centrally tied to its normative framing along with associated modifications in the language of public discourse. The concepts of culture, ideology, politics, and symbols are more than synthesized residuals and epiphenomena. In addition, the growth of language patterns to impart greater respectability to deviant business tactics, such as hostile takeovers, as the practice diffused and attained more widespread acceptance correlates cultural symbols with structural movements (ibid, 1986:814). Hirsch
contends that emergent vocabulary used to publicly frame hostile takeovers was exclusively non-financial. All participants are assigned roles which are coded into an appropriate genre, employing jargon suggestive of the violence, sex and conflict found in dramas about the Old West, piracy on the high seas and other fictional struggles. Initially, the normative framing of external challenges to corporate executives featured a process of one-way stigmatization. Individuals involved in hostile takeovers were pejoratively labeled “pirates,” “pariahs” and “corporate raiders,” while the target company was sometimes referred to as, a “sleeping beauty.” Afterwards, target corporations were viewed sympathetically as “unfortunate victims” or “casualties of war,” albeit the direction of the epithets became more balanced as takeovers became more commonplace. Eventually, epithets became elements of more complex scripts and were seen as “conflicts,” “contests” and a self-effacing “cost of doing business” (ibid, 1986:817-820).

The implementation of language usage, imagery and ideology represent the micro-cultural-subjective and macro-structural-objective sides of social change undergoing institutionalization. The micro element is critical for institutionalization and legitimation to cultivate. Concrete terms, metaphors and context which describe and interpret new, unanticipated events are necessary in order to conceptualize as normal, routine and acceptable, and become absorbed into the culture of the collectivity. Social-psychological forms, such as cognitive functions, use linguistic frames as a resource for participants and observers to describe order and comprehend new innovations or social phenomena. An institutional function
is the manner in which the language of hostile takeovers made possible the larger cultural processing of business innovation through dissemination, routinizing and consensus. Language was overall crucial at the institutional level for takeover participants to exchange roles in ways that would not interrupt the consensus and closeness of the big business community.

Hirsch adds that institutional environments are comprised of a matrix of cultural belief systems, normative frameworks, and regulatory systems that offer meaning and stability. While institutions provide stability in social life, they remain subject to change and unpredictability. Thus, organizations and populations responding to changes in their environments, do so locally, regionally and nationally. The two critical types of external forces in the environment are the institutional and material resources. Material resources, such as technical and productive systems that utilize resources for services as well the sociodemographic characteristics of the human populations of an area that receive an organization’s services are critical factors which affect organizations (Scott, Ruef, Mendel, Caronna, 2000).

Patricia Thornton later augments new institutional theory by integrating it with attention and cognitive perspectives of institutional logics. Attention and decision concepts indicate how individual cognitive representations and structural routines at the organizational level influence the process of attention and decisions. Theories on attention investigate how individuals focus on selective characteristics while excluding alternatives that would have altered choices to
move in another direction, such as bounded rationality. Meanwhile, organizational decisions are based on institutional logics at the societal level (Thornton, 2004). Whereas classic and contemporary theory and research centers on the economic, political and social psychological dynamics of decisions made within organizations, the institutional perspective offers a different focus for the study of attention to organizational decisions. Specifically, it suggests that economic and political interests as well as behavioral perceptions in organizations are fashioned by institutional logics that prevail in wider environments. (Friedland and Alford, 1991). Institutional logics shows that while economic, political and social psychological interests are ubiquitous in every organization, their foundations, meaning and consequences for the focus of attention is heavily dependent on higher order institutional logics (Fligstein, 1991; Thornton, 2004).

Institutional approaches to organization theory, however, have traditionally been macro-level analyses of the relationships among organizations and the fields in which they operate in order to present strong accounts of the processes through which institutions govern action. In addition, early neo-institutional studies have mostly highlighted ways in which institutions controlled organizational structures and activities which provided an explanation for the assimilation of organizational practices within institutional environments. While these studies have been able to explain organizational isomorphism and the reproduction of institutionalized practices, they have been vague in providing details for the possibility of change. More specifically, the studies asserted that behavior was controlled by the
individual’s need to be regarded as legitimate in their institutional environment. Thus, it was implicitly understood that actors possessed a limited degree of agency since individuals and organizations have shown a propensity to comply at least on the surface with institutional pressures. Individual experience and behavior are products of external environments that condition them.

Overall, the determinist orientation of institutional theory focuses on the context of action, not the action itself, within the properties of structural control that influence individual and organizational behavior and which provides organizational life with overall stability and control (Battilana and D'Aunno, 2009). Still, this perspective of limited agency has become problematic and has reduced the theorists’ ability to account for institutional change. Zucker (1991) points out that without firm micro-foundations, institutional theorists jeopardize their ability to account for institutionalizing processes. Evidence from numerous studies of institutional change carried out over the past decade reveals that actors are not always prisoners of the “iron cage” of existing institutions (Weber, 1930; Battilana and D'Aunno, 2009). Albeit institutions are characterized by their repetitive nature, they eventually adapt and change (Flienstein, 1991).

Washington (2009), along with social theorists Berger and Luckman (1967), Bourdieu (1977 and 1994) and Giddens (1984) have recognized that agency and structure are inextricably linked in that individual actors can also influence and shape existing institutions and organizations. DiMaggio and Powell (1991) proposed that focusing research and writing on explanations of relationships between human action and cultures as well as structures in which actors were embedded would provide a more balanced relationship between actors and institutions. This “practice approach” (Bourdieu 1977 and 1994; Giddens, 1984) differed from both structuralist viewpoints developed by Parsons and Saussure where human action was either an enactment of rules and norms or a voluntaristic act made by individuals with unlimited freedom and capacity to create new conditions. Still, while institutional theorists have started tackling the issue of institutional change since the late 1980’s, institutional research on organizations has mostly emphasized the role of collective actions and interactions that generate and transform institutional arrangements (Lawrence, et al, 2009).

The recent concept of institutional work in neo-institutional research originates from an emerging recognition that institutions are products of human action and reaction that can be motivated by both idiosyncratic personal interests and agendas for preservation or institutional change (Lawrence, et al, 2009). DiMaggio (1988) had earlier emphasized the need to place more focus on the role of actors and agency in institutional processes. He argued that new institutions surfaced when organized actors with a sufficient amount of resources seized the
opportunity to fulfill their valued interests. These actors, or institutional entrepreneurs, demonstrate a high level of agency in that they are able to deviate from existing institutions by developing alternative rules and practices (Battilana and D'Aunno, 2009). Selznick (1957) also noted earlier that the executive becomes a statesman after he makes the transition from administrative management to institutional leadership. Kraatz (2009), meanwhile, adds that a leader can both be an agent of institutionalization as well as a guardian and custodian of the living social body that ultimately materializes.

Institutional work is described by theorists as “the purposive action of individuals and organizations aimed at creating, maintaining and disrupting institutions” (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006: 215). The institutional work perspective shifts the focus on institutional research to understanding how action affects institutions. The model attempts to expand research on institutional entrepreneurship, institutional change and innovation, and deinstitutionalization, by examining the intentional actions taken in relation to institutions. While these actions are sometimes overt and dramatic as demonstrated in research on institutional entrepreneurship, most of it is the result of daily routine adjustments, adaptations or compromises by actors attempting to uphold institutional arrangements. Institutional work as a research area is designed to provide broader visions of agency in relationship to institutions by avoiding the notion that actors are either “cultural dopes” fenced in by institutional arrangements, or overvalued rational actors (Lawrence et al., 2009).
Recent studies of institutional change have suggested that isomorphic processes and embeddedness of institutional logics and practices can provide both the foundation and opportunity for change. Agency can occur when actors are less embedded than others in a field or when actors become less embedded because of individual events. Specifically, novices to a field or actors who are relatively unembedded in a newly developed field have the ability to act in ways contrary to the established patterns and norms. In addition, exogenous events may disturb the status quo within a field disembedding endogenous actors who are able to recognize the need for change and react accordingly (Greenwood, et al, 2002; Reay et al, 2002). Individuals who can carry out contrasting organizational change, such as actions that deviate from dominant institutional logics in a given organizational field, are looked upon as institutional entrepreneurs (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006; Battilana and D'Aunno, 2009). Beckert (1999) argues that actors who are embedded in the institutional environment still manage to demonstrate a high level of agency. He suggests that strategic action is more likely to occur in relatively highly institutionalized organizational fields because of security, stability and predictability of institutionalized rules and norms that gives actors more freedom to engage in strategic behavior. The individual's level of agency is not a stable feature, however, in that it varies depending on the time and context in which these individuals are embedded (Trank and Washington, 2009).

Organizational transformations and social movements are not the only actors that may take part in institutional work. Individuals or groups of individuals
like the professional police associations of the IACP, PERF, NOBLE, and NSA may also participate. The organizational field is central to institutional theory in that it embodies the intermediate level between organization and society and is involved in the process of disseminating and reproducing socially constructed expectations and practices (Scott, 2008). The institutional processes within a field may for a time give the appearance of stability since variations in interpretation and emphasis may be resolved temporarily through socially negotiated consensus. Thus, while occupational and professional communities will demonstrate periods of isomorphic stability, fields are not static but evolving (Greenwood et al., 2002). Organizational-level and field-level enabling conditions, such as the size and reputation of an agency or region, have enabled progressive law enforcement leaders like August Vollmer, O. W. Wilson, William Bratton, Jack Maple, James Fyfe, and Lorne Kramer to create, maintain and alter strategy and the role of the police (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006).*

Throughout its modern history, law enforcement agencies have been able to maintain their regulatory and legitimate authority both externally and internally through the creation of rules and standards as well as through the process of internalization and reinforcement of the normative and cognitive bases of the institution (Lawrence et al., 2009; Trank and Washington, 2009). Progressive law enforcement leaders along with their progressive constituents have shown the capacity to contextualize past practices and future projects within the contingencies of the moment while imagining and pursuing alternative strategies.
Their actions over the years challenge the belief that institutions are cognitively complete structures. Although actors may participate in the habitualized routines and practices that reproduce institutions, their actions are not simply unconscious and mechanical but are often made with awareness and purpose (Trank and Washington, 2009).

Still, in spite of these revelations and arguments, most studies of institutional work to date have avoided the individual analysis in favor of the organizational and organizational field levels (Battilana and D’Aunno, 2009). New institutionalists too often viewed attempts to examine the role played by individuals in institutional phenomena as reductionist. To the contrary, Hirsch and Lounsbury (1997) warn that vague descriptions or a lack of comprehension of actors’ agency undermines the ability to understand macro-level phenomena change. A weakness of institutional theory is that it offers organizational-level and organizational-field-level explanations for phenomena that implicitly involve individual behavior. Individual, organizational and organizational field dynamics are all interconnected (Battilana and D’Aunno, 2009). Although organizations and institutions illustrate progressively higher levels of constraint, they also provide opportunities for individual action (Friedland and Alford, 1991).

Police organizations overall are cultural and social systems embedded within an institutional context that includes the state, interests groups, and public opinion (Scott, 2003). Modern police agencies are highly institutionalized organizations that can best be understood by analyzing how their formal structure
and activities are shaped through powerful myths in their institutional environment. The absorption of powerful myths, such as the public perception of the police as the community watchman, which preceded the modern police organization, into the structure and activities of police departments enables them to attain public legitimacy and protection from outside meddling by powerful constituents who are present in the invasive institutional environment. Organizational conflict within the police is sometimes the result of conflicting institutional myths that are eventually resolved ceremonially through a ritual of public degradation of the department and the replacement of the dishonored police chief by a new chief with a “legitimating” mandate. (Crank and Langworthy, 1992; Crank, 1994 and 2003).

Law enforcement agencies are compelled to adopt organizational strategies that will assist them in retaining legitimacy and control. The ceremonial process of becoming accredited can become a ritual that promotes the myth of the professionalization of the police. Myth is a narrative of collective definitions society applies to particular solutions for social problems. They are historically-based traditional stories, usually by unknown authors, that rationalize practices, beliefs and events. Although myth is considered a fictional representation of human action or social phenomena, it uncovers underlying ideals (Kappeler, et al., 1993). Berger and Luckmann (1967) earlier stated that social life was only possible and perceived to the extent that individuals interact to create common cognitive frameworks and recognition that supports collective action. Thus, myths can also be viewed as “widespread understandings of social reality” which have the “ring of
truth to them.” Police departments may promote myths in a “dramaturgy of exchange” so that their moral legitimacy can be ceremonially demonstrated. The status of police accreditation allows departments to “look and act” like a professional police department. Pursuing goals, strategies and tactics will legitimize them with “powerful sovereigns,” such as influential police professional associations and accrediting bodies (Crank, 2003).

A professional police department can essentially be conceptualized as an ideal bureaucratic entity in that it has highly centralized control, strict discipline and stringent selection procedures (Staufenberger, 1977). Ritual and ceremonial activity are natural processes for the police since they are a largely homogenous group strongly cognizant of their own symbols despite geographic distances. Organizational traditions then become time-honored methods which adopt common sense values that cannot be easily or thoughtlessly altered. In a complex social setting, the police symbolically act out their fundamental values and norms through rituals in order to preserve consent and solidarity among its members while balancing outside influence and antagonism. Police funerals along with the ceremonial practices of issuing awards and achieving accreditation sustain police solidarity and public support. Overall, it would appear at first glance that since police executives are guided by professional logics they are compelled to pursue accreditation as a means to achieve professional status and maintain the agency’s legitimacy while police executives who do not pursue accreditation will eventually be replaced by a new executive with a legitimating mandate. On the other hand,
police executives have revealed that they possess a level of agency which allows them to reject the accreditation process and disrupt the institutional logics associated with status and legitimacy.

**Strategic Choice and Contingency Analysis**

As indicated earlier, institutional theory suggests that institutions shape patterns of action and organization instead of instrumental calculations aimed solely at maximizing profit or utility (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). The key difference between institutional theory and rational actor models that characterize many economic theories centers on the role that is assigned to the environment in which actors are embedded. While rational actor models tend to neglect the environmental influences on actors’ decisions, institutional theory takes into account these external influences by assigning a key role to legitimacy considerations in actors’ decision processes (Trank and Washington, 2009).

In the same way, earlier contingency theories counter the rational actions of economics as well as the closed-system organizational perspectives, such as Weber’s *Bureaucracy*, or Taylor's *Scientific Management*, in that the theorists felt that both Weber and Taylor neglected the contingency factors in organizational structures. Contingency theory links the internal environment of organizations and informal structure with formal structure. Several contingency approaches were developed concomitantly in the late 1960s in the United States. These
contingency theories sought to formulate generalities about the formal structures typically associated with, or that best fit the use of different technologies. The contingency perspective was significantly influenced by the research of Joan Woodward (1953), a leading English industrial sociologist. She argued that technologies directly determined differences in such organizational attributes as span of control, centralization of authority, and the formalization of rules and procedures. Contingency theory argues that there cannot be “one best way” to shape, manage or lead, since organizational structure is influenced by various aspects of the environment. The contingency perspective is guided by the general orienting hypothesis that organizations whose internal features best fit the demands of their environment will achieve the best adaptation.

Contingency theorist, Jay R. Galbraith (1973) suggests that there is no one best way to organize as well. On the other hand, any way of organizing is not equally effective. Thus, the best way to organize depends on the nature of the environment in which the organization operates (Scott, 2003). Galbraith’s version of contingency theory is harmonious with the systems design school because of its emphasis on information processing. The environment is characterized in terms of the amount of complexity and uncertainty it poses for the organization. Galbraith connects the extent of environmental challenge with organizational information systems by asserting that environmental uncertainty enters the organization when it affects the work or tasks it performs. He indicates that “the greater the task uncertainty, the greater the amount of information that must be processed among
decision makers during task execution in order to achieve a given level of performance” (Galbraith, 1977:36). Various structural arrangements including rules, hierarchy, and decentralization, are seen as mechanisms determining the information-processing capacity of the system. The rational challenge is to design a structural arrangement appropriate for the information-processing requirements of the tasks to be performed (Scott, 2003).

Other contingency theorists, such as Paul Lawrence and Jay Lorsch (1967), examined three different industries with varying degrees of environmental stability and instability. All the organizations from these three industries were vertical, self-contained entities that designed, marketed and manufactured their products. Meanwhile, the more complex organizations consisted of various departments, such as sales, production, applied research, and fundamental research. They focused on the impact of specific contingency factors to the organizational structures of these industries. These critical contingency factors, or independent variables to organizational structure and performance, were the external and internal environment, as well as, internal differentiation, orientation, formality of structure, and integration. Lawrence and Lorsch attempt to highlight how organizations that receive overriding pressures from the market differ from those confronted by technical and scientific dominant pressures.

Accordingly, they show that environmental conditions are an external dimension which has an impact on the organizational variable. The environmental demands facing various organizations differ and so do the environmental demands
that relate to the internal functioning of an effective organization. Organizations in a stable environment make more exclusive use of formal hierarchy because less integration is required. Decisions are made more effectively at higher organizational levels by fewer people. Greater differentiation among functional departments is required in different industries and influences the problems of integrating the organizational parts. In stable environments, conflicts are easier to resolve and integration is attained through the management hierarchy. In unstable environments, conflict resolution and integration are achieved at lower levels in the organization. Since organizational requirements for effective performance differ, lower-level resolution and integration is necessary.

These earlier contingency theories, however, remain incomplete in that they still lean toward a rational model that focuses internally at the expense of the environment. Conversely, differentiation of tasks and goals provides the framework for managerial decisions that shape the organization and impact the environment at the same time that the environment can shape the organization and impact managerial decisions. Critical strategic contingency theory is also a functionalist and positivistic approach (Donaldson, 1996) dependent on the functional importance of performance based on accompanying internal organizational capabilities to external conditions. Meanwhile, resource dependence suggests that organizational structure is controlled by the need for resources while the institutional perspective indicates that performance, legitimacy and survival is largely dependent on having the organizational forms
characteristic of their sector or niche. Overall, they emphasize environmental determinism rather than selection of the environment, thus largely disregard agency of choice by those with the power to direct the organization (Child, 1997).

The contingency perspective of strategic choice is an open-systems theory approach that attempts to address the critical research issue of the relationship between voluntarism and determinism and how their interactions and consequential tensions culminate in changes over time. Since choice is both a cause and a consequence of environmental influences, organizational adaptations manifest as cause and consequence interact as well as conflict as seen in Figure 2.2. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) and Pfeffer (1981) provided earlier views on power which indicated that the fundamental dependencies and vulnerabilities of organization and within the environment work together to create tensions that produce both organizational and environmental change. This idea suggests that the relative power of the organization and the environment, such as external stakeholders, is based on the balance between influence and countervailing power, and over time explains the prepotency of choice or determinism in the adaptation process. While higher organizational power suggests greater choice and latitude for strategic decisions by executives, powerful stakeholders can also increase environmental determinism concurrently (Hrebinia and Joyce, 1985).
The strategic choice perspective indicates that organizational choices are still possible in an open system environment that is highly deterministic in that the organization controls the means by which the prescribed results and outcomes may be achieved and tolerated by the environment. Hrebiniak and Joyce (1985) argue that organizational choice and environmental determinism can be identified as independent variables in the adaptation process. They indicate that while the interdependence and interactions between strategic choice and
environmental determinism outline adaptation, both are necessary to satisfactorily explain organizational adaptation since separately they are insufficient. Working independently within their institutions, individuals in certain circumstances can construct, eliminate, or redefine the objective features of an environment purposively setting the limits for their own decisions by creating their own measures of reality (Child, 1997). Nonetheless, the visible features of the actual environment, such as the structural characteristics of domains or industries and various niches, are important as well since they clearly exist while some are additionally problematic to control by individuals and their organizations. Albeit these are unconditional effects at times (Hannan and Freeman, 1977 and 1989; Carroll and Hannan, 2000) they are also the result of the strategic decisions of organizations at other times as illustrated in Table 2.1 (Hrebiniak and Joyce, 1985).
### Table 2.1

**Effect of Four Organizational Types in Choice-Determinism Typology on Organizational Variables***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Quadrant I</th>
<th>Quadrant II</th>
<th>Quadrant III</th>
<th>Quadrant IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High determinism</td>
<td>High determinism</td>
<td>Low determinism</td>
<td>Low determinism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low choice</td>
<td>High choice</td>
<td>High choice</td>
<td>Low choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choice</strong></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Differentiated</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Incremental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Strategic choices</strong></td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Medium-high</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision emphasis</strong></td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Primary — means</td>
<td>Primary — ends</td>
<td>Means-ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary — ends</td>
<td>Secondary — means</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic strategies</strong></td>
<td>Defender, cost leader</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Reactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus — analyzer</td>
<td>Focus — prospector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy, innovation</strong></td>
<td>Low (external constraints)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low (internal constraints)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political behavior, conflict</strong></td>
<td>Low-medium</td>
<td>High (interorganizational)</td>
<td>High (interorganizational)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search</strong></td>
<td>Solution-Problematic driven</td>
<td>Solution-driven; some slack search</td>
<td>Slack search</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hrebiniak and Joyce (1985:344)

Strategic choice analysis provides the possibility to integrate some of the different viewpoints in organization studies since it offers a dynamic rather than a static perspective on organizations and their environments. Strategic choice conveys a political process which brings agency and structure into tension and positions them with a significant context. Since the relationship of agency to both structure and environment is dynamic it indicates that there is a continuing adaptive learning cycle within the context of organizations as a socio-political system and reorients organizational analysis to first, the role of agency and choice; secondly, to the nature of the organizational environment; and thirdly, to the relationship between organizational agents and the environment. Strategic choice suggests that action is influenced through prior cognitive framing of actors and of
organizations in the form of embedded routines and culture (Berger and Luckman, 1967).

It is also a practice that demonstrates structuration (Giddens, 1984) in that action is bounded by the cognitive, material and relational structures existing within organizations and their networks while impacting those structures at the same time. Agents attempt to continually modify and redefine structure through their actions in order to allow different possibilities for future action. The process of organizational development includes (1) subjective constructions of situations created by objective events and by others’ interpretations of them; (2) attempts to interpret those subjective constructions into tangible (re)actions; and (3) further analysis of the consequences of those actions have had in a changing context. This process is not necessarily harmonious, but can be disorderly and divergent (Child, 1997).

The strategic choice perspective makes an effort to identify and analyze the role of strategy and management in organizations that are shaped by institutional environments. It stresses that the agent has the ability to make a rational assessment of available means and strategic conditions while there are many instances in which they can make a difference. Although institutional rules and intentional rational agency can be conceived as antagonistic mechanisms that contradict each other under market conditions, they are nonetheless interdependent. While institutions are a prerequisite for strategic decisions, institutionalized structures, informal rules, conventional scripts, and legally
enforced norms are compelled to change under pressure from agents who recognize their constraints when trying to achieve more efficient outcomes. Consequently, the inclusion of a systematic place for interests does not diminish the main theoretical attributes of institutional theory. Rather, it demonstrates the importance of institutional rules for understanding institutional change in a comprehensive model (Beckert, 1999).

Jens Beckert (1999) argues that the notion of uncertainty is at the core of this perspective. He asserts that (1) strategic agency can only be expected if institutionalized structures exist which reduce uncertainty for organizational actors; (2) actions that contradict existing institutional rules can be expected in situations characterized by relatively high degrees of certainty within an institutional field; (3) institutional work reigns in situations of high uncertainty within an institutional field; and (4) under conditions of greater certainty, institutionalized practices can be expected to be more opposed to strategic agency the more these practices receive high levels of social legitimacy and support from powerful agents and constituents.

More specifically, institutions reduce uncertainty by creating expectations in the behavior of others. Institutionalization is the process of social interaction through which actors realize that their expectations will be realized in the behavior of others. Organizations mimic each other in an uncertain environment but the institutional process reduces that uncertainty and allows for strategic choices that contradict institutional rules and norms such as
that which might be seen in decisions made over the pursuit of national police accreditation. Power is also a significant stabilizing aspect in processes of institutional change. Even if actors conclude that existing strategies, rules or structures are inefficient, internal politics within organizations can effectively prevent change. Meanwhile, powerful stakeholders and constituents within the organizational environment can exercise power to force the organization to comply with institutionalized practices. Although the influence of power on institutionalized practices is relative, it is sometimes overlooked by institutional theory which overemphasizes legitimation as the sole stabilizing factor. Strategic choice, on the other hand, underscores the active role of actors and groups who have the power to influence the structures of their organizations through an essentially political process (Beckert, 1999).

The perspective focuses on the process of analyzing constraints and opportunities weighed against values in determining organizational strategies. Organizational decision makers maintain performance and legitimacy and avoid institutional sanctions by responding to reactions within their environment. The feedback becomes an interactive process between choice and constraint and provides the organization learning opportunities (Child, 1997). For instance, although law enforcement CEOs are constrained by the environment, such as public demand and scrutiny as well as legal guidelines, alongside internal forces, such as office politics or unions, their responses or strategic decisions can be modified to adjust to these restraints. Nonetheless, the ability of leaders in the law
enforcement field to make decisions for the profession and respective organizations and choices over policies depends largely on their ability to preserve autonomy within their environment by achieving the levels of performance expected of them (Freidson, 1988; Child, 1997).

Overall, the strategic choice perspective shifts focus from the environmental and organizational conditions and strategy to the role played by managers in influencing conditions and processes both outside and within the organization. It draws upon the social action approach within sociology (Weber, Bourdieu and Giddens) in conjunction with strategic management theory to advance the view that managerial action can impact upon performance and organizational direction (Child, 1997). For example, law enforcement leaders who are members of powerful and influential organizations, such as IACP, PERF, NOBLE, and NSA, which were instrumental in establishing police accreditation over thirty years ago, are more likely than not to reject it. On the other hand, other policing strategies and initiatives developed within the same era, such as community policing and Compstat, are more widely accepted. Strategic choice integrates both an objective and subjective outlook on the organization’s environment in that the objective features of the environment and organizational actions are processed through the subjective evaluation of decision-makers. Law enforcement executives communicate their views and share their thoughts through a large network of professional organizations and educational training and, as a result, normalize and standardize their choices within the scope of their institution. Accordingly, this
in institutional environment consists of social organizations which exhibit a degree of cohesion around a shared identity (Childs, 1997).

Strategic choice provides two very functional contributions to the understanding of the process of accommodating performance expectations from outside the organization. First, the recognition that people in law enforcement often belong, or have access to, such social groups, or organizations, such as IACP, PERF, NOBLE, NSA, FBI-LEEDS, and IACALEA. Meanwhile, executives and senior managers are likely to be members of working governmental working parties or commissions as well as organizational social groups or professional associations as in the case of commissioners for CALEA, or the governing boards of IACP, NOBLE and NSA.

Second, through this social and professional connection, senior executive management exercises influence over the criteria of structure, performance and success for their agency. The relationships between members of an organization and the members of external bodies are likely to exhibit the characteristics of social change (Blau, 1964). These social networks facilitate the attainment of innovation, knowledge and other resources outside organizations and allow exchanges of information related to the development of goals for organizational development and learning. The plurality of these diversified networks across resources and regions creates internal political debates and negotiation as witnessed by the variance rate of accreditation by size and region. Investigating and understanding these conflicts over organizational priorities, policies, structures, and actions is
critical in understanding the processes of how knowledge is achieved and handled and direction taken by law enforcement executives (Child, 1997).

**Part II: Methods**

The goal of the research is to examine and analyze first, how decisions are made by law enforcement leaders in regards to pursuing or rejecting national police accreditation; second, the context in which these decisions are made, or why; and third, the relationship between agency and environmental determinism in these choices. Ethnography was the appropriate method selected since the study looks at the culture and environment of the police and explores their beliefs, language, and behavior, as well as their power and authority. The research was structured for a deductive/inductive analysis, or abductive analysis. This abductive approach at the individual-level was used to compare three competing organizational theories, resource-dependency, institutional and strategic choice/contingency, in order to assess which one(s) offer more relevant explanations to these questions.

**Abductive Analysis**

An abductive analysis of the qualitative data was used to identify and measure the relevant merits of the organizational theories of resource dependency, institutional and strategic choice/contingency in order to generate the theoretical explanations for the interaction between agency and structure.
regarding decisions made on accreditation. The abduction approach provided a mixed-method approach of induction and deduction designed to assist in the analysis of the data. This approach provided relevant explanations as well as to an alternative hypothesis and insight based on the data results.

Although traditional grounded theory is a generally preferred method with inductive research, it can impede theory development because of its primary focus on induction. Grounded theory allows theories to emerge inductively rather than first establishing analytical frameworks. Consequently, the abductive approach to this research began with the theoretical foundations of resource dependency, institutional and strategic choice/contingency. Abductive analysis is reiterative as well and allowed for both inductive and deductive forms of reasoning with regard to decisions made by the law enforcement executives interviewed (Timmermans and Tavory, 2012).

Timmermans and Tavory (2012) describe abduction as an inferential process designed to produce new ideas and theories based on unexpected research evidence. It develops from actors’ social and intellectual positions which are guided by methodological steps of data analysis through the processes of revisiting, familiarization and alternative casing or interpretation (Timmermans and Tavory, 2012; 167). While grounded theory is designed to decode empirical data and construct theory through inductive analysis in qualitative research, abductive logic reflects the process of constructively making inferences by verifying them with more data. Abduction complements traditional grounded theory in that it
moves back and forth between data and theory iteratively (Timmermans and Tavory, 2012).

Abductive analysis represents a qualitative data analysis approach designed to construct theory. It relies on systematic methodological analysis and refinement of empirical findings, which can sometimes be anomalous and unanticipated, against a background of multiple existing sociological theories, such as resource-dependency, institutional and strategic-choice/contingency. Consequently, the principle ideas associated with grounded theory, such as the role of main ideas of present-day theories in qualitative data analysis as well as the relationship between methodology and theory generation, are reconsidered. More specifically, abduction is a method of analyzing data results in relation to previous findings that are similar, but which may uncover hidden cause and effects that can lead to the construction of new general descriptions. As such, it is conjectural because it works toward a situational fit between observed facts and rules. Abductive analysis further stimulates both inductive and deductive forms of reasoning, which can be repeated as new uncharacteristic findings surface. While induction examines the demonstration of generalizations, patterns, outliers, and relevant themes in the data, deduction supports a reanalysis of both existing and new data (Timmermans and Tavory, 2012).

Timmermans and Tavory (2012) have argued that researchers possess model theories of the world that are influenced by their certain positions in life, such as parents and academics, or ethnicity and socio-economic statuses, that
limits our access to a field and provides subjective perceptions regarding empirical data. Since sociology has never been a paradigmatic science, prevailing social theories provide a heuristic potential for debate and augmentation that can broaden theoretical innovation (Abbott, 2004; Timmermans and Tavory, 2012).

While there is no standardized protocol or paradigm for theory construction, the paired processes of searching and revisiting anomalies or new findings expand the possibilities of abduction. Defamiliarization prompts us to reconsider characteristics and viewpoints we took for granted, while revisiting them lets us to return to the same observation and transition to alternative ideas. When these processes occur in the context of existing theories, we can reconsider concepts and theoretical frameworks in both coding and memo writing. The recursive and iterative characteristic of abductive analysis not only produces but also rejects and narrows possible theoretical indications. Still, while some abduction is productive, Timmermans and Tavory (2012) caution that there are more dead ends and erroneous impressions than good ideas that result in the construction of theory.

Research Design

The abductive approach was the method used for the data with the intent to generate fresh theoretical insights through the interaction of developed theoretical knowledge and methodological heuristics. This method did not ignore predetermined theoretical ideas, but rather emphasized the use of a broad
theoretical base throughout the research process that offered deeper insight into the existing theories used in the analysis of the data as seen in Figure 2.3. The methodological guidelines for grounded theory assisted in abductive reasoning through the process of “revisiting, de-familiarizing, and alternative casing in light of theoretical knowledge,” (Timmermans and Tavory, 2012; 180).

Figure 2.3

Analytic Map of Codes and Sub-Codes of the Research Design

Through a purposive, non-probability sampling method, twenty-eight intensive interviews were conducted for several months, beginning in August of 2014 and ending in March of 2015, with law enforcement leaders CEOs.11 The interviewees were subjectively chosen based on my knowledge and experience.

11 See Appendix – B
in policing and accreditation, as well as to ensure that the sample was proportional. Consequently, they were law enforcement leaders from both accredited agencies and non-accredited agencies of various sizes within five specified regions in the United States: Northeast; South; Midwest; Mountain; and Pacific. It included local police departments, sheriffs’ offices, primary state authorities, transportation police, and campus law enforcement. The proportion of agencies that were either located in a region which had a state accrediting body not affiliated with CALEA or not were also considered in the sampling design. Agency types were selected from categories established by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) on law enforcement agencies while agency size was calculated based on data on the number of agencies and personnel in the United States. More agencies in the northeast were selected for greater likelihood of in-person interviews. The participants were equally divided between CALEA accredited and non-accredited agencies (N=14). The interviews (approximately one to two hours in length) were conducted either in-person at the headquarters of the organization (N=14) or by telephone (N=14) due to geographic distances. The interviews were structured as guided conversation in order to provide an idiographic causal explanation for actions, meanings and perceptions. The questions were created to answer the following variables:

---

13 See Appendix – C and Appendix – D
14 See Appendix – E
1. The reasons behind organizational choices at the executive level within the institutional environment;

2. The identification of any variations in procedures and results between accredited and non-accredited agencies;

3. The identification of any variations in the institutional environments between accredited and non-accredited agencies;

4. The identification of any variations in available resources and dependency between accredited and non-accredited agencies;

5. Perceptions of the organization’s efficiency and legitimacy as seen at the executive level and externally;

6. The strength of network ties from both the accredited and non-accredited agencies;

7. The dynamics behind the acceptance or rejection of the police accreditation process and overall the diffusion of ideas, practices and strategies among law enforcement agencies;

8. The bureaucratic and political nature of policing; and

9. The latitude of discretionary power of the police chief, or CEO.

All interviews were recorded, transcribed and coded in order to triangulate the variables involved in the executive decisions and organizational choices to either participate or not participate in national police accreditation within their respective institutional environment. The coding, triangulation and analysis of the variables was facilitated by QSR International’s NVivo 10.\textsuperscript{15} Content from the

\textsuperscript{15} QSR International (2010) states: “Qualitative research is all about exploring issues, understanding phenomena and answering questions. It happens in nearly every workplace; it’s just you might not know by
transcripts of the interviews were organized and structured among a variety of themes and sub-themes based on the characteristics from the three organizational theories used for the comparative analysis in the study.

Owing to the abductive analysis approach, accreditation was treated as the end result of organizational choices and direction for these law enforcement agencies. Since the study tests three competing organizational theories, analytic codes of the variables from these theories were created in order to reflect the purpose the research. Resource-dependency, institutional, and contingency/strategic choice along with their characteristics were coded as three major themes and subthemes within NVivo 10. Responses from the interviews and field notes, were categorized and listed under one of the numerous subthemes for the three competing organizational theories. The data results were then explored in order develop a hypothesis on the more relevant theories(s) along with the possibility for the development of a newer or modified theory. This included both a content analysis and relational analysis of the discussions.

16 See Appendix – F and Appendix – G
IRB and Informed Consent

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Boston University, Charles River Campus, requires that all social and behavioral research involving human subjects be approved prior to the undertaking of any research activities. Primary investigators and researchers at Boston University are also required by the IRB to receive human subjects training, which was completed in April, 2014. IRB approval for Exempt Review was received for this project on April 28, 2014.17 This non-funded study was interviewed-based while the identities of individuals and organizations were protected by identifying the interviewees through their first names only, excluding agency identification, and referring to locations by regions only. As such, it presented no greater than minimal risk to the human subjects.18 The IRB review and approval process is intended to promote ethical conduct and to ensure that the human subjects and other information, such as data collection and processing, are treated with integrity. This includes the acknowledgement and understanding of the rights, risks and rewards of participating in the research by all human subjects. This understanding was conveyed in the current study through an informed consent document which explained the project, such as the purpose of the study, requirements for participation, and a statement of potential risks and benefits to participants. Each participant was required to acknowledge understanding of these by signing the document prior to being interviewed.19

17 See Appendix – H
18 See Appendix – I
19 See Appendix – J
Summary and Limitations

In general, it was understood that the abductive approach for this qualitative study required that general ideas and a broader hypothesis needed to be developed prior to the assignment of analytic codes that were representative of the themes and subthemes derived from the interviews which contradicts the traditional method of induction for qualitative analysis. Nonetheless, their selections were based on prior knowledge of theories, a literature review on the topic, and a review and assessment of the data. This approach was instinctive and logical in that one of goals for the research was to assess the validity of three existing competing theories.

Internal validity of the research findings was determined through the comparisons of three competing organizational theories for analyzing the participants’ responses. The small purposive sample size taken from a field or institution that includes a substantial number of organizations and personnel could cause reservations over the study’s internal validity or generalizability. Nonetheless, the research was conducted at the individual-level over several geographic regions while previous studies and analyses have suggested that the police are largely a homogeneous group despite their numbers and locations.

What the qualitative evaluation has provided, however, is a description of the perceptions, attitudes and understandings of individual law enforcement leaders who are the most closely related to organizational direction, such as the
pursuit of police accreditation, through an analysis of three competing organizational theories regarding their choices. All told, this qualitative research design follows the advice of Timmermans and Tavory who advocate that abductive analysis can generate additional theoretical insights through the interaction of developed theoretical knowledge and methodological heuristics. Rather than ignoring predetermined theoretical ideas, the approach is designed to emphasize the use of a broad theoretical base throughout the research process in order to offer the possibility of deeper insight into existing theories or newly uncovered data. Meanwhile the methodological guidelines for grounded theory can encourage abductive reasoning through a process of “revisiting, defamiliarizing, and alternative casing in light of theoretical knowledge,” which can deliver fresh insights or ideas.

Part III: Data Results

The abductive approach to the data from the twenty-eight interviews intimated responses which supported an institutional organizational perspective the majority of the time, followed by the strategic choice viewpoint as seen in Figure 2.4. Meanwhile, responses that characterized resource dependency fell a distant third, yet it is should be noted that in general the theory is a macro level economic perspective while this study on policing was conducted at the individual level.
The abductive analysis of the empirical findings was determined through the triangulation of sources and references in NVivo 11. Through NVivo 11 sources were identified in this case as the participants and the number of attributes, or references, made by the respondents that were assigned to a specific code or sub-code (i.e. variables). References represented the number of statements that supported the assigned code or sub-code and were sometimes classified by more than one due to their similarities. For example, the institutional
characteristics of entrepreneurial work at the macro level is comparable to the characteristics of strategic choice at the micro level. The coding of statements to variables were also influenced by an overall theme which clearly surface during the interviews. Overall, twenty-eight (27.3) of the sources (participants) provided 745 references (statements), which were classified to support the abductive approaches predetermined codes and sub-codes as seen in Table 2.2. The sources column reveals that twenty-seven out of twenty-eight interviews participant responses supported the characteristics of all three organizational theories at least one time.

Table 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Theory</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Dependency</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Choice</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanwhile, aggregate totals of sources and references for all analytic codes and sub-codes from the twenty-eight interviews are shown in Table 2.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES AND SUBCODES</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Dependency</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Pos-Power</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isomorphism</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext Org Conflict</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Mandates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimetic</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-Ceremony</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy and Symbolism</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Network</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Development</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logics*</td>
<td>28*</td>
<td>28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative*</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative*</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null*</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Work</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Power</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Choice</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead-Adapt-Choice</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. Tool</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Mgt.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Political</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego-Self Interest</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Membership</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Org Conflict</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Aggregate numbers based on solely on answer to binary (yes/no) question of professional development within a particular organization.
CHAPTER 3: RESOURCE DEPENDENCY

As indicated earlier, resource-dependency indicates that organizations are reliant on the environment for their survival. The perspective focuses more on environmental determinism than agency since it asserts that external control is not only possible but inevitable. Organizations are affected by the environment because they are embedded in networks of interdependence and social relationships. Their need for financial and physical resources as well as for information within the environment makes organizations is often reciprocal and sometimes indirect. The organizations’ dependency on the environment for survival and success isn’t necessarily problematic during stable times, but a volatile environment can alter resources. Thus, organizations have to adapt their activities and alter their procedures in response to variations in environmental conditions which can be achieved through political means and inter-organizational relationships. Overall, organizations are more likely to succeed in a competitive, volatile or political environment if they maintain the ability to control their critical resources and create stability.

This chapter will explore the respondents’ ideas concerning four important aspects of resource dependency and how they might be related to the decisions made by law enforcement executives on whether to pursue or not accreditation. These include the overall environment; the impact of police-community relationships; the role of their power and position within their network; and finally,
the availability of resources. It is important to bear in mind that respondents are leaders in distinctive agencies that vary by size, geographical location, and authority who are often confronted by differentiated tasks.

Figure 3.1 below is a simple regression graph that shows the participants who made references to Resource Dependency during the interview. The y-axis (independent variable) identifies the participant while x-axis (dependent variable) indicates the percentage of references made to the environment.

Figure 3.1

Participants References to Resource Dependency
Environment

According to the resource dependency model, the external control of police actions, behavior and direction are inevitable since their continued existence and product are affected by the context in which law enforcement organizations are embedded. The police need to be seen as legitimate in order to function and receive the physical resources necessary to accomplish its mission. Consequently, decisions and actions made by law enforcement leaders are strongly influenced by these factors. Chief P.D.F explains the reasons why many agencies did not become accredited were:

One is cost. Two is the community doesn't want it. There's no expectation from the community to do it. Insurance companies are not pushing it meaning we don't have a lot of lawsuits so (there isn't) external pressure to ... I think that our Department took a lot of CALEA’s (rules) and incorporated them into our standards without going through the CALEA process. But I just don't think there is the community support for us (spend a lot of money) to have move forward on it. Like I said, all the prior initiatives were internal (as) they would never get external support. . .

Another variation on this argument can be seen in the remarks of the Chief D.R.M, the CEO of a large private university police department, who reasons that he has been able to do all the things that accredited departments do without the need to go through the accreditation process while he is not pressured with liability costs issues because of particular environmental elements:
We do all the things that municipal departments and accredited departments do. We do all of the things that CALEA or CFA in Florida requires their accredited agencies to do. We do all those things. However, we're a private university and organization so the issue of reducing liability because of accreditation doesn't really offer as much protection since people see the University as having "very deep pockets." So I don't see the value in it and I don't see the rewards for all the time you have to spend on it. What's the reward for it? I don't see it. And we're pretty leading edge in everything we do. So I don't see us spending all that time on it. We may get a president or we may get somebody here that may say, "I want you guys to be accredited" and then we'll do it, but we'd be doing it just to do it.

Conversely, what may be true in some situations does not necessarily function in quite the same manner in completely different environments, such as urban locations with high levels of poverty, serious crime and violence. Chief M.E.F describes how a set of specific set of environmental factors influences the priorities of his department:

Our greatest crime density is also where our most impoverished areas are which is being treated and in our city poverty correlates with race. So that's a significant problem for us here. It's very high rates of violence (combined with) very weak firearms laws and huge numbers of high quality firearms. Now we're a city of 600,000 people and last year we've seized 2,500 firearms. I am not even talking about a gun buyback program. I am talking about heists with guns, cars with guns, search warrants with guns. I am not even including the buyback in that. So last August, we had NYPD commanders down here looking at our Compstat results because we track performance metrics not just the level of crime. I had a conversation with them about how many guns they've seized. I think at the time they had 150 more guns than we did. There are 8 million people living in New York. On top of that, last year I had 103 homicides and 559 cases of shootings.
Chief M.E.F also tells how he was introduced to these environmental challenges:

The way it was communicated to me when I was hired was that the police department needed to develop a better relationship with the minority and the media. The department also needed to be better and more effective at controlling violent crime and there was a need to look into what were perceived as parochial that were impeding the department's efforts to be accepted by all its constituencies.

Deviations within the environment of the police organization push the leadership to adapt and modify their procedures in order to maintain legitimacy and resources. Director R.S.C points out the dire consequences if police agencies fail to respond internally to environmental forces:

I think that the most effective leaders in law enforcement are those that kind of open themselves to schools of thought that are unconventional. I know it's both tough to do because in our business we're so structured and the impact of error. If you make an error as a chief executive, then policing costs lives; it costs disruption in your community; it can cost you dearly. So a very calculating risk taker I think is the most effective leader in law enforcement. I believe that when we take calculated risks and open our thoughts a little bit we are better off. If we polarize ourselves in this business I don't think we're going to make progress in improving our organizations. It's not a free or forgiving environment.

Still, environmental control of police organizations can also be explained as the socio-political processes of strategic choices, demonstrating that one perspective rarely explains all that is going and, in fact, overlaps with elements of competing ideas and theories. Chief W.H.L highlights how the choice on
accreditation is also a socio-political process of balance between influence and countervailing power by the community:

I always wanted to do accreditation and supported its ideas. But if you want to implement a program like CALEA, you need support from the community. I recall a report from an outside source to the Town before I was the Chief of Police. It determined that professional standards were not worth the money in which they wanted to spend on it. So I haven't been able to get involved in accreditation during my tenure, but that's a political choice that the Town is entitled to make.

Police-Community Relations

Law enforcement agencies are reliant on their relationships with the community and this takes on a particular salience during periods of social change and instability. Under these circumstances, public demands and unpredictable financial resources compel the police to adapt in their response to fluctuations in public trust and support. Director R.S.C alludes to the “broken windows” argument in discussing the significance of accreditation for police-community relations:

Accreditation assists us in providing quality services to the community through various approaches. However, I am sure that George Kelling (co-authored, "Broken Windows") is going nuts with the interpretation of broken windows policing as a main focus on minor order maintenance or Compstat being simply a focus on numbers. Not that that they aren't good and I think Bratton (former NYPD Commissioner) has really exposed on how that's improved quality of life in communities. However, oversimplification of that stuff just drives me nuts because really the most effective way you can police in local communities is policing with the support of majority of the community.
Chief D.A.C links community support for accreditation to quality controls in other services:

I don’t think that the community would stop supporting our accreditation efforts especially since it’s the same city manager and this city manager is very pro-CALEA and accreditation overall. In fact, he wants the fire department to seek their accreditation process and any of our city operations that have accreditation processes, he wants them to try to go through that process.

Meanwhile, several other respondents give credit to close community collaboration and input. Chief B.D.D:

The number one thing that I preach is to make genuine connections with people in the community because if we sit back in our office and think about what communities need, we’re always going to miss the mark. We’re not taking the chance of losing this genuine interaction with all levels of the community by focusing simply on standards and policies. That’s been the one and only thing that I preach to my people. As an example, if the community sees street vendors as the priority then why aren’t we taking care of traffic also? If we completely miss the mark; if we miss the mark on what the community wants, then we will always be behind the curve.

Chief M.D.M:

The community’s perception is important, so we put out, as required by accreditation, a survey. But with police in a large city, especially us, you don’t hear from the people as much that they like what you’re doing. Instead, you hear a lot of complaints but I think we have a very good reputation within the community. I think that with the outreach that the men and women have done here, we’ve started to get—we’re getting awards. We go to community groups and we answer any questions anybody needs or any assistance from us with anything. We try to respond very quickly to any problems in our neighborhoods.
Chief P.D.F:

Some policies and procedures are generated by what the public wants. You can't ignore what the community is looking for in expectations of how they want their police department to operate because what might be some policy in Fort Worth, Texas is not going to be good policy in our community. Maybe most police policies are very similar around the country, I'm not sure, but the community also has a say in where you're going with policy. They have an expectation of what their police department should be and you need to be able to structure your policies around that.

Nevertheless, discussion of the “community” as a single entity omits the recognition of major divisions between sections of that social unit, whether they are geographical location, racial diversity or other factors.

Chief D.G.F:

Like a lot of communities, our community has two very distinct populations. We have a very well-heeled, genteel, if you will, population that lives on the outskirts of the city who are very comfortable, very well to do for the most part, good property owners, maintain their properties, et cetera. Then we have pretty much the downtown area which is very transient. That's where we've seen most of our issues criminally speaking. So the more well-heeled population is very demanding. They want their stop signs and their speed limits enforced. They want the equality of life issues, whereas the downtown population is very adverse to the police and obviously will do anything they can to get, one, away with something; and, two, make sure that we are not aware of that. And if we do, then that's from the experience of dealing with the lies and the behaviors that go along with that. In general, we actually have a relatively good relationship with our overall population so I can usually get the resources that I need, but there can still be some friction.
Of all these community divisions the one that has received the most attention in recent years is the tension between the police and racial minorities as indicated by the following participants.

Deputy Chief F.R.N:

We're kind of reinventing ourselves over the last year because of the events in Ferguson and Baltimore and across the country with police protests. We shifted a little bit more focus towards community-based policing and complementing it with community outreach. For example, tomorrow over in Internal Affairs we selected 12 families that are needy in the community and we're going to go out and we're going to knock in their door in uniform and drive up in a patrol car and hand them a hundred dollars in behalf of our department to start the New Year right. That's our Internal Affairs unit. We're doing things like that in the area of patrol. You got the Chief's community challenge coin where if you're caught doing something good for the community they'll give you this little challenge coin that signifies being engaged with the community.

Director R.S.C:

I don't care whether you're servicing a minority community or not. Unless you are treating that minority community like they're the enemy, they will be with you. They don't want to be held hostage when they're living in their homes, afraid that their kids going to school are going to be assaulted or recruited in the gangs. I mean the minority communities do not want that. For the most part, they want to live normal lives. And if we reflect how effective we can be in policing it goes back to the old community policing

Chief D.K.D:

One of the things I got across to my personnel at a recent department meeting was my philosophy on policing for the Town. I showed some
videos of Ferguson and the abysmal behavior of police out there which is only dreadful because their leader either failed to lead or said this was the culture. I wanted to make it clear that it was not the culture here. There was one point where there was an officer pointing a gun at people in the crowd saying, "Back up. I am going to shoot you." Back up or I am going to shoot? Well, now that he's got the gun out, what is he supposed to do? Shoot them? So I made it clear what I expected from officers in this organization. Good leaders who do this are not afraid of criticism and they're open to new ideas. Generally speaking, they know they don't have all the answers.

In the end, however, despite the acknowledgement of the importance of fostering good police-community relations, many of the interviews reverted to the impediments of time and money of accreditation.

Chief M.A.R:  
I would like to become accredited but it would be a tough sell with our budget because I've essentially got three bosses on the police side. The commissioners, who I have to answer to since they are all elective officials, and then I've got a city manager, a city council and mayor that I have to deal with on non-police related issues, like the budget or personnel matters. So it's an additional layer I have to go through. But I will tell you the commission has helped me from a pay standpoint because under the charter, on the city charter they set salary. So they're very supportive of higher salaries for the officers here.

Deputy Chief C.M.S:  
Many agencies, especially in our area, choose not to undergo accreditation at all because of time and money. So even though we continued it we still eliminated our specific neighborhood policing units per se. However, we didn't step away from our community-oriented policing efforts although in the lean times, from about 2008, frankly until this year when there were heavy, heavy budget constraints on law enforcement agencies across the country. As a result, we became more reactive. There's no doubt about it. We had to push back a lot. We eliminated specialized units. We pushed those officers back to patrol,
and we were limited just by the sheer volume of our calls for service and our ability to handle. As we started to see our response times increase fairly dramatically, we have just now started to see for the first time our response times start to trend down again for the first time since 2008, and we're pleased with that. We got a lot of work to do in that area.

Chief K.B.C reveals that not only are time and money significant considerations regarding accreditation, decisions on whether to become accredited is also, as suggested earlier, an essentially socio-political process of the balance of power and influence between the police and the community:

I think one the biggest drawback to accreditation is the financial commitment. It's hard to support department initiatives when they are already strapped for resources. It's hard for city officials to buy into it and say, "Okay, we're going to assign some people to this process," because it already recognized the value of those funds. People around you don't recognize the value until the process is completed. Then over a period of time, you start to see the benefits. But it's hard to measure those benefits at any time so it's a big commitment. People see that commitment, see that work that's involved, and again, might have to say, "I can't do it; I don't have the people."

Chief M.E.F, meanwhile, suggests that while accreditation can help make an impact on police-community relations, a law enforcement agency can also be coerced into pursuing it because of external conflict and pressure:

You only got three to five years; that's what most of the chiefs have, all right. They're usually in that position at larger departments from three to five years. Well, hell they say, "I want to make an impact on the community during that time." If there's not much going on in the community; okay, then I'll get accredited. So you see there are some big cities that got accredited but usually it's in the context of a lot of litigation.
Networks and Power

Law enforcement organizations are embedded in a network of social relationships and interdependence with the public and other criminal justice organizations that can generate asymmetrical relationships. The level of power and prestige for a law enforcement agency is contingent on its ability to acquire their most critical resources while maintaining a level of control over the environment as is evident with monopolies in the utilities and energy industries.

Chief M.D.M:

I consider us the leaders in law enforcement, in our region. That is why when I became chief, I still get a building where we can have training; and because we’re an accredited agency, we share the training and the facilities with the rest of the law enforcement community in our area. They look to us because we have the larger resources.

Director R.S.C:

From a standpoint of reality, for those who have a better grasp of what it takes to become accredited, we realized that it was a commitment. It was a real commitment to do this and it was a commitment of resources, personnel, energy, time, and investment of belief that in fact we have to conform at least to some broad guidelines and stay between the fences of how we conduct our business. I know I’ve heard it from many chiefs and sheriffs that we just don't have the resources to pour into that. Now that is a prioritization obviously. You have to prioritize what you’re going to put your resources into. And then I've heard others especially smaller agencies say that we don't have the funding to be able to do this, to pay the fees and the cost of contracting with CALEA. We’re a large state agency so not only did we make the commitment, but we had the budget and personnel.
Resources

Law enforcement agencies which have the ability to maintain control over their most critical resources and reduce their uncertainty in an unstable environment are more likely to be successful since they possess the power to modify their organizational strategies and behavior in order to maintain legitimacy with the public. Time and again, the respondents stressed the critical role of resources and how that was strongly linked to the decisions about accreditation:

Chief D.R.M:

One of the major reasons we don’t participate in accreditation is just because of the manpower. And the expense for manpower that it takes; having the assessors come out here and all that work that goes into doing all these things; putting on all that show. I mean, I remember back at the Miami Police Department; I was a Captain on the Bomb Squad and responsible for the static display of all of our equipment and stuff. It took weeks of planning and getting everybody on schedule and cleaning all the equipment and having it all up there for these CALEA assessors to walk around and look at it. To me, I didn't any benefit in having do things like that.

Major N.R.C:

We did not have what was needed for accreditation because what you had was that our barracks were antiquated and wouldn’t have passed. It (CALEA) requires lock-ups and processing, everything you need, evidence, all the way down to where our troop stations don't even have lock-ups, no lock-ups. It literally also takes an act of congress for us to construct a new barracks. The only reason we were able to build that new one in Bedford is because it was combined with the Department of Transportation. It’s the best Troop Station in the State right now, but the only reason we pulled if off was because everybody pooled their resources. So I mean, it was such an expense to really take and do that that and I think that's really what drove us saying, “Hey, you know what?” “Accreditation is something that's hopeful for the future, but we're going to have to make some changes.” In the final analysis, however, we don’t
do accreditation because of a lack of resources; we don't even have enough staff to manage something like that.

Deputy Chief C.M.S:

I think some agencies choose not to undergo accreditation at all because of time and money; and the same probably goes for those who already have it and are now pursuing CALEA’s new “gold standard.” So, I got to be honest; it’s a battle. It hasn’t been this smooth process that everybody picks up every year. People and even myself come to the realization at times is that it is difficult and time-consuming and it takes you away from your real job. For example, when I was working in homicide, which was usually 50 to 60 hours a week, I would stay late on my own because it was the only time I could work on my accreditation standards. So you start to ask yourself, “Is this really worth it? What are we getting out of this?” We’ve had a lot of hard discussions even recently at the command staff level about whether we want to stay on this course. Do we want to keep doing this? Hell, we’re fighting just to get cops to calls for service and in a timely manner.

Some of the respondents linked accreditation to the size of the agency, although this also amounted to budget considerations.

Superintendent E.M.F:

Smaller agencies in our area don’t have budgets of millions, they have budgets of thousands. So the idea of accreditation and adding any sort of cost to that makes it something that's really appealing but very unaffordable.

Chief P.M.M:

I think many agencies don’t get involved with accreditation because it's a perceived cost issue or maybe it’s a real cost issue and also the manpower, the personnel that they believe it takes to get it done, which is true to some extent.
Additionally, a few of the respondents provided other considerations with the resources necessary for accreditation. Chief D.A.C for example, admits that he utilized CALEA as a strategic management instrument for additional resources and improvements for his facilities:

CALEA is a good line of defense when it comes to the budget process and modernizing equipment. For instance, we're changing over to a certain level of equipment. The city officials might, "Why do you need protective barriers in a cruiser?" "Why can't you save a couple of thousand dollars there?" The answer is because it's a CALEA standard. "Oh, okay, no problem." It's almost like when you tell a city councilor during the budget process, "We're paying for that because it's a contractual issue with the unions." They respond, "Oh, okay, that's somewhere we can't cut." CALEA has that same effect. In fact, we're going through that right now with our new police facility and trying to comply with the standards on facilities.

On the other hand, one respondent voices his desire to pursue accreditation for its legitimizing value while describing his lack of resources for it while another insists that agencies should pursue despite their lack of resources.

Chief M.A.R:

We have a tax gap so that further restricts our ability to get additional money as appropriated for programs like this. So would I like to be become accredited. If the lack of money wasn't a problem or an issue for our city, I would move forward with that process because I believe that whenever you can enhance the credibility of your agency in the eyes of the public and in the eyes of the profession, that's a good thing. We should always strive to do that, but it's a money issue.
Chief D.K.D:

I know a lot of people tell me that they don't get into it because it’s costly—I hear that—and it's not inexpensive. And then I hear that I can't dedicate people to do it. I get that one too. But there's nothing in that yellow book that any law enforcement agency shouldn't be doing. And does that mean it's not a pain in the ass? Oh, it's an overt pain in the ass. But I should be doing it and so we do it.

Finally, Chief P.D.F discloses that accreditation causes internal conflicts and grievances along with time and resource problems as the organization attempts to restructure or refine its operational procedures:

The major drawback of CALEA is cost, cost, and time—it’s a long-term system commitment. And internally, you're going to have internal issues that might force you to change some contractual language. Maybe you have to change some sort of past practice behaviors. They're going to get grieved. Yeah; so you're going to have internal strife as well.

Summary

The interviews highlighted in this chapter provide evidence that the four fundamental features of resource dependency; environment, police-community relations, networks and power, and resources, can be linked to decisions about accreditation and how police organizations are shaped and guided externally. Although the law enforcement executives who were interviewed lead agencies of varying types, their decisions on accreditation and strategy were controlled by
For instance, the respondents indicated that many police agencies, whether they were large or small, did not pursue accreditation because of the amount of time and stress on resources that it required along with the lack of community support. Meanwhile, those that did had the resources, power and influence, were well positioned within their network, and had outside support as a result of police-community relations. All the respondents, however, suggested that their organizations were able to be successful despite a volatile and politically challenging environment when they were able to control and receive resources whether they pursued accreditation or not.

Corresponding organizational and managerial themes to resource dependency were also uncovered in the respondents’ answers. Some of the respondents described environmental influences and the need for resources as a socio-political process of balance between influence and countervailing power by the community and other outside constituents. One chief suggested that a police agency in need of resources and legitimacy can being coerced into pursuing accreditation because of external conflict and pressure. Still, another chief admitted that he used accreditation strategically as a management tool to improve his infrastructure and acquire additional resources.

Overall, resource dependency was a natural fit when analyzing the connection between environmental pressures from the community and other
outside constituents along with the organization’s need for resources, which causes law enforcement agencies to adapt and change operational procedures. However, the perspective misses the mark when trying to understand how decisions to pursue accreditation are shaped by organizational culture along with the processes of evaluation through knowledge and experience. The next chapter will take a look at institutional theory and investigate how cultural-cognitive perspectives are correlated with shaping police organizations and how managerial decisions on accreditation are made.
CHAPTER 4: INSTITUTIONAL THEORY

Institutional theory emphasizes the role of cultural-cognitive controls and suggests that nation-states, professional associations and non-governmental bodies establish an expanding collection of beliefs and rules that drives organizational expansion and magnification. Social life is rationalized through the creation of means-end formulas around which behavior can become formalized, organized and consistent. The modern concept of rationality in institutional theory is both a social and cultural construction in that socially it is realized collectively as a prescribed agreement. Law enforcement agencies, like other organizations, keep to stipulated social conventions so their forms are alike. The police exercise institutional isomorphism in order to obtain social legitimacy from the public. They are, therefore, a cultural and social system embedded within an institutional context that includes the state, professions, interests groups, and public perceptions. This social phenomena of isomorphism is a restrictive social process that compels organizations to mirror each other because of institutional processes. Coercive isomorphism develops from political influence and difficulties of legitimacy, while mimetic isomorphism is a result of customary responses to ambiguity and insecurity. Normative isomorphism is the result of the dissemination of bureaucratic standards and norms as well as by professionalization.

The institutional approach to organizations attempts to address both the macro and micro level of analysis since the ability to act within a social structure is inextricably connected. Police organizations are creations of their participants’
actions and reactions that can be motivated by both idiosyncratic personal interests and agendas, or even as the result of institutional change. Decisions within police agencies are also dictated by economic, political and social psychological dynamics. Economic factors, such as the need for resources, and political interests as well as behavioral perceptions within police organizations are shaped by an institutional logic that is present outside of them. Consequently, law enforcement leaders can both be an agent of institutionalization as well as a guardian and custodian of the living social body that ultimately materializes.

Within the institutional framework, the police function in a highly entrenched context. Professional development of their personnel, together with departmental policies, programs and services, are shaped in a way that they can be identified as producing rationality. Law enforcement agencies increase their legitimacy in society, apart from the immediate impact on efficiency, from assimilated practices and procedures. Institutionalized police services, policies, procedures, programs, and prescribed police conduct operate as powerful myths which are ceremonially adopted by police organizations. Thus, in order to maintain ceremonial conformity, police organizations are required to mirror institutional rules that tend to safeguard their formal structures from public uncertainties about their activities.

The previous chapter considered the respondents’ views on how their particular environment, such as police-community relations, the availability of resources, and their agencies’ power and position within their institutional network, affected their decisions about accreditation. This chapter will examine the
respondents’ explanations regarding the culture-cognitive controls that are present within the institutional environment of the police. It will explore their views on their ability to create, reflect, maintain, or disrupt and change operational strategy and policing philosophy in their organizations. It will also look at possible explanations for the similarities in structure and operational strategies of law enforcement agencies despite their geographic location, size, type, and authority; how their professional development influenced them; and what role the bureaucratic nature of the police, outside pressure, and the need for maintaining legitimacy influence their decisions. As stated in the previous chapter, it is essential to bear in mind that respondents are leaders in distinctive agencies that vary by size, geographical location, and authority who are often confronted by differentiated tasks.

Figure 4.1 below reveals the participants and number of times they made references to Institutional Theory.
Entrepreneurial Work

Entrepreneurial work stresses that individuals have awareness, varying levels of skill and the ability to be critically introspective. Thus, even in their highly institutionalized environment, law enforcement leaders possess situational power and ability to act purposely so they can create, reflect, maintain, or disrupt and change operational strategy and policing philosophy in their environment. Police organizations are the products of people’s actions and reactions that are shaped
by personal interests and agendas for either institutional change or preservation. As “entrepreneurs,” law enforcement leaders are deeply embedded within their institutional environment. Consequently it can provide them with the power, legitimacy and opportunity to make changes in the law enforcement profession.

Director R.S.C expresses this entrepreneurial sentiment when he describes the attributes of a successful law enforcement leader:

I think that the most effective leaders in law enforcement are those that kind of open themselves to schools of thought that are unconventional. And it is both tough to do because in our business we’re so structured and the impact of error, if you make an error as a chief executive, then policing costs lives, it costs disruption in your community, it can cost you dearly. So a very calculating risk taker I think is the most effective leader in law enforcement. I believe that when we take calculated risks and open our thoughts a little bit we are better off. If we polarize ourselves in this business I don't think we're going to make progress in improving our organizations. It's not a free environment.

He also points out that an effective leader is not bound by one set of specific rules or formula for managing an agency:

My observation is that you do not survive as a CEO in this business unless you are somewhat pragmatic about the way you go about trying to influence the organization and direct your organization. When I say pragmatic I'm also saying that I don't believe that most CEOs in law enforcement do things the same way just to survive that fits one management or sociological theory. I think you get different manifestations of how CEOs are able to balance the ability to survive in a CEO's position against trying to change organizations in the way they feel is what's right totally to do business.
Chief M.D.M and Chief P.D.F disclose that their respective departments’ pursuit of accreditation was generated internally in order to change and improve their agencies even in the absence of either outside pressure or support.

Chief M.D.M:

It's like everything I tell my people here is, and this is what we strive for, whether or not we had made it (achieved accreditation), I want my SWAT team to be the best in New England. I want my protective division, my patrol division, everybody, my crime analysis, along with being accredited, I want them to celebrate their agency in the law enforcement community. Accreditation assists us in that it allows us to look outside the building and outside of our comfort zone. . .

Chief P.D.F:

Accreditation was always an internal effort. It was never externally driven. It wasn't like the city council wanted us to do it or the mayor and police commissioner wanted us to do it. It was always internally generated meaning that it's either the current chief or captains who were in charge of divisions that wanted to pursue this. The only interest was internally.

Chief M.E.F, meanwhile, reveals that the power possessed by law enforcement leaders is also a socio-political process, which is stressed in strategic choice and contingency analysis, can stabilize aspects of institutional changes:
Our ability to impose our will on an organization has some institutional impediments, but that does not overcome the fact that we can still get a lot done by using our authority or using our influence because chiefs as a public policy participant, have more unquestioned influence than any other player at a local political environment and within the organization as long as they play their cards right.

On the other hand, Chief P.D.F and Chief M.E.F concede that their power and ability to interrupt and change operational strategies is still influenced by the community, the mission and context.

Chief P.D.F:

If you operate simply by what the community wants obviously then you're not a true leader; you're just a manager. There's a difference, right? Obviously, leaders are managers. But if they are asking you to run their police department and they already have the agenda set, well, you're just a manager to them. If they ask you to come in help fix something, then you're going to be a leader and they're going to be looking for recommendations from you.

Chief M.E.F:

The police have authority, they have power, and they have influence. The question is this. What is the balance between how much individual power that you have and how much control the public has over you? I would offer that the ability of a police chief to be a significant change agent, for example, is very much related to whether or not there is a perceived crisis jurisdiction and the balance between external and internal support for change.

Institutional Position and Power

Although occupational and professional entities, as in the police, has demonstrated periods of structural and operational stability since the early
twentieth century, their field is not static, but evolving. Organizational-level and field-level enabling conditions, such as the size, type and reputation of an agency, or region of the country, have empowered progressive law enforcement leaders to become outliers for other law enforcement agencies. For instance, Chief M.D.M explains the benefits of accreditation, which has helped his department’s reputation in his region, and allowed his organization along with other agencies to improve in areas, such as training:

I consider us the leaders in law enforcement, in our region. That is why when I became chief, we were able to get a building where we can have training and because we’re an accredited agency we’ve become a focal point and are able to share the training and the facilities with the rest of the law enforcement community in our area.

Director R.S.C also describes how his accredited agency supports the needs of other departments:

Our agency is not only accredited but has the resources and expertise. When it comes to major crimes, that's the bulk of what we do. But, the bulk of that is in rural areas or small areas of the state which is similar to other states too. I mean the greater part of our state is rural with very small jurisdictions. They don't have the resources or the expertise. They will call us. If they get a homicide or home invasion or sex assault or something like that, then they call for our assistance. And they call for our assistance from an investigative standpoint from both crime scene response and processing as well as criminal investigation.
Conversely, organizational-level and field-level conditions in policing have also allowed law enforcement leaders to challenge the need for accreditation while pursuing other means for professionalizing their agencies and improving their services. Some of the respondents suggest that the lack of participation in accreditation is linked to agency size, and reputation.

Commissioner B.W.E:

We have never pursued CALEA police accreditation. I think the reason being is I think we look at best practices already around the country and we look at other people's policies and we sort of replicate what we see across the country as very good. We don't need to go into a process that's time-consuming, that's very costly to show us what other cities and towns around the country doing. I think there's 18,000 police departments around the country. There's enough examples out there that we don't need someone to come in and tell us what to do. We know what works and what doesn't. . . So we stay in tune with best practices around the country. We have all our command staff going to a lot training here and around the country, learning from what other departments are trying and who are doing well. Learning what they're not doing well, yet just continue to be out there, be proactive and don't be afraid of innovation; and I think that's the key.

Director R.S.C:

Many large agencies like New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, or Boston, don't feel accreditation is necessary for them. It's universal in our business especially in agencies that are very busy and are very large and that the volume of work that they carry out, they practice what they do constantly. And it is very easy to get satisfied with your practices and your skills and your experience in carrying out the operations of your agency and how you operate your agency and what your protocols are and your policies as they manifest as you carry out your duties. It's very easy for large agencies to look upon that as the standard in the industry.
Chief M.E.F:

I mean, one of the most important things a leader does is create a sense of urgency around the department's core mission. I mean, if your department's core mission is to reduce the violence but you're spending all of your time on bureaucratic aspects of the job, well then your actions are not consistent with your message. Just look at NYPD. Bratton got the MBTA accredited when he was there in Boston. But he didn't even try to do it with NYPD. There's too much going on there. They got hundreds of policies and procedures. I think they do a pretty damn good job of complying with them and demonstrating it, but he wasn't going to turn that department upside down for accreditation when they had 2,000 murders a year. The MBTA, on the other hand, admittedly was a busy shop and he got it accredited. But it was still only one-tenth the size of NYPD. The shops that got accredited were pretty quiet but they keep an identity. Accreditation helped. But accreditation wasn't going to help NYPD to become more credible or more professional or better at fighting crime. So there's really no point in doing it.

Conversely, Chief D.G.F suggests that the institutional arrogance with some of the larger, reputable organizations also plays a role:

I don't think that the larger departments like Los Angeles, New York and Boston need accreditation for some kind of symbolic value or legitimizing factor because of who they are. But, you could also argue that they have a lot of ego issues as well quite frankly.

It can also be argued that the organizational power and status of some of its leaders provide them the latitude to play the role of bureaucratic entrepreneurs as suggested in some of the themes in entrepreneurial work and the strategic choice and contingency model. While some police executives see accreditation as a means of raising their professional status and improving their job mobility,
various agendas have moved others to deviate because of the political nature of different geographic locations and affiliations with powerful outside professional organizational, such as PERF, that are present within the police network.

Director R.S.C:

CALEA is not widely accepted in some areas of the country. When you look at the culture of policing in certain regions there are states like California, for instance, that has always resisted any outside influence outside of their area coming in and saying there is a better way to do business. It is well known in the industry that in order to be a police chief in California, almost across the board you have to have grown up policing in California. To come from another state and become a chief in California is almost unheard of. When Willie Williams from Philadelphia got appointed as the LAPD Chief and was followed later by Bill Bratton from Boston and NYPD; I mean they didn't know how to handle that in California.

Chief M.E.F:

You only got three to five years; that's what most of the chiefs have . . . They're usually in that position at larger departments from three to five years. Well, hell, I want to make an impact on the community during that time. If there's not much going on in the community; Okay, then I'll get accredited.

Chief G.C.O:

I would never imply that PERF was anti-accreditation. They were instrumental in introducing it back in the day. But now I don't think they promote it at all. Now, PERF, of course, has a board which is made up of chiefs and you know from time to time some of them are from accredited agencies or are strong accreditation advocates. From time to time, there are others who are not. So that swings and wanes a little bit
in terms of the board. But I don’t think (the Director) has ever been a huge fan of it. Again, I'm not saying (he's) opposed. I've never heard (him) say anything anti-accreditation. But I don’t think I've ever heard (him) say he's pro-accreditation either. I think from (his) perspective and I always—I mean (he) is, to some extent, a reflection of the relatively small group of chiefs that (he's) worked with the most over the years. I think it's most obviously some big city mentality and the tendency to be the big city from the northeast corridor group.

**Coercive Isomorphism**

Police organizations appear similar since they are socially constructed from their institutionalized customs and practices. The social process whereby these actions are repeated and given similar meanings by participants in the police field is defined as institutionalization. Law enforcement organizations practice institutional isomorphism in order to maintain their social legitimacy. Therefore, they are a cultural and social system embedded within an institutional context that includes the state, professions, interests groups, and public perceptions.

**External Organizational Conflict**

Coercive isomorphism in policing occurs as a result of political influence that arise when they experience difficulties with their legitimacy. Police agencies are frequently required to adapt and change from external organizational conflict caused by conflicting institutional myths that are eventually resolved ceremonially. Chief B.M.P, for example, explains how tensions with the community pressures the organization to make changes:
Organizational change can be something innocuous or could be something major that's the tip of the iceberg, right? But you can sense that if your agency or if you and the community are not engaged with community policing, community input, community transparency, something is amiss. Sometimes it takes something very little. When they were marching outside of my door my first year here, although it might have been about (an) arrest we made, it was about bigger issues that students had with the institution itself and their feelings and perspective about policing here in the greater community and with the local (municipal) police department. So typically, it is something that drives community unrest. It's just like Ferguson, Missouri is a tipping point until you start looking at what's happened over the last decade, like the issues of New York, or Fruitvale Station and in Oakland. There's just been a lot of questionable use of force shootings particularly in the minority communities that people, I think, are at a point where they think it's time for a change. Yeah. So that's tough. It's tough because when you're under the spotlight, people are knocking on your door all the time. The community, parents, everybody's concerned, and questioning what the right approach is . . . It puts a lot of strain.

Later he states:

In my first year there was an incident involving a student, a minority student being stopped by our force and the (municipal police force). I had 300 students marching outside my door my first year here which started the whole issue of transparency, accountability and how we're going to take this department to earn the trust and the respect of the community. So it's been a long process but these kids matriculate out, right? So you can't live on your laurels in this business because there's always an issue . . . We have one of the most diverse environments in the world and yet campuses are liberal, and provide the freedom of speech. They pride themselves on this. But we're still dealing with the issues like NYPD Commissioner Ray Kelly coming here last fall and being booed off the stage because of his department's “stop and frisk” policy.

While it has been suggested by the respondents that larger departments, for the most part, tend not to become accredited because their leaders are comfortable with the size and reputation of their agency, Chief M.E.F adds that larger agencies can still also be made to seek accreditation:
There are some big cities around the country that got accredited, but usually it's in the context of a lot of litigation.

Chief K.B.C, meanwhile, underlines the tensions between the police and the community that led to changes in the leadership and direction in his current department:

There was a lot of conflict with this agency and community prior to my arrival, in particular, with the minority community. They were not happy with treatment by officers or perceived treatment by officers. So there was a push for a civilian review board for change but that never transpired . . . The bigger problem was people's perception and I say that because of this; the main reason that everybody was stirred up was over an incident that was caught on video in the high school where an SRO (School Resource Officer) took a girl that was inciting a riot in the school. They basically took her to the ground and handcuffed her and, of course, she then became the poster girl for police brutality. She was not injured in any way but she was 15 years old and going on 30 and was acting out at school and it was a very dangerous situation. I personally believe the officer very rapidly and effectively took care of that but it was pretty criticized by the African American Community.

Legal Mandates

Police operate in an institutional environment of legal statutes and are mandated to perform numerous legitimized functions under local, state and federal laws as indicated by two participants when they compare CALEA standards to mandates already required by law.
Chief D.G.F:

Believe it or not we have certain procedures and policies that we have to follow apart from accreditation because we are forced to. One of the favorite for most of the police departments is the inventory policy because it’s tied to properly admitting evidence in a criminal proceeding. So you get a case that goes to court and the lawyer raises an issue that might be somewhat unique and it comes back to the chief or to the command staff and the question is why did you do this or why didn’t you do that? So you have to refer to your policy and hopefully it covers the bases. If not, accreditation standards can help you fix it and keep you on top of it. But it’s also covered basically under the rules of evidence. Other policies that are affected by the law are policies like use of force. . . The concepts like the escalation of force are guided overall by legal mandates.

Chief P.D.F:

A lot of our high liability standards and procedures are state-mandated issues. Use of force issues are driving up the police officers minimum training hours, things of that nature are all state required in order to hold certification or it's a state law. So a lot of the high liability areas are state required minimum standards. So the fact that we're forced to produce documentation to the state in order to keep our police officers accredited is not so bad. So I know that CALEA helps with minimum qualifications and documentation but honestly some of those mechanisms are already in place.

Mimetic Isomorphism

Mimetic isomorphism in the police arena is the result of law enforcement leaders’ customary responses to the ambiguity that exists in their unpredictable environment. Consequently, the police operate in a milieu of symbolism, myth and ceremonial processes in order to achieve legitimacy and control.
Legitimacy and Symbolism

Law enforcement agencies are compelled to adopt organizational strategies that will assist them in retaining legitimacy and control. Consequently, they promote myths in a “dramaturgy of exchange” so that their moral legitimacy can be ceremonially demonstrated. Within this context, myths are seen as a narrative of collective definitions society applies to particular solutions for social problems. The engagement with these powerful myths, such as the public perception of the police as the community watchman or caretaker, enables them to manage public legitimacy and protection from outside meddling by powerful constituents who are present in the invasive institutional environment. Practically all of the participants stressed the importance of public perception and the notion of community watchman while several highlighted their various methods and strategies they used to promote close community and police relations, such as police surveys, extensive community interaction, television shows, and initiatives like the “Gun-Buy-Back” programs.

Chief D.G.F:

What we need in policing is good public relations, we really do. We got to bring back that idea that the police are good. We got to bring it back to where you can walk down the street and have people think differently, think more positively. Community policing in just one example. I mean Sir Robert Peel practiced community policing. People still want to see us in this community caretaking model.
Chief M.D.M:

The community's perception is important, so we put out, as required by accreditation, a survey. But with police in a large city, especially us, you don't hear from the people as much as you would like about how we're doing. . . I think that with the outreach that the men and women have done here, we've started to get—we're getting awards. We go to community groups and we answer any questions anybody needs or any assistance from us with anything. We try to respond very quickly to any problems in our neighborhoods. . . We've got our own television show. We go to business and community groups and give them instruction on any of the issues they want. For instance, downtown, we give an urban safety class. We give classes to the college students about how to be safe out there. I just got a “thank you” letter from this woman for people that go to house-to-house like “caretakers safety.” So we try to just stay involved with the public, stay close to them and we have our officers on all kinds of committees and commissions. So we try to stay tied in the community. Because of this I think we have a very, very high approval rating within the community.

Chief K.B.C:

I meet regularly with the president of the local of NAACP; about two or three times a month. Generally, it's about some of the protests and demonstrations here, obviously, after the Ferguson incident. When I reached out to them initially she was surprised. I believe you have to maintain those types of relationships with people. She and I both say every time we're somewhere together in an engagement or something that we don't agree on—we agree on very few things. At first neither one of us didn't think we could talk about them, but it's been productive. That's all the difference in the world. In the end, she's very appreciative of that relationship.

Chief B.D.D:

The number one thing that I preach is to make genuine connections with people in the community because if we sit back in our office and think about what communities need, we're always going to miss the mark. We're not taking the chance of missing out on having this genuine, real, policy with all levels of the community. That's been the one and only thing that I preach to my people. If they see street vendors and traffic as the priority then why aren't you taking care of the street vendors or
traffic? We don’t want to completely miss the mark. If we miss the mark on what the community watches, we will always be behind the curve.

Chief M.A.R:

We have a community city council, community members, business leaders, they go to these meetings every month and we have officers that are assigned to represent those wards. They go to the meetings and they report all the crime issues, quality of life issues that are going on in that particular ward. That's kind of kind of a spin off our Compstat program, but it's more outreach engagement and not just crime analysis.

Chief W.H.L:

We use community policing initiatives in terms of the application of personnel to community policing responsibilities specifically. One of the things that came from that is we tried to integrate the idea, what is community policing? Well, first of its establishing relationships with the various stakeholders in your community that includes residents, business owners, visitors. I agree operationally that because we don't have a "Main Street America" in our community we lack an identity. However, philosophically community policing is an attitude not an operational strategy. First off, for a policeman, it’s awareness. The police officer should be aware of what's going on in their community. Well, how do you get that awareness? You establish relationships to develop intelligence. Those relationships are based on trust between a person you are talking with and you. So I think that our community policing philosophy which is kind of built on a foundation to treat everybody as decently as you can.

Commissioner B.W.E:

Our gun buy-back initiative was a good strategy for a couple of reasons. It got criticized a lot. It's again a tough piece to pull off but I think we have gotten close to 350 guns off the street and to me it sets a tone that even for a couple of days that first and foremost the city doesn't tolerate it. It sort of gets a good message out there. But more importantly, if you get 350 guns out of homes, it's 350 guns that can't get into the wrong hands. We've seen back in February when a nine-year-old was shot by his 14-year-old brother because of a gun hanging around the house and it was fired. We've also seen an awful lot of housebreaks where guns
are stolen. I think the gun buyback has made a huge difference. This year, between the gun buyback and the officers good work on the streets we have taken 767 guns off the street. Last year we only had 667. That's probably why 46 less shootings this year than we had all last year.

In addition, the participants consistently expressed concerns with recent events that sparked outrage and protests around the country that made them reevaluate their efforts to connect with the community as expressed by these two respondents.

Deputy Chief F.R.N:

We're kind of reinventing ourselves over the last year because of the events in Ferguson and Baltimore and across the country with police protests. We shifted a little bit more focus towards community-based policing and complementing it with community outreach. For example, tomorrow over in Internal Affairs we selected twelve families that are needy in the community and we're going to go out and we're going to knock on their door in uniform and drive up in a patrol car and hand them a hundred dollars on behalf of our department to start the New Year right. That's our Internal Affairs unit. We're doing things like that in the area of patrol. You got the Chief's community challenge coin where if you're caught doing something good for the community they'll give you this little challenge point that signifies being engaged with the community.

Chief W.H.L:

I think the community's perception of us is generally positive. It's hard to be the person judging what other people think. I mean, that's the distinction between subjective and objective. But at our staff meeting, we try to bring this issue up regularly and it came up today in the wake of the whole Eric Garner, national conversation going on about the relationship of police to their community. So we asked ourselves, do you think we have a trust problem? Do you think we have a good communication with our citizens? I think generally the answer is yes.
Are you going to have problems? Of course, that's the nature of police work. But in general, I think there's a lot of support from the community for us.

Myth and Ceremony

Law enforcement organizations are socially constructed realities that adopt a form created by rationalized myths because they are structured on collective rather than individual designs, while myths are perceived as “true.” Institutionalized policies, procedures and programs operate as powerful myths which are ceremonially adopted by police organizations. In that myths are widespread understandings of social reality which have the “ring of truth to them,” reaching national accreditation status is one method by which an agency can "look and act" like a professional police department as suggested by several of the respondents.

Colonel M.T.R:

Accreditation brings a highly prized recognition of public safety professional excellence to the agency by pursuing a national seal of approval for law enforcement and the agency. In order to achieve it, you need to meet several hundred standards. From crime analysis, to officer training, to balancing the books, any department must demonstrate to CALEA that it meets best practices. The community is reassured that their police department meets national standards and operates under the best practices.
Chief D.G.F:

I think accreditation gives the organization the opportunity to be placed in a position where people can have a lot more confidence in the organization. The organization itself gets the opportunity to know that it can function at a particularly high level, hence particular parameters that go along with it, new policies, procedures, whatever you want to call them. It is absolutely a positive thing. When I think about accreditation, I go back to hospital accreditation. Today, nobody would go to an unaccredited hospital. Why? Because you know there are particular standards that they have to meet. Maybe basic and maybe those standards can be built upon, but they're at least acceptable standards for delivering good medical care. Same thing for a police department.

Chief P.M.M:

Sometimes I get reactions from the community or government leaders who say things about accreditation like, "I don't believe in that stuff; what good does it do?" So, I've responded by telling them that you've got two hospitals to go to for a major surgery. One is nationally accredited and the other one just gave it up and doesn't do it. Which hospital are you picking? I've also said, "You've got your kids to go to a daycare. One is accredited and has met certain standards for good daycare and the other one is not. Which one are you sending your kid to?" "Which one do you want to go to?" I mean, naturally, you'd pick the one that's accredited. I would think you'd say, "Okay, well, if they're all equal, if they're supposed to be equal, I am going to take the one that proves it;" right?

Chief D.K.D:

One of the things in our town was that it was not difficult selling them on accreditation. It costs some money, obviously. In fact, I think even back then it was about $10,000 to get into it. But my argument to them was that they'd never send their money and their kid to a school that wasn't accredited. I mean here we are in this academic environment. I did say that none of them would go to a hospital and have an operation that was not accredited. Police accreditation provides civilian managers, the town manager, with some sense of reassurance that the PD is functioning appropriately.
Chief B.M.P:

We decided to bring a community group that questioned the ability of campus police departments in and what we did was we gave them a lesson on accreditation and the standards that we meet from both CALEA other accreditation organizations like MPAC. We basically demonstrated to them we’re not unsophisticated about the way we approach policing or the way we communicate. I think they came out of there with their heads kind of just shaking going like, "Wow!"

On the other hand, two of the participants warn of the difficulties in embracing various generic strategies in policing and community involvement without a full comprehension of their abstract principles.

Director R.S.C:

Accreditation assists us in providing quality services to the community through various approaches. However, I am sure that (George) Kelling is going nuts with the interpretation of broken windows policing as a main focus on minor crimes and order maintenance or Compstat being simply a focus on numbers. Not that that they aren't good and I think Bratton has really exposed on how that's improved quality of life in communities. However, oversimplification of that stuff just drives me nuts because really the most effective way you can police in local communities is policing with the support of the majority of the community.

Chief B.M.P:

When you consider the broken windows theory and some of the other ones. Yeah, I think it’s true that policing struggles with doing multiple things, right? So when something new comes, they’re all in it, right? Everybody's all in, all hands on deck like Compstat, for instance. But if you utilize Compstat the way it was intended, maybe the community starts to take a back seat and all things start to dip. I think as a profession
we sometimes need to take a step back and really learn how to operate on all cylinders.

**Normative Isomorphism**

Normative isomorphism is closely associated with bureaucracy and professionalization, and is the result of the propagation of bureaucratic standards and norms within their institutional network and the idea of professionalism.

**Bureaucratic Standards and Norms**

Law enforcement organizations are bureaucratic entities that are highly centralized and controlled, maintain strict discipline and employ stringent selection procedures. Police organizational traditions are time-honored methods which adopt commonsense values for those in the field that cannot be easily transformed. They are, in fact, socially constructed realities that provide a framework for the creation and amplification of law enforcement as a formal organization since they operate under institutionalized policies, procedures and organizational culture. The following respondents highlight how accreditation, which was introduced to further professionalism, is an effort to formalize police functions by disseminating and expanding bureaucratic standards, rules and regulations.
Director R.S.C:

If you have very little structure for your policy development, your procedural development for carrying out your roles and responsibilities as a law enforcement agency, accreditation provides an essential tool to give you framework to build upon for the types of issues across the board, such as the management of your agency, the recruitment training management, the operations of a criminal justice agency, or of any police agency. I do believe that most agencies that are fairly large have documented rules of the road, if you will, policies on how their agency operates, what standards they operate off of as well as protocols and procedures for how you carry those out. The problem is when you practice those things over time, your practice tends to take a side road and your practices take on a different interpretation. Actually, the reality of what you are doing procedurally does not align with that you say you are doing and you are committed to doing, what your policy say you do or what your protocols and procedures say you do. Without a system of what you are doing, I believe that a law enforcement agency is at risk. You don't realize it until you have some major disaster happen or major embarrassment happen or major impropriety happen. And then you take a look at what you've been doing and you're told, "Well, chief, this is what we've been doing all along."

Chief S.K.W:

Whether or not we became accredited or not, I would still want to use the accreditation system as a roadmap. . . Professionalization of the police by standards is critical. For instance, the typical officer in our State still only has to meet minimum standards or meet the bare minimum, such as a high school diploma or equivalent; although this is probably the same around the country. So now they make their decision to use deadly force in a few seconds and afterwards articulate why they did it. The people that will spend the next several months examining it will be lawyers or have advanced degrees of some kind. Realistically, they determine whether or not that police officer made the right decision that took a matter of seconds to make. We have to have standards!

Chief M.D.M:

When I came on this job, everything was based on what we did in the 60s and 70s. I came on in 1986. Once we went to accreditation, everything we did changed. The policies were all set up. Then every three years we had to prove that we were following those policies. Accreditation stopped us from doing those things, like making out our
own little laws because we were now following established practices and
criminal procedures established by laws.

Nonetheless, two respondents suggest that the adherence to time honored
practices and common sense shifts the focus to the process of following the rules
and regulations and away from results that procedures can bring which, in the end,
hinders the widespread acceptance of accreditation as a method to professionalize
agencies.

Chief G.C.O:

I think it's an ongoing issue that accreditation is more focused on process
than results. Some argue that the process brings you the results. However, I think that CALEA has been slowly evolving in what I would
call the right direction with trying to focus a little bit more on substance
not just process, a little bit more on outcomes and not just process. But
it's slow. I think it's fairly easy to figure out why it comes so slow. But
besides that, there's not a huge amount of agreement about what
outcomes you should measure and how to measure them. . . Outcomes
for the police are so elusive or so hard to measure or it's so hard to get
a real consensus on them, that it's a lot easier to fall back to things that
well, okay, you know, fall back on things that we can measure. Often
that's process rather than outcomes.

Director R.S.C:

Standing on its own, accreditation is not going to affect the culture of the
department, although it could be one of the elements or components for
change. I think the culture of an organization is much more ingrained
and much more subtle than just rewriting policies and procedures
believing that that's going to change culture of the organization.
Another respondent adds that while all standards have to be met for police to become accredited their substance varies.

Chief M.E.F:

CALEA standards are not equal or given the same weight. So you create an enormous amount of work; for one thing to show you’re complying with your standards. Of course, Internal Affairs is critical. But it’s another thing to find a different standard that is far less significant and aspects that you still have got to get approved. Are all being met all the time? The fact that there is so much in CALEA with all these standards that I think prevented it from becoming a significant player. Now you add it to the cost of CALEA and discounted by the fact that, yes, CALEA can get and keep your insurance rates if you’re buying insurance. But if you are self-insured, it doesn’t matter, right? It makes you even self-insured. So in that case, getting CALEA is like a nice little feather and the departments have that nobody really celebrates except the department.

Other respondents revealed that the unintended consequences of reproducing organizational traditions and institutional practices can generate conflicts between police institutional myths.

Chief G.C.O:

When accreditation really got going in the middle '80s, I saw accreditation as affiliated with formalization, with encouraging police agencies to have more rules, more regulations, more written guidelines, and the police organization trying to formalize officer behavior and guidance or even more. And I questioned whether that was wise, whether that was—how much impact that would really have. I was in the camp of those who believed that we had two interesting things going on at the same time. So CALEA came about and people were pushing the idea. Now I would concede that you need to have policies on use of
force or fast driving and all that stuff. At the same time, we were starting to become interested in this thing called community policing, which is all about giving officers more discretion to work with the community, telling officers you’re empowered to go out and do great things. So I asked myself back then the philosophical question of whether the bureaucratic nature in accreditation on the one hand and the realities of police work and specifically community policing on the other hand. I wasn’t sure whether they were compatible or not at the time.

Chief D.A.C:

I’m surprised by that at least in our state, being on the Police Standards and Training Council, where I’ve been pushing for higher degree candidates at state level to improve more departments that we’ve received pushback on the education levels of officers. We just did our annual report and it’s probably going to be public soon on the Police Standards and Training website. But I was surprised because they looked at all the officers who were hired that year, how many came in, how many came out, but also their education levels. I was also surprised the percentage of people without degrees who are full-time law enforcement because in our department, the vast majority of officers have a bachelor’s degree. I mean the last guy I hired had a master’s degree. We probably have ten people with master’s degrees. Both my captains have masters. I have a master’s. But statewide I was shocked by the number how low it was. I think formal education is important. The officers are better; they’re more mature. They’re outside-the-box thinkers. They can write good police reports. They can communicate well. They can problem solve better. I just think that education is important. Whether it’s a criminal justice degree, an English degree, a psych degree, or a math, I really don’t care.

**Institutional Network**

Police organizations are cultural and social systems embedded within an institutional context that includes the state, interests groups, and public opinion. They are highly institutionalized organizations that are formed through powerful myths in their institutional environment as clearly stated by Chief M.E.F:
There is no police department that functions in a vacuum or in an idealized environment. We all function in a network of stakeholders. And policing has more stakeholders that are by definition irrational stakeholders.

Whether a law enforcement organization is accredited or not, both are embedded in an institutional milieu of stakeholders that influences the custom in which they conduct their operations and seek support within their network. The following respondents from both an accredited agency and non-accredited agency describe their contextual framework.

Director R.S.C:

The networks of accredited agencies give you a support network for best practices of carrying out all of the aspects of a criminal justice agency and reflecting the best practices in the business. And so they're in a general sense a value of it. I think state-level accreditation is also a noble and honorable effort, and it is really great for many of the smaller agencies in this State that just don't feel that they've got the resources and the time and the energy or the money in order to become CALEA accredited. And so they will embrace the professional standards that associations, such as local chiefs of police, has developed.

Commissioner B.W.E:

As you know there's such a close network of the major city chiefs that you have such as PERF. They put out books on best practices on how to handle most critical incidents. I just got one not long ago on actions for shooter training and it discusses the whole concept. . . They are brainstorming for what works well in policing and what doesn't and if you're tied into that network; if you're just a police chief that has a question, you can turn to organizations like that and say, "Hey. How do you do it?" For example. I can call (the Director) of PERF anytime I want when I have an issue and ask, "What programs are out there to reduce guns in the street?" And we'll just talk about it. In fact, I was invited to
go to Chicago in the fall where all the chiefs are going to come in and asks questions about the most difficult situations we’ve had to handle. What did you do to make it better? What went wrong to make it worst?

Another respondent explains how the institutional network from different regions and areas influences decisions made about accreditation.

Chief B.D.D:

We do the vast majority of the things that are required from CALEA in what we do already and kind of our own way which the communities are supportive of it. So all those things come together with the fact that here in the San Francisco Bay area, there are very few agencies that are accredited in our network. In fact, I don’t know any who are accredited other than CHIPS. We have chosen a different path along here in Northern California along with most other agencies from the region.

One respondent, meanwhile, explains the different organizational cultures of policing across the country and contemplates whether accreditation can affect their social system as well as the idea that decisions are manipulated by their socio-political environment as suggested in strategic choice viewpoints.

Chief M.E.F:

There is always going to be an occupational subculture and stuff like you need policing that is a function of the type of work it does, the external environment of where it takes place, the impact of the local political culture on the local police culture, the impact and the nature of the work itself. Those things are always going to exist. I mean, police culture has similarities across the nation, but there is a different police culture in New Orleans from Boston as well, even though they have very big similarities.
But the New Orleans political culture is different from the Boston political culture which is different from the Cincinnati Police culture which is different from Miami-Dade County, Florida political culture. Those political cultures have an impact on how the police think about their job as well. So culture evolves slowly in certain ways. It's so common to the work. It's so much of an endemic to the society where it is. All police is local, just like all politics. Having said that, you can certainly affect police behaviors and police responses. You can lessen the impact of the negative aspects of police culture and you can improve the impact of the positive aspects of the police culture, all right, where police culture always has some combination of idealism and cynicism. I do think in the end accreditation could have some impact on organizational culture.

Professional Development

Institutionalized rules and practices in policing operate as powerful myths that are ceremonially adopted by most police agencies since they are viewed as legitimate because they are rationally effective. These myths which are generated by particular organizational practices are diffused through relational networks via professional associations and the professional development of law enforcement leaders, such as PERF, the IACP or FBI National Academy, as indicated by some of participants.

Chief B.D.D:

I think the first time I heard about CALEA accreditation was when I was at the FBI Academy in Quantico. That would have been 2006.

Deputy Chief C.M.S:

Historically, we have always sent one of our command staff officers to one of the major law enforcement management schools around the
country and we also utilize the FBI National Academy. One of our commanders is leaving for Quantico, VA actually early January. We also have a partnership with our local police foundation here in the state and depending on funds we like to send people to PERF’s SMIP out in Boston. I think for the profession as a whole, both SMIP and the FBI National Academy are good and I see police departments, as a whole, does what the military do in that if you are going to get promoted whether you are now becoming a captain or you’re are probably going to be sent to a school somewhere in order to prepare you for that rank.

Director R.S.C:

At the supervision and management level, we've been assessing all of those types of courses that exist out there. We have heavily emphasized in the past, obviously the FBI National Academy, IACP and PERF’s SMIP, when our rotation comes around here in the city or in the state’s FBI region. We also utilize Northwestern University’s Center for Public Safety. We try to assess the top level management screening as best as we can and look at their training. I've had one individual now besides myself, and I was fortunate enough to attend a senior executives in a local government meeting at Harvard, the 3-week course, before I was here as Director. But I've had one of my deputy directors who I was able to get into that, and we're still seeking that for our other deputy directors.

Likewise, the notion in strategic choice that decisions are also made by persons who belong to professional organizations, such as CALEA, are also likely to make decisions based on their professional development and involvement with these associations is expressed by the following executive.

Chief D.K.D:

When I went to the FBI National Academy, my roommate was a command staff officer from a nearby department. He was heavily
involved in accreditation as well as being an accreditation manager for his agency at the time. He brought me up to meet the people outside of Washington back in 1988 at the CALEA offices. I hit it off with the Director of CALEA at the time. He called me and asked if I was interested in going out to the various agencies as an assessor for CALEA. So the first onsite that I did was in 1989 and the last one I did was in 2013. I have now retired from assessing other agencies for CALEA but have done innumerable assessments for them.

**Professionalism**

Because law enforcement organizations surfaced in a highly institutionalized context, policies and programs were shaped by procedures that were identified as producing rationality. Thus, police agencies increase their legitimacy and survivability in modern society, independent of the immediate impact on efficacy, by acquiring these practices and procedures. Police accreditation was introduced into the United States as part of an overall strategy to raise the professional status of law enforcement agencies by standardizing operating procedures.

Chief G.C.O:

I think the idea of professionalism in policing started in the sixties and seventies. Personally, I could be wrong but the CALEA Commission along with the ABA standards and functions along with the National Criminal Justice goals and project were all big national efforts; all of which produced a whole lot of recommendations and so forth.
Established norms, behaviors and practices in policing are codified as professionalism. The rhetoric of professionalism itself is also an ideal defense mechanism against outside pressure and control.

Chief D.K.D:

I don’t think the community in general knows that they want accreditation. They want the end result of what I believe accreditation provides which is some professionalism. I am the guy that gets to say that; and they get it, like I say, decide that it’s a good agency.

A number of the participants associated professionalism in policing with education and expressed their desire to raise educational requirements for police applicants and personal. They also shared some of the frustrations and difficulties they encounter in revising the accepted norm of minimal educational requirements for police applicants, such as a reduction in qualified candidates who don’t meet their educational criteria.

Chief S.K.W:

Professionalization of the police by standards is critical. For instance, the typical officer in our State still only has to meet minimum standards, but that is probably the same around the country. The requirements are that they are twenty-one years old and they have at least a GED. Besides from having a pulse and the ability to breathe essentially, that's it. Then they attend a police sixteen week police academy where they study every piece of police work, whether it's car stops, use of force, statutes, first aid, crime prevention, all of the things that go into policing in just sixteen weeks. So now go out on patrol even though they're probably in field training and they may have to make a decision to use deadly force in a few seconds. The people that will spend the next nine months reviewing their actions have all graduated from high school, will mostly
likely have a Bachelor's Degree, or higher, or have gone on to receive their Juris Doctorate and have been practicing law probably for many years because we’re talking about a police shooting. Realistically, they determine whether or not that police officer made the right decision that took a matter of three to five seconds to make.

Deputy Chief F.R.N:

I believe that education should be mandatory in order to move policing towards professionalism although right now I have to say that and I can't hire enough good cops. Hell, I'm thinking about waiving the high school diploma. It's ridiculously hard to get qualified applicants. But at the same time it would be nice to be able to require maybe a minimum of a bachelor’s degree to get hired. We don't have that as a requirement now, so maybe we could require an associate’s degree for starters. Even though we don't have either right now I think that's a direction we need to eventually take.

Deputy C.M.S:

I think accreditation is a great step toward formal education. We continue to have that discussion here within our department too, but right now you have to have at least an associate’s degree or sixty hours towards the bachelor's degree at the entry level, and then you have to have your bachelor's degree if you're going to promote beyond the sergeant level. So I think that's another way, having those standards, although we battle that all the time because we talk about do we limit our applicant pool, should we allow people to get that education after they come on and develop themselves that way. A lot of people come out from the military and they don't yet have their degree at the time.

Chief M.A.R.:

I believe the education level threshold should be higher for law enforcement and the reason that I believe that is because the job is much more professional today, the skill set required for being a police officer is much higher today than when I came into the profession. So I believe that we could do better in that area and the standard should be higher. There should be a national standard for higher education. That might
not be a popular decision amongst those particularly with smaller agencies, smaller towns because now you're limiting your applicant pool pretty tightly. However, there's too much liability in the job as far as I am concerned. The skill set and knowledge required to be a police officer today is much higher than it was back then. Education doesn't necessarily mean more common sense on the street but it definitely should be a factor in assessing how qualified the candidate might be coming in because I feel it makes you a better police officer in the end.

**Institutional Logics**

Table 4.1 below indicates that twelve of the participants who chose to participate in accreditation were members of agencies that were accredited or were introduced to accreditation during their professional development while ten participants who did not pursue accreditation were not involved in accreditation during their professional development although they were familiar with it. Thus, 79% of the interviewees followed the institutional logics of their former agencies. The choice of pursuing or rejecting accreditation for the remaining six, or 21%, on the other hand, were not related to their experiences or professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Logics</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Null</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Aggregate numbers based on solely on answer to binary (yes/no) question of professional development within a particular organization.
Institutional logics suggest that law enforcement leaders are introduced to institutionalized rules and practices by their organization as well through professional development within their professional networks. Their institutional environment is comprised of a matrix of cultural belief systems, normative frameworks, and regulatory systems that offer meaning and stability. Since they are rationally bounded, they focus on selective characteristics while excluding alternatives that could vary their choices to move in another direction as Chief M.E.F describes:

I came up through the ranks in an agency in New Jersey that was accredited. At other places where I have been afterwards, some of my departments were accredited and some were not. It really depends on the circumstances at the time. I would agree that many of us go the way that are most familiar to us or how we came up through the ranks. Accreditation can be useful to accomplish certain things at the right time. When I first got here we weren’t ready for it. But now that things have settled with the management of this department, I am taking a look at accreditation.

**Summary**

In this chapter, the interviews offer strong evidence of a culture-cognitive influence present in the institutional environment of the police. The participants supported the hypothesis that the nation-state, professional associations, (such as PERF and the IACP), and non-governmental bodies, (such as CALEA and other state accrediting groups), establish an expanding collection of beliefs and rules that drives organizational expansion of their structure and policing models. These
include community policing and Compstat, despite the geographical location and differences in the size, type, and authority of the agency. For example, a number of participants described organizational-level and field-level empowering conditions, such as the size, type and reputation of an agency, or region of the country, that has allowed law enforcement leaders to either pursue accreditation without outside influence as well as challenge the need for accreditation and follow other means for professionalizing their agencies and improving their services. Meanwhile, several participants revealed that decisions about accreditation is a cultural and socio-political process tied to areas and regions, as in the example of California.

The participants consistently confirmed the institutional social processes of coercive, mimetic and normative isomorphism. Some of the respondents provided anecdotal evidence about police agencies being compelled to pursue accreditation because of political influence and community dissatisfaction with their police department. Others admitted that many of the standards and practices required by accreditation are already being performed by both accredited and non-accredited agencies because they are legally mandated. The majority of the respondents showed how institutionalized policies, procedures and programs, such as community policing, Compstat and accreditation, in some cases, operate as powerful myths which are ceremonially adopted by law enforcement organizations as strategies that will assist them in retaining legitimacy and control. Specifically, they highlighted many of their police-community initiatives, or
community caretaking functions, such as providing social services to the community normally seen as outside the scope of the law enforcement, as well as their crime-fighting function, such as the “Gun-Buy-Back” program. In addition, a number of participants highlighted how standards and norms as well as goals like professionalization are disseminated through the criminal justice network to their organizations. Meanwhile, they disclosed how their professional development influenced them with their decisions on whether or not to become accredited.

Overall, institutional theory accounted for much of the key concepts of resource dependency, such as environment, police-community relations, networks and power, and financial resources, while providing additional insight into the institutional environment of the police that includes organizational culture, and the process of evaluation through knowledge and experience. Meanwhile, the institutional concepts of entrepreneurial work which suggest that law enforcement leaders have the ability to create, reflect, maintain or disrupt and change strategies, such as the decisions on accreditation that countered the status quo, corresponded with key elements found in the strategic choice perspective. The following chapter will explore strategic choice and contingency analysis and assess how the institutional environment affects the role of strategy and management, and above all decisions with decisions about accreditation.
CHAPTER 5: STRATEGIC CHOICE AND CONTINGENCY ANALYSIS

The perspective of strategic choice and contingency analysis addresses the critical areas of the relationship between voluntary actions and external constraints and how their interactions and consequential tensions culminate in changes over time. Since choice is both a cause and an effect of environmental influences, organizational adaptations result from the mingling of internal and external conflicts. Strategic choice and contingency analysis theorizes that law enforcement executives are able to make organizational choices, even though they operate in a highly deterministic environment of legal mandates, governmental controls and public demands. This is because their organizations control the means by which the prescribed results and outcomes may be achieved and tolerated by the environment. The ability of law enforcement leaders to tactically direct their agencies in a highly deterministic environment is possible because institutionalized structure of policing reduces the executives’ reluctance to contradict existing institutional rules and procedures. Formal structures, informal rules, conventional scripts, and legally enforced norms can be made to change under pressure from police managers when they recognize these constraints while trying to achieve more efficient outcomes.

Chapter 3 explored the respondents’ views on how their particular environment, such as police-community relations, the availability of resources, and their agencies’ power and position within their institutional network, affected their decisions about accreditation. Chapter 4 examined, the culture-cognitive controls
present in the institutional environment of the police and explored reasons for the similarities in the organizational structure and operational strategies of law enforcement agencies regardless of the differences in their geographic location, size, type, and authority. Chapter 5 will analyze the role of strategy and management in police organizations which are shaped by their institutional environment. It will look at the active links between police leaders, the organization’s personnel, powerful stakeholders, interests groups, and the public that affect the structure and operations of police organizations through essentially a political process. It will also assess the respondents’ views on their power and ability to make a rational, strategic assessment of available means and conditions and if there are instances in which their decisions can make a difference in a volatile and restrictive environment. As stated in the previous chapters, it is essential to bear in mind that respondents are leaders in distinctive agencies that vary by size, geographical location, and authority who are often confronted by very different tasks.

Figure 5.1 below presents the participants and the number of instances they made references to Strategic Choice and Contingency Analysis.
**Socio-Political**

The relative power between the police organization and their political environment that includes the external stakeholders is based on the balance between influence and countervailing power. While higher organizational power of a law enforcement agency provides more latitude and flexibility for strategic decisions made by police executives, powerful stakeholders also play a part in determining police strategy. This active relationship between the...
police with their influential constituents and interest groups influence the structure and processes of police organizations through an essentially political process. The following participants described the socio-political nature of police management.

Chief M.E.F:

The formal authority of the chief is sometimes dependent upon local statute. For example, I work for a commission. The commission is made up of really basically appointed non-political people. On one level, it provides a lot of oversight over my work. On another level, historically here, it has deferred to police chiefs when it comes to their decisions. Still, even those chiefs that have a fair amount of power can be influenced indirectly through budgeting by the political establishment. So it's an important thing to keep in mind that the individual police chief's ability to balance authority, power and influence, and use that authority and influence to enhance power is a very important set of skills. It is also dependent, as I said, on the external and internal support for change and the ability to use crisis to drive an agenda as opposed to crisis which places you on the defensive and at a disadvantage.

Director M.R.U:

We have several internal and external customers. Of course, we have accountability to the public like any other municipal or state agency. We have accountability to our employees. Part of our mission is to ensure the safety of our employees. We have accountability to our customers. They are paying the company for our service to get them or their product from point A to point B and part of our job is to make sure that that product does move safely and freely from third-party criminal activity that disrupt that movement. We're accountable to our senior staff. We're accountable to our board of directors and ultimately to our shareholders. So we have both external and internal customers. We also deal with the Transportation Security Administration and Department of Homeland Security because we're involved in interstate commerce.
Another participant explained the balance of power and community influence in managing different agencies.

Director R.S.C:

When I was hired from the outside, I encountered a completely different political environment to handle so I went about it in a different way from what I was accustomed to. I feel I profoundly affected that police department in the thirteen years that I was there, and I survived it without serious attacks on me as the Chief. I engendered I think a really deep and abiding respect in the community, the business community, the community throughout the city, and with the elected officials and with my boss as city manager. It was a council manager form of government. So I felt like there was something to look at it to say that I didn’t bow to political pressures as much as I did at my first department. I became more adept at management of those political dynamics as well as taking an organization and crafting the opportunities to change the way the organization was viewed overall.

Director R.S.C also highlighted the differences in the balance of influence and power with important constituencies in state and municipal agencies:

It is next to impossible to influence a state agency, or state police agency the way you can at a municipal level. I don’t care how big or small the city is. You can make more of an impact on the municipal level than you can at a state level. Politics are statewide partisan politics. There are so many fingers in the pie on policy decisions, budget decisions, fiscal decisions, human resource and personnel management decisions.
Ego and Self-Interest

Acting as bureaucratic entrepreneurs, a number of law enforcement leaders have implemented accreditation as a strategy for raising their professional status and improving their job mobility as suggested by the following participants.

Chief D.A.C:

The previous Chief introduced accreditation to our agency when I was moving up through the ranks. I think a lot of it had to do with his desire to move up through the ranks of the IACP, and the IACP was obviously one of the big groups who helped promoted the idea.

Chief D.K.D

I was hired as a change agent, I didn't want to argue about why we were doing this because it was like everyone who was running the agency before I came here understood that these were the industry standards. But I also think candidly a lot of the people who are on accreditation do it for not the best intentions.

Other participants revealed their belief that some law enforcement executives pursue accreditation as a means for professional development.

Chief P.D.F:

A police chief hired from the outside would only introduce accreditation to an agency that hasn't pursued it, I believe, if they're coming in to be a change agent. They either need to change the department for a reason or they're trying to create something for their own resume. Obviously, that's got to be, I would imagine, that as an incentive in some way because they're just trying to develop themselves so they can say I developed that department.
Chief M.E.F:

A police chief hired from the outside would get accredited either to change the department for a reason or they're trying to create something for their own resume. Obviously, that's got to be; I would imagine that as an incentive in some way because they're just trying to develop themselves so they can say I developed that. But I really look at it as a change agent, that vehicle.

Internal Organizational Conflict

Organizational conflict is a mechanism for change. The plurality of diversified police networks across resources and regions creates internal political debates over organizational priorities, policies, structures, and actions. These conflicting processes dictate how knowledge is achieved and handled by law enforcement executives which, in turn, affects organizational direction. Conversely, whether or not police leaders conclude that existing strategies, rules or structures are inefficient, internal politics within police organizations potentially can effectively prevent change as evidenced by the following law executives who depict the internal struggles with change.

Chief M.D.M:

When I came on this job, everything was based on what we did in the '60s and '70s. I came on in '86. Once we went to accreditation, you still have some of that here but it stopped you from doing that because it makes you—when we first got accredited, you have to go through all these best practices. You change everything you do. You set up all the policies. Then every three years, you have to prove that you’re following
those policies. Accreditation stops us from doing those things, making out our own little laws, our own little policies.

Chief B.M.P:

Accreditation plays a role in terms of setting the standards, setting the foundation because it's tough to establish that foundation on your own, but there's a lot of things about accreditation where people are tough to get them to buy into internally. There's a lot of drawbacks to it. It puts people through a lot of stress every three years. If it's not done in a right way because people don't know any better way they can become distressed.

Chief D.G.F:

A strong union is always going to look for where you are changing the work environment. It's everything and they'd want to be part and parcel that in my experience in this state revealed that time and time again. I couldn't change the color of the toilet paper unless I asked the union because they considered it a change in working conditions. I tried to change the color of the shirts of the command staff, but because there was a lieutenants' union, it took me two years to go from white shirts to blue shirts; and I ended up having to buy the shirts even though they got a clothing allowance every year.

Chief K.B.C:

It's been kind of hot and cold with the union members with accreditation or any other issue; it depends on what's going on. They were a little angry with me over the termination of an officer a couple of years ago but things have cooled off since. We're now talking again and making some headway in what they want to try to accomplish for the next year and with accreditation.
Chief P.M.M:

To get the buy-in for our department, we do this stipend and then we send out all of the policies to the entire department and say, "These are up for review. Speak now. Tell us what you think." The problem is very few write back and say, "Hey, do you know there's a typo on this one," or "we don't do this anymore." Unfortunately, I don't think I've driven that buy-in as well as I could. I am not exactly sure how to do it. I thought the stipend piece would help, but overall it hasn't.

Professional Membership

Law enforcement personnel often belong, or have access to, influential professional organizations, social groups and commissions within their networks. Through these social and professional connections, senior executives exercise influence over the criteria of structure, performance and success for their agencies. The relationships between members of a police organization and the members of external bodies are likely to influence the characteristics of social change. These relationships facilitate the assimilation of innovation, knowledge and other resources from outside organizations and allows for the exchange of information related to the development of goals for organizational development and learning as described by the following chiefs.

Chief D.K.D:

I talked about accreditation during my hiring process. I was already an assessor for CALEA. But one of the things I didn't need to talk about is that in previous interviews, the town manager had made it clear that accreditation was one of his goals he wanted to see the department achieve. So I didn't have to worry about it. It was on the list.
Chief D.A.C:

When we became accredited or when we were going for accreditation, the former Chief was the president of the IACP. I think that was a big part of it because he's in this professional organization and a lot of them are talking about, "Hey, I'm getting my department accredited; this is the future."

Chief M.E.F:

I was hired for a couple of reasons I think. First, I am a member of both the IACP and PERF. Secondly, it was my understanding is that the hiring authority in the city was underwhelmed by the choices they had from the candidate pool. So they reached out to George Kelling to help them improve that pool. George is a native of the city. He called me and asked me to take the position. Although I was not looking to leave my other position at the time, I was honored that he wanted me and so you don't say no to George Kelling.

Chief G.C.O:

Mixed in with my academic career, I was also a Chief of Police in Maryland for several years and later a commissioner for CALEA for several years... My awareness or familiarity with and interest in CALEA probably was more academic than practical. I say that because I wrote some things early in my career as a researcher for the various police professional organizations and school that were about police organizations and formal versus informal structures, accreditation, and whatnot. I was pretty much in the camp of arguing that because of the reality of police discretion, that significance of formal rules, policies, procedures, et cetera is probably exaggerated because when push comes to shove, cops have to make stuff up on the spot.
Strategy

The ability of law enforcement leaders to tactically direct their agencies in a highly restrictive environment is possible since institutionalized structures of policing reduce their reluctance to contradict existing institutional rules. When there are periods of external organizational conflict that occur with public dissatisfaction over police performance or behavior, conventional practices and procedures will adjust. On the other hand, strategic choice is curtailed when institutionalized police practices receive high levels of social legitimacy and support from their constituents. Overall, the institutionalizing of the police reduces ambiguity within their environment through the process of social interaction which creates expectations in the behavior of others in the field. Even though police organizations mimic each other in a volatile environment, the institutional process also minimizes anxiety from its leaders and allows for strategic choices that can contradict institutional rules and norms. For instance, the Commissioner from a non-accredited large reputable city agency explains how while his department has not pursued accreditation they implement strategies in policing that are considered progressive.

Commissioner B.W.E:

We have never pursued CALEA police accreditation. I think the reason being is that we look at best practices already around the country and we look at other people's policies and we sort of replicate what we see across the country that we see as very good. We don't need to go into a process that's time-consuming, that's very costly to show us what other cities and towns around the country are doing. I think there's 18,000 police
departments around the country. There's enough examples out there that we don't need someone to come in and tell us what to do. We know what works and what doesn't. The new strategy now is predictive policing. It's generating policies that addresses it. It's crime mapping, its predicting problems with property crimes, it's 'hotspot policing.' Overall, it's paying particular attention to the places and the people who caused the problems and that's the way you reduce crime. That's what we do here. . . The only area where we look at accreditation is in technical services. We look to have our ballistics and our criminal lab accredited because that stands up in court. We want to have certified DNA samples. We want to have a crime lab. The only area we really push in accreditation is technical services surrounding criminal investigation. As a department, I'm not a big advocate of it but when it comes to specialized services we need to go in and testify in court that we are a fully accredited crime lab. Those are certain critical services we look to just get certification so it gives us more credibility.

Leadership, Adaptation and Choice

Progressive law enforcement leaders and their constituents have shown the capacity to contextualize past practices and future projects within the contingencies of the moment while imagining and pursuing alternative strategies. Although agency CEOs participate in habitualized routines and practices that reproduce their profession, their actions are not simply unconscious and mechanical but are often made with awareness and purpose. Once again, however, law enforcement leaders are rationally bounded and focus on selective characteristics while excluding alternatives that would move them in a different direction as highlighted by the following executive.

Chief M.E.F:

I came from a background of accredited agencies and an outside consulting firm recommended that I seek accreditation. That was the report I inherited. It was a good report otherwise but there are smaller things that needed to be done. But I made the imperative decision not
to pursue accreditation because the department was a mess, and I felt that putting these additional tasks necessary in getting the department accredited wasn't prudent as opposed to organizing it and directing it, such as having a coherent anti-crime command. My sense was that my predecessor had to put together the crime plan and get everybody on the police bandwagon effectively as well as develop our command staff people; and then maybe someday get accredited. But policies have to be good policies and they have to be consistent with state standards and the training standards. But I didn’t feel back then that we had the bandwidth, if you will, to jump into accreditation where we had some of the other, more significant problems.

**Management Tool**

Law enforcement leaders work to raise the social status of their profession. The professionalization of policing is part of the pressure generated by powerful and influential constituents to legitimize the profession and policing practices in the eyes of the public. Accreditation in a variety of fields, including the police, is a management strategy used by leaders to enhance legitimacy through the improvement of their operations and services as indicated by the following participants.

Chief D.A.C:

CALEA accreditation really provides a management framework for every aspect of your agency. So I don’t know how anybody can walk into an agency and say, okay, I’m going to write policies and then cover everything that accreditation covers from hiring practices to documentation, to promotion processes, to discipline, to investigations, to evidence handling, handling funds, all the aspects of the agency that high liability policies, use of force, and then also the compliance and review of that on a monthly, quarterly or annual basis. I think that’s the basis where you can look at everything and say, okay, we’re okay here. We’re not okay here. We need to improve here. We’re good here. So it’s really a management framework.
Director R.S.C:

If you inherit an agency that has some real problems with use of force issues or handling of evidence issues, I mean some of the hot button issues that are always out there with agencies, accreditation really gives you a roadmap as a management tool for straightening those things up.

Chief D.R.M:

Accreditation is a tool that you use for quality control. You have to kind of look at it internally or look at yourself a little bit but if you're a good manager you're doing that all the time anyway. But it's a good quality control tool that you do every couple of years. That's the good benefit of it because I just helped Coral Gables, Florida PD get reaccredited and it did make them a little bit better and that they looked at some of their policies and changed things around. They needed help to move data somewhere else. It's internal but accreditation forces you to do that. They needed help because that place has so many policies like the city of Miami and they have 1,300 cops.

Deputy Chief F.R.N:

People like to say that they take a look at themselves internally. The fact of the matter is unless you're faced with a consent decree or something along those lines, you're not going to take that hard look. It's impossible. There's just too many processes, protocols within an organization. Where the heck do you start? When you go into accreditation you're getting to it and you're committing to let somebody come in and they're looking at all of your stuff. I mean, they're in your underwear drawers. And they're asking you tough questions and it forces you to look at it. And again, it's external from the organization. They're not here doing it because they want to be in good favor with the chief; they're doing it because they are appointed as an outsider.
Power

The power of an agency CEO is a significant stabilizing aspect in processes of institutional change. While powerful stakeholders and constituents within the police environment can exercise their own capacity to compel police agencies to comply with institutionalized practice, both influences of power on institutionalized police practices is relative. The following executives highlight the relative power of their positions.

Chief W.H.L:

I would concede that there are the limitations in decision making on a law enforcement CEO. Some of them include the culture of a particular organization; some of them include the professional milieu in which you operate, and the community, most importantly. But the fact of the matter is that carving out the contracts, carving out the community, a police chief has a great deal of decision making authority.

Chief M.E.F:

Police chiefs are inherently credible figures in a public policy environment. But as you function in this political environment that has power over your budget, that has the power over whether or not you remain employed, your ability to influence them and influence the public through the media, through your presence, your communication skills, don't ever underestimate the power of influence. And police chiefs are relatively more powerful to the extent that they are seen as highly respected, credible players and not clearly political one way or the other from the ideology or party. So that's an important thing to keep in mind. The individual police chief's ability to balance authority, power, and influence and use authority and influence to enhance power is a very
important set of skills and that is also dependent, as I said, on the external and internal support for change and the ability to use crisis to drive an agenda as opposed to crisis to put you on the defensive and at a disadvantage.

Chief D.K.D:

I don’t think the community in general knows they want accreditation. They want the end result of what I believe accreditation provides which is some professionalism. So, I am the guy that gets to say that; and they get it, like I say, decide that it's a good agency.

Risk Management

Managers in a variety of fields, including policing, use accreditation as a management tool to reduce risk and liability. Police departments that are accredited have been shown to be more resilient to civil rights penalties or sanctions. The participants from accredited agencies consistently emphasized that accreditation assisted them in risk management and reduced the liability for their agencies.

Chief S.K.W:

If nothing else, what accreditation does is it keeps the agency aware of the smaller tasks that will keep them out of federal district court and keeps those things on the front burner so that we don't let those equal employment opportunity tasks slip through the cracks. We don't let the Fourth Amendment reviews slip through the cracks. We don't let patterns and trends and use of force slip through the cracks. It forces us to do things that ordinarily, we might put less importance to. So we're
protected all the time and that's why I think probably what it makes us attracted to accredited agencies, attracted to the liability underwriters.

Chief David F.:

There's a financial benefit to accreditation. Insurance companies look at your department in a more favorable light. You probably have less liability exposure. I haven't done the research on the likelihood of a CALEA accredited department getting sued versus a non-accredited agency, but I would think that the accredited department would be more difficult to sue at least with the policy issues and documentation on personnel related issues.

The participants also provided anecdotal evidence for the benefits of accreditation in the area of liability while another from an unaccredited agency discloses what happens to departments who are unable to properly document training records.

Chief D.A.C:

The city just moved to another insurance company for liability insurance and because we're accredited, we get a 1% discount. But the representative who reps us said he's been pushing for a bigger discount because he sees the disparity between the accredited agencies and the non-accredited agencies for liability. This insurance company only deals with liability claims and the insurance representative believes that accreditation can reduce the amount of claims they receive based on what they're about. The city hired a risk manager to join a group they had contracted to look at risk management across the city.
Deputy Chief F.R.N:

When it comes to the police civil litigations we’ve had, I can tell you that it's made a difference in a couple of lawsuits already. Accreditation reduces our liability and time on them because we can document and show as an organization what we're doing in order to keep our officers complying with orders and having the correct orders in place. One for instance was a 1.2 million dollars settlement, but I can tell you that had it not been for CALEA I think it would have been significantly more. I think it was admirable to show that there were certain things that we were doing to police ourselves, CALEA being one of them, that helped minimize the actual damages.

Chief D.K.D:

Accreditation helped us from being sued. We were backing up a neighboring town for an escapee from the House of Corrections who had already pointed a gun and fired several shots at an officer and then ran into the woods. Our officers were up the street getting ready to stage and provide support. This guy then came out of the woods. Initially, our guys thought he was maybe someone from the Drug Taskforce who had just got in and scouted the woods. All of a sudden he raises the gun and they realized who he was. Two officers shot and hit him but they ended up saving his life. He had been hit through the femoral artery but one of our officers was a paramedic and knew what to do. So anyway, my point is that inquiries were made and people knew we were an accredited agency. We have yet to be sued on that. Nothing has come from that. Everything we did was structured and much guided by our policies.

Major N.R.C:

In 2014 alone, we have already paid out over $500,000 in liability claims. I had a conversation about an hour ago with our provider over another claim for another $200,000. Now, that was an attorney throwing a dart at a wall and coming up with a number. I didn't know if they came up with $200,000. They simply just do not have the facts in their favor. But they're going to get something. Again, using that cost-benefit analysis, the attorney is going to figure out what's the cost of litigating this versus what can we pay out. . . But using these recent and very publicly laundered events of the Department starting with August of 2014 with an officer involved in shooting, the Attorney General's report indicated that the Department had a policy on it but the officers didn't know what they
were. In some instances, they hadn't seen them or hadn't signed off on them. So we were forced to make changes about that.

On the other hand, Chief P.M.M indicates that the liability or risk management benefits of accreditation are not infallible and do not eliminate human error:

I've heard from many police executives who question the validity of accreditation. They mention that Albuquerque (NMPD) pulled out of CALEA accreditation because of the DOJ investigation on their use of force. If Albuquerque was accredited for all these years and they're in the 'shits,' why are we getting accredited? Why should anybody get accredited? It didn't help them. That's the big question out there is why are we doing this? However, what I have found is that while CALEA or any kind of state accreditation is not going to keep you from making mistakes, it sets up some policies and procedures that help you react to those mistakes.

Meanwhile, Chief G.C.O argued that executive decisions should not be based simply on liability and risk management:

I know that agencies become accredited because of risk management. Of course, philosophically I just cringe because that's the wrong reason to be in favor of accreditation. But money and liability does drive things. If the lawyers and the risk managers say that you ought to do it, then I guess I'll just keep my mouth shut. Now, sometimes you're coming into a big agency and they had some kind of scandal. They've been sued or whatever else.

Summary

The interviews in this chapter explained the role of strategy and management in policing that is affected by their institutional environment. It
described the balance between the law enforcement executive’s influence and the countervailing power of its constituency. The participants’ provided sound evidence on the socio-political nature of police management. For instance, even though chiefs possess a fair amount of power and influence over the political establishment who oversee them, they are in turn constrained by them indirectly through budgeting. Some police executives were described as bureaucratic entrepreneurs since they engage in accreditation as a strategy for raising their professional status while improving their job mobility.

The participants explained that while internal organizational conflict can be a mechanism for change, internal politics within police organizations can effectively prevent change, such as union struggles with management over changes in the work environment. The assimilation of innovation, knowledge and other resources from outside organizations that related to the development of goals for internal development and learning was supported as well the impact of police executives’ membership with professional associations, such as the IACP. The interviewees also explained that accreditation was a management strategy used by law enforcement leaders to enhance legitimacy through the improvement of their operations and services.

Overall, resource dependency illustrated the bond between environmental pressures from the community and other outside constituents with the organization’s need for resources. This prompts law enforcement agencies to adapt and change operational procedures, such as the pursuit or rejection of
accreditation. Institutional theory, meanwhile, highlighted many of the fundamental ideas of resource dependency while offering additional insight into the institutional environment of the police, such as organizational culture and the process of evaluation through knowledge and experience. Strategic choice and contingency analysis focused on how police structure and operations are shaped by a political process of the balance of power between police managers and their constituents. Numerous components of strategic choice and contingency analysis overlapped with elements of institutional work which helped to explain decisions about accreditation as a cultural and socio-political process.

In the final analysis, the three theories of resource dependency, institutional theory, and strategic choice and contingency analysis were only valid under certain conditions because of the complexity of knowledge, culture and organizational structure. Many of the participants’ statements overlapped the three organizational and management theories. Consequently, the final chapter will discuss applications of Weberian principles to policing in the modern state of organizational and public management conditions.
CHAPTER 6: TOWARDS A NEO-WEBERIAN ANALYSIS OF POLICING

“Specialists without spirit, sensualists without heart; this nullity imagines that it has attained a level of civilization never before achieved.”

— Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism

This qualitative study analyzed the strategic decision processes in law enforcement by examining the reasons why law enforcement executives in the United States choose to either participate or not to participate in national police accreditation. The data, which was based on intensive interviews with twenty-eight law enforcement leaders from both accredited and non-accredited law enforcement agencies of various sizes, type and location, was used to test three relevant theories of organization concerning the relationship between agency and structure in order to provide a more forceful explanation for organizational choices and direction. The participants in the study, law enforcement leaders and executives, supported the fundamental elements for all three theories on numerous occasions during the conversations, although institutional theory, followed by strategic choice and contingency analysis, surfaced at more times than did the theory of resource dependency.

Chapter 3 showed that the four primary attributes of resource dependency, such as environment, police-community relations, networks and power, and resources, can be linked to decisions about accreditation and how police organizations are affected externally. The participants revealed how their
decisions on accreditation and strategy were controlled by environmental conditions, such as the resources needed for accreditation and community support and interaction. Nevertheless, resource dependency did not provide insight into organizational culture or the process of evaluation based on knowledge and experience.

Institutional theory described in chapter 4 the key conceptions of resource dependency, such as the role of environment, police-community relations, networks and power, as well as financial resources, and provides additional vision into the institutional environment of the police. This includes organizational culture, and the process of evaluation through knowledge and experience. The ideas regarding entrepreneurial work asserts that law enforcement leaders have the ability to create, reflect, maintain or disrupt and change strategies, and this is correlated closely with strategic choice and contingency analysis.

In chapter 5 strategic choice and contingency analysis outlined the balance between the role of strategy and management in policing that is guided by their institutional environment. It was shown how innovation and knowledge are assimilated because agency leaders are members of professional associations and organizations that promote and disseminate various practices they deem to be progressive.

Overall, the three models appeared related because of the polysemic themes generated in the interviews over choice, power, strategy and structure. The participants revealed the difficulty in defining the role and mission of police
work during many occasions (Barman, 2016). The interviews also showed that while the three models were valid under certain circumstances, they provided a better analysis when linked together due to the complexity of the policing environment. This dissertation contributes to an increasing body of research on the various ways in which the institutional environment influences police agencies and guides those who lead them.

On the other hand, the interviews offered evidence that the modern era of policing operates under neo-Weberian principles in that traditional administrative systems have been strengthened by modernizing managerial strategies and operations over the last several decades. The neo-Weberian term represents an application of Weber’s ideas to a modern state, organization, or management principles. The idea of the existence of a neo-Weberian state within public management was proposed by Christopher Pollitt and Geert Bouckaert in 2004 based on their study of public management reforms that were introduced in the later years of the twentieth century. They suggested that while the reforms resulted in distinctive public service qualities, traditional Weberian administrative systems were reaffirmed as they were being modernized. Significant reforms within public management, that were labeled the “new public management,” were launched in the 1980s in Great Britain under Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. She sought to achieve progressive and entrepreneurial changes in financial management, as far as the civil service, labor relations, and the procurement and auditing procedures used in the public sector were concerned. These strategies
would eventually spread globally in the 1990s. The move to public management reform, which compelled various countries to review their economic and political systems, helped modernize the public sector and services on a global spectrum.

Under this new management system, concepts and ideas that were seen as being successful within the private sector, such as the delivery of services, were introduced into the public sector. The model attempted to provide a more efficient means of achieving the same services by viewing and treating citizens as customers and public managers as public service administrators. Public managers were given incentive-based motivation by providing them with greater discretion rather than having to generate regulated outcomes regardless of the situation. Consequently, public managers are able to provide a variety of choices from which customers can either choose or reject (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2004).

Pollitt and Bouckaert (2004:62) argued that the traditional model in an organization was commonly associated with the Weber’s (1947) ideal-type of rational/legal bureaucracy which was characterized by:

- Fixed spheres of competence;
- A defined hierarchy of offices;
- A clear distinction between the public and private roles (and property) of the officials;
- Specialization and expertise as the basis for action;
- Full-time, career-appointments for officials; and
Management by the application of a set of rules and technical competence of the officials concerned.

Pollitt and Bouckaert (2004:99-100) then identified the Weberian elements that remained after public management reforms:

- Reaffirmation of the role of the state as the main facilitator of solutions to the new problems of globalization, technological change, shifting demographics, and environmental threat.
- Reaffirmation of the role of representative democracy (central, regional and local) as legitimating element within the state apparatus.
- Reaffirmation of the role of administrative law—suitably modernized—in preserving the basic principles pertaining to the citizen-state relationship, including equality before the law, legal security, and the availability of specialized legal scrutiny of state actions.
- Preservation of the idea of a public service with a distinctive status, culture, terms, and conditions.

New public management was advanced into the U.S. military and policing in the United States under the trademark of Total Quality Management (TQM). W. Edwards Deming was credited with its introduction and was recognized as the "father of statistical quality control" (Peters and Austin, 1985:102). Deming developed the modern quality philosophy after lecturing Japanese business leaders in quality control while carefully observing Japanese autoworkers in their
automotive industries. Public management reform was universally welcomed in the public sector due to the failure of the federal and local governments to improve the quality of their services. They were criticized for poor performance, slow service, high costs, failure to complete work properly, and indifference of public employees; all of which resulted in voters’ resistance to tax increases and fiscal constraints (Peters and Austin, 1985).

Similarly, Total Quality Management (TQM) was introduced to policing in the latter half of the 1980s during a resurgence of interest in quality processes in American management. The concept of continuous improvement was previously developed by Walter Shewhart in the 1920s at Bell Laboratories. TQM prescribed organization-wide efforts to establish and maintain a climate in which the agency continuously tried to improve its ability to deliver high-quality products and services. The recipients included its internal customers, or personnel, the public. This was to be achieved by utilizing previously developed procedures and techniques for quality control. For instance, the Madison, Wisconsin Police Department pioneered the Quality Leadership Model in order to transform their agency from a conservative, rigidly defined police force to one characterized by community-based policing strategies, quality leadership practices, and receptiveness to diversity in the workplace and the community. A nine year study revealed success in the areas of employee empowerment, workplace improvement and increased community support (Couper and Lobitz, 1991). However, while TQM enjoyed some interest and endorsement in policing during
the late 1980s and early 1990s it was eventually overshadowed by emerging police operational strategies such as Compstat, and other data-driven, intelligence-led policing.

Nevertheless, in spite of the progressive reforms in policing philosophy and strategy over the last several decades, the bureaucratic practice of professionalizing the police through the rigid control of its operations and personnel continues to dominate law enforcement structure and management practices. The bureaucratic structure of police agencies persevere and the primary police patrol technology has remained largely intact for decades. Even the early involvement with the information technology revolution has not yet profoundly changed or improved policing structures and processes (Mastrofski and Willis, 2010). Police administrative practices remain primarily focused on internal operations of policies and procedures, budgeting, staffing, and internal affairs. Police Accreditation was introduced during this period of rapid innovation, and reflects the interest in advancing the professional model (Cordner and Williams, 1999).

Although the transformation from a bureaucratic structure to the idea of a learning organization has been taking place since the 1990s, policing’s traditional Weberian model has remained intact and viable alongside organizational reforms that challenge both managers and employees. This makes enormous demands on individuals and leaders in law enforcement since their careers and livelihood are at stake. The uncertainty creates a necessity to reassess and adjust skills, attitudes and beliefs in order to succeed in either a progressive or traditional
organizational form (Stone and Rizova, 2014). For instance, strategies like the Madison Police Department’s Quality Leadership Model supporting community oriented policing strategies, failed to change the bureaucratic nature of policing. This is because the leaders and executives in the police were never able to turn over the reins of the organization to subordinates in order to create a flatter organization when the pressure to reduce liability in a political environment necessitated greater control.

Studies on public management have also indicated that improving the quality of services is more difficult in the public sector than it is in the private sector. A complete “paradigm shift” from the Weberian bureaucracy to an evolutionary managerial administration has not transpired in American policing. Many local government and police administrators implemented new structures and procedures that have been introduced and promoted to them through their professional networks and their colleagues. However, they have not effectively managed the process of total transformation because of its unfamiliarity. Instead, they have attempted to make these mechanisms fit into the traditional bureaucracy of policing. In addition, while there have been numerous attempts over the years by criminal justice professionals and governments leaders to modernize and professionalize policing by applying private sector instruments, such as TQM, the public sector remains distinct both in terms of its administrative structure and motivation (Kuhlmann, Bogumil and Grohs, 2009:48).
Figure 6.1 below reveals the participants and number of times they made references to the bureaucratic structure of policing.

The following participants highlight the challenges facing them. They explain, for instance, how organizational culture adapts yet adjusts processes and how it becomes entrenched within the organization.
Director R.S.C:

I believe that most agencies that are fairly large have documented rules of the road, if you will, policies on how their agency operates, what standards they operate off of as well as protocols and procedures for how you carry those out. The problem is when you practice those things over time, your practice tends to take a side road and your practices take on a different interpretation. In reality what you are doing procedurally does not align with that you say you are doing and you are committed to doing, what your policy says what you do or what your protocols and procedures say you do.

Chief William W.H.L:

Police departments are parochial. We're very, very narrow in our views and believe that “don't fix it if it isn’t broken;” we traditionally don't like changes. Nonetheless, the benefits to accreditation is that it provides a relatively objective set of criteria by which to judge yourself with respect to the operational organization of your agency. . . The department may change slightly with respect to policy, procedure and training, but I still don't think it changes the internal culture in a department.

Chief P.M.M:

I don't think accreditation changes the culture of the organization. In fact, certainly it doesn't; it has more of an effect in the upper levels of the organization I think because everybody in the command staff is required to do it. They're complying with the process to get along; or not complying because they plan on getting out of the organization eventually.
It is largely the case that the police function in a modern bureaucracy in a manner that is representative of the social relations of contemporary society. The police continue to cultivate an administrative structure reflecting Weber’s rational-legal mode of authority (Gerth and Mills, 1946; Scott, 2003). Weber asserted that organizations would become increasingly bureaucratized over time by focusing and expanding rationalized structures and practices. Means and ends would become obscured in that only “ideal” structures would surface while practices would be prescribed under strict rules and guidelines. Thus, employees and clients are degraded and desensitized in a manner that is veiled by the notion of rationality and efficiency (Maguire, 2014). The following participants describe the bureaucratic nature of the police.

Chief D.K.D:

The reality of accreditation is that it is simplistic in that we have policies in place and, oh, in an odd way, we actually follow them. We can demonstrate that we follow them.

Chief M.E.F:

With CALEA there’s just an awful lot of standards that aren’t as focused very well to running a police department. The real burden for an agency in accreditation isn’t developing a policy because there are many models out there from the IACP, from any state training council and from various chiefs’ associations. . . At the time CALEA came about, it was the
apogee, if you will, of a professional policing movement which was all about the effectiveness and rationality of the police bureaucracy, promoted earlier by O.W. Wilson. It was all about his plan and accountability and (provided a) fairly narrow view of the police's role in society. What struck me about accreditation was that it was extraordinarily hard work even for a department that had already been accredited several times. Very labor intensive and it's all about making sure that the bureaucracy of the police department functions and its action comport with its policy.

Major N.R.C:

I would say that law enforcement is not only bureaucratic but parochial. That's no small term for the way it was when I came on. I mean it was right down to that if you were left-handed, when I started, you carried your firearm on the right side because everybody's going to look exactly the same. I worked with a guy that was left-handed and he carried his gun on the right. So at the firing range he had it holstered with his right and he switched it to his left hand to shoot. How much sense does that make?

In the final analysis, modern policing operates in accordance with a neo-Weberian model in that many of the components from its traditional bureaucratic structure have persevered under pressure over the years. This has remained true even with the implementation of a number of operational strategies and managerial reforms. The law enforcement executives and CEOs who participated in this study admitted that police accreditation in general increased the bureaucratic processes of the police despite being perceived as progressive. This is mainly due because they have shown the ability to modify reforms in order to fit into the traditional
bureaucracy of policing. Meanwhile, the public sector remains distinct both administratively and motivationally from the private sector. Still, despite its tractability to the Professional Police Model and noted weaknesses, police accreditation offers one of many other opportunities to improve its operations and services that benefits both the community and personnel. One police chief summarizes the challenge law enforcement leaders face as they decide on what path they take their agency in the complex setting of modern policing.

Chief M.E.F:

Accreditation is an option. But first and foremost what are the behaviors you're rewarding? What are the behaviors you're rejecting? What are the established standards? What is it that you emphasize when you talk to the rank and file? What are the standards that you hold your commanders accountable to? It's sometimes a little harder for an insider to get that sense of urgency because inertia is the norm. We're always going to be here. Police departments don't generally go out of business. So it's really up to the police chief to supply some form of urgency for the agency to deal with the real problems.
APPENDIX A

STATE ACCREDITING BODIES
N=25

1. Alaska Law Enforcement Agency Accreditation Commission (ALEAAC)
2. Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police Professional Standards Program
3. Connecticut Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection – Police Officer Standards and Training Council’s Law Enforcement Accreditation Program
4. Delaware Police Accreditation Commission
5. Commission for Florida Law Enforcement Accreditation, Inc.
6. Georgia Police Accreditation Coalition (Note: A CALEA PAC that also awards “State Certification”)
7. Indiana Law Enforcement Accreditation Commission (ILEAC)
8. Illinois Law Enforcement Accreditation Program (ILEAP)
9. Kentucky Association of Chiefs of Police Accreditation Program
10. Massachusetts Police Accreditation Commission (MPAC)
11. Mississippi Law Enforcement Accreditation Commission (MSLEAC)
12. Missouri Police Chiefs State Certification Program
13. New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police Accreditation Program
14. New Mexico Law Enforcement Accreditation Program
15. New York State Law Enforcement Accreditation Council
16. Oklahoma Law Enforcement Agency Accreditation and Professional Standards Program
17. Oregon Accreditation Alliance Program
18. Pennsylvania Law Enforcement Accreditation Commission (PLEAC)
19. Rhode Island Police Accreditation Commission (RIPAC)
20. South Carolina Police Accreditation Coalition
21. Tennessee Law Enforcement Accreditation Program
23. Virginia Law Enforcement Professional Standards Commission (VLEPSC)
24. Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs Accreditation Commission
25. Wisconsin Law Enforcement Accreditation Group

APPENDIX B

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN PSEUDONYM AND REGION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of Participant</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief D.A.C</td>
<td>(Northeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief D.G.F</td>
<td>(Northeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief P.D.F</td>
<td>(Northeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief D.K.D</td>
<td>(Northeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief M.D.M</td>
<td>(Northeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief B.M.P</td>
<td>(Northeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief P.M.M</td>
<td>(Northeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief M.A.R</td>
<td>(Northeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major N.R.C</td>
<td>(Northeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel M.T.R</td>
<td>(Northeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief S.K.W</td>
<td>(Northeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief W.H.L</td>
<td>(Northeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent E.M.F</td>
<td>(Northeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner B.W.E</td>
<td>(Northeast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief D.R.M</td>
<td>(South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief G.C.O</td>
<td>(South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff Chuck S.C.W</td>
<td>(South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Michael M.R.T</td>
<td>(South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel W.P.M</td>
<td>(South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief M.E.F</td>
<td>(Midwest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Chief K.B.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Director M.R.U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Deputy Chief C.M.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Director R.S.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Deputy Chief F.R.N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Chief D.S.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Chief B.D.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Sheriff L.J.M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All interviewees graduated from either the FBI National Academy (FBINA) or the Southern Police Institute at the University of Louisville (SPI). They are all members of the IACP and PERF. One of the CEOs is Professor Emeritus at a major university, a former CALEA Commissioner, and the author and editor of several police administration textbooks and journal articles.
APPENDIX C

PURPOSIVE SAMPLING DESIGN
*Agencies that are either accredited or non-accredited by state accrediting bodies are listed for statistical purposed only since the study does not investigate the potential impact of outside accrediting bodies’ on CALEA accreditation.

**KEY**

Agency-Type: 1) Local (Municipal/Town Police); 2) Sheriff (Sheriff’s Office); 3) State (Primary State); 4) Transportation (Transit/Airport); and 5) Campus (University/College)

Agency Size: 1) Small < 50; 2) Medium < 500; and 3) Large > 500

Regions: 1) Northeast; 2) South; 3) Midwest; 4) Mountain; and 5) Pacific

---

Data Source for Agency Type and Size: 2008. *Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, 2008.* BJS, USDOJ.
APPENDIX D

REGIONAL AGENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CEO INTERVIEWS
APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW GUIDE
Units of Analysis

- QCEO (A) or (N) = Questions for Chief Executive Officer

Key

- (A) = Accredited Agency
- (N) = Non-Accredited Agency

Final Questions

- All interviews will conclude with the following questions:
  
  1) Are there any questions you think I should have asked?
  2) Can you think of anyone else I should interview about accreditation?

Questions for the Chief Executive Officer of the Accredited Agency

QCEO (A) 1: What do you think are the main benefits of accreditation?

QCEO (A) 2: Do you see any other benefits of accreditation?

QCEO (A) 3: How did you become involved with accreditation?

QCEO (A) 4: When and why did you decide to pursue accreditation for this agency?

QCEO (A) 5a: Did the presence of a state accrediting body affect your decision in any way of pursuing national accreditation?

QCEO (A) 5b: If you were located in a state that had a state accrediting body for police accreditation, would you pursue state accreditation as well as national accreditation? Would a state accrediting body help or hinder non-accredited agencies in your state to becoming accredited?

QCEO (A) 6: Were you promoted from within the organization or hired from the outside?

QCEO (A) 7: How did you generate community support for accreditation?

QCEO (A) 8: What was the community’s familiarity with accreditation?

QCEO (A) 9: What is the community’s perception of this agency?
QCEO (A) 10: How has your agency’s reputation been affected by accreditation?

QCEO (A) 11: Did or does accreditation affect your budget, funding or resource allocation?

QCEO (A) 12: Please describe any changes, if any, in operational processes and outcomes for the agency as a result of accreditation; specifically in the areas of:

- Training
- Promotion
- Recruiting, hiring and retention
- Educational incentives
- Education levels of employees
- Career development and mentoring
- Communication
- Evidence procedures
- Technology and equipment
- Strategy and tactics, such as community policing and Compstat
- Police pursuits
- Use of force incidents
- Internal affairs complaints and investigations
- Grievances
- Participation in social services
- Citizen surveys
- Accountability within the organization and to the community

QCEO (A) 13: Why would the head of a law enforcement agency decide not to pursue accreditation?

QCEO (A) 14: What role, if any, do you think the following factors may inhibit those from pursuing accreditation?

- The fear of external scrutiny of internal police administrative practices?
- Organizational networks that not only can disseminate innovative ideas and practices, but impedes the adoption of accreditation?
- The lack of resources?

QCEO (A) 15: What are your thoughts about the CALEA standards themselves in regards to processes (procedures) and outcome (results)?
QCEO (A) 16: Do you think accreditation affects organizational culture? If so, how?

QCEO (A) 17: What are your thoughts on how accreditation addresses order maintenance and service goals? Does it favor one over the other?

QCEO (A) 18: What steps should the police take towards achieving professionalism and/or professionalization? Does accreditation assist the police towards that goal?

Questions for the Chief Executive Officer of the Non-Accredited Agency

QCEO (N) 1: Why have you chosen not to pursue accreditation?

QCEO (N) 2: What do you think are the main drawbacks to accreditation?

QCEO (N) 3: Do you see any additional drawbacks?

QCEO (N) 4: What role, if any, do you think the following factors may inhibit those from pursuing accreditation?
  - The fear of external scrutiny of internal police administrative practices?
  - Organizational networks that not only can disseminate innovative ideas and practices, but impedes the adoption of accreditation?
  - The lack of resources?

QCEO (N) 5a: Have you considered pursuing state accreditation instead of national accreditation?

QCEO (N) 5b: Would you consider pursuing state accreditation if you were located in a state that had a state accrediting body for police accreditation.

QCEO (N) 6: Were you promoted from within the organization or hired from the outside?

QCEO (N) 7: Why would the head of a law enforcement agency decide to pursue accreditation?
QCEO (N) 8: What role, if any, do you think the following factors negate the necessity to pursue accreditation?

- Strong organizational networks that allow an agency to remain current with the latest police policies and procedures, as well as the dissemination of innovative ideas and practices, such as community policing and Compstat?
- The agency is reputable and is seen by the community as legitimate and professional; thus, resources are stable?

QCEO (N) 9: Has anyone or any organization tried to influence you into pursuing accreditation?

QCEO (N) 10: Overall, how do you see the efficiency and effectiveness of your agency? Can you think of how it compares to any accredited agency you’re familiar with?

QCEO (N) 11: Please describe how your agency performs in the following areas:

- Training
- Promotion
- Recruiting, hiring and retention
- Educational incentives
- Education levels of employees
- Career development and mentoring
- Communication
- Evidence procedures
- Technology and equipment
- Strategy and tactics, such as community policing and Compstat
- Police pursuits
- Use of force incidents
- Internal affairs complaints and investigations
- Grievances
- Participation in social services
- Citizen surveys
- Accountability within the organization and to the community

QCEO (N) 12: Do you think accreditation could help in these areas in any way?

QCEO (N) 13: How have the resources been for your agency and has it changed during your term as the chief executive officer?
QCEO (N) 14: What are your thoughts about the CALEA standards themselves in regards to processes (procedures) and outcome (results)?

QCEO (N) 15: Do you think accreditation can affect organizational culture?

QCEO (N) 16: What are your thoughts on how accreditation addresses order maintenance and service goals? Does it favor one over the other?

QCEO (N) 17: What steps should the police take towards achieving professionalism and/or professionalization?
APPENDIX F

RESEARCH DESIGN/ABDUCTIVE APPROACH
APPENDIX G

ANALYTIC CODES FOR THEMES AND SUBTHEMES
THEME 1: RESOURCE DEPENDENCY

Subtheme/Environment: External control of organizational actions and direction are inevitable since survivability and outcome are affected by the context in which the organization is embedded. Because of social and material dependency, human action is highly deterministic.

- **Community:** Law enforcement agencies are dependent on public resources. Although their dependency is reciprocal with the community and not necessarily problematic, a volatile environment that includes public demands and variable financial resources forces law enforcement organizations to adapt in response to variations in environmental conditions.

- **Network Position and Power:** Law enforcement organizations are embedded in a network of social relationships and interdependence with the public and other criminal justice organizations which can produce asymmetrical relationships. The level of power and prestige for a law enforcement agency is contingent on its ability to acquire their most critical resources while maintaining a level of control over the environment as seen with monopolies or in the utilities and energy industries.

Subtheme/Resources: Law enforcement agencies which have the ability to maintain control over their most critical resources and reduce their uncertainty in an unstable environment are more likely to be successful since they possess the power to modify their organizational strategies and behavior in order to maintain legitimacy.

THEME 2: INSTITUTIONAL

Subtheme/Entrepreneurial Work: Individuals and collective actors have awareness, skill and reflexivity. Even in their highly institutionalized environment, law enforcement leaders possess situational power and strategic choice to act purposely in order to create, maintain and disrupt their institution. Police organizations are products of human action and reaction constructed by personal interest and agenda for either institutional change or preservation.
As “entrepreneurs,” agency CEOs are deeply embedded within their institutional environment which can provide them with the power, legitimacy and opportunity to make changes in the law enforcement profession.

- **Institutional Position and Power**: Although occupational and professional communities demonstrate periods of isomorphic stability, the police field is not static but evolving. Organizational-level and field-level enabling conditions, such as the size and reputation of an agency or region of the country, have enabled progressive law enforcement leaders to create and change strategy along with role of the police.

- **Subtheme/Isomorphism**: Organizations in a particular field appear similar since they are socially constructed from institutionalized customs and practices. The social process whereby actions are repeated and given similar meanings by participants is defined as institutionalization. Organizations practice institutional isomorphism in order to obtain social legitimacy and develop their prospects for survival. Organizations, therefore, are cultural and social systems embedded within an institutional context that includes the state, professions, interests groups, and public perceptions.

- **Coercive**: Isomorphism as a result of political influence and difficulties with legitimacy.

  - **External Organizational Conflict**: Police agencies are frequently required to adapt and change from external organizational conflict caused by conflicting institutional myths that are eventually resolved ceremonially.

  - **Legal Mandates**: Police operate in an institutional environment of legal statutes and are mandated to perform numerous legitimized functions under local, state and federal laws.
• **Mimetic**: Isomorphism as the result of customary response to uncertainty within a volatile environment.

• **Legitimacy and Symbolic Value**: Law enforcement agencies are compelled to adopt organizational strategies that will assist them in retaining legitimacy and control. Consequently, they promote myths in a “dramaturgy of exchange” so that their moral legitimacy can be ceremonially demonstrated.

• **Myth and Ceremony**: Law enforcement organizations are socially constructed realities and adopt a form created by rationalized myths because they are structured on collective rather than individual designs, while myths are perceived as “true.” Institutionalized policies, procedures and programs operate as powerful myths which are ceremonially adopted by police organizations.

• **Normative**: Isomorphism associated with bureaucracy and professionalization.

• **Bureaucratic Standards and Norms**: A police organization is bureaucratic entity in that it has highly centralized control, strict discipline and stringent selection procedures. Organizational traditions are time-honored methods which adopt common sense values that cannot be easily transformed. They are socially constructed realities that provide a framework for the creation and amplification of law enforcement as a formal organization since they operate under institutionalized policies, procedures and organizational culture.

• **Institutional Network**: Police organizations are cultural and social systems embedded within an institutional context that includes the state, interests groups, and public opinion. They are highly institutionalized organizations that are formed through powerful myths in their institutional environment.
Professional Development: Institutionalized rules and practices operate as powerful myths that are ceremonially adopted by most police agencies since they are viewed as legitimate because they are rationally effective. These myths which are generated by particular organizational practices are diffused through relational networks via professional associations and the professional development of law enforcement leaders.

Professionalism: Because law enforcement organizations surfaced in a highly institutionalized context, policies and programs were fashioned with procedures that were identified as producing rationality. Thus, police agencies increase their legitimacy and survivability in modern society, independent of the immediate impact on efficacy, by acquiring these practices and procedures.

Subtheme/Logics: Law enforcement leaders are introduced to institutionalized rules and practices by their organization as well through professional development within their professional networks. Their institutional environment is comprised of a matrix of cultural belief systems, normative frameworks, and regulatory systems that offer meaning and stability. Since they are rationally bounded, they focus on selective characteristics while excluding alternatives that could vary their choices to move in another direction.

- Affirmative: The agency CEO developed professionally within an organization(s) that pursued accreditation and pursued it as well.
- Negative: The agency CEO developed professionally within an organization(s) that did not pursue accreditation and did not pursue it.
Null: There is no relationship between choices made by the CEO and institutional logics. The agency CEO either; (1) developed professionally within an organization(s) that pursued accreditation but did not pursue it when he or she became an agency CEO; or (2) developed professionally within an organization(s) that did not pursue accreditation but pursued it when he or she became an agency CEO.

THEME 3: STRATEGIC CHOICE/CONTINGENCY

Subtheme/Socio-Political: The relative power of the police organization and the political environment that includes the external stakeholders is based on the balance between influence and countervailing power. While higher organizational power provides greater choice and latitude for strategic decisions by police executives, powerful stakeholders also maintains environmental determinism. This active role between police personnel and their influential constituents and interests groups all have the ability to influence the structures of police organizations through an essentially political process.

Ego and Self-Interest: Acting as bureaucratic entrepreneurs, a number of law enforcement leaders have implemented accreditation as a strategy for raising their professional status and improving their job mobility.

Internal Organizational Conflict: Organizational conflict is a mechanism for change. The plurality of diversified police networks across resources and regions creates internal political debates over organizational priorities, policies, structures, and actions. These conflicting processes dictate how knowledge is achieved and handled by law enforcement executives which, in turn, affects organizational direction. Conversely, whether or not police leaders conclude that existing strategies, rules or structures are inefficient, internal politics within police organizations potentially can effectively prevent change.
Professional Membership: Law enforcement personnel often belong, or have access to, influential professional organizations, social groups and commissions within their networks. Through these social and professional connections, senior executives exercise influence over the criteria of structure, performance and success for their agencies. The relationships between members of a police organization and the members of external bodies are likely to exhibit the characteristics of social change. These relationships facilitate the assimilation of innovation, knowledge and other resources outside organizations and allows for the exchange of information related to the development of goals for organizational development and learning.

Subtheme/Strategy: The ability of law enforcement leaders to tactically direct their agencies in a highly deterministic environment is possible since institutionalized structures of policing reduces their reluctance to contradict existing institutional rules. When there are periods of external organizational conflict that occur with public dissatisfaction over police performance or behavior, conventional practices and procedures will adjust. On the other hand, strategic choice is curtailed when institutionalized police practices receive high levels of social legitimacy and support from their constituents. Overall, the institutionalizing of the police reduces ambiguity within their environment through the process of social interaction which creates expectations in the behavior of others in the field. Even though police organizations mimic each other in a volatile environment, the institutional process also minimizes anxiety from its leaders and allows for strategic choices that can contradict institutional rules and norms.
Leadership, Adaptation and Choice: Progressive law enforcement leaders and their constituents have shown the capacity to contextualize past practices and future projects within the contingencies of the moment while imagining and pursuing alternative strategies. Although agency CEOs participate in habitualized routines and practices that reproduce their profession, their actions are not simply unconscious and mechanical but are often made with awareness and purpose. Once again, however, law enforcement leaders are rationally bounded and focus on selective characteristics while excluding alternatives that would move them in a different.

Management Tool: Law enforcement leaders endeavor to raise the social status of their profession. The professionalization of policing is part of the pressure generated by powerful and influential constituents to legitimize the profession and policing practices in the eyes of the public. Accreditation in a variety of fields, including the police, is a management strategy used by leaders to enhance legitimacy through the improvement of their operations and services.

Power: The power of an agency CEO is a significant stabilizing aspect in processes of institutional change. While powerful stakeholders and constituents within the police environment can exercise their own capacity to compel police agencies to comply with institutionalized practice, both influences of power on institutionalized police practices is relative.

Risk Management: Managers in a variety of fields, including policing, use accreditation as a management tool to reduce risk and liability. Police departments that are accredited have been shown to be more resilient to civil rights penalties or sanctions.
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IRB APPLICATION: EXEMPT REVIEW
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IRB Application: EXEMPT Review

Part I. Review Path Determination

There are four TYPES of studies that can be designated by the IRB Office as “Exempt from Further IRB Review”. If your study does not fit the criteria of one of these TYPES of Exempt research STOP HERE. Do not continue to complete this application. You will need to complete the Expedited/Full Review Board New Application: http://www.bu.edu/irb/application-forms/

Indicate which category of Exempt research best matches your research study. Click this link for more information from the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP): http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/policy/checklists/decisioncharts.html

☐ TYPE A: NHSR (Not Human Subjects Research)
Some studies may be determined to be Exempt from further IRB review because they do NOT meet the federal definitions of HUMAN SUBJECTS or RESEARCH.

Research means a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. Activities which meet this definition constitute research for purposes of this policy, whether or not they are conducted or supported under a program which is considered research for other purposes. For example, some demonstration and service programs may include research activities.

Human subject means a living individual about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains (1) Data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or (2) Identifiable private information.

☒ TYPE B: Categorical Exemptions
Under the Federal Regulations certain types of research studies can be designated as exempt if all of the study activities fit into one or more specific categories. In order to qualify as Exempt under a categorical exemption the study must

- meet the federal definition of MINIMAL RISK
- fit into one or more of the federally defined Exempt categories.

Minimal Risk means that the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.
Please select the most appropriate exempt categories from the list below. ***Note there are restrictions on research involving prisoners, pregnant women, fetuses, and children.

☐ (1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

☐ (2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation. THIS CATEGORY DOES NOT APPLY TO CHILDREN IN MANY CASES. See 45 CFR 46.401(b) for further guidance.

***Please go to Item #18, page 6 of this application for more information about the requirement that data be anonymous in order to qualify for this category***

☒ (3) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under paragraph (2) of this section, if: (i) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) Federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

☐ (4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data [at the time of this application], documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. ***to qualify ALL THE DATA must exist at the time of this submission. No collection of prospective data is allowed. Also, data must not contain identifiers or links to identifiers via mastercode.***

☐ (5) Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of Department or Agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (i) Public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

☐ (6) Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

☐ TYPE C: BU investigators are not “engaged” in human subjects research
This project is exempt from further CRC IRB review because, according to the Engagement of Institutions in Research guidance by OHRP, BU/ BU investigators are not "engaged" in human subjects research. Specify category of non-engagement: ____

☐ TYPE D: Institutional Authorization Agreement (IAA) with another institution. The investigators are engaged in human subjects research but there is an Authorization Agreement that allows for IRB review to be conducted by another institution’s IRB. This application must be submitted with a
Single IRB review request form which can be found on the CRC IRB website:
http://www.bu.edu/irb/application-forms/

Part II. General Information

1. Study Title: Myth and Reality in an Age of Police Accreditation

2. Principal Investigator
   Full Name: Jack St. Hilaire
   Title: PhD Student
   School, Department/Center: Boston University Department of Sociology
   Mailing Address [where to receive IRB correspondence]: 365 Charlotte Street, Manchester, NH 03103
   Phone: 603-935-8283 Fax: 617-353-1970 Email [required]: jjsthilaire@comcast.net
   a. PI is ☐ faculty ☑ BU staff ☑ student ☐ other (specify)
   b. I confirm that all those responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of the proposed program, including at minimum, all Senior/key personnel in the grant application, have completed the financial interest disclosure forms and training as dictated at http://www.bu.edu/orc/coi/forms/, and as provided under the Boston University Policy on Investigator’s Conflicts of Interest.
      ☑ X YES (Required)
   Of the financial interest disclosure forms submitted, has anyone checked “yes” to any of the questions on either the FIND1 or NONFIND1 form?
      ☐ Yes* ☑ X No

   *If anyone checked “yes” to any of the questions on either the FIND1 or NONFIND1 form, the IRB Director will contact the COI office to obtain the disclosure information.

   c. Has the PI completed human subjects training? ☑ Yes (attach documentation) ☐ NO

3. PI’s Administrative Contact (if any)
   Full Name: Emily Barman
   Title: Associate Professor
   School, Department/Center: Sociology
   Mailing Address: 100 Cummington Mall, Room 248C, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215
**In some cases the Administrative Contact may also be a co-investigator. If so, please answer the following questions:**

a. Is this person a BU faculty member, student or employee? ☑ Yes ☐ No

b. Has this person completed human subjects training? ☑ Yes (attach documentation) ☐ No

4. **Co-investigators- Study Personnel**

Provide the following information for EACH co-investigator and each member of the study team*** who is a student, faculty member or BU employee. List also, those people who are not BU employees but will be working on the study under the supervision of the BU PI.

It will be necessary to "copy" and "paste" the contents of the box below repeatedly to complete this information for EACH member of the study team.

*** List all persons who will have contact with subjects or their identifiable data including those who will be screening, recruiting, consenting, performing study interventions including data collection, chart reviews, interviews and surveys, conducting data analysis, conducting subject follow-up.

**** Students must list their faculty advisor as a co-investigator on the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name: Emily Barman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title: Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School, Department/Center: Boston University Department of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address: 100 Cummington Mall, Room 248C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 617-358-0651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 617-353-4837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:eabarman@bu.edu">eabarman@bu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. a. Has this person completed human subjects training? (attach documentation) Yes
4. b. Is this person a BU faculty member, student or employee? Yes
4. c. What is this person’s role in the study? Faculty Advisor

5. **Funding Source** - provide information related to current AND anticipated funding. **Note – A copy of the grant application or sponsor’s protocol must be attached to this application for all funded research.**

5.a. Check the type of funding for this research and provide award number/funding details:

☐ Federally funded (NIH, CDC, etc.) __
☑ Unfunded __
☐ Departmental or internal funds __
☐ Industry funded __
☐ Foundation funding __

5.b. ☐ Check here if you have received Just in Time notification
6. **Institutions/Sites where Research will be conducted.**

   6a. **List below all sites** where research will be conducted or study activities will take place (including recruitment, enrollment, testing, data collection, etc.). Remember to include any international sites:

   Twenty-Four Law Enforcement Agencies and their respective communities across the United States.

   6b. **Specify whether IRB approval is being obtained at any other sites.** If yes, either attach the IRB approval letter from the other site or explain intentions for obtaining IRB approval (if applicable).

---

**Part III – Study Details**

7. **Study Summary** – **BRIEFLY summarize the study in LAY terms (300 words max)**

   This is a qualitative study in which I examine why some law enforcement executives obtain national police accreditation through the Commission for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) while other law enforcement executives decline to pursue it altogether. Though prior research on accreditation in education, hospitals, corrections, law enforcement, parks and recreation, firefighting and emergency services, and healthcare have produced mixed results between accredited and non-accredited agencies and institutions, accreditation’s symbolic value for maintaining legitimacy and stability in the institutional environment of the police is difficult to quantify and should not be underestimated. Unlike the organizational strategy of community policing or crime analysis led strategy known as Compstat, accreditation has not received the same widespread acceptance. Consequently, the majority of law enforcement agencies in the United States are not nationally accredited whereas the majority of agencies implement some form of community policing. This study attempts to understand the reasons for this through intensive qualitative interviews with twelve chief executive officers from accredited agencies and twelve chief executive officers from non-accredited agencies as well. This will include local police departments, sheriffs’ offices, primary state authorities, transportation police, and campus law enforcement in a purposive, non-probability sampling. If necessary for additional information on ancillary exogenous events, community members from the respective agencies may be interviewed. The data will be used to test three significant sociological theories on organization in order to see which one provides the more relevant explanations behind these decisions.

8. **Purpose/ Background/ Rationale** – Provide background information, study rationale, study purpose, study objectives, study hypothesis.

   The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of why some chief executive officers of law enforcement agencies choose to pursue national police accreditation through the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) while other chief executive officers reject the accreditation process. The majority of law enforcement agencies in the United States are not nationally accredited and accreditation has not been as widely accepted among agencies as, for instance, community policing. This is puzzling in that the symbolic value of accreditation as a management tool to professionalize an agency and a profession should not be underestimated in the institutional environment of the police. This study attempts to assess this impasse qualitatively through intensive interviews with twenty-four chief executive officers from five geographic areas in the United States that will include local police departments, sheriffs’ offices, primary state authorities, transportation police, and campus law enforcement. The study will identify, analyze and discuss the variables
involved in decisions made on accreditation by testing three major sociological theories on organizations which will provide the more relevant explanations.

The establishment of accreditation within institutional fields as a management strategy for professionalizing an organization has gradually increased over the last forty years. The development of accreditation has been fueled by the notion in public administration that professionalism can be achieved through the diffusion of contemporary ideas and innovative practices. Accreditation requires an organization to voluntarily adopt formal procedures called standards authorized independently by outside organizations or governing bodies. These accrediting bodies normally audit the organization periodically in order to ensure compliance to established standards. Proponents of accreditation assert that it improves organizational procedures and results by introducing innovative and more effective practices. More importantly, they argue that accreditation ostensibly instills a culture of professionalism within the organization.

The concept of accreditation began in the United States in 1787 with the creation of the New York State Regents who were charged with ensuring that colleges and universities within the state met minimum standards. While higher education, followed later by hospitals, have been mandated to meet accreditation standards, accreditation bodies have surfaced among other institutional fields and professions. This includes corrections (1974), law enforcement (1979), parks and recreation (1993), firefighting and emergency services (1996), and healthcare (2011). National Accreditation for law enforcement agencies in the United States has always been a voluntary process since its inception. Although professional licenses and credentials are critical elements for a profession a surprisingly small number of American law enforcement agencies are nationally accredited. Despite the fact there are an additional twenty-five state accrediting bodies in the United States independent from the national accrediting body, the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA), the majority of departments are not accredited, either nationally or locally through the state.

Research on accreditation within the various institutional fields and professions has produced mixed results. For the most part, studies have shown that it has little impact on procedures, results or organizational culture. For example, it doesn’t change how faculty members teach in classroom at universities (Brittingham, 2009); it doesn’t affect police use of force (Alpert and MacDonald, 2001) nor does it change clearance rates for violent and property crimes (Doerner and Doerner, 1997); it doesn’t influence employee attitudes (Greenfield and Braithwaite, 2008); and no link can be found between accreditation in patient safety (Miller et al, 2005) or in patient satisfaction (Sack et al, 2010). Nonetheless, police accreditation is an attempt by proponents to address the concept of professionalism by introducing universal standards to highly decentralized policing field. Accreditation may, in fact, have some concealed benefit for an organization apart from procedures and results. Consequently, it would be meaningful to know why some police executives choose to meet national standards while others choose to reject the process and to see if there are notable differences between accredited and non-accredited agencies that haven’t been uncovered. With the possible exception of Teodor’s 2006 study which argued that chief executive officers acted as bureaucratic entrepreneurs who implemented accreditation as a strategy of obtaining status for job mobility, research on accreditation has focused mainly on accreditation’s effect on procedures, results and organizational culture. This study, on the other hand, seeks to identify the independent variables in decision making that leads to accepting or rejecting accreditation.

The data will be used to test three significant sociological theories on organization, institutional analysis, resource dependency and network analysis, in order to see which one provides the more relevant explanations behind these decisions. Briefly, police organizations are cultural and a social system embedded within an institutional context that includes the state, interests groups and public opinion (Scott, 2003). Modern law enforcement agencies are highly institutionalized organizations that can best be understood by analyzing how
their formal structures and activities are shaped through powerful myths in their institutional environment. The incorporation of powerful myths, such as public perceptions of the police as the legitimate community watchman, which preceded the modern police organization, into the structure and activities of police departments enables them to attain public legitimacy and insulation from outside meddling by powerful constituents present in the invasive institutional environment (Crank and Langworthy, 1992; Crank, 1994 and 2003). The ceremonial process of becoming accredited can become a ritual that promotes the myth of professionalization of the police. Law enforcement agencies are especially dependent on the government and the community for their resources and maintaining legitimacy. The need for resources from the environment, such as financial and physical support as well as information needed for organizational decisions, makes law enforcement agencies especially dependent on external sources. In the institutional environment of the police, law enforcement adapts their activity in response to variations in environmental conditions (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978; Scott, 2003). Law enforcement agencies utilize an informal network of communication either directly or through the abundance of ties provided by numerous police professional associations to validate and support organizational decisions. Their social network plays a critical role in the communication and diffusion of ideas, such as community policing, intelligence-led policing through crime analysis, and national accreditation, despite geographic distances (Granovetter, 1973; Weiss, 1997). On the other hand, law enforcement’s extensive network could possibly obstruct the adoption of accreditation. Since knowledge and information is not restricted and limited to the group perspective locally, both accredited and non-accredited agencies operate similarly and produce similar results. Overall, institutional analysis (neo-institutional and institutional logics), resource dependency and network analysis should provide the best sociological explanations for executive decisions made about accreditation.

9. Study Subjects

a. Describe the study subjects; age ranges, gender(s), any specific populations or targeted ethnic groups, etc.
   Male and female adults who are either serve as the chief executive for their law enforcement agency, or is an elected publicly appointed official, or is a community leader.

b. List any languages (other than English) in which you will be enrolling subjects. Describe your plans for consenting subjects and collecting data for non-English speaking subjects.
   None

c. Vulnerable subjects: In most cases enrollment of vulnerable subjects is not allowed under Exempt review. Indicate whether you will be enrolling subjects from any of the following populations; prisoners, children/minors <18 years, pregnant women, fetuses, decisionally/cognitively impaired, mentally ill, BU students, BU/BMC employees, Wards of the state
   [***Note: for survey research you are not required to ask subjects if they are pregnant.]
   None

10. Eligibility Criteria – describe the subject eligibility criteria. Clearly specify the inclusion/exclusion criteria. Describe how any screening to determine eligibility will occur.

   Inclusion criteria: Since this is a non-probability sampling method, persons who are chief executive officers for their agencies, persons who are public officials and persons who are community leaders.
   Exclusion criteria: Since this is a non-probability sampling method, persons who do not make the final organizational decisions for their agency, persons who are not public officials and persons who are not community leaders.
11. Study Procedures – Describe in detail the study design including all study procedures (in sequential order as they will be performed). Include discussion any questionnaires, survey instruments, etc. that will be used. Specify if you will be receiving any biological samples and from whom. (Note: obtaining biological samples directly from subjects is not allowed under Exempt review.) Be sure to describe study methods, any experimental interventions, number and duration and types of subject contacts phone calls, mailings, emails, etc.). Indicate which, if any, procedures will be done at any non-BU sites.

***You must attach to this application a copy of all surveys, questionnaires and other data collection instruments you will be using.

I have selected a purposive, non-probability sampling design. Twenty-four law enforcement agency chief executive officers will be interviewed either by telephone, if not logistically possible since this is an unfunded study, or in person, one-on-one. In person interviews is the preferred method. The chief executive officers will be from twelve accredited agencies and twelve non-accredited agencies. The purposive, non-probability sampling of the chief executive officers will be decided by agency-type (local police departments, sheriff’s offices, primary state authorities, transportation police, and campus law enforcement). Public officials and community leaders from the agency’s respective community may be interviewed if further information is needed. For instance, if it is revealed that due to an exogenous event, a chief executive officer was chosen hired from outside and accreditation was introduced as a change mechanism. Media accounts, public records and government data will be examined as well. Specific agency community surveys, if any and publicly published budgetary information will be inspected in order to locate any possible resource dependent variables. If any primary, secondary or archival source materials are listed in the dissertation, it will be presented in a manner that will not identify chief executive officer or other public figures, the agency or the community.

12. Duration of the Study – How long you expect it to take to complete this study. Estimate the time required for each subject’s participation and the time for the entire study to be completed (including data analysis).

**If this study involves record or chart review; indicate SPECIFICALLY the date ranges for data collection. Note- Exempt category 4 only allows for retrospective review of EXISTING records. All data points must have already been collected at the time of this submission.

Approximate time for interviews will be between 60 to 90 minutes. Interviews will be conducted and completed by September, 2014. Quantitative research will be undertaken simultaneously and the data will be analyzed for common themes during the summer/fall, 2014 semesters. First draft of the dissertation will be submitted in December, 2014.

13. Sample Size /Data Analysis – How many subjects do you expect to enroll? (i.e. how many people will you survey or how many charts do you plan to review?) Briefly describe your plan for data analysis.

Interviews with a minimum of twenty-four subjects and, if necessary, additional subjects not to exceed fifty. Data analysis will include transcription and coding of interviews and the development of themes related to the research question.

14. Risks – Lists the risks /potential risks of harms or discomforts that may occur as a result of participation. Consider physical as well as psycho-social harms (i.e. loss of confidentiality). Include discomforts or inconveniences. Explain how risks will be minimized.
Initially, the subject will be linked to their identity in order to incorporate the interview data with a larger set of data collected on the individual by the primary investigator from primary, secondary and archival research data. Once such aggregation and its coding are complete, the master code will be destroyed. After such time, there will be no way to identify the subjects directly or through identifiers linked to the subject. Risks will be minimized through confidentiality for interview subjects and public figures interviewed will be identified with the use of pseudonyms, masking certain identifying characteristics, such as gender and ethnicity. If any primary, secondary or archival source materials are listed in the dissertation, it will be presented in a manner that will not identify chief executive officer or other public figures, the agency or the community.

15. Potential Benefits – Describe any potential benefits to be gained by the individual subjects as a result of participating in the study. Describe any potential benefits to society and scientific/medical knowledge. **Payments should not be cited as a benefit.

a. Direct benefits to subjects
   There are no monetary or direct benefits to subjects. However, the subject may be content in knowing that they are contributing to an understanding of executive choices or community choices and organizational direction in the institutional environment of the police.

b. Benefits to society
   The study should provide valuable information on underlying reasons in executive decisions within the institutional environment of the police. Specifically, I hope to uncover first, any variations between accredited and non-accredited law enforcement agencies in procedures and results; secondly, to better understand the institutional environment of the police and its effect on organizational choices; third, to better understand executive leadership, strategic decision processes and their results; fourth, to better understand why police organizations adopt or reject certain ideas or practices; fifth, to better understand the role of institutional culture, networks and resource dependency on executive decisions. Overall, the study will benefit practitioners, elected officials, community leaders, and scholars better understand decisions made on police accreditation and how innovative ideas and practices circulate among law enforcement agencies and how organizational choices and direction are affected.

16. Recruitment – Explain who will recruit subjects for this study. Describe in detail how potential study subjects will be identified and your method for contacting them. If this study involves record/chart review be sure to describe how you will determine which records will be reviewed. ***Attach copies of any recruitment materials to this application.

Subjects will be recruited through the personal knowledge of the primary investigator. Subjects will be contacted through telephone calls and e-mail. The study will be described as: “The purpose of this study is to understand why some police executives choose to attain national police accreditation while other police executives decline to pursue it. The study hopes to uncover reasons behind executive decisions within the institutional environment of the police and how innovative ideas and practices circulate among law enforcement agencies.”

17. Consent Procedure for Exempt Studies – A consent process that contains all of the required elements of consent under 45CFR46.116 is not required. For surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc. potential subjects should be informed that they are in a research study, the purpose of the study, that their participation is voluntary and that they can stop at any time, how the confidentiality of their data will be protected and who to contact if they have questions or concerns.
BU investigators can opt to use BU template language to inform subjects of their rights or they can propose an alternate consent procedure. **Some studies (e.g. chart review), may not require any consenting process.

☑️ a. I intend to consent subjects using BU language. Provide, in the box below, the specific language you will use utilizing this template language.

Add the following information to the either the opening paragraph of the questionnaire as part of the cover letter, or in the invitation e-mail/online posting or as part of the online version questionnaire] 1) the purpose of the research study and how the results will be used [if this is a student protocol indicate that the investigator is a student, the school, that this research is part of his/her thesis /dissertation work]; 2) a statement that participation is completely voluntary, and that they can stop the survey at any time; 3) approximately how much time will be needed to complete the survey; 4) that all responses are anonymous and confidential; 5) who they can contact if they have any questions and how this person can be contacted [if this is a student protocol add the name and contact email for the student's advisor also]; 6) the following statement: You may obtain further information about your rights as a research subject by calling the **BU CRC IRB Office at 617-358-6115.

☐ b. I intend to obtain consent using the following alternate consent language/process:

☐ c. I do not intend to obtain consent from subjects. Explain why not.

18. **Confidentiality of the Data** – In most cases, for research to qualify as Exempt, the data must be anonymous (not contain any identifiers).

Data is considered identifiable if it
- contains any subject identifiers, OR
- if the data can be linked to subject identifiers via a mastercode OR
- if subjects can be identified via deductive disclosure (combination of the data elements).

For Type A exemptions (NHSR), the data may not contain any identifiers, the data may not contain any identifiers, the data may not be coded in such a way that it can be linked back (even temporarily) to identifiers (i.e. via a mastercode), and subjects' identities may not be readily ascertained from the data itself (deductive disclosure). **Note: in most instances complete dates (month, day & year) are considered identifiers and only partial dates are acceptable as non-identifiable.

Type B Categorical Exemptions under categories 2 &4- the data may not contain any identifiers, the data may not be coded in such a way that it can be linked back (even temporarily) to identifiers (i.e. via a mastercode), and subjects' identities may not be readily ascertained from the data itself (deductive disclosure) if the data being collected and linked to subjects could put them at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.
For some cases, as in chart reviews, it is allowed to generate a “query list” which identifies which records will be reviewed. The query list can only be temporary and must be destroyed immediately after data is collected. At NO time can there be a mastercode (temporary or permanent) which links the study data being collected to the identifiers on the query list.

In the box below, clearly specify whether any subject data will be recorded in a way that it is identifiable (even temporarily). Specify whether study data will be identified by specific subject identifiers (name, medical record numbers, etc.) or by any study IDs that can be linked to subjects via master-codes. Verify that the study data or combinations of data will not allow subjects to be identified (i.e. initials and birthdates). For data being collected by an online survey service such as PsychSurvey or Survey Monkey, for the study data to be anonymous you must confirm that you will utilize that you will use the anonymity feature provided by these sites from the onset of the study.

Interview subjects will be offered confidentiality as part of their participation. Interview subjects will be assigned a study ID that can be linked via a master code. Their information will remain confidential, as their actual identity will not be connected to their unique study ID, with the exception of the master code document to which only I will have access.

19. **Data Storage** – Describe where research data will be stored, how it will be protected, who will have access, how long it will be kept, and how and when it will be destroyed.

I will not release any identifiable data to anyone. Data will be stored on my home computer and only accessible by me. Data files will be destroyed upon completion of the dissertation. All paper transcripts will be shredded while audio and computer files deleted. The master code will exist on a flash drive used solely for the purposes of the study and to be accessed only by men. I alone will be responsible for maintaining the data. I will keep the information on the drive for seven years per Boston University’s Record Retention Policy, after which point I will delete the confidential information and discard the flash drive.

Per Boston University (BU) Record Retention Policy, records concerning human subjects must be retained for 7 years. Please refer to the policy at: [http://www.bu.edu/policies/files/2012/05/Record_Retention_Policy_1-27-10.pdf](http://www.bu.edu/policies/files/2012/05/Record_Retention_Policy_1-27-10.pdf). As the investigator, you must also adhere to all applicable requirements as defined by regulatory agencies (e.g. FDA, etc.) or Sponsors.

20. **Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)**

HIPAA rules apply if the investigator is part of a covered entity or a covered component and is collecting protected health information. The following components have been determined to be covered entities on the Boston University Charles River Campus:

- Sargent College Rehabilitation Services
- Physical Therapy Center at the Ryan Center for Sports Medicine and Rehabilitation
- Sargent Choice Nutrition Center
- The Danielsen Institute
- Boston University Health Plan

If the research is being conducted in one of the above covered entities, contact the IRB office for assistance.
The PI is not part of the covered entity or a covered component.

21. Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)

Does this study involve collection of information from student school/university records? *If YES, refer to the BU FERPA website for guidance: [http://www.bu.edu/reg/general-information/ferpa/](http://www.bu.edu/reg/general-information/ferpa/)

In accordance with FERPA, written consent must be obtained to access student records. The consent must:
- Specify the records that may be disclosed
- State the purpose of the disclosure
- Identify the person or class of parties to whom the disclosure can be made

Describe your plan for obtaining this information in accordance with FERPA:
The study does not involve collection of information from student school/university records.

22. Costs/Payment

- Indicate any costs that subjects will incur from participating in this research (including travel, parking, postage, etc.). Indicate any payments subjects will receive for participating in the research. If subjects will be paid (money, gift certificates, coupons, etc.) to participate note the total dollar amount (or dollar value) and distribution plan (one payment, pro-rated payment, payment upon completion, etc.) Describe any other reimbursement that will be provided (i.e. parking, mileage, cab vouchers, etc.) Explain specifically how and when these reimbursements for expenses will be paid. Specify the plan for reimbursement if the subject withdraws early from the study.

Costs:
N/A

Payments / Reimbursements:
N/A

Attachments

List all Attachments to this application:

- Human Subjects Training certificates (specify how many: 2)
Certification of the investigator

- By submitting this protocol I attest to the fact that all research activities to be implemented related to human subjects have been completely and accurately described herein.
- I agree to conduct the described research in an ethical manner.
- I agree to comply with all institutional policies and procedures related to human subjects research and will not begin any human subjects research activities until I have obtained full approval from the IRB.
- I agree to conduct the research as described in this protocol and not to make any changes (except to eliminate immediate harm to subjects) without first obtaining approval for the changes from the IRB.
- I agree to immediately report any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others, any subject complaints, and any incidents of non-compliance with the requirements of this protocol as soon as I become aware of them.
- I agree to comply with any relevant HIPAA and FERPA regulations.
- I verify that Project Specific Conflict of Interest (COI) disclosures have been submitted for all BU investigators listed on this protocol.

PI printed name Jack St. Hilaire

Signature of the PI ________________________________ Date April 28, 2014

PI's department Chair or Dean (if student then obtain signature of Faculty Advisor)

Printed name Nazli Kibria

Signature ________________________________ Date April 28, 2014

STUDENT research
Student research: Student research must be signed by the faculty advisor AND the designated School IRB pre-reviewer PRIOR TO submission to the IRB.

By signing this form you are indicating that you have reviewed the application, that you agree to serve as the Co-PI for this study with the student and that you will be responsible for the ethical conduct of this student’s human subjects research.

Printed name of faculty advisor___ Emily Barman
Signature____________________________ Date__ April 28, 2014__________

Printed name of the Designated School IRB pre-reviewer (if Applicable):
   _____________________________

Signature____________________________Date___ April 28, 2014__________________

Directions for Submission:
Exempt protocols may be submitted by email to the IRB:  (irb@bu.edu)
Unsigned and incomplete submissions will be returned and not reviewed.
APPENDIX I

RECRUITMENT LETTER/E-MAIL
Dear (Rank and Name)

I am a Sergeant and Accreditation Manager with the Boston University Police Department and I am conducting research on CALEA National Police Accreditation for my Dissertation as a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Sociology at Boston University. I am contacting you to see if you would be interested in participating in my study which looks at police executive decisions and organizational choices on whether to pursue or not CALEA accreditation; and if police accreditation truly improves police operations and/or affects the culture of the organization. Your participation would require an extensive interview that should only take between 45 to 60 minutes (in-person or by telephone).

The goal for my research is to better understand the context in which executive decisions are made and organizational direction is taken within the institutional environment of the police, such as the power of strategic choice held by the Chief Executive Officer, the community and political environment, executive mobility, the culture of the organization, and available resources. In essence, I have chosen national police accreditation as the mechanism in which to study these critical institutional factors in managing police operations. Although my agency is CALEA accredited, as the primary researcher my position and approach on national police accreditation must remain neutral.

Your participation and assistance will contribute towards research in the field of police sciences and should provide a better understanding about executive choices and organizational directions by law enforcement agencies as well as to extent in which ideas and practices, such as community policing, Compstat, or police accreditation is disseminated and adopted or rejected by agencies within the United States.

I will maintain confidentiality regarding you and your responses. I will change your name as well as your agency’s name when I report the study so as not to make you or your agency identifiable. I will keep all information confidential. There is a minimal risk that someone who is not a part of the study will learn the identity of you or your agency. Please keep this in mind and that you do not have to answer any question that makes you feel uncomfortable.

If you would like I can e-mail you my prospectus and questions in advance which has been approved by my graduate committee and by Boston University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB).

I will contact your agency by telephone shortly in order to follow up on this request submitted by e-mail. I hope you are interested and can assist me with this study and I appreciate your time and consideration.
Sincerely,

Jack St. Hilaire  
Boston University

Page 1 of 2  
Department of Sociology  
100 Cummington Mall  
Suite 260  
Boston, MA 02215  
617-353-2591 (Dept. of Sociology)  
e-mail: socdept@bu.edu

603-935-8283 (Home)

e-mail: jjsthilaire@comcast.net

Committee Chair  
Dr. Emily Barman  
Boston University  
Department of Sociology  
Room 248c  
Boston, MA 02215  
617-358-0651  
e-mail: eabarman@bu.edu
APPENDIX J

INFORMED CONSENT FOR RESEARCH PROJECT
INFORMED CONSENT FOR RESEARCH PROJECT

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study, which will take place from May, 2014 to September, 2014. This form details the purpose of this study, a description of the involvement required and your rights as a participant.

**Title of Project:** Myth and Reality in an Era of Police Accreditation

**Study Background**

This study looks at the reasons why police executives choose to either attain or decline to pursue national police accreditation for their agencies. National police accreditation was introduced into the United States as part of an overall strategy to raise the professional status of law enforcement agencies by standardizing operating procedures. In 1979, though support from the U.S. Department of Justice four major professional police associations, the International Chiefs of Police Association (IACP), the National Association of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), the National Sheriff’s Association (NSA), and the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), created the national accrediting body, the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) and national police standards were established subsequently. Thirty-five years later, the percentage of nationally accredited law enforcement agencies is small when compared to non-accredited law enforcement agencies in the United States. Meanwhile, research on accreditation for police as well as on other institutions, such as higher education, hospitals and healthcare, corrections, firefighting and emergency services, and parks and recreation, so far has suggested that there are no significant measurable differences between accredited and non-accredited organizations in procedures, results or availability of resources. In addition, accreditation has shown to have little impact on organizational culture. Nonetheless, accreditation’s symbolic value of maintaining legitimacy and stability in the institutional environment of the police is difficult to quantify and should not be underestimated. There may also be hidden benefits from accreditation apart from the process and output of an organization. This study attempts to assess this impasse through intensive qualitative interviews with twenty-eight chief executive officers from both accredited agencies and non-accredited law enforcement agencies of various sizes and type from five geographic areas in the United States that will include local police departments, sheriffs’ offices, primary state authorities, transportation police, and campus law enforcement.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study is:

To gain a better understanding of why some chief executive officers of law enforcement agencies in the United States choose to pursue national police accreditation through the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) while other chief executive officers reject the accreditation process. Consequently, the study will concentrate on:
10. The reasons behind organizational choices at the executive level within the institutional environment.

11. The identification of any variations in procedures and results between accredited and non-accredited agencies.

12. The identification of any variations in the institutional environments between accredited and non-accredited agencies.

13. The identification of any exogenous event that led to accreditation.

14. The identification of any variations in available resources and dependency between accredited and non-accredited agencies.

15. Perceptions of the organization’s efficiency and legitimacy as seen at the executive level and externally from administrators and community leaders who interact with the agency.

16. The strength of network ties from both the accredited and non-accredited agencies.

17. The dynamics behind the acceptance or rejection of the police accreditation process and overall the diffusion of ideas, practices and strategies among law enforcement agencies.

**Benefits**

While you may not personally receive any benefits from this study, your participation will contribute to an understanding of executive choices and organizational direction in the institutional environment of the police. Specific benefits of the research will be:

- To uncover any variations between accredited and non-accredited agencies in organizational processes and outcomes.
- To better understand the institutional environment of law enforcement and its effect on organizational choices and paths.
- To better understand executive leadership, strategic decision processes and their results.
- To better understand why police organizations adopt or reject certain ideas or practices, such as community policing, Compstat (crime analysis), predictive policing, and police accreditation.
- To better understand the role of institutional culture, networks and resource dependency in executive decisions.
Research Method

The methods that will be used to meet this purpose include:

- In person, or by telephone, confidential interviews.
- Archival and document research.

Interviews

The interviews will be audio taped to help me accurately capture your insights in your own words. The tapes will only be heard by me for the purpose of this study. If you feel uncomfortable with the recorder, you may ask that it be turned off at any time.

Risk and Discomforts

There is no inherent risk in this study. If you feel any discomfort answering my questions, you are not required to respond. Your participation is voluntary and you may choose to end the interview at any point. You also have the right to withdraw from the study at any time. In the event you choose to withdraw from the study all information you provide (including tapes) will be destroyed and omitted from the final product.

Confidentiality

Insights gathered from you and other participants will be used in writing a qualitative research report, which will be read by my BU professors and may become part of a dissertation and/or book project. Though direct quotes from you may be used in the paper, your name and other identifying information will be kept anonymous, unless you explicitly waive that right. If you wish for the use of your full name in the study, this request will be adhered to as well. Participation is voluntary and the interviewee has the right to terminate the interview at any time. I will replace the names of CEOs and agencies with pseudonyms and protect the confidentiality of interviewees who request it. Data will be stored on my home computer and only accessible by me. Data files will be destroyed upon completion of the dissertation. All paper transcripts will be shredded while audio and computer files deleted.
A summary of the results will be available to participants upon request.

You are encouraged to ask questions or raise concerns at any time about the nature of the study or the methods I am using. Please contact me at any time at the bupd307@bu.edu, or jjsthilaire@comcast.net or, at 617-358-6732 (Work), or 617-799-5207 (Cell), or 603-935-8283 (Home).

Advisor: Dr. Emily Barman
Department of Sociology
Boston University
100 Cummington Mall, Room
Boston, MA 02215
eabarman@bu.edu
617-358-0651

You may obtain further information about your rights as a research subject by calling the BU CRC IRB Office at 617-358-6115.
Subject Understands

☐ I agree to participate in this study that I understand may be submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology at Boston University.
☐ I understand that my participation is voluntary.
☐ I understand that all data collected will be limited to this use or other research-related usage as authorized by Boston University.
☐ I understand that I will not be identified by name in the final product, unless I waive that right or request that I be identified.
☐ I am aware that all records will be kept confidential in the secure possession of the researcher and destroyed upon completion of the research.
☐ I acknowledge that the contact information of the researcher and his advisor have been made available to me along with a duplicate copy of this consent form. And I understand that I may withdraw from the study at any time.

I waive my right to being treated as a confidential informant and agree that any information provided by me may be attributed to me.

I agree _______ I disagree and want my identity kept confidential ______

By signing this consent form I certify that I ______________________________ agree to
(Print full name here)
the terms of this agreement.

________________________________________________________  _____________________
(Signature) (Date)

Researcher: ______________________________________________  _____________________
(Signature) (Date)
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