Accreditation and Community Policing: Are They Neutral, Hostile, or Synergistic? An Empirical Test among Street Cops and Management Cops

Terry E. Gingerich
and Gregory D. Russell*

Volume 3 - No. 2 – Fall 2006

* *Terry E. Gingerich is an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at Western Oregon University. Gregory D. Russell is the Director of Criminology at Arkansas State University.*

Abstract

This research quantitatively examined the relationship between police agency accreditation and community policing in Washington State. Specifically, it compares the opinions (receptiveness to COP) of CEOs, staff officers/middle managers, first line supervisors, and line officers in accredited agencies with those of like officers in non-accredited agencies. The study hypothesized that accreditation (through organizational influences) leads to greater employee receptivity to a department's policies and procedures, specifically those associated with COP. Data were collected through a statewide survey of 202 Washington law enforcement agencies. Four officers from each agency (divided by rank) were invited to participate, 530 responded. Analysis considered seven control variables: the respondent's rank, age, veteran status, education, work experience, and accreditation status. Analysis also employed one index variable, constructed from 14 questions related to COP. The authors found that line officers in accredited agencies are significantly more receptive to the philosophy and strategies of COP when compared to line officers in non-accredited agencies. All other rank groups share similar (generally positive) opinions of COP. The authors also found that acceptance of the philosophies and strategies of COP (whether in accredited or non-accredited agencies) is universally predictable based on one's rank –higher rank = higher receptiveness to COP. Policy implications are also discussed.

About the Authors

Terry E. Gingerich is an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at Western Oregon University. Prior to entering academia he served 25 years with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, retiring in 1996 as a sergeant. He is the coauthor of *Law Enforcement in the United States* (2005). He is an executive board member of the Western Community Policing Institute and a member of the Police Administration Committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. His research interests include police history, ethics, criminal justice policy, and comparative policing. E-mail: gingert@wou.edu

Dr. Greg D. Russell is the Director of Criminology at Arkansas State University. He is the author of two books, the *Death Penalty and Racial Bias* (1994) and with coauthors *Law Enforcement in the United States* (2000, 2005). He has also published in numerous academic journals, such as *Police Quarterly*, *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, and *Journal of Crime and Justice*, and the American Journal of Criminal Justice. His research interests include policing, the courts, and criminal justice policy.

Accreditation and Community Policing:
Are They Neutral, Hostile, or Synergistic?

Introduction

Law enforcement accreditation and community policing have a common purpose –improving the quality of police services. They also have a common origin that traces its roots to a turbulent and conflicted era in American history, the 1960s. Excluding the dark cloud of the Cold War, for many it was a good time. The American economy had produced a growing middle class complete with all its trappings, benefits, and privileges. Yet, it was also a bad time. Whether by design, omission, and/or neglect many minority citizens where still excluded from the prize. The inequity was all too apparent. The very best and worst of these conditions were presented to America on a new mode of mass communication –television. Sandwiched between "Leave it to Beaver" and the "Ed Sullivan Show," the stark black and white pictures of Woodstock, riots, political assassinations, the murders of civil rights workers, and protests against the war in Viet Nam fueled a general anxiety. To make matters worse, beyond the social conditions that produced the riotous flames of summer, it was apparent to many citizens (especially African-Americans) and political leaders that the law enforcement establishment was at worst part of the problem and at best inadequately staffed, trained, and managed to effectively respond to the challenges at hand. Images of police dogs tearing at peaceful marchers and/or officers clubbing protesters were compounded by news stories depicting corrupt police and police practices. The general public had seen enough, television had captured the ugly side of policing in the 1960s and placed it in every American living room. Consequently, as part of a wider effort to ensure that all citizens would share in the American dream, police reform became a political necessity.

The first wave of change came in the form of Supreme Court rulings that both criticized the status quo and established minimum procedural standards for certain aspects of law enforcement (e.g., *Mapp v.* Ohio, 1961; *Escobedo v. Illinois*, 1964; *Miranda v. Arizona,* 1966). The second wave of reform established personnel practices consistent with the 1964 Civil Rights Act. This law attempted to eliminate discrimination in hiring, promotion, and assignment of law enforcement personnel. In quick succession, a third wave of reform emerged from the collective recommendations of four investigative commissions –the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice (1967), the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (the Kerner Commission, 1968), the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973), and the American Bar Association (1974). Each of these august commissions was tasked with reviewing the condition of American law enforcement in the mid-1960s and early-1970s, and with making recommendations for improving both policy and product.

Reaching broad consensus in their findings, the commissions would make many important recommendations to improve the quality of law enforcement and police services. In fact, two of their many recommendations would come to dominate reform in police and sheriff's departments for the next thirty years. The first of these recommendations was that police and sheriff's departments adopt nationally recognized policy and procedural standards, a concept that would lead to the creation of state peace officer standards and training commissions (POST), and indirectly, to law enforcement accreditation; an idea that would take form under the umbrella of the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) (Joseph, 1980). The second

recommendation was that police and sheriff's departments establish community-relation units designed to improve relations between the police and the public (especially the minority community). Importantly, the strategies and philosophies developed within community-relations bureaus of progressive police and sheriff's departments in the 1970s (Earl, 1972) would lay the foundation for the more refined strategies of community and problem-oriented policing –concepts that would emerge in the 1980s, and would come to define policing in the 1990s (Cordner, 1997).

Both reform concepts –accreditation and community-relations (and its end product community policing) – were designed to address very different aspects of the same problem; specifically, law enforcement's capacity to effectively respond to the challenges of crime in a free society. Certainly, in their unique ways accreditation and community policing[1] have made important contributions toward this objective. Yet, the operational relationship between the two reforms is poorly understood. To help fill the gap, this study examines the relationship between police agency accreditation (i.e., the influence of its procedural and policy mandates on officer attitudes) and community policing (i.e., officer receptiveness to specific strategies and concepts of COP) in Washington State.

Accreditation

Accreditation is a growing trend within law enforcement administration in the State of Washington and nationally. Yet, with the exceptions of Kenneth Joseph (1980), Gerald Williams (1988), William Crowder (1998), and Rob Sofie (1995) who reported on its organizational benefits; David Carter and Allen Sapp (1994) and Gary Cordner and Gerald Williams (1997) who studied is relationship with COP; Timothy Ortmeier (1996)

and Gary Sykes (1994) who questioned its utility as a reform strategy; and Kimberly McCabe and Robin Fajardo (2000) who reported on organizational differences between accredited and non-accredited agencies, there has been little research on its influences or contributions.

Simply defined, accreditation is a voluntary, peer reviewed certification-program that affords police and sheriff's departments the opportunity to review, revise, and update their administrative policies and procedures based upon a comprehensive set of nationally recognized standards. From a practical viewpoint, according to the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC, 2001), "Accreditation is a way of helping institutions evaluate and improve their overall performance," based on the adoption and maintenance of policies and procedures that conform to national standards.

An agency secures accreditation status through a rigorous five-step process: (1) application to CALEA, or a State accreditation body associated with CALEA, like WASPC; (2) self-evaluation, which can take one year, or more, of internal review and policy adaptation; (3) on-site peer evaluation, which usually takes two or three days as a team of law enforcement executives inspects/evaluates the current status of a department's policies and procedures to ensure compliance with over 200 mandatory standards; (4) appearance before the state Law Enforcement Accreditation Commission, which confers the accreditation certification; (5) reevaluation through on-site peer review visits every five years to maintain accreditation status.

Testaments to Accreditation

Accreditation, at least from the executive perspective, seems to add value to an agency's internal operations. For example, Williams (1988) found that chief executive

officers (CEOs) who command accredited agencies believe that the introduction of accreditation standards improved their agency's ability to develop goals and objectives, to foster greater employee input in the development of goals and objectives, and to improve operational aspects of policing. Carter and Sapp (1994) report similar findings after surveying CEOs in accredited police agencies. Respondents in their study reported that accreditation improved organizational control, accountability, and consistency of performance, while setting a benchmark for organizational evaluation. Crowder (1998) added credence to the aforementioned studies when he surveyed CEOs in accredited agencies and found that accreditation (in the opinion of respondents) improved policy review, management practices, management-employee relations, morale, and teamwork. Based on the evidence of these limited studies, we might conclude that the reforms of accreditation lead to more professional and effective police service –better police service.

Community Policing

However, in contemporary American policing "better police service" is often judged by how closely it comports with the popular[2] philosophies underlying community policing, a concept first introduced by John Angell (1971) and popularly defined by Robert Trojanowicz and Bonnie Bucqueroux (1990, p.5) in a now famous sentence that captures its essence:

> Community policing is a new philosophy of policing, based on the concept that police officers and private citizens working together in creative ways can help solve contemporary community problems related to crime, fear of crime, social and physical disorder, and neighborhood decay.

Yet, as Cordner (1997, p.451) observes, there is "…no single definition of community policing nor any universal set of program elements." Owing to this insightful observation, we could fill several pages with definitions and descriptions of community

policing that others have offered. However, we believe the essence of our research concerning COP is captured in the above statement, which we have conceptualized in 14 questions in our survey questionnaire. (For a further discussion see section *Operationalizing Concepts of Community Policing into Survey Questions*.)

Relationships: Equal Partners or Conflicting Strategies?

Community policing calls for innovative interaction and cooperation between police and community members (the co-production of order) as they work to address the problems of crime and disorder. It is, according to Cordner and Trojanowicz (1992, p.12), a "new philosophy" of police service, which mandates a philosophical restructuring of police attitudes and behaviors, evidenced in creative problem solving strategies.

Accreditation, on the other hand, is a managerial strategy designed to enhance police operations through the introduction and maintenance of standardized policies and procedures, applied within a traditional hierarchical structure. It is, according to Cordner and Williams (1995, 1997), traditional and formalistic in its approach to police administration, relying on mandated procedural and accountability standards to help establish boundaries of professional conduct. Some observers, including Sykes (1994), even suggest that accreditation is simply an attempt to maintain the status quo of the professional model of policing. Based on these observations, one might conclude that accreditation is restrictive, process oriented, and bureaucratic. One might also conclude that it is an impediment to the democratic reforms proposed by community policing, which favor a highly decentralized decision making structure, one not burdened with

bureaucratic or administrative restrictions. Consequently, one might ask, "Could these reform models be working at cross purposes, or even be incompatible?"

The general question of compatibility was initially answered in the findings of two studies that surveyed police executives who commanded accredited agencies in the mid-1990s. Carter and Sapp (1994) conducted the first study using *executive attitudes toward accreditation* as their unit of analysis. Cordner and Williams (1995, 1997) conducted a second study using a three-component (i.e., content analysis, expert survey, and case study) examination of the *impact of accreditation* as it applied to community policing as their unit of analysis. Importantly, both studies concluded that the relationship between accreditation and the philosophies and strategies of community policing are, for the most part, neutral. Accreditation standards (in their specific wording and intent) neither advocate nor hinder activities associated with community policing, even though they are, according Cordner and Williams (1995, 1997), overwhelmingly process-oriented as opposed to community policing's out-come orientation. (See Table 1)

The Focus of This Study

While Carter and Sapp (1994) and Cordner and Williams (1995, 1997) offer important baseline information concerning the comparability of the accreditation and community policing models, their work only broaches the compatibility question from the executive perspective, and, more importantly, from the executive perspective within accredited agencies. We believe that while law enforcement executives offer great insight into the workings of their agency, it is only one perspective. There are, as Elizabeth Reuss-Ianni (1984) observes, two general perspectives in policing –a management perspective and a line (street cop) perspective (Also see John Crank's

excellent work *Understanding Police Culture*, 1998). Therefore, a rank-differentiated comparative exploration of the subject would move the discussion of compatibility beyond the executive perspective.

Table 1 General Characteristics of Accreditation and Community Policing

Accreditation	Community Policing
A reform model that:	A reform model that:
Advances organizational and procedural efficiency through the application of rigorous standards –professionalization.	Embraces a philosophy of greater community participation in the design and delivery of police services –co-production of order
Can trace its evolutionary roots to State police standards commissions recommended by the President's Crime Commission, 1967.	Can trace its evolutionary roots to the community-relations programs recommendation by the President's Crime Commission, 1967.
Critical function: improve operational/managerial efficiency through procedural reform.	Critical function: improve the design/delivery of police services through democratic participation.
Process-oriented with a focus on mandated procedural and accountability standards	Outcome-oriented with a focus on innovated crime control strategies and police/citizen collaboration
A voluntary assessment process designed to ensure that police agency practices are consistent with rigorous professional standards	A philosophy of police service based on the co-production of order that varies by agency in degree, practice, and acceptance.

This brings us to the central question of our study: Are there attitudinal differences between officers (viewed by rank: executive officer, staff officers, middle managers, first line supervisors, and line officers) in accredited agencies when compared to like officers in non-accredited agencies regarding community policing programs or the underlying philosophy of community policing? And if there are differences, what organizational factors within accredited agencies might explain this variation?

Research Hypotheses

We believe Sykes (1994) was too pessimistic when he asserted that accreditation produces restrictive, process oriented, and bureaucratic routines within police agencies, traditional qualities that promote the status quo of policing. A more accurate observation (we believe) was offered by Carter and Sapp (1994) and Cordner and Williams (1995, 1997) when they asserted that accreditation is simply neutral in regards to progressive police strategies, specifically the philosophies and strategies of community policing. However, while we agree that accreditation standards do not speak directly to issues of community policing, we believe that the department wide team-effort of securing and maintaining accreditation produces a greater receptiveness among officers to a department's general policies and procedures, including those associated with community policing. In other word, collective participation results in shared ownership of product. We also contend that this phenomenon will be most apparent at the line officer level because higher ranks in both accredited and non-accredited agencies already perceive the fruits of the administrative/management process as their own. In conducting this research, we hope to demonstrate that accreditation (beyond its relationship with COP)

provides a platform for line officers to participate in the policy/procedure development and maintenance process.

The benefit of employee participation is not a new concept. Chris Argyris (1955) noted that participative management has several employee centered benefits: (1) it produces a "we" feeling of cohesiveness; (2) it enhances their over-all organizational point of view; (3) it decreases conflict among coworkers; (4) it increases individual tolerance and patience; (5) it increases individuality and freedom of expression; (6) and it promotes a creative work climate. Consequently, we contend that accreditation (as a hybrid form of participative management) pushes ownership of policy and procedure down the chain-of-command to the line officer level. Thus our first through fifth hypotheses are these (stated in the null):

- H1. CEOs in accredited agencies will hold *dissimilar* opinions of COP when compared to CEOs in non-accredited agencies.
- H2. Staff officers (captains to assistant CEOs) in accredited agencies will hold *dissimilar* opinions of COP when compared to staff officers in non-accredited agencies.
- H3. Middle managers (lieutenants) in accredited agencies will hold *dissimilar* opinions of COP when compared to middle managers in non-accredited agencies.
- H4. First line supervisors (sergeants) in accredited agencies will hold *dissimilar* opinions of COP when compared to first line supervisors in non-accredited agencies.
- H5. Line officers in accredited agencies will hold *similar* opinions of COP when compared to line officers in non-accredited agencies.

Additionally, building on the work of Elizabeth Reuss-Ianni (1984), who observed that there are two cultures of policing –a management culture and a line culture, we contend that the degree (intensity) of one's acceptance of the philosophies and strategies of community policing (whether in accredited or non-accredited agencies) is universally predictable based on one's rank –higher rank = higher receptiveness to COP. Consequently, we hypothesize that officers of comparable ranks in accreditation agencies will hold similar opinions of community policing when compared with their counterparts in non-accredited agencies, and these similarities will descend (more favorable to less favorable) through the ranks of CEO, staff officer, middle manager, line supervisor, and line officer. Thus our sixth hypothesis is this (stated in the null):

- H6. The level of receptiveness to COP is *not* influenced by rank, in the sense that –higher rank = greater receptiveness, regardless of accreditation status.

Research Methodology

Data Source and Study Population

Data used in this study consist of responses to survey questionnaires that were mailed to all law enforcement agencies (sheriff's and police departments) in Washington State between May and August 2001. Only agencies that employed four or more sworn officers were invited to participate (this excluded 46 agencies that employed four or less officers). Using this criterion, 202 agencies were included in the study, 57 accredited agencies (39 police departments and 18 Sheriff's departments) and 145 non-accredited agencies (124 police and 21 sheriff's departments) (See Table 2).

Table 2 Departments Invited to Participate in Survey

Non-Accredited Agencies		Accredited Agencies		Totals
Sheriff's Departments	N- 21	Sheriff's Departments	N-18	N- 39
Police Departments	N-124	Police Departments	N-39	N-163
Totals	N-145		N-57	N-202

Sampling Procedures

Four officers from each of the 202 qualifying agencies were invited to participate in the survey. Except for the chief executive officer, survey subjects were culled from the general population of each department by using a modified[3] snowball selection technique. Specifically, the executive officer at each agency was invited to complete a survey and to select a middle manager (lieutenant or above), a first line supervisor (sergeant), and a line officer to also complete a survey. The CEO was asked to select officers who were "characteristic" of his or her department. This could be taken as a judgment sample (and certainly a limitation of this research) but we believe, even though the sample is admittedly biased, the sample largely reflects those officers considered most reliable and trusted by the CEO in both accredited and non-accredited agencies.

No assurance can be made that the CEO at each agency strictly followed the survey instructions. We can only assume that the CEO, or his or her representative, picked candidates that were respected/trusted (i.e., experienced, knowledgeable, and motivated) within the organizational setting. In other words, it is unlikely that marginal (i.e., inexperienced, unmotivated, recalcitrant, and distrusted) individuals within the organization would be selected. We also assume (based on the fact that there is no literature countering our assumption) that the vast majority of individuals within a law

enforcement organization (in Washington State) fall within the respected/trusted category of employees, in other words the "average" officer. Consequently, the sampling validity, the degree to which respondents adequately represent the "average" law enforcement officers in Washington, is reasonably satisfied.

A survey package containing a cover letter (which informed the reader that the research was supported by the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, – WASPC, and the Western Regional Institute for Community Oriented Public Safety – WRICOPS) and four survey questionnaires were mailed to the chief executive officer of each agency meeting the selection criteria. The cover letter asked the executive officer to complete a survey and select a staff officer/middle manager, first line supervisor, and line officer to also complete a survey. A return envelope was included with each survey questionnaire.

Units of Analysis

The units of analysis in this research are sworn law enforcement officers within Washington State divided by rank groups – CEOs, middle managers (lieutenants and above), first line supervisors (sergeants), and line officers. Importantly, we should note that during coding we refined the "middle manager" category by dividing it into two categories –staff officers (personnel between the rank of assistant-CEO to captain) and middle managers (lieutenants). This allowed for a more defined (five-rank) analysis. We might also note that these rank categories are common in American policing

Survey Responses

Personnel from 47 of 57 accredited agencies responded to the survey, totaling 191 responses. Personnel from 119 of 145 non-accredited agencies responded to the survey,

totaling 339 responses. Consequently, 530 officers participated in the study. Table 3 displays the number of officers (by rank group) who were invited to participate in the research, number of responses, response rates, and the overall response rate (65.6%). Table 4 displays all respondents by rank group and agency status (accredited or non-accredited), including percentage of response. We draw the reader's attention to the low response rates of all ranks of officers in non-accredited agencies when compared to officers in accredited agencies (a possible explanation for this disparity is offered in the Discussion Section)

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was designed to solicit both demographic information (gender, age, ethnicity, years-of-service, education, and veteran status) and information regarding an officer's opinion of selected aspects of community policing. Two question designs were employed –open-ended and closed–ended. Open-ended questions were used to solicit general demographic information, while a closed-ended question format was employed to solicit attitudinal information regarding community policing (Salant and Dillman, 1994). The closed-ended format was selected because it offers a foundation for Likert scaling (Don't Know, Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree), which is a commonly accepted technique suitable for measuring the degree to which an individual is receptive/unreceptive to a concept, in this case aspects of community policing (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992, p.436).

Operationalizing Concepts of Community Policing into Survey Questions

Attitudes, as we all know, are a complex consequence of the human condition. Therefore, as Nachmias and Nachmias (1992, p.427) point out, they "are extremely

difficult to measure because, among other things, they are composites of several empirical properties." Recognizing this limitation, but hoping to probe the mind-set of officers, we carefully constructed 14 questions designed to solicit attitudinal information regarding an individual's receptiveness to selected concepts or strategies associated with community policing.

Table 3 Rank Group Participation and Response Rates

Rank Group	Invited	Responded	Response Rate
Chief Executive officers	N= 202	129	63.8 %
Middle managers*	N= 202	112	55.4
First Line Supervisors	N= 202	122	60.3
Line officers	N= 202	167	82.6
Totals	N= 808	N= 530	65.6 %

*Research Note: During coding, this category was divided into two categories –Staff Officers (assistant CEO to captain) and Middle Managers (lieutenant) to facilitate a more detailed statistical analysis.

Table 4 Rank Group Participation, Response Rates, and Agency Accreditation Status

Rank Group	Accredited			Non-Accredited		
	Invited	Respond	/ %	Invited	Respond	/ %
Chief Executive officers	57	40	73.7 %	145	89	63.4 %
Staff Officers	29	25	86.2	73	38	52.0
Middle managers	28	19	67.8	72	31	43.0
First Line Supervisors	57	51	84.2	145	70	49.0
Line officers	57	50	93.0	145	117	78.6
Totals	228	185	81.1%	580	345	59.4%

Total Respondents 530 Cumulative Response Rate: 65.6%

"Community policing" was conceptualized (for this study) by selecting the most common community policing activities and strategies currently employed in the United States. "Most common" was defined by selecting community policing activities that were utilized by at least 50% of American police and sheriff's departments (a process that identified 28 activities). The list of 28 activities was culled from four larger data sets collected between 1993 and 1997 by the Police Foundation, and by the Office of Community Oriented Policing. Maguire and Mastrofski (2000) originally collected this data to determine the national extent of community policing activities and strategies. Consequently, the 28 activities represent a broad cross section of programs, strategies, or concepts that are currently (or have recently been) employed within American police and sheriff's departments. Working from the list of 28 activities, we operationalized (collapsed or configured) them into 14 topical survey questions, which, we believe, accurately represent the most common community policing programs, strategies, or concepts. We should note that a pretest of the questions within a medium sized police department (which was excluded in the final study) lead to further refinement before final adoption.

Analysis Strategy

We employed several analytic techniques to explore the hypothesized relationships central to the study's inquiry. First, a crosstab analysis for each question (1-14) was conducted to test for measures of association (receptiveness to selected aspects of COP) between officers (divided by rank: CEO, staff officer, middle manager, first line supervisor, and line officer) in accredited and non-accredited agencies (the control variables). Second, a Pearson correlation matrix revealed significant relationships

between the 14 survey items; consequently a "receptiveness index" was constructed. Third, an ANOVE analysis of variance was conducted using the "receptiveness index." Both of these statistical procedures are discussed in greater detail in the following section.

Construction of Receptiveness Index and ANOVA Analysis

During analysis we noticed strong correlations between all 14 survey items. Consequently, various measures of association were employed. A Pearson correlation matrix revealed significant relationships between the 14 survey items. Because they appeared to be theoretically related (i.e., were measures of the same phenomenon on different dimensions), we collapsed them into a single index, which we labeled RECEPCOP (receptiveness to COP). A Cronbach's Alpha test revealed a strong coefficient of reliability (or consistency) indicating strong inter-correlation; subsequently the RECEPCOP index was retained.

A reliability analysis (Alpha) of the 521 responses within the RECEPCOP index produced a .8705 reliable measure. It is generally accepted that an Alpha measure exceeding .750 is a strong indication of reliability. We should also note that indices employing more than 6 component items can be problematic during analysis. However, when the RECEPCOP index was broken into smaller question-sets analysis still demonstrated no significant differences. Hence, the original formulation was retained.

Because we wished to make comparisons between rank groups for both accredited and non-accredited agencies using the RECEPCOP Index, we conducted an analysis of variance using a one-way ANOVA. This allowed us to measure mean dispersion

between and within each of our five rank groups (CEOs, staff officers, middle managers, line supervisors, and line officers).

Findings

Our analysis revealed several noteworthy relationships. First, we found no significant correlations between demographic variables like age, ethnicity, years of service, education, or veteran status and receptiveness to community policing in our study populations. Second, reviewing the results of the ANOVA test, we found no significant differences regarding receptiveness to the philosophies and strategies of community policing among CEOs, staff officers, middle managers, and line supervisors in our study populations. In general, these groups are equally receptive to community policing. For example, the mean scores (on an ascending Range of 1-6, 6 being most receptive) for CEO's, staff officers, middle managers, and line supervisors in accredited and nonaccredited agencies are very similar (See Table 5). However, we found a significant difference regarding the degree of receptiveness to community policing among line officers. Line officers in accredited agencies are significantly more receptive (.012*) to the philosophies and strategies of community policing when compared to line officers in nonaccredited agencies (See Table 5).

A discussion of our findings and their applicability to public policy is presented following a brief discussion of the limitations of this research.

Table 5 Descriptives and ANOVA Analysis of the RECEPCOP Index (Receptiveness to COP)

Rank Group	Accredited		Non-Accredited		ANOVA	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	*F-ratio*	Sig.
Chief Executive officers	40	4.0	87	3.9	.303	.583
Staff Officers	24	3.8	38	3.9	.249	.620
Middle managers	18	3.6	31	3.9	2.706	.107
First Line Supervisors	50	3.6	70	3.6	.183	.670
Line officers	49	3.6	114	3.3	6.328	.012*

Means are based on an acceding Range of 1-6, 6 being most receptive
One-way ANOVA was used to compute the ratio. *$p < .05$

Limitations

As we explained previously, the CEO at each of the 202 agencies included in this survey were asked to "select" three officers[4] divided by rank (i.e., middle manager, first line supervisor, and line officer) who were "characteristic" of his or her department. This could be taken as a judgment sample wherein there is an obvious bias that favored those officers who were trusted; we might say the "average" officer, in both accredited and non-accredited agencies. Consequently, the findings should be viewed with some caution in that we see them as tentative and exploratory, yet offering a starting point for further research.

Discussion

A review of our findings lead us to several conclusions: First, line officers in accredited agencies are significantly more receptive to the strategies and philosophies underlying COP when compared to line officers in non-accredited agencies. Consequently, we are confident in rejecting the null hypothesis for H5.

A possible explanation for this finding might be found in an observation we made early in our research. When we began our research in 2000, we visited several police departments in Washington State that were in the self-evaluation phase of the accreditation process. We noticed how this labor intensive process seemed to involve almost everyone in the department to a greater or lesser extent. Moreover, at each department, there seemed to be an enthusiasm and unity of purpose that transcended ranks. Almost every officer we spoke with (regardless of rank) conveyed a similar message –the self-evaluation phase of the accreditation process is both time consuming and labor intensive, but, "it has made us more of a team."

Based on the above observations, we began to suspect that accreditation might produce an organizational climate where reform becomes a department-wide and ongoing team effort; a phenomenon where pride and ownership of policies and procedures are accepted as a creation of the team effort. An analysis of our findings now convinces us that our first impressions were correct. We can offer no other reason to explain why line officers in accredited agencies are significantly more receptive to their department's community policy strategies, when compared to line officers in non-accredited agencies. We are drawn to the hypothesis that line officers in accredited agencies see themselves as an important part of the policy development process and therefore are more invested in the success of innovations and programs. We are also drawn to the idea that accreditation positively influences (motivates) every officer in an organization. This, we believe, helps to explains why there were significant differences in survey response rates between officers in accredited agencies (81.1% response rate) vises non-accredited agencies (59.4% response rate), a phenomenon apparent at every rank level (See Table 4).

Second, CEOs, staff officers, middle managers, and first line supervisors in accredited and non-accredited agencies held generally similar opinions of COP. Again, we base this conclusion on a review of mean "receptiveness" scores presented in Table 5. Consequently, we are confident in accepting the null hypotheses of H1 through H4, which collectively assert that there is no significant difference in levels of receptiveness to COP in these rank groups.

Our third finding is a confirmation of Reuss-Ianni's (1984) observation that there are two cultures in policing, a management culture and a line culture. Based on an analysis of mean "receptiveness" scores presented in Table 5, we are confident in rejecting the null hypothesis of H6. In fact, as we predicted, the level of receptiveness to COP is correlated with rank, in the sense that –higher rank = greater receptiveness, regardless of accreditation status. Not surprisingly, we found that management (first line supervisors up to CEOs) in both accredited and non-accredited agencies hold generally similar opinions of COP. We suspect this is true for two reasons. First, officers at the management level see themselves as part of the policy development process (in both accredited and non-accredited agencies). Second, as "part of the management team" they are more invested in the success of each policy. Consequently, they hold similar opinions of the value of department policies.

This brings us to our fourth finding. We undertook this study to answer a simple question: Are the reforms of accreditation (standardized policies and procedures) in conflict with the reforms (philosophies and strategies) of community policing? The simple answer to this question is no. The policy and procedural standards associated with accreditation do not conflict with the underlying philosophies of community policing. In

fact, we found empirical support for Gerald Williams' (1988) anecdotal assertion that accreditation creates organizational conditions that foster greater employee participation in the development of departmental policies and procedures; in our case the innovations of community policing. From a policy perspective, accreditation seems to create an organizational climate of team work and group participation that leads to what Chris Argyris (1955, p.1) called an "overall organizational point of view."

References

American Bar Association (1974). Urban *Police Function*, American Bar Association, Chicago, Illinois

Angell, J. (1971). "Toward an alternative to the classic police organizational arrangement: a democratic model," *Criminology*, Vol. 9, pp. 185-206.

Argyris, C. (1955). "Organizational leadership and participative management," *The Journal of Business*, Vol. 28, No 1, pp. 1-7.

Carter, D. L. and A. D. Sapp (1994). "Issues and perspectives of law enforcement accreditation: a national study of police chiefs." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 195-204.

Cordner, G.W. (1997). "Community policing elements and effects," in R.G. Dunham and G.P. Alpert (eds.) *Critical issues in policing: contemporary readings*, pp. 451-468, Waveland Press, Prospect Heights, IL

Cordner, G.W. and R.C. Trojanowicz (1992). "Patrol," in: Cordner, G.W. and Hale, D.C. (eds.), *What works in policing? Operations and administrations examined.* Anderson Publishing, Cincinnati, Ohio

Cordner, G.W. and G.L. Williams (1997). Community policing and police agency accreditation, *Executive Summary*, National Institute of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Cordner, G.W. and G.L. Williams (1995). The CALEA standards: what is the fit with community policing, *Research in Action,* National Institute of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Crank, J.P. (1998). *Understanding Police Culture,* Anderson Publishing, Cincinnati, Ohio

Crowder, W.S. (1998). *Law enforcement accreditation: Has it professionalized American law enforcement?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, UMI Dissertation Services, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Earl, H.H. (1972). *Police-community relations: crisis in our time*. Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas, Publisher.

Joseph, K.E. (1980). Law enforcement accreditation: Meeting tomorrow's challenges today, *F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin*, vol. 49, No. 10, pp. 6-9, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

McCabe, K.A. and R.G. Fajardo (2001). "Law enforcement accreditation: a national comparison of accredited vs. nonaccredited agencies," *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 29 pp. 127-131.

Maguire, E.R. and S.D. Mastrofski (2000). Patterns of community policing in the United States, *Police Quarterly*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 4-45.

Nachmias, C. and D. Nachmias (1992). *Research methods in the social sciences*, St. Martin's Press, New York

National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (1968). *The Kerner commission report*, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

Ortmeier, T.N. (1996). Can accreditation survive the 90s?, in: Bizzack, J. (ed), *Issues in policing new perspectives*, Autumn House Publishing, Lexington, Kentucky, pp. 96-112

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967). *The challenge of crime in a free society*, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

President's National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973). *Report on police*, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

Reuss-Ianni, E. (1984). *Two cultures of policing: Street cops and management cops*, Transaction Books, New Brunswick, Connecticut

Salant, P. and D.A. Dillman (1994). *How to conduct your own survey*, John Wiley and Sons, New York

Sofie, R. (1995). *Accreditation program evaluation.* A report presented to the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Leadership Institute. (Report provided by Chief Rob Sofie, Snohomish Police Department, Snohomish, WA).

Sykes, G.W. (1994). Accreditation and community policing: Passing fads or basic reforms? *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp.1-16.

Trojanowicz, R. and B. Bucqueroux (1990). *Community policing: A contemporary perspective*, Anderson Publishing, Cincinnati, Ohio

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (2001, updated monthly). "Accreditation Program," Available: http://www.waspc.org/

Williams, G.L. (1988). *Law enforcement accreditation: An effort to professionalize American law* enforcement, unpublished dissertation, UMI Dissertation Services, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Notes

[1] For an excellent discussion of how difficult it is to determine the true extent of COPs contributions see Cordner (1997).

[2] The Bureau of Justice Statistics' *Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics, 1999* (LEMAS Survey), reported that, a majority of the Nation's sheriff's departments (62%) and almost all the Nation's municipal police departments (90 %) engaged in some form of community policing activity that centered around problem-solving partnerships.

[3]A modified version of the snowball-selection-technique was adopted for this research. This method was selected based on critiques of the pretest and the recommendations of executive officers that were contacted by the researchers during the design of the survey instrument. The original plan was to have the executive officer of each agency complete a survey and in-turn select a middle manager to complete a survey. The middle manager would, in-turn, complete a survey, and then select a first line supervisor, who would complete a survey and in-turn, select a line officer. However, this strategy was discouraged by several police executives who stated they believed the plan was "too involved" and would "likely be subverted" (by well meaning subordinate personnel) in the process.

[4] We should again note that during coding we refined the "middle manager" category by dividing it into two categories –staff officers (personnel between the rank of assistant-CEO to captain) and middle managers (lieutenants). This allowed for a more defined (five-rank) analysis.