

142125

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

142125

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIJ

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

The Production and Consumption of Research in Police Agencies in the United States

NCJRS

MAY 11 1993

ACQUISITIONS

A Report to the National Institute of Justice

Grant # 90 - IJ - CX- 0031

Carl B. Klockars
William E. Harver

March 1993

The opinions and assertions contained herein are the views of the authors and should not be considered as official or as views of the U.S. Department of Justice or of the National Institute of Justice.

ABSTRACT

Based on a national survey of 491 U.S. police agencies it was found that about one third of those agencies had formal planning and research units; that the national research agenda of police agencies was large and remarkably diverse; that about one-third of the sampled agencies believed that they had conducted a research project of potential national interest; that four months prior to the Rodney King incident 65% of U.S. police agencies were involved in revising their use of force policies; that, within the past year, more than two thirds of the agencies had conducted a library or literature search, more than half conducted a study that employed a survey or questionnaire, and about a quarter did research that employed an experimental design.

The survey also found that few police agencies subscribe to journals that report academic research on police; that the single most frequently used research method of police is consultation with other police agencies; that a quarter of the agencies in the sample reported making use of college or university resources at least "often" and 63.3 percent of agencies report using them at least "sometime." This reported frequency exceeds that at which police agencies report making use of the FBI National Academy, the Southern Police Institute, the Police Executive Research Forum, the Police Foundation, or any other national police organization except the IACP.

In addition, seventy percent of agencies in the survey reported that research in their agency usually consisted of introducing new ideas which have proven to be successful elsewhere; eighty-four percent of the respondents agreed that additional research training would substantially improve their ability to produce research helpful to their agencies.

Analysis of the survey and site visits to twelve police agencies suggested a theoretical, organizational typology of the police research function that divides police researchers into four polar types: proactive producers; proactive consumers; reactive producers; and reactive consumers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Executive Summary	
Part I : Police and Research	1
Research "on," "with," and "by" Police	3
Defining "Research"	7
What Research is versus What Research ought to be	7
Defining Research in Terms of Ends	8
Defining Research in Terms of Means	8
Part II: The National Survey	12
Sample Selection	12
What is Police Research?	13
The Research Agenda of U.S. Police Agencies	13
Top Five Research Topics	16
Projects of National Interest	17
Research Methods and Resources	18
Professional Publications	19
The Nature of Police Research	22
What is Police Research? - A Summary	24
Who Does Police Research?	25
What Initiates Police Research?	27
Who Initiates Police Research	28
What Impact does Police Research Have?	30
Part III: The Dynamics of Police Research	33
Proactive and Reactive Research and Planning	33
The Research Agendas of Police Agencies with Proactive and Reactive Research	35
Functions	35
Research Producers and Consumers	39
A Typology of the Police Research Function	43
Agencies Selected for Site Visits	44
Typology Agencies, Structural Characteristics	45
Proactive Producers	47
Eugene, Oregon	53
Wilmington, Delaware	55
Multnomah County Sheriff's Office, Oregon	56

	iv
Proactive Consumers	58
Providence, Rhode Island	58
Maryland State Police	59
Key West, Florida	60
Reactive Producers	62
High Point, North Carolina	63
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office, California	66
Kansas City, Missouri	68
Reactive Consumers	70
Apopka, Florida	70
Newport Beach, California	72
Milwaukee County Sheriff's Department	73
Part IV: Police Research and Public Policy	76
Policy Recommendations for Police Agencies	77
Appendices	
I. Survey Questionnaires and Supporting Documents	
II. Agencies Surveyed	
III. Top Five Research Topics	

**THE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF RESEARCH IN
POLICE AGENCIES IN THE UNITED STATES**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Carl B. Klockars
William E. Harver**

April 1993

The opinions and assertions contained herein are the views of the authors and should not be considered as official or as views of the U.S. Department of Justice or of the National Institute of Justice.

There is a large and ever expanding research literature "on" police. It is primarily the work of academics. Within the past decade, the character of that research has evolved to reflect joint efforts by police and academic researchers. To a considerable degree contemporary research "on" police is research "with" police. This change in the character of police research has been stimulated by organizations such as the Police Executive Research Forum and the Police Foundation, and particularly by National Institute of Justice efforts to involve police leaders and police practitioners in the review and evaluation of all of the police research it supports.

The extent to which police are aware of this research, the extent to which this research is consumed by police, the extent to which they are capable of evaluating what they read of it, and the extent to which they are guided or willing to be guided in policy or practice by this research is presently unknown. Moreover, not only is there little known about the research consumption habits and capacities of police, even less is known about the production of research by police. This is so despite the fact that a research capacity is integral to development of both community-oriented and problem-oriented policing and formal "planning and research" units are common in police agencies. Indeed, to become accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies all police agencies that employ 200 or more persons must have a planning and research capacity and at least one full-time employee assigned to planning and research. Although there are national organizations of persons engaged in police planning and research, we are unaware of any previous attempt to describe, on a national scale, the research police do or the role research plays in contemporary police agencies.

The Fundamental Questions

To fill that gap in our knowledge, this study attempts to answer, on a national scale, four fundamental questions:

- *What is police research?**
- *Who does it?**
- *Why is it done?**
- *What impact does it have?**

In order to answer these fundamental questions, two general strategies were employed. The first was a mail survey of a large, representative sample of police agencies in the United States. The second was a series of site visits to twelve police agencies, each of which exemplified a pattern in the conduct of research and planning that was identified in the national survey.

THE NATIONAL SURVEY

The national survey was based on a 50% sample of all U.S. police agencies employing more than 50 sworn officers, as well as a selected sample of 91 small municipal police agencies, each of which employed between 35 and 49 sworn officers. This produced a total initial sample of 777 police agencies of which 491 (64%) returned survey questionnaires.

WHAT IS POLICE RESEARCH?

The survey attempted to answer the question "what is police research?" by describing police research agendas, by identifying the methods and resources police employed in doing research, and by polling respondents agreement or disagreement with a series of statements that characterized the nature of research as it was practiced in their agencies.

The Research Agendas of U.S. Police Agencies

Three questions in the survey sought to describe the research agenda of U.S. police agencies. The first, the responses to which are displayed in Table I, asked respondents to identify the extent to which they were involved in each of twenty-six distinct topic areas within the past year.

Two of the topic areas stand out from all others in the proportion of agencies reporting that their research and planning employees were "very involved" in them: policy manual revisions (63.5%) and agency budget compilations (59.7%). Each of these topic areas is critical to the administration of police agencies: budget, for reasons that are obvious, and policy manual revisions because the vast majority of U. S. police agencies are managed by a quasi-military system of general orders.

Use of Force Policy - The high proportion of agencies attending to one other topic bears comment. Just over thirty-five percent (35.6%) of the agencies surveyed reported being "very involved" with revising the agency's use of force policy and another twenty-nine percent (29.3%) of agencies reported being "moderately involved" in force policy changes. While finding that more than 65% of police agencies in the United States were involved in revising their force policies might have been expected in the wake of the Rodney King incident in March of 1991, this survey was completed at least four months prior to that incident.

Two additional, open-ended questions in the national survey also attempted to get agencies to describe their research agendas. One asked agencies to list the five activities that consumed most of their time during the previous year, while the other invited respondents to identify projects currently underway that they felt might be of interest to other police agencies. Both of these questions produced answers that were staggering in their diversity. The two-hundred and thirty eight agencies that responded to the first question reported research activities in ninety-seven separate categories. In response to the question about projects of national interest, one hundred and sixty four respondents, about a third of our sample, provided brief sketches of 286 different projects.

TABLE I: Involvement in Selected Research Topics by Number and Percent

Question: Please indicate the degree to which the research and planning unit¹ has been involved in the following issues WITHIN THE PAST YEAR.

	Not Involved	Slightly Involved	Moderately Involved	Very Involved	No Ans
(a) Accreditation/ Re-accreditation	230 46.8	89 18.1	55 11.2	106 21.6	11 2.2
(b) Agency Budget Compilation(s)	30 6.1	84 17.1	84 17.1	293 59.7	0
(c) Call Prioritization	180 36.7	123 25.1	105 21.4	77 15.7	6 1.2
(d) Community- Oriented Policing	151 30.8	148 30.1	105 21.4	84 17.1	3 .6
(e) Computerization	35 7.1	103 21.0	126 25.7	226 46.0	1 .2
(f) Capital Improvement	72 14.7	94 19.1	124 25.3	199 40.5	2 .4
(g) Career Criminal/ Target Offender Program(s)	320 9.6	96 7.3	36 7.3	36 0.0	0
(h) Carrying Weapons Off-Duty	214 43.6	117 23.8	75 15.3	82 16.7	3 .6
(i) Case Screening	299 60.9	91 18.5	60 12.2	39 7.9	2 .4
(j) Crime Analysis	130 26.5	146 29.7	111 22.6	104 21	0 .2
(k) Directed Patrol	168 34.4	143 29.1	114 23.2	62 12.6	4 .8
(l) Domestic Violence Reduction	226 46.0	119 24.2	86 17.5	58 11.8	2 .4
(m) Drug Education	139 28.3	105 21.4	131 26.7	114 23.2	2 .4
(n) Employee Drug Testing	228 46.4	115 23.4	76 15.5	69 14.4	3 .6
(o) Grants Administration	99 20.2	101 20.6	108 22.0	182 37.1	1 .2
(p) Health/Wellness Training	208 42.4	125 25.5	105 21.4	50 10.2	3 .6

¹In agencies with no formal planning and research unit this question read "Please indicate the degree to which to which those persons most responsible for planning and research in your agency have been involved in the following issues WITHIN THE PAST YEAR."

Table II (continued)

		Not Involved	Slightly Involved	Moderately Involved	Very Involved	No Ans
(q)	In-house program evaluation(s)	83 16.9	136 27.7	140 28.5	128 26.1	4 .8
(r)	Neighborhood Watch	219 44.6	133 27.1	77 15.7	59 12.0	3 .6
(s)	Off-Duty Employment	221 45	142 28.9	76 15.5	50 10.2	2 .4
(t)	Personnel Deployment (Agency-wide)	100 20.4	113 23.0	137 27.9	138 28.1	3 .6
(u)	Police Equipment (testing and evaluation)	111 22.6	134 27.3	135 27.5	110 22.4	1 .2
(v)	Policy Manual Revisions	30 6.1	53 10.8	95 19.3	312 63.5	1 .2
(w)	Problem-Oriented Policing	150 30.5	144 29.3	116 23.6	79 16.1	2 .4
(x)	Uniform Crime Reports	138 28.1	121 24.6	107 21.8	123 25.1	2 .4
(y)	Use of Force Policy	83 16.9	87 17.7	144 29.3	175 35.6	2 .4
(z)	Vehicle Pursuit Policy	98 20.0	82 16.7	127 25.9	183 37.3	1 .2

Research Methods and Resources

The second approach taken in our survey to answer the question, "What is police research?" sought to describe police research not in terms of the agenda of topics studied but in terms of the methods police use to study those topics. More than two thirds (68.8%) of the respondents reported conducting literature/library searches, more than half (58.7%) reported conducting a survey, and nearly a quarter (23.6%) reported conducting a study that employed an experimental design. More than a third (34.8) of the agencies had presented a paper on their research at a professional meeting, though only 7.7% had published their results.

While we made no attempt to evaluate the quality of the research efforts of our respondents, we did probe further into some of the areas raised about methods of research. On the matter of library and literature searches we asked our respondents to identify professional publications that their agency received. Those results are reported in Table III above. Of the eighteen publications on the list we presented to respondents, five publications were reported to be received by fifty percent or more of the responding agencies: The Police Chief (82%); Law and Order (79.6%); NIJ Reports (77.6%); Law Enforcement Technology (62.7); and the agency's state law enforcement journal (50.3%). While NIJ Reports may be classified as a research reporting publication, journals reporting largely academic research on police, (eg. The

American Journal of Police, Journal of Police Science and Administration, Criminology, Justice Quarterly) were received by only a small proportion of police agencies².

TABLE II - Professional Publications Received

Number and percent of respondents reporting receiving selected publications

	Number	Percent
(a) AELE Bulletin	120	24.4
(b) American Journal of Police	56	11.4
(c) Contemporary Policing	12	2.4
(d) Crime Control Digest	97	19.8
(e) Crime and Delinquency	45	9.2
(f) Criminal Law Reporter	150	30.5
(g) Criminology	8	1.6
(h) Journal of Crime and Justice	32	6.5
(i) Journal of Pol. Sci. & Admin.	65	13.2
(j) Justice Quarterly	39	7.9
(k) Law Enforcement News	234	47.7
(l) Law Enforcement Technology	308	62.7
(m) Law and Order	391	79.6
(n) NIJ Reports	381	77.6
(o) National Sheriff's Association Magazine	119	24.2
(p) Police Chief Magazine	403	82.1
(q) Your state law enforcement journal	247	50.3
(r) FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin	61	8.0

Research Resources - The list of publications received by police agencies provides only a modest indicator of one of the types of research resources they tend to have on hand. A more important finding concerning police use of research resources is the discovery that *the single most common method of research by U.S. police agencies is consultation with other police agencies*. More than three quarters of responding agencies reported that they either used the resource of other agencies either "always" (13.8%) or "often" (62.9%)."

Two national organizations also appear to play a major role in the research and planning activities of the U.S. police agencies. They are the National Institute of Justice and International Association of Chiefs of Police. Given that more than three quarters of the respondent agencies reported receiving publications from these organizations, the finding that about 40% of the respondents use their services always or often in research and planning is not surprising.

Local Colleges and Universities as a Police Research Resource - What was unanticipated in these results is the proportion of agencies which reported making use of the

² A source of distortion in the reporting of publications may come from the desire on the part of respondents to report more familiarity with the professional police literature than they actually have. Wanting to "look good" in a national survey might stimulate some overreporting. To test this we included a fictitious journal in our list, one we entitled Contemporary Policing. Twelve agencies, 2.4% of our respondents, reported receiving it. All things considered we find this to be a very low rate of exaggeration, one which gives us some confidence in the accuracy of responses not only to this question but to others in our survey.

services of local colleges and universities in planning and research. A quarter of the agencies in our sample report making use of college or university resources at least "often" and 63.3 percent of agencies report using them at least "sometime." By comparison, this reported frequency exceeds that at which police agencies report making use of the FBI National Academy, the Southern Police Institute, the Police Executive Research Forum, the Police Foundation, or any other national police organization except the IACP.

The Nature of Police Research

A third approach to answering the question, "What is police research?" asked respondents to react to ten statements characterizing the "nature" of research as it was practiced in their agencies. The questions and the answers to them are reported in Table III.

More than 70% of the agencies responding to our survey describe the majority of their work as introducing new ideas which have been proven to be successful elsewhere. However, responding agencies are almost equally divided on the question of whether or not it is more important to make good use of the research of others than to generate their own. Also supporting the importance of importing research, programs, and policies from other agencies is the finding that nearly 80% of responding agencies reported that day-to-day demands on them prevented them from engaging in long-range research and planning. This was the case despite the fact that nearly half of the responding agencies (46.6%) reported that they were provided with adequate resources to conduct their planning and research activities. Under such conditions, importing and, as necessary, modifying the work of others may simply be the most practical and efficient use of a police researcher's time.

In describing the nature and character of police research we may also emphasize that over 80% of the respondents agreed that additional training in research methods would substantially improve their capacity to produce research that would be helpful to their agency. We do not regard this response as an indicator that research produced within police agencies is of poor quality. Rather we regard it not only as an acknowledgement on the part of police researchers that their research training needs improvement but also of their belief that improving their research training would of help to the agency that employs them.

WHO DOES POLICE RESEARCH?

In just over one-third (36.3%) of the 491 agencies in the national survey sample research was done by persons employed in formal research and planning units. Moreover, the proportion of agencies with such units rises steadily in an almost perfect correlation with size from only 7% of agencies with 49 or fewer officers with research and planning units to a high of 91% among agencies with 1000 or more sworn employees. Also, as agency size increases the number of persons employed in formal units increases as well.

Due to limitations on the length of the questionnaire, it was not possible to explore the training, education, background, or qualifications of persons employed at police research. However, we did find that civilian employees were well represented among research units in agencies of virtually every size and outnumbered sworn research employees in many agencies.

TABLE III - On the Nature of Police Research

	Strongly Agree		Disagree	Strongly Disagree		No Answer				
	#	%		#	%					
1) In the research unit ³ in this agency, "research" usually consists of introducing new ideas which have proven to be successful elsewhere.	47	9.6	298	60.7	138	28.1	7	1.4	1	.2
2) In the research unit in this agency, "research" usually consists of producing written reports and studies in response to requests from management.	123	25.1	262	53.4	96	19.6	9	1.8	1	.2
3) In the research unit in this agency, "research" usually consists of identifying problems, proposing solutions, and evaluating outcomes.	162	33.0	262	53.4	60	12.2	6	1.2	1	.2
4) In the research unit in this agency "research" usually consists of responding to requests for information from other units within the agency.	65	13.2	250	50.9	160	32.6	15	3.1	1	.2
5) Most of the work done by the research and planning unit is designed to improve the quality of administration in this agency.	101	20.6	238	48.5	136	27.7	11	2.2	5	1.0
6) Most of the work done by the research and planning unit is designed to evaluate the effectiveness of "street level" operations.	53	10.8	224	45.6	196	39.9	14	2.9	4	.8
7) It is usually more important for the research and planning unit to make good use of research from other sources than to generate its own.	34	6.9	219	44.6	216	44.0	9	1.8	13	2.6
8) Additional training in research methods research methods would substantially improve the capacity of members of this unit to produce research that would be helpful to the agency.	158	32.2	255	51.9	74	15.1	2	.4	2	.4
9) The demands on this unit to respond to to respond to immediate concerns allow little time for long-term research and planning.	172	35.0	217	44.2	88	17.9	10	2.0	4	.8
10. This unit is provided sufficient resources to adequately conduct its research and planning activities	22	4.5	208	42.4	208	42.4	48	9.8	5	1.0

³In agencies without formal planning and research units, questions of this type read "those responsible for research and planning" rather than "the planning and research unit."

WHAT INITIATES POLICE RESEARCH?

Organizations do not engage in research without a reason. In order to describe what initiated research in the police agencies surveyed, respondent agencies were asked to evaluate fifteen factors played a role in initiating research in their agencies. Responses to this question are displayed in Table IV.

Law and Civil Liability - The dominant position of changes in the law and concern for civil liabilities deserves emphasis. At least according to our respondents, there is no more important motive force for change in American than fear of civil liability. (We interpret the general "changes in the law" category to include changes civil liability exposure.) This conclusion was supported in interviews at our site visits. In fact, one police researcher reported that one way to get the attention and the support from police administrators for change was to suggest, even when the truth of such a suggestion was questionable, that unless the change were made the agency might suffer a civil action were the change not made.

Responses to this question about factors initiating police research confirm again the importance of the experience of other police agencies as a driving force for change. More than seventy percent of our respondents indicate that successful programs in other departments are at least somewhat responsible for initiating research in their agencies. One of most persuasive arguments that can be made to encourage the introduction of a new program is that some other police agency is already doing it successfully.

Finally, although on-going needs assessment and the introduction of successful programs from other agencies are high on the list of factors initiating research, much of the list and four out of six of the most frequently mentioned motives for police research are categories of "problems." This suggests that the majority of police research is done in response to the identification of some practical problem and constitutes (and this may be so even when it is innovative or imitative of a successful program in some other agency) an attempt to correct, avoid, or minimize some problem. In short, police research, as it is practiced in U.S. police agencies, is applied research.

Who Initiates Police Research?

The question of what initiates police research is, in a sense, inseparable from the question of who initiates it. Problems do not define themselves. If the vast majority of police research is done in response to perceived problems, how those problems becomes identified, raised, recognized, and placed on the research agenda of police agencies is crucial to understanding the motivations for police research.

According to our respondents, by a considerable margin, the agency persons most responsible for dictating the agendas of police researchers are agency heads. Initiatives from the agency head also exceed all other factors by a considerable margin as well. We reported above that changes in law and civil liabilities led all external factors influencing research with 33% and 35% of respondents reporting that the influenced research "a great deal". By contrast the influence of the agency head was reported to be "a great deal" by nearly sixty percent (59.1%) of our respondents.

Table IV: External Factors Initiating Research by Number and Percent of Agencies

Category	A Great Deal		Somewhat		Not Very Much		None	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(p) Law Changes	176	35.8	234	47.4	56	11.4	23	4.7
(p) Civil Liabilities	166	33.8	220	44.8	67	13.6	35	7.1
(r) On-Going Needs Assessment	140	28.5	235	47.9	85	17.3	31	6.3
(i) Successful Programs in Other Agencies	62	12.6	296	60.3	98	20.0	33	6.7
(p) Changes in Local Government	113	23.0	194	39.5	62	12.6	112	22.8
(p) Community Pressure	64	13.0	221	45.0	151	30.8	52	10.6
(i) Articles in Police Journals	28	5.7	244	49.7	156	31.8	62	12.6
(i) Professional Organizations	30	6.1	167	34.0	203	41.3	89	18.1
(p) Changes in Federal Government	40	8.1	136	27.7	132	26.9	163	33.2
(p) Changes in State Government	84	17.1	64	13.0	104	21.2	125	25.5
(i/r) Vendors of Police Equipment	14	2.9	108	22.0	196	39.9	170	34.6
(i) Articles in Popular Magazines	8	1.6	109	22.2	218	44.4	149	30.3
(p) Police Shootings	28	5.7	74	15.1	130	26.5	256	52.1
(p) Police Vehicle Fatalities	18	3.7	51	10.4	94	19.1	325	66.2

WHAT IMPACT DOES POLICE RESEARCH HAVE?

In assessing the impact of research on police agencies we relied on six questions, each of which appears in Table V. Responses are tabulated for agencies with and without research and planning units and by all responding agencies.

Overall, our interpretation of these findings is that:

- ◆ There is little resistance to research in police agencies;
- ◆ the vast majority of top police administrators, including agency heads are generally supportive of it;
- ◆ research and planning units play a major role in agency change, probably second in importance only to that of the chief.
- ◆ most researchers believe they play a significant role in most administrative decisions.

Table V: The Impact of Research, by Presence of a Formal Planning Unit and by Number and Percent of Respondents

1) The research and planning unit/those responsible for research and planning is/are more important in generating change than any other unit in this organization.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Ans		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
R&P Unit	24	13.5	62	34.8	88	49.4	3	1.7	1	.6	178	36.3
No Unit	22	7.0	117	37.4	154	49.2	19	6.1	1	.3	313	63.7
Total	46	9.4	179	36.5	242	49.3	22	4.5	2	.4	491	100.0

2) The research and planning unit/those responsible for research play(s) a substantial role in most administrative decisions.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Ans		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
R&P Unit	22	12.4	93	52.2	54	30.3	5	2.8	4	2.2	178	36.3
No Unit	68	21.7	179	57.2	55	17.6	11	3.5	0	0.0	313	63.7
Total	90	18.3	272	55.4	109	22.2	16	3.3	4	0.8	491	100.0

3) In the research unit in this agency, 'research' usually consists of producing written reports and studies in response to requests from management.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Ans	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
R&P Unit	77	43.3	87	48.9	12	6.7	1	.6	1	.6
No Unit	46	14.7	175	55.9	84	26.8	8	2.6	0	0
Total	123	25.1	262	53.4	96	19.6	9	1.8	1	.2

4) In this agency, the research and planning unit/those responsible for research and planning, regularly share(s) information with other police organizations.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Ans	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
R&P Unit	91	51.1	73	41.0	13	7.3	0	0	1	.6
No Unit	66	21.1	194	62.0	52	16.6	1	.3	0	0
Total	157	32.0	267	54.4	65	13.2	1	.2	1	.2

5) Generally speaking, it is not practical for a police agency to put research results into everyday practice.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Ans	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
R&P Unit	0	0	16	9.0	112	62.9	49	27.5	1	.6
No Unit	2	.6	44	14.1	213	68.1	50	16.0	4	1.3
Total	2	.4	60	12.2	325	66.2	99	20.2	5	1.0

6) Research efforts in this agency are hindered by a lack of interest at the command level.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Ans	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
R&P Unit	3	1.7	23	12.9	94	52.8	57	32.0	1	.6
No Unit	10	3.2	46	14.7	173	55.3	81	25.9	3	1.0
Total	13	2.6	69	14.1	267	54.4	138	28.1	4	.8

PART II
THE DYNAMICS OF POLICE RESEARCH

In addition to describing the overall contours of the of the conduct of research in U.S. police agencies, we also sought to explore some of the organizational dynamics that might contribute to understanding some of the different roles research plays in different organizations.

Proactive and Reactive Researchers

The first conceptual tool with which we sought to tease apart the dynamics of the police research function divides agencies into those whose research function is "proactive" and those in which it is "reactive." Agencies which reported that their research and planning units (or those responsible for planning and research) were largely responsible for dictating their own research agendas were identified as "proactive"; those whose research agenda's largely dictated by others were identified as "reactive." It is important to emphasize that these concepts refer **only** to whether research is typically initiated by those employed in research and planning or by others within the organization. Although "proactive" is a term commonly employed to mean "dynamic," "energetic," "vigorous," and a host of other laudatory adjectives, and "reactive" is often associated with passivity, we do not intend to signal with our choice of terms any of these common connotations. We mean simply whether those who do planning and research get to set their own research agenda or have it set for them by someone else, and nothing more.

If respondents indicated that they exercised considerable autonomy in choosing research topics and research projects were usually initiated by researchers they were classified as "proactive." If respondents reported that they did not exercise considerable autonomy in setting their research agenda and that research initiatives came from persons other than researchers, they were classified as "reactive." Of the 491 responding police agencies 159 (35%) had a "reactive" research orientation and 127 (28%) had "proactive" research orientation.

Analyses demonstrated significant differences in the research agendas, factors initiating research, research resources, and research impact between proactive and reactive researchers. Those differences may be summarized as follows:

Differences in Research Agendas - The ability to dictate one's own research agenda appears to make a consistent difference in the degree of involvement in many different types of projects. Of the twenty-six topic areas we specifically inquired about in our survey, *agencies with a proactive research function reported a statistically significant (.05 level) higher level of involvement in twenty-two areas.* Only in accreditation, employee drug testing, health and wellness training, and vehicle pursuit policy were there no significant differences between proactive and reactive researchers.

Differences in Factors Initiating Research - While agencies with proactive research functions were more involved than researchers with reactive research functions in twenty-two out of the twenty-six research areas, they also reported a higher sensitivity to a variety of factors initiating research. They were significantly more responsive to articles in police journals and popular magazines, to professional organizations and line officer suggestions, and to civil

liabilities. And, as might be expected by definition, they were substantially more influenced by initiatives from those responsible for research and on-going needs assessments.

Differences in Impact on Agency - It was also the case that agencies with proactive researchers reported significantly greater impact of the research function on agency change and substantially greater involvement of researchers in major administrative decisions. This finding holds for all agencies, both those with formal planning and research units as well as those without formal units. However, the extent of researcher involvement in most administrative decisions may be slightly less in agencies with formal units.

Agency Correlates of Proactivity and Reactivity - Because proactive and reactive researchers appear to have such differences in their impact on their agencies, we attempted to discover in our sample structural or organizational correlates of each type of research function. We found no differences in type of agency, (sheriff, municipal, county, or state police), no difference in accreditation, and no difference in the size of the research unit. We did, however, find significant differences exceeding the .05 level in agency size and in whether the planning and research function was organized into a formal unit. Larger agencies and agencies with their research and planning function assigned to a formal unit were both slightly more likely to have a reactive research and planning function.

The only area in which we found a substantial significant difference between agencies with proactive and reactive research functions was in response to the question that asked whether or not the research unit or those responsible for research responded directly to the chief. While researchers in 57.9% of agencies with reactive research functions reported directly to the chief, researchers in 76.3% of agencies with proactive functions reported directly to the chief.

Research Producers and Consumers

A second analytic dimension we introduced to explore the impact of research on police agencies separates police researchers into "producers" and "consumers." We mean by these designations whether or not those who do research in police agencies, by and large, produce their own research or consume the research produced by others. Given that we reported earlier that the single most common method of research by U.S. police agencies is consultation with other agencies, we must quickly qualify our classification by saying that no police agency is in any strict sense exclusively a "producer." Likewise, because adaptation of the research of others virtually always requires the production of some local modifications of projects imported from elsewhere, even agencies that are predominantly consumers are in this sense producers as well.

Recognizing these qualifications on the concepts of both "consumer" and "producer," we classified respondent agencies as "consumers" if they stated that they believed that it was more important to make good use of the research of others than to generate their own and if they described their research as usually consisting of introducing new ideas which had proven successful elsewhere. If they disagreed with both of these statements they were classified as "producers" Of the 491 responding agencies, 197 (40.1%) could be identified as consumers while 86 (17.5%) could be identified as producers.

While we found a systematic and significant difference in the research agendas of proactive and reactive researchers, there was no significant difference in the research agendas of producers and consumers in any one of the twenty-six topic areas about which we asked. Research consumers do, however, report substantially stronger agreement with the statement that demands on them allow little time for long-range planning and express a substantially stronger belief than producers that additional training in research methods would substantially improve their capacity to produce research helpful to the agency. We believe that a substantial number of research consumers in U.S. police agencies would become producers if their research skills were enhanced.

Whether the persons responsible for research and planning in police agencies in the United States adopt a producer or consumer orientation is in some part a reflection of their level of research training. In some part as well it may reflect demands on those who would do research to rely on the research of others because of lack of time to produce their own. Producer researchers tend to have slightly larger numbers of persons employed at research than those that are primarily consumers, although one finds both producing and consuming research functions in agencies of every size. While both producers and consumers report support for research efforts at the command level, the interest in research is stronger in agencies that produce research than in those that are largely consumers of it. None of these differences, though, is sufficiently strong enough to determine whether police researchers become producers or consumers.

A TYPOLOGY OF THE POLICE RESEARCH FUNCTION

It is possible to combine the producer-consumer and proactive-reactive dimensions to describe further the dynamics of research in U.S. police agencies. Doing so forms a logical typology of the police research function that consists of four principal types: 1. **proactive-producers**; 2. **reactive producers**; 3. **proactive consumers**; and 4. **reactive consumers**. (See Figure 1)

	Proactive	Reactive
Producer	Proactive Producers	Reactive Producers
Consumer	Proactive Consumers	Reactive Consumers

Figure 1: A Typology of the Police Research Function

Combining these dimensions of the research function in this way permits us to identify 169 police agencies with a planning and research function that corresponds to one of the four types: 29 proactive producers, 47 proactive consumers, 24 reactive producers, and 69 reactive consumers. These 169 police agencies whose research functions could be classified into one of these four types comprise 34.4% of our respondent sample of 491 police agencies. The

remaining 322 agencies (65.5% of the sample) do not fall clearly into one of the four types. This is, of course, to be expected given that both of the defining dimensions, proactivity and reactivity, production, and consumption are continuous variables with only about 55% of our sample able to identify itself as predominantly of one type or the other.

This typology should not be understood as an empirical description of the organization of police research and planning. Describing only 34.4% of the agencies in the sample, clearly it is not. Rather it is a theoretical creation, a vehicle with which it is possible to identify and explore some of the dynamics that tend to shape the production and consumption of police research.

While discussion of the dynamics of the four types of research function depends in part on analysis of responses to the national survey, it also draws heavily upon information gathered in site visits to twelve police agencies, each of which corresponded to one of the four types. These visits were conducted in the summer of 1991 and ten of the twelve extensive open-ended interviews were recorded and transcribed. They permit identification of organizational, contextual, and historical dimensions and attitudes of both researchers and administrators that it was not possible to discover or elaborate through the national survey.

PROACTIVE PRODUCERS

Proactive producers are largely responsible for setting their own research agendas. They see themselves as major players in the administration of police agencies. They are involved to a greater degree than reactive researchers in a larger number of different topics. They make greater use of consultants than either of the reactive types, and, within the past year, are more likely to have conducted a study that employed an experimental design. Although they claim that demands on their time tend to prevent them from engaging in long term planning, they do more of it than other proactive researchers. They are more likely than reactive researchers to play a role in most administrative decisions and they see themselves more as participants in administration than as servants or a service to management.

In order to maintain their autonomy, proactive producers of research must have the capacity to produce research that is seen as valuable to the agency. The agency, in turn, must provide a structure, formal or informal, that recognizes the value of their contribution and preserves and supports them. At the same time, proactive producers must enjoy a mandate or role that gives legitimacy to research involvement in a wide range of agency business.

In any particular police agency a variety of conditions can exist to permit proactive producers of research to flourish. In the three police agencies we visited that sustained a proactive research function the following patterns emerged. In one agency the research team was composed of three civilian employees with extensive experience and expertise in municipal planning. They were brought into the agency by a chief who was dedicated to restructuring his police agency along community-policing lines and he saw in the research team he composed the skills he needed to design and manage the transition. The chief protects his team of proactive producing researchers, enjoys a collegial relationship with them, and acts, as he describes it, as their "champion."

In a second agency with proactive producing research function, the autonomy of the research function and the major producing role it maintained appeared to be the product of the personal energies and political skills of the senior officer in charge of it. Although only two sworn officers were assigned to the agency's research and planning function, the Captain in charge of that function also controlled the agency's training, budget, and accreditation efforts. Combining persons assigned to all of these functions permitted him to draw upon the skills, talents, and expertise of nearly a dozen people in team planning, research, and brainstorming efforts at the same time it provided a mandate for research into virtually every aspect of agency operations. Both proactive and producing dimensions of this agency's research effort achieved reward and recognition when the agency received substantial increases in state grant monies to pursue innovative projects.

In all of the site visits to agencies with proactive producing research functions we were struck by what might be called the organizational "fragility" of that function. To preserve it seemed to require a concerted effort by someone with sufficient organizational power to preserve its autonomy and permit it to generate new ideas. An organizational irony may be that the more successful a proactive producing research effort becomes, the more it will attract demands that its skills and services be brought to the aid of other functions in the agency. In this way, there may be a "natural" organizational demand for proactive producers to evolve into reactive producers.

REACTIVE PRODUCERS

The impact and role of reactive producers is more limited than that of the proactive types. Reactive producers have their research agendas set by others; they understand that their work to consist largely of producing research reports in response to management requests; and, although they see themselves as less involved in making management decisions, they believe they enjoy strong support from the administration. They seem to be involved in fewer research topic areas than proactive researchers of either type. They make less use of consultants and are less likely than proactive producers to see themselves as engaged identifying problems, proposing solutions, and evaluating outcomes. They also see themselves as less influenced by external factors in initiating research than proactive types.

In site visits to agencies with reactive producing research functions, what appeared to characterize such efforts was that the role and function of the researchers who occupied it was stable and explicit. Reactive producers provided a service to the agency and particularly to management and that service was well integrated into the operations of the agency. The nature of the research service that was expected could, of course, be very different in different agencies. In one extremely large police agency that did not have a formal research unit research projects and proposals from dozens of different divisions in the agency were submitted to an Executive Planning Council for review. In this structure the research function was decentralized and consisted of innovative projects and proposals from throughout the agency, but decisions on whether or not the agency would support projects was a Executive Planning Council decision. In another, much smaller agency, also without a formal research unit, the research function was divided up among a series of task forces. Each task force was given a specific agenda and the

entire effort was coordinated by a highly innovative chief who was committed to a vision of community policing,

Possibly the most interesting instance of a reactive producer research function was found in the Kansas City Police Department. In Kansas City the research function is highly centralized, the responsibility of an "Administrative Analysis Unit" composed of fourteen people, ten sworn officers and four civilians. The unit responds to requests for studies from many parts of the department. In fact, the demand for studies and analyses from other parts of the department is so heavy that the unit found that it had no time to engage in exploration or innovation on its own. In response to this problem, the unit was restructured into a "Reactive Planning Unit" that would continue to respond to demands for studies and analyses from other parts of the agency and a "Proactive Planning Unit" whose mandate was to set their own agenda of research, be innovative, and continually scan the horizon for new trends and ideas.

PROACTIVE CONSUMERS

Proactive consumers see themselves as playing a significant role in the administration of their agencies. Their work usually consists of identifying problems, proposing solutions and evaluating outcomes and they frequently see themselves as more important in generating change than other units in their agencies. They are similar in many respects to proactive producers but find themselves more involved in importing ideas that have proven successful in other agencies than in generating their own. In part, this choice to become consumers of the research of others rather than producers of their own research may be a product of demands on their time. However, it may also be a response to the nature of the problems they confront and the availability of methods or materials to deal with it.

In site visits to agencies with a proactive consuming research orientation, we encountered persons responsible for research who saw no purpose in trying to "reinvent the wheel." In one agency the director of research was convinced that whatever program, policy, or project might be necessary in his agency had already been developed elsewhere. In another agency with a proactive consuming attitude toward research those responsible for research simply regarded the problems they had to deal with as so obvious and so fundamental, (eg. corruption) that there was no need to develop new technologies to deal with them. In still another agency, proactive consumption was also a considered strategy by researchers who described their research strategy as acting as "information sponges."

REACTIVE CONSUMERS

Reactive consumers do not dictate their own research agenda, nor do they produce their own research. They tend not to be major players in their organizations. They less involved than proactive types in a range of research topics. They were less likely than agencies with a proactive research orientation to use consultants and less likely than proactive agencies to describe their function as identifying problems, proposing solutions, and evaluating outcomes.

Their research activity usually means responding to information requests from other parts of the organization. On-going needs assessments initiated less research for them than for the proactive agencies. They were less likely than proactive researchers to play a major role in most administrative decisions or to see themselves as prime movers in organizational change.

Because reactive consumers tend to be defined in the negative (ie. they do not set their own research agendas and they do not conduct their own research) site visits to police agencies with a reactive consumer research orientation produced interviews in which some respondents confessed that there was little that they did that they themselves would call "research." In one agency the person in charge of research spent his entire time developing and revising forms. In another the person charged with research served as an administrative aid to a chief who saw no value whatsoever in any kind of research and discouraged exchange of any type of management or administrative information with other police agencies. In still another agency the research functions that once had been assumed by a research and planning office had been progressively assigned to other units in the agency and the final person remaining in what was once an position of major importance in the agency was left with little to do.

Police Research and Public Policy

What "research" is in any police agency depends heavily on the skills, talents, and initiative of the individuals who assume resume responsibility for it. The consumption and production of meaningful research can take place in agencies of any size and any type under any form of organization. And, in agencies of any size, type, or form of organization, it can be trivial and meaningless.

Research of many types and kinds is already a major part of U.S. police administration. In three-quarters of the police agencies in this country, those who do it play a substantial role in most administrative decisions. In just under half of the police agencies in the United States police researchers see themselves as more important to agency change than any other unit in the agency. Its value is, in general, broadly recognized and the need to improve the skills and capacities of those who do it is acknowledged by nearly eighty-five percent of the police researchers in the United States.

It is, in our opinion, desirable to encourage such research, improve and enhance the methods used to do it, improve the skills of those who are charged with doing it, and facilitate the exchange of it. We further believe that there are efforts that could be made that would serve these ends and serve them at a very modest cost. Among the most important of these steps that might be taken at a national level are:

- ◆ To survey annually the research agenda of U.S. police agencies and establish a system of abstracting projects.
- ◆ To establish a national repository for police-generated research based on the annual survey and to publish survey results and abstracts, making them available to every police agency in the United States.

- ◆ **To encourage research training and education for persons engaged or contemplating careers in police research and planning.**

At the same time there are steps that can be taken by police agencies at very modest costs that will enhance the research function to the benefit of the agency. They are:

- ◆ **To issue an explicit policy statement on the role of research and planning in the organization.**
- ◆ **To create and support mechanisms and arrangements that will permit the active consumption of the research of others.**
- ◆ **To enhance the research and planning capacities of those persons charged with that responsibility in their agencies.**

It is not only important to police agencies that they have the capacity to access the research of others. It is necessary that they have the capacities to consume it intelligently. Our sense is that in many areas, particularly those connected with new technologies, police agencies are victims of their own inability to evaluate proposed changes effectively. A major role of research is often to caution that reliable evidence in support of certain new ideas is lacking or that similar approaches have lead to unanticipated problems.

PART I

INTRODUCTION

POLICE AND RESEARCH

The police, through their actions and pronouncements, often sound anti-intellectual and suspicious of academics. University personnel often hold the police in contempt and treat them with condescension. The two attitudes feed on each other: the intellectual snobbery of the academics provides justification for the anti-intellectual attitude of the police, and the actions and pronouncements of the police provide continued justification for the contempt in which they are held. ...

For the universities to be helpful to the police, the two interests must engage each other. They must build a relationship over a long period of time, defining problems and working jointly toward solutions. Academics must become intimately familiar with their needs. They should associate directly with a police agency and its personnel. And they must be willing to engage in applied research. The police, on the other hand, must become familiar with the tools and capacities of academics.

Herman Goldstein
Policing a Free Society (1977)

Fifteen years ago, in the quote above, Herman Goldstein not only diagnosed the tensions which prevailed between police and academics, but outlined the directions in which the relations between them would have to evolve if the situation was going to change. Since then, enormous progress has been made in precisely the directions Goldstein indicated. Over the past decade the work of individual researchers, Bayley, Brown, Cordner, Eck, Fyfe, Greenwood, Geller, Greene, Guyot, Kelling, Langworthy, Manning, Mastrofski, Muir, Reiss, Sherman, Skogan, Skolnick, Trojanowicz, Wilson, and Wycoff, to name but a few, not only reflects an intimate familiarity with police needs but is virtually inseparable from the efforts of individual police leaders, Behan, Bouza, Brzeczek, Brown, Couper, Davis, Greenberg, Hart, Joiner, Kelly, Murphy, Napper, Stephens, O'Connor, Ronstadt, Ward, and Williams, to accommodate them. At the institutional level, the Police Foundation, the Police Executive Research Forum, and the National Institute of Justice have brought researchers and police together as equal partners in pursuit of answers to commonly identified research problems.

This report seeks to examine the capacity of police agencies in the United States to evolve further in directions Goldstein and the movement he has become identified with, problem-

oriented policing, have recently suggested are necessary.⁴ Problem-oriented policing is generally understood to require a four-stage, problem-solving process: scanning, analysis, response, and assessment.⁵ In all four of these stages a research capacity is essential. Indeed, it may not stretch things too far to say that problem-oriented policing seeks, at its most fundamental, philosophical levels to model the field experiment as a way of identifying, defining, understanding, and resolving problems.

However, Goldstein suggests

On a scale of one to ten, I would estimate that we have yet to reach one in development of our thinking and, most important, in the validation of some of our assumptions. ... Research on the value of community policing is in its infancy. ... It is natural to call for more rigorous research, especially since the percentage of funds we invest in evaluating the effectiveness of what we are doing in policing is such an infinitesimal percentage of the enormous total investment we make in the financing of police services in this country. But the effect of some of the changes advocated may simply not be subject to evaluation. Too many changes are occurring at the same time. And there are enormous methodological problems - put aside cost - in conducting large-scale experiments. We may have to be satisfied with the results of less rigorous research.⁶

Critics of community policing, Greene, Manning, Mastrofski, Holdaway, Klockars, Short, and Weatheritt, to name but a few, have made much of its confessed lack of rigorous

⁴Herman Goldstein, *Problem-Oriented Policing* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990); Herman Goldstein, "Improving Policing: A Problem-oriented Approach," *Crime and Delinquency* 25 (1972):236-258; Herman Goldstein and Charles E. Susmilch, *Experimenting with the Problem-Oriented Approach to Improving Police Service: A Report and Some Reflections on Two Case Studies* (Madison, Wisconsin, Law School, University of Wisconsin, 1982); Herman Goldstein, "Toward Community-oriented Policing: Potential, Basic Requirements, and Threshold Questions," *Crime and Delinquency* 33 (1987): 6-30. See also M.A. Hoare, G. Stewart, and C.M. Purcel, *The Problem Oriented Approach: Four Pilot Studies* (London, U.K.: Metropolitan Police, Management Services Department, 1984) and John Eck and Richard Spelman, *Problem Solving: Problem-Oriented Policing in Newport News* (Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum, 1987).

⁵See Eck and Spelman, *Ibid.*, p. xx.

⁶*Op.cit.*, 1986, p. 26.

research support.⁷ Given the history of police fads and highly questionable "reforms" which have been enthusiastically advanced and quickly abandoned or, worse yet, adopted and survived to plague rather than promote good policing, their criticism should not be taken lightly.

It is, of course, a criticism which goes beyond community or problem-oriented policing. It is not merely that community-oriented or problem-oriented policing has failed to secure adequate research corroboration of either its assumptions or its claimed effects. Their criticism is grounded in a much more general point. It is that few police practices of any type have received enough systematic research attention to document their claimed effects. Despite appearances to the contrary in "professional" police agencies "accredited" to be in compliance with hundreds of certified "standards," even the most routine, everyday forms of police conduct remain virtually untested.

Moreover, it is most unlikely that this situation will change significantly until police agencies themselves develop both an internal, "in-house" research capacity and an experimental attitude toward their own practices and behavior. This is not to say that highly sophisticated, large-scale, national-scope, federally-funded, research projects conducted by leading professional researchers in collaboration with the nation's largest and most progressive police agencies will not or should not continue to shape the major contours of police practice. Rather, it is to say that the hundreds of day-to-day topics in policing and the thousands of area-specific, situated problems to which any would-be problem-oriented police agency must attend will simply not be studied if each study requires a million dollar federal grant and the Police Foundation or the Police Executive Research Forum, or the Rand Corporation to do it.

Research "on," "with," and "by" Police

What this study attempts to describe, on a national scale, is the internal research activity of police agencies in the United States. There is a large and ever expanding research literature "on" police.⁸ It is primarily the work of academics. Within the past decade, the character of

⁷ Jack R. Greene and Stephen D. Mastrofski (eds.), Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality (New York: Praeger, 1988); Peter Manning, "Community Policing". American Journal of Police 3:2 (1984):205-227; Simon Holdaway, Inside the British Police: A Force at Work (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1984) Carl B. Klockars, "The Rhetoric of Community Policing" in Green and Mastrofski, op. cit. pp. 239-258; C. Short, "Community Policing: Beyond Slogans" in T. Bennet (Ed.) The Future of Policing (Cambridge, UK: Institute of Criminology, 1983); and Mollie Weatheritt, "Community Policing: Does it Work and How Do We Know?" ibid.; "Community Policing Now" in P. Willmot (ed.) Policing and the Community (London: Policing Studies Institute: 1987; and "Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?" in Green and Mastrofski, (eds.) op. cit.. See also Lawrence Sherman, "Policing Communities: What Works?" in Albert J. Reiss, Jr. and Michael Tonry (eds.) Communities and Crime (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986) pp. 343-386.

⁸ There are, at present, at least eleven journals, eight of them refereed, that are primarily devoted to the publication of research on police: *American Journal of Police*, *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, *International Criminal Police Review*, *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, *Police Chief*, *Police Computer Review*, *Police Forum*, *Police Journal*, *Police Liability Review*, *Police Studies: The International Review of Police Development*, and *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy*. In addition, there are dozens of other journals in criminology, criminal justice, law and society, and sociology that frequently contain reports of research on police. See M.S. Vaughn and R. V. del Carmen "An Annotated List of Journals in Criminal Justice and

that research has evolved, precisely in the way Goldstein advocated in the quotation at the head of this chapter, to reflect heavily joint efforts by police and academic researchers. To a considerable degree contemporary research "on" police is research "with" police. This change in the character of police research has been stimulated by organizations such as the Police Executive Research Forum and the Police Foundation, and particularly by National Institute of Justice efforts to involve police leaders and police practitioners in the review and evaluation of all of the police research it supports. These developments reflect, as well, an appreciation by researchers that the quality of research is improved by collaborative efforts and an appreciation by police leaders that research can be of value to them.

This research "on" and "with" police is largely public. Much of it is published in professional journals and government reports or presented in papers at professional meetings. This is so primarily because the reward system for researchers and standards of social scientific practice requires publication of research results. A portion of this research is summarized in practitioner publications and eventually finds its way into texts, manuals, police academies, and other mechanisms of police education and training. Research of this type is subject not only to discussion in police circles but also to critical review and analysis by professional researchers. The extent to which police are aware of this research, the extent to which this research is consumed by police, the extent to which they are capable of evaluating what they read of it, and the extent to which they are guided or willing to be guided in policy or practice by this research is presently unknown.

Moreover, not only is there little known about the research consumption habits and capacities of police, even less is known about the production of research by police. This is so despite the fact that formal "planning and research" units are common in police agencies. Indeed, to become accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies all police agencies that employ 200 or more persons must have a planning and research capacity and at least one full-time employee assigned to planning and research.⁹ Although there are national organizations of persons engaged in police planning and research, we are unaware of any attempt to describe, on a national scale, the research police do or the role research plays in contemporary police agencies.¹⁰

Criminology: A Guide for Authors" *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 3:1 (1992), pp. 93-142.

⁹Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies imposes standards for agencies seeking accreditation based upon agency size. Some standards are understood to be not applicable to smaller agencies, others are optional, and still others are mandatory for all agencies regardless of size. CALEA makes a planning and research component mandatory for agencies with more than two hundred employees, optional for agencies with 50-199 employees, but regards the requirement of planning and research capacity as "Not Applicable" to agencies with 49 or fewer employees. Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, *Standards for Law Enforcement Agencies*, Fairfax, VA, 1987, pp. 14.1-14.2. Our research discovered that seven percent of the responding agencies with less than 50 *sworn* employees had a formal research and planning unit.

¹⁰ In many states and regions there are a variety of associations and collections of police planners and researchers that meet periodically to share information and discuss common problems. Until 1991 there were two major national police planning and research organizations, the National Association of Police Planners and the

Despite the fact that there exists no systematic study of research by police, a number of persons of substantial experience with many police agencies have offered characterizations of it. They range from encouraging accounts of research as practiced in some model problem-oriented police agencies¹¹ to enthusiastic reviews of the growth of analyses now possible with sophisticated computer technologies¹² to critical assessments of the state of research by police, usually calling for more of it¹³. A typical critical assessment is offered by Reiss:

One might contrast the R&D budget of American police departments and related organizations that support research and development, such as the National Institute of Justice, with the R&D budget of the U.S. Department of Defense. Defense expenditures for R&D are variously estimated at 10 to 15 percent of the total defense budget. By contrast, less than half of 1 percent of the police budget ordinarily is allocated to research and development and nationally it is estimated to be less than 1 percent of all expenditures on policing. Compared with expert estimates of the size and nature of the R&D industry, police organizations fall at the bottom in percentage of the budget expended for R&D, comparable perhaps to the furniture industry.¹⁴

Such evaluations of the amount of research and development engaged in by police, all estimates of the proportion of police budgets dedicated to research, and all assertions about

Association of Police Planners and Research Officers. The two groups joined in 1991 to form the International Association of Law Enforcement Planners.

¹¹ For example, John Eck and William Spelman, "Who Ya Gonna Call? Police as Problem Busters," *Crime & Delinquency* Vol 63 (1987), pp. 31-52; Dorothy Guyot, "Problem-oriented Policing Shines in the Stats," *Public Management* 73:9 (Sept. 1991); Brian D. Cummings, "Problem-oriented Policing and Crime Specific Planning," *The Police Chief*, 57:3 (March, 1990).

¹² David Roberts and Judith Ryder, *New Technologies in Criminal Justice: An Appraisal* (Sacramento, CA: Search Group Inc., 1987); Kent Colton, Margaret Bradeau, and James Tien, *A National Assessment of Police Command, Control and Communications Systems* (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, 1983); Laura Lang, "To Catch a Thief: High Tech Cops Using Crime Information Systems," *Government Technology* 2:6 (Oct. 1989).

¹³ Lawrence Sherman, Book Review, *Problem-Oriented Policing* by Hermann Goldstein, New York: McGraw Hill, 1990 *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 82:3, 690-707; James K. Stewart, "Research and the Police Administrator: Working Smarter, Not Harder" In William A. Geller (ed.) *Police Leadership in America: Crisis and Opportunity* (New York: Praeger, 1985); Louis A. Mayo, "Leading Blindly: An Assessment of Chief's Information about Police Operations." *ibid.* pp. 397-417; Mollie Weatheritt, "Why Should the Police Use Police Research?" in Mollie Weatheritt (ed) *Police Research: Some Future Prospects* (Brookfield: Avebury, 1989).

¹⁴ Albert J. Reiss, Jr., "What is 'R&D' Really?" in William E. Geller, *Local Government Police Administration*, 3rd Edition (Washington, D.C.: International City Managers Association, 1991), p. 339.

whether police fall at the "top" or "bottom" of some measure of the amount of their budgets dedicated to research depend almost entirely upon the definition one accepts for "research" and what organizations or industries one selects for comparison.

For example, it is probably the case that the average police agency devotes as much if not more of its budget to research on policing as the average social welfare agency devotes to the study of social welfare¹⁵, the average newspaper devotes to research on journalism¹⁶, or the average college or university devotes to research on higher education¹⁷. While the R&D component of police budgets surely pales in comparison with high-technology industries such as defense, research by police may well compare favorably with research in other less technologically-dependent human service agencies such as social work, journalism, or education.

All such comparisons, however, depend so heavily upon what one is willing to define as "research", that, absent a common, explicit definition, they are virtually meaningless. Consider, for example, what might be called "research" on higher education in a typical college or university and "research" on policing in a typical municipal police agency. If "research" is defined, as a recent work by Cordner, Fraser, and Wexler suggests, as "*the careful, systematic study of a subject*"¹⁸ it is possible to construe every college teacher who works to improve his teaching and every police officer who works to improve his police skills as a "researcher," and their efforts, providing they are "careful and systematic", as "research." A definition of research that renders it the equivalent of "study" makes most everyone who thinks a researcher.

¹⁵Research of the kind that is published in professional journals in social welfare is conducted predominantly by professional researchers located in academic institutions or contract research organizations. However, other conceptions of what social welfare should be or how it should be understood suggest that a radically different understanding of the role, practice and extent of the conduct of research in social welfare is possible. See Dennis L. Poole, "Broadening the Definition of Scholarship, Practice and Action Research," *Health and Social Work*. 16:4. pp. 294-301 (Nov. 1991) and Ruth G. Dean, "Ways of Knowing in Clinical Practice," *Clinical Social Work Journal*. 17:2., pp. 116-28. (Summer 1989).

¹⁶Robert G. Picard, "Research and Development Still Misses Its Mark," *Editor and Publisher* Vol 125, No. 51, pp. 46-47 reports that with the exception of a few projects funded by the American Newspaper Publishers Association the newspaper industry spends almost nothing on research and development.

¹⁷Research in higher education is generally understood to be of two types. There is what is called "institutional research" which is a type of research practiced within many if not most colleges and universities that collects and analyzes data on admissions, class sizes, salaries, etc. for use in administrative decision-making. General research on higher education may be conducted by historians, sociologists, psychologists, economists, and educators. Whether a given college or university conducts any general research on higher education is solely a matter of whether doing so happens to be a research interest of any faculty member,. It is probably the case that the overwhelming majority of colleges and universities do no research of this type whatsoever.

¹⁸Gary W. Cordner, Craig B. Fraser, and Chuck Wexler, "Research Planning and Implementation," in William E. Geller (ed) *Local Government Police Administration* 3rd. Edition, (Washington, D.C.:International City Managers Association, 1991), pp. 333.

Similarly, if one restricts the idea of "research" as Reiss does in the quote above to "*empirical investigation that describes and explains how things behave and change their behavior*"¹⁹ the only forms of inquiry that qualify as research are empirical investigations that aspire to contribute to theory construction, to *explanation* of how things behave and change. Under Reiss's definition a study providing a mere statistical description of an organization's activities, its workload, crime and arrest rates, response times, budget, consumption of overtime, distribution of calls for service, distribution of disciplinary measures, or use of force, does not qualify as "research." Excluded as well by such a definition are analyses of policy and practice that are not empirical. Most legal research, review of agency policy, importation and implementation of programs from other agencies, and the exploration of political, ethical, and philosophical questions raised by police practice would fail to meet this "empirical" criterion for qualification as research.

The close reading of such definitions of research reveals that they contain a vision of not only what research ought to be but also of the role it ought to play and the uses to which it ought to be put. The Cordner, Fraser, Wexler definition above that finds research to be any "careful and systematic study" is offered in an essay that seeks to encourage police to gather and employ quantitative information in police administration and management. They encourage and offer as examples of research: collecting data on workload as a basis for patrol deployment, measuring the consequences of a foot patrol or fear reduction project to support continued funding, assembling of information on career offenders and their crimes to pressure prosecutors to create a target offender program. Likewise, Reiss aspires to establish police research and development units within police agencies that "shape both internal and external environments .. (by) development of models and their testing under field conditions." Reiss would have research of this type become a "core technology" of police agencies.

DEFINING "RESEARCH"

As our definition of "research" will also configure most of the evaluations, estimates, and assertions about research by police that will be offered in this report, it is imperative that our definition be made explicit and that we offer a defense for defining it as we do. Throughout this document we will define "*research*" by police as *what people who are employed by police agencies to do research do when they are doing it*. This definition, based on an approach to analysis of the social science research enterprise adopted by Abraham Kaplan²⁰ is radically different from conventional definitions. However, it has three crucial virtues that appear to us to make it superior to them.

What Research is versus What Research ought to be

Its first virtue is that, unlike other approaches to defining research, it seeks to make possible a description what police research *is* rather than prescribe what it *ought to be*. The definitions of research offered by Reiss and Cordner, Fraser, and Wexler above both embody

¹⁹ *ibid.* p. 339.

²⁰ Abraham Kaplan, *The Conduct of Inquiry* (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1964).

conceptions of research that tell what their authors hope research will be. They are norm-derivative definitions in that they are based upon convictions by their authors about what research ought to be and do. Cordner *et al* hope that research will be "careful and systematic" while Reiss insists that research must not only be empirical but also both describe and explain how things behave and change.

Defining Research in Terms of Ends. - These definitions and others that approach defining research in norm-derivative ways²¹ have a stork-story character to them. While they claim laudable aspirations for research, (which, incidentally the authors of this study share) there is obviously much research that is conducted both within and outside of police agencies that fails to achieve or aspire to those goals. There is, as anyone even remotely familiar with research will admit, a considerable quantity of research that is less than careful and systematic. There is careless and sloppy research, pointless research, trivial research, idiosyncratic research, research motivated entirely by commercial or political considerations and research that does not even make a pretense to contribute to models or theories. Put simply, research by academics, by contract researchers, and by police is subject to all of the failings, shortcomings, and complications of any other human enterprise and any definition of research that attempts to define away those realities is patently defective. Indeed, many of the mechanisms of the scientific community, from peer review to publication to tests of statistical significance are specifically created to identify and moderate such influences.

Defining Research in Terms of Means

An alternative approach to defining research that seeks to avoid norm-derivative assumptions about its goals and motives seeks to define it, not in terms of its end or objectives, but in terms of its methods. This approach is at least partially reflected in the definition of criminal justice research offered in the *Report of the Task Force Report on Criminal Justice Research and Development*: "the body of knowledge (research and development) that attempts to provide understanding of and solutions to criminal justice problems and is based on replicable scientific procedures."²² The distinguishing portion of this definition is that it requires that research be based upon "replicable scientific procedures."

Means of Discovery - The difficulty with such a definition is that while it is probably headed in the right definitional direction the fact of the matter is that we know so little about the actual conduct of science that defining research in terms of its procedures is largely an illusion.

²¹See, for example George A. Theodorson and Achilles G. Theodorson, *A Modern Dictionary for Sociology* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1969) who define research as "a systematic and objective attempt to study a problem for the purpose of deriving general principles. The investigation is guided by previously collected information and aims to add to the body of knowledge on the subject... All honest attempts to study a problem systematically or to add to (our) knowledge may be regarded as research."

²² National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. *Criminal Justice Research and Development* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976).

At minimum, researchers are engaged in two very different but often related activities: discovery and verification. While there are techniques that scientists commonly use in both activities, how researchers, in the natural sciences or the social sciences, actually go about discovering things is no better understood today than in 1918 when Max Weber spoke to an audience of would-be scientists:

Ideas occur to us when they please, not when it pleases us. The best ideas do indeed occur to one's mind in the way in which Ihering describes it: when smoking a cigar; or as Helmholtz states of himself with scientific exactitude; when taking a walk on a slowly ascending street; or in a similar way.

...the scientific worker has to take into his bargain the risk that enters into all scientific work: Does an 'idea' occur or does it not? He may be an excellent worker and yet never have any valuable idea of his own. ... inspiration plays no less of a role in science than it does in art. It is a childish notion to think that a mathematician obtains any scientifically valuable results by sitting at his desk with a ruler, calculating machines, or other mechanical means.²³

While we do not know how the logic of discovery actually works, there are thoughtful suggestions on how to stimulate it²⁴ and engaging descriptions of its operation in practice.²⁵ Probably least helpful are those treatises for students and other beginners that attempt to reduce the conduct of scientific inquiry into four or five or six or some other number or arrangement of logically interrelated steps. Such "reconstructed logics," to use Kaplan's term, bear little relationship to what goes on in the conduct of research at the same time they sponsor the totally erroneous impression than anyone who follows them can manage to fashion a meaningful idea.

²³Max Weber, "Science as a Vocation" in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, (eds. and trans.) From Max Weber: *Essays in Sociology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1948) p. 136.

²⁴The best in the social sciences remains C. Wright Mills' *The Sociological Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959). The Appendix, "On Intellectual Craftsmanship" begins "...social science is the practice of a craft. A man at work on problems of substance, he is among those who are quickly made impatient and weary by elaborate discussions of method-and-theory-in-general; so much of it interrupts his proper studies. It is much better, he believes, to have one account by a working student of how he is going about his work than a dozen codifications of procedure by specialists who as often as not have never done much work of consequence." (p. 195).

²⁵See Philip Hammond (ed.), *Sociologists at Work: Essays on the Craft of Social Research*, (New York: Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1967).

Means of Verification - The same situation obtains with respect to the researcher's conduct of verification. Although there is an impressive array of tools, implements, techniques, and apparatus available to the modern researcher who seeks to verify the existence of any alleged relationship, the ineluctable fact remains that, as Popper demonstrated, it is not possible to "prove" any causal relationship or any hypothesis.²⁶ The best one can do is seek to eliminate rival hypotheses or alternative explanations of why an observed event occurred. Understanding the role of specific techniques of verification in this way permits us to appreciate that the real task of verification is not in the application of some statistic or experimental procedure but in envisioning potentially plausible rival hypotheses and designing ways to eliminate them. This is not to say that knowledge of research techniques, statistical methods, questionnaire construction, or experimental design and the like is not important to the conduct of research. They are about as important as a well-stocked kitchen is to a cook. It is difficult for chefs or researchers to work without proper tools and ingredients, but such tools and ingredients should not be confused with the skill of cooking or of doing research.

One can, of course, specify many tools and techniques commonly used by researchers. The use of such instruments is largely what is taught in courses in research methods. There are, as well, "reconstructed logics" to use Kaplan's term, that offer abstract, idealized schemes, typically drawn from models of the natural sciences, that claim how research *ought to be* conducted. While such abstractions can provide valuable outlines for the conduct of inquiry, it is a mistake to confuse such abstractions with the logics that active researchers actually employ in discovery and verification.²⁷

But as no one really knows how researchers actually go about discovering or verifying relationships, attempting to define research in terms of "replicable scientific procedures" offers an illusion of concreteness that merely begs the question of defining research.

Research as a matter of police discretion - The second virtue of the definition which finds police research to be what people who are employed by police agencies to do research do when they are doing it is that it explicitly recognizes that the conduct of research in police agencies is a matter of police discretion. By this we mean that the research topics, research methods, standards of proof, form and style of presentation of research results as well as the role research plays in police organizations are dictated solely by police researchers and those who employ them. This is not to say that in setting their research agendas (or in deciding to do no research at all) police will not be influenced by all sorts of social, political, and economic

²⁶Karl Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (New York: Basic Books, 1959).

²⁷ On this point Kaplan writes "The great danger in confusing the logic-in-use with a particular reconstructed logic, and especially a highly idealized one, is that thereby the autonomy of science is subtly subverted. The normative force of the logic has the effect, not necessarily of improving the logic-in-use, but only of bringing it into closer conformity with the imposed reconstruction. It is often said that the behavioral sciences should stop trying to imitate physics. I believe this recommendation is a mistake: the presumption is certainly in favor of those operations of the understanding which have already shown themselves to be so preeminently successful in the pursuit of truth. What *is* important, I believe, is that behavioral science should stop trying to imitate only what a particular reconstruction claims physics to be. *Ibid.* p. 11.

forces. It is also not to say that in designing and conducting research police may not attempt to employ common social science methods such as interviews, surveys, and experiments. What our definition does maintain that although the conduct of police research can be influenced by numerous political, social, legal, cultural, organizational, and methodological considerations the final decision as to what police research is and will be is a police decision.

Different Understandings of the Nature, Conduct, and Role of Research - The third and final virtue of conceiving of police research in this way is that it makes possible the discovery of roles of research and conceptions of the proper conduct of research, both in methods and objectives, that differ markedly from understandings of what research is or ought to be in other settings, industries, and organizations. It is obvious that the role of research is radically different in different industries. Research enjoys a different role and status and is conducted with different methods in policing, journalism, medicine, engineering, social service, and education. The task of understanding the production and consumption of research in U.S. police agencies should not be governed by an aspiration to make the role and conduct of police research like its role in some other industry. It should be to understand what it is, who plays it, why it is that way, and what impact it has. Only then will we be in an informed position to consider changing it and what doing so might entail.

PART II

THE NATIONAL SURVEY

Although, in some sense, all police agencies engage in some form of "research" there is no systematic study of this activity or its impact on police agencies. The study described below seeks to fill that void in our knowledge. It attempts to answer, on a national scale, four fundamental questions:

- *What is police research?
- *Who does it?
- *Why is it done?
- *What impact does it have?

In order to answer these questions, two general strategies were employed. The first was a mail survey of a large, representative sample of police agencies in the United States. The second was a series of site visits to twelve police agencies, each of which exemplified a pattern in the conduct of research and planning that was identified in the national survey.

SAMPLE SELECTION

In selecting the sample for the national survey, we employed as a description of the population of police agencies in the United States, the 1989 edition of the Directory of Law Enforcement Agencies. Cross checking this directory, which provides the names, addresses, and phone numbers of almost all police agencies in the United States, with the 1988 Uniform Crime Reports, we were able to identify about 1,375 police agencies that employ 50 or more sworn officers. We selected a 50% sample from this listing.

Secondly, because we were also interested in how police research is produced and consumed in small police agencies, we selected from the directory (which is organized by state) the first two police agencies in each state which the UCR reported to have between 25 and 35 sworn officers. Twenty-five state police agencies were also surveyed. This produced a total initial sample of 777 police agencies. Surveys were mailed during the last two weeks in August, 1990.

In October 1990, all police agencies that had not returned a questionnaire were sent a follow-up letter requesting return of our survey. In that letter we invited agencies to call us if another copy of the questionnaire was needed. About fifty agencies called and new survey packages were sent out on October 25. Table I provides data concerning sample characteristics, number and percent of questionnaires returned, and distribution of agencies in the final sample by type.

By normal mail survey standards the 64% return rate was exceptionally good, particularly given the fact that the questionnaire was sixteen pages long and asked for more than 100 discrete bits of information. We attribute this high return rate, at least in part, to the fact that our request to complete the survey was directed to the head of each agency by name and that the letter of request was personally signed, not stamped, by the Sheriff of the police agency in which we worked.

The survey instrument was offered to agencies in two formats, one of which phrased questions in terms of "the research and planning unit," the other of which phrased questions in terms of "those responsible for research and planning." Agencies were instructed to chose the first format if they had a formal research and planning unit, the second if they did not. Copies of the survey instruments, cover letters, and follow-up letters are attached as Appendix I. Appendix II lists the agencies surveyed.

Table I: Survey Return Data By Agency Type

Agency Type	Sent	Returned	%Returned	Returned Usable	%Final Sample
State Police	25	25	100%	25	5.1%
County & Municipal	469	304	65%	300	61.1%
County Sheriffs	192	100	53%	100	20.4%
Small Municipal	91	66	70%	66	13.4%
Totals	777	495	64%	491	100.0%

WHAT IS POLICE RESEARCH?

In our survey we approached the question of "what is police research?" from three different but complementary directions. In one part of our questionnaire we asked a series of questions designed to get respondents to identify the topics on which they worked during the past year. In another, a series of questions addressed methods and resources they employed in the course of doing their research. Finally, we asked respondents to indicate their agreement or disagreement with a series of statements that characterized the nature of research as it was practiced in their agencies.

THE RESEARCH AGENDA OF U.S. POLICE AGENCIES

Three questions in our survey sought to describe the research agenda of U.S. police agencies. The first, the responses to which are displayed in Table II below, asked respondents to identify the extent to which they were involved in each of twenty-six distinct topic areas within the past year.

The list of topic areas was prepared from our own experience in planning and research and supplemented after early pre-testing in a small number of agencies not in our national

sample. The topic area selection would appear to be rather good in that out of the twenty-five topic areas only two, case screening and target offender programs, found less than 10% of agencies "very involved" in those areas and only target offender programs were found to have less than 20% of the agencies at least "moderately involved" in them.

TABLE II: Involvement in Selected Research Topics by Number and Percent

Question: Please indicate the degree to which the research and planning unit²⁸ has been involved in the following issues WITHIN THE PAST YEAR.

		Not Involved	Slightly Involved	Moderately Involved	Very Involved	No Ans
(a)	Accreditation/ Re-accreditation	230 46.8	89 18.1	55 11.2	106 21.6	11 2.2
(b)	Agency Budget Compilation(s)	30 6.1	84 17.1	84 17.1	293 59.7	0
(c)	Call Prioritization	180 36.7	123 25.1	105 21.4	77 15.7	6 1.2
(d)	Community- Oriented Policing	151 30.8	148 30.1	105 21.4	84 17.1	3 .6
(e)	Computerization	35 7.1	103 21.0	126 25.7	226 46.0	1 .2
(f)	Capital Improvement Issues	72 14.7	94 19.1	124 25.3	199 40.5	2 .4
(g)	Career Criminal/ Target Offender Program(s)	320 65.1	96 19.6	36 7.3	36 7.3	0 0.0
(h)	Carrying Weapons Off-Duty	214 43.6	117 23.8	75 15.3	82 16.7	3 .6
(i)	Case Screening	299 60.9	91 18.5	60 12.2	39 7.9	2 .4
(j)	Crime Analysis	130 26.5	146 29.7	111 22.6	104 21	0 .2
(k)	Directed Patrol	168 34.4	143 29.1	114 23.2	62 12.6	4 .8
(l)	Domestic Violence Reduction	226 46.0	119 24.2	86 17.5	58 11.8	2 .4

²⁸In agencies with no formal planning and research unit this question read "Please indicate the degree to which to which those persons most responsible for planning and research in your agency have been involved in the following issues WITHIN THE PAST YEAR."

Table II (continued)

	Not Involved	Slightly Involved	Moderately Involved	Very Involved	No Ans
(m) Drug Education	139 28.3	105 21.4	131 26.7	114 23.2	2 .4
(n) Employee Drug Testing	228 46.4	115 23.4	76 15.5	69 14.4	3 .6
(o) Grants Administration	99 20.2	101 20.6	108 22.0	182 37.1	1 .2
(p) Health/Wellness Training	208 42.4	125 25.5	105 21.4	50 10.2	3 .6
(q) In-house program evaluation(s)	83 16.9	136 27.7	140 28.5	128 26.1	4 .8
(r) Neighborhood Watch	219 44.6	133 27.1	77 15.7	59 12.0	3 .6
(s) Off-Duty Employment	221 45	142 28.9	76 15.5	50 10.2	2 .4
(t) Personnel Deployment (Agency-wide)	100 20.4	113 23.0	137 27.9	138 28.1	3 .6
(u) Police Equipment (testing and evaluation)	111 22.6	134 27.3	135 27.5	110 22.4	1 .2
(v) Policy Manual Revisions	30 6.1	53 10.8	95 19.3	312 63.5	1 .2
(w) Problem-Oriented Policing	150 30.5	144 29.3	116 23.6	79 16.1	2 .4
(x) Uniform Crime Reports	138 28.1	121 24.6	107 21.8	123 25.1	2 .4
(y) Use of Force Policy	83 16.9	87 17.7	144 29.3	175 35.6	2 .4
(z) Vehicle Pursuit Policy	98 20.0	82 16.7	127 25.9	183 37.3	1 .2

Two of the topic areas stand out from all others in the proportion of agencies reporting that their research and planning employees were "very involved" in them: policy manual revisions (63.5%) and agency budget compilations (59.7%). Each of these topic areas are critical to the administration of police agencies: budget, for reasons that are obvious, and policy manual revisions because the vast majority of U. S. police agencies are managed by a quasi-military system of general orders. As we will discuss later in this report, the capacity to control or influence budget and the preparation of general orders can accord substantial organizational power to research and planning personnel.

Use of Force Policy - The high proportion of agencies attending to one other topic bears comment. Just over thirty-five percent (35.6%) of the agencies surveyed reported being "very involved" with revising the agency's use of force policy and another twenty-nine percent (29.3%) of agencies reported being "moderately involved" in force policy changes. That finding that more than 65% of police agencies in the United States were involved in revising their force policies is a finding that was totally unanticipated. While such a finding might have been expected in the wake of the national display of the brutalization of Rodney King by members of the Los Angeles Police Department in March of 1991, this survey was completed at least four months prior to that incident.

There is substantial theoretical and empirical evidence that modifying force policies can have dramatic impact on the reduction of officer use of deadly force.²⁹ Moreover, given that the capacity to use force is the defining characteristic of police and is what police make available to society, how a force policy is written and administered not only reveals the values of that agency, but the style of police work it encourages, the behavior of officers it monitors, and the relationship it requires between officers and supervisors, the capacity to influence or control how it is written and enforced is a responsibility of major consequence.

Top Five Research Topics

A second question in our national survey also attempted to get agencies to describe their research agendas. Unlike the fixed option question above, this open-ended question asked agencies to list the five activities that consumed most of their time during the previous year. Two-hundred-and-thirty-eight agencies responded to this question and the range of activities was staggering in its diversity. In attempting to summarize these responses we coded them under rather broad categories. Despite this effort we ended up with ninety-seven (97) separate categories. Categories were again combined producing a final list of seventy-eight (78) categories³⁰.

The highest proportion reported in any category was 80.3% for "policy manual revisions," but as one can see from Table III, which reports only those activities identified by 25% or more of the responding agencies, the proportion of agencies reporting any category as one of their top five activities over the past year drops rather rapidly. We interpret these responses to mean two things. First, it appears to emphasize the national diversity of research and planning activities in which U.S. police agencies are involved. Second, it would seem to emphasize that within individual agencies the research and planning agendas are also quite diverse.

²⁹See William A. Geller and Michael S. Scott, "Deadly Force: What We Know" in Carl B. Klockars and Stephen D. Mastrofski (eds) Thinking about Police, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw Hill, 1991. pp. 446-76.

³⁰This list is attached as Appendix III.

Table III: Most Frequently Reported Research Activities for Past Year, by Number and Percent of Responses

Activity	Number	Percent
1. Policy Manual Revisions	191	80.3
2. Computerization	167	70.2
3. Budget Matters	140	58.8
4. Training Related	107	45.0
5. Accreditation	97	40.8
6. Personnel Deployment	95	40.0
7. Personnel Issues	88	37.0
8. Police Equipment Testing/Evaluation	81	34.0
9. Capital Improvements	76	32.0
10. Community Relations	62	26.1
11. Grants Administration	60	25.2

Some top priority activities were both unusual and unique to a very small number of agencies. One agency listed producing a history of the department as a top research activity. Seven agencies noted space utilization and needs studies; two agencies were very involved in the merger of police and fire service; one agency listed the publication of in-house weapons alerts; one agency listed police-tourist relations; seven agencies were very involved in asset forfeiture procedures; one agency was preparing for annexation; five agencies were involved in off-duty employment issues; and two agencies specifically listed gun control legislation as a top research activity.

While a considerable number of police researchers were engaged in what might be thought of as a core group of activities (policy manual revisions, budget, computerization, personnel, and training) research and planning appears to be the place within police agencies that new, unusual, and non-routine problems and activities are assigned for development and evaluation.

Projects of National Interest

A third question was designed to identify projects currently being undertaken by the respondents that they felt might be of interest to other police agencies. Respondents were asked to briefly describe any such projects. About one-third of the respondents (164 agencies or 33.4%) provided brief sketches of 286 different projects. Table IV lists the ten most frequently reported categories of projects.

As was the case with the fixed-option survey of research agendas and with our open-ended priority question, a very few core categories capture a certain proportion of the responses, while the vast majority of responses are spread over dozens of different categories. It is, again, the diversity of topics that marks police planning and research activities.

Table IV: Ten Most Frequently Reported Types of Projects of National Interest, by Number and Percent of Responses

Project Description	Number	Percent
(1) Computerization	32	19.5
(2) Personnel Deployment	17	10.4
(3) Community Oriented Policing	16	9.8
(4) Juvenile Programs/Initiatives	15	9.1
(5) Weapons Conversion	12	7.3
(6) Domestic Violence Reduction	10	6.1
(7) Employee Drug Testing	8	4.8
(8) Strategic Planning	6	3.7
(8) Community Surveys	6	3.7
(9) Drug Law Enforcement	6	3.7
(10) Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention	5	3.0

RESEARCH METHODS AND RESOURCES

The second approach taken in our survey to answer the question, "What is police research?" seeks to describe police research not in terms of the agenda of topics studied but in terms of the methods police use to study those topics. Table V reports responses to five questions, each of which asks about a different aspect of the methods of police research. More than two thirds (68.8%) of the respondents reported conducting literature/library searches, more

Table V - Methods of Police Planning and Research

	Yes #	%	No #	%	No Answer #	%
Within the past year, has the research and planning unit conducted literature/library searches?	338	68.8	151	30.8	2	.4
Within the past year, have reports/papers been presented at professional meetings as a result of this unit's research efforts?	171	34.8	319	65.0	1	.2
Within the past year, has the research and planning unit conducted a study which employed a survey or questionnaire?	288	58.7	201	40.9	2	.4
Within the past year, has the research and planning unit conducted a study which employed an experimental design?	116	23.6	373	76.0	2	.4
Within the past year, has the research and planning unit published research results in a journal or magazine?	38	7.7	452	92.1	1	.2

than half (58.7%) reported conducting a survey and nearly a quarter (23.6%) reported conducting a study that employed an experimental design. More than a third (34.8) of the

agencies had presented a paper on their research at a professional meeting, though only 7.7% had published their results.

The questions and answers reported in Table V offer only a very rough approximation of the type of methods police use in the conduct of research. We recognize fully that each of the questions asked about the use of particular research methods permits a fairly broad range of interpretation. Consulting a single text can constitute a literature search; participating in a discussion at a local meeting of police planners can constitute a "report at a professional meeting," and even a simple before/after measurement of some program's effectiveness can be construed as a form of experimental design.

We also made no attempt to evaluate the quality of the research efforts of our respondents. However, we did probe further into some of the areas raised in the five general methods questions reported in Table V. On the matter of library and literature searches we asked our respondents to identify professional publications that their agency received. Those results are reported in Table VI below.

Of the eighteen publications on the list we presented to respondents, five publications were reported to be received by fifty percent or more of the responding agencies: The Police Chief (82%); Law and Order (79.6%); NIJ Reports (77.6%); Law Enforcement Technology (62.7); and the agency's state law enforcement journal (50.3%). While NIJ Reports may be classified as a research reporting publication, journals reporting largely academic research on

TABLE VI - Professional Publications Received

Number and percent of respondents reporting receiving selected publications		
	Number	Percent
(a) AELE Bulletin	120	24.4
(b) American Journal of Police	56	11.4
(c) Contemporary Policing	12	2.4
(d) Crime Control Digest	97	19.8
(e) Crime and Delinquency	45	9.2
(f) Criminal Law Reporter	150	30.5
(g) Criminology	8	1.6
(h) Journal of Crime and Justice	32	6.5
(i) Journal of Police Science and Administration	65	13.2
(j) Justice Quarterly	39	7.9
(k) Law Enforcement News	234	47.7
(l) Law Enforcement Technology	308	62.7
(m) Law and Order	391	79.6
(n) NIJ Reports	381	77.6
(o) National Sheriff's Association Magazine	119	24.2
(p) Police Chief Magazine	403	82.1
(q) Your state law enforcement journal	247	50.3
(r) FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin	61	8.0

police, (eg. The American Journal of Police, Journal of Police Science and Administration, Criminology, Justice Quarterly) were received by only a small proportion of police agencies.

It bears mention that the above reports of publications received may be distorted by at least two different sources. Respondents were asked to identify publications that the planning and research unit or those most responsible for research and planning received. It may be that certain publications were received by other divisions or members of the agency and that planning and research simply did not get a copy. This is probably the case with the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. While only 8% of our respondents reported receiving it, it is probably distributed to well over 90% of the police agencies in the United States. It may not, however, circulate within agencies much beyond the office of the chief.

A second source of distortion in the reporting of publications may come from the desire on the part of respondents to report more familiarity with the professional police literature than they actually have. Wanting to "look good" in a national survey might stimulate some overreporting. To test this we included a fictitious journal in our list, one we entitled Contemporary Policing. Twelve agencies, 2.4% of our respondents, reported receiving it. All things considered we find this to be a very low rate of exaggeration, one which gives us some confidence in the accuracy of responses not only to this question but to others in our survey.

Research Resources - At best, the list of publications received by police agencies provides only a modest indicator of one of the types of research resources they tend to have on hand. In Table VII we identify a broad range of research resources and report the frequency of their reported use by respondent agencies. Perhaps the most important finding among these answers reported in line "a" of Table VII. It is the discovery that *the single most common method of research by U.S. police agencies is consultation with other police agencies*. More than three quarters of responding agencies reported that they either used the resource of other agencies either "always" (13.8%) or "often (62.9%)."

From interviews conducted in site visits to a dozen police planning and research units across the country and from our own experience in police planning and research, we can not only confirm this survey finding but elaborate on some of the features of the organization and administration of U.S. police agencies that encourage it. Although the quasi-military administrative order of U.S. police agencies has been subject to severe criticism, one of its latent benefits is that it makes programs or policies in one agency rather readily transferable to another. For example, an agency considering revising its vehicle pursuit policy, its officer drug testing policy, or its alarm response policy can obtain copies of similar policies already written in other departments without unduly imposing on them. This ease of information transfer is reciprocal and persons in police planning and research positions know that by responding to another agency's request for information they can guarantee equivalent assistance in return.

Supporting this practical exchange relationship are at least two normative themes in U.S. police culture. The first is the general expectation that police will help each other. This expectation extends from the patrol officer who expects assistance from nearby officers from

TABLE VII: Research Resources, Frequency of Use, by Number and Percent of Respondents

"Please indicate how often you make use of the following in your research and planning activities." (A=Always O=Often ST=Sometimes S=Seldom N=Never NA=No Answer)

	A	O	ST	S	N	NA
(a) Consult(s) with other police agencies	68 13.8	309 62.9	104 21.2	10 2.0	0 0	0 0
(b) National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service	16 13.3	131 26.7	179 36.5	111 22.6	53 10.8	1 .2
(c) National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives	3 .6	10 2.0	67 13.6	128 26.1	280 57.0	3 .6
(d) Police Executive Research Forum	8 1.6	53 10.8	111 22.6	142 28.9	174 35.4	3 .6
(e) FBI National Academy	7 1.4	107 21.8	178 36.3	130 26.5	69 14.1	0 0
(f) Local College(s) or University(ies)	9 1.8	111 22.6	191 38.9	132 26.9	47 9.6	1 .2
(g) Consultants	4 .8	48 9.8	158 32.2	182 37.1	97 19.8	2 .4
(h) Police Journals	21 4.3	162 33.0	214 43.6	79 16.1	14 2.9	1 .2
(i) International Assn. of Chiefs of Police	24 4.9	164 33.4	194 39.5	75 15.3	33 6.7	1 .2
(j) Agency person(s) not in the research/planning unit	56 11.4	206 42.0	162 33.0	52 10.6	12 2.4	3 .6
(k) Southern Police Institute	1 .2	18 3.7	54 11.0	112 22.8	304 61.9	2 .4
(l) Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute	1 .2	4 .8	22 4.5	85 17.3	375 76.4	4 .8
(m) Northwestern Traffic Institute	0 0	49 10.0	137 27.9	148 30.1	153 31.2	4 .8
(n) Case Western Reserve	0 0	12 .4	11 2.2	46 9.4	428 87.2	4 .8
(o) Text/resource manual literature	41 8.4	160 32.6	175 35.6	57 11.6	53 10.8	5 1.0
(p) In-house experiment(s) survey(s)	20 4.1	165 33.6	207 42.2	71 14.5	24 4.9	4 .8
(q) Police Foundation	2 .4	22 4.5	89 18.1	110 22.4	261 53.2	7 1.4

other agencies to the detective who expects assistance from a fellow detective in another agency when on business there. This norm extends, as well, to police planners and researchers. In fact, as is the case with other police personnel, and particularly detectives, police researchers regard their relationships with other police researchers as valuable personal resources.

A second norm supporting this exchange relationship is the understood obligation of large, progressive, "professional" police agencies to share their knowledge with smaller counterparts. It is understood by members of the planning and research units in such agencies that their agency bears a leadership role. However, at least on occasion, this very norm that obliges superior departments to help inferior ones, can discourage exchanges between agencies of similar status that are located in the same area.

After "consults with other police agencies", two national organizations appear to play a major role in the research and planning activities of the U.S. police agencies. They are the National Institute of Justice and International Association of Chiefs of Police. Given that more than three quarters of the respondent agencies reported receiving publications from these organizations, the finding that about 40% of the respondents use their services always or often in research and planning is not surprising.

What was unanticipated in these results is the proportion of agencies which reported making use of the services of local colleges and universities in planning and research. A quarter of the agencies in our sample report making use of college or university resources at least "often" and 63.3 percent of agencies report using them at least "sometime." By comparison, this reported frequency exceeds that at which police agencies report making use of the FBI National Academy, the Southern Police Institute, the Police Executive Research Forum, the Police Foundation, or any other national police organization except the IACP.

THE NATURE OF POLICE RESEARCH

After identifying the topics on the research agendas of U.S. police agencies and describing the methods and resources they employed in their work, a third approach to answering the question, "What is police research?" asked respondents to react to a series of statements characterizing the "nature" of research as it was practiced in their agencies. Ten questions in our survey were of this type. The questions and the answers to them are reported in Table VIII below.

Responses to these questions generally confirm the findings we report above. One question in particular emphasizes the importance of exchange of ideas, programs and information between police agencies. More than 70% of the agencies responding to our survey describe the majority of their work as introducing new ideas which have been proven to be successful elsewhere. However, responding agencies are almost equally divided on the question of whether or not it is more important to make good use of the research of others than to generate their own. This apparent contradiction is probably reconcilable by understanding that the activity of introducing a new idea that has been successfully elsewhere may require substantial research,

planning, or modification before it is implemented in a new location or different agency.

TABLE VIII- On the Nature of Police Research

	Strongly Agree		Strongly Disagree		No Answer					
	#	%	#	%						
1) In the research unit ¹ in this agency, "research" usually consists of introducing new ideas which have proven to be successful elsewhere.	47	9.6	298	60.7	138	28.1	7	1.4	1	.2
2) In the research unit in this agency, "research" usually consists of producing written reports and studies in response to requests from management.	123	25.1	262	53.4	96	19.6	9	1.8	1	.2
3) In the research unit in this agency, "research" usually consists of identifying problems, proposing solutions, and evaluating outcomes.	162	33.0	262	53.4	60	12.2	6	1.2	1	.2
4) In the research unit in this agency "research" usually consists of responding to requests for information from other units within the agency.	65	13.2	250	50.9	160	32.6	15	3.1	1	.2
5) Most of the work done by the research and planning unit is designed to improve the quality of administration in this agency.	101	20.6	238	48.5	136	27.7	11	2.2	5	1.0
6) Most of the work done by the research and planning unit is designed to evaluate the effectiveness of "street level" operations.	53	10.8	224	45.6	196	39.9	14	2.9	4	.8
7) It is usually more important for the research and planning unit to make good use of research from other sources than to generate its own.	34	6.9	219	44.6	216	44.0	9	1.8	13	2.6
8) Additional training in research methods research methods would substantially improve the capacity of members of this unit to produce research that would be helpful to the agency.	158	32.2	255	51.9	74	15.1	2	.4	2	.4
9) The demands on this unit to respond to to respond to immediate concerns allow little time for long-term research and planning.	172	35.0	217	44.2	88	17.9	10	2.0	4	.8
10. This unit is provided sufficient resources to adequately conduct its research and planning activities	22	4.5	208	42.4	208	42.4	48	9.8	5	1.0

¹In agencies without formal planning and research units, questions of this type read "those responsible for research and planning" rather than "the planning and research unit."

Also supporting the importance of importing research, programs, and policies from other agencies is the finding that nearly 80% of responding agencies reported that day-to-day demands on them prevented them from engaging in long-range research and planning. This was the case despite the fact that nearly half of the responding agencies (46.6%) reported that they were provided with adequate resources to conduct their planning and research activities. Under such conditions, importing and, as necessary, modifying the work of others may simply be the most practical and efficient use of a police researcher's time.

In describing the nature and character of police research we must also report that *over 80% of the respondents agreed that additional training in research methods would substantially improve their capacity to produce research that would be helpful to their agency.* We do not regard this response as an indicator that research produced within police agencies is of poor quality. Rather we regard it not only as an acknowledgement on the part of police researchers that their research training needs improvement but also of their belief that improving their research training would of help to the agency that employs them.

What is police research? - A Summary Before proceeding to the next question we sought to answer about research in U.S. police agencies, it may be helpful to summarize our major findings about what it is:

*The research agenda of U.S. police agencies is distinguished by its enormous diversity. Although a few core responsibilities, policy manual revision, computerization, budgeting, personnel, and training, are common to the majority of police researchers, scores of very different types of projects are currently underway in U.S. police agencies.

*Not only is the national research agenda of police agencies tremendously diverse, but within individual agencies the diversity of topics under study in a given year is remarkable.

*Our description of the research agendas of U.S. police agencies produced the quite unanticipated finding that four months prior to the Rodney King incident, 65% of U.S. police agencies were either moderately involved or very involved in revising their agency's use of force policy.

*About one-third of the respondents in our survey reported to be conducting a total of 286 research projects that they believed might be of national interest. While a third of the agencies in our sample would present their research findings at professional meetings and conferences, only 8% reported that they had published research findings within the past year.

* Within the past year, more than two thirds of our respondents conducted a library or literature search, more than half conducted a study that employed a survey or questionnaire, and about a quarter did research that employed an experimental design.

*Other than NIJ Reports, few police researchers subscribe to journals that report

academic research on police.

* The single most frequently used research method of police is consultation with other police agencies. A latent benefit of the quasi-military administrative system is that its system of general orders facilitates interagency information transfer. Such transfers are also supported by the norms or police culture.

*A quarter of the agencies in our sample report making use of college or university resources at least "often" and 63.3 percent of agencies report using them at least "sometime." This reported frequency exceeds that at which police agencies report making use of the FBI National Academy, the Southern Police Institute, the Police Executive Research Forum, the Police Foundation, or any other national police organization except the IACP.

*Seventy percent of agencies in our survey report that research in their agency usually consists of introducing new ideas which have proven to be successful elsewhere.

* Eighty-four percent of the respondents in our sample agree that additional research training would substantially improve their ability to produce research helpful to their agencies.

WHO DOES POLICE RESEARCH?

This section describes the characteristics of those responsible for research. Police agencies are complex organizations. Structurally, they are marked by a division of labor which, in some form, is a response to a perception of the requirements of agency function. This relationship between structure and function is mediated in large part, though by no means entirely, by agency size. For example, a one officer police agency, (and there are still many such agencies in the United States) may perform virtually all the functions of a 10,000 employee big-city agency and have no division of labor whatsoever. The "chief" of such an agency may be a patrol officer, accident investigator, evidence technician, community relations/crime prevention officer, detective, public information officer, juvenile aid officer, jailer, dispatcher, secretary, and planner. It is only when a police agency grows in size that it possible for a division of labor to develop and to assign these functions to different individuals who to one degree or another can specialize in them.

Our national survey data offer strong support for the relationship between agency size and division of labor with respect to the planning and research function. (Tables IX and X below.) Although just over one-third (36.3%) of the 491 agencies in our total sample had formal research and planning units, the proportion of agencies with such units rises steadily in an almost perfect correlation with size from only 7% of agencies with 49 or fewer officers with research and planning units to a high of 91% among agencies with 1000 or more sworn employees.

Data presented in Table IX indicate that as agency size increases, the average number of police research employees increases. For police agencies with 250 or less sworn officers, the size of the planning and research unit, among agencies with formal units, is approximately one fiftieth of the sworn officer total. Above 250 sworn employees this ratio is on the order of 1 to 100. Civilian researchers are well represented in planning units of agencies of all sizes, but there appears to be a slight tendency toward a higher proportion of civilian researchers as agencies increase in size.

It should be emphasized that, although the correlation between agency size and the establishment of a formal research and planning unit is nearly perfect, there are, even among very large police agencies, many that have elected not to establish such a formal unit. This is not to say that planning and research does not take place in these agencies, only that it is not the exclusive province of a specialized unit.

Respondents were also asked if they reported to the agency head, and, if not, to whom they reported. Just over 65% of the sample reported directly to the agency head. Of those who did not (only 152 respondents indicated to whom other than the agency head they reported), 93 reported to the deputy or assistant chief and 46 reported to a division commander. Four reported to a first-line supervisor and the reporting relationship for five agencies was unclear.

Table IX: Agencies With Formal Research and Planning Units by Number Sworn Personnel, Type and Size of Agency. (PD=Police Agency SD=Sheriff's Office SP=State Police Agency)

Number Sworn Personnel	R&P Unit			Sub Total	No PD	R&P Unit			Sub Total	Total
	PD	SO	SP			PD	SO	SP		
49 or less	4	0	0	4	53	0	0	53	57	
50 to 100	24	0	0	24	110	29	0	139	163	
101 to 150	24	5	0	29	37	13	1	51	80	
151 to 200	13	4	1	18	11	6	1	18	36	
201 to 250	7	1	1	9	6	5	0	11	20	
251 to 350	9	4	2	15	4	5	0	9	24	
351 to 500	9	1	0	10	2	4	0	6	16	
501 to 750	8	2	4	14	0	1	1	2	16	
751 to 1000	8	3	3	14	0	0	2	2	16	
over 1000	21	3	9	33	1	2	0	3	36	
Unknown	5	3	0	8	10	9	0	19	27	
Totals	132	26	20	178	234	74	5	313	491	

Given the length of our survey instrument, we decided not to probe issues such as the education, training, or experience of those who were employed at police research. We did, however, inquire about membership in professional organizations. We found that 86.7 percent of our respondents reported that they or someone else in their agency was a member of the Association of Police Planning and Research Officers International, an international organization of police planners. By contrast less than five percent of our respondents indicated that they or

anyone else in their organization was a member or either the American Society of Criminology (3.7%) or the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (4.3%).

Table X: Number and Percent of Agencies With Formal Research Units, Average Size of Units, by Sworn Personnel, Agency Size

Number Sworn Personnel	R & P Unit		Average Number R&P Personnel		
	#	%	Sworn	Civilian	Total
49 or less	4	7.0	.75	.25	1.00
50 to 100	24	14.7	1.25	.79	2.04
101 to 150	29	36.3	1.52	1.24	2.76
151 to 200	18	50.0	1.47	.77	2.11
201 to 250	9	45.0	1.00	1.44	2.44
251 to 350	15	62.5	1.68	.87	2.53
351 to 500	10	62.5	1.60	2.70	4.30
501 to 750	14	87.5	3.71	3.43	7.14
751 to 1000	14	87.5	3.21	4.36	7.57
over 1000	33	91.7	8.06	6.76	14.82
Unknown	8	29.6	1.36	.88	2.25
Totals	178	36.3	2.95	2.59	5.54

Note: Percent figures for R&P Units are percent of each group not percent of total.

WHAT INITIATES POLICE RESEARCH?

Organizations do not engage in research without a reason. In order to describe what initiated research in the police agencies we surveyed, we first composed a list of fourteen factors that our own experience and the agencies we pretested suggested might be influential in initiating police research. Respondent agencies were asked to evaluate on a four point scale the degree to which each factor played a role in initiating research in their agencies. Responses to this question are displayed in Table XI. In ordering the responses in Table XI we combined the "great deal" and "somewhat" categories and sorted from highest to lowest among the fifteen fixed options we presented to our respondents.

Three observations about our respondents answers seem appropriate. First, the dominant position of changes in the law and concern for civil liabilities deserves emphasis. At least according to our respondents, there is no more important motive force for change in American than fear of civil liability. (We interpret the general "changes in the law" category to include changes civil liability exposure.) This conclusion was supported in interviews at our site visits. In fact, one police researcher reported that one way to get the attention and the support from police administrators for change was to suggest, even when the truth of such a suggestion was questionable, that unless the change were made the agency might suffer a civil action were the change not made.

Table XI: External Factors Initiating Research by Number and Percent of Agencies

Category	A Great Deal		Somewhat		Not Very Much		None	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(p) Law Changes	176	35.8	234	47.4	56	11.4	23	4.7
(p) Civil Liabilities	166	33.8	220	44.8	67	13.6	35	7.1
(r) On-Going Needs Assessment	140	28.5	235	47.9	85	17.3	31	6.3
(i) Successful Programs in Other Agencies	62	12.6	296	60.3	98	20.0	33	6.7
(p) Changes in Local Government	113	23.0	194	39.5	62	12.6	112	22.8
(p) Community Pressure	64	13.0	221	45.0	151	30.8	52	10.6
(i) Articles in Police Journals	28	5.7	244	49.7	156	31.8	62	12.6
(i) Professional Organizations	30	6.1	167	34.0	203	41.3	89	18.1
(p) Changes in Federal Government	40	8.1	136	27.7	132	26.9	163	33.2
(p) Changes in State Government	84	17.1	64	13.0	104	21.2	125	25.5
(i/r) Vendors of Police Equipment	14	2.9	108	22.0	196	39.9	170	34.6
(i) Articles in Popular Magazines	8	1.6	109	22.2	218	44.4	149	30.3
(p) Police Shootings	28	5.7	74	15.1	130	26.5	256	52.1
(p) Police Vehicle Fatalities	18	3.7	51	10.4	94	19.1	325	66.2

Secondly, response to this question about factors initiating police research confirm again the importance of the experience of other police agencies as a driving force for change. More than seventy percent of our respondents indicate that successful programs in other departments are at least somewhat responsible for initiating research in their agencies. Again, our own experience and our interviews at site visits confirm that one of most persuasive arguments that can be made to encourage the introduction of a new program is that some other police agency is already doing it successfully.

Finally, although on-going needs assessment and the introduction of successful programs from other agencies are high on the list of factors initiating research, much of the list and four out of six of the most frequently mentioned motives for police research are categories of "problems." This suggests that the majority of police research is done in response to the identification of some practical problem and constitutes (and this may be so even when it is innovative or imitative of a successful program in some other agency) an attempt to correct, avoid, or minimize some problem. In short, police research, as it is practiced in U.S. police agencies, is applied research.

WHO INITIATES POLICE RESEARCH?

The question of what initiates police research is, in a sense, inseparable from the question of who initiates it. Problems do not define themselves. If the vast majority of police research is done in response to perceived problems, how those problems becomes identified, raised,

recognized, and placed on the research agenda of police agencies is crucial to understanding the motivations for police research.

In our survey we asked six questions designed to probe the question of problem definition. They are displayed in Table XII.

Table XII: Agency Persons Initiating Research by Number and Percent of Agencies

Initiatives From:	A Great Deal		Somewhat		Not Very Much		None		No Ans	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Agency Head	290	59.1	160	32.6	26	5.3	9	1.8	6	1.2
Research Unit/ Those Responsible For Research	173	35.2	225	45.8	66	13.4	19	3.9	8	1.6
Other Administrators	134	27.3	265	54.0	74	15.1	16	3.3	4	0.4
Suggestions From Line Officers	49	10.0	277	56.4	139	28.3	26	5.3	0	0

Q 1 - In this agency, 'research' is usually initiated by individuals outside the research and planning unit/persons other than those responsible for research and planning.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Ans	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All	42	8.6	203	41.3	221	45.0	19	3.9	6	1.2
R&P Unit	27	15.2	72	40.4	69	38.5	7	3.7	3	1.7
No R&P Unit	15	4.8	131	41.9	152	48.6	12	3.8	3	1.0

Q 2 - In this agency, the research and planning unit/those responsible for planning and research exercise(s) considerable autonomy in choosing topics for study.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Ans	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All	32	6.5	180	36.7	246	50.1	23	4.7	10	2.0
R&P Unit	12	6.7	57	31.0	96	53.9	9	5.1	4	2.2
No R&P Unit	20	6.4	123	39.3	150	47.9	14	4.5	6	1.9

According to our respondents, by a considerable margin, the agency persons most responsible for dictating the agendas of police researchers are agency heads. Initiatives from the agency head also exceed all other factors by a considerable margin as well. We reported above that changes in law and civil liabilities led all external factors influencing research with 33% and 35% of respondents reporting that the influenced research "a great deal". By contrast the influence of the agency head was reported to be "a great deal" by nearly sixty percent (59.1%) of our respondents.

This finding is consistent with much that has been written about the highly centralized character of police administration. We do not dispute this finding, however, some qualifications and elaborations are necessary. In interpreting this finding it must be remembered that 63.7% of the responding agencies (313 agencies) did not have a formal planning and research unit. In those agencies, many of which were the smaller agencies in our sample, research and planning was a function that was handled by the agency head or the agency head and one or two key members of the agency's command staff.

Secondly, in agencies with formal planning and research units, we found in field interviews and site visits that the role of the chief differed markedly. In some agencies we were told flatly "the chief decides." More commonly we found that a focus of such units was often to persuade an agency head to adopt or consider some idea. In this way police research units are probably not much different from any other units in police organizations that must get the chief's approval for a major effort. One respondent described the situation in his agency this way: "Actually we can do anything we want, all we have to do is convince the chief that it was his idea."

Overall, we found about a 60-40 split among our respondent agencies on the question of the autonomy of planning and research unit autonomy in dictating their own research agendas. About thirty-eight percent (37.7%) of agencies with planning and research units reported that they exercised considerable autonomy in the selection of topics for study, a figure that rose to 45.7% in agencies without formal planning and research units. Despite the fact that these reported percentages are far lower than that accorded to the preferences of the agency head, when assessing the relative importance of the influence of the staffs of police planning and research units, it should be remembered that both figures are higher than the reported influence of any external factor initiating police research.

WHAT IMPACT DOES POLICE RESEARCH HAVE?

In assessing the impact of research on police agencies we relied on six questions, each of which appears in Table XIII. Responses are tabulated for agencies with and without research and planning units and by all responding agencies. We are aware that in asking respondents to assess their own impact on agencies we invite a tendency to overestimate that impact. Undoubtedly, some component of the responses we received inflate the actual impact of research. However, the mix of questions probing this question and the phrasing of the questions themselves was designed to control and minimize this phenomenon.

Table XIII: The Impact of Research, by Presence of a Formal Planning Unit and by Number and Percent of Respondents

1) The research and planning unit/those responsible for research and planning is/are more important in generating change than any other unit in this organization.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Ans		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
R&P Unit	24	13.5	62	34.8	88	49.4	3	1.7	1	.6	178	36.3
No Unit	22	7.0	117	37.4	154	49.2	19	6.1	1	.3	313	63.7
Total	46	9.4	179	36.5	242	49.3	22	4.5	2	.4	491	100.0

2) The research and planning unit/those responsible for research play(s) a substantial role in most administrative decisions.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Ans		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
R&P Unit	22	12.4	93	52.2	54	30.3	5	2.8	4	2.2	178	36.3
No Unit	68	21.7	179	57.2	55	17.6	11	3.5	0	0.0	313	63.7
Total	90	18.3	272	55.4	109	22.2	16	3.3	4	0.8	491	100.0

3) In the research unit in this agency, 'research' usually consists of producing written reports and studies in response to requests from management.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Ans	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
R&P Unit	77	43.3	87	48.9	12	6.7	1	.6	1	.6
No Unit	46	14.7	175	55.9	84	26.8	8	2.6	0	0
Total	123	25.1	262	53.4	96	19.6	9	1.8	1	.2

4) In this agency, the research and planning unit/those responsible for research and planning, regularly share(s) information with other police organizations.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Ans	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
R&P Unit	91	51.1	73	41.0	13	7.3	0	0	1	.6
No Unit	66	21.1	194	62.0	52	16.6	1	.3	0	0
Total	157	32.0	267	54.4	65	13.2	1	.2	1	.2

5) Generally speaking, it is not practical for a police agency to put research results into everyday practice.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Ans	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
R&P Unit	0	0	16	9.0	112	62.9	49	27.5	1	.6
No Unit	2	.6	44	14.1	213	68.1	50	16.0	4	1.3
Total	2	.4	60	12.2	325	66.2	99	20.2	5	1.0

6) Research efforts in this agency are hindered by a lack of interest at the command level.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Ans	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
R&P Unit	3	1.7	23	12.9	94	52.8	57	32.0	1	.6
No Unit	10	3.2	46	14.7	173	55.3	81	25.9	3	1.0
Total	13	2.6	69	14.1	267	54.4	138	28.1	4	.8

For example, in the question that asked about the importance of research and planning to making change in the agency, we deliberately phrased the question in the most dramatic form. We asked respondents to evaluate the claim that research and planning was *more important to agency change than any other unit in the agency*. By phrasing this statement in this most dramatic form it permitted respondents to disagree with the statement and still maintain that they were very important to organizational change - just not more important than everyone else. Despite the dramatic phrasing of this question, respondents from forty-eight percent of the agencies with formal research and planning units and forty-four percent of respondents from agencies without formal research units agreed with it. Likewise, sixty-five percent of respondents from agencies with formal planning and research units and seventy-nine percent of respondents from agencies without formal planning units claimed to play a substantial role in most administrative decisions.

In an attempt to probe this question from an opposite direction and elicit responses that would let respondents complain about insufficient impact, we asked them to respond to the statement that their efforts were hampered by a lack of interest in research at the command level. An overwhelming proportion (82.5%) of respondents disagreed with this statement, twenty-eight percent strongly so. We also tried to tap into any anti-research sentiment with the statement, "generally speaking it is not practical for a police agency to put research results into everyday practice." We found less than 13% of our respondents willing to agree with it.

Overall, our interpretation of these findings is that *there is little resistance to research in police agencies; the vast majority of top police administrators, including agency heads are generally supportive of it; research and planning units play a major role in agency change, probably second in importance only to that of the chief; and most play a significant role in most administrative decisions*. We reach these general conclusions despite the fact that there is probably a natural tendency on the part of respondents to exaggerate or overestimate their importance. However, it must also be said that while these statements characterize the role of planning and research generally in police agencies, there are a wide range of responses to all of these impact questions. To probe the question of impact further what is required is a means of sorting the research function into different dimensions, each of which can be seen to serve a somewhat different research role and respond to a somewhat different organizational need.

PART II
THE DYNAMICS OF POLICE RESEARCH

We have, thus far, attempted to describe the research agenda, research methods, and the character of research as it is practiced in U.S. police agencies, why is it done, who does it, and, according to the impressions and evaluations of researchers, the impact that it has on police agencies. This description was based almost entirely on responses to the national survey questionnaire.

In this section we attempt to describe the dynamics of police research, how its role and practice differs among police agencies and why it appears to do so. Although this analysis is grounded in major part on responses to the national survey, it is heavily influenced both by our own experience as police researchers³² and by site visits and interviews in twelve police agencies across the country.

This latter influence is most apparent in the conceptual framework that organizes and guides our analysis. There are countless ways the data from the national survey could have been organized and analyzed, an equally large set of criteria that could have been used to select agencies for site visits, and a nearly infinite number of questions that could have been explored interviews.

Be that as it may, our analytic focus was largely constructed in two dimensions. The first sought to distinguish between agencies that support what we will call "proactive" versus a "reactive" research function; the second between agencies whose researchers are largely "producers" of research as opposed to those who are primarily research "consumers."

PROACTIVE AND REACTIVE RESEARCH AND PLANNING

The first conceptual tool with which we sought to tease apart the dynamics of the police research function divides agencies into those whose research function is "proactive" and those in which it is "reactive." Agencies which reported that their research and planning units (or those responsible for planning and research) were largely responsible for dictating their own research agendas were identified as "proactive"; those whose research agenda's largely dictated by others were identified as "reactive." It is important to emphasize that these concepts refer only to whether research is typically initiated by those employed in research and planning or by others within the organization. Although "proactive" is a term commonly employed to mean "dynamic," "energetic," "vigorous," and a host of other laudatory adjectives, and "reactive" is

³²William E. Harver was formerly a Captain with the Richmond, Virginia Bureau of Police. During his career he served for two years in that agency's research and planning unit. Carl Klockars was formerly Director of the Police Research Office of the Harford County (Maryland) Sheriff's Department.

often associated with passivity, we do not intend to signal with our choice of terms any of these common connotations. We mean simply whether those who do planning and research get to set their own research agenda or have it set for them by someone else, and nothing more.

Agency responses to two questions on the national survey determined how their research function was classified:

Agencies were classified **PROACTIVE** if they answered the following two questions as indicated.

"In this agency "research" is usually initiated by individuals outside the research and planning unit. **DISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE**

"In this agency, the research and planning unit exercises considerable autonomy in choosing topics for study." **AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE**

Agencies were classified **REACTIVE** if they answered the following two questions as indicated.

"In this agency, the research and planning unit exercises considerable autonomy in choosing topics for study". **DISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE**

"In this agency 'research' is usually initiated by individuals outside the research and planning unit". **AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE**

Table XIV - Proactive and Reactive Research and Planning

"Exercise Considerable Autonomy in Choosing Research Topics"						
Count	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	Row Total
Row Pct	1	2	3	4	9	
Col Pct	A	B	C	D	E	
1		8	29	5		42
Strongly Agree		19.0	69.0	11.9		8.6
		4.4	11.8	21.7		
"Research Usually Initiated Outside R&P"						
2	11	62	113	12	5	203
Agree	5.4	30.5	55.7	5.9	2.5	41.3
	34.4	34.4	45.9	52.2	50.0	
3	18	97	96	6	4	221
Disagree	8.1	43.9	43.4	2.7	1.8	45.0
	56.3	53.9	39.0	26.1	40.0	
4	3	9	7			19
Strongly Disagree	15.8	47.4	36.8			3.9
	9.4	5.0	2.8			
9		4	1		1	6
No Answer		66.7	16.7		16.7	1.2
		2.2	.4		10.0	
Column Total	32	180	246	23	10	491
	6.5	36.7	50.1	4.7	2.0	100.0

Table XIV displays the distribution of responses to the two defining questions. Of the 491 agencies in our sample, 159 (35%) with a "reactive" research function are identified in the highlighted four boxes (C,D,H and I) in the upper right of the table. One hundred and twenty seven agencies (28%) with "proactive" research functions are identified in the highlighted four boxes (K,L, P, and Q) in the lower left of the table.

Both questions were designed to operationalize the concepts of "proactive" and "reactive" and appear to do so in a quite consistent fashion. Of the 205 agencies that could not be clearly defined by our criteria as clearly proactive or reactive, 158 are found in boxes G and M on Table XIV. This suggests that their agreement or disagreement with one or both questions was an equivocal response due to the fact that they were neither predominantly one type or the other. Fifteen agencies could not be classified because they failed to answer one or both of the defining questions. Thirty-three agencies, slightly less than 7% of our respondents, offered a mix of answers that we found logically difficult to reconcile.

The Research Agendas of Police Agencies with Proactive and Reactive Research Functions

According to our respondents, all of whom were employed in research and planning, the ability to dictate their own research agenda appears to make a consistent difference in the degree of involvement in different types of topics. Of the twenty-six topic areas we specifically inquired about in our survey, *agencies with a proactive research function reported a statistically significant (.05 level) higher level of involvement in twenty-two areas.* Only in accreditation, employee drug testing, health and wellness training, and vehicle pursuit policy were there no significant differences.

Two reservations must be entered, however, with respect to this finding. First, although we find proactive researchers report statistically significantly higher levels of involvement in twenty two of the twenty-six topic areas, in many of the areas the difference is rather small, on the order of 0.3 - 0.4 points between group means on our 4 point scale. These differences would seem to suggest that agencies with a proactive research operation are generally more involved in many different areas than those that are reactive. It does bear mention, though, that the topic areas where the differences between groups are not only significant but approach or exceed a half a point on our four point scale, budget, call prioritization, community and problem oriented policing, grants administration, and personnel deployment are among those that are most closely associated with major agency changes.

A second caution in interpreting the findings that appear in Table XIV is associated with the fact that 41 (32.2%) of 127 agencies with a proactive research function had formal research and planning units while 73 (45.9%) of 159 agencies with a reactive research function had formal research and planning units. Typically, in agencies without formal research and planning units the research function is assumed by administrative staff or members of command staff who may not distinguish their research function from their general administrative duties. Thus, their reporting of involvement in more areas than their reactive counterparts may be a reflection less of their research activities than their administrative responsibilities with their agency.

Table XV - Agency Involvement in Selected Research Topics, by Proactive and Reactive Research Function

Research Topic	All Proactive (N=127)		All Reactive (N=159)		p
	Mean	St Dev	Mean	St Dev	
Budget Compilations	3.55	.7757	3.08	1.0492	.0000
Call Prioritization	2.44	1.1888	1.84	.9907	.0000
Community-Oriented Policing	2.54	1.1255	2.04	.9636	.0001
Computerization	3.25	.9005	2.92	.0071	.0051
Capital Improvements	3.11	1.0448	2.88	1.1169	.0019
Career Criminals	1.71	.9929	1.42	.8442	.0073
Carrying Weapons Off Duty	2.31	1.1920	1.97	1.0459	.0111
Case Screening	1.87	1.1081	1.45	.8164	.0003
Crime Analysis	2.48	1.0224	2.21	1.0913	.0316
Directed Patrol	2.33	1.0684	1.92	.9971	.0012
Domestic Violence Reduction	2.15	1.0989	1.78	1.0041	.0033
Drug Education	2.75	1.0950	2.16	1.1111	.0000
Grants Administration	2.86	1.1409	2.57	1.1935	.0331
In-house Evaluations	2.77	1.0211	2.50	1.0365	.0307
Neighborhood Watch	2.16	1.1057	1.71	.9464	.0003
Off-Duty Employment	2.08	1.0778	1.74	.9016	.0043
Personnel Deployment	2.94	1.0143	2.32	1.0869	.0000
Police Equipment	2.67	1.0869	2.35	1.0311	.0096
Policy Manual Revisions	3.60	.7266	3.35	.9422	.0160
Problem-Oriented Policing	2.54	1.0746	1.92	.9714	.0000
Uniform Crime Reports	2.62	1.1122	2.35	1.1347	.0468
Use of Force Policies	2.99	1.0196	2.65	1.1315	.0080

To test this possibility we performed the same tests of significance we did for all agencies with proactive and reactive functions on only those with a formal research and planning unit. (Table XVI) Doing so eliminated significant differences in fifteen topic areas. Of the seven significant differences that remained, all were sample mean differences of one half point or more on our four point scale. While some portion of the reduction in the number of significant differences in level of involvement may be attributable to the reporting of administrative duties other than those of planning and research, the loss is more plausibly due to the reduction in sample size.

Table XVI - Agency Involvement in Selected Research Topics, by Proactive and Reactive Research Units

Research Topic	Proactive Units N=41		Reactive Units N=73		p
	Mean	St Dev	Mean	St Dev	
Budget Compilations	3.55	.7737	3.08	1.0492	.0000
Community-Oriented Policing	2.54	1.1255	2.04	.9636	.0001
Drug Education	2.37	1.0899	1.64	.5395	.0001
Grants Administration	3.23	1.0127	2.64	1.2289	.0121
In-house Evaluations	3.12	.9797	2.61	1.0057	.0107
Problem-Oriented Policing	2.64	1.1960	1.79	.8654	.0000
Neighborhood Watch	1.83	1.1159	1.26	.5008	.0003

Differences in Factors Initiating Research in Agencies with Proactive and Reactive Research Functions - While agencies with proactive research functions were more involved in twenty-two out of the twenty-six research areas about which we inquired than researchers in agencies with reactive functions, they also reported a higher sensitivity to a variety of factors initiating research. As reported in Table XVII they were slightly more responsive to articles in police journals and popular magazines, to professional organizations and line officer suggestions, and to civil liabilities. And, as might be expected by definition, they were substantially more influenced by initiatives from those responsible for research and on-going needs assessments.

Table XVII - Selected Factors Initiating Research in Agencies with Proactive and Reactive Research Functions

	Proactive N=127		Reactive N=129		p
	Mean	St Dev	Mean	St Dev	
Articles in Police Journals	2.65	.7403	2.34	.8100	.0011
Articles in Popular Magazines	2.14	.7870	1.82	.7095	.0004
Civil Liabilities	3.14	.7840	2.90	.9264	.0227
Initiatives from Those					
Responsible for Research	3.51	.6030	2.83	.7972	.0000
On-Going Needs Assessment	3.17	.7978	2.72	.8261	.0000
Professional Organizations	2.50	.8055	2.07	.8070	.0000
Line Officer Suggestions	2.83	.6518	2.60	.7632	.0071

The Impact of Proactive and Reactive Researchers- It was also the case that agencies with proactive researchers reported substantially greater impact of the research function on

agency change and substantially greater involvement of researchers in major administrative decisions. This finding holds for all agencies, both those with formal planning and research units as well as those without formal units. However, the extent of researcher involvement in most administrative decisions may be slightly less in agencies with formal units.

Agency Correlates of Proactivity and Reactivity - Because proactive and reactive researchers appear to have such differences in their impact on their agencies, we attempted to discover in our sample structural or organizational correlates of each type of research function. We found no differences in type of agency, (sheriff, municipal, county, or state police), no difference in accreditation, and no difference in the size of the research unit. We did, however, find significant differences exceeding the .05 level in agency size and in whether the planning and research function was organized into a formal unit. Larger agencies and agencies with their research and planning function assigned to a formal unit were both slightly more likely to have a reactive research and planning function.

Table XVII - The Impact of Proactive and Reactive Researchers on Agency Functions

Statement	All Proactive (N=127)		All Reactive (N=159)		p
	Mean	St Dev	Mean	St Dev	
	(Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree: 1 - 4)				
Those responsible for research play a major role in most administrative decisions	1.85	.6701	2.36	.6694	.0000
Those responsible for research are more important in generating change than any other unit in the agency	2.19	.7097	2.74	.6694	.0000
	Proactive Units (N=41)		Reactive Units (N=73)		
Those responsible for research play a major role in most administrative decisions	2.05	.7143	2.32	.6883	.0446
Those responsible for research are more important in generating change than any other unit in the agency	2.15	.7603	2.59	.6420	.0013

The area in which we found the only substantial significant difference between agencies with proactive and reactive research functions was in response to the question that asked whether or not the research unit or those responsible for research responded directly to the chief. While researchers in 57.9% of agencies with reactive research functions reported directly to the chief, researchers in 76.3% of agencies with proactive functions reported directly to the chief.

RESEARCH PRODUCERS AND CONSUMERS

A second analytic dimension we introduced to explore the impact of research on police agencies separates police researchers into "producers" and "consumers." We mean by these designations whether or not those who do research in police agencies, by and large, produce their own research or consume the research produced by others. Given that we reported earlier that the single most common method of research by U.S. police agencies is consultation with other agencies, we must quickly qualify our classification by saying that no police agency is in any strict sense exclusively a "producer." Likewise, because adaptation of the research of others virtually always requires the production of some local modifications of projects imported from elsewhere, even agencies that are predominantly consumers are in this sense producers as well.

Recognizing these qualifications on the concepts of both "consumer" and "producer" we operationalized the identification of each type in terms of respondents answers to two questions:

Agencies were classified **PRODUCERS** if they answered as indicated.

"In this agency, 'research' usually consists of introducing new ideas which have proven to be successful elsewhere." **DISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE**

"It is usually more important for the research and planning unit (those responsible for research and planning) to make good use of research from other sources than to generate its own". **DISAGREE OR STRONGLY DISAGREE**

Agencies were classified **CONSUMERS** if they answered as indicated.

"In this agency, 'research' usually consists of introducing new ideas which have proven to be successful elsewhere." **AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE**

"It is usually more important for the research and planning unit (those responsible for research and planning) to make good use of research from other sources than to generate its own." **AGREE OR STRONGLY AGREE**

On Table XIX we have displayed the intersection of respondents' answers to these two defining questions. Agencies whose researchers see themselves as predominantly "consumers" are found in cells A, B, F, and G, while agencies with "producer" research functions may be found in cells M, N, R, and S. Of the 491 responding agencies, 197 (40.1%) could be identified as consumers while 86 (17.5%) could be identified as producers. Of the 206 agencies

that could not be defined as either producers or consumers, 169 (34.4%) answered in such a way as to suggest that they were predominantly of neither type, 14 (2.8%) failed to answer one of the defining questions, and 25 (5.1%) answered in ways that were difficult to reconcile.³³

Table XX Producers and Consumers of Police Research

Count Row Pct Col Pct	"Research consists of introducing others' ideas"					Row Total Pct.	
	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Disagree 3	Strongly Disagree 4	No Answer 9		
"More important to use others' research than to generate own"	CA	B			E		
	O	11	18	14	1	3	47
	Strongly Agree	N 23.4	38.3	29.8	2.1	6.4	9.6
	S	32.4	8.2	6.5	11.1	23.1	
	UF	G	H	I	J		
	M	20	148	118	5	7	298
	Agree	E 6.7	49.7	39.6	1.7	2.3	60.7
	R	58.8	67.6	54.6	55.6	53.8	
	SK	L	PM	N	O		
	Disagree	3	51	80	1	3	138
	2.2	37.0	O 58.0	.7	2.2	28.1	
	8.8	23.3	D 37.0	11.1	23.1		
	P	Q	UR	S	T		
Strongly Disagree		2	C 3	2		7	
		28.6	E 42.9	28.6		1.4	
		.9	R 1.4	22.2			
	U	V	SW	X	Y		
No Answer			1			1	
			100.0			.2	
			.5				
Column Total	34 6.9	219 44.6	216 44.0	9 1.8	13 2.6	491 100.0	

While we found a systematic and significant difference in the research agendas of proactive and reactive researchers, there was no significant difference in the research agendas of producers and consumers in any one of the twenty-six topic areas about which we asked. We did find significant differences between producers and consumers in factors initiating research, the use of research resources, in respondents' perceptions of the nature of research, and in their perception of the impact of research on the agency that employed them. All of these significant differences in characteristics of producers and consumers are reported in Table XXI.

However, inspection of the significant differences in mean responses reveals that almost all of them, while significant, are so small that they fail to distinguish producer from consumer research functions in any meaningful way. Most are on the order of two tenths of a point on

³³One way to reconcile discrepant answers is to understand that the question asking about what research consists of in the respondents agency asks for a descriptive statement of fact while the other asking about the importance of generating one's own or consuming others research solicits an opinion. Thus a respondent could quite logically answer that research in his agency was largely consumption of the research of others, but that he believed strongly that producing one's own research was more important.

Table XXI - Significant Differences in Characteristics of Research Producers and Consumers

	Producers		Consumers		p
	Mean	St Dev	Mean	St Dev	
Factors Initiating Research					
(A Great Deal, Somewhat, Not Very Much, None - 4-1)					
Articles in Popular Magazines	1.85	.7595	2.05	.7843	.0447
Community Pressure	2.42	.8874	2.68	.8126	.0169
Initiatives from Administrators	3.16	.6483	2.92	.7641	.0119
Initiatives from Those Responsible for Research	3.30	.7832	3.03	.7787	.0078
On-Going Needs Assessment	3.14	.8833	2.85	.8769	.0121
Professional Organizations	2.09	.7612	2.41	.8269	.0028
Successful Programs in Other Agencies	2.56	.7912	2.78	.6775	.0007
Research Resources					
(Always, Often, Sometimes, Never - 1-4)					
Consults with Other Agencies	2.227	.6932	2.08	.6463	.0259
Nature of Research					
(Strongly Agree - Strongly Disagree, 1-4)					
Research usually consists of responding to information requests from other units	2.42	.7270	2.19	.7095	.0152
Research usually consists of producing written reports at the request of management	2.17	.7226	1.95	.7406	.0185
Demands on those responsible for research allow little time for long-range planning	2.12	.8734	1.72	.7358	.0001
Additional training in research methods would substantially improve capacity to produce helpful research	2.17	.6172	1.72	.6704	.0000
Research Impact on Agency					
(Strongly Agree - Strongly Disagree, 1-4)					
Generally speaking, it is not practical for a police agency to put research results into everyday practice	3.24	.5726	3.04	.5702	.0052
Research efforts are hindered by a lack of interest at the command level	3.38	.6168	2.97	.7315	.0000

a four point scale. The exceptions are the responses to the questions about opportunities for long term planning, support for research at the command level, and the need for additional training in research methods. Consumers report stronger agreement with the statement that demands on them allow little time for long-range planning while producers disagree more strongly than consumers with the idea that their research efforts are hindered by a lack of interest at the command level. A substantial difference between producers and consumers was found in their response to the question which probed the extent to which additional training in research methods would substantially improve their capacity to produce research helpful to the agency. It appears from this finding that *a substantial number of research consumers in U.S. police agencies would become producers if their research skills were enhanced.*

An additional significant difference ($p = .0000$) we found between producers and consumers that we regard as meaningful in explaining their production and consumption activities is the difference in the number of persons employed at research and planning. The average number of persons employed at research in agencies with a producer orientation was nearly six (5.98, std. dev. 9.23) while the average number in consumer agencies was about three (3.1, std. dev. 3.3). However, as one can see from the frequency distributions reported in Table XXI there are substantial numbers of both producers and consumers among research groups of all sizes.

Table XXI - Research Producers and Consumers by Number of Persons Employed in Research and Planning

Producers											
N	FREQ	PCT	CUM PCT	N	FREQ	PCT	CUM PCT	N	FREQ	PCT	CUM PCT
1	16	19	19	7	2	2	81	19	1	1	94
2	20	23	42	8	3	3	85	23	1	1	95
3	11	13	55	9	2	2	87	26	1	1	97
4	10	12	66	12	1	1	88	28	1	1	98
5	7	8	74	13	2	2	91	46	1	1	99
6	4	5	79	14	2	2	93	62*	1	1	100
Mean	5.977		Median	3.000			Std Dev	9.228			

Consumers											
N	FREQ	PCT	CUM PCT	N	FREQ	PCT	CUM PCT	N	FREQ	PCT	CUM PCT
<1**	1	1	1	5	14	7	88	11	2	1	98
1	62	32	33	6	5	3	91	13	1	1	98
2	51	27	60	7	6	3	94	14	1	1	99
3	24	13	72	8	5	3	96	15	1	1	99
4	16	8	81	10	1	1	97	32	1	1	100
Mean	3.079		Median	2.000			Std Dev	3.267			

p. = .0002

*Response of a relatively small agency that maintained that "everybody" in the agency was responsible for research and planning.

**Response of an agency with one person employed part-time in research and planning.

Our interpretation of these data is that *whether the persons responsible for research and planning in police agencies in the United States adopt a producer or consumer orientation is in some part a reflection of their level of research training. In some part as well it may reflect demands on those who would do research to rely on the research of others because of lack of time to produce their own. Producer researchers tend to have slightly larger numbers of persons employed at research than those that are primarily consumers, although one finds both producing and consuming research functions in agencies of every size. While both producers and consumers report support for research efforts at the command level, the interest in research is stronger in agencies that produce research than in those that are largely consumers of it. None of these differences, though, is sufficiently strong enough to determine whether or not police researchers will be producers or consumers.*

A TYPOLOGY OF THE POLICE RESEARCH FUNCTION

In the next step in our attempt to describe the dynamics of research in U.S. police agencies, we combine the proactive-reactive and producer and consumer dimensions. Doing so forms a logical typology of the police research function that consists of four principal types: 1. proactive-producers; 2. reactive producers; 3. proactive consumers; and 4. reactive consumers. (See Figure 1)

	Proactive	Reactive
Producer	Proactive Producers	Reactive Producers
Consumer	Proactive Consumers	Reactive Consumers

Figure 1: A Typology of the Police Research Function

Combining these dimensions of the research function in this way permits us to identify 169 police agencies with a planning and research function that corresponds to one of the four types: 29 proactive producers, 47 proactive consumers, 24 reactive producers, and 69 reactive consumers. These 169 police agencies whose research functions could be classified into one of these four types comprise 34.4% of our respondent sample of 491 police agencies. The remaining 322 agencies (65.5% of the sample) do not fall clearly into one of the four types. This is, of course, to be expected given that both of the defining dimensions, proactivity and reactivity, production, and consumption are continuous variables with only about 55% of our sample able to identify itself as predominantly of one type or the other.

The typology we offer should, therefore, not be understood as an empirical description of the organization of police research and planning. Describing only 34.4% of the agencies in our sample, clearly it is not. Moreover, as it reduces the sample size to only 169 agencies, the capacity to draw statistical inferences from that subsample is accordingly reduced. Rather it is a theoretical creation, a vehicle with which it is possible to identify and explore some of the dynamics that tend to shape the production and consumption of police research.

In discussion of the dynamics of types of research function we have drawn heavily upon information gathered in site visits to twelve police police agencies, each of which corresponded to one of the four types. These visits were conducted in the summer of 1991 and ten of the twelve extensive open-ended interviews were recorded and transcribed. They permit identification of organizational, contextual, and historical dimensions and attitudes of both researchers and administrators that it was not possible to discover or elaborate through the national survey.

AGENCIES SELECTED FOR SITE VISITS

The agencies visited are identified in Table XXII below. Three agencies were selected from each of the four types. The three individual agencies selected from among each type were chosen in an effort to secure a mix of agencies of different size, administration, geographical location, and political organization. Some consideration was given to travel convenience. Toward the end of each interview, we described our typology and asked respondents to identify which type best described the conduct of research in their agency. All twelve agencies agreed with our anticipated description of them, though, as we will note below, some described themselves as in the process of change. Table XXIII provides a summary of the characteristics of the agencies selected for site visits.

Table XXII : Agencies Selected for Site Visits by Research Type

	Producers	Consumers
Proactive	Proactive Producers Eugene, OR Multinomah Cty Wilmington, DE	Proactive Consumers Providence, RI Maryland State Police Key West, Fla.
Reactive	Reactive Producers LA Cnty Sheriff High Point, N.C. Kansas City, MO	Reactive Consumers Milwaukee Cnty Sheriff Newport Beach, CA Apopka, Fla.

Throughout the discussion of the dynamics of police research we will make reference to observations from the interviews taken at these sites. No promises of confidentiality were tendered during the field interviews. Because some interview material is not flattering to certain agencies, we have been selective in our attribution of quotes. Our own experience in planning and research and our familiarity with the internal politics of police agencies made it possible for

us to establish rapport rather quickly with the persons we interviewed. In most cases the interviews struck us as extremely candid. We were, on a few occasions, asked to turn off our tape recorder or erase portions of interviews that, upon reflection, our interviewees thought might be better treated as "off the record." Naturally, we obliged, but, naturally as well, made detailed records of this "off the record" information shortly after the interviews.

Table XXIII - Characteristics of Agencies Selected for Site Visits

Agency	Agency Size		# in R&P		Rpt. to Chief?	Formal Unit?	Accred-ited?
	Sworn	Civil*	Sworn FT/PT	Civil FT/PT			
Proactive Producers							
Eugene, OR Multnomah County	145	287	0/0	3/0	No	Yes	No
Sheriff, OR Wilmington, DE	143	507	0/0	7/0	No	Yes	No
	262	70	2/2	0/0	No	Yes	No
Proactive Consumers							
Providence, RI	440	80	4/0	1/1	Yes	Yes	No
Maryland State	1782	769	6/0	5/0	Yes	Yes	No
Key West, FL	77	33	0/3	0/0	Yes	No	No
Reactive Producers							
High Point, NC LA County	163	19	2/2	0/0	Yes	No	No
Sheriff, CA	7408	2857	3/0	1/0	Yes	No	Yes
Kansas City, MO	1139	576	10/0	4/0	No	Yes	No
Reactive Consumers							
Apopka, FL Milwaukee County	42	15	2/0	1/0	Yes	No	No
Sheriff, WI	455	133	0/4	0/1	No	No	No
Newport Beach, CA	150	70	1/0	0/0	No	Yes	No

*Figures for civilian employees include corrections officers in cases where an agency maintains a jail or detention facility, communications officer in agencies that operate their own radio dispatch, and fire and emergency medical service employees in agencies in which those services are merged into a single department of public safety.

TYOLOGY AGENCIES, STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS

Table XXIV below summarizes the structural characteristics, by type of research function of the 169 agencies that could be defined as containing a research function of one of the four types. There is a tendency for reactive producers to be found in larger agencies than proactive and reactive consumers, but considering the variations in size of all of the typology agencies as reflected by the large standard deviations and the large discrepancies between mean and median agency sizes this statistically significant difference must be treated with caution.³⁴

³⁴ The reader should also be reminded that all findings of statistical significance have some probability of being wrong by chance. We have accepted the .05 level by convention and, when appropriate reported the actual probability that the finding could have been a chance phenomenon. We will, in addition, remind the reader that in the course of preparing this document we have performed hundreds of tests of significance and we assume that,

Table XXIV - Structural Characteristics of Types of Research Function

		Proactive Producer N=29	Proactive Consumer N=47	Reactive Producer N=24	Reactive Consumer N=69
Number of Sworn Officers in Agency	Mean	376.9	212.3 [#]	794.7 [#]	227.6 [*]
	Median	95.0	77.0	163.0	111.0
	St. Dev.	1050	427	1726	310
	Typology Mean = 331.23		St. Dev. = 854.04	FProb ³⁵ = .0328	
Number & Percent Accredited		5 (17.0)	6 (12.8)	5 (20.8)	3 (18.8)
Type of Agency	County/Municipal	21 (72.4)	36 (76.6)	17 (70.8)	56 (81.2)
	Sheriff	6 (20.7)	10 (21.2)	5 (20.8)	11 (15.9)
	State	2 (6.9)	1 (2.1)	2 (8.3)	2 (2.9)
Number & Percent Who Report Directly to Agency Head		23 (79.3)	36 (76.6) [*]	12 (50.0) [*]	45 (65.2)
	Typology Mean = 68.6%		Fprob = .0384		
Number & Percent With Formal Research and Planning Unit		7 (24.1)	18 (38.3)	14 (58.3)	24 (34.8)
Employees involved in Research & Planning Sworn	Mean	2.9	2.1	3.3	2.1
	Median	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Typology Mean = 2.4		St. Dev. = 3.0	Fprob = .2406	
Civilian	Mean	1.6	.89 [#]	2.5 [#]	.85 [*]
	Median	0	0	1.0	0
	Typology Mean = 1.2		St. Dev = 2.6	Fprob = .0275	
Total	Mean	4.6	3.0	5.9 [*]	3.0 [*]
	Median	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Typology Mean = 3.7		St. Dev. = 4.7	Fprob = .0323	

at the .05 level, each of them has a one in twenty chance of being in error. This error figure includes cases in which true differences were not discovered due to chance variation and in which false differences were reported due to chance variation.

³⁵ The Fprob figure reported throughout the remainder of the document is the product of a one way analysis of variance. It expresses the likelihood that *all four* sample means were drawn randomly from the same population. It is thus a test of significant difference in the entire typology. The significant differences between individual sample means denoted by symbols *, @, #, and + above are the product of a Tukeyb difference of means calculation. Throughout the document we have reported analysis of data in terms of analysis of mean difference even when, as in the case of evaluative responses on the survey, only ordinal scale data is available. As doing so violates a necessary assumption of interval scale data, we have also subjected all of the below reported significant differences that violate the interval scale assumption to Kruskal-Wallace mean rank analysis. We found almost no difference in outcome and have chosen to report our findings in terms of differences in means because doing so makes differences far more easy to comprehend than would a presentation of it in terms of mean rank.

It is, however supported in a consistent fashion by the only three other significant differences in structural characteristics, the tendency for reactive producers to employ both more civilian and more total employees than other types and the tendency for fewer reactive producers to report directly to the agency head. All of these are patterns that suggest that the reactive producer type is more characteristic of larger agencies with a more specialized division of labor.

Beyond those differences reported for reactive producers, we were unable to find any other structural differences distinguishing types of research function. This is, in itself, an important finding in that it suggests that the type of research function an agency hosts is due to influences *within* rather than *of* the agency.

Table XXV summarizes all of the significant differences discovered among the four research function types. It is divided into seven subsections: I. Differences in Research Agendas; II. Differences in Research Resources; III. Differences in Research Methods; IV Differences in the Nature of Research; V. Differences in External Factors Initiating Research; VI. Differences in Internal Research Initiatives; and Differences in Impact of Research. These are, of course, the same categories into which we organized our discussion of the entire sample. In describing the dynamics that are associated with each type of research function we will begin with a summary statement based on findings and references to specific sections of Table XXIII and then proceed to elaborate on those differences with comments and descriptions from interviews and observations in agencies with that type of research function.

PROACTIVE PRODUCERS

Eugene, Oregon; Multnomah County Sheriff, Oregon; Wilmington, Delaware

Proactive producers see themselves as major players in the administration of police agencies. In nine out of ten research topics in which a significant difference was found, they have a significantly higher level of involvement than reactive types. (Sec.I) They make greater use of consultants than either of the reactive types (Sec. II), and, within the past year, are more likely to have conducted a study that employed an experimental design (Sec.II). They see the research they do as the product of their own initiatives (Sec.VI) and are less directed in their work by other units in the agency than either proactive or reactive consumers (Sec IV). Although demands on their time tend to prevent them from engaging in long term planning, they do more of it than other proactive researchers (Sec IV). They are more likely than reactive researchers to play a role in most administrative decisions (Sec. VII), and they see themselves more as participants in administration than as servants or a service to management (Sec.VII).

In setting these findings in context, the problem is to identify the forces that come together to support an organizational role of that type. Each of the sketches below describes a configuration of such forces that is unique to a particular agency and setting. We find it convenient to characterize those forces in general terms of (1) a combination of the assets of the individuals who occupy the role, (2) a structure, formal or informal, that recognizes the value

of those assets and preserves and supports them, and (3) a mandate or role that gives legitimacy to research involvement in a wide range of agency business.

Table XXV - Statistically Significant Differences among Types of Research Function

I. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RESEARCH AGENDAS

"Please indicate the degree to which the research and planning unit has been involved in the following issues WITHIN THE PAST YEAR" (Not, Slightly, Moderately, Very Involved, 1-4)

		Proactive Producer N=29 Mean/SD	Proactive Consumer N=47 Mean/SD	Reactive Producer N=24 Mean/SD	Reactive Consumer N=69 Mean/SD
(1)	Agency Budget Compilations	3.76* .6356	3.51 .7766	3.13 1.0759	3.25* .0012
	Typology Mean/SD	3.39	(.9136)	FProb=.0246	
(2)	Call Prioritization	2.28 1.1618	2.40*+ 1.1456	1.71* .8687	1.85+ .9591
	Typology Mean/SD	2.05	(1.062)	Fprob=.0114	
(3)	Computerization	3.45* .8275	3.17 .9399	2.71* 1.1602	3.01 .8659
	Typology Mean/SD	3.09	(.9439)	Fprob=.0294	
(4)	Case Screening	2.00* 1.1952	1.77 1.0260	1.38 .7109	1.43* .7948
	Typology Mean/SD	1.62	(.9512)	FProb=.0178	
(5)	Domestic Violence Reduction	2.24* 1.0907	1.94 1.0301	1.37* .7697	1.77 .9723
	Typology Mean/SD	1.84	(1.0080)	FProb=.0137	
(6)	Drug Education	2.90*+ 1.0805	2.61 1.0641	2.04* 1.0417	2.29+ 1.1128
	Typology Mean/SD	2.45	(1.1093)	FProb=.0147	
(7)	Neighborhood Watch	2.21* 1.0816	2.11+ 1.0589	1.42*+ .5836	1.90 .9946
	Typology Mean/SD	1.94	(1.0042)	FProb=.0174	
(8)	Personnel Deployment	2.97* 1.0851	2.70 1.0513	2.25 .9441	2.32* 1.1310
	Typology Mean/SD	2.52	(1.0996)	FProb=.0200	
(9)	Problem-Oriented Policing	2.48* 1.0563	2.55*+ 1.1192	1.83# 1.0072	1.94*+ .0956
	Typology Mean/SD	2.19	(1.0464)	FProb=.0018	
(10)	Use of Force Policy	2.96* 1.01712	2.87+ 1.0758	2.13*+ 1.1910	2.68 1.1179
	Typology Mean/SD	2.70	(1.1212)	FProb=.0270	

Note: Symbols *, #, @, and + denote significant differences between groups at the .05 level.

Table XXV - Statistically Significant Differences among Types of Research Function (Cont.)

II. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RESEARCH RESOURCES

"Please indicate how often you make use of the following in your research and planning activities". (Always, Often, Sometimes, Seldom, Never, 1-5)

	Proactive Producer N=29 Mean/SD	Proactive Consumer N=47 Mean/SD	Reactive Producer N=24 Mean/SD	Reactive Consumer N=69 Mean/SD
(1) Consultants	3.24* .9124	3.47+@ 1.0183	4.17*+ .7614	3.88*@ .8730
Typology	Mean/SD 3.70	(.9525)	FProb=.0003	
(2) Southern Police Institute	4.69* .6038	4.66+ .5999	4.08*+ 1.0180	4.52* .7972
Typology	Mean/SD 4.53	(.7720)	FProb=.0129	

III. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RESEARCH METHODS

(1) Within the past year, has the research and planning unit conducted a study which employed an experimental design? (Yes = 1, No = 2)

	1.55*+ .5061	1.83* .3799	1.75 .4423	1.88+ .3246
Typology	Mean/SD 1.79	(.4073)	FProb=.0023	

IV. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN THE NATURE OF RESEARCH

(1) "Research" usually consists of identifying problems, proposing solutions, and evaluating outcomes. (Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree 1-4)

	1.51* .5085	1.77+ .6644	2.13* .7409	2.19* .7910
Typology	Mean/SD 1.95	(.7501)	FProb=.0001	

(2) "Research" usually consists of responding to requests for information from other units within the agency. (Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree 1-4)

	2.69*+ .7608	2.36 .7350	2.13+ .7409	2.14* .6009
Typology	Mean/SD 2.30	(.7122)	FProb=.0027	

(3) The demands on this unit to respond to immediate concerns allow little time for long-term research and planning. (Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree 1-4)

	2.14* .9151	1.62* .7388	1.88 .7409	1.72 .7047
Typology	Mean/SD 1.79	(.7728)	FProb=.0276	

Note: Symbols *, @, #, and + denote significant differences between groups at the .05 level.

Table XXV - Statistically Significant Differences among Types of Research Function (Continued)

V. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN EXTERNAL FACTORS INITIATING RESEARCH

1. "As you look back on your research activity over the past year, to what extent did each of the following factors initiate research efforts in the research and planning unit/by those most responsible for research?" (None, Not Very Much, Somewhat, A Great Deal 1-4)

	Proactive Producer N=29 Mean/SD	Proactive Consumer N=47 Mean/SD	Reactive Producer N=24 Mean/SD	Reactive Consumer N=69 Mean/SD
(a) Changes in the Law Typology Mean/SD	3.41* .6278 3.15 (.7319)	3.15 .6909	2.75** .8969 FProb=.0101	3.19+ .6919
(b) Civil Liabilities Typology Mean/SD	3.10 .9002 3.01 (.8556)	3.13* .7972	2.54** .9315 FProb=.0348	3.04+ .8123
(c) Successful Programs in other Police Departments Typology Mean/SD	2.76 .7395 2.82 (.7035)	2.91* .6196	2.33** .8165 FProb=.0014	2.96+ .6333
(d) On-Going Needs Assessment Typology Mean/SD	3.24* .8274 2.88 (.8919)	3.15+ .8070	2.83 .9168 FProb=.0004	2.57** .8485
(f) Articles in Police Journals Typology Mean/SD	2.62 .6769 2.48 (.8100)	2.62* .8223	2.08* .7755 FProb=.0451	2.48 .8333
(h) Professional Organizations Typology Mean/SD	2.24* .6895 2.24 (.8257)	2.60**@ .8251	1.63**# .5758 FProb=.0000	2.20**@# .8328
(j) Articles in Popular Magazines Typology Mean/SD	1.96 .6805 1.99 (.7524)	2.24* .7940	1.63* .6469 FProb=.0114	1.96 .7418

Note: Symbols *, @, #, and + denote significant differences between groups at the .05 level.

Table XXV - Statistically Significant Differences among Types of Research Function (Continued)

VI. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN INTERNAL RESEARCH INITIATIVES

	Proactive Producer N=29 Mean/SD (None, Not Very Much, Somewhat, A Great Deal 1-4)	Proactive Consumer N=47 Mean/SD	Reactive Producer N=24 Mean/SD	Reactive Consumer N=69 Mean/SD
(1) Initiatives within the Research and Planning Unit	3.62*# .6219	3.49+@ 1.6260	2.75** .7940	2.78#@ .7250
Typology Mean/SD	3.11 (.7871)		FProb=.0000	

VII. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN THE IMPACT OF RESEARCH

(1) *The research and planning unit/those most responsible for research is/are more important in generating change than any other unit in the organization.*

(Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree 1-4)

	1.93* .7527	1.81+ .6801	2.25 .7372	2.36** .7664
Typology Mean/SD	2.19 (.7701)		FProb=.0005	

(2) *The research and planning unit/those most responsible for research play(s) a substantial role in most major administrative decisions.*

	2.17** .7592	2.19+@ .7413	2.96** .2041	2.75#@ .6551
Typology Mean/SD	2.52 (.7255)		FProb=.0000	

(3) *"Research" usually consists of producing written reports and studies in response to requests from management.*

	2.45** .7361	2.13+ .7694	1.83* .5647	1.74** .7603
Typology Mean/SD	1.98 (.7752)		FProb=.0001	

(4) *Generally speaking, it is not practical for a police agency to put research results into everyday practice.*

	3.31* .4708	3.11 .5608	3.25 .5316	2.94* .5472
Typology Mean/SD	3.10 (.5514)		FProb=.0079	

(5) *Research efforts in this agency are hindered by a lack of interest at the command level.*

	3.38* .7277	3.02 .7658	3.42+ .5636	2.88** .7353
Typology Mean/SD	3.08 (.7353)		FProb=.0014	

Note: Symbols *, @, #, and + denote significant differences between groups at the .05 level.

EUGENE, OREGON

The way I would describe the relationship that I have with them, I call, I think of it in terms of John Porter, Fred Wilson, Donna Isadore. We call it the P&R unit, but I think of it in terms of those three people. I would describe that relationship as very collegial and I think that that's primarily as a result of the fact that John Porter, who is doing the planning in there right now, is an executive manager and has been for 18 years. I have a great deal of confidence in the direction that he provides that unit. I would say that I keep them busy, but by the same token, they initiate their own work as well.

I think our direction around research for the past couple of years has really been more of a, I would call it, social research, surveying the community in terms of attitudes and trying to determine what types of services they want and the levels of services they want. In fact, we're going through a major process right now, city wide, to do just that.

"Do they have a law enforcement background?"

No. Neither one of them. Like I say, John Porter was the director of planning [for the City of Eugene] for 18 years. Fred Wilson is, um, you'd have to meet Fred. The man is a genius. And his, he has a technical background. He's in a Ph.D. program.... I can't even tell you what he's studying. But, ah, you know, he speaks several languages. He knows computers inside out. He's just a tremendous thinker. Those people, um, would not survive in this organization if they didn't have a champion. I feel like the role that I play is, I am their champion. And I am able to make things happen because of who I am that wouldn't otherwise occur. And so I think that's the unique set of circumstances that we have right now. Without somebody to promote the work that they're doing and to convince people that it's important, it would fall on deaf ears....

Bill DeForest

Deputy Chief
Department of Public Safety
Eugene, Oregon
July 8, 1991

If one calls the administrative offices of the Eugene, Oregon Department of Public Safety and asks for the Chief of Police, the caller will be told that they do not have a chief of police but that Bill DeForest is in charge of policing. As a Department of Public Safety, Eugene combines police, fire, and emergency medical services into one 430 member organization in which Bill DeForest is the highest ranking sworn officer.

Eugene moved to the Department of Public Safety structure in 1986 and in the subsequent five years worked toward the consolidation of the three very different types of service that each of its divisions offered. DeForest, as Deputy Chief of Administrative Services managed the business and finance function, central training, planning, research, and development, and served as liaison to the Public Safety Advisory Committee. When we interviewed him he had just assumed responsibility for position of Deputy Chief of Police Operations, but retained his role as supervisor of the Planning and Research Unit as well as his position as liaison to the Public Safety Advisory Committee. Both roles, as he sees them, are integral to his vision for policing in Eugene.

The Public Safety Advisory Committee is a group of citizens that meet monthly to work with the Department to set priorities, to review policy, to decide what levels of service should be offered to the community, and to determine what the community is willing to do financially to support those services. The Public Safety Advisory Committee is responsible, along with the Planning, Research, and Development Unit, for developing a twenty year plan for Eugene that will move it away from a traditional, incident-driven, reactive police agency to a community-oriented, proactive, problem-solving agency. The plan, entitled *Partnership for Public Safety* was produced as a product of multi-step strategic planning process that brought together groups of community "stake holders" to determine community needs and interests and employed a technique called "slot analysis" to identify the strengths, weaknesses, of the department and the threats, and opportunities they would be likely to face in the future.

Eugene's Planning, Research, and Development Unit designed the planning process, acts as liaison to the Public Safety Advisory Committee, and is charged with assisting in the implementation of the plan. This mandate, to transform the agency from its present "professional model" organization to one which truly integrates it with the community it serves, combined with the support of DeForest and the Public Safety Advisory Committee, gives the Planning, Research, and Development Unit authority to initiate research and analysis in virtually every area of agency operations.

As might be expected, there is both external and internal resistance to the radical transformation DeForest and the Planning, Research, and Development Unit are attempting to achieve. There is some community apathy, based on historical police-community relations that were largely public relations devices.

"But," says DeForest, "if we don't do it {integrate the community into agency operations}, than even places like Eugene will become like Portland and Los Angeles and Seattle and all those places. I mean, we know that reactive policing doesn't work. ...it's been demonstrated time and time again. And if the community wants to acquiesce in their responsibility and just believe that the police are going to go out and deal with all the crime problems and social ills that exist in their community, then we're going to fail. It's that simple".

In seeking to overcome internal resistance, DeForest employs a management style he calls "steering from the rear." It involves "planting ideas and letting them emerge in the organization." It marks his collegial relations with his planning, research, and development unit as well as other parts of the agency.

For the past two years the primary focus of the Eugene Planning, Research, and Development Unit has been developing the model for community input, evolving a definition of what community policing will mean in Eugene, preparing the agency's twenty year plan, and working with DeForest on its implementation. In the immediate future DeForest seeks to integrate the research and planning function into everyday operations and particularly to encourage the command staff to make use of the unit's research and planning skills. "I see at some point in time this whole unit (P,R,and D) will be an extension of our command staff and will be doing a lot of follow up work on the issues and those kinds of things that emerge from our decision making model, as well as I see the research component of this unit having, changing its focus to providing information that's going to enable officers on the street to do better work. ..There are people in the organization at my level who don't see this as being necessary. But it will happen. It makes sense. If we are what we say we are, it has to happen. If not, we're not what we say we are".

Only time will tell whether or not the Eugene Department of Public Safety will realize the vision of its future designed by the Public Safety Advisory Committee and outlined in *The Partnership for Public Safety*. "The people that we have in our current research unit are probably the most effective change agents that we've had in the organization for some time." But, says DeForest, their "real impact {may} not be seen for 15 years". If Eugene, its Public Safety Advisory Committee, and its Planning, Research, and Development Unit fail to realize that vision it will not be for a lack of Bill DeForest's passionate commitment to it.

WILMINGTON, DELAWARE

The Wilmington Bureau of Police employed, in 1991, a 262 sworn officers and 70 civilian personnel. Its Research and Planning Unit was composed of two full-time sworn police officers under the command of Captain Ronald Stoner. Stoner was also in charge of Wilmington's training, personnel, budget, and accreditation efforts, all of which are located in the same group of offices on the second floor of Wilmington's new public safety building. Having all of these administrative services near to one another and under his command permits Stoner to draw upon a broad range of resources in research and planning efforts and to mobilize the talents and expertise of more than a dozen people in brainstorming and planning sessions. It also facilitates exchange between members of the planning and research unit and officers assigned to other administrative duties.

According to Stoner, the three main responsibilities of Wilmington's planning and research unit are 1.) the development and publication of department policy; 2.) compiling the agency's operating budget in all non-salary areas; and, 3) application for and administration of both state and federal grants, an activity that had significantly increased since he assumed

command of research and planning. These responsibilities give Stoner and his planning and research unit access to virtually all administrative and policy activities in the agency, an opportunity Stoner and his unit read as an open invitation to engage in progressive change.

A "new breed" police administrator, a college graduate who recently earned a law degree from a local university, Stoner is exceptionally articulate, highly analytical, and politically savvy. He prides himself on having selected the best and brightest of Wilmington's police officers for assignments to the units he supervises and is aware, as are those who work for him, that a position in research and planning, budget, personnel, or grants administration can be a high visibility, fast-track opportunity for a talented police officer. He encourages creativity on the part of those who work for him and expects from them what he calls "self-generated ideas." His expectation is that those who work for him will be innovators and that their innovations will reflect well on them and on him as their supervisor.

Under the eighteen months of his administration the research and planning unit had made considerable progress toward accreditation, initiated a series of community policing projects, developed an innovative anti-drug program, the success of which encouraged the state legislature to increase its budget for such efforts from \$1 million to \$1.5 million in a second year.

When asked where he would place his research and planning unit in our four-fold typology, he immediately identified it as a "proactive producer," but added the observation that he hoped it would evolve into a "reactive producer" role. "At the present time," observed Stoner, "we are the ones who are making things happen in this agency. The more successful we are at showing we can get things done, the more we will attract ideas and initiatives from others. So far, most what we have done has been on our own, but if we continue to produce that will change."

Stoner's doubts about the future of the research and planning function in the agency are connected to the fact that his term of commander of the unit is limited by agency policy to two years. After two years he must rotate to another division, (he will be moving to drug enforcement) and another captain will assume Stoner's role in administrative services. By Stoner's calculation, there is a 50/50 chance that the proactive producing planning and research unit he created and encouraged will continue its success and, because of it, evolve into a more reactive producing unit. It will, according to Stoner, depend entirely upon which of the other eight captains the Wilmington Bureau of Police is selected to succeed him.

MULTINOMAH COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE, OREGON

The change from doing pure kinds of research to doing this defensive kind of research was really hard on us. Because all of a sudden we know we're doing good work, we know that when we put out a product it was ours and it was solid. .. And when I pick up a product from my own parent government and I see that its not only sloppy statistically and not only sloppy analytically but blatantly

dishonest.. that peaks my very being. It strikes that part of me that makes me a police officer - my sense of rightness and justice and fair play. It makes me boil! I don't know how I lasted as long as I did.

There was a time it was fun to work in here.

Sgt. Merlin Juilfs

Former Member of the Planning and Research Unit
8 July 1991

In the mid 1970's the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office was widely regarded as one of the most progressive and most innovative police agencies in the country. It was the first non-federal police agency in the country to require a baccalaureate degree for all new officers, a policy it instituted in 1964. In 1975, with Lee P. Brown, Ph.D. (Berkeley) as Director of Justice Services, it was the first sheriff's office in the country to adopt team policing and probably the first police agency of any type, to do so on a department-wide, without first implementing it on a trial basis.³⁶ In 1975 it had 229 sworn deputies and 165 non-sworn personnel and provided police services to some 180,000 people.

In July of 1991, it employed 507 non-sworn personnel, most of whom were corrections officers, and 143 sworn police deputies, of whom perhaps only 50 or 60 were performing police duties, serving about 60,000 residents of unincorporated areas in the county. The remainder of the sworn personnel were employed in court security, service of civil process, or other court service roles. What produced this decline in the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office police function was a program of aggressive annexation of county territory by the City of Portland that dramatically reduced the Sheriff's policing responsibilities and reduced that portion of his budget that supported police services.

The annexation had occurred in various stages over the past seven years. It forced severe restructuring of the Sheriff's Office and, understandably, created tremendous problems with police morale. An agency that once saw itself as one of the finest police agencies in the country witnessed its transformation into court and correctional services agency, in which the police function was progressively minimized.

The police planning and research function was transformed as well. Although Multnomah reported having seven full-time employees in its research and planning unit, research and planning was, in fact, only a small part of the activities of the seven person Management and Fiscal Services would be called planning and research by those who do it. Three of the unit's employees are exclusively occupied with budget matters, another specialized in office automation. What had occupied the Multnomah County researchers over the past few years was producing reports and studies that attempted to justify retaining portions of the police

³⁶ Lee P. Brown, (Ed.) *Neighborhood Team Policing: The Multnomah County Experiment, Multnomah County Sheriff's Office: 1976*, p. 8.

function or expanding it into new areas. As the annexation process was driven by political forces that were inexorable (expanding Portland's tax base, reducing pressure for services on the county, and doing so at the expense of politically unimportant taxpayers) the efforts and studies by the Multnomah County generally fell on deaf ears.

Despite the fact that the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office had become largely a corrections and court service agency and its police function continued to diminish and would, in the future, diminish further, the people in research and planning maintained a police rather than a corrections orientation in their research interests. They produced the defensive documents referred to above, helped promote a project in community policing in a low income housing project, tinkered with police policy and had conducted some community surveys in the past year but had not gotten around to analyzing them. They failed to identify on their questionnaire what their top five research activities were during the past year and when asked to do so during the site visit were hard pressed. We requested, in July of 1991, a copy of their most recent annual report. The latest one was published in 1989. We came away with the sad sense that they were police researchers, proactive and trying to produce, in an agency that was no longer seriously in the police business.

PROACTIVE CONSUMERS

Providence, Rhode Island; Maryland State Police; Key West, Florida

Proactive consumers see themselves as playing a significant role in the administration of their agencies. In five of the ten research topics in which a significant difference between types was found, they had a significantly higher level of involvement than the reactive types (Sec.I). They were more likely than the reactive producers to use consultants as a research resource (Sec.II) and were more likely than reactive producer agencies to agree that civil liabilities and successful programs in other departments initiated research efforts. They were also more likely than reactive consumers to agree that on-going needs assessment programs initiated research (Sec.V) and to see their function as identifying problems, proposing solutions, and evaluating outcomes (Sec.IV). They tend to see their research efforts as more self-initiated than is the case with the reactive agencies (Sec.VI) and are more likely than reactive consumers to play a substantial role in administrative decisions (Sec. VII). Lastly, they are more likely than reactive consumers to see themselves as more important in generating change than other units in their agencies.

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

One enters the building that serves as the headquarters of the Providence Police Department through a door with a smashed window. A desk sergeant sitting at an information desk will direct you to where you want to go if you do not know or cannot read the handwritten paper signs posted with scotch tape on the panelled walls. Arrows indicate directions to proceed to pay fines and which to proceed for other business. None indicated where to go to find the

planning and research unit, called in Providence, "Special Projects." It is located on the third floor, just outside the office of the Chief.

The Special Projects Unit is commanded by Captain Gerald Aubin who is the right hand man of the Chief and occupies the office next to him. Aubin is college-educated, articulate, analytical, and confident. Unlike the Chief, who came to his present position through detectives, Aubin rose through the ranks in administrative service assignments, starting out as a patrolman in Special Projects. He describes the strategy that advanced his career as being willing to accept and claim he could accomplish any project, even if, initially, he had no idea how to do so. Accepting such assignments gave him a range of experience and contacts within the Department and throughout city government that no other person in the Providence Police Department can claim.

The Special Projects Unit is composed of four full-time sworn officers and one full time civilian employee. They are responsible for policy development, purchase of new equipment, managing the agency's budget, coordinating special events including parades and demonstrations, long and short term planning, and monitoring the agency's educational incentive program. Within the past year they revised their force and pursuit policy, conducted a survey of all employees that solicited their complaints and suggestions for change, organized a series of committees to address the problems that were identified in the survey, and computerized the agency's reporting system in such a way that enables officers to make their reports by telephone.

Aubin believes that the Special Projects Unit is more important to change in the Providence police department than any other unit in the agency. He attributes its importance to a chief who supports him strongly and is willing to listen to suggestions and the fact that, along with him, the members of the Special Projects Unit exercise a virtual monopoly in the kind of information that is necessary to effect change. "Whether it is knowing how to get an electrical outlet installed or negotiate a contract with an architect for the design of a new police building, we are the only ones who know how to do it." This explanation of his unit's critical importance is an institutionally strategic version of the formula that has guided his personal career.

The range of his involvement in department affairs makes Aubin a very busy man and, in part, reflects his orientation as a consumer rather than a producer of police research. "I can't believe," he said. "that the kind of problems we have in Providence are unique to us. Someone somewhere else has already tackled them. I see no reason to reinvent the wheel." He believed that there ought to be some kind of national repository for department policies and standards should be established and was unaware that any resources of that type existed.

MARYLAND STATE POLICE

With more than 2500 employees and a \$145 million annual budget the Maryland State Police are about six times the size of Providence Department. Their Research and Planning Unit is staffed by eleven people, five sworn officers and six civilians, including a civilian director of

the Unit, Carl Banaszewski, who reports directly to the Colonel. They are an agency with an active network of national contacts with police planners, having hosted in 1990 the IACP State and Provincial Police Planning Officers Conference. They are located next to the training division and its library which receives nearly 25 different police planning and administrative publications and are members of a State Police electronic bulletin board on which they can solicit and exchange information.

They keep a detailed computerized accounting of every project they engage in. By the end of the first week in June of 1991, their list contained 258 projects, which ranged from issuing clarifications on agency smoking, drug screening, harassment, and affirmative action policies, through twenty or so orders updating and revising various agency forms, to compiling promotion eligibility lists, reviewing promotional exams, completing more than a dozen different types of surveys from other police agencies, and conducting their own studies of salaries in comparable agencies and a evaluating a variety of police equipment, ranging from 9mm handguns to soft body armor and cyalume light sticks. They report a substantial amount of their time involves dealing with adjustments to the agency's budget, which, in recent years has been subject to mid-year cuts and adjustments by the governor and state legislature. This, they report, has made budgeting and the planning and redistribution of resources that are a consequence of it a full-time year round project.

Though the survey responses of the Maryland State Police revealed that they were proactive-consumers, our interviews indicated a substantial reactive component to their work. Our respondents spoke of frequently receiving "notes from the superintendent" to "find out about" something. They also review reports and proposals from commanders in the field, especially to ensure they conform with the operating manual. However, they describe themselves as "information sponges," alert not only to problems and issues within the organization but developments in policing generally. They report, though, that the civilian Director of their unit, Banaszewski, is an intimate and close advisor of the Superintendent and it is often difficult to distinguish whether the idea for a particular initiative actually comes from him or from the Superintendent. Regardless of the source of the project they regard themselves as more important to change than any other unit in the Maryland State Police not only because they are frequently the initiators of that change but because of their control over the way it is shaped in the agency's policy manual and funds are found, or not found, to support it in the agency's budget will be heavily influenced by their input.

KEY WEST, FLORIDA

Within a month of coming here, (in 1978) the head of the detective bureau, two detective sergeants, and, I believe, one motor lieutenant were taken down and involved in an eleven ton (marijuana) smuggling operation.

Ah, one of the things that shocked me when I first came here was the attitude of this community towards illegal behavior. For example, people took the

attitude, quite literally, that being arrested for trafficking cocaine was like being arrested for DUI in my hometown. My hometown is Reno, Nevada.

Five, six years years ago, they took down the deputy chief of police, then the head of the detective bureau, one of the detective sergeants, along with a bunch of other locals on multiple federal charges, everything from income tax evasion to smuggling cocaine and running protection for cocaine operations, etc. An awful lot of people were arrested. The chief of police at that time was referred to an open court as an unindicted co-conspirator. He testified as being a bag man on a \$35,000 illegal house purchase and other things, but he wasn't charged. Basically, the department made changes back then, of which I take some pride in being the one that did substantially to help the changes. I was the only cop to testify against the crooked cops.. A bunch of cops testified for them, but they were all found guilty. They were. And in 1987, as a result of my work, a lot of other people's work, and consensus, at least some section of the community, they hired Chief Tom Webster, who was highly credentialed Chief of Police. And since then, the department has changed drastically. Unfortunately, Mr. Webster has been fired, effective next Thursday, and it looks as though we're going to be changing directions again."

Is his firing in connection with any kind of corruption?

No, in fact, I believe its just the exact opposite. As a matter of..we don't respond to special interest groups. We don't care who you are....if you're guilty of it, you need to be arrested, you're arrested. No matter what your political connections or who your friends are, or how much money you have. It's straight law enforcement, and it's equitable to everybody.

Bill Mc Neill
Captain
Key West Police Department
Florida
9 August 1991

Although it employs 110 people, the Key West, Florida, Police Department does not have a formal planning and research unit. The person most responsible for planning and research is the Chief, Tom Webster, who was hired in 1987 to clean up a department with a long history of mismanagement and corruption. His chief assistants in that effort were Bill McNeill, whose testimony in a federal investigation was crucial to the criminal prosecution of Webster's predecessors in the agency, and Major L.J. Mertz, a graduate of the FBI National Academy and an experienced, professional police administrator, whom Webster brought to Key West in 1989 to help him with his reform efforts. On the day that Webster was fired (for refusing to renegotiate a substantial reduction in his salary), Mertz's position was abolished. As the top

three administrators in the agency, they dictated their own reform agenda, making them "proactive" in our typology. They were "consumers" partially because of their lack of resources, partly because there was little time to do research, and partly because the changes that needed to be made were so obvious and so fundamental that they did not require invention.

A major effort of Webster, Mertz, and McNeill was creation of a policy and procedures manual. When Webster arrived in 1987 the department had what officers called "the little blue book." It was lifted from the City of Miami in the mid-fifties, revised in the mid-sixties and contained a set of rules and regulations that were largely ignored. There was no mention in it of use of force, but it instructed officers not to lend their motorcycles to anyone without the permission of the chief. The final instruction in it quaintly prohibited officers from playing dominoes in public.

One consequence of the absence of policy was that there was no control of evidence or recovered stolen property. Under Webster, one officer was prosecuted for running a stolen property ring, numerous others, including an internal affairs investigator, resigned in the face of investigation. These dismissals and resignations permitted Key West to hire new officers and promote and reassign to positions of responsibility those who could be trusted. The new procedures called for extensive, serious background checks on all new recruits and established a probable cause drug testing policy for all employees. (Florida law prohibits random testing.)

Throughout the course of developing new policy, the emphasis was on first creating controls on opportunities for corruption and then on areas that exposed the agency to civil liability. It has a progressive use of force and pursuit policy, a strict evidence control program, and does serious internal affairs investigations.

After Webster's dismissal and the abolition of Mertz's position, McNeill predicts that the effort to create department policy and procedures will probably stop. Or possibly, says McNeill "someone will take some model policies and procedures from Nome, Alaska, or somewhere, or another agency's policies and procedures, and drop them in and hope they fly, which they probably won't."

REACTIVE PRODUCERS

High Point, North Carolina; Los Angeles County Sheriff, California; Kansas City, Missouri

The impact and role of reactive producers is more limited than that of the proactive types. In terms of research topics, they did not differ significantly from reactive consumers, but there were significant differences compared with the proactive types (either one or both) in seven of the ten areas where such differences were found (Sec.I). They make less use of consultants than proactive agencies (Sec.II) and are less likely than proactive producers to see their role as identifying problems, proposing solutions, and evaluating outcomes (Sec.IV). They are generally less likely than the other types to be motivated by external factors in initiating research

(Sec. V) and more likely than the proactive types to have their agendas set by others (Sec. VI). Reactive producers are less involved in major administrative decisions than either of the proactive types. As our interviews demonstrate, however, this does not mean that agencies of this type are not progressive or do not have an active research agenda.

HIGH POINT, NORTH CAROLINA

I'm impressed with this guy (John Faircloth, Chief of High Point). He's looking down the road. He's a visionary. Seeing things down the road. What do we need to be doing next year, five years from now, fifteen years. He's really well read, keeps up on what's going on. Ah, when we went into this, ah, community policing, he had done his research. His own research. He knew what was, he had read what was working and what was not working... He's the reason I went into (police) work in the first place, and the reason I'm here now..

He's getting ready to retire this year, but about a year ago he came back (from a Southwest Law Enforcement Institute Seminar on Demming Management) with new enthusiasm... He came back all fired up. And it's lit some fires around here. He said, and, in all those years of police work, that was probably the best program he'd ever been to. He said it was tremendous. When he came back, and, ah, we've been having sessions about once a month, ah, just reviewing some of the things that he has learned, and how he interpreted, how he interpreted it. We did not have a mission statement. There is a group working on that right now. He wanted a training outline, .. community policing, incorporating some of that. ..I was on that task force. We're getting ready to change our work schedule (to facilitate the community policing effort).

Maybe my eyes are shaded by the clouds and I can't see through them, but, ah, a good portion of the officers realize that this is, this is what we need to be looking forward to.....getting more involved in the community because we're getting our, pardon me, we're getting our butts kicked. I mean crime is soaring.....we could put a cop on every corner and I don't think it would help a lot sometimes, you know. They realize that community involvement is going to have to be the answer.

Randy Tysinger
Captain
High Point Police Department
24 June 1991

Two major forces drive research and planning in the High Point, North Carolina, Police Department. One is the Chief, John Faircloth. The other is a vision of community policing that

he, Randy Tysinger, the head of his community policing team, and other members of his Command Staff have been trying to develop and implement.

Tysinger heads a team of six lieutenants (there is no sergeant rank in High Point) each of whom is designated as a community liaison officer in one of the six zones into which the 44 square mile city is divided. Each works in support of the patrol officers who are assigned beats in those zones, but none has supervisory responsibility for those patrol officers. They are all volunteers for their assignment. They are, says Tysinger, "people-oriented" rather than "enforcement-oriented" police officers whose "total job" is to "coordinate anything that need to be done in the community." He offers an example:

We had a housing project. There were signs.....posters that were going up all around town for a party, Friday night....it gave the date. Ah, \$3.00 admission, kegs of beer, whatever. And this is in a housing complex, at a house. Federal housing complex. And we knew exactly what was going to happen. We could picture 200 or 300 people there, cops being called. One of my officers, there were two of them actually, went out and they talked to them. They asked, you know, "What are you doing?" She said, "Well, my brother's coming in. He's lived out of state for about four years, and we just wanted to have a party, you know, and I'll get some kegs of beer, and"

They said, "Well, lady. Do you know what's gonna happen if you put these posters up?" I mean, they were, she put them up for at least a mile away from her home, and in one of the pizza places down here. They said, "Do you realize what's going to happen? All of these signs up.....you're gonna have every bit of riff-raff coming in, especially when the clubs close..." And she lives, probably four blocks from some of the clubs. "When they close, they're all going to come down here, and you're gonna have a heck of a time." And she said, "God! I never thought about that." She said, "I'll get them all, I'll get my signs off." She said, "We won't do it." She said, "I'll just have my brother over, and invite some friends over." And she was really appreciative of the fact that that, hey, we took the time to come out and say, "Do you know what's really going to happen?" Rather than wait until that night, and

We have, housing authority has off-duty officers working, so they were aware of it, and they, you know, they took the approach, we'll wait until Friday night, and we'll go in and just arrest everybody there. That was the sort of philosophy they took. But we, all we could see was rocks being thrown at police cars, and, 200 drunken people, but nothing happened.

You know, that may seem minor and insignificant, but I think it's, I think it's very indicative of what we're trying to do, and what we are doing. It's those minor little things that, ah, you know, it's hard to say, "Well, yeah, we did that."

And a lot of it sounds very insignificant. I mean, nothing happened. So, what's the big deal. That was it, the big deal is that. Nothing happened.

At the time of our interview, Faircloth had organized, in addition to Tysinger's unit, four task forces, each of which addressed a different problem but was guided in a direction that would support the community policing effort. One of the task forces were charged with developing a mission statement consistent with the community policing effort. Another sought to reform evaluation, and another the agency's work schedule. The fourth was charged with developing a new approach to training that would give officer's an appreciation of the lives of the people they policed:

The training (task force) looked at incorporating the philosophy of community policing into the whole aspect of training. Ah, one of my big things is to look at the type of people that you're working with out there. And we're gonna branch out, rather than sit there and tell them about, we're gonna take them to some of these, some of these places, and let them, let them spend some time in a mill where they make sox all day. .. I worked in the mill when I was in college. I had forgotten.. I went through one of the mills here that makes socks. And they had people .. they had sock forms that came through. They were metal, they were about this wide, a metal foot that was about this thick. They had a person that their only job was to sit there and pull socks down over those forms. And they were about this far apart, and they went through an oven cured, came back out, and they took them off. You tell me if you sit there 8 hours a day, you don't know why people get drunk and fight. I mean, it was very obvious to me but some of our officers, ah, lead a very sheltered life.

They come on pretty young, and have very few life and work experiences. Ah, kind of always wanted to be police officers. So, we're gonna plan to take them into some of those places. Let them see how people.....and that's a large percentage of what you have in this community. Take them into a furniture plant, and let them see people put furniture together and see people standing all day long at buffing tables.

Um, we have a museum here, and we'll take you on a tour of High Point. Explain, you know, you ride through, and you see streets named after these folks, but you don't know why. You know, where they got the name. And you'll find out where they got the names, and you'll still see those names appear in the newspaper every day. Their grandchildren or great-grandchildren. And you know why things are like they are in High Point. Ah, you know, I for years in training, we, you know, all we taught was this is your baton, this is how you use this. Or this is how to write the report. But, I think, if we get them involved, let

them know more about the city, why things are the way they are. I think they'll do a better job. And I think they'll understand some things.

Despite the fact that High Point was engaged in devising a version of community policing that was unique to them, exploring a definition of their mission, and experimenting with approaches to training that they hoped would help them realize that mission, they were reluctant to identify themselves as "producers." They acknowledged that they had been stimulated by seminars and training, admitted that a community survey they had done was a composite of questionnaires they had gathered from other agencies, and credited a professor from a local college with assistance in its design. They reported that the leaders of three of the four task forces were graduates of the Southern Police Institute and the first thing each did after receiving his assignment was to telephone a former instructor to describe their assignment, seek his guidance, and get references to other SPI graduates who might be involved in the same area.

We remained comfortable with our classification of High Point as a "producer," despite their the extent to which they drew upon the work of others. It appeared to us that they were engaged in a highly creative process which was not only transforming their agency but developing and exploring the consequences and implications of a new theory of policing. Their research did not involve systematic quantitative measurement but accumulating anecdotes and experiences, including some that recalled why "nothing happened," that, they felt, advanced the theory that guided them.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE, CALIFORNIA

*And so these men of Hindostan
Disputed loud and long,
Each of his own opinion
Exceeding stiff and strong,
Though each was partly in the right,
And all were in the wrong!*

John Godfrey Saxe
The Blind Men and the Elephant

Like the six, learned, blind men of Hindostan who in Saxe's famous poem came away from their brief encounter with an elephant finding it, respectively, to be much like a wall, a spear, a snake, a tree, a fan, and a rope, we came away from our site visit to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department describing it as a reactive producer of research. We fully realize that this classification is largely a reflection of the portion of this massive beast onto which we happened to fall. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department employs more than 10,000 people. The jails for which it is responsible hold an average daily inmate population in excess of 22,000. It provides, on a contractual basis, police services to some 45 municipalities, furnishing each of them with relatively autonomous local police forces ranging in size from a

few deputies to more than three hundred. It runs a transportation system with more than 100 vehicles that move nearly 2 million passengers a year.

It does not have a formal research and planning unit, though it identifies four persons, a sergeant, three deputies, and a civilian employee, as most responsible for research and planning. They serve as the support staff for the department's Executive Planning Council, a group chaired by the undersheriff and composed of two assistant sheriffs, division commanders and civilian division directors, in-house council, and psychological services director. The Executive Planning Council meets once a week to review and pass on planning decisions and projects that are of sufficient size or scope to warrant their attention.

The Executive Planning Staff reviews reports and proposals prior to their being placed on the Executive Planning Council agenda. They will often prepare executive summaries or help polish up reports and presentations. When they believe it appropriate, they will issue opinions on proposed projects, delivering them to the Undersheriff. The Undersheriff, who functions as the executive officer of the Sheriff's department and chairs the Executive Planning Council determine what, and what will not appear on the council agenda.

The items for the agenda of the Executive Planning Council may be initiated from anywhere in the organization, but they typically must work their way up to the council by a division commander or a civilian division director, if they are not stimulated by the sheriff, undersheriff, assistant sheriff, or a member of the Executive Planning Staff. In addition to monitoring the flow of business to Executive Planning Council, the Executive Planning Staff monitors legislation, state, federal, and local, evaluates its impact, advises the sheriff on support or opposition, and lobbies and testifies before legislative committees on behalf of the sheriff.

Despite the fact that plans and projects with agency-wide implications are approved, disapproved, or returned for further study by the Executive Planning Council, research and planning activities are profoundly decentralized and often highly specialized. There are separate and specialized units in communications, management information, forensics, facilities planning, budget, accounting, transportation, and automotive services. They have a unit which does nothing but design jails. Moreover, while captains who are in charge of the forty-five or so contract police agencies are all members of the Sheriff's Department, each exercises considerable autonomy in delivering police services of a type that is appropriate to the community contracting for that service. Among the worst things that could happen to a captain of a local contract command is to lose the contract and have a municipality create its own police force. They are, therefore, quite receptive to community needs and only in rare instances has a community that contracted with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department decided to form a municipal force of its own.

In the 1970's the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office had a large, centralized planning unit, but dissolved it under the pressure of budget limitations. It looks back on the decision as one that was probably wise, irrespective of budget considerations. The theory, according to the present Executive Planning Council Staff, is that each unit or division is an expert in its special

area and planning and research should come from that area rather than from generalist planners in a central planning unit. It is a theory of the organization of the research function that envisions dozens of proactively producing decentralized units petitioning a central council for approval to proceed with their plans and projects.

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

I'd say we're the Type B's in a Type A organization. Our unit has a reputation among the command ranks of 'it goes there and disappears. We never see it again'. Candidly, it doesn't disappear. But those folks out there... (are) very action oriented... want to handle everything like a call for service... they don't understand you can't do research that way. If you do, you put out a bad product that's extremely flawed and (research) doesn't work that way. ...if you're looking (out) for the welfare of the organization, you're trying to anticipate the unanticipated consequences... sometimes they don't understand that.

Officer James Kobolt
Project Officer
Staff Research Section
Administrative Analysis
Kansas City Police Department
June, 1991

There has been an active research function in the Kansas City Police Department for about forty years. During that time it has changed in both form and mandate. A very brief sketch of its evolution will be helpful in understanding what it is today. According to John Kobolt planning in the Kansas City Department started in the 1950's during the tenure of Chief Bernard Brennan. When Clarence Kelly became Chief in 1961, he maintained Brennan's organization for a while but eventually moved to a decentralized planning model under which commanders would essentially be the agency's planners. As it turned out the day-to-day demands on the commanders were such that their planning efforts suffered and in the 1970's the department eventually organized a centralized planning unit.

That unit was divided into two separate sections. One was called the "Proactive Planning Unit" and the other the "Reactive Planning Unit."³⁷ The primary purpose of the Reactive Planning Unit was to take care of issues and problems brought to its attention by the department. The "Proactive Planning Unit" was given the mandate to initiate ideas, to engage in brainstorming and "what if" exercises, to scan what other departments were doing and consider the

³⁷Having developed our typology two years before our visit to Kansas City and with no knowledge of their history or that the terms "proactive" and "reactive" had ever been previously applied to research and planning gave us some inkling of how Darwin might have felt upon his arrival in Galapagos to find the turtles labeled with the inscription, "a product of natural selection".

potential for their application to Kansas City. As a consequence of financial limitations and the agency demands on the Reactive Planning Unit, the planning and research function was restructured into an "Administrative Analysis Unit." Although the administrative analysis unit was divided into a "research" section and a "planning" section, the "research" function became progressively more driven by reactive demands. "We found ourselves, says Kobolt, "doing research but it was all guided research, applied research. The organization would tell us what the problem was and want a response on how they should deal with it...Research kind of found itself in the reactive mode."

At the time they completed their questionnaire for the national survey in the fall of 1990, they were, therefore, classified as "reactive producers." However, between that time and our site visit in June of 1991, their formal structure remained unchanged but...

.. Now, the guidance that we've been given in our recent staff meetings with Chief (Steven) Bishop is that he doesn't like operating that way. He feels like there are too many things that sneak up and bite us. And so our charge has been moved back to the, to the proactive mode - to do the 'what if', the trend analyses, to do, to continually do environmental scans, to find out what we can do to, to, to make this police department more responsive to the needs of the community. And, you know, I find that really exciting. I, I think that's, I mean, that's what we ought to be doing. And I think we're headed back into that direction, but we're not there yet. Ah, and what he wants, what they want us to do is to pull our ideas out down here and that's terribly risky for management. I mean, that really is when you, when you start taking on the bureaucratic models of police agencies. That is terribly, terribly risky to take people and say, 'We're gonna turn you loose. We want your ideas.' 'But we don't just want your ideas, we want a workable plan to go along with those ideas.' And, so, so for a lot of us down here right now, we're really excited about that. And we're, we're really chomping at the bit. Chomping at the bit to be cut loose, and getting to work on our little pet projects that we had sitting in the drawer now for a while.

In January of 1992 the name of the Administrative Analysis Unit was changed to "Planning and Research" and what previously were called the "Research" and "Planning" sections of it were retitled, respectively, "Special Projects and Programs" and "Policy and Procedures." "Special Projects and Program" continues to operate in a proactive mode. Throughout the many phases of its evolution, the research and planning function in Kansas City reported to a committee composed of deputy chiefs that functioned in much the same manner as the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Executive Planning Council. It should be added that this committee of deputy chiefs received research and planning proposals from other units in the agency. In particular, Fiscal Services was responsible for grant funding and for long term planning, particularly plans which involved capital projects.

The history of the research function in Kansas City illustrates a special kind of vulnerability it may tend to suffer from in police organizations. It is often one of the first

functions to be reduced under the strain of tight budgets and, whether centralized or decentralized, tends to experience some pressure to diminish its creative and innovative side to support immediate management needs. To resist such pressures, the Kansas City experience suggests that, in order to endure, the proactive research mode requires both an explicit definition and certain institutional or organizational arrangements that preserve it.

REACTIVE CONSUMERS

Apopka, Florida; Milwaukee County Sheriff, Wisconsin; Newport Beach, California

Reactive consumers do not dictate their own research agenda, nor do they produce their own research. They tend not to be the major players in their organizations. They are less involved than proactive types in six of the ten research topics for which a significant difference between types was found (Sec.I). They were less likely than the proactive agencies to use consultants (Sec.II) and less likely than proactive agencies to describe their function as identifying problems, proposing solutions, and evaluating outcomes. Their research activity usually means responding to information requests from other parts of the organization (Sec.IV). On-going needs assessments initiated less research for them than for the proactive agencies while changes in the law, civil liabilities, and successful programs in other departments initiated more research for them than it did for reactive producers (Sec.V). They were less likely than proactive agencies to play a major role in most administrative decisions or to see themselves as prime movers in organizational change (Sec.VII).

APOPKA, FLORIDA

I think the insecurity (of the commanders) comes when you realize that when a chief administrator takes, makes all the decisions, makes all the calls, the buck stops here, there's no responsibility out there on these men out here. Consequently, change that around to where you place the responsibility on the people..hey, you know, now you have to answer for it. That can be frightening to someone who has been under the other regime.

That's what he was talking about, the placing the responsibility on the division heads. Since he (Chief Bob Campbell) took office and realizing the need for research and training and this and that, we stepped out and made contact with APPRO, which is a police Research and Planning Organization, and right away made contacts with other people. Because we were re-writing our general orders, and we made contact with other people, and they shared copies of their general orders. That type of a connection is so helpful in not reinventing the wheel... going through the same experiences other departments have gone through. This type of initiative would not have been tolerated under the older regime.

Suppose you came in and told the previous chief, "Chief Collins, I think we need to re-write our policy and procedures."

(Extended laughter.)

Donald Harris
Administrative Assistant to Former Chief Tom Collins
Capt. Fred Morrison
Apopka Police Department
8 August 1991

Apopka is a small municipal police department of 42 sworn and 15 civilian employees. In the fall of 1990 when they completed their survey, their responses qualified them as a "reactive consumer." There was no formal research and planning unit and the people most responsible for research and planning exercised little autonomy in what they did. They expressed the belief that it was more important for police agencies to make use of the research of others than to generate their own. Although they agreed that "research" in their agency could be described as introducing new ideas that had been proven to be successful elsewhere, our site visit suggests that there probably was very little consumption of research of any kind. Were there a category in our typology of "reactive non-consumer," Apopka would have qualified.

The explanation of Apopka's classification revolves around the role of the then Chief, Tom Collins. His administration, of twenty years duration, was described various people we interviewed as a "monarchy," "tyranny," or "dictatorship", in which he made, literally, all decisions and was governed by few rules other than those of his own creation. His former administrative assistant, Donald Harris, describes, for example, his theory of personnel and budget.

The way he saw it he was the Chief of Police and he administered the discipline. Particularly with the discipline. We had a City Employee Handbook that everybody had. The former chief, his view was that, that didn't pertain to the police officers. He ran this department. He had a separate set³⁸.

The chief.. administered the budget, he signed the purchase orders. He was responsible for expenditures. He approved all expenditures. No expenditure made it through that he didn't approve... the budget was confined to the chief. I mean, he administered the budget and oversaw the budget and he got the monthly reports.

Q. Did anybody else get reports on the budget?

³⁸ Shortly after he took office, Chief Campbell moved to fire a police officer with Ku Klux Klan affiliations who had called a black female supervisor a "nigger bitch" and had to be restrained by other officers from striking her. At the hearing challenging the move to dismiss him, the officer argued that far worse behavior had been permitted in the past without provoking dismissal. He charged that in a previous incident a supervisor ordered an officer to get a haircut. When the officer refused and cursed the supervisor, the supervisor attacked the officer, knocked him to the ground, and proceeded to trim his hair with a pocket knife. If such behavior did not result in dismissal, the officer claimed that firing him for his outburst was unduly severe.

No. No.

Q. If I went to the captain of patrol, and say to that guy in the previous administration, "What's the patrol budget?" Could he answer that?

No. He could not.

Upon Chief Collins' retirement, a new Chief, Robert Campbell, was brought in with a mandate to upgrade the department. Although Collins was infuriated when the new Chief took away his parking spot, and eventually succeeded in banning him from entering the Department, former Chief Collins continued to be active in city government, but was soundly defeated in a bid for a seat on city council. It was a defeat Collins attributed to the fact that so many people considered him such a shoe-in for the position that they failed to vote for him.

Chief Campbell brought in a full-time training officer, restructured the budget giving his commanders responsibility for the budget in their areas, introduced a new force policy and systematic discipline system, encouraged contacts with other agencies, and, in the first eighteen months of his term as chief, about a quarter of the agency's sworn personnel were fired, demoted, or retired. He reassigned and transferred half a dozen others. Within a year, Fred Morrison, Captain of Administrative Services had applied for and received a grant to create a position for a police legal advisor who would be located in the Apopka Department but serve other departments in the region.

It is fair to say that as of the time of our site visit in August of 1991 that Apopka, under its new chief was still reactive, driven largely by the reform efforts of the new chief. However, Apopka had become a genuine consumer, aggressively importing policy, procedures, and practices from elsewhere. The nature of the reforms needed in Apopka were so elementary that what was needed could be relatively easily imported from elsewhere. "We are still," said Chief Campbell in a follow-up interview in July of 1992, "reactive consumers. That is not where I want to be, but this place needed so much work to get it under control, that, for now, we have to settle for that."

NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA

"Mostly, I would see myself as maintenance. I do very little research".

Corporal Tom Tolman
Newport Beach, California
July, 1991

Newport Beach is an affluent city in Orange County, California. The police department has 150 sworn and 70 civilian members, one of whom, Corporal Tom Tolman, was ostensibly responsible for research and planning at the time of our interview. Tolman was also responsible for the department's reserve program and he was president of the employee collective bargaining association. His role in the research and planning function was summed up by him as:

"...mostly what I do is change forms...Everybody wants their forms. And they range from very simple to pretty complex...Between that and revising the manual...". Occasionally he would offer suggestions for a policy revision, but "more often than not the revisions stem from the chief's office". If the suggested change originated with an employee, he would be involved in assessing whether the change was "actually needed or it's already addressed somewhere else".

Research, planning, and change in the department are mostly initiated by the chief and his executive officer and the training sergeant, who has a Ph.D in counseling psychology. According to Tolman, they are the persons instrumental to change in the department. The sergeant is apparently quite active in the change process; "...he's very interested in R&P and he's always suggesting things. I get a lot of projects from him". Tolman believed that the role these two played in the administration and change of the department were not formal requirements of their positions but "something they've taken on". Absent their initiatives, he observed, he would be more responsible for and involved in research. So, while the chief was receptive to ideas and suggestions from anyone in the department, there was no other central responsibility for generating them: "We find that most of the changes that come through, come from the chief's office".

We asked how the research function had changed over time and were told "we had three officers here at one time and called it P&R, but it was actually crime stats and several other duties". With the increase in computer capability, the "crime stat" portion was transferred to another section and the unit was reduced to one person. Tolman's predecessor, it turns out, also devoted much of his time to "forms": "...the officer before me spent almost all of his time revising forms. He was a very meticulous man. He spent a lot of time on it, and justified his time very easily doing all these forms".

Corporal Tolman characterized both his position in the research structure and the general orientation of the department as reactive consumer. The extent of research activity throughout the department is unknown. We are, however, quite confident that Newport Beach has its forms in order.

MILWAUKEE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

George Brotz came to the Milwaukee County Sheriff's Department in 1976 as the coordinator of research and planning. He had been a budget analyst for the county's Department of Administration, where he oversaw the sheriff's budget. At the time he entered the Sheriff's Department, they had no formal research unit or any one person responsible for research and planning. Moreover, according to Brotz, few of the bureau directors (the equivalent of captain) were competent "to do desk work." Brotz, however, had budget skills, an intimate knowledge of the county bureaucracy, and the ability to write clearly and effectively. As these were skills that were largely absent among commanders in the Milwaukee County Sheriff's Office in the mid 1970's, they made Brotz very valuable to the department and he became coordinator of the budget and research and planning and a major contributor to the administration of the agency.

In 1983, the governor appointed Richard Artison as Sheriff of Milwaukee County. Artison, who has won all subsequent elections, brought an administrative competence to the sheriff's office that had been lacking. Over the years, he initiated several new programs and gave more administrative responsibility to the department's new bureau directors, most of whom had at least some college training. The sheriff delegated most of the department's research projects and program development to his administrators. As the skills and abilities of the administrators increased, they were assigned research and program development projects. Brotz's special skills and knowledge became less valuable to the research process and his role in research and planning diminished.

Brotz attributes this reduced role to his increased budget involvement as well as the increased capabilities of the new bureau directors. The department had become involved in a number of programs. Many had been initiated by Artison, but others were in place prior to his arrival. The result was a more complex agency that required more time devoted to the budget process. Brotz was given full-time budget responsibilities and "got away from research and planning because I had less time".

For the six years prior to our interview, Brotz's predominant job was budget coordinator. As the result of a 1991 re-organization, the qualifications for that position were changed to require that it be held by a Certified Public Accountant. The position was filled (after our interview with Brotz) and Brotz reverted to a part-time research and planning role as part of the newly re-organized Technical and Auxiliary Services Bureau. He has recently completed a study on the feasibility of the agency's securing accreditation, prepares the agency's annual report, and serves on a committee that advises the sheriff on matters relating to computerization.

Conclusions: Common Themes Emerging from the Site Visits

Brotz's career reflects three themes that run throughout all twelve of our accounts of research and planning. The first is that what "research" is in any police agency depends heavily on the skills, talents, and initiative of the individuals who assume resume responsibility for it. The influence of structural characteristics is relatively minor. The consumption and production of meaningful research and planning can take place in agencies of any size and any type under any form of organization. And, in any size, type, or form of organization, it can be trivial and meaningless.

The second is that the value of certain types of skills and talents vary within organizations over time. There was a time in the Milwaukee County Sheriff's Department when Brotz's ability to write clearly and effectively was a rare and valuable commodity. The same can be said of Bill McNeill's integrity in the corrupt environment of Key West, John Porter's skill at planning in Eugene, and Gerry Aubin's monopoly of information on the intricacies of city government in Providence.

The third is that, as the administrative and management environment of police agencies becomes more complex and more sophisticated, the skills required and expected of police researchers will increase accordingly. George Brotz is a literate, sensitive, intelligent man with

years of budget experience, but he is not a CPA. Seventy percent of police researchers in the United States report "computerization" as one of their top five activities, but few employ systems analysts or programmers. The two most important initiators of police research are changes in the law and fear of civil liabilities, but fewer still are lawyers. More than half engage in agency program evaluations, nearly sixty percent regularly conduct surveys, and a quarter report doing projects that employ an experimental designs. But more than eighty percent express a desire for additional research training and believe that it would substantially improve their capacity to produce research that would be helpful to the agencies that employ them.

Research of many types and kinds is already a major part of U.S. police administration. In three-quarters of the police agencies in this country, those who do it play a substantial role in most administrative decisions. In just under half of the police agencies in the United States police researchers see themselves as more important to agency change than any other unit in the agency. Its value is, in general, broadly recognized and the need to improve the skills and capacities of those who do it is acknowledged by nearly eighty-five percent of the police researchers in the United States.

PART III
POLICE RESEARCH AND PUBLIC POLICY

Throughout this document we have employed a definition of "research" that is extraordinarily broad. We have accepted as "research" virtually anything that people who were charged with doing it described as what they did. Often it would be more appropriately described as "planning" or the routine maintenance of forms, policies, or records. There is, however, a substantial amount of real, enormously diverse, and serious enquiry and experimentation underway in U.S. police agencies. Much of it is crucial to change, and, as agencies continue to experiment with new approaches to policing, the importance of research as a source of creative approaches and as a tool for evaluation will continue to grow.

It is, in our opinion, desirable to encourage such research, improve and enhance the methods used to do it, improve the skills of those who are charged with doing it, and facilitate the exchange of it. We further believe that there are efforts that could be made at the Federal level by an agency such as the National Institute of Justice that would serve these ends and serve them at a very modest cost.

1. The National Institute of Justice should survey annually the research agenda of U.S. police agencies.

The survey should identify police research agendas, the priority agencies themselves assign to specific research issues, and individual projects specific agencies believe are of national interest. Doing so will permit NIJ to monitor police trends, concerns, problems, issues, and activities and enhance its own capacity, where appropriate, to support national research efforts that will address them.

2. NIJ should establish a repository for police-generated research based on the annual survey.

Agencies participating in the survey should be asked to provide one page abstract and summaries of research completed or underway in their agencies that they believe to be possible national interest. The abstracts should provide concise summaries of research projects, the name, address, telephone, and fax numbers for contact persons in each agency, a list of documents available for distribution, and the terms under which they are willing to do so.

3. NIJ should publish the survey results and abstracts, making them available to every police agency in the United States.

NIJ should publish an annual hard copy of these abstracts, distributing it to appropriate users through the National Criminal Justice Reference Service. As well, it should create an electronic database of these abstracts, that agencies can search through modem access. There is, at present, very little publication of police generated research and as the rewards for doing so are minimal and the pressure to move on to other problems is significant. This situation is

unlikely to change in the future. Informal networks now exist to overcome the problem of lack of publication and NIJ can make these channels more efficient and more accessible to agencies that sorely need to be connected to them. Our research shows unequivocally that this is the major form in which research is conducted and transferred and NIJ can and should enhance it.

4. *NIJ should sponsor and encourage research training and education for persons engaged or contemplating careers in police research and planning.*

An overwhelming majority of police researchers in the United States report that increased training in research methods would substantially improve their capacity to produce research that would improve their agencies. NIJ leadership can establish a national commitment to increasing the research capabilities of American police agencies. We recommend that it create a national advisory panel to develop a curriculum of study for police researchers and support efforts that would lead to a certification of skill in that area.

5. *NIJ should support and work with the International Association of Law Enforcement Planners.*

IALEP, recently formed by combining the National Association of Police Planners (NAPP) and the Association of Police Planning and Research Officers (APPRO) should be consulted for its assistance with the national survey, the repository of police research and planning abstracts, the police planning and research curriculum advisory committee, and the effort to make police research and planning a certified specialty.

6. *Issues of Quality*

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICE AGENCIES

Our study of the production and consumption of research in U.S. police agencies also has policy relevance for police agencies and police executives. We believe a competent research function is essential to the operation of every police agency. In both its production and consumption dimensions it is crucial to positive change. It can be organized and structured in many different ways, although we believe that some forms are preferable to others, but its role and function should be made explicit in agency policy and it should be encouraged and supported. It will grow in importance as demands are made on police agencies to operate more efficiently and effectively and to experiment with alternatives to traditional police response. We believe that every police agency can take steps to enhance their research function at very modest costs and do so with the potential of very high returns. We recommend that:

1. *Police agencies should issue an explicit policy statement on the role of research and planning in the organization.*

Agency policy should identify research and planning as a function that is crucial to the growth and development of the agency. It should identify those responsible for creating the

agency's research and planning agenda and encourage broad contribution to it, declare its support for the development of cooperative liaisons with other agencies as sources of experience and innovation, affirm the agency's commitment to share its experience with others, and declare its willingness to participate in appropriate research.

2. *Police agencies should support and create mechanisms and arrangements that will permit them to actively consume the research of others.*

For reasons we have described in the report, most police agencies are consumers far more than they are producers of research. Indeed, the major way of doing research in U.S. police agencies is to consult other agencies for their help, advice, and experience. It is an extremely effective and highly cost efficient way for agencies to begin to address their own problems. This is particularly so of small agencies with limited capacities to produce research of their own.

3. *Police agencies should enhance the research and planning capacities of those persons charged with that responsibility in their agencies.*

It is not only important to police agencies that they have the capacity to access the research of others. It is necessary that they have the capacities to consume it intelligently. Our sense is that in many areas, particularly those connected with new technologies, police agencies are victims of their own inability to evaluate proposed changes effectively. A major role of research is often to caution that reliable evidence in support of certain new ideas is lacking or that similar approaches have lead to unanticipated problems.

Enhancing the research and planning capabilities of those persons charged with that function will also improve the agency's capacity to monitor its own projects and activities. Eighty percent of the respondents in our survey expressed the opinion that additional training in research methods would substantially improve their capacities to make positive contributions to their agencies.

3. *Police agencies should encourage a proactive research orientation.*

Although consumption of the research of others and tailoring it to the specific needs of their own agency will constitute the major function of most people who assume responsibility for police planning and research, such activities will invariably lead to occasions on which they learn about projects which have proven successful elsewhere. They should be encouraged to bring such projects to the attention of appropriate decision makers. Police agencies should be willing to experiment with new approaches and new ideas. Larger police agencies should formally designate at least some portion of their research function as "proactive," free to engage in study that will encourage agency innovation.

4. Agencies should consider civilianization of at least some portion of its research function.

Civilians are not subject to police socialization, are not competitors for higher positions in police ranks, and can bring to police agencies skills and perspectives not normally found in police officers. Agencies without formal units and with limited capacities to produce their own research should encourage research and evaluation studies by researcher outside of their agencies. They should develop collaborative research relations with local colleges and universities. Larger agencies should recognize that it may be desirable to recruit for research positions civilian employees with specialized skills in law, risk management, systems analysis and programming, accounting, and research design and method.

5. Those charged with police research and planning and those responsible for giving direction to police research and planning efforts should remain mindful that the "bottom line" of all police research and planning should be to make the practice of policing better.

Based on the national survey and site visits, our sense of things is that a substantial portion of the work of many police researchers has little direct effect on quality of the police service that the agency actually delivers. In quasi-military organizations the temptation to spin policy that is largely ignored and to establish detailed procedures that are routinely violated must be resisted. Police researchers and police planners should direct their energies to projects and studies that will make the lives of the people whom they serve safer, less violent, and more secure.

APPENDIX I
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES
AND
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

QUESTIONNAIRE A

Please complete Questionnaire A ONLY if your agency has a formal research and planning unit. If your agency HAS NO formal research and planning unit, please complete Questionnaire B and discard this Questionnaire.

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

1. Agency Name and Address: _____

2. Telephone Number: () _____

3. Agency Type: Police Dept. ____ Sheriff's Office ____ Other ____

4. Total Number of Personnel: _____ Sworn: _____ Civilian: _____

5. Is your department accredited? Yes ____ No ____

6. Please provide the name, title, and telephone number of the persons(s) in charge of the research and planning unit.

Name: _____ Title: _____

Telephone Number: () _____

Name: _____ Title: _____

Telephone Number: () _____

7. Please provide the name, title, and telephone number of the person completing this survey.

Name: _____ Title: _____

Telephone Number: () _____

8. Number of person(s) in the research and planning unit.

Sworn: _____ Civilian: _____

Full Time: _____ Full Time: _____

Part Time: _____ Part Time: _____

9. Does the research and planning unit report directly to the agency head? Yes ____ No ____

If "No", to whom does it report? _____

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

10. Please indicate the degree to which the research and planning unit has been involved in the following issues **WITHIN THE PAST YEAR**.

	<i>Not Involved</i>	<i>Slightly Involved</i>	<i>Moderately Involved</i>	<i>Very Involved</i>
(a) <i>Accreditation/ Re-accreditation</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) <i>Agency Budget Compilation(s)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) <i>Call Prioritization</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) <i>Community- Oriented Policing</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) <i>Computerization</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) <i>Capital Improvement Issues</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) <i>Career Criminal/ Target Offender Program(s)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(h) <i>Carrying Weapon(s) Off-Duty</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(i) <i>Case Screening</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(j) <i>Crime Analysis</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(k) <i>Directed Patrol</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(l) <i>Domestic Violence Reduction</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

10. (continued)

	<i>Not Involved</i>	<i>Slightly Involved</i>	<i>Moderately Involved</i>	<i>Very Involved</i>
(m) <i>Drug Education</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(n) <i>Employee Drug Testing</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(o) <i>Grants Administration</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(p) <i>Health/Wellness Training</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(q) <i>In-house program evaluation(s)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(r) <i>Neighborhood Watch</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(s) <i>Off-Duty Employment</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(t) <i>Personnel Deployment (Agency-wide)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(u) <i>Police Equipment (testing/evaluation)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(v) <i>Policy Manual Revisions</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(w) <i>Problem-Oriented Policing</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

10. (continued)

	<i>Not Involved</i>	<i>Slightly Involved</i>	<i>Moderately Involved</i>	<i>Very Involved</i>
(x) <i>Uniform Crime Reports</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(y) <i>Use of Force Policy</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(z) <i>Vehicle Pursuit Policy</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(aa) <i>Other</i>				
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. As you look back on your research activity over the past year, to what extent did each of the following factors initiate research efforts in the research and planning unit?

	<i>None</i>	<i>Not Very Much</i>	<i>Very Somewhat</i>	<i>A Great Deal</i>
(a) <i>Article(s) in Police Journals</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) <i>Article(s) in Popular Magazines</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) <i>Change(s) in Government:</i>				
<i>City/County</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>State</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

<i>Federal</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<i>ll. (continued)</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Not Very Much</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>A Great Deal</i>
<i>(d) Changes in the Law</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<i>(e) Civil Liability(ies)</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<i>(f) Community Pressure(s)</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<i>(g) Initiative(s) from Agency Head</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<i>(h) Initiative(s) from Other Administrative Person(s)</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<i>(i) Initiatives within the Research and Planning Unit</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<i>(j) On-Going Needs Assessment</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<i>(k) Professional Organization(s)</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<i>(l) Police Shootings</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<i>(m) Police Vehicle Fatality(ies)</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<i>(n) Successful Program(s) in other Police Department(s)</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<i>(o) Suggestion(s) from Line Officer(s)</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<i>(p) Vendors of Police Equipment/Supplies</i>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<i>(q) Other:</i> _____	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

12. Please indicate how often you make use of the following in your research and planning activities.

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Some- times</i>	<i>Seldom</i>	<i>Never</i>
(a) <i>Consult(s) with other police agencies</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(b) <i>National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(c) <i>National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(d) <i>Police Executive Research Forum</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(e) <i>FBI National Academy</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(f) <i>Local College(s) or University(ies)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(g) <i>Consultants</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(h) <i>Police Journals</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(i) <i>International Association of Chiefs of Police</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(j) <i>Agency person(s) not in the research/planning unit</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(k) <i>Southern Police Institute</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

12. (continued)

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Some- times</i>	<i>Seldom</i>	<i>Never</i>
(l) <i>Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(m) <i>Northwestern Traffic Institute</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(n) <i>Case Western Reserve</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(o) <i>Text/resource manual literature</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(p) <i>In-house experiment(s)/ survey(s)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(q) <i>Police Foundation</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(r) <i>Other:</i>					
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>				

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

13. Please circle the publications your research and planning unit currently receive(s).

- | | |
|---|--|
| (a) <i>AELE Bulletin</i> | (l) <i>Law Enforcement Technology</i> |
| (b) <i>American Journal of Police</i> | (m) <i>Law and Order</i> |
| (c) <i>Contemporary Policing</i> | (n) <i>NIJ Reports</i> |
| (d) <i>Crime Control Digest</i> | (o) <i>National Sheriff's Association Magazine</i> |
| (e) <i>Crime and Delinquency</i> | (p) <i>Police Chief Magazine</i> |
| (f) <i>Criminal Law Reporter</i> | (q) <i>Your state law enforcement journal</i> |
| (g) <i>Criminology</i> | (r) <i>Other:</i> |
| (h) <i>Journal of Crime and Justice</i> | _____ |
| (i) <i>Journal of Police Science
and Administration</i> | _____ |
| (j) <i>Justice Quarterly</i> | _____ |
| (k) <i>Law Enforcement News</i> | _____ |

14. Are you or anyone else in your agency a member of:

- | | |
|---|----------|
| (a) <i>Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences</i> | Yes / No |
| (b) <i>American Society of Criminology</i> | Yes / No |
| (c) <i>Association of Police Planning
and Research Officers International</i> | Yes / No |
| (d) <i>International Association of
Chiefs of Police</i> | Yes / No |
| (e) <i>National Sheriff's Association</i> | Yes / No |

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

(f) *Other planning or professional organization* Yes / No

15. *Please list, in order of importance, the top five research and planning activities which have consumed most of your time **WITHIN THE PAST YEAR.***

- 1) _____
- 2) _____
- 3) _____
- 4) _____
- 5) _____

16. a) *Within the past year, has the research and planning unit conducted literature/library searches?*

1 Yes 2 No

b) *Within the past year, have reports/papers been presented at professional meetings as a result of this unit's research efforts?*

1 Yes 2 No

c) *Within the past year, has the research and planning unit conducted a study which employed a survey or questionnaire?*

1 Yes 2 No

d) *Within the past year, has the research and planning unit conducted a study which employed an experimental design?*

1 Yes 2 No

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

16. (continued)

e) *Within the past year, has the research and planning unit published research results in a journal or magazine?*

1 Yes 2 No

17. **THE STATEMENTS IN THIS SECTION DEAL WITH THE CONCEPT OF RESEARCH. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH.**

a) *In the research unit in this agency, "research" usually consists of introducing new ideas which have proven to be successful elsewhere.*

1 *Strongly Agree*
2 *Agree*
3 *Disagree*
4 *Strongly Disagree*

b) *In the research unit in this agency, "research" usually consists of producing written reports and studies in response to requests from management.*

1 *Strongly Agree*
2 *Agree*
3 *Disagree*
4 *Strongly Disagree*

c) *In the research unit in this agency, "research" usually consists of identifying problems, proposing solutions, and evaluating outcomes.*

1 *Strongly Agree*
2 *Agree*
3 *Disagree*
4 *Strongly Disagree*

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

17. (continued)

d) *In the research unit in this agency, "research" usually consists of responding to requests for information from other units within the agency.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

18. **THE STATEMENTS IN THIS SECTION DEAL WITH WHY RESEARCH IS CONDUCTED. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH.**

a) *In this agency "research" is usually initiated by individuals outside the research and planning unit.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

b) *Most of the work done by the research and planning unit is designed to improve the quality of administration in this department.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

c) *Most of the work done by the research and planning unit is designed to evaluate the effectiveness of "street level" operations.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

- 2 Agree
- 3 Disagree
- 4 Strongly Disagree

19. THE STATEMENTS IN THIS SECTION DEAL WITH WHO CONDUCTS RESEARCH. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH.

a) *It is usually more important for the research and planning unit to make good use of research from other sources than to generate its own.*

- 1 Strongly Agree
- 2 Agree
- 3 Disagree
- 4 Strongly Disagree

b) *Additional training in research methods would substantially improve the capacity of members of this unit to produce research that would be helpful to the agency.*

- 1 Strongly Agree
- 2 Agree
- 3 Disagree
- 4 Strongly Disagree

20. THE STATEMENTS IN THIS SECTION DEAL WITH HOW RESEARCH IS DONE. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH.

a) *In this agency the research and planning unit regularly shares information with other police organizations.*

- 1 Strongly Agree
- 2 Agree
- 3 Disagree
- 4 Strongly Disagree

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

20. (continued)

b) *In this agency, the research and planning unit exercises considerable autonomy in choosing topics for study.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

c) *The demands on this unit to respond to immediate concerns allow little time for long-term research and planning.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

d) *Most members of this agency frequently share ideas, concerns, and information with members of the research and planning unit.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

21. **THE STATEMENTS IN THIS SECTION DEAL WITH HOW RESEARCH IS RECEIVED IN YOUR AGENCY. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH.**

a) *Generally speaking, it is not practical for a police agency to put research results into everyday practice.*

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

21. (continued)

b) *Research efforts in this agency are hindered by a lack of interest at the command level.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

c) *This unit is provided sufficient resources to adequately conduct its research and planning activities.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

22. **THE STATEMENTS IN THIS SECTION DEAL WITH THE IMPACT OF RESEARCH. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH.**

a) *The research and planning unit is more important in generating change than any other unit in the organization.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

b) *The research and planning unit plays a substantial role in most major administrative decisions.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

23. *Is your agency currently involved in or has your agency recently been involved in any project(s) that you feel would be of particular interest to police agencies or police research and planning units across the country? Yes _____ No _____*

If so, please describe briefly below.

Thank you for your cooperation. Please return this survey form to the:

*Police Research Office
220 S. Main St.
Bel Air, Maryland 21014*

in the stamped, addressed envelope provided.

Should you have any questions about this survey or the project of which it is a part, feel free to write to the above address or call us at (301) 838-6000 ext. 337.

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

QUESTIONNAIRE B

*Please complete **Questionnaire B** ONLY if your agency has NO formal research and planning unit. If your agency HAS a formal research and planning unit, please complete **Questionnaire A** and discard this questionnaire.*

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

1. Agency Name and Address: _____

2. Telephone Number: () _____

3. Agency Type: Police Dept. ____ Sheriff's Office ____ Other ____

4. Total Number of Personnel: _____ Sworn: _____ Civilian: _____

5. Is your department accredited? Yes ____ No ____

6. Please provide the name, title, and telephone number of the persons(s) most responsible for research and planning.

Name: _____ Title: _____

Telephone Number: () _____

Name: _____ Title: _____

Telephone Number: () _____

7. Please provide the name, title, and telephone number of the person completing this survey.

Name: _____ Title: _____

Telephone Number: () _____

8. Number of person(s) most responsible for research and planning.

Sworn: _____ Civilian: _____

Full Time: _____ Full Time: _____

Part Time: _____ Part Time: _____

9. Do the above person(s) report directly to the agency head? Yes ____ No ____

If "No", to whom do they report? _____

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

10. Please indicate the degree to which the person(s) most responsible for research and planning has (have) been involved in the following activities **WITHIN THE PAST YEAR**.

	<i>Not Involved</i>	<i>Slightly Involved</i>	<i>Moderately Involved</i>	<i>Very Involved</i>
(a) <i>Accreditation/ Re-accreditation</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) <i>Agency Budget Compilation(s)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) <i>Call Prioritization</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) <i>Community- Oriented Policing</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) <i>Computerization</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) <i>Capital Improvement Issues</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) <i>Career Criminal/ Target Offender Program(s)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(h) <i>Carrying Weapon(s) Off-Duty</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(i) <i>Case Screening</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(j) <i>Crime Analysis</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(k) <i>Directed Patrol</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(l) <i>Domestic Violence Reduction</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

10. (continued)

	<i>Not Involved</i>	<i>Slightly Involved</i>	<i>Moderately Involved</i>	<i>Very Involved</i>
(m) <i>Drug Education</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(n) <i>Employee Drug Testing</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(o) <i>Grants Administration</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(p) <i>Health/Wellness Training</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(q) <i>In-house program evaluation(s)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(r) <i>Neighborhood Watch</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(s) <i>Off-Duty Employment</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(t) <i>Personnel Deployment (Agency-wide)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(u) <i>Police Equipment (testing/evaluation)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(v) <i>Policy Manual Revisions</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(w) <i>Problem-Oriented Policing</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

10. (continued)

	<i>Not Involved</i>	<i>Slightly Involved</i>	<i>Moderately Involved</i>	<i>Very Involved</i>
(x) <i>Uniform Crime Reports</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(y) <i>Use of Force Policy</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(z) <i>Vehicle Pursuit Policy</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(aa) <i>Other</i>				
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. As you look back on your research activity over the past year, to what extent did each of the following factors initiate research efforts by the person(s) most responsible for research and planning?

	<i>None</i>	<i>Not Very Much</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>A Great Deal</i>
(a) <i>Article(s) in Police Journals</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) <i>Article(s) in Popular Magazines</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) <i>Change(s) in Government:</i>				
<i>City/County</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>State</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

Federal
11. (continued)

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>None</i>	<i>Not Very Much</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>A Great Deal</i>
(d) <i>Changes in the Law</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) <i>Civil Liability(ies)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) <i>Community Pressure(s)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) <i>Initiative(s) from Agency Head</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(h) <i>Initiative(s) from Other Administrative Person(s)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(i) <i>Initiative(s) by Person(s) most Responsible for Research and Planning</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(j) <i>On-Going Needs Assessment</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(k) <i>Professional Organization(s)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(l) <i>Police Shootings</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(m) <i>Police Vehicle Fatality(ies)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(n) <i>Successful Program(s) in other Police Department(s)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(o) <i>Suggestion(s) from Line Officer(s)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(p) <i>Vendors of Police Equipment/Supplies</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(q) <i>Other: _____</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

12. Please indicate how often you make use of the following in your research and planning activities.

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Seldom</i>	<i>Never</i>
(a) <i>Consult(s) with other police agencies</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(b) <i>National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(c) <i>National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(d) <i>Police Executive Research Forum</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(e) <i>FBI National Academy</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(f) <i>Local College(s) or University(ies)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(g) <i>Consultants</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(h) <i>Police Journals</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(i) <i>International Association of Chiefs of Police</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(j) <i>Agency person(s) not responsible for research and planning</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(k) <i>Southern Police</i>	—	—	—	—	—

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

Institute

12. (continued)

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Some- times</i>	<i>Seldom</i>	<i>Never</i>
(l) <i>Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(m) <i>Northwestern Traffic Institute</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(n) <i>Case Western Reserve</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(o) <i>Text/resource manual literature</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(p) <i>In-house experiment(s)/ survey(s)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(q) <i>Police Foundation</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
(r) <i>Other:</i>					
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>				

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

13. Please circle the publications the person(s) most responsible for research and planning currently receive(s).

- | | |
|---|--|
| (a) <i>AELE Bulletin</i> | (l) <i>Law Enforcement Technology</i> |
| (b) <i>American Journal of Police</i> | (m) <i>Law and Order</i> |
| (c) <i>Contemporary Policing</i> | (n) <i>NIJ Reports</i> |
| (d) <i>Crime Control Digest</i> | (o) <i>National Sheriff's Association Magazine</i> |
| (e) <i>Crime and Delinquency</i> | (p) <i>Police Chief Magazine</i> |
| (f) <i>Criminal Law Reporter</i> | (q) <i>Your state law enforcement journal</i> |
| (g) <i>Criminology</i> | (r) <i>Other:</i> |
| (h) <i>Journal of Crime and Justice</i> | _____ |
| (i) <i>Journal of Police Science
and Administration</i> | _____ |
| (j) <i>Justice Quarterly</i> | _____ |
| (k) <i>Law Enforcement News</i> | _____ |

14. Are you or anyone else in your agency a member of:

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| (a) <i>Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences</i> | <i>Yes / No</i> |
| (b) <i>American Society of Criminology</i> | <i>Yes / No</i> |
| (c) <i>Association of Police Planning
and Research Officers International</i> | <i>Yes / No</i> |
| (d) <i>International Association of
Chiefs of Police</i> | <i>Yes / No</i> |

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

(e) *National Sheriff's Association* Yes / No

(f) *Other planning or professional organization* Yes / No

15. *Please list, in order of importance, the top five research and planning activities which have consumed most of your time WITHIN THE PAST YEAR.*

- 1) _____
- 2) _____
- 3) _____
- 4) _____
- 5) _____

16. a) *Within the past year, has(have) the person(s) most responsible for research and planning conducted literature/library searches?*

1 Yes 2 No

b) *Within the past year, have reports/papers been presented at professional meetings as a result of this (these) person's (persons') research efforts?*

1 Yes 2 No

c) *Within the past year, has(have) the person(s) most responsible for research and planning conducted a study which employed a survey or questionnaire?*

1 Yes 2 No

d) *Within the past year, has(have) the person(s) most responsible for research and planning conducted a study which employed an experimental design?*

1 Yes 2 No

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

16. (continued)

- e) *Within the past year, has(have) the person(s) most responsible for research and planning published research results in a journal or magazine?*

1 Yes 2 No

17. **THE STATEMENTS IN THIS SECTION DEAL WITH THE CONCEPT OF RESEARCH. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH.**

- a) *In this agency, "research" usually consists of introducing new ideas which have proven to be successful elsewhere.*

1 Strongly Agree
2 Agree
3 Disagree
4 Strongly Disagree

- b) *In this agency, "research" usually consists of producing written reports and studies in response to requests from management.*

1 Strongly Agree
2 Agree
3 Disagree
4 Strongly Disagree

- c) *In this agency, "research" usually consists of identifying problems, proposing solutions, and evaluating outcomes.*

1 Strongly Agree
2 Agree

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

17. (continued)

d) *In this agency, "research" usually consists of responding to requests for information from other units within the agency.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

18. **THE STATEMENTS IN THIS SECTION DEAL WITH WHY RESEARCH IS CONDUCTED. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH.**

a) *In this agency "research" is usually initiated by individuals other than the person(s) most responsible for planning and research.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

b) *Most of the work done by the person(s) most responsible for research and planning is designed to improve the quality of administration in this department.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

c) *Most of the work done by the person(s) most responsible for research and planning is designed to evaluate the effectiveness of "street level" operations.*

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

- 1 Strongly Agree
- 2 Agree
- 3 Disagree
- 4 Strongly disagree

19. THE STATEMENTS IN THIS SECTION DEAL WITH WHO CONDUCTS RESEARCH. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH.

- a) *It is usually more important for the person(s) most responsible for research and planning to make good use of research from other sources than to generate his/her(their) own.*

- 1 Strongly Agree
- 2 Agree
- 3 Disagree
- 4 Strongly Disagree

- b) *Additional training in research methods would substantially improve the capacity of the person(s) most responsible for research and planning to produce research that would be helpful to the agency.*

- 1 Strongly Agree
- 2 Agree
- 3 Disagree
- 4 Strongly Disagree

20. THE STATEMENTS IN THIS SECTION DEAL WITH HOW RESEARCH IS DONE. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH.

- a) *In this agency the person(s) most responsible for research and planning regularly share(s) information with other police agencies.*

- 1 Strongly Agree
- 2 Agree
- 3 Disagree

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

4 *Strongly Disagree*

20. (continued)

b) *In this agency, the person(s) most responsible for research and planning exercise(s) considerable autonomy in choosing topics for study.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

c) *The demands on the person(s) most responsible for research and planning allow(s) little time for long term research and planning.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

d) *Most members of this agency frequently share ideas, concerns, and information with the person(s) most responsible for research and planning.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

21. **THE STATEMENTS IN THIS SECTION DEAL WITH HOW RESEARCH IS RECEIVED IN YOUR AGENCY. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH.**

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

- a) *Generally speaking, it is not practical for a police agency to put research results into everyday practice.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

21. *(continued)*

- b) *Research efforts in this agency are hindered by a lack of interest at the command level.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

- c) *The person(s) most responsible for research and planning is(are) provided sufficient resources to adequately conduct research and planning activities.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

22. **THE STATEMENTS IN THIS SECTION DEAL WITH THE IMPACT OF RESEARCH. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH.**

- a) *The person(s) most responsible for research and planning is(are) more important in generating change than any other person(s) in the agency.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

POLICE RESEARCH AND PLANNING SURVEY

b) *The person(s) most responsible for research and planning play(s) a substantial role in most major administrative decisions.*

- 1 *Strongly Agree*
- 2 *Agree*
- 3 *Disagree*
- 4 *Strongly Disagree*

23. *Is your agency currently involved in or has your agency recently been involved in any project(s) that you feel would be of particular interest to police agencies or police research and planning units across the country? Yes _____ No _____*

If so, please describe briefly below.

Thank you for your cooperation. Please return this survey form to the:

*Police Research Office
220 S. Main St.
Bel Air, Maryland 21014*

in the stamped, addressed envelope provided.

Should you have any questions about this survey or the project of which it is a part, feel free to write to the above address or call us at (301) 838-6000 ext. 337.

Agency Head
Agency
City/State/Zip

Date

Dear ,

The Harford County Sheriff's Office, along with the County Executive for Harford County, has entered into a cooperative research and planning project with a team of advanced graduate students directed by Dr. Carl B. Klockars of the University of Delaware. The project, which is partially funded by the National Institute of Justice, is investigating whether or not this type of relationship can make a positive contribution to police agencies. The team consists of Ph.D students from The University of Delaware, The University of Maryland, and The Pennsylvania State University.

One of the several projects the research team has undertaken is an investigation into the production and use of research by police agencies. Little is known about the nature and extent of research in police agencies across the country. You can make a very valuable and positive contribution to our understanding of police research by having the enclosed survey completed, preferably by the person most responsible for research and planning in your agency. You will note that there are two survey forms enclosed: one for police agencies with formal planning and research units. the other for agencies without formal planning and research units. Please complete only the survey appropriate to your agency and discard the other.

The research team and I realize that the time of your staff is valuable. The survey has been designed in an attempt to gather as much information as possible without overly imposing on your agency. The survey should take no longer than fifteen minutes to complete. Please have the survey returned to the team in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. Again, your contribution will be most valuable and appreciated. Should you desire, a copy of the study results will be forwarded to you.

I thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. If I can be of service to you, please feel free to call on me. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

*Dominick J. Mele
Sheriff for Harford County*

(301) 838-6000 Ext. 337

Dear ,

Several weeks ago your assistance was solicited in completing a survey which seeks to identify how police agencies use and produce research. Our records indicate that we have not yet received a completed survey from your agency.

If you have misplaced the survey, please call us at the above number and we will send you another copy. If not, we ask that you complete the survey and return it to us at your earliest convenience. We value your response and insight into this issue, and believe you can make a positive contribution to our understanding of police research. The survey should take no longer than fifteen minutes to complete.

We again thank you for your time and assistance, and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

*William E. Harver
Project Director,
National Police
Research Survey*

October 1990

MEMORANDUM FROM:

*THE POLICE RESEARCH OFFICE
HARFORD COUNTY GOVERNMENT
220 S. MAIN STREET
BEL AIR, MARYLAND 21014
(301) 838-6000 Ext. 337*

Per our telephone conversation, enclosed is the Research and Planning Questionnaire package requested. Thank you for your interest and time in answering the appropriate Questionnaire. A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

POLICE RESEARCH OFFICE

Enclosures

APPENDIX II
AGENCIES SURVEYED

Agencies Surveyed

MUNICIPAL & COUNTY

ALABAMA

Anniston Police Department
Bessemer Police Department
Decatur Police Department
Florence Police Department
Homewood Police Department
Huntsville Police Department
Montgomery Police Department
Phenix City Police Department
Tuscaloosa Police Department

ARIZONA

Bullhead City Police Department
Flagstaff Police Department
Mesa Police Department
Phoenix Police Department
Tempe Police Department
Yuma Police Department

ARKANSAS

Fayetteville Police Department
Hot Springs Police Department
North Little Rock Police Dept.
Texarkana Police Department

CALIFORNIA

Alhambra Police Department
Antioch Police Department
Azusa Police Department
Baldwin Park Police Department
Beverly Hills Police Department
Buena Park Police Department
Carlsbad Police Department
Chino Police Department
Clovis Police Department
Compton Police Department
Corona Police Department
Covina Police Department
Cypress Police Department
Downey Police Department
El Monte Police Department
Escondido Police Department
Fontana Police Department
Fremont Police Department
Fullerton Police Department
Gardena Police Department
Glendora Police Department
Hayward Police Department

Huntington Park Police Dept.
Irvine Police Department
La Mesa Police Department
Lodi Police Department
Los Angeles Police Department
Merced Police Department
Modesto Police Department
Montebello Police Department
Mountain View Police Department
National City Police Department
Newport Beach Police Department
Oakland Police Department
Ontario Police Department
Oxnard Police Department
Palo Alto Police Department
Petaluma Police Department
Pleasanton Police Department
Redding Police Department
Redondo Beach Police Department
Rialto Police Department
Riverside Police Department
Salinas Police Department
San Diego Police Department
San Jose Police Department
San Luis Obispo Police Department
San Rafael Police Department
Santa Barbara Police Department
Santa Cruz Police Department
Santa Monica Police Department
Simi Valley Police Department
South Lake Tahoe Police Department
Stockton Police Department
Torrance Police Department
Union City Police Department
Vacaville Police Department
Ventura Police Department
Walnut Creek Police Department
Westminster Police Department
Woodland Police Department

COLORADO

Aurora Police Department
Colorado Springs Police Department
Englewood Police Department
Grand Junction Police Department
Littleton Police Department
Pueblo Police Department
Westminster Police Department

County and Municipal Police Agencies

CONNECTICUT

Bridgeport Police Department
Danbury Police Department
Enfield Police Department
Greenwich Police Department
Hamden Police Department
Manchester Police Department
Middletown Police Department
New Britain Police Department
New London Police Department
Norwalk Police Department
Southington Police Department
Stratford Police Department
Trumbull Police Department
Waterbury Police Department
West Haven Police Department
Norwalk Police Department

DELAWARE

Dover Police Department
Wilmington Police Department

FLORIDA

Altamonte Springs Police Dept.
Boynton Beach Police Department
Cape Coral Police Department
Coconut Creek Police Department
Coral Springs Police Department
Daytona Beach Police Department
Delray Beach Police Department
Fort Lauderdale Police Department
Fort Pierce Police Department
Hallandale Police Department
Hollywood Police Department
Jacksonville Police Department
Key West Police Department
Lakeland Police Department
Largo Police Department
Melbourne Police Department
Miami Beach Police Department
Naples Police Department
North Miami Police Department
Oakland Park Police Department
Orlando Police Department
Palm Bay Police Department
Palm Beach Gardens Police Dept
Pembroke Pines Police Department
Pinellas Park Police Department
Plantation Police Department

Quincy Police Department
St. Petersburg Police Department
Sarasota Police Department
Tallahassee Police Department
Tampa Police Department
Vero Beach Police Department
Winter Haven Police Department
Winter Park Police Department

GEORGIA

Athens Police Department
Augusta Police Department
Chatham Co. Police Department
Clayton Co. Police Department
College Park Police Department
Dalton Police Department
East Point Police Department
Gainesville Police Department
Griffin Police Department
LaGrange Police Department
Marietta Police Department
Roswell Police Department
Smyrna Police Department

HAWAII

Hilo Police Department

IDAHO

Boise Police Department
Pocatello Police Department

ILLINOIS

Alton Police Department
Aurora Police Department
Berwyn Police Department
Bolingbrook Police Department
Carbondale Police Department
Chicago Police Department
Danville Police Department
Des Plaines Police Department
East St. Louis Police Department
Elk Grove Village Police Department
Evanston Police Department
Harvey Police Department
Hoffman Estates Police Department
Kankakee Police Department
Maywood Police Department
Moline Police Department
Naperville Police Department

County and Municipal Police Agencies

Oak Lawn Police Department
Orland Park Police Department
Park Ridge Police Department
Quincy Police Department
Rockford Police Department
Schaumburg Police Department
Springfield Police Department
Wheaton Police Department

INDIANA

Bloomington Police Department
East Chicago Police Department
Evansville Police Department
Gary Police Department
Indianapolis Police Department
Lafayette Police Department
Michigan City Police Department
Muncie Police Department
Richmond Police Department
Terre Haute Police Department

IOWA

Council Bluffs Police Department
Des Moines Police Department
Iowa City Police Department
Waterloo Police Department

KANSAS

Olathe Police Department
Shawnee Police Department

KENTUCKY

Ashland Police Department
Covington Police Department
Fayette Co. Police Department
Owensboro Police Department

LOUISIANA

Alexandria Police Department
Bossier City Police Department
Lafayette Police Department
Monroe Police Department
New Orleans Police Department
West Monroe Police Department
Lewiston Police Department
South Portland Police Department

MARYLAND

Anne Arundel Co. Police Department

Baltimore Police Department
Hagerstown Police Department
Montgomery Co. Police Department
Prince George's Co. Police Dept.

MASSACHUSETTS

Andover Police Department
Attleboro Police Department
Boston Police Department
Cambridge Police Department
Dartmouth Police Department
Everett Police Department
Fitchburg Police Department
Gloucester Police Department
Lawrence Police Department
Lexington Police Department
Melrose Police Department
Needham Police Department
Newton Police Department
Norwood Police Department
Pittsfield Police Department
Salem Police Department
Springfield Police Department
Taunton Police Department
Waltham Police Department
Weymouth Police Department
Worcester Police Department

MICHIGAN

Ann Arbor Police Department
Bay City Police Department
Detroit Police Department
Farmington Hills Police Department
Flint Police Department
Hamtramck Police Department
Kalamazoo Police Department
Lincoln Park Police Department
Madison Heights Police Department
Muskegon Police Department
Pontiac Police Department
Redford Township Police Department
Roseville Police Department
Saginaw Police Department
Southfield Police Department
Taylor Police Department
Warren Police Department
Westland Police Department

MINNESOTA

County and Municipal Police Agencies

Bloomington Police Department
Minneapolis Police Department
St. Cloud Police Department

MISSISSIPPI

Columbus Police Department
Gulfport Police Department
Jackson Police Department
Meridian Police Department
Tupelo Police Department

MISSOURI

Bridgeton Police Department
Clayton Police Department
Florissant Police Department
Jefferson City Police Department
Kansas City Police Department
Maryland Heights Police Department
St. Charles Police Department
St. Louis Police Department
Springfield Police Department

MONTANA

Billings Police Department
Missoula Police Department

NEBRASKA

Omaha Police Department

NEVADA

North Las Vegas Police Department
Sparks Police Department

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Manchester Police Department
Portsmouth Police Department

NEW JERSEY

Asbury Park Police Department
Bayonne Police Department
Bergen Co. Police Department
Bloomfield Police Department
Bridgeton Police Department
Cherry Hill Police Department
Dover Township Police Department
East Orange Police Department
Egg Harbor City Police Department
Englewood Police Department

Fair Lawn Police Department
Franklin Township Police Department
Hillside Police Department
Hackensack Police Department
Hudson Co. Police Department
Jersey City Police Department
Lakewood Police Department
Linden Police Department
Maplewood Police Department
Middletown Police Department
Millville Police Department
Morristown Police Department
Newark Police Department
North Bergen Police Department
Nutley Police Department
Ocean Township Police Department
Orange Township Police Department
Parsippany Police Department
Paterson Police Department
Perth Amboy Police Department
Plainfield Police Department
Sayreville Police Department
So. Brunswick Twp. Police Dept.
Teaneck Police Department
Union Police Department
Vineland Police Department
Wayne Police Department
West New York Police Department
Willingboro Twp. Police Department
Woodbridge Police Department

NEW MEXICO

Albuquerque Police Department
Farmington Police Department
Hobbs Police Department
Roswell Police Department

NEW YORK

Auburn Police Department
Buffalo Police Department
Clarkstown Police Department
Eastchester Police Department
Freeport Police Department
Greenburgh Police Department
Harrison Police Department
Irondequoit Police Department
Jamestown Police Department
Lackawanna Police Department
Long Beach Police Department

County and Municipal Police Agencies

Mount Vernon Police Department
New Rochelle Police Department
Niagara Falls Police Department
Peekskill Police Department
Port Washington Police Department
Poughkeepsie Police Department
Riverhead Police Department
Rockville Center Police Department
Saratoga Springs Police Department
Southampton Police Department
Tonawanda Police Department
Utica Police Department
West Seneca Police Department
Yonkers Police Department

NORTH CAROLINA

Burlington Police Department
Charlotte Police Department
Fayetteville Police Department
Goldsboro Police Department
Greenville Police Department
High Point Police Department
Kannapolis Police Department
Lexington Police Department
Morganton Dept. of Public Safety
Rocky Mount Police Department
Sanford Police Department
Wilmington Police Department

NORTH DAKOTA

Bismarck Police Department
Grand Forks Police Department

OHIO

Akron Police Department
Cincinnati Police Department
Columbus Police Department
East Cleveland Police Department
Euclid Police Department
Kettering Police Department
Lima Police Department
Middletown Police Department
Parma Police Department
Springfield Police Department
Warren Police Department
Zanesville Police Department

OKLAHOMA

Broken Arrow Police Department

Enid Police Department
Midwest City Police Department
Norman Police Department
Ponca City Police Department
Tulsa Police Department

OREGON

Eugene Police Department
Medford Police Department
Salem Police Department

PENNSYLVANIA

Abington Police Department
Allentown Police Department
Bensalem Township Police Department
Bristol Township Police Department
Chester Police Department
Harrisburg Police Department
Lower Merion Twp. Police Dept.
Penn Hills Police Department
Pittsburgh Police Department
Scranton Police Department
Upper Darby Twp. Police Department
Wilkes-Barre Police Department
York Township Police Department

RHODE ISLAND

East Providence Police Department
Newport Police Department
Providence Police Department
Woonsocket Police Department

SOUTH CAROLINA

Anderson Police Department
Charleston Co. Police Dept.
Florence Police Department
Horry Co. Police Department
North Charleston Police Department
Spartanburg Dept. of Public Safety

SOUTH DAKOTA

Rapid City Police Department

TENNESSEE

Chattanooga Police Department
Cleveland Police Department
Jackson Police Department
Kingsport Police Department
Memphis Police Department

County and Municipal Police Agencies

Nashville Police Department

TEXAS

Amarillo Police Department
Austin Police Department
Beaumont Police Department
Brownsville Police Department
Carrollton Police Department
Conroe Police Department
Dallas Police Department
Denton Police Department
Eules Police Department
Fort Worth Police Department
Garland Police Department
Grapeville Police Department
Houston Police Department
Irving Police Department
Laredo Police Department
Longview Police Department
McAllen Police Department
Midland Police Department
Odessa Police Department
Plano Police Department
Richardson Police Department
San Antonio Police Department
Temple Police Department
Texas City Police Department
Victoria Police Department
Wichita Falls Police Department

UTAH

Orem Dept. of Public Safety
Salt Lake City Police Department
West Valley City Police Dept.

VIRGINIA

Albemarle Co. Police Dept.
Chesapeake Police Department
Danville Police Department
Fairfax Police Department
Hampton Police Department
Lynchburg Police Department
Martinsville Police Department
Norfolk Police Department
Portsmouth Police Department
Richmond Police Department
Salem Police Department
Virginia Beach Police Department

WASHINGTON

Bellingham Police Department
Everett Police Department
Olympia Police Department
Seattle Police Department
Tacoma Police Department
Yakima Police Department

WEST VIRGINIA

Huntington Police Department
Wheeling Police Department

WISCONSIN

Beloit Police Department
Eau Claire Police Department
Green Bay Police Department
Kenosha Police Department
Manawa Police Department
Milwaukee Police Department
Oshkosh Police Department
Waukesha Police Department
Wauwatosa Police Department

WYOMING

Cheyenne Police Department

STATE POLICE AGENCIES

Alabama Department of Public Safety
Alaska State Troopers
Arizona Department of Public Safety
Arkansas State Police
California Highway Patrol
Colorado State Patrol
Connecticut State Police
Delaware State Police
Florida Highway Patrol
Georgia Department of Public Safety
Idaho State Police
Illinois State Police
Indiana State Police Department
Iowa State Patrol
Kansas Highway Patrol
Kentucky State Police
Louisiana State Police
Maine State Police
Maryland State Police
Massachusetts State Police
Michigan State Police

County and Municipal Police Agencies

Minnesota State Patrol
Mississippi Highway Safety Patrol
Missouri State Highway Patrol
Montana Highway Patrol
Nebraska State Patrol
Nevada Highway Patrol
New Hampshire State Police
New Jersey Division of State Police
New Mexico State Police
New York State Police
North Carolina State Highway Patrol
North Dakota State Highway Patrol
Ohio State Highway Patrol
Oklahoma Department of Public Safety
Oregon State Police
Pennsylvania State Police
Rhode Island State Police
South Carolina State Highway Patrol
South Dakota Highway Patrol
Tennessee Department of Public Safety
Texas Department of Public Safety
Utah Highway Patrol
Vermont Department of Public Safety
Virginia Department of State Police
Washington State Patrol
West Virginia State Police
Wisconsin State Patrol
Wyoming Highway Patrol

SHERIFF'S AGENCIES

Jefferson Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Mobile Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Tuscaloosa Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Coconino Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Pimo Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Yavapai Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Alameda Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Contra Costa Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Fresno Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Imperial Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Kings Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Los Angeles Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Mendocino Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Monterey Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Nevada Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Placer Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Sacramento Co. Sheriff's Dept.
San Diego Co. Sheriff's Dept.

San Luis Obispo Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Santa Barbara Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Santa Cruz Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Solano Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Stanislaus Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Tulare Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Adams Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Boulder Co. Sheriff's Dept.
El Paso Sheriff's Dept.
Larimer Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Weld Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Alachua Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Brevard Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Charlotte Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Clay Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Columbia Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Escambia Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Highland Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Indian River Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Lee Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Manatee Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Martin Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Nassau Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Orange Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Palm Beach Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Pinellas Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Putnam Co. Sheriff's Dept.
St. Lucie Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Sarasota Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Volusia Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Bibb Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Cherokee Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Clayton Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Columbia Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Dougherty Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Fulton Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Hall Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Houston Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Richmond Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Spalding Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Whitfield Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Bannock Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Canyon County Sheriff's Dept.
DeKalb Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Kane Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Madison Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Peoria Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Sangamon Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Winnebago Co. Sheriff's Dept.

County and Municipal Police Agencies

Elkhart Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Marion Co. Sheriff's Dept.
St. Joseph Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Linn Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Johnson Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Shawnee Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Ascension Parish Sheriff's Dept.
Calcasieu Parish Sheriff's Dept.
Iberia Parish Sheriff's Dept.
Jefferson Parish Sheriff's Dept.
Livingston Parish Sheriff's Dept.
Ouachita Parish Sheriff's Dept.
St. James Parish Sheriff's Dept.
St. Landry Parish Sheriff's Dept.
St. Mary Parish Sheriff's Dept.
Terrebonne Parish Sheriff's Dept.
Vernon Parish Sheriff's Dept.
W. Baton Rouge Sheriff's Dept.
Charles Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Harford Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Prince George's Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Eaton Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Ingham Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Kalamazoo Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Lenawee Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Macomb Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Muskegon Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Ottawa Co. Sheriff's Dept.
St. Clair Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Washtenaw Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Anoka Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Hennepin Co. Sheriff's Dept.
St. Louis Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Wright Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Hinds Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Boone Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Clay Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Greene Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Jefferson Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Douglas Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Sarpy Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Washoe Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Bergen Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Cape May Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Essex Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Hudson Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Middlesex Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Morris Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Passaic Co. Sheriff's Dept.

Union Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Dona Ana Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Chautauqua Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Nassau Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Oneida Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Ontario Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Oswego Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Rockland Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Suffolk Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Warren Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Westchester Co. Dept. of Pub. Safety
Buncombe Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Catawba Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Davidson Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Forsyth Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Guilford Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Iredell Co. Sheriff's Dept.
New Hanover Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Orange Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Randolph Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Rockingham Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Union Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Allen Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Clark Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Fairfield Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Greene Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Lucas Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Montgomery Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Oklahoma Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Clackamas Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Lane Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Multnomah Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Allegheny Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Anderson Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Charleston Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Greenville Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Pickens Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Spartanburg Co. Sheriff's Dept.
York Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Bradley Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Knox Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Rutherford Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Sullivan Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Bexar Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Collin Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Denton Co. Sheriff's Dept.
El Paso Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Galveston Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Harris Co. Sheriff's Dept.

County and Municipal Police Agencies

Jefferson Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Midland Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Nueces Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Smith Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Taylor Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Victoria Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Williamson Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Salt Lake City Sheriff's Dept.
Campbell Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Hanover Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Loudoun Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Pittsylvania Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Stafford Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Clark Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Kitsap Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Snohomish Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Thurston Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Kanawha Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Dane Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Jefferson Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Manitowoc Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Milwaukee Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Racine Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Sheboygan Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Washington Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Winnebago Co. Sheriff's Dept.
Laramie Co. Sheriff's Dept.

SMALL MUNICIPAL AGENCIES

Alabama

Albertville Police Dept.
Alexander City Police Dept.

Arizona

Camden Police Department

Arkansas

Paragould Police Dept.

California

Atascadero Police Dept.
Barstow Police Dept.

Colorado

Brighton Police Dept.
Broomfield Dept. of Public Safety

Connecticut

Ansonia Police Dept.
Avon Police Dept.

Florida

Apopka Police Dept.
Bartow Police Dept.

Georgia

Calhoun Police Dept.
Cartersville Police Dept.
Illinois
Barrington Police Dept.
Indiana
Clarksville Police Dept.
Iowa
Bettendorf Police Dept.
Keokuk Police Dept.
Kansas
El Dorado Dept. of Public Safety
Kentucky
Elizabethtown Police Dept.
Georgetown Police Dept.
Louisiana
Bogalusa Police Dept.
Crowley Police Dept.
Maine
Brunswick Police Dept.
Sanford Police Dept.
Maryland
Aberdeen Police Dept.
Bel Air Police Dept.
Massachusetts
Acton Police Dept.
Michigan
Adrian Police Dept.
Albion Police Dept.
Minnesota
Albert Lea Police Dept.
Anoka Police Dept.
Mississippi
Brookhaven Police Dept.
Clarksdale Police Dept.
Missouri
Ballwin Police Dept.
Montana
Bozeman Police Dept.
Helena Police Dept.
Nevada
Fremont Police Dept.
New Hampshire
Claremont Police Dept.
Hampton Police Dept.
New Jersey
Aberdeen Township Police Dept.
Avalon Police Dept.
New Mexico
Las Vegas Police Dept.

County and Municipal Police Agencies

New York

Amityville Police Dept.

Batavia Police Dept.

North Carolina

Boone Police Dept.

North Dakota

Dickinson Police Dept.

Jamestown Police Dept.

Ohio

Alliance Police Dept.

Oklahoma

Ada Police Dept.

Chickasha Police Dept.

Oregon

Bend Police Dept.

Grants Pass Dept. of Public Safety

Pennsylvania

Bethel Park Police Dept.

Carlisle Police Dept.

Rhode Island

Barrington Police Dept.

Bristol Police Dept.

South Carolina

Cayce Police Dept.

Beaufort Police Dept.

South Dakota

Brookings Police Dept.

Watertown Police Dept.

Tennessee

Bartlett Police Dept.

Brentwood Police Dept.

Texas

Alice Police Dept.

Alvin Police Dept.

Utah

Bountiful Police Dept.

Layton Police Dept.

Vermont

Brattleboro Police Dept.

South Burlington Police Dept.

Virginia

Christiansburg Police Dept.

Colonial Heights Police Dept.

Washington

Aberdeen Police Dept.

Edmonds Police Dept.

West Virginia

Clarksburg Police Dept.

Bluefield Police Dept.

Wisconsin

Ashwaubenon Dept. of Public Safety

Beaver Dam Police Dept.

Wyoming

Gillette Police Dept.

Green River Police Dept.

APPENDIX III

Top Five Research Activities

Top Five Research Activities

Appendix III lists the subjects comprising the top five research activities which consumed most of the sample's time during the year prior to the survey. Two-hundred and thirty-eight agencies listed at least one activity. Categories were combined, where feasible, from the original activities provided by the agencies.

Research Activity	#	%
(1) Policy Manual Revisions/General Orders	191	80.3
(2) Computerization	161	70.2
(3) Agency Budget Compilations	140	58.8
(4) Department Training Related	107	45.0
(5) Agency Accreditation/Reaccreditation	97	40.8
(6) Personnel Deployment	95	40.0
(7) Personnel Issues	88	37.0
(8) Police Equipment (testing and evaluation)	81	34.0
(9) Capital Improvement Issues	76	32.0
(10) Community Relations Programs	62	26.1
(11) Grants Administration	60	25.2
(12) Weapons Related Research	57	24.0
(13) In-house Program Evaluations	39	17.2
(14) Drug Education	39	16.4
(15) Crime Analysis	38	16.0
(16) Strategic Plan/Planning	37	15.5
(17) Use of Force Policy	33	13.9
(18) Directed Patrol	26	11.0
(19) Miscellaneous Administrative Duties	26	11.0
(20) Employee Drug Testing; Drug Abuse Policy	25	10.5
(21) Vehicle Pursuit Policy	25	10.5
(22) Call Prioritization	23	9.7
(23) Work Scheduling Studies	22	9.2
(24) Policy Formulation-General	22	9.2
(25) Health/Wellness Training	21	8.8
(26) Department Reorganization/ Police-Sheriff Merger	20	8.4
(27) Jail Accreditation	20	8.4
(28) Critical Incident Response Studies	19	8.0
(29) Domestic Violence Reduction	18	7.6
(30) Survey Development, Administration, and Data Interpretation	17	7.1

Top Five Research Activities

Research Activity	#	%
(31) Review Legislative Changes/New Laws	15	6.3
(32) Juvenile Related Programs	13	5.5
(33) Legal Research/Updates	13	5.5
(34) Civil Liability/Risk Management	12	5.0
(35) Salary Surveys	11	4.6
(36) Take Home Car Plan	10	4.2
(37) Annual Report	9	3.9
(38) Inter-Agency Agreements	9	3.9
(39) Preparation of City/County Ordinances	9	3.9
(40) Research Assistance (Other than Agency Head)	9	3.9
(41) Special Events Planning	8	3.4
(42) Barricaded Gunman/SWAT Issues	7	3.0
(43) Cost Recovery Programs/Asset Forfeiture	7	<1.0
(44) Space Utilization/Needs Studies	7	3.0
(45) False Alarm Studies/False Alarm Ordinances	6	2.5
(46) Other Chief's Projects (R&D Priority)	6	2.5
(47) Special Crime Victimitizations	6	2.5
(48) Uniform Crime Reports	6	2.5
(49) Air Support Related	5	2.1
(50) Improving Information Exchange	5	2.1
(51) Off-Duty Employment	5	2.1
(52) Police Vehicle Accidents	5	2.1
(53) Career Criminal/Target Offender Programs	4	1.7
(54) Employee Suggestions	4	1.7
(55) Major Non-police Facility Construction	4	1.7
(56) Police Service Delivery City/County Analyses	4	1.7
(57) Reporting Systems Implementation	4	1.7
(58) Vehicle Fleet Management	4	1.7
(59) Consolidation/Annexation Studies	3	1.3
(60) Responses to Nuisance Calls	3	1.3
(61) "Acute Concerns Requiring Immediate Attention"/Immediate Projects	2	<1.0
(62) Case Screening	2	<1.0
(63) Environmental Impact Reports	2	<1.0
(64) Gun Control Legislation	2	<1.0
(65) Management Issues Surveys	2	<1.0
(66) Merge Police/Fire Services	2	<1.0
(67) Presentations for City/County Council	2	<1.0
(68) Search and Seizure Policy	2	<1.0
(69) Annexation Preparation	1	<1.0
(70) Arrest Policy	1	<1.0

Top Five Research Activities

	Research Activity	#	%
(71)	Court-Ordered, Computerized Inmate Release List	1	<1.0
(72)	Crime Scene Diagrams	1	<1.0
(73)	History of Agency	1	<1.0
(74)	Lease Program for Unmarked Vehicles	1	<1.0
(75)	Police Impact Fees on Developers	1	<1.0
(76)	Prisoner and Cell Policies	1	<1.0
(77)	Sexual Harassment Policy	1	<1.0
(78)	State Revision of Accident Forms and Traffic Summonses	1	<1.0