

Seton Hall University

## eRepository @ Seton Hall

---

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses  
(ETDs)

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses

---

Summer 8-1-2020

# Understanding the Perceptions of Supervision and Supervisory Behavior of Patrol Precinct Patrol Supervisors in a Goal-Oriented Police Department

Jerry L. Garcia

Seton Hall University, [jerry.garcia43@verizon.net](mailto:jerry.garcia43@verizon.net)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Law Enforcement and Corrections Commons](#), [Leadership Studies Commons](#), and the [Organization Development Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Garcia, Jerry L., "Understanding the Perceptions of Supervision and Supervisory Behavior of Patrol Precinct Patrol Supervisors in a Goal-Oriented Police Department" (2020). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 2784.

<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2784>

**UNDERSTANDING THE PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISION AND  
SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR OF PATROL PRECINCT PATROL  
SUPERVISORS IN A GOAL-ORIENTED POLICE DEPARTMENT**

By

Jerry L. Garcia

Dissertation Committee:

Barbara V. Strobert, Ed. D., Mentor

Christopher H. Tienken, Ed.D.

Domenick R. Varricchio, Ed. D.

Edward J. Lynskey, Ed. D.

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree  
Doctor of Education  
Department of Education Leadership, Management, and Policy  
Seton Hall University  
2020

Copyright © 2020 By Jerry L. Garcia

All Rights Reserved



**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES**  
**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY**

**APPROVAL FOR SUCCESSFUL DEFENSE**

**Jerry Garcia** has successfully defended and made the required modifications to the text of the doctoral dissertation for the Ed.D. during this **Spring Semester 2020**.

**DISSERTATION COMMITTEE**

(please sign and date beside your name)

Mentor:

Dr. Barbara Strobert

*Barbara Strobert, Ed.D.*

05/14/2020

Date

Committee Member:

Dr. Christopher Tienken

*Christopher Tienken*

05/14/2020

Date

Committee Member:

Dr. Domenick Varricchio

*Domenick Varricchio*

05/14/2020

Date

Committee Member:

Dr. Edward Lynskey

*Edward J. Lynskey*

05/14/2020

Date

The mentor and any other committee members who wish to review revisions will sign and date this document only when revisions have been completed. Please return this form to the Office of Graduate Studies, where it will be placed in the candidate's file and submit a copy with your final dissertation to be bound as page number two.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

First, I would like to thank Dr. Barbara Strobert, my Dissertation mentor. It was your inspirational words that helped to finally convince me to finish my Dissertation, although others have tried. I will never forget those words “don’t waste my time and I won’t waste yours. I’ve been known to go to peoples’ homes and jobs to get my papers”. Sometimes it takes something that simple to light a spark. You kept me moving forward. For that, and for your unwavering guidance in completion of this academic achievement – I am truly grateful.

Next, I would like to thank Dr. Domenick Varricchio. I was lucky enough to have you as my Professor. Over time, I rose to become your colleague. Over the years, I ultimately became your friend. You encouraged me to further my education after completion of each degree I received. It is with your encouraging words, your interest in my success, and the resilience to see me through it that I ultimately became a Doctor. For that, I am sincerely and eternally grateful – I cannot thank you enough.

Then, I would like to thank Dr. Edward Lynskey. I was lucky enough to also have you as my Professor. Your academic excellence created a presence I admired as a student, and used for a role model when I became a nascent Professor. You supported me throughout my dissertation process, and was always there when I needed advice. For that – I am truly grateful.

Lastly, I would like to thank Dr. Christopher Tienken. Your reputation as an academic scholar is without refute, as you truly represent the essence of higher education. Although you had a very busy schedule, you still took time to become a member of my committee, and helped to refine my writing. For that – I am truly grateful.

While some may have had a more direct influence in my academic endeavor, others have contributed to my academic success in their own ways. I would like to thank Seton Hall University, and the Police Graduate Studies program, for giving me the opportunity and environment which contributed to my learning and growth in academics. They have allowed me to meet individuals whose selfless contributions were pivotal to my academic success: Dr. Gerard Babo (R.I.P), Dr. Christopher Zimmerman, Dr. Joseph Zagarella, Dr. Rodney Boyd, and the staff members in the College of Education. For all that you did – I am truly grateful.

## **DEDICATION**

To my two sons – Justin and Trevor:

It's not where you came from – that can never be changed.

It's where you want to go – that can always be changed.

There is nothing in life you can't accomplish if you truly want it.

Life will throw obstacles your way – overcome them.

To the man in the mirror:

While my gaze was far and wide, Perseverance was always by my side.

## **ABSTRACT**

This research was focused on understanding the perceptions of patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors, within the New York City Police Department, as they relate to supervision of Police Officers in a goal-oriented police department, and whether there is a connection between this perception and a supervisors behavior.

In 1994, policing in the New York City Police Department had shifted to a predictive approach to law enforcement. Police Officers were now given performance objectives to achieve. Patrol Supervisors were given the responsibility to ensure that Police Officers met those objectives, and were held strictly accountable for it. Since accountability was now placed on supervisors for performance objective achievement, there arose concerns as to whether goal-oriented policing affected supervisors and their manner of supervision.

To conduct this phenomenological research, a qualitative methodological design was utilized to collect, process, and code relevant data. This design included the utilization of open-ended interviews for data collection, transcriptions for data processing, and themed coding for data interpretation. The research findings were used to answer an overarching research question, and three sub-questions, that undergirded the research.

The results of this research seem to suggest that, as accountability is placed on Patrol Supervisors to get Police Officers to achieve performance objectives, Patrol Supervisors tend to behave in contrary to what is expected of them, and how they are trained. Results also seem to suggest that a Patrol Supervisors behavior is dependent on non-departmental guideline factors in conjunction with departmental guidelines.

In conclusion, the 21<sup>st</sup> century has demonstrated a new paradigm of law enforcement implemented by way of predictive policing. Some police departments have changed their



management of crime to reflect goal-oriented policing. However, these departments have not adapted their organizational structure, from which they were founded on, to a model that is more flexible in supervision. If police departments are going to require more from their supervisors, and hold them strictly accountable for these requirements, then these departments must be structured accordingly.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	i
DEDICATION .....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	x
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION .....	1
Background .....	1
Statement of The Problem .....	7
Purpose of The Research .....	9
Research Questions .....	10
Theoretical Framework .....	11
Design and Methodology .....	12
Limitations of The Research .....	13
Delimitations of The Research .....	14
Significance of The Research .....	15
Definitions of Terms .....	17
Summary .....	19
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	21
Introduction .....	21
Literature Search Procedures .....	22
Evolution and Professionalization of Policing .....	23

Ancient Origins .....	23
Early England .....	26
Late England and Britain .....	28
America .....	30
New York City .....	32
New York City Police Department .....	37
Operations and Structure .....	37
Training and Standards .....	40
Supervisor Development and Assignments .....	44
Organizational Structures and Foundations .....	47
Differentiated Models .....	47
Business Theories .....	50
Leadership and Management .....	53
Organizational Change .....	57
Goal-Oriented Policing .....	61
Summary .....	65
CHAPTER III: DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY .....	66
Introduction .....	66
Researcher Background .....	66
Purpose of The Research .....	68
Design of The Research .....	69
Methodology of The Research .....	69
Research Permission .....	69

Interview Site .....	70
Participant Solicitation and Selection .....	71
Interview Procedures and Format .....	71
Data Collection .....	73
Jury of Experts .....	75
Interview Questions .....	77
Participant Demographics .....	80
Data Analysis .....	81
Validity and Reliability .....	82
Summary .....	84
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS OF RESEARCH .....	85
Introduction .....	85
Data Collected .....	86
Data Coding .....	86
Emergent Themes for Participant Interview Questions # 1 – 5 .....	87
Emergent Themes for Participant Interview Questions # 6 – 10 .....	91
Emergent Themes for Participant Interview Questions # 11 – 16 .....	96
Categorical Themes .....	101
Categorical Themes for Research Sub-Question # 1 .....	101
Categorical Themes for Research Sub-Question # 2 .....	103
Categorical Themes for Research Sub-Question # 3 .....	105
Dominant Themes .....	108
Dominant Themes for Research Sub-Question # 1 .....	108

Dominant Themes for Research Sub-Question # 2 .....	110
Dominant Themes for Research Sub-Question # 3 .....	112
Findings .....	114
Summary .....	117
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	119
Introduction .....	119
Research Questions .....	119
Summary of Findings .....	121
Conclusion .....	123
Recommendations for Practice .....	127
Recommendations for Policy .....	128
Recommendations for Future Research .....	129
Summary and Reflection .....	131
REFERENCES .....	135
APPENDICES .....	150
Appendix A – Solicitation Letter to Sergeants Benevolent Association .....	150
Appendix B – Response Email from Sergeants Benevolent Association .....	152
Appendix C – Seton Hall Institutional Review Board Approval Letter .....	153
Appendix D – Solicitation Letter to Participants .....	154
Appendix E – Informed Consent Letter to Participants .....	155
Appendix F – Demographic Data Form .....	159
Appendix G – Participant Interview Transcripts .....	160
Appendix H – Participant Interview Observations .....	217

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Participant Demographic Data .....	80
Table 2. Demographic Data Ranges and Averages .....	81
Table 3. Thematic Coding of Data for Research Sub-Question # 1 .....	87
Table 4. Thematic Coding of Data for Research Sub-Question # 2 .....	91
Table 5. Thematic Coding of Data for Research Sub-Question # 3 .....	96

## **CHAPTER I**

### **Background**

This research explores the perceptions and behaviors of Patrol Supervisors in a goal-oriented police department. To better understand police practices, an historical overview on the development of policing is warranted. Modern day policing in America, with its paramilitary structure and distinct role in domestic affairs, can trace its roots back to the colonial period. During that time, the first European settlers brought with them a sense that God and society are intertwined. As such, any offense committed against society was also considered an offense committed against God, and vice versa (Walker, 1998). This strong religious belief encouraged members of the community to take matters of law into their own hands. Still, while there may have been officials to oversee the laws, there was little in the way of structure to it. As such, it may have appeared that there were times of lawlessness in the community.

It was not until the American revolution that the notion of a military style structure for policing came about. During the American revolution, the British crown used their standing army to police civilians in Boston, Massachusetts; and other cities to keep the peace, collect taxes, and squash revolts (Roots, 2001). Nonetheless, this enforcement of civilian laws by the British standing army did not go over well with civilians, who were also experiencing another burden of the British standing army, as the army often sought quartering in civilian homes.

After the American revolution ended, and the British crown lost the war, the newfound American government was able to enact a constitution to govern its people (White House, 2019). This constitution would contain a bill of rights that included the

third amendment which would bar a standing army from quartering in civilian homes (National Archives, 2019). Still, as much as this constitution would limit government powers, it did not bar a standing army from enforcing civilian laws. This was crucial, because after the retreat of the British army back to Europe, the American standing army was left to enforce civilian laws. All at a time when the newfound American government would continue to experience revolts by its citizens. Shays rebellion, and later the Whiskey rebellion, were two such revolts that led the newfound American government to continue utilizing a standing army to enforce civilian laws (Balko, 2013).

With that in mind, and with the fear that other civilian rebellions may arise, it became apparent to the newfound American government that there needed to be a separate and distinct way of policing citizens, and subsequent enforcement of civilian laws. A new way which would not involve a standing army. Nevertheless, could project a military like presence. The new way of policing would be expected to enforce civilian laws and squash civilian revolts. Hence, the birth of paramilitary policing was now set in motion. After the 1850's, cities in the northeast began to engage in this style of paramilitary policing as more and more civilians became uniformed Patrol Officers (Roots, 2001). Cities such as Boston, Philadelphia, and New York were some of the first to try and develop a formal division of a police force within their city government (More, Vito, & Walsh, 2006; Walker & Katz, 2013). As a result, more cities began to take control of their communities in order to limit government and remove the distrust of the American standing army (National Criminal et al., 2019).

Unfortunately, many of these new police forces were ineffective and inefficient in their communities (More et al., 2006; Walker & Katz, 2013). They were plagued with



corruption, violence, and discrimination as many citizens only joined these police forces in order to avoid military service or just to have a job (More et. al., 2006; Walker & Katz, 2013). One such police force was New York City's Night Watch Police. It was loosely created in 1828, and was subsequently designed to follow the London, England police model established by Sir Robert Peel (Swanson, Territo, & Taylor, 2012). The hope was that this force could keep the peace better than the various civilian patrols and constable forces that were utilized right after the American revolution. However, this police force ultimately proved to be a failure as well (National Criminal et al., 2019).

In the many years that followed the American revolution, the city of New York became increasingly strife with crime. Destitute and desperate immigrants from European countries came looking for a better life, and had to settle into squalor conditions with few having jobs (National Criminal et al., 2019). The New York City Night Watch Police was charged with keeping the peace, enforcing the laws, and squashing disturbances in these communities. However, they were not effective. This precipitated a need for a more well-organized, well-structured, and better trained police force. As a result, in 1845 the New York City Night Watch Police was disbanded, and replaced with the Municipal Police force. This new force was now issued a first set of printed rules and regulations (National Criminal et al., 2019).

However, this police force was still not enough to combat the mushrooming crime rate in New York City. As a result, a state controlled Metropolitan Police District was created in 1857 to phase out the Municipal Police force (National Criminal et al., 2019). Even so, members of the Municipal Police did not want to give up their position and would clash with members of the Metropolitan Police District. Eventually, an agreement was reached,

and members of the Municipal Police soon joined the Metropolitan Police District; which was governed by three Police Commissioners of New York City (National Crime et al., 2019). Ultimately, the Metropolitan Police District became so large that in late 1857 it was subdivided into precincts, which were then further subdivided into patrol beats.

Finally, the new Metropolitan Police District was now in place and charged with combating crime conditions, civilian disturbances, and later on the Civil War draft riots (National Criminal et al., 2019). However in 1870, after much political wrangling, New York City was given control of the Metropolitan Police District within the city. At which point, the Municipal Police force was resumed and responsible for policing in New York City. Then on June 18, 1878, President Rutherford B. Hayes signed into law the “Posse Comitatus Act” (Posse Comm., 1878). This act essentially ended the American standing military from enforcing domestic policy, thereby leaving the enforcement of domestic policy strictly up to police forces. Now, police forces not only had a defined structure, but domestic autonomy as well. However, this did little to stem the continued increase in crime, particularly in the city of New York. Which in 1898, had now become bigger in size due to the consolidation of areas outside of New York City into New York City; making it the Greater City of New York (History, 2019). Even more, in order to create a greater police force at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, in 1898 the New York State legislature forced the incorporation of 18 smaller police agencies, from the consolidated areas, into the Municipal Police force. The result was a larger police department, which was then renamed the New York Police Department of the Greater City of New York. This newly created police department was now run by a single Police Commissioner (National

Criminal et al., 2019). This was just the beginning for key pivotal changes in New York City on how policing was conducted.

The start of the 20<sup>th</sup> century saw some technological and social changes in society (Reiss, 1992). The invention of the automobile, communications, and demand for a more professional police force were three of the main changes (Walker & Katz, 2013). Even more, politicians and police leaders wanted to reduce corruption and inefficiency within the police department; as well as transforming the administration and delivery of police services (Fogelson, 1977). Because of this demand for change, command and control of the department was now centralized to a new police headquarters. The hope was that it would improve police accountability and remove the corrupt influences of neighborhood politics. Thus, with the new technologies of cars and radios, the New York City Police Department started keeping crime statistics and was now able to respond more quickly to crime problems (Manning, 1992). These changes, combined with principles of military science that included: strategy, tactics, and logistics (Vollmer, 1933) helped the New York City Police Department become a modernized paramilitary police department.

After the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, crime in New York City continued to rise throughout much of the century. In addition, New York City's population continued to rise as well. Immigrants from other areas of the world now began their arrival into the city (History, 2019), bringing with them the same destitution and desperation as their European counterparts. This rise in population, coupled with the effects of: global wars, stock market crashes, organizing of criminal enterprises and gangs, prohibition, drug epidemics, and even social unrests inadvertently brought attention to the limitations of the newly reformed New York City Police Department (Kelling & Moore, 1988).

Over the course of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, attempts were made by the New York City Police Department to combat the continued rising crime in the city. However, the crime management methods utilized by the department were sporadic at best, with operational strategies and policing concepts that were more reactive than proactive. From Operation Crossroads, to Community Policing beats, to Police Officers participating in crime awareness lectures, many of these policing concepts typically required little effort on the part of Police Officers in the way of enforcement. Other concepts required no effort at all for Police Officers, as they were civilian driven. Civilian programs like Gun Buy-Back and the Crime Stoppers Hotline, which were also sporadic, did little to reduce crime. As Kelling (2009) noted: “As soon became clear, sporadic police programs weren’t enough”.

Then in 1994, the new Commissioner of the New York City Police Department, William Bratton, recognized that the department needed a new and lasting way to manage crime. One that was different from the previous methods used, and a lot more proactive in enforcement. The new method for crime management that was chosen was centered on an operational strategy utilizing the business model theory ‘Management By Objectives’. This theory was previously used by Police Commissioner Bratton when he served as the Chief of Transit in the New York City Police Department (NYPD, 1995). As Kelling (2009) explained it:

. . . [the theory was used in order to impart on] the force’s members a clear vision of the “business” of the NYPD and how their activities contributed to it. In short, a theory previously advocated largely by elites filtered down to—and inspired—line police officers, who had constituted a largely ignored and underused capacity.

As such, supervisors were now expected to utilize Police Officers more aggressively in

managing crime than they had ever been used in the past. From then on, Police Officers would be given performance objectives to achieve that were enforcement centered.

However, a new operational strategy alone would not be enough. There needed to be a system in place that would guide the performance objectives, sort of like a new policing principle. Henceforth, the CompStat system was created. This system was a computer program designed to receive data input on crime variables and store them in a single database. This database would then be searched by Commanding Officers, using specific parameters, in order to determine high crime locations whereby targeted enforcement would be directed (Haberfeld, 2006). Commanding Officers would then advise Patrol Supervisors to allocate Police Officers to these locations; as well as advise what type of objectives should be achieved. In addition, these performance objectives would all be measured. As the Six Sigma model would infer – whatever gets measured gets done (Denhardt, Denhardt, & Aristigueta, 2009). Police Officers were now not only assigned targeted locations within their precincts to achieve performance objectives, but these objectives were now being measured as well. Accordingly, the New York City Police Department began implementing the goal-oriented policing method of managing crime.

### **Statement of The Problem**

Since 1828, with the inception of organized police forces in New York City, there has always been a need for supervision of Police Officers. These forces were continuously plagued with internal problems; many related to the Police Officers themselves. From the New York City Night Watch Police, to the later New York City Municipal Police force, to the merger with the Metropolitan Police Division, and finally the renaming to the New York Police Department; Police Officers were historically viewed as drunks, violent,

corrupt, and discriminating. Since this inception of organized police forces, there has always been a constant demand by politicians, police leaders, and communities to remove those negative elements from those police forces.

Because of that, historically supervisors had a clear role when it came to supervision. The role of the supervisor was to hold individual Police Officers accountable for their actions or inactions. Even more, the paramilitary structure of policing gave supervisors a hierarchy in which to compel this accountability. Later in 1845, when a set of rules and regulations were introduced to policing, supervisors now had a set of guidelines in which to formally hold Police Officers accountable. At the end of the day, it was the Police Officers who were ultimately held accountable for their actions or inactions. It was the role of the supervisors to be responsible for holding this accountability.

However in 1994, the assigning of accountability all changed with the implementation of the goal-oriented system of crime managing. As Police Officers were given quantified performance objectives to achieve, it now became the responsibility of the supervisors to ensure that Police Officers met those objectives. If Police Officers failed to meet those objectives, the accountability for failure would now be shifted to the supervisors, rather than on the individual Police Officers. Since the accountability was now being placed on supervisors, rather than individual Police Officers for achieving performance objectives, there became concerns as to whether goal-oriented policing, in some way, influences how supervisors perceive the meaning of supervision. There is very little qualitative research conducted on whether this perception of supervision influences a supervisors' behavior, in relation to duties and responsibilities, when interacting with Police Officers in pursuit of these individual performance objectives.

## **Purpose of The Research**

The purpose of this qualitative research is to describe the perceptions that patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors have in relation to supervision, and supervisory behavior, in a goal-oriented police department. Also, whether this perception has any influence on their behaviors in relation to Police Officers achieving performance objectives. This research is predicated on the theoretical framework that Patrol Supervisors in the New York City Police Department are expected to follow a paramilitary style of supervision when supervising subordinates, and when performing duties and responsibilities. The term “paramilitary” is loosely defined as hierarchical in nature and emphasizes a military-like adherence to organizational rules and regulations. Furthermore, when supervising in a paramilitary structured organization, the expectation for supervisors is such that any deviation by subordinates from the rules and regulations is to be met with immediate corrective measures.

With the introduction of goal-oriented policing into the New York City Police Department, it is suggested patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors have begun to re-evaluate their role as supervisor. Moreover, this re-evaluation may have had an effect on how supervisors behave in an organization that is paramilitary in structure, yet is goal-oriented in management. This phenomenological research is being conducted in order to explore the perceptions New York City Police Department patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors have about supervision in a goal-oriented police department. This research will also examine how these perceptions may have an influence on supervisory behavior, as it pertains to duties and responsibilities, when supervisors interact with Police Officers, in pursuit of achieving performance objectives.

Since its' inception, there have been many studies conducted related to goal-oriented policing. Some studies have examined whether the CompStat computer crime tracking system had any effect on crime. Still, other studies have examined the use of quantified performance objectives on community perceptions. Even more, some legal scholars have questioned whether implementing performance objectives for Police Officers were legal. With that, there is a lack of research concerning the effect goal-oriented policing has on supervision. More specifically, a supervisors' perceptions of supervision, and how it relates to their supervisory behavior. The results of this research may help to add to the existing body of literature on supervision in law enforcement by understanding whether a paradigm change in crime management imparts a change in policing supervision.

### **Research Questions**

Research overarching question:

What perceptions do patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors have in a goal-oriented police department as they relate to supervision, and supervisory behavior, when interacting with Police Officers in pursuit of achieving performance objectives?

Research sub-questions:

SQ # 1 – How do patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors perceive their promotional training in relation to preparedness for their duties and responsibilities in a goal-oriented police department?

SQ # 2 – How do patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors perceive their duties and responsibilities in relation to supervising a patrol squad in a goal-oriented police department?



SQ # 3 – How is a patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors performance perceived in relation to the expectations and performances of other Patrol Supervisors in a goal-oriented police department?

### **Theoretical Framework**

This phenomenological research examines the perceptions and behaviors of patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors as they relate to supervising in a police department that is goal oriented. In order to conduct this examination, there must be an understanding of the factors involved in the pursuit and achievement of organizational goals. As such, a theoretical framework will be used to undergird this research. The theory chosen is ‘Management by Objectives’; as it will help to contextualize this research as it relates to the demands, expectations, motivational forces, and intricacies of both supervision and the organization.

Management By Objectives (M.B.O.) is an organizational business theory which suggests that an organization can reach pre-determined goals by utilizing quantifiable objectives to be achieved by employees. M.B.O. further emphasizes the decision-making process as being the primary tool of management (Lynch & Lynch, 2005). Yet, in an organization where supervisors are typically the ones held accountable for an employees’ success, or lack thereof, the achieving of pre-determined goals, and subsequent decision-making can become conflicted. This, then creates uncertainty within the supervisor as there is now a concern for production, as well as a concern for people (Blake & Mouton, 1964). It is these concerns that the research will examine in relation to how they influence a supervisors’ perceptions and behaviors.

## **Design and Methodology**

In order to garner the proper data to answer all research questions posed, this research must have a clear and concise methodology. This qualitative design phenomenological methodology will use semi-structured interviews to collect the descriptive data needed for the phenomenon occurring. Phenomenological research is used when the data sought is based upon the experiences of the Participants (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). The research will begin by forwarding a letter to the Sergeants Benevolent Association (S.B.A.) of the New York City Police Department. This letter will request the S.B.A. query 108 Bronx county patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors for volunteers to participate in research being done. This query will advise any potential Participants of the nature of the research and that anyone interested in volunteering should contact the S.B.A. within 30 days. After 30 days, the S.B.A. will be asked to select a sample size of 15 volunteer Participants from all the Patrol Supervisors that responded back by utilizing purposive sampling (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). This sampling method will provide a diverse background of Participants. These Participants will then be identified by a single unique Participant letter throughout the research. To be eligible to participate in the research the Participants will be required to perform strictly patrol duties, in a patrol precinct, within the county of Bronx, and have the designation of Patrol Supervisor for at least the prior 6 months. This time frame is suggested in order to give the Participants time to acclimate to the position of Patrol Supervisor, and to develop patrol experiences.

After selection, all Participants will be given an in-depth one-on-one interview using a set of open-ended, pre-determined questions related to the three research sub-questions (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). The questions will be reviewed by a 'jury of experts', all of

whom are subject matter experts, for approval. The Participants' answers will then be electronically recorded and later transcribed. The interview site will be determined by each individual Participant to allow for comfort, and to avoid generating responses which may have been chosen under pressure, or unduly influenced by the New York City Police Department. It will also remove the potential for "observer effect" (Creswell, 2009). This privacy should add a degree of validity and reliability to the research (Creswell, 2009). Participants will also be asked to fill out a demographic questionnaire to collect data on each Participants' background. During the interview, the Researcher will take field notes to record all non-verbal data. Once all the interviews are completed, and the responses are transcribed, the transcriptions will then be given to each respective Participant for review, and to ensure the validity of the answers (Creswell, 2009).

After all transcripts are acceptable, all data collected will then be reviewed. The most pertinent data will be thematically coded, categorized, and analyzed for both meaning and dominant themes. Utilizing the results from analysis, conclusions will then be drawn to answer each of the three research sub-questions posed. Whereby, in conjunction with a review of existing literature, the conclusions will help to answer the overarching research question that undergirds the research.

### **Limitations of The Research**

The New York City Police Department employs approximately 5,000 uniformed members serving in the rank of Sergeant. While this may seem like a large enough pool to draw a good sampling size from, not all Sergeants are patrol oriented. Department-wide duties and assignments vary greatly. Even within the patrol precincts themselves, many Sergeants perform only patrol-related functions and are not designated as a Patrol

Supervisor. As a result, most Sergeants are not eligible to participate in this research due to their lack of direct and dedicated patrol experiences. This, thereby limits the pool to a small, yet purposive group of potential Participants.

Furthermore, because qualitative designs rely on descriptive data from Participants, responses given by Participants are limited by the subjectivity of ones perceptions, ability for ones recollection, and may contain potential biases. These biases can be related to: the interview questions, the Interviewer, the New York City Police Department, or harbored by the Participant. Therefore, the Researcher must rely on honest and accurate responses from the Participants to ensure proper data is collected. What's more, these Participant limitations create limitations on the research design as the results of the research cannot be used to determine cause and effect of the phenomenon occurring.

As a retired Captain from the New York City Police Department there is a potential for personal bias. While I may be unaware of my personal biases guiding this research, every attempt will be made to conduct this research as fair and impartial as possible. Even more, at the time of this research, I am 5 years removed from the New York City Police Department. As such, any influences I may have held within the New York City Police Department have significantly diminished over this time.

### **Delimitations of The Research**

In order to collect data that is valid and reliable there must be parameters under which the data will be sought and collected. This research will collect only qualitative data, from 15 volunteer Participants, with at least 6 months experience as a Patrol Supervisor, and are assigned to Bronx county patrol precincts. The county of Bronx is chosen for this research as it contains approximately 108 Patrol Supervisors to sample from, and is

considered one of the busiest counties, crime wise, in New York City. Because the sizes and demographics of all 5 counties comprising New York City vary, only one county was chosen for this research. Therefore, the results of this research may not be generalizable beyond the Bronx county, or the New York City Police Department. This research will then use a one-on-one interview format with the Participants. These Participants will be chosen by the union organization that represents them using purposive sampling. The reason the union is asked to select the Participants is to help remove any perceived Researcher bias, and to add a degree of validity to the research.

### **Significance of The Research**

An increasing number of law enforcement organizations – throughout the nation – have begun to implement goal-oriented policing to address crime issues. This nation-wide phenomenon is a direct result of the New York City Police Department having reduced its crime rates through the use of goal-oriented policing. However, inasmuch as goal-oriented policing has generated some success in reducing crime, it has also generated some concerns as well. These concerns are the result of conflict between how supervision is understood and how it is perceived. Even more, this conflict may have affected how Patrol Supervisors behave toward their Police Officers when performing supervisory duties and responsibilities.

This research will address the beliefs, perceptions, decision-making motivations, and experiences of New York City Police Department patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors as they relate to supervising in a goal-oriented police department. There are certain understandings that come with being a supervisor, particularly in the areas of duties and responsibilities. In a law enforcement organization that is paramilitary in structure, those

understandings can typically be narrower and more defined. However, when a law enforcement organization is goal-oriented in its management, those understandings can be broader and more adaptive to the goals being sought. As a result, when you now have a law enforcement organization that is paramilitary in structure, yet is goal-oriented in its management, a supervisors understandings of supervision can become conflicted. Even more, this conflict can impact a supervisors' perceptions on how to perform duties and responsibilities. When this happens, a supervisors' motivation in making decisions can also be affected. At which point, decisions may not be made that are in the best interests of the organization, but are in the best interests of the supervisor.

This research may be used to assist law enforcement organizations in the future by:

- 1) Helping to better understand how operational changes affect a supervisors' perceptions of supervision.
- 2) Understanding how a supervisors' motivation to supervise can be affected by personal accountability in pursuit of organizational goals.
- 3) Helping to better understand the importance of evaluating current practices of supervision and supervisory behavior leading to the development of effective supervisory training programs that assist in achieving organizational goals.
- 4) Understanding the need to establish organization-wide policies on best practices for supervision in a changing organization – along with what constitutes acceptable supervisory behavior during organizational change.

In order to effectively implement change, an organization must be able to recognize and understand the variables that affect perceptions and experiences of supervisors, as well as how the variables influence supervisory behavior and decision-making. The data

collected from this research may help to uncover those variables. If supervisory behavior is going to be predicated on the perceptions of supervision, then an organization needs to develop a comprehensive protocol that will clearly define supervision and enhance the performance and competency of supervisors.

### **Definitions of Terms**

To have a better understanding of what is being researched some terms, acronyms, and definitions need to be explained a little more in-depth, as they will be used throughout the research, and may be referred to in full or by abbreviated form unless otherwise noted.

**B.L.C. – Basic Leadership Course.** A four-week departmental training course taken by Police Officers, who are newly promoted to the rank of Sergeant, in order to acclimate them to the position of supervisor.

**Commanding Officer –** For the purpose of this research, a person in charge of a patrol precinct, typically serving in the rank of Captain, Deputy Inspector, or Inspector.

**CompStat –** For the purpose of this research, is a computer program designed to assist in crime fighting whereby crime statistics and enforcement data are inputted into a database for analysis. This database can then be queried using specific parameters to find specific data results.

**Goal-Oriented Policing –** A method of crime management where Police Officers, based on data driven analysis, engage in targeted enforcement to achieve pre-determined performance objectives to reach organizational goals.

**I.C.O. – Integrity Control Officer.** For the purpose of this research, is the person within a patrol precinct, typically in the rank of Lieutenant, who is responsible for overseeing the adherence of precinct personnel to departmental rules and regulations.

New York City Police Department – A large municipal police department encompassing the greater City of New York. As of January 2019, there were approximately 36,000 paid uniformed officers, arranged in a hierarchical structure from Police Officer to Chief of Department (New York..., 2019).

Paramilitary Structure – An organizational outline that is arranged in such a way that it resembles a standing military in hierarchy, discipline, training, and protocol, and is employed in civilian organizations.

Patrol Precinct – A police station located within demarcated geographical boundary lines, subdivided into sectors, and whose Police Officers are charged with enforcing laws and providing service to the community within those boundary lines. As of January, 2019, the New York City Police Department contained 77 patrol precincts (New York..., 2019).

Patrol Supervisor – For the purpose of this research, is a person who holds the rank of Sergeant in a patrol precinct and is charged with direct supervision of a patrol squad.

Patrol Squad – For the purpose of this research, is group of approximately 8 – 10 Police Officers whose primary function is patrol duties, and is overseen by a Sergeant.

Platoon Commander – For the purpose of this research, is a person who holds the rank of Lieutenant in a patrol precinct and is charged with direct supervision of 3 patrol squads during a single tour of duty.

Police Officer – For the purpose of this research, is a paid uniformed officer in the New York City Police Department, sworn to uphold the laws of New York State and to serve members of the community.



Sector – A sub-division of a patrol precinct where specific Police Officers are assigned for the purpose of patrolling during their tour of duty.

Supervisor – For the purpose of this research, is a person who is at least one rank above a subordinate, and may have direct or indirect authority over that subordinate.

Targeted Enforcement – The allocation of Police Officers to specific locations, to address identified crimes, utilizing enforcement tools. For example: arrests, summons, or intelligence gathering paperwork.

### **Summary**

Chapter I provided a background on the evolution of policing in America: from the early colonists seeing it as God-centered, to the influence of British Crown rule, to its constitutional and federal codifying. The background then touched on the basic principles of supervision in policing with an emphasis on the New York City Police Department. A theoretical framework on ‘Management by Objectives’ was then provided to demonstrate how supervision can be used to attain organizational goals through the use of objectives, and how supervision relates to the treatment of subordinates.

After the background is described, a statement of the problem is derived from which this research will be based. The chapter then described the importance of conducting this research, along with benefits associated with its findings. Finally, the chapter delineated how the research will be organized including: what data will be needed to conduct the research, where this data will come from, and how it will be coded for analyzing.

Supervisors are typically given latitude when making decisions. The expectation of an organization is such that these decisions will be in the best interests of the organization. However, when a supervisor is conflicted in decision-making there can be consequences.

Therefore, it is the intention of this research to understand a supervisors' perceptions and behaviors when supervising in a goal-oriented police department, as they relate to interacting with Police Officers in pursuit of achieving performance objectives.

Chapter II will review the existing body of literature as it relates to: the evolution of policing, the history of the New York City Police Department, various business theories, various organizational structural models, and organizational change.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **Introduction**

The role of supervisor traces back to the earliest known times of civilized humanity. Families, communities, and even militaries espoused a hierarchy whereby someone was charged with overseeing someone else. Over time, as private and public organizations developed, particularly law enforcement organizations, the role of supervisor became more prominent. Although the function of supervisor has changed little since its earliest implementation, the methods of supervising, as well as the behavior of supervisors, have changed noticeable. These changes have led to many studies by researchers throughout the last century. At the core of these studies, researchers have endeavored to understand what people perceive in their role as supervisor, as well as why people behave a certain way when supervising. Scholars have written many books on the topic of supervision. At times, even offering up suggestions for best practices.

However, very little research has been done on a phenomenon the Researcher refers to as ‘Conflicted Supervision’. This occurs when an organizations’ structure and training is imparted on a supervisor that can be counter-effective to reaching the organizations’ goals. As a result, the supervisor tends to be conflicted about the role of supervisor. In some law enforcement organizations that utilize goal-oriented policing, this phenomenon has become prevalent. Reason being, this type of law enforcement organization utilizes a paramilitary style structure and training to guide a supervisors’ behavior. Then, tells a supervisor what performance objectives must be achieved by Police Officers. Then, holds a supervisors’ behavior accountable for the efforts of Police Officers when pursuing their performance objectives. When this conflict occurs, the supervisor must decide which

behavior is best; one that conforms to the structure and training of the organization, or one that conforms to ensuring a positive accountability for achievement of performance objectives. Ultimately, decisions are made that are in the best interests of the supervisor, and not necessarily in the best interests of the organization.

This chapter provides a review of existing literature that relates to the phenomenon being researched. The first section of the chapter provides an overview on the evolution of policing: from its ancient origins across Europe, to the legitimizing of policing in America, to the establishment of the New York City Police Department. The second section of the chapter provides an overview of the New York City Police Department: from a delineation of its hierarchical paramilitary structure, to an examination of departmental training and organizational standards, to insights into the development of supervisors and their relevant supervisory roles in the New York City Police Department. The third section of the chapter provides an overview of organizational structures and foundations: from various structures that can be implemented, to prominent business management theories, to a review of different styles of leadership and management, to the effects of changing operations within an organization. The last section of the chapter provides an overview on the precepts and functionality of goal-oriented policing.

### **Literature Search Procedures**

To review the existing literature most prevalent to the phenomenon being researched, the Researcher engaged numerous resources. First, the Seton Hall University Walsh library was queried for relevant book publications, journals, and peer-reviewed articles, as well as the perusal of the educational resources information center. Walsh library also allowed access to eRepository and ProQuest in order to search for relevant dissertation

and thesis manuscripts. Next, the internet was queried for relevant databases using such websites as Google Scholar and Sage publications. Finally, local libraries were also queried for relevant book publications, journals, and works. The quest for relevant literature was dependent upon the prevalence of the following keywords: supervision, law enforcement, police, supervisor, evolution of policing, organizational structures, training, Management by Objectives, crime fighting strategies, New York City Police Department, goal-oriented policing, performance objectives, management, organizational conflict, business theories, and CompStat. All relevant literature was then examined, and the findings summarized.

## **Evolution and Professionalization of Policing**

### **Ancient origins**

The modern word ‘police’ traces its origin back to ancient Greece where it originally stemmed from the word ‘polis’; which meant citadel or government center, and was a place where groups of people congregated (Haberfeld, 2002). The ancient Greeks later changed the word ‘polis’ to ‘politeia’; which meant administration, citizenship, or civil polity. The word ‘politeia’ was later translated into Latin to ‘politia’. Finally, the word ‘politia’ was later translated into French to ‘police’; whereby the word ‘police’ is used today in its current form (Tsolakidou, 2013). As the word changed, so did its meaning. Eventually, the meaning evolved to become synonymous with regulating or governing inhabitants of a city or country (Haberfeld, 2002). Finally, to the body enforcing law and order (Tsolakidou, 2013).

The idea of policing dates back just as far as the word police. Since the beginning of civilized humanity people often sought protection from danger, and to ensure everyone

was participating in the well-being of the community. It was this desire to be free from danger, and to ensure participation, that brought about the first semblances of policing. As Reith (1975) described it, there are four phases that brought about the evolution of policing:

Phase I: People came together to form small communities, predominantly to ease the food findings but also to achieve a greater sense of security.

Phase II: The need for laws is discovered.

Phase III: The ‘rule breakers’ emerge.

Phase IV: In one form or another, means to compel the observance of laws were established.

These communities had no formal police force. Enforcement of the ‘laws’ was carried out by community involvement.

In ancient Greece, when the city of Athens was established, official laws were created which governed its people. While there was no formal police force to enforce these laws, a system of justice was put in place. This system consisted of courts with magistrates and juries, and jails with guards and executioners (Haberfeld, 2002). The accused were often brought to justice by the community or by soldiers. After Greek dictator Peisistratus took control of Athens, a formal police force was finally established (Haberfeld, 2002). Later, after ancient Greece was conquered by Alexander the Great of Macedonia, the concept of policing was spread to ancient Egypt by conquered Greek soldiers that resettled in Egypt. (History, 2019; Experience...,2019). It was in ancient Egypt where an established police force was given structure (Experience..., 2019). When the ancient Egyptian police force, known as the ‘Medjay’, became more organized a hierarchy was eventually formed. The

Medjay were led by a chief that supervised deputies and regional captains. The duties of this police force consisted of protecting civilians and property, and accompanying tax collectors (Experience..., 2019).

Ancient Egypt later fell under the control of the ancient Romans (Wasson, 2016). During this time, ancient Rome was introduced to the concept of policing. Emperor Augustus Caesar, wanting a group of men to maintain peace in ancient Rome, added to the concept of policing by creating a distinct police force (Haberfeld, 2002). This police force was separate from the military, wore distinct clothing, had a separate living style, and lived in separate quarters (Stead, 1977). This police force was called the 'Praetorian Guard', and it became the foundation on which Emperor Augustus Caesar based the ancient Roman empire (Haberfeld, 2002). The Praetorian Guard became responsible for protecting the emperor, and for keeping law and order throughout the empire.

The ancient Roman empire eventually spread to the land of England. Once there, the ancient Romans encountered tribes of people, known as Germanic, throughout the land. These tribes were diverse in ancestry, but were predominately of German and Celt region descent (Encyclopaedia, 2017). After many wars with the Germanic tribes, the ancient Romans were able to establish a close relationship with the tribes (Encyclopaedia, 2017). During this time, ancient Roman administrators were instrumental in the codification of Germanic laws – linguistic and juridical (Tyree, 2017). By the start of the fifth century, the English had defeated the ancient Romans, driving them from the land. This led to the eventual collapse of the ancient Roman empire. In its absence, the ancient Romans left behind many improvements on inventions and innovations in England, including those of law (Mark, 2018).

## **Early England**

After the ancient Romans were forced from England in the fifth century, a void was created in certain regions of England where the ancient Romans once occupied. Three Germanic tribes resettled there and took control of those regions. The three tribes were the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes (Encyclopaedia, Jan. 2018), or Anglo-Saxon for short. During this time, the Anglo-Saxon tribes began to define English culture (Haberfeld, 2002). This included establishing English jurisprudence, which was based on all laws up to that point (Tyree, 2017). Eventually, with the co-mingling of Germanic and English people, the term Anglo-Saxon became synonymous with all people collectively living in England during the time known as the Anglo-Saxon period (Encyclopaedia, Jan. 2018).

By the eighth century, policing in England had changed. The Kings of England had converted to Christianity, and allowed the Church influence in governing (Haberfeld, 2002). According to Rodger (2006), "... by the late Anglo-Saxon period, the influence of the Church was undeniably strong. The Church was thus in an ideal position to influence justice in the period.". However, during this formative period when English jurisprudence was developing, there weren't many judicial records kept that described advancements or efficacy in English policing (Rodger, 2006). Historians were faced with evidential problems. Sometimes there was explicit evidence, but most often there were only hints of evidence (Musson, 2004; Rodger, 2006). It wasn't until the Normans conquered England in 1066 that recorded evidence of policing practices became more abundant.

The Norman conquest caused social upheaval throughout England. This, then led to a rise in crime (Barlow, 1965). The Normans addressed this rise in crime by combining the Anglo-Saxon legal system with Norman King Williams' demand that all free Englishmen



maintain peace. King Williams even divided the land into 'shires'. This was known as the Frankpledge system of policing (Haberfeld, 2002). Over time, the Frankpledge system gave rise to the positions of shire 'reeve' and 'comes stabuli' (Schmallegger, 1993); from which the modern terms 'Sheriff' and 'Constable' were derived. The King appointed a Sheriff to police a specific shire. The Sheriff was then assisted by Constables that helped in policing that shire. Eventually, every shire had its own Sheriff and Constables. These Sheriffs reported back to the King. This system of separate police forces removed any influence the Church, or local royalty, had in policing, and placed control over policing back into the hands of the King (Klockars, 1985).

The Church did leave a lasting impression on policing, which is reflected in mentions of God in jurisprudence and the Anglo-Saxon coronation oath, as described by Robertson (1925),

In the name of the Holy Trinity! I promise three things to the Christian people who are under my authority:

1. Firstly, that true peace shall be assured to the church of God and to all Christian people in my dominions.
2. Secondly, I forbid robbery and all unrighteous deeds by all classes of society.
3. Thirdly, I promise and enjoin justice and mercy in the decision of all cases, in order that God, who liveth and reigneth, may in his grace and mercy be brought thereby to grant us all his eternal compassion.

The Frankpledge system of policing continued on for centuries in England with no significant contribution to the evolution of policing. Instead in 1707, the kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Wales united to become a union of countries known as Britain

(World, 2005); as it is known by today. The individual governments of these kingdoms were then integrated to be controlled by a single entity, known as the British Parliament (World, 2005); as it is known by today.

### **Late England and Britain**

During the 18<sup>th</sup> century, England began to experience an industrial revolution. This period of economic growth led to a rapid increase in population size in some towns (Encyclopaedia, Oct. 2018). One town most affected by the increase in population was London; which experienced an increase in crime, societal concerns, and labor protests that coincided with the rise in population (Encyclopaedia, Oct. 2018; Dinsmore, 2018). Home Secretary Sir Robert Peel decided to address the growth issues by modernizing London's police force. The underpinning for the modernization was inherent upon three components to policing: mission, strategy, and organizational structure, all of which was designed to garner public support (Walker & Katz, 2013). Sir Peel based these three components on nine principles of policing. According to Shrestha (2015), Sir Peel's nine principles are:

Principle 1—The basic mission for which the police exist is to prevent crime and disorder.

Principle 2—The ability of the police to perform their duties is dependent upon public approval of police actions, behavior, and the ability of the police to secure and maintain public respect.

Principle 3—Police must secure the willing cooperation of the public in voluntary observance of the law to be able to secure and maintain the public respect.

Principle 4—The degree of cooperation of the public that can be secured diminishes, proportionately the necessity for the use of physical force and compulsion in achieving police objectives.

Principle 5—Police seek and preserve public favor not by catering to the public opinion but by constantly demonstrating absolute impartial service to the law.

Principle 6—Police use physical force to the extent necessary to secure observance of the law or to restore order only when the exercise of persuasion, advice and warning is found to be insufficient to achieve police objectives; and police should use the minimum degree of physical force that is necessary on any particular occasion for achieving a police objective.

Principle 7—Police at all times should maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historical tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police; the police are the only members of the public who are paid to give full time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of community welfare.

Principle 8—Police should always direct their actions strictly towards their functions and never appear to usurp the powers of the judiciary by avenging individuals or the state, or authority judging guilt or punishing the guilty.

Principle 9—The test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder, not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with them.

Sir Peel, “skillfully managed to convince the British Parliament about his proposal to establish a new municipal police force” (Haberfeld, 2002). In 1829, the British Parliament passed the Metropolitan Police Act, which authorized the establishment of London’s first modern, professional police force (Swanson, Territo, & Taylor, 2012). Sir Peel, wanting to solidify public support for his new police force, chose a blue uniform to distinguish it from the military’s red uniform (Williams, 2015). This police force, known unofficially as Bobbies and Coppers, became “the prototype on which law enforcement throughout the British Empire would subsequently be modeled” (Dinsmore, 2018). This prototype also became the model for law enforcement organizations in the United States of America. These changes represented a significant impact on the evolution of policing (Godfrey & Lawrence, 2005).

## **America**

During the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Peelian model of policing was making its way into the foundation of many American law enforcement organizations (Dinsmore, 2018). This was at a time when America was seeing a growth in industrialization and urbanization, and experiencing regional differences in policing methods (Dinsmore, 2018). Different regions of the country had their own societal issues. The north had crime issues; the south had slavery issues, and the west had civilian policing issues (Bass, 2001; Reichel, 1988; Bopp & Schultz, 1972). What’s more, the influx of immigrants from around the world, coupled with the industrial revolution, created an immense problem in policing efforts. Over time, different regions of the country established law enforcement organizations that integrated parts of night watch, civilian militias, and slave patrols (Williams, 2015). The main law enforcement officer was usually the Sheriff (Haberfeld, 2002). However,

the old colonial method of policing which utilized a system of sheriffs, constables, and night watchmen, proved inadequate to meet policing needs; particularly in the north, and crumbled under these societal issues (Walker & Katz, 2013; Decker, 2018).

At the start of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, policing had evolved again to meet the needs of law enforcement organizations. Berkeley Police Chief August Vollmer, considered the father of modern policing, advanced Sir Peels principles of policing (Zimmerman, 2018; Carte, 1972). Chief Vollmer incorporated three additional principles of policing into his already established law enforcement organization, which was based on the Peelian model. These new principles were logistics, strategy, and tactics, and were grounded in military science (Vollmer, 1933). Furthermore, Chief Vollmer wanted to professionalize policing, seeking advancements in his law enforcement organization that included: improvements in officer mobility, training and standards for officers, better communications, and organizational division that included the use of specialty units (Vollmer, 1933; Swanson et al., 2012). The professionalized policing model ultimately established by Chief Vollmer “included the use of bicycles, cars, a dispatch system, intelligence collection, crime analysis, a scientific laboratory, training, recruitment of college-educated persons, and intelligence and psychological standards for officers” (Zimmerman, 2018).

These advancements enabled law enforcement organizations “to expand their forces, assume greater responsibilities, and unify their functions” (Seo, 2016). With New York City expanding in size, and with the New York State legislature forcing the incorporation of 18 smaller police agencies into the newly created New York City Police Department (National Criminal et al., 2019), these advancements were welcomed. New York City implemented Chief Vollmer’s ideas on professionalizing policing, and combined with a

specialized police force operating 24 hours a day, “became the first city in the United States to introduce a modern police department”; becoming the national standard for law enforcement organizations (Dinsmore, 2018; Haberfeld, 2002; Williams, 2011).

### **New York City**

As New York City was instituting itself as the national standard for modern policing, it also sought to further professionalize its police force. The impetus on how to further professionalize the New York City Police Department was derived from organizational challenges and experiences that stemmed from external and internal problems. The most notable external problems resulted from political influences in policing, patronage, crime, and civil unrest (Zimmerman, 2018; Haberfeld, 2002). The most notable internal problems came from corruption and discrimination (Decker, 2018; Czitrom, 2016), and “early operating procedures which were arguably loosely defined and rarely framed with consideration of actual situations that might be encountered by police officers” (Decker, 2018; Jung, 2012).

To eliminate external and internal problems, New York City invoked changes to the operations and structure of the New York City Police Department. Women and minorities were finally accepted to the department (Zimmerman, 2018). Discrimination was banned in hiring, firing, and promotion of all Officers (Swanson et al., 2012). As a result of the 1894 Lexow Committee recommendations, a civil service system and corruption reforms were instituted (Johnson, 2003; Chin, 1997). The Bingham Bill of 1907, and subsequent three general orders, removed political influence from the ranks of Captain and above by restructuring all ranks to be more aligned with the military’s rank structure. This gave the ranks more defined duties, and put any promotional discretion in the hands of the Police

Commissioner (Storino Jr., 2018). Finally in 1985, drug testing was beginning to be implemented as a condition of employment (White, 2011). With a more professionalized police force in place, New York City and the New York City Police Department were better able to manage societal issues, particularly those that resulted in crime. What's more, crime management was now handled through the implementation of operational strategies (Haberfeld, 2002), and were more reflective of actual situations encountered by Police Officers and the city of New York.

Throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the New York City Police Department encountered an abundance of societal issues. An increasing immigration population, organized crime, World War I, labor disputes, and prohibition dominated the first quarter of the century (Rodgers, 2019; History, 2019). The second quarter of the century was saddled by the impacts from the great depression and World War II (Kennedy, 2019). The Korean and Vietnam wars, anti-war protesting, race riots, rising crime rates, and Police Officer lay-offs spot-lighted much of the third quarter of the century (Chafe, 2019; Oreskes, 1985; White, 2011). The last quarter of the century saw a near New York City bankruptcy, the cocaine and heroin epidemics, gang violence, record crime rates, and terrorism (Oreskes, 1985; Kerr, 1986; White, 2011).

Many of these societal issues gave rise to various forms of crimes. At times, these crimes created a challenge for the New York City Police Department in combating them. As a result, when a challenging new form of crime emerged, a new operational strategy was implemented that approached crime management by employing a policing concept of how best to react to the crime. As suggested by Haberfeld (2002), "Concepts such as team policing, Integrated Criminal Apprehension programs, neighborhood foot patrols,

Problem-Oriented Policing, Community-Oriented Policing, and COPPS (Community-oriented policing and problem-solving) became central to the success of the new approach”. Sometimes the implemented operational strategy was sufficient to manage the crime. At other times it was not, demonstrating the limitations of the department (Kelling & Moore, 1988), and exposing primary operational strategies that had almost no effect on crime (Bayley, 1994).

Some have argued that operational strategies for crime management throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century challenged police effectiveness, questioned police actions, and created a perceived need for change (Weisburd & Braga, 2006; Williams, 2011). Some have even argued, “The police do not prevent crime. This is one of the best kept secrets of modern life. Experts know it, the police know it, yet the police pretend that they are society’s best defense against crime.” (Bayley, 1994). This argument coincides with the New York City Police Department’s revelation, “For years, the traditional focus of law enforcement had been to respond to crimes that had already been committed” (New York..., 2019). As White (2011) described it,

basic principles of the traditional professional model of policing that had prevailed for the better part of 70 years were now being questioned...As the need for change took hold, scholars and practitioners began to rethink core assumptions regarding how police go about their business.

This led reformers to argue that the function of the police should be focused on crime (Dinsmore, 2018). As Kelling & Moore (1988, Nov.) explained it,

Using the focus on criminal law as a basic source of police legitimacy, police in the reform era [around the 1930’s – 1970’s. (Schmallager, 2012)] moved to



narrow their functioning to crime control and criminal apprehension. Police agencies became *law enforcement* agencies. Their goal was to control crime. Their principal means was the use of criminal law to apprehend and deter offenders. Activities that drew the police into solving other kinds of community problems and relied on other kinds of responses were identified as “social work,” and became the object of derision.

In 1994, in response to calls for change and reform in the New York City Police Department, Police Commissioner William Bratton implemented what was referred to as a “new paradigm in police management” (Walsh, 2001); which can be argued as the latest evolution in policing with “hortatory statements similar to those [Chief] Vollmer reserved for police advances at the beginning of the last century” (Willis, Mastrofski, & Weisburd, 2003). The new paradigm, considered ‘Goal-Oriented’ policing, combined a new principle of policing, a new policing concept, and a new operational strategy that put the “focus of policing shifted towards crime prevention, quality of life improvement, and resource and personnel management” (New York..., 2019). As noted by White (2011), “When Bill Bratton was appointed as [Police] Commissioner of the NYPD, he took the helm of a department that he believed was in deep trouble. As a result, he set about making philosophical, structural, strategic and operational changes to the Department that, in just a few years, transformed the organization”.

The new principle of policing, called ‘CompStat’, was based on computer science and utilized sophisticated computer maps (Willis et al., 2003), data management and analysis, and geographic information systems (Weisburd, Mastrofski, McNally, & Greenspan, 2002) to “facilitate timely and targeted responses to crime problems” (Willis et al., 2003).

The new policing concept, called ‘Broken Windows’, was based on a theory that was developed by criminologist George Kelling and sociologist James Wilson in explaining urban decay. The theory argued that if the police left small crimes unchecked it showed the community they did not care about low level crimes. In turn, this would lead to bigger crimes. Therefore, if low level crimes were checked, bigger crimes would be deterred and prevented (Kelling & Wilson, 1982).

The new operational strategy, called ‘Management by Objectives’, was based on a business model theory which incorporated principles of business management into law enforcement management. As explained by Weisburd et al. (2002),

...included developing a management commitment and capacity to (1) clarify the agency’s mission by focusing on its basic values and embodying them in tangible objectives, (2) give priority to operational objectives over administrative ones, (3) simplify managerial accountability for achieving those objectives, (4) become more adept at scanning the organization’s environment to identify problems early and develop strategies to respond (e.g., being “data-driven”), (5) increase organizational flexibility to implement the most promising strategies, and (6) learn about what works and what does not by following through with empirical assessment of what happened.

This latest evolution in policing, ‘Goal-Oriented’ policing, became the foundation for future crime management in the New York City Police Department, and set the standard for law enforcement organizations across America. Although a survey by Weisburd et al. (2002) has argued that some police agencies have claimed to have used CompStat-like programs prior to the New York City Police Department, the survey also found “...large

growth in implementation of CompStat programs in larger police agencies occurred a few years after New York's program had begun to gain wide-scale publicity, between 1997 and 1998".

### **New York City Police Department**

#### **Operations and structure**

They are trained as soldiers and expect to perform as social workers .... well, at least 90 percent of their time, and then, in a split second – they have to be soldiers again – quite a trick! (Haberfeld, 2002).

Before the latest evolution and professionalization in policing became the standard for law enforcement organizations, reformers sought ways to improve police effectiveness (Dinsmore, 2018). To accomplish this, reformers looked for the best operational model which could remove external influences while further professionalizing law enforcement. The United States military model appeared to have the most advantageous characteristics. The military was held in high esteem, appeared to be above political influence, was highly disciplined, was hierarchically organized, and contained a large pool of potential candidates to draw from (Deakin, 1988; Leichtman, 2008; Williams, 2015). As a result, law enforcement organizations adopted the hierarchical command-and-control structure characteristic of the military, and divided their organizations into more specialized units (Dinsmore, 2018; Williams, 2015). This gave Police Officers the ability to enhance their expertise in crime control – much like soldiers honing their skills (Center..., 1975). However, because the 'Posse Comitatus Act' (Posse Comm., 1878) prohibited a standing military from enforcing domestic policy, law enforcement organizations were considered to be only 'paramilitary' in their enforcement of domestic policy.

The New York City Police Department is described by many as being a paramilitary law enforcement organization. This description is based on: its military-like hierarchical structure that closely resembles a standing military's structure (Storino, Jr., 2018); its military-like operations described by Kraska (2007) as, "having a set of beliefs, values, and assumptions that stress the use of force, and if necessary, violence as a means to solve problems"; its military-like logistics that emphasize military power, hardware, and technology as its primary tools (Dinsmore, 2018; Williams, 2011); and its military-like hiring requirements whereby potential candidates can be disqualified "if they demonstrate a history of...not adjusting to discipline" (New York..., 2019). As suggested by Parenti (2008), it is where military technology and organization meet in perfect synthesis.

As an organization, the New York City Police Department remains the largest police department in the United States; employing approximately 36,000 uniformed officers and 19,000 civilian members. These individuals work in such areas as: traffic management, counterterrorism, public safety, law enforcement, and emergency response (New York..., 2019). Although civilian members are distinguished by titles, the uniformed officers are designated by a hierarchical rank structure – lowest to highest ranks are: Police Officer, Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain, Deputy Inspector, Inspector, Deputy Chief, Assistant Chief, Bureau Chief, and Chief of Department. The Police Commissioner and all Deputy Commissioners are civilians, and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. A Police Officer that performs duties in an investigative track is given the 'lateral' rank designation of Detective (New York..., 2019). Historically, adherence to this hierarchy was so ingrained that any deviation from the 'chain of command' produced little results. As suggested by Johnson et al. (2010), "Before [Commissioner] Bratton, innovation and creativity were

seen as threats to smooth operations and invitations for trouble. The NYPD had been organized as a strict hierarchy with approvals needed at all levels before any operational changes were allowed”.

The New York City Police Department is comprised of 17 bureaus and 5 major offices that handle all of the departments enforcement, investigations, and administration (New York..., 2019). The departments structure is the traditional line and box organizational concept. A “form adopted by police reformers [that] generally reflected the *scientific* or *classical* theory of administration advocated by Frederick W. Taylor during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century” (Kelling & Moore, 1988 Nov.), and which helps to interconnect all the bureaus and offices. The patrol bureau is the largest of all the bureaus and offices; as it contains the largest number of uniformed officers in the department, approximately 17,000 (New York..., 2019). The patrol bureau is comprised of 77 patrol precincts, and various other units, that are dispersed throughout New York City’s five boroughs: The Bronx, Queens, Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Staten Island. The patrol precincts contain the overwhelming majority of uniformed officers in the patrol bureau, and are considered the “backbone” of the New York City Police Department (NYPD, 2019), as well as policing in general – as pious testimony from police executives would attest (Weisburd et al., 2002).

Each patrol precinct is also structured along the traditional line and box organizational concept. The average patrol precinct can contain anywhere from 150 – 250 uniformed officers that are divided between patrol functions, specialty units, and administration, with patrol containing the largest number of uniformed officers. The patrol functions are carried out by Police Officers under the direct supervision of their squad Sergeants, also referred to as Patrol Supervisors. The function of patrol is to be responsible for the safety

of the community, enforcement of the laws, and preserving of the peace (New York..., 2019; White, 2011). As suggested by Scott (2000) and Famega (2003), patrol operations are structured primarily around three functions: preventive patrol, emergency responses, and the handling of routine incidents – which are influenced by such factors as: citizens demands, societal demands, officers demands, and political influence. It is also suggested by Kelling and Moore (1988, Nov.) that the traditional structure of the patrol precinct is designed to routinize and standardize police work, especially patrol work. Reason being, there were attempts made to limit discretion in patrol work, as police work was seen as a form of crime management whereby Police Officers enforced laws and made arrests only if the opportunity was presented.

### **Training and standards**

Working as a Police Officer in the New York City Police Department requires having a great deal of education on many levels, and in many disciplines. A Police Officer must possess knowledge of federal, state, and local penal and procedural laws, as well as many municipal codes and charters. This is in addition to numerous departmental regulations and rules that must be learned and followed (New York..., 2019). As such, academic and physical preparation begins in the Police Academy whereby uniformed officers undergo extensive and rigorous training (New York..., 2019). However, prior to 1967, Police Officers received very little formal training outside of their paramilitary instruction and preparation. Because of this, Police Officers developed skill sets, and an understanding of their professional culture, through on the job trial and error, and from mentoring by more senior Police Officers (Jung, 2012). Some studies have found that Police Officer attitudes and behaviors were shaped by the nature of their work. This included the culture of the

organization, and not by their personal background characteristics such as education or race (Skolnick, 1993).

In the late 1960s through the 1970s, there was an unprecedented growth in new police research. This was most notable from President Lyndon B. Johnson's 'Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice'; which had "collected data and analyzed statistics on an unprecedented scale" (Feucht & Zedlewski, 2007). This new research had produced a substantial body of information on patrol work, criminal investigation, Police Officer attitudes, and other important aspects of policing (Walker & Katz, 2013). As a result of all this research, policing in America had changed significantly. With a very different organizational environment to work in, and with new ideas about the role of the police emerging, the characteristics of Police Officers changed dramatically (Walker, 1998). Over time, law enforcement organizations slowly evolved their police training to be centered around a hybrid model of policing skills, science training, and a paramilitary socialization, or "indoctrination", to the profession (White & Escobar, 2008). Although there is discussion, both supporting and not supporting the paramilitary Police Academy role, many agree that a formalized training model is superior to the earlier chaotic era of the profession (White, 2008). However, some in academia and research have argued that the rigidity of a military style training environment is counterintuitive to training Police Officers to function in a democratic society (Jung, 2012). As suggested by White and Escobar (2008), "As departments have moved toward problem-oriented styles of policing, critical thinking and analytic skills have become centrally important".

To help law enforcement organizations improve their training, the President Johnson Commission on policing also reported on some ways to professionalize law enforcement

organizations. It recommended that Police Officers throughout the country be required to have Baccalaureate degrees by 1984; this is in addition to other recommendations (Hess, Hess Orthmann, & Cho, 2014). However, law enforcement organizations throughout the country are bound by state regulations that govern the requirements for maintaining status as a law enforcement organization. These requirements delineate such things as the minimum amount of training time and course content that law enforcement organizations must incorporate into Police Academy training to meet state regulations (Haberfeld, 2002; New York State..., 2019). These requirements therefore cause the organizations to develop a curriculum that is in accordance with the states' regulations, but seldom go beyond these minimum requirements. Resultingly, law enforcement training and education usually falls behind when societal changes moved forward (Haberfeld, 2002). While there are ongoing efforts to professionalize policing through the requirement of a college degree, some have argued that a college degree alone is not sufficient for law enforcement organizations to achieve status as being professionalized (McClellan & Gustafson, 2012). As of 2019, the New York City Police Department requires a Police Officer candidate to have earned at least 60 college credits, with a minimum 2.0 GPA, from an accredited institution, in order to be accepted to the Police Academy. Otherwise have two years of active military service in lieu of education (New York..., 2019).

In 1979, in response to the growing demand for police professionalization and standardization, the 'Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies' was created. This commission, a privately-run non-profit corporation, was comprised of four major executive associations in law enforcement: National Sheriffs' Association, Police Executive Research Forum, International Association of Chiefs of Police, and National



Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives. The goal of this commission was to be a credentialing authority for law enforcement organizations (Commission..., 2019). However, the commission "...has given rise to discussion and generated strong opinions around the country...[as] The individual police department decides whether it wishes to seek accreditation" (Lynch & Lynch, 2005). With accreditation optional, over the years professional associations that represent almost all of law enforcements interests have come together and developed a new set of standards. These standards, which provide a greater degree of protection for law enforcement organizations, now encourages a police department to seek accreditation from the commission (Lynch & Lynch, 2005).

Moreover, as of 2019, these professional associations are now represented within the commission, with commission membership increasing to 21 individual associations. They represent professions in many areas of law enforcement, as well as the public and private sectors (Commission..., 2019). According to the Commission... (2019), the new goal of the currently expanded commission is:

The CALEA Accreditation programs provide public safety agencies with an opportunity to voluntarily meet an established set of professional standards, which require:

- Comprehensive and uniform written directives that clearly define authority, performance, and responsibilities
- Reports and analyses to make fact-based and informed management decisions.
- Preparedness to address natural or man-made critical incidents
- Community relationship-building and maintenance
- Independent review by subject matter experts

- Continuous pursuit of excellence through annual reviews and other assessment measures.

Law enforcement organizations that now achieve commission accreditation will have a set of professionalized standards on which to guide their organizational operations, and to train their personnel, above what is required by state regulations. While the New York City Police Department is not an accredited organization as a whole, its training bureau has received accreditation status in 2006, and continued to remain accredited yearly until 2015 (Commission..., 2019).

### **Supervisor development and assignments**

Every police officer remembers his first patrol sergeant, the way a Marine remembers his boot camp drill instructors...Being a sergeant carries a heavy burden and sets the standard for the level of policing by those who answer to them. It is without question the most integral role in the paramilitary structure that is the NYPD (Sergeants Benevolent Association, 2015).

In 1915, Raymond Fosdick completed the first comprehensive study of policing in the United States and found that many police departments were burdened with inept leadership (More et al., 2006). Years later, Vollmer (1932, Jan.) added to that sentiment by stating, “Intimate and sympathetic understanding of the men by a leader distinguishes the effective from the ineffective department, promotes morale in the organization and can only be achieved where there is continuity of leadership”. As suggested by Decker (2018) and Scharf (2009), although many things have changed in policing, including education, technology, structures, and societal values as a whole, the process of providing quality public service under good leadership has not. Some have argued that this is due to

the traditional policing structures having primarily autocratic organizations, and having leaders that were held to strict standards and rules that rewarded loyalty and obedience (More et al., 2006). Others have argued that this is due to supervision in policing being complicated by the diffuse environments in which Police Officers work, and the very nature of police work itself (Brown, 1988; Lipsky, 1980; Lundman, 1979). Still, others have suggested that you would expect an organization to take a critical look at its own approach to producing supervisors if it is ever going to have a full complement of supervisors who are of top quality (Lynch & Lynch, 2005).

As policing evolved over the last several decades, many police Chiefs moved away from a more stringent approach. The reason being, this style of police management stifled the development of leadership abilities in subordinates because they are rarely allowed to make meaningful independent decisions (More et al., 2006). Some have even argued that learning to be a leader is a long-term process, and that training to be a leader should begin on the first day of a Police Officers career (Baker 2000; Haberfeld 2002). As suggested by Haberfeld (2002), “Education, academy training, in-service training, and continuing education – all are essential to ensuring that the new generalist law enforcement officers are equipped with information and skills to meet the demands of the new millennium”.

To improve leadership, Haberfeld (2002) suggested there are five so-called “prongs” that are important to the successful grooming of police leaders, and all of these prongs must be completed in equal proportion to each other in order to achieve success. These five prongs are: recruitment, selection, training, supervision, and discipline seemingly referred to as the “Pentagon of Police Leadership” (Haberfeld, 2002). In the New York City Police Department, this grooming process all takes place in the training bureau. The

training bureau is comprised of four sections, two units, and one Cadet Corps. According to its stated mission, it “provides recruits, uniformed officers, and civilians with the most up-to-date academic, tactical, and technological information available, transforming them into the best trained, most prepared law enforcement professionals in the nation” (New York..., 2019).

The leadership training section, which is one of the four sections in the training bureau, is responsible for the “supervision” prong. It is accountable for providing “the full gamut of leadership training for the department” to all supervisory ranks and titles; its stated mission is to “provide quality leadership training...[that] offer instruction in utilizing management theories, leadership concepts, supervisory information, and best practices consistent with department policies” ( New York..., 2019). To be eligible for leadership training, a Police Officer must meet certain requirements. Among the most notable requirements are: pass a civil service promotional exam for the rank of Sergeant, serve for five permanent years in the rank of Police Officer, and have at least 64 college credits (Department..., 2016). After all requirements are achieved, a Police Officer is now eligible, and may eventually be assigned to, the leadership training section for the ‘Basic Leadership Course’ (New York..., 2019). This course is a four-week course that teaches new supervisors basic supervisory skills. This course must be completed within one year of being assigned to the course. As per General Municipal Law 209-q, and the Municipal Police Training Council, the leadership training section must conduct a leadership training course for all newly appointed ‘first-line’ supervisors, which must be completed within one year of promotion, or the position is forfeited (New York State..., 2019). Once a Police Officer has successfully completed the Basic Leadership Course

that Police Officer is now promoted to the rank of Sergeant. After promotion, Sergeants are then transferred with most being assigned to a patrol precinct (New York..., 2019). While in the precinct, new Sergeants are typically assigned to supervise patrol squads. Here, the Sergeants begin to utilize their newly acquired supervisory skills and learnings as Patrol Supervisors, as well as begin to acquire perceptions and understandings about supervision, along with gaining experiences in decision-making.

### **Organizational Structures and Foundations**

#### **Differentiated models**

Over the last century, there have been many theories developed about the best ways to operate an organization, and these theories all tend to look at organizations from different perspectives. Some theories look at organizations from the outside in, and some from the inside out. However, the one thing that is common to these theories is their concept, and that is that the structure of an organization is critical. As Bolman and Deal (2008) have suggested, in any organization the right structure forms a solid underpinning to combat the risk that individuals will become confused, ineffective, apathetic, or hostile. O'Hara (2005) further added that organizations can suffer a slow torture of a thousand cuts when employees take many liberties at work, or their collective actions lead to scandal and embarrassment for the organization. Yukl (2006) even argued that organizations are like biological organisms that go through "a birth stage, a growth stage, a maturity stage, and a decline or revitalization stage".

Bolman and Deal (2008) have suggested that structures can take on one of two forms: vertical or lateral. These forms help in delineating between who is in charge, what each employees functions are, what the goals of the organization are, and how everything and

everyone should come together to reach those goals. As Adler and Borys (1996) further suggested, the type of structure an organization has is just as important as the amount of structure an organization has. Robbins (2005) concluded that there are six key elements that need addressing when designing an organizations structure: work specialization, span of control, departmentalization, formalization, chain of command, and centralization and decentralization. However, McRel (2003) argued that it is often the individuals interests, and not the organizational structure, that makes the work happen or not. As Wheatley (1999) and Kauffman (1980) have explained it, in order to understand the whole, you must first study the parts; as such, “Each being is noticeable as a separate entity, yet it is simultaneously part of the whole system”. O’Hara (2005) further noted, an organizations operational structure begins to deviate from its initial intentions from day one.

Historically, discussions on organizational structures typically centered on several key theories – how various functions, and employees associated with those functions, should be grouped into units such as: departments, divisions, or sections (Denhardt et al., 2009). There are two original theorists on organizational structures. The first is Frederick Taylor, considered by many to be the father of time and motion studies. Taylor (1911) founded a working structure called “scientific management”; whereby work was broken down into individual parts, and workers were trained to work only on one specific individual part. This structure was designed to maximize a workers motion and time spent while working. The second original theorist is Max Weber, a German economist and sociologist. Weber (1947) is credited with founding the “monocratic bureaucracy” organizational structure. This structure was designed to remove the culture of nepotism, and maximize the culture of rationality, in an organization by implementing such tenets as: a hierarchy of offices, a

fixed division of labor, a set of rules governing performance, a separation of personnel from official property and rights, use of technical qualifications for selecting personnel, and employment as a primary occupation and long-term career.

As suggested by Bolman and Deal (2008), organizational structure is what begins to shape human behavior. Based on such, they have defined six basic assumptions derived from an organizations structure:

1. Organizations exist to achieve established goals and objectives.
2. Organizations increase efficiency and enhance performance through specialization and a clear division of labor.
3. Appropriate forms of coordination and control ensure that diverse efforts of individuals and units mesh.
4. Organizations work best when rationality prevails over personal preferences and extraneous pressures.
5. Structures must be designed to fit an organization's circumstances (including its goals, technology, workforce, and environment).
6. Problems and performance gaps arise from structural deficiencies and can be remedied through analysis and restructuring.

The New York City Police Department embodies the “traditional” organizational structure because it encompasses the scientific management and monocratic bureaucracy structures espoused by Taylor (1911) and Weber (1947). The operational structure is that of a paramilitary organization which utilizes multiple vertical methods of coordination of labor (integration) in which to control the behavior of the employees, their work habits, and the conditions under which they work. However, more recently, “Increasingly, and

for various reasons, organizations are moving to team-based operations. That is, they are organizing around various types of teams as opposed to organizing around the traditional organizational hierarchy and horizontal division of labor.” (Denhardt et al., 2009). As Robbins (2005) added, in recent years a number of organizations have been working to develop new organizational structure options. The most popular of these structures are the virtual organization, the boundaryless organization, and the team structure. Robbins (2005) explained that the forces determining an organizations structure typically depends on the organizations strategy, size, technology, and outside influences. Bolman and Deal (2008) further added, “Structure needs to be designed with an eye toward desired ends, the nature of the environment, the talents of the workforce, and the available resources (such as time, budget, and other contingencies)”.

### **Business Theories**

Green (1999) suggested that all organizations have two sets of goals upon which they operate: the formal goal and the informal goal. The formal goal is the one offered as the official organizational goal, and is made public. The informal goal is the one adopted by management as the ‘de facto’ organizational goal, and is typically politically motivated. As Bolman and Deal (2008) have posited, “If political pressures on goals are visible in the private sector, they are blatant in the public arena”. Westerlund and Sjostrand (1979) have suggested that there are four other organizational goals upon which an organization operates: honorific, taboo, stereotypical, and existing. Honorific goals are fictitious goals that credit the organization with desirable qualities. Taboo goals are goals an organization pursues which are not openly discussed. Stereotypical goals are goals that any reputable organization should have and are common in organizations. Existing goals are goals that



are quietly pursued, usually by employees, that may be conflicting with the organizations goals. Bolman and Deal (2008) offered that existing goals are when some employees may not have endorsed the formal organizational goal and find their own existing goal is more desirable. As Maslow (1954) proved, people have needs, and there is a hierarchy of needs in everyone, including at work. As Dornbusch and Scott (1975) concluded, authority in any organization works the best when it is both endorsed by subordinates and authorized by superiors. Weber (1947) linked authority to legitimacy, and offered that if leaders lose legitimacy, they lose the capacity to lead.

In law enforcement organizations, where Police Officers are given autonomy to work with little direct oversight from supervisors, achieving organizational goals is dependent upon individual Police Officer motivation. As a result, a supervisors behavior must stimulate the motivation in Police Officers to reach organizational goals. Bolman and Deal (2008) even suggested through a symbolic frame that meaning is derived not just from words but by actions as well. Robbins (2005) utilized the SIP (Social Information Processing) model to argue that employees adopt attitudes and behaviors in response to the social cues emitted by others with whom they have contact. These others can be co-workers, supervisors, friends, family members, or customers. Robbins (2005) further noted that research indicated that “there is no evidence to support a relationship between span of control and employee performance”. According to Schafer (2009), “Despite the limited extent of direct contact officers have with those in formal positions of leadership (i.e. supervisors), research suggests officer behavior can be subject to some level of supervisory influence”. Dessler (2003) concluded that an employee’s commitment to an organization is tantamount to an agreement to pursue the company’s goals, as committed

employees tend to act more like owners than employees, “In today’s organization, in other words, the idea is to get the employees...to use their brains and initiative and creativity as if they owned the company, and not just when their supervisor is around”.

Hess et al. (2014) noted,

Several management specialists from corporate America have had a great influence on approaches to management in policing. The first is American economist, management specialist and consultant Peter Drucker (1909-2005), who became influential during the 1940s when he asserted that productivity was the result of self-starting, self-directed workers who accepted responsibility. He advocated a shift from traditional production line to flexible production methods.

Drucker (1954) developed a business theory referred to as Management by Objectives (MBO), whereby managers set forth specific performance objectives based on mutually agreed upon goals. Management then conducts interim progress reviews and comparisons between expected and actual accomplishments (Berman et al., 2006; Hess et al., 2014). However, Dessler (2003) has argued that there are three problems with MBO. The first problem occurs when performance objectives are unclear or immeasurable. The second problem is that MBO is time consuming whereby performance objectives have to be established, eventually measured, and then feedback given to each employee. The third problem occurs when setting objectives becomes a “tug-of-war” with employees looking to minimize performance objectives. Lynch and Lynch (2005) further added an additional problem with MBO, police supervisors are not only responsible for meeting performance objectives and organizational goals, but must also handle daily functions and activities of

the organizations operations. Although Cayer (2004) did note that, “Most MBO in the public sector is a streamlined version focusing mostly on setting objectives”.

The second management specialist from corporate America was W. Edwards Deming. Deming (1986) created a business theory known as Total Quality Management (TQM). As Decker (2018) explained it, TQM is focused on serving customers with high quality service, whether the customers are external or internal to the organization. Bolman and Deal (2008) summarized the essential components of TQM as: emphasizing workforce involvement, participation by employees, and teamwork that provide effective human resource management. DeCenzo and Silhanek (2002) further described TQM as utilizing statistics to analyze the variations in the production processes. As Deming (1986) noted, a well-managed organization is one where statistical control reduces variance in output and results in a predictable quantity of output.

### **Leadership and management**

According to Lynch and Lynch (2005), the history of management can be divided into three broad philosophical methods: scientific management, human relations management, and systems management. These methods all have one thing in common, that there is a degree of power that goes along with someone’s position in an organization (Denhardt et al., 2009). As Burns (1978) suggested, although leadership is an aspect of power, there is a difference in use. The difference between power and leadership is that power serves the interests of the power wielder; whereas leadership serves the interests of both the leader and those who are the followers. According to Bass (1990), there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are people trying to define it, and many of these definitions are ambiguous. White and Bednar (1986) posited that the reason for so many

definitions of leadership is that research in this area has produced very little agreement on what exact qualities outstanding leaders have, or how leaders should be identified. Even more, leadership no longer needs to come from someone in a “formal” position of leadership. Rather it can come from anyone with the ability to influence others (Denhardt et al., 2009). Maxwell (2011) further added that there are so many misconceptions about leadership. It is not something that can be awarded, appointed, or assigned to someone. Leadership comes from influence, and that must be earned.

As Decker (2018) noted, leadership or management qualities can be categorized by three theoretical perspectives: trait, behavior, and situation. Stogdill (1948) argued that leadership traits showed that leaders are different from other people. This difference was not based on any physical appearance, but rather on one's personal characteristics such as intelligence or responsibility – among others. Stogdill (1948) did caution though that just because someone possessed the characteristics of a leader does not make them a leader; leaders are effective time and time again. Engel (2000) posited that leadership behavior can be categorized into four styles: traditional, innovative, supportive, and active. These styles were dependent upon a supervisor's actions toward: task orientation, subordinates, management, and decision-making. Girodo (1998), Williams (1992), and Northouse (2013) have suggested that situations determine leadership qualities, and these qualities will change as situations change. They argue that with proper training leaders can identify appropriate ways to lead as the situation changes.

McGregor (1960) proposed his theory on leadership and management, and that it was based on how leaders or managers interact with employees in relation to the perceptions they have of employees. Although McGregor was not a motivational theorist, “he used

Maslow's hierarchy of needs to capture the dramatic shift in management thinking that was occurring based on the changing conceptions of human motivation and the needs of people at work" (Denhardt et al., 2009). McGregor (1960) identified two contrasting approaches to employees and called them Theory X and Theory Y. The Theory X approach views employees as: lazy, avoids any responsibilities, is resistant to change, and is motivated by pay. With this, management is left to make all the employees decisions, and directs them to work through coercion, threats, and possible punishment. The Theory Y approach views employees as: committed, motivated by growth and development, and can be trusted to share in the decision-making process. With this, management gives little direction, and trusts employees to do a good job.

As suggested by Haberland (2006), Northouse (2007), Powell and Graves (2003), and Yukl (2006), when looking at different leadership styles a front-line supervisor can adopt three styles are becoming widely recognized as defining. They are transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. McGregor's Theory X can be compared to transactional style leadership; whereby managers rule by fear and consequence, with negative behavior punished and employees motivated through incentives (Robbins, 2015). Theory Y can be compared to transformational style leadership; whereby managers seek to encourage their employees, assume the best of their employees, and believe they are trusting, respectful, and self-motivated (Ware, 2012). The laissez-faire style leadership is one where hardly any direction or guidance is provided to employees by their managers, thus resulting in leaderless management. These managers delay, appear indifferent, and fail to take action to what is happening around them (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

As Powell and Graves (2003) described it, with the laissez-faire style leadership, “leaders avoid taking responsibility for leadership altogether. Such leaders refrain from giving direction or making decisions and do not involve themselves in the development of their followers”. Yukl (2006) further added that one of the reasons managers avoid involvement with employees is because of the potential need to take corrective action. As Yukl (2006) explained it,

Many managers avoid confronting subordinates about inappropriate behavior or poor performance, because such confrontation often degenerate into an emotional conflict that fails to deal with the underlying problem, or does so only at the cost of lower respect and trust between the parties.

What’s more, when managers are uncomfortable with taking corrective action against employees, then performance problems can occur (Guffey & Helms, 2001).

In contrast to McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y labeling of employees, and the categorizing of leader or manager qualities and behavior, Robbins (2005) offered up an alternate theory of leadership and management. This theory, called the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory, argued that leaders or managers establish early relationships with employees. These relationships are based on characteristics that employees display. If employees display characteristics that leaders or managers find a connection with, the employees become part of the “in-group”, and receive preferential treatment. Otherwise, the employees fall into the “out-group”, and receive very few privileges (Robbins, 2005). However, Brislin (2000) noted the danger of establishing relationships with employees,

Once people establish a trusting relationship, they must demonstrate loyalty to each other, especially when challenges to the relationship arise. A person

cannot seemingly have a good relationship with another on Monday but then put that same person at a disadvantage on Tuesday.

In law enforcement, being that police departments are paramilitary organizations, the autocratic style would seemingly be the dominant leadership style based on the nature and culture of the organizations (Decker, 2018). However, research "...indicates that a move toward a more transformational approach is taking place."..."more recent research has found that the transformational leadership style was one of the most favored styles of police chiefs" (Sarver & Miller, 2014; Kapla, 2005; Morreale, 2003). As Roberg et al. (2002) also concluded, based on a study conducted in 1977 by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, police Chiefs found that the most important characteristics of effective leadership and the most desirable management skills were identified as: (1) maintain morale, (2) develop subordinates so they will be effective team members, (3) relate to the community, (4) organize personnel and maintain control of operations, (5) communicate effectively, (6) establish priorities and objectives. All of these characteristics are indicators of a transformational leader.

### **Organizational Change**

Organizations fail all the time. As Bolman and Deal (2008) concluded, "Only in the last half century have social scientists devoted much time or attention to developing ideas about how organizations work, how they should work, or why they often fail". According to O'Hara (2005), among the most notable reasons for these organizational failures include: "normal accidents", structural failures, cultural deviations, institutionalization, resource diversion, and oversight failure. Robbins (2005) has suggested an additional reason for an organizations failure, "One of the most well-documented findings from

studies of individual and organizational behavior is that organizations and their members resist change.” DeCenzo and Silhanek (2002) and Connor (1993) further explained how resistance to change is a common phenomenon for individuals and organizations. They posited a number of different reasons why people resist major changes in an organization. Some reasons include: lack of trust, belief that change is unnecessary, belief that change is not feasible, economic threats, relative high cost, fear of personal failure, loss of status and power, threat to values and ideals, and resentment of interference. Megginson, Byrd, Scott, and Megginson (1997) noted one reason members of an organization resist change is because of a buzz word called “stress”. Megginson et al. (1997) suggested that when it comes to stress,

Nearly everyone feels its presence, and few can fully escape it. Stress can arise suddenly or gradually and can last for a short time or can persist for years.

Whatever its nature, though, stress usually begins when individuals are placed in a work environment that’s incompatible with their professional work style and/or temperament. And stress becomes aggravated when individuals find that they can exercise little control over their work environment.

Denhardt et al. (2009) further added that stress occurs in response to some demand or need to adapt, particularly when there is some role ambiguity or role conflict at work.

Berman, Bowman, West, and Wart (2006) suggested the necessity for an organization to be mindful of stresses placed on an employee. They argued that if stress is significant and pervasive enough, it can cause the organization to fail over time. This is due to any manifestations that may arise from resistance to the stress. Robbins (2005) suggested there are four different types of approaches that can be used to demonstrate displeasure



and thereby resist organizational change: overt, implicit, immediate, and deferred. The approaches of implicit and deferred are the most detrimental to an organization because they are harder to detect and can occur after the change is implemented. Even more, they can lead to a loss of employee loyalty to an organization, or a loss of motivation to work. As suggested by DeCenzo and Silhanek (2002) and Beehr (1995), job “burn out” is characterized by physical and emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and disengagement that is often related to chronic stress. Yukl (2006) further explained, “Large-scale change in an organization usually requires some change in the organization culture as well as direct influence over individual subordinates. By changing the culture of an organization, top management can indirectly influence the motivation and behavior of organization members”. Powell and Graves (2003) further added that an organizations culture is an elusive concept that lies beneath the organizations life, yet influences how employees are treated and work is conducted.

There have been many books written on how to reshape cultures, or to simply bring about compliance to new changes in the existing ones. Such books include, *Change the culture Change the game* (Connors & Smith, 2011). This book describes techniques on how to be an effective leader, manager, supervisor, or even a change agent. It describes different styles, practices, and methods one can use to bring about reshaping of a culture. According to Denhardt et al. (2009), “those organizations that develop the creativity and flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances will be those that will thrive during the coming decades.” However, Tichy and Devanna (1986) caution against over changing in an organization. They argue that although organizations must adapt to new and changing conditions, there must also be some stability as to not spin the organization out of control.

DeCenzo and Silhanek (2002) further added that any organization which undergoes a major change needs at least one human catalyst, referred to as a “change agent”, inside the organization. This person, or persons, are responsible for influencing the change process. Denhardt et al. (2009) suggested that there are three ideas critical for change success. First, a change agent inside the organization needs to communicate to everyone the inherent need for change. Second, everyone within the organization should have a hand in the change process. Third, a change agent must understand that different employees change at different paces; as such, sufficient time should be given for the change process to be completed by everyone.

As suggested by Zimmerman (2018) and McGregor (1960), employee satisfaction can have a positive effect on job performance and work performed. Employees who reach a certain degree of job satisfaction improve organizational effectiveness. Thus, if you treat employees a certain way, they eventually will conform. Haberfeld (2006) noted that even though an organization undergoes changes in leadership, and the organization itself, it doesn't mean the culture of the organization has changed. As stated by Haberfeld (2006),

A fully functional and transformed organization cannot exhibit dysfunctional qualities. One cannot claim both success and change for the better if employees are dissatisfied or potential quality candidates do not fight for a job offer within the organization. When employees wake up in the morning having to go to work rather than wanting to go to work, one can posit that the organization is as dysfunctional as it was years ago, even factoring in major innovations and directional change.

In law enforcement organizations, the way Police Officers handle any assignment is directly related to their perceptions of the culture of the organization (Lynch & Lynch, 2005). When an assignment results in conflict between a supervisor and a Police Officer, they each rely on the culture of the organization to make the right decision. If the culture of the organization is that conflict is not confronted, then the supervisor may back down. However, if the supervisor feels supported in decision-making, the supervisor may take a completely different course of action in dealing with a conflict (Lynch & Lynch, 2005). As Ayres and Flanagan (1990) concluded in their research of police departments, “it is clear that the law enforcement administrator of the 1990’s who wants to eliminate management practices and organizational factors as sources of stress...must make their departments good places to work”.

### **Goal-Oriented Policing**

O’Hara (2005) concluded that, “Regardless of the terminology, superior officers direct the subordinate officers”. As Dessler (2003) further explained it, front line supervisors are authorized to direct the work of subordinates; thereby always making them someone’s boss. Even more, they are in charge of accomplishing the organizations goals. Hence, the supervisor must therefore be ready, willing, and able to take on this responsibility – with a strong emphasis on being willing. Engel (2000) further added that based on a review of literature about a police supervisors’ responsibilities, activities, and roles:

First, it has been acknowledged that first-line supervisors’ performances are measured through the effectiveness of their subordinates’ performances; a positive effort by subordinates reflects positively on their supervisors. This encourages supervisors and subordinates to engage in a reciprocity of informal

‘exchanges’... Second, police sergeants are in a position of conflict, caught between their responsibility to superior officers and their responsibility for subordinate officers. Faced with this conflict, individual sergeants adapt and define their roles differently.

In 1994, the New York City Police Department hired William Bratton as the new Police Commissioner. His self-imposed mission as the new Commissioner was to be a change agent in the department while implementing a new operational strategy for crime management. As Bratton (1998) described it,

The New York [City] Police Department was dysfunctional. First, it was divided into little fiefdoms, and some bureau chiefs didn’t even talk to each other. OCCB didn’t talk to patrol, patrol didn’t get along with the detective bureau and nobody talked to internal affairs...Each bureau was like a silo.

To accomplish his organizational change in the New York City Police Department, Commissioner Bratton followed a typical model approach. He sought out organizational development experts that conducted a candid diagnosis of the organizations strengths and weaknesses. Commissioner Bratton then implemented the change ideas prescribed by the experts. First, he implemented top-down and bottom-up procedures to begin the change. Second, he reviewed indicators on the success or failures of the change efforts. Lastly, he utilized incentives and disincentives to reinforce the individual efforts of the rank and file to buy into the change (Weisburd et al., 2002). Top management even suggested that the mission statement of the department include specific terms on how the organization and its’ supervisors could be held accountable (Willis et al., 2003).

One notable incentive was for Commanding Officers to bring their subordinates to the ‘CompStat’ meetings. At these meetings, Commanding Officers and subordinates would report on their crime management efforts while standing at a podium. Here, they received recognition while as many as 200 people, including press and outside agencies, watched. As Bratton (1998) described it, this was “great theater”, and also helped to develop public awareness of how the department was being managed. However, the union that represents the Police Officers, the Patrolmen’s Benevolent Association, argued that this was actually a disincentive. As noted by Zink (2004),

It was a great idea that has been corrupted by human nature. The Compstat program that made NYPD commanders accountable for controlling crime has degenerated into a situation where the police leadership presses subordinates to keep numbers low by any means necessary. The department’s middle managers will do anything to avoid being dragged onto the carpet at the weekly Compstat meetings.

Haberfeld (2006) described Commissioner Bratton’s “zero-tolerance” approach to his organizational change, which was based on the recommendations of the organizational development experts, as that of a directive leader. Haberfeld (2006) further explained that “The directive style sets standards of performance and rules for tasks, and it clarifies goals and expectations. According to this approach, the leader tells the subordinates what to do, when to do it, and how to do it”. DeCenzo and Silhanek (2002) concluded that while outside consultants may be objective, and may provide an outside perspective, they are at a disadvantage because they are not familiar with the operating procedures, culture, employees, and history of the organization. This in turn can result in perceptions that end

with conflict in the organization. McRel (2003) further added that change agents must be continuously aware of how groups work within the identity, information, and relationship domains of an organization, and should employ guiding principles and practices so that people can address any issues in these domains.

As Willis et al. (2003) suggested, before the implementation of CompStat and goal-oriented policing, Commanding Officers did not routinely and proactively go over reports and study maps to familiarize themselves with crime conditions and locations. However, after the implementation of CompStat and goal-oriented policing, these actions became a daily imperative; mostly due to the accountability mechanisms in place to which these actions were now so closely tied (Willis et al., 2003). This accountability now established Commanding Officers as the central figures in carrying out the organizations mission on crime management, and held them accountable for the performances of their subordinates (Weisburd et al, 2002). As a result, Commanding Officers now began to rely on precinct personnel for crime management activities instead of relying on outside specialized units. This in turn produced an effect on the precincts rank-and-file performance accountability (Kelling & Sousa, 2001).

Some have argued that crime rates and a Police Officers' quantitative productivity cannot be used to effectively measure job performance (Nimsombun, 2000). Willis et al. (2003) further argued that "some of the challenges [of performance accountability] arise from implementation problems that departments can correct, but others appear because Compstat calls for the pursuit of conflicting goals". Blake and Mouton (1964) suggested that there are two universal concerns that managers must have: a concern for production and a concern for people. Lynch and Lynch (2005) noted that the attitude of performance

accountability “...comes from our results-oriented society. We confuse process with product. We evaluate the results, find them less than satisfactory, and neglect to look at the process that has undoubtedly brought about those very results”. As Berman et al. (2006) explained it, outcome-oriented approaches attempt to attach one’s contributions to the success of the organization. As Zimmerman (2018) concluded, “In 1996, [as goal-oriented policing was fully operational] performance management and appraisals started to align with corporate goals to give employees clear expectations of performance and organizational goals”.

### **Summary**

Chapter II provided an historical timeline on the evolution of the concept of policing: from its nascent origins in Greece, to its subsequent adaptations and improvements across Europe, finally to its professionalization in New York City. The chapter also provided an overview of the New York City Police Department: from its origin as an unstructured and unofficial police force, to the efforts utilized to create the first modern, professionalized, and crime predictive police department in law enforcement. The chapter then provided a comparative look between the various aspects of a business modeled organization, and a paramilitary modeled organization, applying existing literature to compare the successes and failures of both; even offering suggestions on actions that can be employed to prevent such failures. The chapter concluded by assessing the New York City Police Departments organizational change, and its impact on behaviors of supervisors within the department.

Chapter III will provide a delineation of the methodological approach used to research the phenomenon that occurred as a result of the aforementioned organizational change, and its resultant impact on supervision.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **Introduction**

This chapter provides a background on the Researcher conducting this research, as well as the interest in researching this specific topic. This chapter also provides an in-depth explanation on why this research was important, as well as why a specific research design was chosen. Finally, this chapter provides a detailed description of the methods used to conduct this research. The methods described pertain to: permission received to conduct the research, Participants used in the research, location and instruments used for data collection, process used to code and analyze the data collected, and the efforts used to maintain the integrity of the research.

### **Researcher Background**

My personal experiences that relate to this research involved working for the New York City Police Department. I was hired in 1992 and assigned to the Police Academy. At the Police Academy, I received six months of academic and physical training built around a paramilitary structure. After the Police Academy, I was assigned to a patrol precinct in Bronx county; whereby I utilized my academic, physical, and paramilitary learnings from the Police Academy. In addition, I was assigned to a Patrol Supervisor who explained enforcement activity expectations, as well as the consequences for non-compliance to the rules and regulations of the department. However, in 1994, a new system of fighting crime, CompStat, was implemented. This new system changed the operations of a patrol precinct. As a result, I was now given performance objectives to achieve by my Patrol Supervisor that were directly related to targeted enforcement.



In 1999, I was promoted to the rank of Sergeant; whereby I was assigned to a patrol precinct in Manhattan county. While there, I served as a Patrol Supervisor and was charged with overseeing a patrol squad of approximately 8 Police Officers. During this time as Patrol Supervisor, the CompStat system of fighting crime was fully implemented. As such, my responsibility for overseeing the achievement of performance objectives by Police Officers was also in full implementation. However, toward the end of 1999, I was transferred out of my patrol precinct to a non-precinct assignment. Hence, I received very little exposure to the demand for Police Officers to achieve performance objectives.

In 2004, I was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant; whereby I was assigned to another patrol precinct in Manhattan county. While there, I served as a Platoon Commander and was charged with overseeing 3 patrol squads – each consisting of 1 Patrol Supervisor and approximately 8 Police Officers. As Platoon Commander, two of my primary functions were: to ensure that Patrol Supervisors kept Police Officers compliant with departmental rules and regulations, and to ensure Patrol Supervisors kept Police Officers engaged in meeting their performance objectives. It was during this time that I first began to notice that compliance to departmental rules and regulations by Police Officers appeared lapse. What's more, it appeared as though Patrol Supervisors were hesitant towards enforcing compliance, and were more anxious about each Police Officer achieving performance objectives.

In 2009, I was promoted to the rank of Captain. As Captain, I had worked in several patrol precincts within the Bronx and Manhattan counties. While in each patrol precinct, I served as the Executive Officer and was charged with overseeing 3 Platoon Commanders, 9 Patrol Supervisors, and approximately 72 Police Officers, in addition to other precinct

personnel. As Executive Officer, two of my primary functions were: to administer disciplinary proceedings for violations of departmental rules and regulations, and to review Police Officer monthly activity reports. It was during this time that I began to notice that it appeared as though Police Officers with lesser activity seemed to violate departmental rules and regulations more often than Police Officers who had performed better. Even more, it appeared that the same few Patrol Supervisors were the ones noting the violations of the departmental rules and regulations by these same Police Officers.

Based on these observations and experiences from working in several patrol precincts, within two separate counties, I began to wonder if a Patrol Supervisors' behavior was influenced in some way with respect to enforcing of departmental rules and regulations and a Police Officers achievement of performance objectives.

### **Purpose of The Research**

The purpose of this qualitative research was to describe the perceptions that patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors had in relation to supervision, and supervisory behavior, in a goal-oriented police department. Also, whether this perception had any influence on their behaviors in relation to Police Officers achieving performance objectives. This research was predicated on the theoretical framework that Patrol Supervisors in the New York City Police Department were expected to follow a paramilitary style of supervision when supervising subordinates, and when performing duties and responsibilities. As such, through one-on-one interviews conducted, this research allowed Participants the ability to provide firsthand accounts of their insights into supervising and to share their experiences as Patrol Supervisors (Seidman, 2006) in helping to answer research questions.

## **Design of The Research**

The Researcher chose a qualitative design phenomenological method for this research to address the research questions posed. The reason for this research design was based on the statement of the problem; whereby the phenomenon occurring may not be localized to specific individuals, groups, or places. Even more, the reason for the phenomenon may not be related to identifiable factors, but individual experiences that are unique to each patrol precinct Patrol Supervisor. As Bogdan and Biklen (2007) state, “Researchers in the phenomenological mode attempt to understand the meaning of events and interactions to ordinary people in particular situations”. Because of this, the data needed to understand the phenomenon, and to answer all the research questions, were derived from descriptive data. This data included written words, groupings, patterns, and narratives that were obtained directly from: one-on-one Participant interviews that utilized open-ended pre-determined questions, Participant background questionnaires, and personal observations of each Participant made by the Researcher.

## **Methodology of The Research**

### **Research permission**

According to the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board, and the National Institute of Health guidelines, a solicitation letter (see Appendix A) was prepared and mailed to the President of the Sergeants Benevolent Association. The letter requested the selection of 15 Patrol Supervisors, purposively chosen, to partake in voluntary research. The Sergeants Benevolent Association responded (see Appendix B) by granting the request, and by stating that the interviews must be completely anonymous, voluntary in

nature, and conducted on each Participant's personal time. Furthermore, at no time should any data or information proprietarily owned by the N.Y.P.D. be requested or released.

The Researcher then submitted a completed Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board package, and requested permission to continue the research. The Research Ethics Committee of the Institutional Review Board responded (see Appendix C) by granting approval to continue the research during their December 4, 2019 meeting.

### **Interview site**

According to Bogdan and Biklen (2007), the mere presence of the Researcher has been known to change the behavior of the people being studied. This is known as the “observer effect”. Hence, to limit any possibility of altering behavior, the Researcher allowed each Participant the option to choose the location where their interview took place. As Bogdan and Biklen (2007) described it,

...since interviewers in this type of research are interested in how people think about their lives, their experiences, and particular situations, they model their interviews after a conversation between two trusting parties rather than on a formal question-and-answer session between a researcher and a respondent. It is only in this manner that they can capture what is important in the minds of the subjects themselves.

When an individual Participant elected to have the Researcher select an interview site, the Researcher selected the Bronx Botanical Gardens. This location is a public place, centrally located within Bronx county, and contains a bucolic setting ideal for a “natural, unobtrusive, and nonthreatening” interview (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). The interview site for each Participant's interview is presented in Appendix H.

### **Participant solicitation and selection**

In order to conduct this research, Participants were needed that could provide the most comprehensive data to answer research questions (Maxwell, 2013). The Participants chosen were all active members of the New York City Police Department, serving in the rank of Sergeant, assigned to a Bronx county patrol precinct, and is currently performing in the title of Patrol Supervisor, for at least the prior 6 months. The Researcher chose the population of Patrol Supervisor to sample because of the accountability placed on Patrol Supervisors in ensuring Police Officers meet individual performance objectives. To garner a proper sample size from this population of 108 Patrol Supervisors, the Sergeants Benevolent Association (S.B.A.) was solicited to provide 15 volunteer Participants. First, all Patrol Supervisors were queried by the S.B.A. regarding the research. Next, Patrol Supervisors were given 30 days to respond back to the S.B.A. if interested. Finally, from all Patrol Supervisors opting to partake in the research, Participants were chosen by the S.B.A. based on purposive sampling (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). This sampling method is designed to provide a diverse background of Participants based on certain criteria dictated by the research. The most apropos criteria was such that Participants were diverse in: age, experience, education, gender, and race. Furthermore, upon introduction each Participant was provided with an introductory solicitation letter (see Appendix D) which made them aware of the purpose of the research, interview parameters, and there is no compensation for their voluntary participation in the research.

### **Interview procedures and format**

This research used a one-on-one interview format to gather data from each Participant. The reason for this format was to afford each Participant the flexibility to schedule their

interview at a convenient time (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). In addition, the procedure used for conducting each interview was semi-structured to permit each Participant to "...tell his or her story personally in his or her own words..." (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Prior to commencing each interview, the Researcher provided each Participant with a copy of the interview questions. This allowed each Participant time to reflect on the subject matter being queried. Moreover, the Researcher provided each Participant with a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix F) to collect pertinent information on Participants that was used to categorize Participant demographics. Finally, the Researcher engaged in a pre-interview question-and-answer dialogue with each Participant. As Bogdan and Biklen (2007) stated, "Most interviews begin with small talk...The purpose this chit-chat serves is to develop rapport...". During this dialogue, each Participant was advised regarding specific topics related to the research, and was encouraged to provide any feedback regarding those topics, as well as any other topics of concern. The following topics were discussed:

- The purpose and significance of the research.
- The Researchers' role in the research.
- The necessity of honesty in responses given.
- The complexity of each response, if given, was solely up to each Participant.
- Length of interview time was approximated to be 30 minutes.
- If any questions needed clarification.
- All conversations were treated confidentially.
- Participants were not compensated.

After each pre-interview was completed, each Participant signed an informed consent letter (see Appendix E) attesting to their advisement of the research, and their voluntary willingness to be interviewed.

At the commencing of each formal interview, a cassette tape recorder was used to record the interactions between the Researcher and the Participant. Additionally, the Researcher utilized a notepad to record the setting of each interview, as well as each Participants' non-verbal responses that were not captured by the tape recorder. Such non-verbal responses included: reactions, expressions, and demeanors. Furthermore, during each interview extra caution was used before posing each question to ensure each Participant did not divulge any personal information while the recorder was operating; thereby limiting the risk of exposure and maintaining confidentiality. Also, during each interview the Researcher was aware of potential personal biases, and took efforts to refrain from personalizing the interactions. The only additional questions asked by the Researcher was to clarify responses given. After each interview was completed, the recorded data was kept secure by the Researcher until such time as to transcribe the data. Based on the completeness of responses given by each Participant, there were no follow up interviews needed or requested. The approximated total interview time for each Participant is presented after each transcription of each respective Participants interview (see Appendix G).

### **Data collection**

This phenomenological research used a qualitative design; whereby the Researcher was resigned to collect research data that was descriptive in nature, yet relevant to the research questions posed. To do this, the Researcher first required an understanding of

what may be considered research data. According to Bogdan and Biklen (2007), “Data include materials the people doing the study actively record, such as interview transcripts and participant observation fieldnotes. Data also include what others have created and the researcher finds, such as diaries, photographs, official documents, and newspaper articles”.

With that in mind, the Researcher conducted a one-on-one recorded interview with each Participant. This helped to collect descriptive data derived from each Participants’ responses to open-ended questions. Furthermore, during each interview the Researcher took fieldnotes of each Participants’ mannerisms, as well as the ambiance of the location where each interview was conducted. This also helped to collect descriptive data derived from the Researchers’ own observations. Finally, the Researcher requested that each Participant complete a demographic questionnaire. This also helped to collect additional descriptive data derived from each Participants’ unique background. As Witte and Witte (2004) suggested, descriptive statistics can be utilized when organizing and summarizing information in relation to a collection of observations. Based on such, the resultant data collected from all three sources were then used in triangulation (Creswell, 2014) to help converge on single themes used for coding during data analysis. As such, the following data gathering instruments were utilized for this research:

- A Participant demographic questionnaire was used to collect personal information on Participant pedigrees and backgrounds.
- A set of 16 pre-determined, validated, and open-ended interview questions were used that afforded each Participant the latitude to respond as each Participant deemed appropriate.



- An “Optimus” cassette tape recorder, model CTR-115, was used to record all verbal interactions between the Researcher and the Participant.
- A 6” x 9” ‘Ampad’ steno style notepad was used to collect each Participants non-verbal responses to interview questions, and overall demeanor throughout the interview process.

### **Jury of experts**

In order to utilize pre-determined interview questions for Participant interviews, the questions first had to be validated to ensure they measure the data they were intended to measure (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). To validate the questions, a jury of three experts in the field of the subject matter being researched were chosen to scrutinize the questions and ascertain their accuracy. The following experts were consulted:

Expert # 1: Dr. Domenick Varricchio is a former Lieutenant from the Port Authority Police Department who retired after 30 years of service. Dr. Varricchio is currently an Adjunct Professor at Seton Hall University where he has been teaching in the Police Graduate Studies program for the past 22 years. Dr. Varricchio is also the recipient of a Doctorate degree in Education.

Dr. Varricchios’ rank as Lieutenant made him directly responsible for overseeing Sergeants under his purview. As such, he was able to witness the behaviors, demands, and decisions of those Sergeants, as well as other Sergeants within his police department. Furthermore, Dr. Varricchios’ position as an Adjunct Professor in a police-oriented program, as well as his academic achievement, has helped him to understand the experiences of Sergeants within his police department, and within the police program,

through an academic lens. As a result, his professionalism in law enforcement, and as an educator, made him an ideal expert on the subject matter being researched.

Expert # 2: Dr. Edward Lynskey is a former Lieutenant from the New Jersey State Police who retired after 28 years of service. Dr. Lynskey is currently a full-time Professor at Berkley College where he has been teaching for the past 13 years, and an Adjunct Professor at Seton Hall University where he has been teaching in the Police Graduate Studies program for the past 20 years. Dr. Lynskey is also the recipient of a Doctorate degree in Education.

Dr. Lynskeys' rank as Lieutenant made him directly responsible for overseeing Sergeants under his purview. As such, he was able to witness the behaviors, demands, and decisions of those Sergeants, as well as other Sergeants within his police department. Furthermore, Dr. Lynskeys' positions as a full-time professor, and as an Adjunct Professor in a police-oriented program, as well as his academic achievement, has helped him to understand the experiences of Sergeants within his police department, and within the police program, through an academic lens. As a result, his professionalism in law enforcement, and as an educator, made him an ideal expert on the subject matter being researched.

Expert # 3: Dr. Christopher Zimmerman is a former Lieutenant from the New York City Police Department who retired after 29 years of service, and is also a former Adjunct Professor at John Jay College where he has taught law and police science for 7 years. Dr. Zimmerman is currently an Adjunct Professor at Seton Hall University where he has been teaching in the Police Graduate Studies program for the past 9 years. Dr. Zimmerman is also the recipient of a Doctorate degree in Education.

Dr. Zimmermans' rank as Lieutenant made him directly responsible for overseeing Sergeants under his purview. As such, he was able to witness the behaviors, demands, and decisions of those Sergeants, as well as other Sergeants within his police department. Furthermore, Dr. Zimmermans' former and current positions as Adjunct Professor in police-oriented programs, as well as his academic achievement, has helped him to understand the experiences of Sergeants within his police department, and within the police programs, through an academic lens. As a result, his professionalism in law enforcement, and as an educator, made him an ideal expert on the subject matter being researched.

The three experts chosen to review the interview questions brought a diverse range of experiences from three major police departments, as well as academic knowledge from three well-respected educational institutions. With that, the feedback received from the three experts was considered, and used to revise the interview questions as suggested. The resultant final version of interview questions was then re-submitted to the experts, and subsequently approved for use.

### **Interview questions**

The 16 interview questions that were developed, and 'jury of experts' approved, were based on the three research sub-questions posed, and the data needed to answer each sub-question. These 16 interview questions were then arranged in such a way as to garner the best possible data. First, the three sub-questions were separated into three individual sections. Next, each individual interview question was strategically placed into one of the three sections, in a specific order. The placement of each interview question was based on the data it would most likely garner, while allowing for a more focused train of thought

from each Participant. As Leedy and Ormrod (2001) suggested, “the participants must rely on memory, which is notoriously inaccurate”. Based on this, each interview question was then read to each Participant in strict numerical order. The research sub-questions, and their corresponding interview questions, are as follows:

Research sub-question # 1:

How do patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors perceive their promotional training in relation to preparedness for their duties and responsibilities in a goal-oriented police department?

Interview questions # 1 – 5:

- 1) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?
- 2) How would you describe your promotional training experience?
- 3) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?
- 4) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?
- 5) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

Research sub-question # 2:

How do patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors perceive their duties and responsibilities in relation to supervising a patrol squad in a goal-oriented police department?

Interview questions # 6 – 10:

- 6) How would you describe your familiarity of department guidelines?

- 7) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?
- 8) How would you describe your adherence to department guidelines?
- 9) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?
- 10) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

Research sub-question # 3:

How is a patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors performance perceived in relation to the expectations and performances of other Patrol Supervisors in a goal-oriented police department?

Interview questions # 11 – 16:

- 11) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?
- 12) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?
- 13) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?
- 14) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?
- 15) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?
- 16) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

## Participant demographics

Based on the purposively selected sample of Participants (n = 15) provided by the S.B.A., from a population of Bronx county patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors (N = 108), the following table was created as shown below (table 1). The data in this table corresponds to the data requested in the demographic data form (see Appendix F), and demonstrates the diversity of Participants. In order to maintain the confidentiality of all Participants, some data in some columns were randomly shuffled to avoid having a single row contain all identifying characteristics of any individual Participant. The shuffling of this data did not affect the integrity of the data, or the Researchers ability to demonstrate the diversity of Participants through data ranges and averages.

**Table 1. Participant demographic data**

Part.	Age	Gen.	Race	Education	Time in service	Time in rank	Time in assign.	Prior super.	Prior l/e	Training o/s NYPD
A	29	M	B	Bachelors	12y 10m	1y 10m	1y 10m	No	No	No
B	35	M	W	Bachelors	13y 0m	9y 0m	3y 0m	Y- Private	No	Y – L/M/S
C	53	F	W	Bachelors	28y 0m	10y 8m	10y 8m	No	No	No
D	37	M	W	Associates	15y 0m	7y 7m	7y 7m	No	No	No
E	32	M	H	Bachelors	10y 3m	0y 9m	0y 9m	No	No	Y – Lead
F	28	M	W	Masters	5y 11m	0y 8m	0y 8m	No	No	No
G	45	M	W	Bachelors	20y 0m	5y 0m	5y 0m	No	No	No
H	31	F	H	Bachelors	12y 0m	2y 4m	2y 4m	No	No	No
I	28	M	H	Associates	7y 6m	0y 9m	0y 9m	Y-Private	No	No
J	29	M	A	Bachelors	6y 6m	1y 0m	1y 0m	No	No	No
K	30	F	W	Associates	9y 1m	3y 0m	3y 0m	Y- Public	No	Y – Super
L	48	F	H	Associates	6y 0m	4y 10m	4y 10m	No	Yes	No
M	27	M	H	Associates	11y 4m	6y 0m	2y 0m	No	No	No
N	30	M	W	Bachelors	8y 1m	1y 6m	1y 6m	No	No	No
O	37	M	W	Bachelors	7y 0m	3y 7m	3y 7m	No	No	No

After analyzing all the demographic data contained in table 1, the Researcher created the following table as shown below (table 2) to demonstrate the ranges of Participant data

from highest to lowest data values, as well as data averages utilizing the mean (for numerical data), or mode (for descriptive data).

**Table 2. Demographic data ranges and averages**

<b>Demographic category</b>	<b>Highest data value</b>	<b>Lowest data value</b>	<b>Mean/Mode</b>
Age	53	27	34y 6m
Gender	Male	Female	Male – 11x
Race	White	Asian/Black	White – 8x
Education	Bachelors	Masters	Bachelors – 9x
Time in service	28y 0m	5y 11m	11y 6m
Time in rank	10y 8m	0y 8m	3y 10.8m
Time in assignment	10y 8m	0y 8m	3y 2.8m
Prior supervisor	No	Yes – Public	No – 12x
Prior law enforcement	No	Yes	No – 14x
Training outside NYPD	No	Yes - Management	No – 12x

### **Data analysis**

Once all the descriptive data germane to this research were collected, the Researcher then followed the steps suggested by Creswell (2014) for thematic coding and resultant analysis of themes. First, the Researcher transcribed all recordings of all the Participants interviews into written data. This allowed for a more thorough examination of all verbal data collected from each Participant. Next, since the descriptive data from the Researcher observations, and Participant backgrounds, were already in written form, the written data from all three sources of collection were then organized, and a preliminary read through was conducted. During this first read through, the Researcher identified recurring words, groupings, patterns, and narratives in the data. This would then help the Researcher to conduct a second, more detailed, read through of the organized data to identify and code the most pertinent data relative to the research (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Patton, 1990).

Finally, after conducting the second read through of the organized data, utilizing the more detailed analysis, the most pertinent data were identified and individually coded by

theme. After coding all the pertinent data, they were then utilized to help create themed categories. Each category theme was determined by using inductive analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007) based on the three research sub-questions posed. After themed categories were established, the theme coded data were then separated and placed one-by-one into a category which corresponded with its theme. Once all the data were placed into themed categories, the Researcher then examined each themed category individually for meaning of data themes within the category (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). After determining meaning for all the data, the Researcher then re-examined each category individually to determine dominant meanings in each category. The dominant meanings were then identified, and based upon their themes, conclusions were reached to answer the three research sub-questions posed. These conclusions, in conjunction with a review of existing literature, then helped to answer the overarching research question that undergirded the research.

### **Validity and reliability**

The legitimacy of all research is based upon the validity and reliability of its contents. As such, any research conducted must demonstrate measures employed to ensure of their existence (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001; Patton, 1990). The following steps were utilized to ensure that the research was potentially free from bias, undue influence, or any external interference that may have affected the integrity of the Participants, the data collected, the Researcher, or the research itself.

Since most of the descriptive data was derived from verbal data, which was incumbent upon Participants to provide intellectually honest answers to each interview question, the Researcher utilized the following measures:



- The Participants were assigned letter designations, and all references to individual identities were removed to ensure confidentiality.
- The Participants were allowed to select their own interview sites and times for comfort, and to avoid observer effect.
- The Participants' answers were electronically recorded for transcribing. Once transcribed, Participants were allowed to review their transcripts for accuracy of responses.
- All Participants were interviewed utilizing the same one-on-one interview format.

What's more, since the Researcher conducting this research is a retired New York City Police Department Captain, there could have been unintentional personal biases.

Because of such, the Researcher utilized the following additional measures:

- The Researcher enlisted the help of an independent peer reader to review the research for unintended personal bias (Creswell, 2009). This reader was someone that recently received an Ed.D. degree, and had no affiliations in the area of law enforcement.
- The Researcher asked the union organization that represents the Participants to purposively select volunteer Participants in order to avoid the impression of coerced participation.
- The Participants were asked to volunteer, and to sign letters attesting to their voluntary participation.

Lastly, since this research is reliant upon descriptive data, and the data is only credible if the handling of the data is credible, the Researcher utilized the following additional measures:

- A three-member jury of experts was asked to review the interview questions for clarity and relevance to the data sought.
- After each step of collecting, transcribing, organizing for review, and coding of the data, the data was reviewed several times for any composition errors.

### **Summary**

Chapter III provided an in-depth look into the Researchers background. This included: personal experiences, reason for pursuing the research, and the potential for unintended biases. The chapter also detailed the qualitative methodological approach the Researcher used to collect, process, and thematically code the data needed to conduct the research. This included: the Seton Hall University's Institutional Review Boards permission to conduct the research, the approval of the primary data collection instrument by three experts in the field of the subject matter, and the treatment of Participants and their data. The chapter then displayed the depth of the research by describing the diversity of the Participants and the data collected. Finally, the chapter demonstrated the validity and reliability of the research by identifying the steps used to achieve validity and reliability.

Chapter IV will discuss the results of the research outlined in chapter III. This includes explaining the process used to: code the data, determine meaning for the data, summarize the findings, and draw conclusions.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this qualitative research was to describe the perceptions that patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors had in relation to supervision, and supervisory behavior, in a goal-oriented police department. Also, whether this perception had any influence on their behaviors in relation to Police Officers achieving performance objectives. This research recognized that there is a distinction between a Patrol Supervisors need to supervise and a police departments need to achieve objectives in pursuit of organizational goals. As such, the premise of this research was predicated on an overarching research question which is used to understand whether goal-oriented policing had any influence on the way Patrol Supervisors supervise Police Officers in relation to their duties and responsibilities.

This chapter provides a brief overview of the data collection process and subsequent handling of data. This chapter will also provide an array of various constructed tables, based on descriptive data from transcribed Participant interviews, that will be used for coding of collected data to identify emergent themes. Once identified, this chapter will then place each theme into a relevant themed category; whereby these categories will be reviewed to identify dominant themes based on the three research sub-questions posed. This chapter will conclude by discussing the findings for the research sub-questions.

Based on the 6<sup>th</sup> edition of the American Psychological Association publication manual (APA, 2010), the Researcher has opted to incorporate the tables, created for the data and subsequent coding of such data, into the text. This is in lieu of utilizing separate pages for each constructed table, which does not allow for each table to run concurrent with the text that is relative to that table.

### **Data Collected**

The underpinnings of this research is the data required from all Participants. This data must be properly collected, coded, and interpreted so that conclusions can be adequately drawn. The Researcher has presented the data collected by way of transcriptions of all Participant interviews. However, to avoid any unnecessary gaps in texts, and to create a more coherent flow in sentences, the Researcher chose to remove non-relevant data that consisted of such things as: breaks in answers, requests to repeat questions, duplications in wording, and verbal graffiti (described by Koegel (2007) as filler words extraneous to a conversation). These Participant interview transcripts are presented in Appendix G.

During Participant interviews, the Researcher made observations of each interview site and each Participant. The purpose of these observations was to evaluate the comfort and interest of each Participant, as well as gauge the sincerity of answers given. This allowed the Researcher the ability to make any adjustment to the site if necessary, or to determine if clarification questions were needed. The Participant interview observations are presented in Appendix H.

### **Data Coding**

The Researcher examined all Participant interview transcripts during a preliminary and secondary reading in order to thematically code all relevant data. This coding was based on the identifying of recurring: patterns, words, groupings, emotions, similarities, differences, meanings, and expressions. After coding all data, the Researcher identified emergent themes for each interview question posed utilizing inductive reasoning. As Bogdan and Biklen (2007) have suggested “Qualitative researchers tend to analyze their data inductively. They do not search out data or evidence to prove or disprove

hypotheses...rather, the abstractions are built as the particulars that have been gathered are grouped together”. The interview questions were then grouped into sections based on the research sub-questions they support. The following tables as shown below (tables 3, 4, 5) were created which demonstrate the emergent themes, as well as their correlated coded data, for each interview question posed. Because the Researcher should report all data, and not omit data, coded data from a Participants response to an individual question may be placed, or separated, into multiple emergent themes.

IQ = Interview question

Pt = Participant

### **Emergent themes for Participant interview questions # 1 – 5**

**Table 3. Thematic coding of data for research sub-question # 1**

Research sub-question # 1:

How do patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors perceive their promotional training in relation to preparedness for their duties and responsibilities in a goal-oriented police department?

Interview question # 1:

How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#1	Patrol guide	“vastly about patrol guide procedures” Pt. A “making sure we knew our responsibilities” Pt. C “cover everything that a Sergeant needs to know” Pt. I “it would prepare you for the job” Pt. K
#1	No idea	“no idea of what to expect” Pt. D “I don’t know what I was expecting” Pt. L
#1	Not serious	“it wasn’t very serious” Pt. E “would be boring and tiring” Pt. F “did not feel BMOC was going to teach me anything that

		was useful” Pt. G “I knew what it was like and what would happen. There were no surprises for me when I got there” Pt. O
#1	Instructional	“little bit of role playing or scenarios” Pt. A “taught how to perform daily tasks” Pt. B “would encompass specific job responsibilities” Pt. J “I kind of anticipated being overwhelmed” Pt. H “a higher level of instruction” Pt. M “my expectation was extremely high” Pt. N

Interview question # 2:

How would you describe your promotional training experience?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#2	Good	“the training was good overall” Pt. A “it was good” Pt. D “it’s good in the way that it is set up” Pt. I “positive in the sense that a few guest speakers came... shared their supervisory experiences” Pt. J
#2	Lacking	“it needed more real life, hands on training” Pt. A “very little training on the day to day tasks of a first line supervisor” Pt. B “it could have been more in-depth though” Pt. C “could have been more engaging” Pt. E “it needs to be longer” Pt. I “little hands on instruction due to the large number of trainees” Pt. M “I expected in-depth training on specific topics. However, the training I received was general in various fields” Pt. N
#2	Boring	“was long and drawn out” Pt. B “content was dry” Pt. E “long and drawn out” Pt. F “definitely long...boring” Pt. L “as I thought it would be, I was already pre-prepared for it” Pt. O
#2	Overwhelming	“bit overwhelming with everything they throw at you” Pt. D
#2	Informative	“how to write a 49, mock roll calls, scenarios regarding what I do” Pt. G “it definitely gave you a lot of information” Pt. I “the best was the hands on training” Pt. L
#2	Personable	“you were treated differently...it was more personal” Pt. H “the atmosphere became looser. It was more...personal I guess” Pt. K

Interview question # 3:

How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#3	Accurate	<p>“was quite on point” Pt. A</p> <p>“promotional training..is always consistent with department guidelines. Pt. G</p> <p>“for the most part, it was centered around the patrol guide” Pt. K</p> <p>“the training that involved paperwork...was the closest to the guidelines” Pt. L</p>
#3	Inadequate	<p>“did not relate to department guidelines” Pt. B</p> <p>“it wasn’t adequate” Pt. C</p> <p>“they only covered what they decided was important” Pt. D</p> <p>“the training was brief” Pt. E</p> <p>“the training wasn’t good enough for everything we do” Pt. F</p> <p>“there are so many guidelines in the patrol guide they couldn’t possibly touch them all” Pt. H</p> <p>“promotional training left a lot of patrol guide areas uncovered” Pt. I</p> <p>“promotional training has to follow its own guidelines to meet state requirements...department guidelines is only one area” Pt. O</p> <p>“the training received did follow specific guidelines relating to certain subjects only” Pt. M</p>
#3	Average	<p>“the training was specific and in-depth...assuring you are aware of the risk of recklessly supervising” Pt. N</p>
#3	Inaccurate	<p>“my promotional training...was skewed...actual department guidelines often contradict what is traditionally done in the field” Pt. J</p> <p>“the lectures had almost nothing to do with the guidelines themselves” Pt. L</p>

Interview question # 4:

What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#4	Scenarios	<p>“role playing and scenarios” Pt. A</p> <p>“also mock role calls” Pt. G</p>

		<p>“training sessions that involved hands on instruction...which emulated actual scenarios” Pt. M</p> <p>“the time and topics spent on preparing you to supervise in the field” Pt. N</p>
#4	Task oriented	<p>“four hours of desk officer training, and the four hours of leadership training” Pt. B</p> <p>“the areas covering E.D.P.’s and prisoners” Pt. C</p> <p>“probably desk duties and E.D.P.’s” Pt. D</p> <p>“I would say training on E.D.P.’s and use of force” Pt. E</p> <p>“mostly desk officer training” Pt. F</p> <p>“certainly how to do a 49” Pt. G</p> <p>“basically what I just mentioned, desk officer duties, integrity, also paperwork...patrol supervisors” Pt. H</p> <p>“the paperwork, it’s probably the biggest concern we have” Pt. L</p>
#4	Patrol guide	<p>“it’s all relevant...training is pretty much all about that. Preparing you for patrol in a precinct” Pt. I</p> <p>“basically all of it in some way or another” Pt. K</p> <p>“in some way they are all relevant to a Patrol Supervisor” Pt. O</p>
#4	Decision making	<p>“a good manager should not be afraid to make an intelligent decision” Pt. J</p> <p>“being able to work and make decisions under great stress” Pt. N</p>

Interview question # 5:

How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#5	Unprepared	<p>“I was definitely not one hundred percent quite ready” Pt. A</p> <p>“I realized I was prepared for stuff that I could take my time doing, but wasn’t prepared for anything that required immediate action” Pt. H</p> <p>“anyone who tells me they were prepared is crazy...you’re never going to be 100 percent prepared” Pt. I</p> <p>“the real learning starts in the street” Pt. O</p> <p>“I don’t think I looked at it as being prepared...I don’t recall any training that kicked in while I was in the street” Pt. K</p> <p>“you know, no matter what you learned, you just weren’t prepared...I’m in the spotlight now and I wasn’t prepared for it” Pt. L</p>
#5	Needing	<p>“more hands on real life training would have made me feel way more confident” Pt. A</p>



		“I was very little prepared for the position of supervisor” Pt. B “not too good, I should have a six month training period” Pt. E “I needed some more practical training to feel comfortable” Pt. F “not adequate enough...because of the disconnect between written guidelines and real world situation” Pt. J
#5	Transition	“didn’t tell us how to transition into a boss” Pt. C “I thought I was prepared, but the transition was tough” Pt. D “I felt prepared, but it certainly did not give me the wear with all to do the job well your first run out” Pt. G “once training was completed...I did not feel as confident making decisions as I should” Pt. M
#5	Prepared	“I feel I was prepared and knowledgeable of the requirements to perform the duties of a supervisor” Pt. N “I had a good handle on what needed to be done” Pt. O

Based on emergent themes from interview questions # 1 – 5, the data would suggest that patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors had diverse responses concerning: the expectations about what promotional training would entail, what training actually did encompass, and what was learned from this training. Furthermore, the data would also suggest a majority of these supervisors felt that they were insufficiently prepared for their new position as a squad Sergeant. These findings suggest that Patrol Supervisors have various perceptions regarding their duties and responsibilities after receiving promotional training.

#### **Emergent themes for Participant interview questions # 6 – 10**

**Table 4. Thematic coding of data for research sub-question # 2**

Research sub-question # 2:

How do patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors perceive their duties and responsibilities in relation to supervising a patrol squad in a goal-oriented police department?

Interview question # 6:

How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#6	Assured	“I feel pretty confident about knowing what they are” Pt. A “I’m on top of it because I like to read” Pt. C “pretty good. I studied a lot for the test” Pt. E “good” Pt. F “very good. I studied them numerous times” Pt. H “my familiarity...is relatively extensive” Pt. J “I’ve definitely learned a lot more over the years” Pt. L “I’m very familiar with department guidelines” Pt. M
#6	Adequate	“The familiarity was a result of studying for the promotional exam and on the job training” Pt. B “I survive...I have an idea of what’s in it” Pt. D “I was familiar with department guidelines from studying the patrol guide and day to day routines” Pt. G “because I worked in...I was already exposed to learning them” Pt. O
#6	Partial	“I would say I know the important procedures” Pt. I “I think I now know most of the procedures that I need to know” Pt. K “I was familiar with the requirements needed to supervise” Pt. N

Interview question # 7:

How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#7	Doesn’t relate	“the department guidelines are just not in touch with reality” Pt. A “the information in department guidelines...often creates confusion” Pt. J
#7	Relates well	“the information...related very well to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor” Pt. B “I think the patrol guide covers a lot” Pt. F “I would have to say that the patrol guide covers a lot of stuff” Pt. H “it’s pretty clear. Every procedure tells the Sergeant what to do” Pt. K “detailed. Every procedure tells the Patrol Supervisor what exactly they have to do” Pt. L

#7	Lacks information	<p>“while it does cover a lot of areas it does leave a grey area on use of force” Pt. C</p> <p>“the guides are written...to protect the job, not the supervisor” Pt. D</p> <p>“it’s somewhat accurate...it’s very hard to cover everything” Pt. E</p> <p>“the department guidelines are not specific and leaves gray areas” Pt. N</p>
#7	Partial relation	<p>“there is always a balancing act the Patrol Supervisor has to do...and adhering to department guidelines” Pt. G</p> <p>“it’s supposed to tell me what to do so I don’t make a mistake” Pt. I</p> <p>“the department guidelines were written and created in response to past situations...it is difficult to strictly follow the guidelines” Pt. M</p> <p>“the guidelines...are just that a guide” Pt. O</p>

Interview question # 8:

How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#8	Total commitment	<p>“I always try my best to give total commitment” Pt. A</p> <p>“I’m pretty rule oriented, so I think I follow the rules closely” Pt. C</p> <p>“adherence to guidelines can never get you jammed up” Pt. G</p> <p>“you have no choice. If you don’t follow department guidelines expect to get jammed up” Pt. H</p> <p>“I adhere to the department guidelines” Pt. N</p>
#8	Very well	<p>“I adhere to the department guidelines very well” Pt. B</p> <p>“I follow them close enough to get the job done” Pt. D</p> <p>“I follow them as best I can” Pt. I</p> <p>“I try my best to follow them as best as possible” Pt. K</p> <p>“on a scale of 1 to 10, 10 the highest, I’m around an 8” Pt. L</p> <p>“for the most part, I adhere to the department guidelines” Pt. M</p> <p>“I’ll follow them as close as possible” Pt. O</p>
#8	Sporadic	<p>“I try to follow them, but I am too busy, so I cut corners” Pt. E</p> <p>“I follow them by the seat of my pants” Pt. F</p> <p>“My adherence...is based on the individual situation” Pt. J</p>

Interview question # 9:

What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#9	Task driven	"it varies, from securing a crime scene, personnel allocation...or confrontational situations" Pt. A
#9	Abundance driven	"I am called upon to make many decisions" Pt. B "my responsibility...is to decipher information...and I'm expected to make sound judgements" Pt. J "there's a lot of decisions made every day" Pt. L "after a while you cover most everything...so decisions become routine" Pt. O
#9	Experience driven	"I generally make decisions based on experience" Pt. C "as long as you're fair and reasonable and utilize good common sense you will always be ok" Pt. G "as I continued to have to make decisions...and gain experience my decisions seemed to flow" Pt. H "just everything is subjective in your decisions" Pt. I "as time went by, I became more experienced and confident in my decision making" Pt. M "I have to adhere to the department guidelines while re-enforcing my judgement in the field based on my previous experiences" Pt. N
#9	Avoidance driven	"notify the ranks above me for everything to protect myself" Pt. E
#9	Questionable	"I make judgements that won't get anyone in trouble" Pt. D "I always doubt whether I made the right decision or not" Pt. F "I don't have time to sit around and wait and wonder if it was right" Pt. K

Interview question # 10:

How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#10	Affirmative	"I feel like they look at me as though I'm confident and efficient" Pt. A "the feedback I received...was good and positive" Pt. B "they ask me for guidance often, so I guess they respect my decisions" Pt. C "it's positive" Pt. F "my feedback...is very useful" Pt. J

		“my experiences are good” Pt. N
#10	Neutral	“they don’t really give me any” Pt. D “you don’t hear from anyone unless something happened, and a lot of these bosses aren’t going to get involved unnecessarily” Pt. I “feedback is really hit or miss” Pt. L “the only feedback I receive...is when something goes wrong, or someone made a mistake” Pt. M “I really don’t look for feedback directly” Pt. O
#10	Chatty	“they tell me to make sure I’m covered” Pt. E “I always function under the premise that asking opinions of other senior Sergeants or Lieutenants is the best way to learn” Pt. G “I then tended to gravitate to other Sergeants who were newer, just to get a feel of what they thought” Pt. H “we’ll talk about stuff just to make conversation...there are times when I would ask what someone would have done” Pt. K

Based on emergent themes from interview questions # 6 – 10, the data would suggest that patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors are familiar with their departmental guidelines. The data would also suggest that these supervisors are aware of expectations to adhere to departmental guidelines when decision-making. Even more, these supervisors indicated a willingness to adhere to their departmental guidelines. However, the data also suggests that when it comes to decision-making, a large majority of these supervisors felt various factors were involved in the decision-making process. These findings suggest that Patrol Supervisors, when attempting to adhere to departmental guidelines in decision-making, have also taken various other factors into account in their decisions.

## Emergent themes for Participant interview questions # 11 – 16

**Table 5. Thematic coding of data for research sub-question # 3**

Research sub-question # 3:

How is a patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors performance perceived in relation to the expectations and performances of other Patrol Supervisors in a goal-oriented police department?

Interview question # 11:

How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#11	Competence level	“it depends in the individuals level of competence” Pt. A “depends on the officer...it really depends on who I’m dealing with” Pt. H “depends on the officer...how they’re treated is up to them” Pt. I “I may use their personal or professional experience to aid in my decision making process” Pt. J “I would analyze each individual to determine their character, personality, and abilities” Pt. M “I put my cops into 3 categories A, B, and C” Pt. O
#11	Limited	“I would describe my manner of supervision...as fair and supported” Pt. B “I do take each officers opinion into consideration” Pt. C “I try to lead by example” Pt. F “try to be fair with everyone...motivate them fair across the board” Pt. G “I would never ask a subordinate to do anything that I’m not prepared to do myself” Pt. J “everyone knows what’s expected of them. I’m not going to ride you unless you bring it on yourself” Pt. K
#11	Autocratic	“it’s definitely not democratic, I call the shots” Pt. C “I’m the boss so it’s like here I’m telling you what to do, go do it, get it done” Pt. L
#11	Easy	“pretty easy because they may have to help me in the street one day” Pt. D “It’s not necessary to always be in their face” Pt. E “it is better to be respected then liked” Pt. N

Interview question # 12:

What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#12	Hands on	"I'd say they look at me as hands on...not to the point of being a micro manager" Pt. A
#12	Fair	<p>"the feedback I received ....was that I was fair and cared about their needs" Pt. B</p> <p>"positive, but they wish they had more freedom" Pt. E</p> <p>"I think they like it. I haven't had any complaints that I know of" Pt. F</p> <p>"that depends on each officer. The ones that do their job...love me" Pt. I</p> <p>"the feedback...varies, from being appreciative of my approachable nature to displeasure of my blunt direct style" Pt. J</p> <p>"officers in my squad are positive and content with my supervision until I make a decision or request that they are not happy with" Pt. M</p> <p>"but a fair one" Pt. N</p> <p>"as expected, my A team cops like me, and my C team cops hate me" Pt. O</p>
#12	Affable	<p>"They call me pops, so I think I'm like a father figure to them. I'm guessing they respect me" Pt. C</p> <p>"they view me as a friend" Pt. D</p> <p>"I only had one cop I have a problem with. Everyone else to my knowledge like and respect me" Pt. G</p> <p>"I think that, more than anything else, earns the respect of most of your squad" Pt. H</p> <p>"As far as what I can see they all like me" Pt. K</p>
#12	None	"We don't have a system for Police Officers to provide feedback" Pt. K
#12	Strict	<p>"If I had to guess what they think about me, they probably think I'm strict" Pt. L</p> <p>"I've been told that I am a hard, rough and tough, no messing around boss" Pt. N</p>

Interview question # 13:

How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol

Supervisors?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#13	Easier	<p>“I make sure the job gets done...I don’t believe in micro-managing” Pt. A</p> <p>“I am easy compared to other Sergeants” Pt. D</p> <p>“some may think that that type of supervision is too lenient and personal” Pt. M</p>
#13	Similar	<p>“is very similar...most of the other Patrol Supervisors were my elders or trainers who I would follow their lead” Pt. B</p> <p>“I get the feeling I’m in the middle...I’m right in the middle” Pt. I</p> <p>“there’s some unwritten rules that we kind of work by” Pt. K</p> <p>“overall we’re on the same page” Pt. L</p>
#13	Calmer	<p>“I like to make calm and sound decisions...other supervisors...tend to make more panicked or rushed decisions” Pt. C</p> <p>“I feel I’m much more relaxed than they are” Pt. F</p>
#13	Stricter	<p>“I’m probably a littler stricter in certain areas” Pt. E</p>
#13	Different	<p>“by in large...not all the same, just different” Pt. G</p> <p>“my manner of supervision...varies” Pt. J</p> <p>“I won’t give them advice on how to handle their cops and I don’t let them give me advice on mine” Pt. O</p>
#13	Better	<p>“in comparison to them I’m top notch” Pt. H</p> <p>“I was fortunate to have real life experiences with my environment...however other supervisors not familiar with the area are at a loss leaving the cop to educate the supervisor” Pt. N</p>

Interview question # 14:

What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#14	Positive	<p>“I feel like they look at me as being competent and efficient” Pt. A</p> <p>“I was given positive feedback in regards to my supervisors behavior” Pt. B</p> <p>“they complement me and say that everyone respects me”</p>



		Pt. C “I have always gotten good feedback” Pt. G
#14	Constructive	“I am too close to my cops” Pt. D “I’ve been told to relax a bit, that I’m a little energetic” Pt. E “some supervisors...would describe it as being too lax or too personable with subordinates” Pt. J “I have had supervisors make suggestions to modify my style of supervision, like...don’t be so hard or expect so much from your cops” Pt. N
#14	None	“we don’t question each other about how we work with our squads” Pt. F “ I don’t think I get any negative feedback” Pt. H “I think everyone is on the same page. Like I said before, I’ll handle my people, you handle yours” Pt. K “we really aren’t second guessing each other” Pt. L “none that I recall” Pt. M “it’s more working together as bosses than critiquing each other” Pt. O
#14	Negative	“I hate to say it, but feedback is usually given for negative things, rarely for positive things” Pt. I

Interview question # 15:

How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#15	Fair	“I would say I’m fair. I give everyone the same opportunity to show their work quality” Pt. A
#15	Attentive	“my actions as a Patrol Supervisor are attentive and supportive of the needs to...the Police Officers” Pt. B “I now try to look at situations and evaluate them to see if there was a different way of handling the issue to improve the outcome” Pt. M
#15	Sound judgement	“I feel that I have sound judgement on the street” Pt. C “I’m pretty good with decision making...I think my actions are fine” Pt. H “I would evaluate my actions...based upon the information as well as resources I would have at my disposal and compare that to the decisions made by other supervisors under similar circumstances” Pt. J “I’m going to say I make good decisions” Pt. L “I would ask myself if I achieved the end result I set out to get” Pt. N
#15	Adequate	“I get it done and everyone goes home safe” Pt. D “I haven’t gotten in trouble yet, must be doing ok” Pt. E

		<p>“could be better. I do just enough to get by without drawing attention to myself” Pt. F</p> <p>“I can’t remember any substantial mishaps that I’ve done” Pt. G</p> <p>“I do what the job wants me to do. I follow the book. Get the jobs done, and everyone goes home” Pt. I</p> <p>“I do my job. I do what is expected of me...overall I’d say my actions are fine” Pt. K</p> <p>“based on everything I’m required to do, I think I meet the requirements pretty well” Pt. O</p>
--	--	--

Interview question # 16:

What feedback have you received from supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

<b>IQ</b>	<b>Emergent Theme</b>	<b>Coded Data</b>
#16	Positive	<p>“that I’m a good decision maker. Trustworthy to handle complex tasks...good sound judgement with allocating personnel” Pt. A</p> <p>“as I remember were all positive” Pt. B</p> <p>“I always get well above standards on all my evaluations” Pt. C</p> <p>“the C.O...to ask me to get my cops to get extra numbers. when I do it’s an attaboy” Pt. H</p> <p>“the feedback I receive...is predominately positive” Pt. J</p> <p>“I think my supervisors appreciate my work ethics” Pt. K</p> <p>“the lieutenant seems happy with my work...let’s me do my job and doesn’t really change anything...that’s a positive feedback” Pt. L</p> <p>“I receive good marks on my evaluations...the comments are positive” Pt. O</p>
#16	Evaluations	<p>“the feedback I have received...were normally in the form of departmental evaluations” Pt. B</p> <p>“I always get well above standards on all my evaluations” Pt. C</p> <p>“other than my annual evaluations, none really” Pt. F</p> <p>“I usually wait for my eval’s” Pt. H</p> <p>“Nothing that I remember as a new Sergeant. Now, I’ll just wait for the annual evaluations to see what they are thinking” Pt. M</p> <p>“I receive good marks on my evaluations” Pt. O</p>
#16	Character	<p>“I am told that I have to be more of a boss and less of a friend” Pt. D</p> <p>“I need to calm down and relax” Pt. E</p>

#16	Negative	“my supervisors will chime in when something doesn’t go right, that’s when you’ll be critiqued” Pt. G
#16	None	“Now, unless I mess up, or my cops really produce for the month, I won’t hear anything” Pt. I “I’ve been fortunate never to have a supervisor of mine evaluate my actions or style of supervising” Pt. N

Based on emergent themes from interview questions # 11 – 16, the data would suggest that patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors approach decision-making with a consideration of various existing factors. The data further suggests that some of the more common factors under consideration include: how supervisors prefer to be perceived by Police Officers regarding their manner of supervision, whether the supervisors behavior is comparative to their own peers, and whether supervisors find their own behavior acceptable. However, the data also suggests that advice from peers is not a factor in decision-making. These findings suggest that, while Patrol Supervisors may understand that decision-making should be based on departmental guidelines, their decisions are ultimately made based on guidance from non-departmental guideline factors.

### **Categorical Themes**

#### **Categorical themes for research sub-question # 1**

The Researcher identified the following categorical themes, based on emergent themes that were subsequently derived from individual interview questions # 1 – 5, and relevant to research sub-question # 1 – How do patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors perceive their promotional training in relation to preparedness for their duties and responsibilities in a goal-oriented police department?

In relation to interview question # 1, the category of ‘Departmental Guidelines Laden’ was chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘patrol guide’ whereby Participants A, C, I, and K agreed directly or in substance, and ‘instructional’ whereby Participants A, B, H, J,

M, and N agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Uncertain’ was also chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘no idea’ whereby Participants D and L agreed directly or in substance, and ‘not serious’ whereby Participants E, F, G, and O agreed directly or in substance.

In relation to interview question # 2, the category of ‘Positive Experience’ was chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘good’ whereby Participants A, D, I, and J agreed directly or in substance, ‘informative’ whereby Participants G, I, and L agreed directly or in substance, and ‘personable’ whereby Participants H, I, and K agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Negative Experience’ was also chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘lacking’ whereby Participants A, B, C, E, I, M, and N agreed directly or in substance, ‘boring’ whereby Participants B, E, F, L, and O agreed directly or in substance, and ‘overwhelming’ whereby Participant D agreed directly or in substance.

In relation to interview question # 3, the category of ‘Consistent’ was chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘accurate’ whereby Participants A, G, K, and L agreed directly or in substance, and ‘average’ whereby Participant N agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Inconsistent’ was also chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘inadequate’ whereby Participants B, C, D, E, F, H, I, O, and M agreed directly or in substance, and ‘inaccurate’ whereby Participants J and L agreed directly or in substance.

In relation to interview question # 4, the category of ‘Performance’ was chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘scenarios’ whereby Participants A, G, M, and N agreed directly or in substance, and ‘task oriented’ whereby Participants B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and L agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Knowledge’ was also chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘patrol guide’ whereby Participants I, K, and O agreed directly

or in substance, and ‘decision-making’ whereby Participants J and N agreed directly or in substance.

In relation to interview question # 5, the category of ‘Confident’ was chosen based on the emergent theme of ‘prepared’; whereby Participants N and O agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Doubtful’ was also chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘unprepared’ whereby Participants A, H, I, O, K, and L agreed directly or in substance, and ‘needing’ whereby Participants A, B, E, F, and J agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Transitioning’ was also chosen based on the emergent theme of ‘transition’; whereby Participants C, D, G, and M agreed directly or in substance.

In summary, Police Officers that are awaiting promotional training often have an organizational view of what they expect to encounter during promotional training. After training, these newly promoted patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors are often faced with being disenchanted with their training. What’s more, these new supervisors often feel as though they have to continue their training, on their own, while performing in their new role. This now leaves these supervisors open to making decisions that may allow non-departmental guideline factors to play a role in their decision-making.

### **Categorical themes for research sub-question # 2**

The Researcher identified the following categorical themes, based on emergent themes that were subsequently derived from individual interview questions # 6 – 10, and relevant to research sub-question # 2 – How do patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors perceive their duties and responsibilities in relation to supervising a patrol squad in a goal-oriented police department?

In relation to interview question # 6, the category of ‘Comprehensive’ was chosen based on the emergent theme of ‘assured’; whereby Participants A, C, E, F, H, J, L, and M agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Satisfactory’ was also chosen based on the emergent theme of ‘adequate’ whereby Participants B, D, G, and O agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Incomplete’ was also chosen based on the emergent theme of ‘partial’; whereby Participants I, K, and N agreed directly or in substance.

In relation to interview question # 7, the category of ‘Connection’ was chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘relates well’ whereby Participants B, F, H, K, and L agreed directly or in substance, and ‘partial relation’ whereby Participants G, I, M, and O agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Disconnection’ was also chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘doesn’t relate’ whereby Participants A and J agreed directly or in substance, and ‘lacks information’ whereby Participants C, D, E, and N agreed directly or in substance.

In relation to interview question # 8, the category of ‘Complete’ was chosen based on the emergent theme of ‘total commitment’; whereby Participants A, C, G, H, and N agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Ample’ was also chosen based on the emergent theme of ‘very well’; whereby Participants B, D, I, K, L, M, and O agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Occasional’ was also chosen based on the emergent theme of ‘sporadic’; whereby Participants E, F, and J agreed directly or in substance.

In relation to interview question # 9, the category of ‘Involved’ was chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘abundance driven’ whereby Participants B, J, L, and O agreed directly or in substance, ‘task driven’ whereby Participant A agreed directly or in

substance, and ‘experience driven’ whereby Participants C, G, H, I, M, and N agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Distant’ was also chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘avoidance driven’ whereby Participant E agreed directly or in substance, and ‘questionable’ whereby Participants D, F, and K agreed directly or in substance.

In relation to interview question # 10, the category of ‘Supportive’ was chosen based on the emergent theme of ‘affirmative’; whereby Participants A, B, C, F, J, and N agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Impartial’ was also chosen based on the emergent theme of ‘neutral’; whereby Participants D, I, L, M, and O agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Conversational’ was also chosen based on the emergent theme of ‘chatty’; whereby Participants E, G, H, and K agreed directly or in substance.

In summary, patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors view their duties and responsibilities as being entirely codified. What’s more, they view their supervisory behaviors as already being pre-determined as well. Because of these views, these supervisors feel compelled to follow their departmental guidelines with strict adherence. However, because Patrol Supervisors feel that decision-making is more involved than just the codified guidelines, they will often take into account various other factors that may influence their final decision. While these supervisors have indicated that feedback from their peers is non-existent in the decision-making process, they have noted a positive feedback from peers after a decision is finally made.

### **Categorical themes for research sub-question # 3**

The Researcher identified the following categorical themes, based on emergent themes that were subsequently derived from individual interview questions # 11 – 16, and relevant to research sub-question # 3 – How is a patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors

performance perceived in relation to the expectations and performances of other Patrol Supervisors in a goal-oriented police department?

In relation to interview question # 11, the category of 'Assessment Based' was chosen based on the emergent theme of 'competence level'; whereby Participants A, H, I, J, M, and O agreed directly or in substance. The category of 'Open-Minded' was also chosen based on the emergent themes of: 'limited' whereby Participants B, C, F, G, J, and K agreed directly or in substance, and 'easy' whereby Participants D, E, and N agreed directly or in substance. The category of 'Direct' was also chosen based on the emergent theme of 'autocratic'; whereby Participants C and L agreed directly or in substance.

In relation to interview question # 12, the category of 'Good Natured' was chosen based on the emergent theme of 'affable'; whereby Participants C, D, G, H, and K agreed directly or in substance. The category of 'Rigid' was also chosen based on the emergent themes of: 'strict' whereby Participants L and N agreed directly or in substance, and 'none' whereby Participant K agreed directly or in substance. The category of 'Reasonable' was also chosen based on the emergent themes of: 'hands-on' whereby Participant A agreed directly or in substance, and 'fair' whereby Participants B, E, F, I, J, M, N, and O agreed directly or in substance.

In relation to interview question # 13, the category of 'Comparable' was chosen based on the emergent theme of 'similar'; whereby Participants B, I, K, and L agreed directly or in substance. The category of 'Variation' was also chosen based on the emergent theme of 'different'; whereby Participants G, J, and O agreed directly or in substance. The category of 'Relaxed' was also chosen based on the emergent themes of: 'easier' whereby Participants A, D, and M agreed directly or in substance, and 'calmer' whereby



Participants C and F agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Enhanced’ was also chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘stricter’ whereby Participant E agreed directly or in substance, and ‘better’ whereby Participants H and N agreed directly or in substance.

In relation to interview question # 14, the category of ‘Favorable’ was chosen based on the emergent theme of ‘positive’; whereby Participants A, B, C, and G agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Substantial’ was also chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘constructive’ whereby Participants D, E, J, and N agreed directly or in substance, and ‘negative’ whereby Participant I agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Nonexistent’ was also chosen based on the emergent theme of ‘none’; whereby Participants F, H, K, L, M, and O agreed directly or in substance.

In relation to interview question # 15, the category of ‘Acceptable’ was chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘fair’ whereby Participant A agreed directly or in substance, and ‘adequate’ whereby Participants D, E, F, G, I, K, and O agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Conscientious’ was also chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘attentive’ whereby Participants B and M agreed directly or in substance, and ‘sound judgement’ whereby Participants C, H, J, L, and N agreed directly or in substance.

In relation to interview question # 16, the category of ‘Attributes’ was chosen based on the emergent themes of: ‘positive’ whereby Participants A, B, C, H, J, K, L, and O agreed directly or in substance, and ‘character’ whereby Participants D and E agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Annual Appraisal’ was also chosen based on the emergent theme of ‘evaluations’; whereby Participants B, C, F, H, M, and O agreed directly or in substance. The category of ‘Isolated’ was also chosen based on the

emergent themes of: ‘negative’ whereby Participant G agreed directly or in substance, and ‘none’ whereby Participants I and N agreed directly or in substance.

In summary, although patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors feel that their perceptions of supervision are in line with department guidelines; they also feel that their performances are more in line with their peers, and with their acceptance of their own behaviors. This difference stems from their desire to perform with an open mind, and to be accepted by Police Officers within their patrol squad. What’s more, the supervisors of these Patrol Supervisors appear to have accepted their manner of supervision as evidenced by the positive evaluations received.

### **Dominant Themes**

#### **Dominant themes for research sub-question # 1**

An individual emergent theme is considered a dominant theme for a Participant interview question if the emergent theme represents a sum of coded data that exceeds 50% of all coded data for that interview question. In the absence of a dominant individual emergent theme, an individual categorical theme will be deemed dominant if the sum of coded data within the individual categorical theme exceeds 50% of all coded data for that interview question. If there is more than one dominant theme for a Participant interview question, or if no individual categorical theme reaches the above threshold for being a dominant theme, then the individual emergent theme or individual categorical theme with the highest sum of coded data will be considered the dominant theme for that respective Participant interview question. All coded data is derived from Participant responses to Participant interview questions, and may contain the whole or part of the entire response.

The dominant theme for interview question # 1 is ‘Departmental Guidelines Laden’, and is based on the overall responses from 9 Participants (60.00% of Participants). This theme is identified as a Patrol Supervisors greatest expectation as to what promotional training would entail. Some Participants alluded to being trained mostly on their patrol guide as indicated by the examples: Participant A “vastly about patrol guide procedures”, and Participant C “making sure we knew our responsibilities”. Other Participants alluded to the instructional training as indicated by the examples: Participant M “a higher level of instruction”, and Participant I “would encompass specific job responsibilities”.

The dominant theme for interview question # 2 is ‘Negative’, and is based on the overall responses from 11 Participants (73.33% of Participants). This theme is identified as a Patrol Supervisors response to how they would describe their promotional training experience. Some Participants felt that their promotional training was lacking as indicated by the examples: Participant A “it needed more real life, hands on training”, and Participant B “very little training on the day to day tasks of a first line supervisor”. Other Participants felt that promotional training was boring as indicated by the examples: Participant E “content was dry”, and Participant L “definitely long...boring”. One Participant felt that promotional training was overwhelming as indicated by Participant D “bit overwhelming with everything they throw at you”.

The dominant theme for interview question # 3 is ‘Inadequate’, and is based on the overall responses from 9 Participants (60.00% of Participants). This theme is identified as a Patrol Supervisors response to how promotional training related to their departmental guidelines. This is indicated by the examples: Participant B “did not relate to department

guidelines”, Participant C “it wasn’t adequate”, and Participant I “promotional training left a lot of patrol guide areas uncovered”.

The dominant theme for interview question # 4 is ‘Task Oriented’, and is based on the overall responses from 8 Participants (53.33% of Participants). This theme is identified as the greatest aspect of promotional training that Patrol Supervisors felt were relevant to the position of Patrol Supervisor. This is indicated by the examples: Participant B “four hours of desk officer training, and the four hours of leadership training”, Participant D “probably desk duties and E.D.P.’s”, and Participant F “mostly desk officer training”.

The dominant theme for interview question # 5 is ‘Doubtful’, and is based on the overall responses from 10 Participants (66.66% of Participants). This theme is identified as how, after promotional training, Patrol Supervisors felt they were prepared for their position as a Patrol Supervisor. Some Participants described being unprepared as indicated by the examples: Participant A “I was definitely not one hundred percent quite ready”, and Participant I “anyone who tells me they were prepared is crazy...you’re never going to be 100 percent prepared”. Other Participants described needing more training as indicated by the examples: Participant A “more hands on real life training would have made me feel way more confident”, and Participant E “not too good, I should have a six month training period”.

### **Dominant themes for research sub-question # 2**

The dominant theme for interview question # 6 is ‘Assured’, and is based on the overall responses from 8 Participants (53.33% of Participants). This theme is identified as the familiarity that Patrol Supervisors have about their departmental guidelines. This is indicated by the examples: Participant M “I’m very familiar with department guidelines”,

Participant J “my familiarity...is relatively extensive”, and Participant H “very good. I studied them numerous times”.

The dominant theme for interview question # 7 is ‘Connection’, and is based on the overall responses from 9 Participants (60.00% of Participants). This theme is identified as how the information in department guidelines relates to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor. Some Participants felt that the information relates well as indicated by the examples: Participant B “the information...related very well to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor”, and Participant H “I would have to say that the patrol guide covers a lot of stuff”. Other Participants felt that there was a partial relation as indicated by the examples: Participant G “there is always a balancing act the Patrol Supervisor has to do...and adhering to department guidelines”, and Participant M “the department guidelines were written and created in response to past situations...it is difficult to strictly follow the guidelines”.

The dominant theme for interview question # 8 is ‘Very Well’, and is based on the overall responses from 7 Participants (46.66% of Participants). This theme is identified as how Patrol Supervisors would describe their adherence to their departmental guidelines. This is indicated by the examples: Participant K “I try my best to follow them as best as possible”, Participant M “for the most part, I adhere to the department guidelines”, and Participant O “I’ll follow them as close as possible”.

The dominant theme for interview question # 9 is ‘Involved’, and is based on the overall responses from 11 Participants (73.33% of Participants). This theme is identified as how Patrol Supervisors describe their experiences in decision making. Some Participants stated that their experiences were abundance driven as indicated by the

examples: Participant B “I am called upon to make many decisions”, and Participant L “there’s a lot of decisions made every day”. Other Participants stated that their experiences were experience driven as indicated by the examples: Participant C “I generally make decisions based on experience”, and Participant H “as I continued to have to make decisions...and gain experience my decisions seemed to flow”. One Participant stated that experience was task driven as indicated by Participant A “it varies, from securing a crime scene, personnel allocation...or confrontational situations”.

The dominant theme for interview question # 10 is ‘Affirmative’, and is based on the overall responses from 6 Participants (40% of Participants). This theme is identified as how Patrol Supervisors describe their feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision making. This is indicated by the examples: Participant B “the feedback I received...was good and positive”, Participant F “it’s positive”, and Participant N “my experiences are good”.

### **Dominant themes for research sub-question # 3**

The dominant theme for interview question # 11 is ‘Open Minded’, and is based on the overall responses from 9 Participants (60.00% of Participants). This theme is identified as the manner of supervision in which Patrol Supervisors supervise each Police Officer in their patrol squad. Some Participants described their supervision of Police Officers as limited as indicated by the examples: Participant J “I would never ask a subordinate to do anything that I’m not prepared to do myself”, and Participant K “everyone knows what’s expected of them. I’m not going to ride you unless you bring it on yourself”. Other Participants described their supervision of Police Officers as easy as

indicted by the examples: Participant D “pretty easy because they may have to help me in the street one day”, and Participant E “It’s not necessary to always be in their face”.

The dominant theme for interview question # 12 is ‘Fair’, and is based on the overall responses from 8 Participants (53.33% of Participants). This theme is identified as how Police Officers deem a Patrol Supervisors manner of supervision. This is indicated by the examples: Participant B “the feedback I received...was that I was fair and cared about their needs”, Participant I “that depends on each officer. The ones that do their job...love me”, and Participant N “but a fair one”.

The dominant theme for interview question # 13 is ‘Similar’, and is based on the overall responses from 4 Participants (26.66% of Participants). This theme is identified as how Patrol Supervisors deem their manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors. This is indicated by the examples: Participant B “is very similar...most of the other Patrol Supervisors were my elders or trainers who I would follow their lead”, Participant K “there’s some unwritten rules that we kind of work by”, and Participant L “overall we’re on the same page”.

The dominant theme for interview question # 14 is ‘None’, and is based on the overall responses from 6 Participants (40.00% of Participants). This theme is identified as to what feedback Patrol Supervisors receive from each other in relation to their manner of supervision. This is indicated by the examples: Participant F “we don’t question each other about how we work with our squads”, Participant M “none that I recall”, and Participant K “I think everyone is on the same page. Like I said before, I’ll handle my people, you handle yours”.

The dominant theme for interview question # 15 is ‘Acceptable’, and is based on the overall responses from 8 Participants (53.33% of Participants). This theme is identified as how Patrol Supervisors rate their own actions. Most Participants felt that their actions were adequate as indicated by the examples: Participant D “I get it done and everyone goes home safe”, Participant G “I can’t remember any substantial mishaps that I’ve done”, and Participant K “I do my job. I do what is expected of me...overall I’d say my actions are fine”. One Participant felt their actions were fair as indicated by Participant A “I would say I’m fair. I give everyone the same opportunity to show their work”.

The dominant theme for interview question # 16 is ‘Positive’, and is based on the overall responses from 8 Participants (53.33% of Participants). This theme is identified as the feedback Patrol Supervisors received from their supervisors that evaluated their actions. This is indicated by the examples: Participant A “that I’m a good decision maker. Trustworthy to handle complex tasks...good sound judgement with allocating personnel”, Participant B “as I remember were all positive”, and Participant J “the feedback I receive...is predominantly positive”.

### **Findings**

Based on the dominant themes identified for the Participant interview questions, the Researcher has ascertained the following findings for the three research sub-questions:

Research sub-question # 1 was designed to ascertain how Patrol Supervisors perceive their duties and responsibilities, before and immediately after, going through promotional training. The intention was to capture their expectations as Police Officers waiting to receive promotional training. Then, capture their experiences after promotional training. Finally, to understand whether experiences aligned with expectations. The majority of



Patrol Supervisor responses indicated that promotional training was expected to entail department guidelines in some form. Some of these expectations included learning about supervisor responsibilities, knowing the contents of the patrol guide, and learning about specific daily tasks. However, after receiving promotional training, a majority of Patrol Supervisors felt that the training received was negative in some form. A few complaints were that it lacked enough hands-on training, or it was not in-depth enough. Other complaints were that it was boring, or the content was dry.

When Patrol Supervisors were asked if their training related to their departmental guidelines as they expected it would be, a majority indicated that they were disappointed by the training, explaining that it was inadequate. Some of the reasons given were that it left a lot of patrol guide areas uncovered, or it did not relate to the department guidelines at all. However, a majority of Patrol Supervisors did indicate that the parts of training that involved specific tasks such as desk officer duties was the greatest aspect of training, and was part of their initial expectations. Even so, based on their promotional training experiences, an overwhelming majority of Patrol Supervisors felt that they were under prepared for the position of Patrol Supervisor immediately after leaving promotional training. Some Patrol Supervisors indicated that they should have been trained for at least six months. Others indicated that more real-life hands-on scenarios would have helped in their preparedness.

Research sub-question # 2 was designed to ascertain how Patrol Supervisors perceive their duties and responsibilities after being assigned to a patrol squad of Police Officers. The intention was to understand whether first-hand experiences with Police Officers had any impact on the decision-making between what a Patrol Supervisor was trained to do,

and what they actually do, regarding the handling of Police Officers and job situations. The majority of Patrol Supervisors indicated that they were very knowledgeable about their departmental guidelines, even alluding to having an extensive knowledge of them. Even more, a majority of Patrol Supervisors have suggested that there was a connection between departmental guidelines and what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor. Although, several Patrol Supervisors did state that there was a variation in the amount of that connection.

A majority of Patrol Supervisors further noted that they adhere to their departmental guidelines very well, or at least try to follow them as close as possible. Based on these few dominant themes, it would suggest that Patrol Supervisors make decisions based on their departmental guidelines. However, a near unanimous majority of Patrol Supervisors indicated that decision-making is driven by experiences learned as a Patrol Supervisor. With that said, a majority of Patrol Supervisors felt that the feedback they received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to decision-making was either good, or was positive in some way.

Research sub-question # 3 was designed to understand how a Patrol Supervisors performance is perceived in relation to the expectations and performances of other Patrol Supervisors. The intention was to look at how Patrol Supervisors view other Patrol Supervisors' decision-making, in relation to the handling of Police Officers and job situations. The majority of Patrol Supervisors indicated that they are open-minded with their manner of supervision when it comes to decision-making. Some Patrol Supervisors suggested that they won't ride their Police Officers. Others even suggested that they are pretty easy as a boss. A majority of Patrol Supervisors further noted that the feedback

they receive from Police Officers, in relation to their supervising, is that they are fair, care about the officer's needs, or are simply loved.

When Patrol Supervisors were asked how they see their manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors, a majority of Patrol Supervisors stated that they see their manner as similar to other Patrol Supervisors. Some reasons they cited were that Patrol Supervisors tended to follow what other Patrol Supervisors did, or they were on the same page, or they just followed the unwritten rules that Patrol Supervisors work by. A majority of Patrol Supervisors agreed that they don't provide each other with any kind of feedback on their manner of supervision. When Patrol Supervisors were asked how they perceive their own performance as a supervisor, a majority identified acceptable as the standard. Some Patrol Supervisors stated that their actions were adequate, and they do enough to get the job done. Others stated their actions were rated based on not messing up. What's more, a majority of Patrol Supervisors did acknowledge that the feedback they receive from their own immediate supervisors were positive in some form.

### **Summary**

Chapter IV detailed the coding of data relative to the responses given to Participant interview questions. The chapter then expounded on the subsequent handling of such coded data: from establishing emergent themes, to placing these emergent themes into themed categories. The chapter then identified a dominant theme for each Participant interview question based on the rate of responses relative to each interview question. The chapter then concluded by examining these dominant themes for findings that were used to answer the three research sub-questions posed.

Chapter V will review these findings and draw conclusions that will be used to answer the overarching research question. Furthermore, based on these conclusions drawn and a thorough review of existing literature, chapter V will offer suggestions for future policies, practices, and research in the areas of: supervision in law enforcement, law enforcement organizations, and goal-oriented policing.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **Introduction**

This chapter examines the findings from the three research sub-questions posed. These findings are then used in conjunction to suggest an answer to the overarching research question. Once the overarching question has been addressed, the Researcher reviews the existing literature on the subject matter researched, and together with the answer for the overarching question, draws conclusions about the phenomenon that was researched. This chapter will also expound on the conclusions drawn by utilizing the information gathered from a review of existing literature in the areas of law enforcement and supervision, and from the Researchers own background in law enforcement, and make recommendations for future changes to policies and practices in law enforcement organizations; particularly those organizations that are goal oriented. Furthermore, the Researcher will recommend topics for future research that may be conducted to further add to the body of knowledge about supervision in a goal-oriented police department.

This chapter concludes with the Researcher reflecting on the entire research conducted by summarizing: what existing literature indicated about the history of policing, what led the Researcher to choose the New York City Police Department to be researched, what this research added to the existing body of knowledge on supervision in law enforcement, and what the Researcher gleaned from having conducted this research.

### **Research Questions**

Since the implementation of organized policing in New York City, supervisors had a clear role when it came to supervision – hold Police Officers accountable for their actions or inactions. This paramilitary style of supervision persisted for more than a century as

the operational strategy for the New York City Police Department. However, with the implementation of a new goal-oriented system of crime management, the assigning of accountability had changed. Now, Police Officers were given quantified performance objectives to achieve, and it became the responsibility of the supervisors to ensure Police Officers met those objectives. If officers failed to meet their objectives, the accountability for failure was now shifted to the supervisors, rather than on individual Police Officers.

As a result of this shift, concerns arose as to whether goal-oriented policing, in some way, influences how supervisors perceive supervision, as well as whether this perception has any influence on a supervisors' behavior when interacting with Police Officers in pursuit of performance objectives. To address this phenomenon, an overarching research question was developed that undergirded this research – What perceptions do patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors have in a goal-oriented police department as they relate to supervision, and supervisory behavior, when interacting with Police Officers in pursuit of achieving performance objectives? Based on this overarching question, three research sub-questions were developed:

- 1) How do patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors perceive their promotional training in relation to preparedness for their duties and responsibilities in a goal-oriented police department?
- 2) How do patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors perceive their duties and responsibilities in relation to supervising a patrol squad in a goal-oriented police department?
- 3) How is a patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors performance perceived in relation to the expectations and performances of other Patrol Supervisors in a goal-oriented police department?

These three research sub-questions guided the Researcher in crafting Participant interview questions that were then used to elicit the data needed for this research. This data was then thematically coded for review in order to determine dominant themes from which findings for the three research sub-questions were rendered.

### **Summary of Findings**

This research was conducted to understand a phenomenon occurring within the New York City Police Department. The N.Y.P.D. was an organization that, up until 1994, operated as a strictly run paramilitary organization with defined supervisory roles. After 1994, the N.Y.P.D. changed its century old policing concept and became a goal-oriented police department. In essence, this change made ‘Management By Objectives’ its new operational strategy. However, the defined supervisory roles remained paramilitary, even as the expectations for a supervisor changed. This led to questions as to whether a Patrol Supervisor, trained to follow rules and regulations as they are codified, can accomplish managements objectives as they are now expected to, based on the training they received.

The results of this research suggest that there is some degree of change in the way a Patrol Supervisor behaves when interacting with Police Officers within their patrol squad. According to the findings, Patrol Supervisors had noted that their departmental guidelines are paramount when it comes to decision-making. They felt that these guidelines dictated what was expected from a Patrol Supervisor. They even acknowledged that any deviation from these departmental guidelines can result in negative consequences. For this reason, many Patrol Supervisors had suggested that they know their departmental guidelines very well. What’s more, these supervisors indicated that they try to adhere to these guidelines as best as possible.

When further queried about their actual decision-making, an overwhelming majority of Patrol Supervisors indicated that their personal experiences played a role in what they ultimately decided to do as a supervisor. These experiences varied from being fair and reasonable, to making subjective decisions. This subjectivity included a need for being open-minded in their manner of supervision. Patrol Supervisors went on to suggest that when it came to decision-making, they took the impact it may have on Police Officers into account, indicating that they won't ride their officers, or are pretty easy as a boss. A majority of Patrol Supervisors felt that the feedback they received from Police Officers in their patrol squad was positive in regard to their manner of supervision.

The overall responses from Patrol Supervisors seem to suggest that the disconnection between what is perceived as supervision, and the manner in which Patrol Supervisors actually supervise, is organizationally and culturally driven. The first area of disconnect Patrol Supervisors encountered was when they were assigned to the promotional training unit. Many Patrol Supervisor complaints revolved around incomplete, inaccurate, or insufficient supervisory training that left them feeling underprepared the moment they were assigned to a patrol squad of Police Officers. This feeling of being inept now caused Patrol Supervisors to fill in their training gap the best way they could.

The second area of disconnect Patrol Supervisors encountered was when they looked to other supervisors for either advice, answers, or direction. Patrol Supervisors indicated that feedback from other supervisors regarding their manner of supervision is seldom, if ever, given. Even more, feedback from a Patrol Supervisors own supervisor is annual or sporadic at best. This now left Patrol Supervisors to mimic what other Patrol Supervisors did, or to behave in accordance with what's accepted as cultural norms.



Patrol Supervisors have suggested that ultimately they became content with merely having an acceptable manner of supervision, and were complacent with just getting the job done by whatever means necessary. Based on these findings, one could conclude that Patrol Supervisors will do whatever it takes to get Police Officers to achieve performance objectives, including being lapse in enforcement of departmental rules and regulations.

### **Conclusion**

This research explored the perceptions and behaviors of 15 New York City Police Department patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors, assigned to Bronx county, to understand whether there was some relationship between how they perceive supervision and how they actually supervise. These Patrol Supervisors were ideal for this research as they represented diverse backgrounds and experiences. The average age of each Participant was 34 years and 6 months. The average time earned as a member of the N.Y.P.D. was 11 years and 6 months. The average time earned in the rank of Sergeant was 3 years and 10.8 months. The average time earned as a Patrol Supervisor was 3 years and 2.8 months. Twelve Participants indicated that they had no prior supervisory experience or training outside of the N.Y.P.D. Fourteen Participants indicated that they had no prior law enforcement experience at all; suggesting that all of their law enforcement experiences came from the N.Y.P.D.

The results of this research suggest that a Patrol Supervisor's overall behavior was affected by several factors. The first factor was the demand for Patrol Supervisors to get Police Officers to achieve performance objectives, or be held accountable if they don't. As suggested by Robbins (2005), the problem with this factor is that achieving objectives for the organization is dependent upon the motivation of each Police Officer, and Patrol

Supervisors must be able to stimulate that motivation. Moreover, Robbins (2005) utilized the SIP (Social Information Processing) model to argue that employees adopt behaviors in response to social cues. Thus, if Patrol Supervisors are held accountable for a Police Officer's activity, these supervisors may motivate Police Officers based on what they feel they can get away with and is socially acceptable. This is evidenced by the data that some Patrol Supervisors follow the cultural norms, "there's some unwritten rules that we kind of work by" (Participant K, 2019). This notion was furthered by McRel (2003) which offered that it's the individual's interest, and not the organization's structure, that makes work happen or not. Engel (2000) further suggested that any time Sergeants are faced with conflict they will adapt and define their roles differently.

The second factor was that Patrol Supervisors were not properly trained in persuading Police Officers to perform as expected. As Haberfeld (2002) had offered, you train them as soldiers, yet expect them to behave differently. In 1994, when Police Commissioner Bratton decided to change the department (Walsh, 2001), he implemented 'Management By Objectives' (Kelling, 2009). A business model theory developed by Drucker (1954), which based management objectives on mutually agreed upon goals. However, Bratton enforced management objectives through incentives and disincentives (Weisburd et al., 2002). Top-level management even suggested ways in which supervisors could be held accountable for not producing results (Willis et al., 2003). More et al. (2006) noted that the problem with this factor is that you have leaders that were held to strict standards and strict adherence to departmental guidelines – as this was ingrained through training. This is evidenced by the data, "promotional training...is always consistent with department guidelines" (Participant G, 2019). Haberfeld (2002) offered that state regulations govern

course content minimums for promotional training. Resultantly, these Patrol Supervisors were rewarded for their obedience to departmental guidelines. After the implementation of CompStat and goal-oriented policing, rewards now came via achievement. As Bratton (1998) suggested, it was great theater to have Precinct Commanders explain their actions and achievements to others all while standing at a podium, even bringing subordinate supervisors along to share in the accolades. Kelling (2009) went further and offered that success in reaching organizational goals was now the new business end of the N.Y.P.D.

Dessler (2003) has argued there are three problems with Management By Objectives. 1) Performance objectives can be unclear or immeasurable. 2) M.B.O. is time consuming. 3) A “tug-of-war” occurs with employees looking to minimize performance objectives. Lynch and Lynch (2005) further added an additional problem: 4) Police supervisors are not only responsible for meeting performance objectives and organizational goals, but must also handle daily functions and activities of the organizations operations. This is evidenced by the data, “I am called upon to make many decisions” (Participant B, 2019). Lynch and Lynch (2005) emphasized that the decision-making process is the primary tool of management. Although Cayer (2004) did note that, “Most MBO in the public sector is a streamlined version focusing mostly on setting objectives”. Denhardt et al. (2009) has further noted that the Six-Sigma business theory of whatever gets measured gets done undergirded those objectives in the N.Y.P.D., and is what led to the accountability placed on Patrol Supervisors (Willis et al., 2003).

Where Commissioner Bratton failed with his organizational change was that he failed to provide the proper training needed to get Patrol Supervisors ready for their new roles. Of which, historically, came from an indoctrination into the chain of command (Johnson

et al., 2010). O'Hara (2005) suggested it's a reason why law enforcement organizations fail. Habersfeld (2002) offered, as society moves forward law enforcement training falls behind. Some in academia have already argued that the current military style of training in law enforcement may not be apropos in today's democratic society (Jung, 2012). As Baker (2000) and Habersfeld (2002) concluded, training to be a leader should begin on the first day of a Police Officer's career, not their last.

In addition to the training failure, Commissioner Bratton left in place the old line and box organizational concept where workers were trained to work on specific parts (Taylor, 1911). This further reinforced a strict chain of command (Kelling & Moore, 1988 Nov.). According to O'Hara (2005), an organization's operational structure begins to deviate from its initial intentions starting from day one. Bolman and Deal (2008) suggested that the right organizational structure is critical to combating the risk of employees becoming disengaged. In law enforcement, where police departments are paramilitary by design, the autocratic (transactional) leadership style is seemingly the dominant style (Decker, 2018). However, research "...indicates that a move toward a more transformational approach is taking place... more recent research has found that the transformational leadership style was one of the most favored styles of police chiefs" as this allowed supervisors more latitude in decision-making (Sarver & Miller, 2014; Kapla, 2005; Morreale, 2003). In the future, if police departments are going to become goal oriented, yet expect to maintain a disciplined foundation, there needs to be a new organizational model. A model where the structure is designed around a military like authority, yet is adaptable enough to allow for daily operations that function, and practice, as a modern business.

## **Recommendations for Practice**

As law enforcement has evolved over the last few centuries, through advancements and professionalization, operational practices have also changed to coincide with this evolution. However, with the implementation of goal-oriented policing in the New York City Police Department, changes in practices for Patrol Supervisors to adapt to their new role, and new accountability, have lagged. Based on the data gleaned from one-on-one interviews with these Patrol Supervisors, and from the Researchers personal experiences working within the N.Y.P.D., the following recommendations are suggested for practices to assist Patrol Supervisors in adapting to their new role in goal-oriented policing.

- 1) Patrol Supervisors should be afforded more latitude in decision-making considering the volume and breadth of decisions they make daily, and the accountability placed on them in making those decisions.
- 2) Precinct commanders should routinely review random jobs and meet with those Patrol Supervisors to discuss their actions on handling those jobs. This could allow for a timelier and more consistent feedback, potentially avoiding future mistakes.
- 3) A common practice in the N.Y.P.D. is for Patrol Supervisors to pick their own drivers. These drivers are usually the same people, and are relegated to the role of chauffeur. Police Officers awaiting promotion should be utilized as the Patrol Supervisors driver, and given an opportunity to assist in the decision-making. This could increase a future Patrol Supervisors knowledge and confidence in the decision-making process.
- 4) Precinct commanders should review discipline records on a continuous basis. This will help to determine if any patterns of discipline exist, as well as whether there is a lack of discipline being dispensed. Both of which could indicate a disparity in treatment of

Police Officers, and suggest a concern with supervisory behavior.

While these practice suggestions are just a few, they are based on the more common concerns Patrol Supervisors have indicated in their interviews. Further suggestions for practices can be gleaned from a reading of tables 3, 4, and 5, which demonstrate the wide range of responses Patrol Supervisors have given regarding supervisory concerns.

### **Recommendations for Policy**

For over a century, the New York City Police Department has run its patrol operations based on a set of departmental guidelines compiled in a book called the ‘Patrol Guide’, to which all members of patrol must adhere. However, as the N.Y.P.D. advanced with a new operational strategy of Management By Objectives, changes in policies helping Patrol Supervisors adjust to this new strategy is non-existent. Based on the data gleaned from one-on-one interviews with these Patrol Supervisors, and from the Researchers personal experiences working within the N.Y.P.D., the following recommendations are suggested for policies to help Patrol Supervisors adjust to their new role in a goal-oriented police department.

- 1) The N.Y.P.D. should prohibit Sergeants from fraternizing with Police Officers that work within their same precinct. This could remove the practice of being personal with Police Officers, which has been suggested as a goal of some Patrol Supervisors.
- 2) The N.Y.P.D. should add an additional ‘open’ week to the promotional training units’ schedule. This additional week could provide future Patrol Supervisors with the ability to obtain additional instruction in any area of training they felt they were lacking.
- 3) The N.Y.P.D. should adopt the military’s concept of grading the rank of Sergeant. This could allow the more competent Sergeants to be rewarded and recognized as a higher

grade rank. Patrol Supervisors needing help could seek out these competent Sergeants for advice and direction.

- 4) The N.Y.P.D. should review its Patrol Guide procedures regularly to keep it accurate and relevant to the position of Patrol Supervisor, as this was a recurring theme from Patrol Supervisors suggesting that departmental guidelines were not entirely accurate or relevant to the position of Patrol Supervisor.

These policy suggestions are just a few potential changes that could help assist in the transitioning process from Police Officer to Patrol Supervisor, and could help speed up the acclimation to the position of Patrol Supervisor. Further suggestions for policies can be gleaned from a reading of tables 3, 4, and 5, which demonstrate the wide range of responses Patrol Supervisors have given in relation to current policies.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

The purpose of this research was not to determine whether goal-oriented policing was effective in crime management in the New York City Police Department. The purpose of this research was to understand the effects that implementing a new method of crime management would have on patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors. When Police Officers are promoted they enter a promotional course that trains them to supervise according to their departmental guidelines. The preparation they receive is based on situations they would most likely encounter when supervising. However, there still exists a need to have Patrol Supervisors motivate Police Officers to achieve performance objectives. While this research may have developed some understandings of what Patrol Supervisors in the New York City Police Department perceive as supervision, there are still questions as to what lengths these supervisors are willing to go to in order to get Police Officers to achieve

performance objectives. Future research may be able to help answer those questions.

Some future research questions suggested are:

- 1) What discipline, if any, is meted out by Patrol Supervisors to Police Officers in their respective squads? This research may help to understand if a pattern of disciplining exists, to whom any discipline is given, and for what reasons.
- 2) Do Police Officer evaluations accurately reflect their performance in relation to other Police Officer evaluations and performances in the same squad? This research may help to understand if Patrol Supervisors evaluate their Police Officers accurately, and to what specifically these evaluations are based on.

On a national level, as more police departments throughout the country continue to make goal-oriented policing their new standard for crime management, there still exists questions as to whether goal-oriented policing has any detrimental effect on the way supervisors behave. Also, whether this effect on behavior is police department specific, or indicative of law enforcement as a whole. Future research may be able to help answer those questions. Some future research suggestions are:

- 1) Research could be conducted on police departments similar to the New York City Police Department to determine whether the results of this research are localized to the N.Y.P.D., or are more indicative of the effects of goal-oriented policing throughout law enforcement.
- 2) Research could also be conducted on police departments that are not goal oriented. This may allow a comparison to be conducted between supervisory behavior in a goal-oriented police department and a police department that has yet to become goal oriented. The results would add to the body of literature on supervisory behavior.



## **Summary and Reflection**

Throughout history, the concept of policing has traditionally been a reactionary role in civilized humanity: from guarding communities, to enforcing tax collection, to protecting Kings, to squelching riots, to apprehending law breakers (Roots, 2001; Balko, 2013).

Because of this reactionary way of policing, fundamental changes to policing was rarely seen. As Willis, Mastrofski, and Weisburd (2003) have noted; "...for revolutions rarely come to U. S. police departments – or any organization". As such, policing was seen as it historically was, a military style unification of individuals with a hierarchical structure, a disciplined foundation, and a working operational strategy. However, after thousands of years, policing began to change noticeably, much like civilizations began to change. No longer was policing done by a standing army, but a paramilitary organization dedicated to protecting civilians (Posse..., 1878).

The 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries saw vast improvements in the way policing was conducted: from the enactment of Sir Robert Peels' principles of policing (Shrestha, 2015), to Chief August Vollmers' advancements in policing (Carte, 1972). Police departments began to experience fundamental changes, not only in its practices, but it's principles as well. As Willis et al. (2003) have also noted; "Change is occurring, but at a much slower, evolving pace". These changes came under the guise of professionalizing police departments. They included: better communications, military logistics, officer mobility, improved training, and increased standards (Vollmer, 1933). All of which may be considered by some to be advancements in policing, yet have all added to the evolution of the concept of policing.

The 21<sup>st</sup> century may have brought what some may argue is the newest evolution in policing, while others may argue is the newest advancement in policing. But, none can

deny that goal-oriented policing has changed the way management of crime is handled. No longer are police departments simply reactive (Weisburd & Braga, 2006). Now, they are seen as proactive, and Management By Objectives is now their preferred operational strategy (Zimmerman, 2018).

Since 1994, the New York City Police Department has been at the forefront of this change in policing. Based on the 'Broken Windows' theory, which changed the concept of policing to a proactive approach, a new principle of policing was created (Kelling & Wilson, 1982). This new principle, referred to as 'CompStat', would let precinct commanders know where, when, how, and by whom crimes in the past were committed (Willis et al., 2003). Based on this information, Police Officers would then be directed to specific locations to achieve measured performance objectives (Nimsombun, 2000). It would also become the responsibility of these Police Officers' supervisors to ensure and measure these performance objectives on a monthly basis (Kelling & Sousa, 2001).

However, CompStat was not without its drawbacks. Now that precinct commanders were given this new tool, they were expected to use it to drive down crime. As noted in chapter II, CompStat soon became a weapon to be used against precinct commanders who did not reduce crime in their precincts (Zink, 2004). This, then led to many precinct commanders fixing crime reports to give the appearance of a reduction. According to a study by Eterno and Silverman (2010), hundreds of retired N.Y.P.D. executives admitted to distorting crime reports for the sake of reducing crime. Unfortunately, the CompStat drawbacks didn't just affect reports. Precinct commanders were pressed to show activity at crime locations to indicate that they were addressing crime in a proactive way. Thus, precinct commanders were now relying on Police Officers to achieve specified activity.

More importantly, the officers supervisors were now held accountable for ensuring this activity was achieved (Kelling & Sousa, 2001). This was a phenomenon that was new to the New York City Police Department, and all of its members.

In the years that followed the implementation of CompStat, studies were conducted on this new paradigm of crime management. These studies were geared toward determining whether goal-oriented policing: actually worked to reduce crime, had a negative impact in certain communities, or if it was legal to mandate performance objectives for Police Officers to achieve (Eterno & Silverman, 2010; Carr, 2017; Seo, 2016). Where studies were lacking was on the impact goal-oriented policing would have on those accountable for performance objective success – the Patrol Supervisors.

This research was conducted to explore and understand whether supervisory behavior, and perceptions of supervision, of patrol precinct Patrol Supervisors would be affected in a police department that has now become goal oriented. The results of the research found that there was some affect in the relationship between a Patrol Supervisors behavior and how one sees supervision. Even more, this research offered that with proper training the effects from supervising in a goal-oriented police department may be mitigated. As White and Escobar (2008) have suggested: going forward, as policing moves towards being goal oriented, critical thinking and analytical skills must become a component of training new supervisors. As the Researcher, what I have learned from this research is the importance of proper training in a goal-oriented police department, and that cannot be overstated. An organization cannot be successful if the organizational structure and training provided to its supervisors is in contradiction to the abilities and expectations of its supervisors, or the organizational goals. As Blake and Mouton (1964) offered years ago, and is still relevant

even today, there must be a concern not only for production, but for the people as well. A modern, professionalized police department cannot train supervisors to be transactional, yet expect them to behave as transformational leaders. As the results of this research have suggested, the end product of conflicted supervision are supervisors whose perceptions and behaviors are more in line with a *laissez faire* manner of supervision.

## REFERENCES

- Adler, P. S., & Borys, B. (1996). Two Types of Bureaucracy: Enabling and Coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 41, 61-89.
- American Psychological Association (2010). *Publication Manual*. Washington, D.C.
- Ayres, R. M., & Flanagan, G. S. (1990). *Preventing law enforcement stress: The organizations role*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/141934NCJRS.pdf> on 6/20/2019.
- Baker, T. E. (2000). *Effective police leadership. Beyond management*. New York: Looseleaf Law Publications Inc.
- Balko, R. (2013, July). How did America's police become a military force on the Streets? *ABA Journal*. Retrieved from [http://www.abajournal.com/magazine/article/how\\_did\\_americas\\_police\\_become\\_a\\_military\\_force\\_on\\_the\\_streets/](http://www.abajournal.com/magazine/article/how_did_americas_police_become_a_military_force_on_the_streets/) on 1/27/2019.
- Barlow, F. (1965). *William I and the Norman Conquest*. London: The English Universities Press Ltd.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, & Managerial Application*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, S. (2001). Policing Space, Policing Race: Social Control Imperatives and Police Discretionary Decisions. *Social Justice/Global Options* 28(1), 156–176. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29768062> on 4/29/2019.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Bayley, D. H. (1994). *Police For The Future*. Oxford: University of Oxford Press.

- Beehr, T. (1995). *Psychological Stress in The Workplace*. London: Routledge.
- Berman, E. M., Bowman, J. S., West, J. P., & Wart, M. V. (2006). *Human Resource Management in Public Service: Paradoxes, Processes, and Problems*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The Managerial Grid*. Houston Tx: Gulf Publishing Company.
- Bogden, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bopp, W. J., & Schultz, D.O. (1972). *A Short History of American Law Enforcement*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Bratton, W. J. (1998). *Turnaround: How America's top cop reversed the crime epidemic*. New York: Random House.
- Brislin, R. (2000). *Understanding Culture's Influence on Behavior*. Canada: Thomson Learning.
- Brown, M. K. (1988). *Working the Street: Police Discretion and the Dilemmas of Reform*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Carr, P. J. (2017). *Examining the Relationship Between Incidents of Police Corruption, Location of Assignment, and Elite Unit Corruption (EUC) in the New York City Police Department*. Dissertation, Northcentral University, 2017.

- Carte, G. E. (1972). *August Vollmer And The Origins Of Police Professionalism*. Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1972.
- Cayer, N. J. (2004). *Public Personnel Administration*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Center for Research on Criminal Justice. (1975). *The Iron Fist and the Velvet Glove: An Analysis of the U.S. Police*. Berkeley, CA.
- Chafe, W. H. (2019). 1945 to the Present. *The Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History*. Retrieved from <https://www.gilderlehrman.org/history-now/1945-present> on 5/8/2019.
- Chin, G. J. (1997). *New York City Police Corruption Investigation Commissions 1894-1994*. William S Hein & Co.
- Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies. (2019). Official CALEA website. Retrieved from <http://www.calea.org/> on 6/1/2019.
- Conner, D. R. (1993). *Managing at the Speed of Change: How Resilient Managers Succeed and Prosper Where Others Fail*. New York: Random House Publishing.
- Connors, R., & Smith, T. (2011). *Change the culture Change the game*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Czitrom, D. (2016, June 28). Official Time Magazine Website. *The Origins of Corruption in the New York City Police Department*. Retrieved from <http://time.com/4384963/nypd-scandal-history/> on 5/6/2019.

- Deakin, T. (1988). *Police Professionalism: The Renaissance of American Law Enforcement*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- DeCenzo, D. A., & Silhanek, B. (2002). *Human Relations: Personal and Professional Development*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Decker, J. P. (2018). *A Study of Transformational Leadership Practices to Police Officers' Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment*. Dissertation, Seton Hall University, 2018.
- Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the Crisis*. Mass: MIT Center for Advanced Engineering Study.
- Denhardt, R. B., Denhardt, J. V. & Aristigueta, M. P. (2009). *Managing Human Behavior in Public and Nonprofit Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Department of Citywide Administration Services. (2016). Official D.C.A.S. Website. Retrieved from <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcas/downloads/pdf/noes/201606540000.pdf> on 6/13/2019.
- Dessler, G. (2003). *Human Resource Management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Hall.
- Dinsmore, E. (2018). *Blurring the Thin Blue Line: The Rise of the Military Model in U.S. Policing*. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2018.
- Dornbusch, S., & Scott, W. R. (1975). *Evaluation and The Exercise of Authority*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Drucker, P. F. (1954). *The Practice of Management*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2018, Jan.). Official E.B. Website. *Anglo-Saxon*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Anglo-Saxon> on 4/11/2019.



- Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2017, Sept.). Official E.B. Website. *Germanic Peoples*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Germanic-peoples> on 4/11/2019.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2018, Oct.). Official E.B. Website. *Industrial Revolution*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Industrial-Revolution> on 4/21/2019.
- Engel, R. S. (2000). The Effects of Supervisory Styles on Patrol Officer Behavior. *Police Quarterly*, 3, 262.
- Eterno, J. A., & Silverman, E. B. (2010). The NYPD's Compstat: Compare statistics or compose statistics? *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 8, 218-231.
- Experience Ancient Egypt. (2019). Official E.A.E. Website. *Ancient Egyptian Police*. Retrieved from <http://www.experience-ancient-egypt.com/ancient-egyptian-history/ancient-egyptian-armies/ancient-egyptian-police> on 4/9/2019.
- Famega, C. N. (2003). *Discretion or Direction? An Analysis of Patrol Officer Downtime*. Dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 2003.
- Feucht, T. E., & Zedlewski, E. (2007, June). The 40<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Crime Report. *National Institute of Justice*. Retrieved from <https://nij.gov/journals/257/Pages/40th-crime-report.aspx> on 6/1/2019.
- Fogelson, R. F. (1977). *Big-City Police*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Girodo, M. (1998). Machiavellian, bureaucratic, and transformational leadership styles in police managers: Preliminary findings of interpersonal ethics. *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, 86(2), 419-427.
- Green, G. S. (1999). *Occupational Crime*. Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

- Godfrey, B. S., & Lawrence, P. (2005). *Crime and Justice, 1750–1950*. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.
- Guffey, C. J., & Helms, M. M. (2001). Effective employee discipline: A case of the Internal Revenue Service. *Public Personnel Management*, 30(1), 111–127.
- Haberfeld, M. R. (2002). *Critical Issues In Police Training*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Haberfeld, M. R. (2006). *Police Leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hess, K. M., Hess Orthmann, C., & Cho, H. L. (2014). *Introduction to law enforcement and criminal justice*. Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.
- History. (2019). Official History Website. *New York City*. Retrieved from <https://www.history.com/topics/us-states/new-york-city> on 2/9/2019.
- History. (2019). Official History Website. *Alexander the Great*. Retrieved from <https://www.history.com/topics/ancient-history/alexander-the-great> on 4/9/2019.
- Johnson, M. S. (2003). *Street Justice: A History of Political Violence in New York City*. Beacon Press.
- Johnson, B. D., Golub, A., & McCabe, J. (2010). The international implications of quality-of-life policing as practiced in New York City. *Police Practice and Research*, 11, 17-29.
- Jung, A. A. (2012). *Police Education And Discipline*. Dissertation, University of Capella, 2012.
- Kapla, D. P. (2005). *Personalizing leadership: Institutional and individual factors affecting the leadership styles and policy choices of Wisconsin police chiefs*.

- Dissertation, West Virginia University, 2005.
- Kauffman, D. L. (1980). *Systems one: An introduction to systems thinking*. Minneapolis, MN: Future Systems, Inc.
- Kelling, G. L. (2009). Official City Journal Website. *How New York Became Safe: The Full Story*. Retrieved from <https://www.city-journal.org/html/how-new-york-became-safe-full-story-13197.html> on 2/5/2019.
- Kelling, G. L., & Moore, M. H. (1988). From Political Reform to Community: The Evolving Strategy of Police. In *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality*, ed. Jack R. Greene and Stephen D. Mastrofski, 3-25. New: Praeger.
- Kelling, G. L., & Moore, M. H. (1988, Nov.). Official N.C.J.R.S. Website. *The Evolving Strategy of Policing*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/114213.pdf> on 5/13/2019.
- Kelling, G. L., & Sousa, W. H. (2001). Do police matter? An analysis of the impact of New York City's police reforms. *Manhattan Institute*. Retrieved from [http://www.manhattan-institute.org/pdf/cr\\_22.pdf](http://www.manhattan-institute.org/pdf/cr_22.pdf) on 6/24/2019.
- Kelling, G. L., & Wilson, J. Q. (1982, March). Official The Atlantic Website. *Broken Windows The police and neighborhood safety*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1982/03/broken-windows/304465/> on 5/20/2019.
- Kennedy, D. (2019). The Great Depression and World War II, 1929-1945. *The Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History*. Retrieved from <https://www.gilderlehrman.org/history-now/great-depression-and-world-war-ii-1929-1945> on 5/8/2019.

- Kerr, P. (1986, Sept. 13). Official NYTimes Website. *Growth In Heroin Use Ending As City Users Turn To Crack*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/1986/09/13/nyregion/growth-in-heroin-use-ending-as-city-users-turn-to-crack.html> on 5/9/2019.
- Klockars, C. (1985). *The Idea of Police*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Koegel, T. J. (2007). *The Exceptional Presenter*. Austin, Tx: Greenleaf Book Group.
- Kraska, P. B. (2007). Militarization and Policing--Its Relevance to 21st Century Police. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*. 1(4), 501–513.
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2001). *Practical Research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill – Prentice Hall.
- Leichtman, E. C. (2008). Complex Harmony: The Military and Professional Models of Policing. *Critical Criminology*. Prentice Hall.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Service*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lundman, R. (1979). Organizational norms and police discretion: an observational study of police work with traffic law violators. *Criminology*, 17, 159-171.
- Lynch, R. G., & Lynch, S. R. (2005). *The Police Manager*. Anderson Publishing.
- Manning, P. (1992). Information Technologies and The Police. In *Crime and Justice*, ed. University of Chicago Journals, 15, 349-398. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mark, J. J. (2018, March 22). Roman Empire. *Ancient History Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from [https://www.ancient.eu/Roman\\_Empire/](https://www.ancient.eu/Roman_Empire/) on 4/9/2019.
- Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. NY: HarperCollins.

- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maxwell, J. C. (2011). *The 5 levels of leadership: Proven steps to maximize your potential*. New York, NY: Center Street Publishing.
- McClellan, S. E., & Gustafson, B. G. (2012). Communicating law enforcement professionalization: Social construction of standards. *Policing*, 35(1), 104–123.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The Human Side Of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McREL. (2003). *A Monograph On Creating Organizational Change Using A Living-Systems Approach*. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C.
- Megginson, W. L., Byrd, M. J., Scott Jr., C. R., & Megginson, L.C. (1997). *Small business management: An entrepreneur's guide to success*. Boston, MA: Irwin, McGraw Hill.
- More, H. W., Vito, G. F., & Walsh, W. F. (2006). *Organizational behavior and management in law enforcement*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Morreale, S. A. (2003). *Analysis of perceived leader behaviors in law enforcement agencies*. Dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, 2003.
- Musson, A. (2004). Myth, Mistake, Invention? Excavating the Foundations of the English Legal Tradition. In *Law and History*, ed. Andrew Lewis and Michael Lobban , 77. Oxford: University of Oxford Press.
- National Archives. (2019). Official National Archives Website. *Constitution*. Retrieved from <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution> on 1/20/2019.
- National Criminal Justice Reference Service. (2019). Official N.C.J.R.S. Website. *History of The New York City Police Department*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/App/publications/abstract.aspx?ID=145539> on 2/6/2019.

- New York City Police Department. (2019). Official N.Y.C.P.D. Website. Retrieved from <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/nypd/index.page> on 1/28/2019.
- New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. (2019). Official N.Y.S.D.C.J.S. Website. Retrieved from <https://www.criminaljustice.ny.gov/ops/training/index.htm> on 6/6/2019.
- Nimsombun, T. (2000). *The Job Performance of Thai Police Officers: A case study of the non-commissioned patrol officers and community poling [sic] officers of the Metropolitan Police Bureau*. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 2000.
- NYPD Recruit. (2019). Official N.Y.C.P.D. Recruitment Website. Retrieved from <http://www.nypd2.org/recruit/html/overview.html> on 5/20/2019.
- NYPD, Inc. (1995, July 29). *Economist*, 336 (7925), 50.
- O'Hara, P. (2005). *Why Law Enforcement Organizations Fail: Mapping the Organizational Fault Lines in Policing*. Durham, North Carolina: Carolina Academic Press.
- Oreskes, M. (1985, July 6). Official NYTimes Website. *Fiscal Crisis Still Haunts The Police*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/1985/07/06/nyregion/fiscal-crisis-still-haunts-the-police.html> on 5/9/2019.
- Parenti, C. (2008). *Lockdown America: Police and Prisons in the Age of Crisis*. New York, NY: Verso.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Posse Comitatus Act of 1878, 18 U.S.C. & 1385.

- Powell, G. N., & Graves, L. M. (2003). *Women and Men in Management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Reichel, P. L. (1988). Southern Slave Patrols as a Transitional Police Type. *American Journal of Police* 7(2), 51–77.
- Reiss, A. Jr. (1992). Police Organization in the Twentieth Century. In *Modern Policing*, ed. Michael H. Tonry and Norval Morris, 11-97. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Reith, C. (1975). *The Blind Eye of History: A Study of the Origins of the Present Police Era*. Montclair NJ: Patterson Smith.
- Robbins, S. P. (2005). *Essentials of organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rodger,V. A. (2006). *From Restoration to Retribution: Evolution in the treatment of wrongdoing in early English law c.600 A.D. to c.1135 A.D.* Masters Thesis, University of Alberta, 2006.
- Rodgers, D. T. (2019). The Progressive Era to the New Era, 1900-1929. *The Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History*. Retrieved from <https://www.gilderlehrman.org/history-now/progressive-era-new-era-1900-1929> on 5/8/2019.
- Robertson, A. J. (1925). *The Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roots, R. (2001). Are cops constitutional?. *Seton Hall Constitutional Law Journal*, 685.
- Sarver, M. B., & Miller, H. (2014). Police chief leadership: Styles and effectiveness. *Policing*, 37(1), 126-143.

- Schafer, J. A. (2009). Developing effective leadership in policing: perils, pitfalls, and paths forward. *Policing*, 32(2), 238-260.
- Schmallegger, F. (1993). *Criminal Justice Today*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Regents/Prentice Hall.
- Schmallegger, F. (2012). *Criminal justice: A brief introduction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Scott, M. S. (2000). *Problem-oriented policing: Reflections on the first 20 years*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and in the social sciences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Sergeants Benevolent Association. (2015). Official Sergeants Benevolent Association Website. Retrieved from <https://sbanypd.nyc/our-legacy/our-purpose/> on 6/10/2019.
- Seo, S. A. (2016). *The Fourth Amendment, Cars, And Freedom In Twentieth-Century America*. Dissertation, University of Princeton, 2016.
- Shrestha, T. M. (2015). Policing challenged and peoples' expectations. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 3(2), 7-14.
- Skolnick, J. H. (1993). *Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in Democratic Society*. Prentice Hall PTR.
- Stead, P. J. (1977). *Pioneers in Policing*, Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership. *Journal of Psychology*, 54, 259-269.



- Storino Jr., P. (2018, April). Official NYPD History Website. *What's the Deal with: The Present Rank Structure in the NYPD & The "Slaughter of 1907"*. Retrieved from <http://nypdhistory.com/whats-the-deal-with-the-present-rank-structure-in-the-nypd-the-slaughter-of-1907/> on 5/6/2019.
- Swanson, C. R., Territo, L., & Taylor, R. (2012). *Police administration structures: Processes and behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper.
- Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). *The Transformational Leader*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Tsolakidou, S. (2013, May). *The Police in Ancient Greece*. Retrieved from <https://greece.greekreporter.com/2013/05/30/the-police-in-ancient-greece/> on 4/9/2019.
- Tyree, J. V. (2017). *Code and Custom: Evidence of Widespread Tradition in Medieval Germanic Law*. Masters Thesis, University of Houston, 2017.
- Vollmer, A. (1932, Jan.). Wickersham Police Report. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 22(5), 716-723.
- Vollmer, A. (1933). Police Progress in the Last Twenty-Five Years. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 24(1), 161-175.
- Walker, S. (1998). *A history of American criminal justice*. New York: Oxford university Press.
- Walker, S., & Katz, C. M. (2013). *The Police in America: An introduction*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Walsh, W. F. (2001). Compstat: an analysis of an emerging police managerial paradigm. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*. 24(3).

- Wasson, D. L. (2016, October 24). Roman Egypt. *Ancient History Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from [https://www.ancient.eu/Roman\\_Egypt/](https://www.ancient.eu/Roman_Egypt/) on 4/9/2019.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations*. New York: Free Press.
- Weisburd, D., & Braga, A. A. (2006). *Police Innovation: Contrasting Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weisburd, D., Mastrofski, S. D., McNally, A. M., & Greenspan, R. (2002). *Reforming to Preserve: Compstat and Strategic Problem Solving in American Policing*. Manuscript, Berkley Law, University of California, 2002.
- Westerlund, G. & Sjostrand, S. (1979). *Organizational Myths*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Wheatley, M. J. (1999). *Leadership and the new science*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- White, D., & Bednar, D. (1986). *Organizational behavior: Understanding and Managing People at Work*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- White, M. D. (2008). Identifying good cops early: Predicting recruit performance in the academy. *Police Quarterly*, 11(1), 27-49.
- White, M. D. (2011). *The New York City Police Department, its Crime-Control Strategies and Organizational Changes, 1970-2009*. Manuscript, Arizona State University, 2011.
- White, M. D., & Escobar, G. (2008). Making good cops in the twenty-first century: Emerging issues for the effective recruitment, selection and training of police in the United States and abroad. *International Review of Law Computers & Technology*, 22 (1-2), 119-134.

- White House. (2019). Official White House Website. *The Constitution*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/about-the-white-house/the-constitution/> on 1/20/2019.
- Williams, A. J. (1992). The effects of police officer supervisory training on self-esteem and leadership style adaptability considering the impact of life experiences. Dissertation, Georgia State University, 1992.
- Williams, K. (2011). The Other Side of the COIN: Counterinsurgency and Community Policing. *Interface: A Journal For and About Social Justice*. 3(1), 81–117.
- Williams, K. (2015). *Our Enemies in Blue: Police and Power in America*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Willis, J. J., Mastrofski, S. D., & Weisburd, D. (2003). Compstat In Practice: An In-Depth Analysis Of Three Cities. *Police Foundation*. Washington, D.C.
- Witte, J. S., & Witte, R. S. (2004). *Statistics*. Fort Worth, Texas: Harcourt.
- World Encyclopedia. (2005). Official Encyclopedia.com Website. *Great Britain*. Retrieved from <https://www.encyclopedia.com/reference/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/great-britain-0> on 4/22/2019.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in Organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Zimmerman, C. C. (2018). *Law Enforcement Employees' Perceptions of Performance Appraisals in a Medium-Size, Suburban Police Department*. Dissertation, Seton Hall University, 2018.
- Zink, R. (2004, summer). The trouble with Compstat. *PBA Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.nycpba.org/publications/mag-04-summer/compstat.html> on 6/24/2019.

## **APPENDICES**

### **Appendix A**

Edward D. Mullins, President  
Sergeants Benevolent Association  
New York City Police Department  
35 Worth Street, Suite 1  
New York, NY 10013

Dear Sergeant Mullins;

My name is Jerry Garcia. I am a retired Captain from the NYPD. I am currently a Doctoral student enrolled in a Doctoral program at Seton Hall University, College of Education and Human Services, Department of Education Leadership, Management, and Policy.

I am presently conducting research for my doctoral dissertation on perceptions of supervision, and how they relate to supervisory behavior in a goal-oriented police department. The focus of this research is to understand whether supervisor accountability, for Police Officers achieving performance objectives, has any influence on supervisory behavior, or if it influences the way supervisors view supervision. This research is of a qualitative design, and requires descriptive data that would be obtained by interviewing participants. The responses given would then be coded and analyzed for meaning. Once concluded, this research would contribute to the growing body of knowledge about supervision in law enforcement, particularly supervision in police departments that are data driven.

The purpose of this letter is to request your assistance in obtaining 15 participants to volunteer in this research based on the following participant criteria: they are assigned to a Bronx county patrol precinct, currently serve as a Patrol Supervisor and have been for the prior 6 months, and have a diverse background in education, ethnicity, age, and gender. The participants will be asked to do the following:

- 1) Sign an 'Informed Consent' form explaining the research, parameters of the research, participation is voluntary, and participant can withdraw at any time (attached).
- 2) Prepare a demographic questionnaire (attached).

In addition, participants will be asked to engage in a one-on-one interview for approximately 20 minutes, at a location of participants choosing. Otherwise, a neutral setting will be chosen for interviews.

During the interview, participants will be asked to respond to 16 open-ended questions that are pre-determined, and panel of experts approved for this research (attached).

It is requested that you provide a list and contact information for all participants selected. The identity of all participants will remain confidential. Their responses will be

identified through a single letter designation, and their demographic information will be co-mingled to show only the ranges of diversity of participants.

All data received from participants will be stored on a USB flash drive and secured by me at my home. At no time will any participants' information be divulged. Approval for this study has also been sought through the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Seton Hall University.

If you have any questions please contact me by phone at [REDACTED], or you can reach me by email at [jerry.garcia43@verizon.net](mailto:jerry.garcia43@verizon.net) or [jerry.garcia@student.shu.edu](mailto:jerry.garcia@student.shu.edu). Otherwise, you can contact my dissertation advisor Dr. Barbara Strobert by phone at [REDACTED], or by email at [barbara.strobert@shu.edu](mailto:barbara.strobert@shu.edu) for further information. For questions regarding participants rights as a research subject please contact the Institutional Review Board at Seton Hall University by phone at (973) 275-4654, or Dr. Michael LaFontaine by email at [Michael.lafontaine@shu.edu](mailto:Michael.lafontaine@shu.edu).

I would like to thank you in advance for your consideration regarding this research.

Sincerely,

Jerry L. Garcia

## Appendix B

# SERGEANTS BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION

POLICE DEPARTMENT, CITY OF NEW YORK

35 Worth Street, New York, NY 10013

212.226.2180 FAX 212.431.4280

[www.sbanyc.org](http://www.sbanyc.org)



Edward D. Mullins  
President

November 22, 2019

Vincent J. Vallelong  
Vice President

Mr. Jerry Garcia  
Via email: [jerry.garcia43@verizon.net](mailto:jerry.garcia43@verizon.net)

Paul A. Capotosto  
Treasurer

Dear Mr. Garcia:

John Dorst  
Recording Secretary

Anthony Borelli  
Financial Secretary

Vincent Guida  
Health & Welfare Secretary

Edmund Small  
City-Wide Secretary

I understand that you are conducting a research paper on supervision in law enforcement and would like to interview 15 sergeants in order to collect data based on their personal experiences. As the President of the NYC Sergeants Benevolent Association, which represents 13,000 active and retired frontline supervisors, it is imperative that these interviews be completely anonymous, voluntary in nature, and conducted on each participant's personal time.

At no time should any data or information  
proprietary owned by the NYPD be requested or released.

Should these non-negotiable considerations be agreed and adhered to, I wish you much success with your timely, topical, and interesting endeavor.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ed Mullins".

Ed Mullins  
President

## Appendix C



December 5, 2019

Jerry Garcia  
[REDACTED]

Re: Study ID# 2020-017

Dear Mr. Garcia,

At its December 4, 2019 meeting, the Research Ethics Committee of the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved your research proposal entitled “Understanding the Perceptions of Supervision and Supervisory Behavior of Patrol Precinct Patrol Supervisors in a Goal-Oriented Police Department” as submitted. This memo serves as official notice of the aforementioned study’s approval as exempt. Enclosed for your records are the stamped original Consent Form and recruitment flyer. You can make copies of these forms for your use.

The Institutional Review Board approval of your research is valid for a one-year period from the date of this letter. During this time, any changes to the research protocol, informed consent form or study team must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to their implementation.

You will receive a communication from the Institutional Review Board at least 1 month prior to your expiration date requesting that you submit an Annual Progress Report to keep the study active, or a Final Review of Human Subjects Research form to close the study. In all future correspondence with the Institutional Review Board, please reference the ID# listed above.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Mara Podvey'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mara C. Podvey, PhD, OTR  
Associate Professor  
Co-Chair, Institutional Review Board

### Office of the Institutional Review Board

Presidents Hall · 400 South Orange Avenue · South Orange, New Jersey 07079 · Tel: 973.275.4654 · Fax 973.275.2978 ·  
[www.shu.edu](http://www.shu.edu)

WHAT GREAT MINDS CAN DO

## Appendix D

Dear Candidate;

My name is Jerry Garcia. I am a former Captain from the N.Y.P.D. I am currently a Doctoral student at Seton Hall University whereby I am conducting research for my dissertation topic “Understanding the Perceptions of Supervision, and Supervisory Behavior, of Patrol Precinct Patrol Supervisors in a Goal-Oriented Police Department”. The focus of this dissertation is to understand whether placing accountability on supervisors, for the achievement of performance objectives by Police Officers, has any influence on a supervisors’ perceptions of supervision, or whether it has any influence on a supervisors behavior.

The purpose of this letter is to request your participation in this research. Your experiences as a patrol precinct Patrol Supervisor, together with your perceptions of supervision – from which you gleaned though experiences and training – makes you an ideal participant. This research will help add to the current body of knowledge on supervision in goal-oriented policing, and may be used to assist police departments in the future in understanding supervisor accountability and Police Officer performance.

You were requested for this research because of your relevance to the topic being researched, and because of the large population size of Patrol Supervisors from which a diverse sample of potential participants can be drawn. The data needed to conduct this research will be descriptive in nature, and will come from two separate data gathering instruments:

- 1) One-on-one interview. Your responses to 16 pre-determined questions will be recorded and transcribed. The transcriptions will be thematically coded, grouped, and analyzed for meaning.
- 2) Demographic data form. This data will be used to show the ranges of participants in selected categories. No data will be attributed to, or can be used to identify, any individual participant as all data will be co-mingled.

The time frame to complete both data gathering instruments is approximately 20 minutes. All data collected will be secured by the researcher, and at no time will anyone have access to this data. Furthermore, because confidentiality is important in research, the researcher will never disclose your information to anyone.

I have discussed this research with the Sergeants Benevolent Association, and have been given full support. I have included an Informed Consent form that explains the parameters of the research, as well as your rights as a participant. I would like to thank you in advance for your consideration in becoming a participant.

Sincerely,

Jerry L. Garcia



## Appendix E



### Researcher's Affiliation

The researcher is currently a Doctoral student at Seton Hall University, College of Education and Human Services, Department of Education Leadership, Management, and Policy, where the researcher is enrolled in a K-12 Doctoral degree program.

### Purpose And Duration Of The Research

The purpose of this research is to understand how supervisors from a goal-oriented police department perceive supervision, and whether this perception has any impact on the supervisors' behavior. This research will also explore whether a supervisors' accountability for police officer performance has any impact on perceptions of supervision and supervisory behavior. Each volunteer participant should expect to participate for approximately 20 minutes.

### Procedures To Be Used In The Research

In order to conduct this research, data is needed from participants that are not related to factors that are readily identified, but rather from experiences that are unique to each individual participant. The data that is obtained will be thematically coded, placed into themed categories using inductive analysis, and all themes analyzed for meaning. The dominant themes of each category will then be identified, and conclusions will be drawn to answer the research questions posed. To collect the data, all participants will be asked a set of pre-determined questions. This will be done using a one-on-one format, in a semi-structured interview, for approximately 20 minutes. All verbal and non-verbal responses to questions will be recorded utilizing a cassette tape recorder and a steno type notepad. Participants will be given the pre-determined questions ahead of the formal interview to allow them time to reflect on the matter queried, and to ask clarifying questions. Participants will also be asked to complete a demographic questionnaire so the researcher can demonstrate the diversity of participants' backgrounds. Once all research questions have been asked, participants will be given an opportunity to add any additional responses that relate to the study, which may not have been covered by the pre-determined questions.

### Instruments To Be Used In The Research

There are no questionnaires or survey instruments being given to the participants. Instead, the researcher will conduct an interview with each participant, and will read from a list of 16 pre-determined questions with answers recorded. A sample of such questions are:

- 1) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?
- 2) How would you describe your promotional training experience?
- 3) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?
- 4) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

Seton Hall University  
Institutional Review Board

DEC 04 2019

Approval Date

Department of Education Leadership, Management & Policy  
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey • 07079 • [www.shu.edu](http://www.shu.edu)

Expiration Date

DEC 04 2020

A HOME FOR THE MIND, THE HEART AND THE SPIRIT



### **Voluntary Participation**

The nature of this research is predicated on the voluntary participation by the participants. Because of such, each participant will have the ability to refuse to answer any question at any time, or may discontinue participation at any time. There will be no penalties for participants if they should choose to exercise their refusal, or opt out options. Participants will also be entitled to any benefits offered to them for their willingness to partake in this research.

### **Confidentiality Of The Participants**

To help protect the confidentiality of the participants, each participant will be allowed to choose the location for their interview. Each participant will also be designated a single unique letter that will correspond to the data that they provide. Only the letter will be referenced throughout the research. The identities of the participants will not be divulged to anyone.

### **Confidentiality Of Stored Data**

The participants' responses to the interview questions will be recorded by audio device. To ensure confidentiality of all data, the researcher will keep all data in a locked, secure safe located within the researchers home. Such data will include: audio recordings of interviews until their transcription, transcripts, USB memory stick containing all written data from research, and any other printed materials with data. All data will be kept, and secured in the aforementioned safe, for a period of 3 years from the time research is completed. After which time, all data will be destroyed.

### **Confidentiality Of Records**

The analyzing of the data will be conducted by the researcher in private. Only the researcher, and if requested members of the dissertation committee, will have access to the participants' data. However, only the researcher will know the identities of the participants.

### **Risk Or Discomfort**

There are no anticipated risks or discomforts to participants expected during this research. If any risk develops, or a participant becomes uncomfortable at any time, the participant may refuse to answer the questions, opt out of the research, or make any requests to mitigate any such risk or discomfort. Furthermore, the researcher will remind all participants, prior to beginning the interviews, that any identifying or sensitive information should not be divulged. However, if any participant does divulge identifying or sensitive information, the researcher will utilize one of two strategies to protect the confidentiality of the participant. If the information is not pertinent to the research, the researcher will redact such information from the transcripts. If the information is pertinent to the research, to protect the integrity of the data, the researcher will utilize pseudonyms in lieu of the identifying or sensitive information on the transcripts.

Seton Hall University  
Institutional Review Board

DEC 04 2019

Approval Date

Department of Education Leadership, Management & Policy  
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey • 07079 • [www.shu.edu](http://www.shu.edu)

Expiration Date

DEC 04 2020



### **Benefits Of Study**

The participants may not receive any direct benefits from this research. However, there are potential benefits for the participants for participating in the research. The data collected may be used to assist law enforcement organizations in the future by:

- 1) Helping to better understand how operational changes affect a supervisors' perceptions of supervision.
- 2) Understanding how a supervisors' motivation to supervise can be affected by personal accountability in pursuit of organizational goals.
- 3) Helping to better understand the importance of evaluating current practices of supervision, and supervisory behavior, leading to the development of effective supervisory training programs that assist in achieving organizational goals.
- 4) Understanding the need to establish organization-wide policies on best practices for supervision in a changing organization, along with what constitutes acceptable supervisory behavior during organizational change.

### **Remuneration**

The participants will not be paid for their participation in this research, nor will they receive any other kind of remuneration benefits for their participation.

### **Compensation**

Because the research does not pose any risk of physical or psychological harm to participants, no compensation will be awarded to the participants.

### **Alternative Procedures**

Because the research is not intended to harm participants, no alternative procedures for this research is necessary.

### **Contact Information**

If you have any questions regarding the research, please contact the researcher by phone at (917) 925-9955, or by email at [jerry.garcia@student.shu.edu](mailto:jerry.garcia@student.shu.edu). Otherwise, you may contact the researchers faculty advisor, Dr. Barbara Strobert, by phone at (201) 865-3555, or by email at [barbara.strobert@shu.edu](mailto:barbara.strobert@shu.edu) for further information. For questions regarding participants rights as a research subject please contact the Institutional Review Board at Seton Hall University by phone at (973) 275-4654, or Dr. Michael LaFountaine by email at [Michael.lafountaine@shu.edu](mailto:Michael.lafountaine@shu.edu)

### **Audio Recordings**

All interviews will be audio recorded on an Optimus cassette recorder, model CTR - 115. All

Seton Hall University  
Institutional Review Board

**DEC 04 2019**

**Approval Date**

Department of Education Leadership, Management & Policy  
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey • 07079 • [www.shu.edu](http://www.shu.edu)

**Expiration Date**

**DEC 04 2020**



of the participants will be referred to by a unique individual letter during the recorded interviews. The taped recordings will be locked in a secure safe in the researchers home, accessible only to the researcher, whom will personally transcribe the recordings. The recordings will then be kept for three years after completion of the study, at which time they will be destroyed.

By signing below I agree to give my written permission to have my responses audio recorded.

**The researcher will maintain possession of the original Informed Consent form and will provide a copy of the signed and dated Informed Consent form to the participant.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Participant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Seton Hall University  
Institutional Review Board

DEC 04 2019

Approval Date

Expiration Date

DEC 04 2020

## Appendix F

### Demographic Data Form

The following information is being collected to establish the ranges of demographic backgrounds of participants. This information will then be used in the interpretation of the final data.

1. Age \_\_\_\_\_
2. Gender Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_
3. Race White \_\_\_\_\_ Black \_\_\_\_\_ Hispanic \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_
4. Educational background Associates Degree (64 credits or more) \_\_\_\_\_  
Bachelors Degree (128 credits or more) \_\_\_\_\_  
Masters Degree (164 credits or more) \_\_\_\_\_  
Doctorate Degree \_\_\_\_\_  
Other Degree \_\_\_\_\_
5. Time in service Years \_\_\_\_\_ Months \_\_\_\_\_
6. Time in rank Years \_\_\_\_\_ Months \_\_\_\_\_
7. Time in current assignment Years \_\_\_\_\_ Months \_\_\_\_\_
8. Have you ever held the position of supervisor prior to the NYPD?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, was it: Public Sector \_\_\_\_\_ Private Sector \_\_\_\_\_ Both \_\_\_\_\_
9. Have you ever had law enforcement experience prior to the NYPD?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
10. Have you ever received any of the following training outside of the NYPD?  
Leadership: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Management: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Supervisor: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

## **Appendix G**

R = Researcher

P = Participant

### **Participant A**

#### **Question # 1**

R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?

P) I imagined it to be vastly about patrol guide procedures and a little bit of role playing or scenarios about day to day duties and responsibilities.

#### **Question # 2**

R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?

P) The training was good overall. I believe that it gave me an idea of how and what it takes to be a supervisor. I just felt that it needed more real life, hands-on training.

#### **Question # 3**

R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?

P) My promotional training in relation to our department guidelines was quite on point.

#### **Question # 4**

R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

P) The more relevant training in regards to being a Patrol Supervisor were the role playing and scenarios. Most importantly were the scenarios about handling EDP jobs, when to call HNT, and notifications to the duty captain.

R) When you say EDP and HNT, what are you referring to?

P) Oh, emotionally disturbed people and hostage negotiations teams. We tend to abbreviate a lot in the department.

Question # 5

R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

P) I would say I was definitely not one hundred percent quite ready. A little bit more hands-on real life training would have made me feel way more confident.

Question # 6

R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

P) In regards to my duties and responsibilities I feel pretty confident about knowing what they are.

Question # 7

R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I feel like the department guidelines are just not in touch with reality in some occasions in relation to what is expected from a Patrol Supervisor.

Question # 8

R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

P) I always try my best to give total commitment to departmental guidelines as much as possible.

Question # 9

R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

P) It varies, from securing a crime scene, personnel allocation, appointing or selecting the

best fit guys for a specific task, personnel safety and tactics in dangerous or confrontational situations.

Question # 10

R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

P) I feel like they look at me as though I'm confident and efficient.

Question # 11

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?

P) It depends in the individuals level of competence. Guy with a low level of competence would get more supervision and guidance from myself.

Question # 12

R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) I'd say they look at me as a hands-on supervisor. However, not to the point of being a micro-manager.

Question # 13

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) I make sure the job gets done by following up with my guys. However, I don't believe in micro-managing. I want my guys to be Police Officers and be able to make decisions within their parameters.



Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) Like I said before, I feel like they look at me as being competent and efficient.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I would say I'm fair. I give everyone the same opportunity to show their work quality.

Question # 16

R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) That I'm a good decision-maker. Trustworthy to handle complex tasks. And that I have good sound judgment with allocating personnel tactically and efficiently.

Approximate total interview time = 19 minutes.

**Participant B**

Question # 1

R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?

P) I expected to be taught how to perform the daily tasks expected of a first line supervisor.

Question # 2

R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?

P) The promotional training I received was long and drawn out with very little training on the day to day tasks of a first line supervisor.

Question # 3

- R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?
- P) The promotional training did not relate to the department guidelines. The department should have spent the majority of training on the day to day duties, and the other rest of the time on leading people.

Question # 4

- R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?
- P) There were several aspects of promotional training that I felt were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor, they were the four hours of desk officer training, and the four hours of leadership training.

Question # 5

- R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?
- P) In my opinion, I was very little prepared for the position of supervisor at the completion of my training.

Question # 6

- R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?
- P) The training did not aid in my familiarity of department guidelines. The familiarity was a result of studying for the promotional exam and on the job training. That's where you truly learn.

Question # 7

- R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to

what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

- P) The information in the department guidelines related very well to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor.

Question # 8

- R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

- P) As a supervisor, I adhere to the department guidelines very well.

Question # 9

- R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

- P) As a Patrol Supervisor, I am called upon to make many decisions. The Patrol Lieutenant is often equally as busy as I am doing Lieutenant stuff, or she is off for the day, and as a result, most command decisions rely on me to make.

Question # 10

- R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

- P) For the most part, the feedback I received from other supervisors in relation to my decision making was good and positive. I was often stressed that it was best to make a wrong decision than no decision at all.

Question # 11

- R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?

- P) I would describe my manner of supervision with each Police Officer as fair and supported in my patrol squad.

Question # 12

R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) The feedback I received from the Police Officers under my supervision was that I was fair and cared about their needs.

Question # 13

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) My manner of supervision in relation to the other Patrol Supervisors is very similar. As a young supervisor, most of the other Patrol Supervisors were my elders or trainers who I would follow their lead. What I learned I learned from them.

Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) The other Patrol Supervisors were often engaged in giving advice to me due to my lack of time as a supervisor. But, often I was given positive feedback in regards to my supervisors behavior.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) In my opinion, my actions as a Patrol Supervisor are attentive and supportive of the needs to the department and the Police Officers under my supervision.

Question # 16

R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your

actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

- P) The feedback I have received from my supervisors in relation to evaluating my actions as a patrol supervisor are normally in the form of departmental evaluations which as I remember were all positive.

Approximate total interview time = 20 minutes.

### **Participant C**

#### **Question # 1**

- R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?
- P) It has been a long time since I was in B.M.O.C. I am sure things have changed. What I do remember is that it was about making sure we knew our responsibilities as a supervisor.

#### **Question # 2**

- R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?
- P) It was ok. It could have been more in-depth though.

#### **Question # 3**

- R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?
- P) At the time it wasn't adequate. And because the department guidelines change over the years, supervisors should be retrained to keep up with the changes. But, we are not, and left to learn the changes on our own.

#### **Question # 4**

- R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

P) The areas covering E.D.P.'s and prisoners.

R) When you say E.D.P.'s what are you referring to?

P) That's what we call emotionally disturbed people.

Question # 5

R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

P) They taught us our job responsibilities but didn't tell us how to transition into a boss.

Question # 6

R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

P) I'm on top of it because I like to read.

Question # 7

R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

P) While it does cover a lot of areas it does leave a grey area on use of force. I think it's intentionally done.

Question # 8

R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

P) I'm pretty rule oriented, so I think I follow the rules closely.

Question # 9

R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

P) I generally make decisions based on experience and what has happened to other Sergeants with their decisions.

Question # 10

R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

P) They ask me for guidance often, so I guess they respect my decisions.

Question # 11

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?

P) It's definitely not democratic, I call the shots. But I do take each Officers opinion into consideration.

Question # 12

R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) They call me pops, so I think I'm like a father figure to them. I'm guessing they respect me.

Question # 13

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) I like to make calm sound decisions. I do not let my emotions get involved in my decisions. Other supervisors, especially the newer ones, tend to make more panicked or rushed decisions.

Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) They complement me and say that everyone respects me.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I feel that I have sound judgment on the street.

Question # 16

R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I always get well above standards on all my evaluations.

Approximate total interview time = 18 minutes.

### **Participant D**

Question # 1

R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?

P) I walked into Sergeants class with no idea of what to expect.

Question # 2

R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?

P) It was good. But, it was a bit overwhelming with everything they throw at you.

R) Can you elaborate on what everything is?

P) Lectures, role playing, then out into the field for ride alongs, and then you're back in class again. It's almost like, here learn all this stuff quickly.

Question # 3

R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?



P) They only covered what they decided was important.

Question # 4

R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Probably desk duties and E.D.P.'s.

R) When you say E.D.P., what do you mean?

P) It's a term we use to describe anybody acting erratically.

Question # 5

R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

P) I thought I was prepared, but the transition was tough. I didn't like telling people what they didn't want to hear and what to do. I had to get past that.

Question # 6

R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

P) I survive.

R) What does that mean you survive?

P) Well I had to study the guide to pass the test, so I have an idea of what's in it.

Question # 7

R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

P) The guides are written with a lawyers point of view and are guided to protect the job, not the supervisor.

Question # 8

R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

P) I follow them close enough to get the job done.

Question # 9

R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

P) I make judgements that won't get anyone in trouble.

Question # 10

R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

P) They don't really give me any.

Question # 11

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?

P) I am pretty easy because they may have to help me in the street one day.

Question # 12

R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) They view me as a friend.

Question # 13

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) I am easy compared to other Sergeants.

Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) The feedback I get is that I am too close to my cops.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I get it done and everyone goes home safe.

Question # 16

R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I am told that I have to be more of a boss and less of a friend.

Approximate total interview time = 18 minutes.

### **Participant E**

Question # 1

R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?

P) I figured B.M.O.C. was all about the job protecting itself by saying they were training us to be better bosses. It wasn't very serious.

Question # 2

R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?

P) It could have been more engaging. But, the content was dry.

Question # 3

R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?

P) As far as I'm concerned the training was brief. Especially since the rules are so comprehensive.

Question # 4

R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I would say training on E.D.P.'s and use of force.

R) When you say E.D.P., what are you referring to?

P) People with mental problems we end up taking to a hospital.

Question # 5

R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

P) Not too good. I should have a six month training period in a precinct then move on.

Question # 6

R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

P) Pretty good. I studied a lot for the test.

Question # 7

R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

P) It's somewhat accurate. I know they try but it's very hard to cover everything.

Question # 8

R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

P) I try to follow them, but I am too busy, so I cut corners.

Question # 9

R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

P) Notify the ranks above me for everything to protect myself.

Question # 10

R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

P) They tell me to make sure I'm covered since Sergeant [redacted] got into trouble for doing his job.

Question # 11

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?

P) We get the job done, but this isn't the army. It's not necessary to be always in their face.

Question # 12

R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) Positive, but they wish we had more freedom.

Question # 13

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) I'd say I'm probably a little stricter in certain areas, not so much in others.

Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) I've been told to relax a bit, that I'm a little energetic.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I think I'm doing a good job with what time I have in rank. I haven't gotten in trouble yet, must be doing ok.

Question # 16

R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Same as before, I need to calm down and relax.

Approximate total interview time = 18 minutes.

**Participant F**

Question # 1

R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?

P) I figured B.M.O.C. would be boring and tiring.

Question # 2

R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?

P) Much like I figured, long and drawn out.

Question # 3

R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?

P) The training wasn't good enough for everything we do. There's a reason we get six months to study for the test.

Question # 4

R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Mostly desk officer training.

Question # 5

R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

P) I needed some more practical training to feel comfortable.

Question # 6

R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

P) Good.

Question # 7

R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I think the patrol guide covers a lot, but we don't always follow it. If we did we'd never get anything done.

Question # 8

R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

P) I follow them by the seat of my pants. I just hope nothing comes back to me.

Question # 9

R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

P) Without question I always doubt whether I made the right decision or not. Job just makes you that way.

Question # 10

R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

P) It's positive.

Question # 11

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?

P) I try to lead by example.

Question # 12

R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) I'd think they like it. I haven't had any complaints that I know of.

Question # 13

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) I feel I'm much more relaxed than they are.

Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) None. We don't question each other about how we work with our squads. Wouldn't sit well. I'll handle my squad my way and you yours.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?



P) Could be better. I do just enough to get by without drawing attention to myself.

Question # 16

R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Other than my annual evaluations, none really. When I was a rookie Sergeant I may have been given some instruction. But, since then nothing. It's only when the C.O. has a problem do you hear it.

Approximate total interview time = 17 minutes.

**Participant G**

Question # 1

R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?

P) Prior to being promoted I was excited, but did not feel B.M.O.C. was going to teach me anything that was useful. As a cop for ten years all the training with very few exceptions was the department covering itself.

Question # 2

R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?

P) There were a few speakers and instructors who did give me or help me in the transition into boss. How to write a 49, mock rollcalls, scenarios regarding what do I do sergeant, etc. But, it was like a long tailored borough based training type of experience.

R) When you say a 49, what do you mean.

P) A 49 is a type of report we Sergeants prepare for incidents.

Question # 3

R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?

P) Promotional training, like all department training, is always consistent with department guidelines, that's kind of the point. I never had department training that went against department guidelines.

Question # 4

R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Well, certainly how to write a 49. But, most people just take one that matches the event and utilizes the same format, like turning the command log to a previous tour to copy. Also, mock rollcalls were a help. Most of us all stood rollcalls. Training did not teach you how to do it but it gave you a little feel for it, which is really how you learn your job.

Question # 5

R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

P) I felt prepared, but it certainly did not give me the wear with all to do the job well your first run out. Like I said, experience teaches you how to be a boss.

Question # 6

R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

P) I was familiar with department guidelines from studying the patrol guide and day to day routines of police work. As well as paying attention to what my Sergeants and Lieutenants told me. I do not think knowing department guidelines is something

B.M.O.C. is supposed to teach you. You should know that stuff beforehand, and if you don't shame on you.

Question # 7

R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

P) There is always a balancing act the Patrol Supervisor has to do with respect to protecting his men, getting the job done, satisfying the Lieutenant, C.O. etc, and adhering to department guidelines. It is an art police work as well as a science.

Question # 8

R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

P) Department guidelines are there to help guide the supervisor in the execution of his duties. We all know that good judgement is learned. Taking the guidelines and making them work for all, or most all involved, adherence to guidelines can never get you jammed up.

Question # 9

R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

P) I, like all Patrol Supervisors, did not always make or handle everything that comes on my plate exactly in the best way possible. But, I can say that 90% of all my decisions were correct. That is not to say everybody was happy about it. But, being a good supervisor is not a popularity contest. As long as you're fair and reasonable and utilize good common sense you will always be ok.

Question # 10

R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-

making?

- P) The Sergeants kick it around in the locker room, lounge, after work, etc. and listen to any advice that would help next time, especially if it was from a veteran Sergeant or Lieutenant. I always function under the premise that asking opinions of other senior Sergeants or Lieutenants is the best way to learn and reassess so as to be better, or sometimes confirm what you did was right, and if not find out why.

Question # 11

- R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?
- P) My manner of supervision with each of the officers in my squad is always the same. Try to be fair with everyone. Get to know each officer as a person and their personalities. To find the best way to supervise and motivate them fair across the board. But, if someone needs to be disciplined or corrected be sure it is done quick. .

Question # 12

- R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?
- P) As a Sergeant, I worked all 3 platoons. In these years as a Sergeant I can say I only had one cop have a problem with me. Everyone else to my knowledge like and respected me. I know this mainly from feedback which I sought out overtly as well as covertly.

Question # 13

- R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) Like being a cop, there are cops you like and try to emulate, and those you think are not good and try not to emulate. The same can be said for supervisors. But, by in large, most I found to be good, not all the same, just different. Just as we are all different based on our own experiences.

Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) I have always gotten good feedback regarding handling my personnel, as well as my duties.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I can't remember any substantial mishaps that I've done. I was never involved in any royal screw ups that got me or my personnel in a fix that was not reasonably explainable.

Question # 16

R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Feedback as a Patrol Supervisor is always constant. One always goes over the events of the day or week with another. That is the best way to learn. My supervisors will chime in when something doesn't go right, that's when you'll be critiqued.

Approximate total interview time = 23 minutes.

## **Participant H**

### **Question # 1**

R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?

P) I knew B.M.O.C. was four weeks long. So, I expected them to cover a lot of information. I kind of anticipated being overwhelmed. But, as a young cop, I was still excited that I was going to be promoted.

### **Question # 2**

R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?

P) The first thing that stood out was when you were treated differently. As I cop I went to many department trainings. This one was different. You could feel that you were now elevated, it was more personal a feel. It was no longer Officer so and so. It was now so [redacted – first name given] what do you think?

### **Question # 3**

R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?

P) There are so many guidelines in the patrol guide they couldn't possibly touch them all. They mainly focused on the bigger issues like desk officer duties, use of force. Integrity was a big concern. Stuff like that.

### **Question # 4**

R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Basically what I just mentioned, desk officer duties, integrity, also paperwork that gets filled out by Patrol Supervisors.

Question # 5

R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

P) At the end of B.M.O.C. my expectation was that I would be semi prepared. What I did during B.M.O.C. was to study the patrol guide again to make sure I knew it good.

Once I got out of B.M.O.C. I realized I was prepared for stuff that I could take my time doing, but wasn't prepared for anything that required immediate action. I can honestly say that the first few months out on patrol and listening to that radio was nerve wracking. I dreaded getting that call.

Question # 6

R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

P) Very good. I studied them numerous times.

Question # 7

R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Wow. I would have to say that the patrol guide covers a lot of stuff. It literally will dictate to you every action you must take. In fact, if you did every single thing the patrol guide told you to do you'd never get anything done. You'd be too busy trying to finish up the procedure you're working on.

Question # 8

R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

P) You have no choice. If you don't follow department guidelines expect to get jammed up. That's the first thing this department looks for when something happens. Did you

follow patrol guide procedures? No? Oh well. Good luck.

Question # 9

R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

P) At first I was a little nervous I'd say. But, as I continued to have to make decisions, handle jobs, and gain experience my decisions seemed to flow a lot quicker. It's gotten to the point where I'd say I'm borderline confident cocky.

Question # 10

R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

P) First thing I did was look for other rookie Sergeants. I figured we're in the same boat why not help each other. I then tended to gravitate to other Sergeants who were newer. Just to get a feel of what they thought. The veteran Sergeants were funny. Depends on who they were. Some were approachable, some were not. Overall, unless you did something stupid you never really heard anything.

Question # 11

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?

P) Depends on the officer. I have officers who are go getters. I have officers who barely do what you want. And, I have officers who are useless. It really depends on who I'm dealing with. The one thing I learned from being a cop and seeing what went on, I refuse, and I can't say that strongly enough, is to give a lazy cops work to a hard worker just to get the work done. I will ride that lazy cops ass until that work is done.



Question # 12

R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) Like I said in your last question, I will not give a lazy cop a free ride. I think that, more than anything else, earns the respect of most of your squad. They see exactly who you are and what you will tolerate. I don't need anyone to tell me how I'm doing. I'll tell you how I'm doing.

Question # 13

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) Good question. I've seen so many supervisors. Some are great, but some drive you bonkers. They truly run the gamut. I don't want to tie you up with stories. But, I'll tell you, there are some who should not be Sergeants. In comparison to them I'm top notch.

Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) Not sure if I answered this question. But, now that I'm comfortable with where I'm at I don't think I get any negative feedback.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Hate to say it, but I'm pretty good with decision making. I know the patrol guide. I know what the job wants. There's very few jobs now that I don't think I can handle.

So, I think my actions are fine.

Question # 16

R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Unless I messed up, I usually wait for my evals. Although, the C.O. and the X.O. have been known to come to me to ask me to get my cops to get extra numbers. When I do it's an atta boy.

Approximate total interview time = 23 minutes.

**Participant I**

Question # 1

R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?

P) I expected it to cover everything that a Sergeant needs to know or is required to do or probably should do.

Question # 2

R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?

P) Overall, in my opinion, I think it's good in the way that it is set up. It definitely gave you a lot of information. But, I think it needs to be longer.

Question # 3

R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?

P) Unlike the promotional classes I took, which followed the patrol guide to a tee, promotional training left a lot of patrol guide areas uncovered. If it was longer you

might have covered more material.

Question # 4

R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Well, it's all relevant to a Patrol Supervisor. That's who you're going to be when you come out. You're not going right into a detail. You go right to patrol when you get to a precinct. So, training is pretty much all about that. Preparing you for patrol in a precinct.

Question # 5

R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

P) Anyone who says they were prepared is crazy. Me, I'm still learning. You're never going to be 100 percent prepared.

Question # 6

R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

P) I would say I know the important procedures. You get the same jobs over and over so you learn them quickly. When I get a job I haven't gotten in a while, or it involves an M.O.S. I'll look up how to handle it.

R) What do you mean when you say M.O.S.

P) Member of the service.

Question # 7

R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

P) It's supposed to tell me what to do so I don't make a mistake.

Question # 8

R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

P) I follow them as best I can. There's going to be times when you can't do exactly what it says, or it will take too long to follow. Sometimes you just have to cut corners to get a job done also. It's busy where I work and you have to keep moving so you don't have the luxury to work on one job for too long.

Question # 9

R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

P) That everything is subjective. How you handle the job, how you handle your cops, what has to get done. Just everything is subjective in your decisions.

Question # 10

R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

P) Most of the time you're the only Patrol Supervisor working that tour. So, no one is going to question what you do or did. You don't hear from anyone unless something happened. And a lot of these bosses aren't going to get involved unnecessarily. They have their own cops to worry about.

Question # 11

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?

P) Depends on the officer. I've got great ones and not so great ones. How they're treated is up to them. Some you have to handle with kid gloves and some just do their job. They know what needs to be done and they do it.

Question # 12

R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) Again, that depends on each officer. The ones that do their job without me having to look over their shoulder love me. Then I have those who hide from me because they know I'm going to be on them. It's usually the laziest cops who aren't happy with any kind of supervision.

Question # 13

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) I get the feeling I'm in the middle. We have some really tight Sergeants who are by the book. And, we have some really loose ones who let the cops walk all over them. I'm right in the middle. Who you are is how you get supervised.

Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) The only real time you are going to get feedback from other Patrol Supervisors is when you directly affect other Patrol Supervisors, not the cops. For example, if I come in to start a tour and the current tour Sergeant gave off too many cops leaving me short handed. Then feedback will most certainly be given. I hate to say it, but feedback is usually given for negative things, rarely for positive things.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I do what the job wants me to do. I follow the book. Get the jobs done, and everyone goes home.

Question # 16

R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) As a rookie Sergeant I probably got more feedback than I do now. Now, unless I mess up or my cops really produce for the month, I won't hear anything.

Approximate total interview time = 21 minutes.

**Participant J**

Question # 1

R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?

P) My expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor was that the training would encompass specific job responsibilities.

Question # 2

R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?

P) My promotional training experience was positive in the sense that a few guest speakers came into my training and shared some real life examples of their supervisory experiences.

Question # 3

R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?

P) My promotional training in regards to the guidelines was skewed due to the fact that

actual department guidelines often contradict what is traditionally done in the field.

It's much like they said when you graduated the academy, now you're going to learn.

Question # 4

R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

P) The aspect of promotional training that was relevant to being a Patrol Supervisor was that regardless of the circumstances, a good manager should not be afraid to make an intelligent decision.

Question # 5

R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

P) My preparedness for the position of supervisor as it relates to promotional training was not adequate enough in my humble opinion mainly because of the disconnect between written guidelines and real world situations.

Question # 6

R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

P) My familiarity with department guidelines is relatively extensive because this was a requirement for passing promotional exams. I had to study the department guidelines for about 6 months.

Question # 7

R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

P) The information in department guidelines in regards to expectations as a Patrol Supervisor often creates confusion because guidelines are just that, not strict rules and

regulations. Yet, you are not allowed to stray from them. So, you would think you have autonomy in decision making. But, you pretty much have to adhere to the guidelines.

Question # 8

R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

P) My adherence to department guidelines is based on the individual situation, as well as the chain of command of supervisors above my rank. Meaning, a higher level of supervisor often times states how a specific situation is to be handled.

Question # 9

R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

P) My experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision making go hand in hand. On a daily basis, my responsibility as a front line manager is to decipher information usually in a pressure filled environment and I'm expected to make sound judgements.

Question # 10

R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

P) My feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision making is very useful because many times I would be faced with an incident that another supervisor had past experience handling or dealing with. And they would say, hey maybe next time consider x, y, and z.

Question # 11

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?



P) The manner of police supervision that I apply to personnel under my supervision is to manage them in a manner of how I would like to be treated. Meaning that I would never ask a subordinate to do anything that I'm not prepared to do myself. Also, I pride myself on using all resources available to make the best informed decisions. So, regardless of a subordinates police experience, I may use their personal or professional experience to aid in my decision making process. .

Question # 12

R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) The feedback that I receive from personnel under my supervision varies, from being appreciative of my approachable nature to displeasure of my blunt direct style.

Question # 13

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) My manner of supervision in relation to other supervisors varies as well. Some supervisors have a similar style of supervision in regards to their down to earth demeanor. Yet, other supervisors take an approach of I'm the boss. That's not me.

Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) The feedback that I receive from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to my manner of supervision is mostly positive in regards to my approachable demeanor. But, some supervisors who are more rigid would describe it as being too lax or too personable

with subordinates.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I would evaluate my actions as Patrol Supervisor based upon the information as well as resources I would have at my disposal and compare that to the decisions made by other supervisors under similar circumstances. Once completed, I would reevaluate and adjust the process moving forward.

Question # 16

R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) The feedback I receive from supervisors in relation to my actions as Patrol Supervisor is predominantly positive because I use common sense as well as sound judgement when dealing with sensitive matters.

Approximate total interview time = 22 minutes.

**Participant K**

Question # 1

R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?

P) Based on what I saw from other newly promoted Sergeants, I thought it would prepare you for the job.

Question # 2

R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?

P) At first I was a little nervous. It was organized like any other training I've been to, get

there on time, follow this rule or that rule. But, as it went on, the atmosphere became looser. It was more, how can I explain it, personal I guess.

Question # 3

R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?

P) For the most part, it was centered around the patrol guide. Some training directly reflected it, and some training indirectly reflected it. Some training however, had nothing to do with the patrol guide. It was more administrative stuff.

Question # 4

R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Basically all of it in some way or another. That's what B.M.O.C. is about.

Question # 5

R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

P) I don't think I looked at it as being prepared. I looked at it like, ok, now that I'm out let me start learning as quick as possible. Honestly, so far, I don't recall any training that kicked in while I was in the street.

Question # 6

R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

P) At this point, except for like the newest changes, I think I now know most of the procedures that I need to know.

Question # 7

R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to

what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

P) It's pretty clear. Every procedure tells the Sergeant what to do. And, if you don't do it and something happens they say, you didn't follow the patrol guide so you're in trouble.

Question # 8

R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

P) I try my best to follow them as best as possible. I've seen so many other bosses, in all ranks, get in trouble for not following them, even in the slightest. If I don't follow a particular procedure there's got to be a reason and I'll explain that reason when I have to. Other than that, it's not worth taking the chance.

Question # 9

R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

P) Never really dwelled on them. You make a decision and you move on to the next one. I don't have time to sit around and wait and wonder if it was right. This isn't the rank for that. The only real time I rethink what I did has to involve cops somehow. You really don't want to screw that up.

Question # 10

R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

P) We'll talk about stuff just to make conversation. But, it's more like I got this job and this and that happened can you believe that. It's not really a what would you do conversation. I think I'm passed that. Although, there are times when I would ask what someone would have done. But, mostly it's just passing time.

Question # 11

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?

P) My manner of supervision? I'd have to say everyone starts out the same. Here's your assignment go do your job. Everyone knows what's expected of them. I'm not going to ride you unless you bring it on yourself. I'm a patient person, but eventually those who need more supervision will get it. I have some sectors who are just phenomenal. And, I have other sectors I wish I could fire. Thankfully, there's only a few of them.

Question # 12

R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) Officially, none. We don't have a system for Police Officers to provide feedback. Though that's an interesting idea. Might help some Sergeants out. As far as what I can see they all like me. We go out all the time. I get along with everyone.

Question # 13

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) Let's just say, there's some unwritten rules that we kind of work by. There's always two squads in on any given day. So, even when the other Sergeant is out. You don't kind of mess with that Sergeants' people and vice versa. So, I'll take care of my people, and I'll leave the handling of other cops to the other Sergeant. If there's a problem with another Sergeants' cop I'll let that Sergeant know and hope that that Sergeant handles that cop.

Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) We get along great. I think everyone is on the same page. Like I said before, I'll handle my people, you handle yours. Tell me when you have a problem with my people, and I'll tell you when I have a problem with yours.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I do my job. I do what is expected of me. There are days when things are a mess. And, there are days when things are great. Overall, I'd say my actions are fine.

Question # 16

R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I think I'm on the right track. I'm looking to go into a detail, and I've been told I'm in line for it. So, I think my supervisors appreciate my work ethics.

Approximate total interview time = 35 minutes.

**Participant L**

Question # 1

R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?

P) I don't know what I was expecting. As a cop I saw all types of new Sergeants coming and going and they're all different. They all had their own way of doing things. They all acted differently, looked at cops differently. So, I really didn't know how I'd be

trained. I just knew I'd take advantage of whatever they gave me.

Question # 2

R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?

P) Definitely long. There were some things they could have removed. Boring stuff like lectures, or stuff that's common sense. Those days just dragged. But, it wasn't all bad. I think the best was the hands on training. You learned the most doing what you're supposed to be doing under the eye of a mentor.

Question # 3

R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?

P) The lectures had almost nothing to do with the guidelines themselves. I'd say the training that involved paperwork that supervisors are required to do was the closest to the guidelines.

Question # 4

R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

P) The paperwork. It's probably the biggest concern we have.

Question # 5

R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

P) You know, no matter what you learned, you just weren't prepared. The first thing that hit me when I got to my command, and was given a squad, was that very first cop who came up to me to sign a 28. I remember being like frozen. I was thinking to myself who are you, why you coming up to me, I don't even know if I'm allowed to give you

off. All of a sudden I realized I'm in the spotlight now and I wasn't prepared for it.

R) What do you mean by sign a 28.

P) That's a leave of absence report that bosses sign to give someone off for the day or a vacation. The cop fills it out and we sign it.

Question # 6

R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

P) Now, as opposed to promotion, I've definitely learned a lot more over the years.

Question # 7

R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Detailed. Every procedure tells the Patrol Supervisor what exactly they have to do. Who to call, what paperwork to fill out. It pretty much tells you how to handle the whole job from start to finish.

Question # 8

R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

P) On a scale of 1 to 10, 10 the highest, I'm around an 8.

Question # 9

R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

P) I don't know if I'd refer to them as experiences. Every day I have to make like 10, 15 decisions. It's every day. I'd say most are the same ones. Who gets what car, what assignment, who goes where. Actually it's probably more than 15. Then there's decisions you have to make out on the street. Like I said, there's a lot of decisions made every day.



Question # 10

R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

P) Depends on who the other supervisors are. You get more feedback from the ones on your tour instead of the other tours. On the other tours it's like hi and goodbye. You barely see them. There are times when I can go days or weeks without seeing other supervisors. So, feedback is really hit or miss.

Question # 11

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?

P) I don't look at it like treating each one individually. To me, I'm the boss so it's like here I'm telling you what to do, go do it, get it done. I shouldn't have to cater to each one individually. I refuse to.

Question # 12

R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) If I had to guess what they think about me, they probably think I'm strict.

Question # 13

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) I can only speak for the ones on my tour. Overall we're on the same page.

Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your

manner of supervision?

P) Not to be repetitive, but there's only three of us on my tour. And we're pretty much on the same page. We really aren't second guessing each other.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I'm going to say I make good decisions. They may not always be perfect but they're still good.

Question # 16

R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) The lieutenant seems happy with my work. [redacted] let's me do my job and doesn't really change anything. To me, that's a positive feedback.

Approximate total interview time = 21 minutes.

## **Participant M**

Question # 1

R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?

P) I believed that the training would be a higher level of instruction and in an executive environment.

Question # 2

R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?

P) The training experience was as expected. The majority of the training sessions are class lectures with little hands on instruction due to the large number of trainees.

Question # 3

R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?

P) The training received did follow specific guidelines relating to certain subjects only, mainly mandatory forms that keep statistical data, and use of force legality.

Question # 4

R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

P) The training sessions that involved hands on instruction for the trainees, which emulated actual scenarios that forced the trainee to make decisions independently and be responsible for the outcome.

Question # 5

R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

P) Once training was completed and I was assigned to a precinct as a Patrol Supervisor, I did not feel as confident making decisions as I should. While I was assigned to Desk Officer duties, I felt more capable with completing my responsibilities. When I was assigned to patrol supervision, the situations required decisions to be made on the spot which required more experience and I did not have the time or the resources available on the field as I did while sitting on the desk.

Question # 6

R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

P) I'm very familiar with department guidelines, especially from the time spent studying for the promotional exam.

Question # 7

R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

P) The department guidelines were written and created in response to past situations and incidents that may have ended in undesirable consequences. But, as a Patrol Supervisor, it is difficult to strictly follow the guidelines due to the changing dynamics of each individual incident.

Question # 8

R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

P) For the most part, I adhere to the department guidelines, especially the rules and regulations that require notifications to superior leadership. There are many administrative functions that require complete adherence to be properly completed.

Question # 9

R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

P) Initially, my decision making was lacking confidence and I would look for some guidance from more experienced supervisors. But, as time went by, I became more experienced and confident in my decision making ability.

Question # 10

R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

P) The only feedback I receive from other supervisors is when something goes wrong, or someone makes a mistake. Besides that, not much feedback is received.

Question # 11

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?

P) Initially, I would analyze each individual to determine their character, personality, and abilities. From those observations I treat them accordingly, but I always treat them in a fair and equal manner.

Question # 12

R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) From what I see, officers in my squad are positive and content with my supervision until I make a decision or request that they are not happy with.

Question # 13

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) I always try to have a personal connection with my officers and have an understanding of their personalities. Some may think that that type of supervision is too lenient and personal.

Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) None that I recall.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Once I got more tenure as a supervisor and personal growth, I now try to look at situations and evaluate them to see if there was a different way of handling the issue to improve the outcome.

Question # 16

R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Nothing that I remember as a new Sergeant. Now I'll just wait for the annual evaluations to see what they are thinking.

Approximate total interview time = 20 minutes.

**Participant N**

Question # 1

R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?

P) My expectation was extremely high. In never having been a supervisor, my knowledge of being a supervisor in the N.Y.P.D. was non-existent, resulting in elevating my expectations.

Question # 2

R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?

P) I was a little disappointed in the training. I expected in-depth training on specific topics. However, the training I received was general in various fields.

Question # 3

R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?

P) The training was specific and in-depth on following department guidelines assuring you are aware of the risk of recklessly supervising outside the department guidelines.

Question # 4

R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

P) The time and topics spent on preparing you to supervise in the field, and being able to work and make decisions under great stress.

Question # 5

R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

P) I feel I was prepared and knowledgeable of the requirements to perform the duties of a supervisor.

Question # 6

R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

P) I had [redacted] of service prior to being promoted to supervisor, so I was familiar with the requirements needed to supervise. As I worked in many areas of the N.Y.P.D. and closely with other supervisors.

Question # 7

R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

P) It leaves a gap in your decision making in the field. The department guidelines are not specific and leaves gray areas. You must rely on your experience and modify your decisions to fit the guidelines.

Question # 8

R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

P) I adhere to the department guidelines. Unfortunately, as a supervisor you are very well aware of the guidelines fearing the repercussions from the department for not following them.

Question # 9

R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

P) As a Patrol Supervisor my experiences at times are a struggle. I have to adhere to the department guidelines while re-enforcing my judgement in the field based on my previous experiences like what worked and did not work on patrol.

Question # 10

R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

P) My experiences are good. In discussing a particular incident with more experienced supervisors gives me a different perspective, and helps me in my future situations.

Question # 11

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your patrol squad?

P) My experience with working in one of the highest crime areas, and supervising is that it is better to be respected then liked. When your subordinates respect you and know you are competent, and willing to work as hard as them, it brings a different level to supervising. Your subordinates are willing to work their best for you.



Question # 12

R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) I have been told that I am a hard, rough and tough, no messing around boss, but a fair one. My officers have on more than one occasion complimented me on my supervising abilities.

Question # 13

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) I was fortunate to have real life experiences with my environment. Which allowed me to educate my cops about the pros and cons. However, other supervisors not familiar with the area are at a loss, leaving the cop to educate the supervisor and become a buddy, leaving the supervisor vulnerable to have a different supervising style.

Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) I have had supervisors make suggestions to modify my style of supervision, like for example, don't be so hard or expect so much from your cops. I listen and weigh the advice, but still keep my style of supervising.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I would ask myself if I achieved the end result I set out to get. And, if there was anything I could have done differently to achieve the same result. If I was able to

answer the question I would modify my actions for the next time.

Question # 16

- R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?
- P) For myself, I've been fortunate never to have a supervisor of mine evaluate my actions or style of supervising.

Approximate total interview time = 20 minutes.

**Participant O**

Question # 1

- R) How would you describe your expectations of promotional training prior to being trained for the position of supervisor?
- P) As a cop, I worked in the [redacted], so I knew what it was like and what would happen. There was no surprise for me when I got there.

Question # 2

- R) How would you describe your promotional training experience?
- P) As I thought it would be. I was already pre-prepared for it.

Question # 3

- R) How would you describe your promotional training in relation to your department guidelines?
- P) Promotional training has to follow its own guidelines to meet state requirements. So, in the time allotted for it, it has to touch on certain areas, state required areas. The department guidelines is only one area. There's a lot that needs to be taught in other areas.

Question # 4

R) What aspects of promotional training do you feel were relevant to a Patrol Supervisor?

P) In some way, they are all relevant to a Patrol Supervisor. It's what you get out of it that counts. Everything boils down to patrol. No matter what detail you go into it's still the N.Y.P.D. and patrol is still the core of it.

Question # 5

R) How would you describe your preparedness for the position of supervisor in relation to the completion of your training?

P) After spending time in the [redacted], I had a good handle on what needed to be done. But, much like you are told when you get out of the academy, the real learning starts in the street. I'm going to say, it's the same thing for a new Sergeant.

Question # 6

R) How would you describe your familiarity of your department guidelines?

P) Because I worked in the [redacted] I was already exposed to learning them. It comes with being in the [redacted].

Question # 7

R) How would you describe the information in your department guidelines in relation to what is expected of a Patrol Supervisor?

P) The guidelines, or patrol guide as we call it, are just that a guide. You can't possibly tell everyone how to act. But, you can't have people doing what they feel like either. Maybe I'm a little biased because of my time in the [redacted]. But, I kind of understand the departments point of view. You want to have some type of control over behavior, especially a supervisors behavior.

Question # 8

R) How would you describe your adherence to your department guidelines?

P) I'll follow them as close as possible. If I have to make some decision that isn't covered, I'll try to make sure it's close to what is covered. If I'm still concerned about the decision, I'll call the Lieutenant or Duty Captain, let them decide. This way I'm covered.

Question # 9

R) What are your experiences as a Patrol Supervisor in relation to decision-making?

P) I think I can handle most anything. After a while you cover most everything. Most jobs are repetitive, even the heavier ones. So, the decisions become routine. Once in a while you'll get that job though where the decisions are above me. Usually a homicide, or a special category missing, or something like that, which is fine with me.

Question # 10

R) How would you describe your feedback from other supervisors in relation to decision-making?

P) You know, I really don't look for feedback directly. What I'll do is go over past 49's and see what other supervisors did. From there I'll know if I missed anything.

R) What do you mean by past 49's?

P) A UF49 is a report that we do when there is an unusual incident. After our tour we sit down and fill one out. It describes what actions we took, who we notified, etc. It lets our C.O. know something happened.

Question # 11

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision with each Police Officer in your

patrol squad?

P) I put my cops into 3 categories A, B, and C. My A team knows what to do and they go out and do it. I really don't need to bother with them, or spend much time supervising them. My B team needs prompting from time to time. But, overall they are good cops and do their job. My C team are the problems. They could be the hair bags, lazy, whatever. They are the ones I need to ride. If there is one thing I refuse to do is to give a lazy cops job to someone who works hard.

Question # 12

R) What feedback have you received from Police Officers in your patrol squad in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) As expected, my A team cops like me, and my C team cops hate me. Oh well, do your job or you're going to have a problem.

Question # 13

R) How do you describe your manner of supervision in relation to other Patrol Supervisors?

P) I don't pay attention to them and what they do. They have to answer for what they do and I have to answer for what I do. I won't give them advice on how to handle their cops and I don't let them give me advice on mine.

Question # 14

R) What feedback have you received from other Patrol Supervisors in relation to your manner of supervision?

P) I wouldn't call it feedback. If you're on patrol and I'm on the desk, I would say leave these two together, or watch these two, who are in my squad. It's more like letting the

other Sergeants know who's who. It's more working together as bosses than critiquing each other.

Question # 15

R) How do you evaluate your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) Based on everything I'm required to do, I think I meet the requirements pretty well.

I'm sure there are still things out there I need to learn. When it comes, I'll learn it. If

I'm still in a precinct of course.

Question # 16

R) What feedback have you received from your supervisors in relation to evaluating your actions as a Patrol Supervisor?

P) I receive good marks on my evaluations. The comments are positive, so I'm guessing they're happy.

Approximate total interview time = 22 minutes.

## **Appendix H**

### **Participant A**

The site for this interview was an office in the Participants precinct. This Participant appeared to be comfortable and relaxed. The answers given tended to be direct and flowed naturally. It did not appear as though this Participant labored to answer questions posed.

### **Participant B**

The site for this interview was a public library located within the Participants precincts geographical area. This Participant appeared at ease. The answers given were very direct as this Participant didn't seem to hesitate when speaking.

### **Participant C**

The site for this interview was an office in the Participants precinct. This Participant appeared to have no issues with participating in the interview and generally seemed to enjoy answering the research questions.

### **Participant D**

The site for this interview was an office in the Participants precinct. This Participant appeared a bit cavalier with answers and didn't really project a seriousness. It felt as though this Participant was venting more than answering questions, as though not satisfied with the department.

### **Participant E**

The site for this interview was the muster room in the Participants precinct. Although this area is not private, this Participant seemed comfortable using the location. This Participant appeared to give honest answers and was attentive throughout the interview.

**Participant F**

The site for this interview was an office in the Participants precinct. This Participant also appeared comfortable and relaxed during the interview. The answers given appeared to be genuine and thoughtful. This Participant was grateful for the opportunity to help in the research.

**Participant G**

The site for this interview was the muster room in the Participants precinct. Although this area is not private, this Participant also appeared comfortable and relaxed in the location setting. The answers given appeared to be well thought out, in-depth, and complete.

**Participant H**

The site for this interview was the Bronx Botanical Gardens. This Participant appeared eager to do the interview. At times, this Participant was almost animated. The answers given were often times succinct. However, there were times when this Participant opened up with answers that was verbose.

**Participant I**

The site for this interview was the Bronx Botanical Gardens. This Participant appeared very nice and had a pleasant demeanor. This Participant was engaged throughout the entire interview process, and offered to assist further with the research if needed.

**Participant J**

The site for this interview was the Bronx Botanical Gardens. This Participant was very comfortable, as this Participant was very familiar with the location and tends to visit for relaxation. The answers given were relatively concise and to the point.



**Participant K**

The site for this interview was the Bronx Botanical Gardens. This Participant appeared a bit apprehensive in doing the interview. The answers given appeared guarded as though the Participant was choosing the words carefully.

**Participant L**

The site for this interview was an office in the Participants precinct. This Participant appeared anxious and wanted to get the interview done as quick as possible. The answers given were direct, but appeared to be honest.

**Participant M**

The site for this interview was the muster room in the Participants precinct. Although this area is not private, this Participant assured the Researcher that it wouldn't be a problem to use. The answers given appeared to be genuine.

**Participant N**

The site for this interview was a public park located in this Participants county of residence. This site was chosen by this Participant for comfort and ease of travel. The answers given appeared to be hesitant at times, as though this Participant didn't want to say something wrong.

**Participant O**

The site for this interview was a public location situated in this Participants county of residence. This Participant had a prior engagement to be there and felt comfortable using it for the interview. The answers given seemed to be a bit off as though this Participant had a different understanding of the questions posed.