

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY
LAW ENFORCEMENT LEADER

A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL STUDIES

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY
LAW ENFORCEMENT LEADER

A THESIS

BY
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

MASTER OF LIBERAL STUDIES

By


DAVID D. LYONS
Norman, Oklahoma
2005

LI
HESIS
LYD
Cap. 2


TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY
LAW ENFORCEMENT LEADER

A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL STUDIES


BY



Dr. Trina Hope



Dr. John Duncan



Dr. Kelly Damphousse

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is the result of many hours of study and research. I owe a great debt of gratitude to my thesis committee chair, Dr. Trisa Hays, and members, Dr. John Duncan and Dr. Kelly Demphousse for their time, patience, and effort into this project. In addition, I want to thank Dr. Jane Bowersman, for inspiring me, and teaching me that I am a visual learner; Dr. Brad Elder, for recommending that I attend graduate school; and Dr. John Duncan, for being a guiding light in my academic endeavor. I want to thank my many colleagues in the field of law enforcement, especially Reggie Cotton and Todd Whitmer, who continued to encourage me during times of doubt. I also owe a big "thank you" to my wife Linda and friends, Lisa and Lance, for proof reading and suggesting that I had made mistakes.

The acknowledgements would not be complete without the many thanks due to my family. I am thankful to my parents, Donald and Gloria, for emphasizing continued education. I want to especially recognize my wife Linda, whose love and support helped me through all the long hours of research. Last, but certainly not least, I want to thank my daughter Amber, who often stayed when daddy had to "do school work."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is the result of many hours of study and research. I owe a great debt of gratitude to my thesis committee chair, Dr. Trina Hope, and members, Dr. John Duncan and Dr. Kelly Damphousse for their time, patience, and effort into this project. In addition, I want to thank: Dr. Jane Bowerman, for inspiring me, and teaching me that I am a visual learner; Dr. Brad Elder, for recommending that I attend graduate school; and Dr. John Duncan, for being a guiding light in my academic endeavor. I want to thank my many colleagues in the field of law enforcement, especially Reggie Cotton and Todd Whitman, who continued to encourage me during times of doubt. I also owe a big “thank you” to my wife Linda and friends, Lisa and Lance, for proof reading and suggesting that I had made mistakes.

The acknowledgements would not be complete without the many thanks due to my family. I am thankful to my parents, Donald and Gloria, for emphasizing continued education. I want to especially recognize my wife Linda, whose love and support helped me through all the long hours of research. Last, but certainly not least, I want to thank my daughter Allee, who understood when daddy had to “do school work.”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Method	3
Literature Review	6
Research Questions	7
II. LAW ENFORCEMENT HISTORY	9
III. MANAGEMENT THEORY	14
IV. POLICE ADMINISTRATION	21
V. BUREAUCRACY	27
VI. LEADERSHIP	34
Leadership History	34
Leadership Defined	36
Leadership vs. Management	42
Situational Leadership	44
Contingency Theory	45
Path-Goal Leadership	46
Transactional Leadership	49
Charismatic Leadership	51
VII. TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP	54
Transformational Process	54
Leader Attributes	60
Law Enforcement Application	63
Organizational Change	67
VIII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	71
IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY	77

ABSTRACT

Modern day law enforcement and its successful future will be contingent upon the attributes of the law enforcement leaders and the style of leadership in which they will practice. The focus of the study is to illustrate a potential paradigm shift from the historical bureaucratic style of management to the modern day teachings of transformational leadership. The study will attempt to address two research questions: 1) Will a paradigm shift from the traditional teachings of management theory to the current philosophy of leadership benefit law enforcement in the future? 2) Will transformational leadership better support the law enforcement administrator in contrast to the traditional bureaucratic style of management? The purpose of the research is to provide evidentiary support that transformational leadership would provide a law enforcement leader with the necessary skills for survival in the 21st century. *Police Management Concepts* (1971), Sanford Shook's suggests, "The administrator who does not anticipate and prepare for the future usually discovers a crisis when the future becomes the present" and "The administrator who does not plan will have others plan for him with frequent undesirable results; therefore the police administrator must be capable with police management concepts to effectively lead his organization and meet primary police responsibilities" (Hansa & Gerstel, 1971, p. vii).

In today's society, law enforcement has the difficult task of maintaining law and order in, perhaps, one of the most troubling times in history. Law enforcement

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY LAW ENFORCEMENT LEADER

I

INTRODUCTION

The term *Leadership* may have as many definitions as there are individuals who attempt to define it. There appears to be a greater emphasis on the topic of leadership from the traditional theme of management. Within any organization, group, or gathering, there appears to be one who will direct others through certain tasks and accomplishments. The role the individual will play becomes vitally important for the success of the group in the completion of the task in which they are entrusted. In many cases, the individual who guides others will accept a certain amount of responsibility for the success or failure of those being led. In *A Guide to Primary Police Management Concepts* (1971), Sanford Shoults suggests, "The administrator who does not anticipate and prepare for the future usually discovers a crisis when the future becomes the present" and "The administrator who does not plan will have others plan for him with frequent undesirable results; therefore the police administrator must be capable with police management concepts to effectively lead his organization and meet primary police responsibilities" (Hanna & Gentel, 1971, p. vii).

In today's society, law enforcement has the difficult task of maintaining law and order in, perhaps, one of the most troubling times in history. Law enforcement

administrators are faced with global terrorism, cyber crime, increased population, catastrophic natural disasters, and changing social attitudes towards law enforcement. During these troubling times, law enforcement administrators are faced with making decisions that will affect the lives of thousands, if not millions, of people. The decisions can set precedence and have a lasting effect on how law enforcement is viewed by the public. Perhaps one of the greatest challenges and most distinctive characteristics about the management of policing a community is that of public scrutiny (Hanna & Gentel, 1971, p. 4). The eyes of the public are continually watchful and mass media coverage has become the norm whenever the actions of law enforcement are in dispute. Law enforcement administrators will also have the task of making decisions that will affect the lives of the citizenry and fellow officers within their respective organizations. It is abundantly clear that those who will lead law enforcement into the 21st century must have the capability and skills necessary to guide the members of the force and the public through turbulent times.

Law enforcement officials have traditionally been categorized as management or managers who have operated in a bureaucratic environment with the emphasis being on top-down management. Current leadership training supports a transfer from the traditional management style of guidance to a supportive role of interactive leadership. The proposed question then becomes whether or not the current trends in leadership will be acceptable and successful as a way of leading law enforcement officers in the future.

With a proposed shift from traditional management to modern day leadership, there also becomes the question of which leadership theory will be the most beneficial for those within police organizations. The transformational leadership style is currently one of the most popular styles of leadership. There lies a potential for a paradigm shift (Kuhn, 1996) from the basic teachings of management to those of leadership. Governing law enforcement officials will have the responsibility of interacting with others in a form that is both modern and acceptable by society and those within the organizations. As a transition takes place in the perceptions of society, law enforcement officials must also be willing to change.

The leaders of the future must possess the learned skills and attributes necessary for successful leadership. Future leaders in law enforcement must be able to establish a protocol for future enforcement as well as utilize an appropriate leadership style that will prove to be beneficial in the fight against criminal activity. It is clear that the police administrator will be leading and directing “an organization where human life is often at stake and where human rights, welfare, and dignity are always at stake” and “it is a vital, necessary task which must survive a changing society” (Hanna & Gentel, 1971, p. 4). It is possible that the changing society will be one of, if not the most, instrumental aspect in the paradigm shift from the traditional teachings of management and bureaucracy to leadership and transformational theory.

Method

The method for the research will be the utilization of primary source material that describes the history of law enforcement as well as, the history of police

administration. In order to bring one up to date with the modern day police profession, one must have an understanding of how law enforcement evolved from the early creation of rules in the primitive society to the complex legal systems of the modern world. Topics discussed will include the changes that have taken place over centuries of time. When one has the understanding of how law enforcement was created, one can then begin to understand the need for law enforcement administration. The need for direction and organization is crucial if law enforcement is to attempt, maintain, or increase efficiency. The focus of administration topics will be limited to the progression of American law enforcement.

The thesis will discuss the late 19th century concepts of management theory and will introduce theories that began in the 20th century. Frederick Taylor's scientific management theory discussed in his book, *The Principles of Scientific Management* (1911) will be the basis for many works to come. Henri Fayol's functional management theory will be discussed, along with Max Weber's *ideal bureaucracy*. Weber described his theory as "capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency and is in this sense formally the most rational known means of carrying out imperative control over human beings" and "it is superior to any other form in precision, in stability, in stringency of its discipline, and in its reliability" (Weber, 1947, p. 337). The journey will continue with a discussion of both the human relations management theory and systems management approach. The investigation will explore the inadequacies of these theories, which will be the basis for the shift to a more modern theory (transformational leadership).

With the change in times, the need for the investigation into new concepts suggests the need for a change from manager or management to leader and leadership. This change will be a major supporting point for the research into the adaptability of transformational leadership.

The concepts surrounding modern leadership training, particularly those that are applicable to transformational leadership, will be studied in a compare and contrast evaluation to those theories studied in classical management. The concepts of contingency theory and path-goal leadership will be examined for possible inclusion as necessary attributes for the successful 21st century law enforcement leader. Contingency theory explains “Leadership effectiveness in terms of situational moderator variables” (Yukl, 2002, p. 208). The leader will utilize the most effective style of leadership for the situation with a response that deems it to be the most effective. Law enforcement has traditionally been governed by the principle of “by the book” mentality, which in many ways has proven to be least effective with subordinates and the public.

Path-goal leadership will assist with the understanding of “how” the behaviors of a leader will influence the satisfaction and performance of subordinates. The potential advantage is that the law enforcement administrator will understand the effects that their decisions will have on others. With this understanding, it is hopeful that the administrator will make more accurate decisions, which will in turn lead to success within the department.

Law enforcement in America can only exist if it is the will of the people. The citizenry play an instrumental role in the acceptance of the powers entrusted to law enforcement. At the forefront of administration and line officers is the personal attribute of ethics. Ethics within the entire structure of law enforcement cannot be a topic of debate. Ethics is a required element for the successful leader. Public examination of unethical behavior has caused the demise of many law enforcement leaders.

The topic of charisma will be researched as a possible element within the transformational leader. Law enforcement administrators must exhibit the ability to not only be trusted by the people, but also have the ability to effectively be heard and understood. The effective administrator must have the supernatural ability to captivate an audience while also communicating the goals and ideologies of the organization.

Literature Review

The basis for the research will be the utilization of several primary sources of material. James MacGregor Burns' 1978 publication, *Leadership*, will be the foundational source material for the topic of transformational leadership. The focus will rely upon the interpretation of transformational leadership and how the principles can be applied to the field of law enforcement. Burns combines the mutual needs of leaders and followers as a way of being transformational. Burns describes this style of leadership as *moral leadership*. He contends that transformational leadership has

the ability to produce social change that will satisfy follower's authentic needs (Burns, 1978).

In 1985, Bernard Bass published the book, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, in which he supplemented the work of Burns by adding that the transformational leader seeks to increase the full potential of the follower by encouraging and nurturing them to higher levels of efficiency.

Historical background covering bureaucracy will be accomplished through the works of Max Weber and his 1947 published book entitled *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Max Weber's contribution to the ideology of the bureaucratic style of management theory has been instrumental in the makeup of the way law enforcement organizations have been lead.

Primary concepts regarding the evolution of police administration will begin with Leonhard Felix Fuld and his early 20th century police administration concepts, which were published in *Police Administration* (1909). Later, Raymond Fosdick and Elmer Graper added to Fuld's initial findings. It would be the 1943 publication of *Police Management* by the International City Management Association, which would recognize policing as a distinct function and would reflect the thinking of many public administrators.

Research Questions

By investigating the history of law enforcement and the transition to police administration, it is hopeful that one will have a clear guidance into the possible implementation of transformational leadership. The foundational work of Taylor's

scientific management and Max Weber's ideal bureaucracy, along with other classical theory failures, are crucial in the potential paradigm shift (Kuhn, 1996) from one theory to another. The focus of the thesis will be to investigate and attempt to answer two main research questions: 1) Will a paradigm shift from the traditional teachings of management theory to the current philosophy of leadership benefit law enforcement in the future? 2) Will transformational leadership better support the law enforcement administrator in contrast to the traditional bureaucratic style of management? It is expected that the transformational style of leadership will prove to be more efficient and beneficial for law enforcement administrators. It is believed that the style will also benefit subordinates within the organizations and the citizenry in which the administrators lead.

II

LAW ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

History provides the best possible clues for insight into the future. One of the best ways to tell where one is heading is to see where one has been. The history of law enforcement is filled with intrigue, adventure, complication, adversity, complexity, and change. Early examples of cuneiform symbols were chiseled onto rock with the best known examples being the Code of Hammurabi which dates to about 2100 B.C. (Hunt, 1989a). Law enforcement has evolved through the Norman (French) Period, the Westminster Period, to the adoption of common law in America in the early 19th century (Hunt, 1989b). By understanding the history and evolution of the field of law enforcement, one will be able to better grasp the sparks that have created change in the past, which provides clues for potential change in the future.

Anthropologists have found rules of conduct and definite enforcement as far back as early primitive societies. As these societies grew in complexity, the citizens became more and more involved with each other. The definite need for specialized law enforcement functions came from these complexities and eventual societal issues. Thus, the modern forms of law enforcement came from these simple functions (Kuykendall & Unsinger, 1975, p. 7).

Leonard Felix Fuld, in *Police Administration* (1971), suggests that, "Historically the police is the child of the military" (Fuld, 1971, p. 7). The first organized police force and ancestor of the *gendarmérie* was the *marechaussée*,

established in France in 1356. The force was created in order to suppress crime, which was being committed by deserters of the army (Fuld, 1971, p. 10). The forces' original jurisdiction was enlarged to include all crimes committed within the boundaries of enforcement. In 1720, the force became recognized as the famous *gendarmerie* of France.

The ancient societies saw two distinct law enforcement patterns emerge; the centralized and decentralized forms of enforcement. The centralized form was under the control of a single governing body. The enforcement unit, as a whole, was generally located and led by a central location of power. Control was maintained over the use of enforcement by the centralized or governing body. Examples of centralized law enforcement include: China, Egypt, and Rome (Kuykendall & Unsinger, 1975, p. 7).

The decentralized form was one of fragmentation. In the decentralized form, the local form of power or governing entity maintained the control. The best example of decentralized law enforcement is that of the United States. The Americans chose a preference for decentralized enforcement after England's experience with Oliver Cromwell. During the Cromwell Protectorate, centralized law enforcement appeared in the form of mounted police patrol. The colonists had a distaste and distrust for the English military and central control of police and a preference for local government. With the memory of the War of Independence and the experiences of centralized police power, the colonists maintained that the decentralized method was the better choice. The colonists wanted to keep their enforcement agencies restricted to the

local level (Kuykendall & Unsinger, 1975, p. 10). Law enforcement in America is basically fragmented into the federal, state, and local levels. There are countless jurisdictions that further illustrate the divisions within law enforcement. Modern law enforcement in the United States is still one of decentralization. There have not been any changes towards a centralized law enforcement system.

The American development of police administration is traced back to the English law enforcement system. The community policing found in the Americas grew out of the Anglo-Saxon and Norman traditions of enforcement. The foundational heritage coupled with the geographical isolation resulted in the consideration of policing as a local matter, which reflected the preferences of the local citizenry (Kuykendall & Unsinger, 1975, p. 8).

The foundational heritage of America's small units of law enforcement evolved from the fear of centralized government, which existed in England. The citizenry found ways of solving local problems and provided security within the local area. The American term sheriff derived from the European term *shire reeve*, which was the law enforcement leader who directed the activities within the shire (Kuykendall & Unsinger, 1975, p. 9). Today, the sheriff is the elected law enforcement official who governs a county.

The Norman period of enforcement was mixed with the Anglo-Saxon, when William the Conqueror gained control of England in the 11th century. William introduced the constable in areas of dispersed population in an attempt to maintain the peace and to collect taxes. The *shire reeve* and constable would later become firmly

established in England. The English style of law enforcement would later become copied and adopted by the colonists in America (Kuykendall & Unsinger, 1975, p. 10).

During the reign of Edward I, the English developed community watches in London. The watchmen were citizens supervised by a local alderman. The watchmen functioned as the modern day patrol officer, and the alderman functioned as the local judge. Together these units created the watch and ward system of enforcement. When the American eastern seaboard was settled, most of the settlements formed these types of watch systems (Kuykendall & Unsinger, 1975, p. 9).

In 1828, Sir Robert Peel (Secretary of State for the Home Department, Metropolis of London) formed the world's first modern urban police force. Peel created a force that had three predominating characteristics that differentiated it from all other pre existing organizations. They are:

1. The police were all professional.
2. It was uniformed and disciplined.
3. It was semi-military in structure.

(Fuld, 1971, p. 21). Peel also articulated the first nine principles of law enforcement:

1. Crime Prevention-The Basic Police Mission
2. Citizen Respect for Police
3. Citizen Respect for Law
4. Public Cooperation vs. Physical Force
5. Law Enforcement Must be Impartial
6. Physical Force-A Last Resort
7. Police and Public as One
8. Police Represent the Law
9. Police Efficiency-The True Test

(Hunt, 1989b, p. 1).

By the middle of the 19th century, most American cities had adopted a police organization that was patterned after the London Police (Fuld, 1971, p. 26). With few modifications, the same system is in existence today in many American cities. Kuykendall and Unsinger (1975) contend that "Historically, Americans have not been interested in police doing an effective job, but in their avoiding unnecessary interventions in private matters" (p. 11). In the early 20th century, the politics of government began to strongly influence the field of law enforcement and police administration.

The History of Law Enforcement helps to establish the progressive nature of law enforcement and it emphasizes the continual change in an ancient form of public service. The history of law enforcement assists one with the understanding that potential change for the future is not only advantageous but necessary as well.

III

MANAGEMENT THEORY

It is extremely important for one to understand the foundational elements of management and managerial theories as they have evolved through time. The underlying structure of managerial theories and their respective elements are instrumental in establishing a historical view of the management of people. It is also important to understand how the different management theories evolved through the science of law enforcement. With the understanding of management, its historical significance, and its evolution, it is hopeful that one can see the potential benefits of a continued change in management principles, with a possible transition into leadership theory.

Management theory includes “the development of a hierarchy of objectives in the organization under changing circumstances to get the optimum combination of general and special purpose both as to resources with the optimum degree of flexibility” (Hanna & Gentel, 1971, p. 10). Within an organization, there must be a form of structure in which the activities of the organization are controlled and monitored. The activities must be beneficial to the organization and there must be a measure of success or failure in which the designed structure can be compared.

The term management can be defined as, “the relentless and continuous activity of striving to design and implement the most valuable course of action” (Hanna & Gentel, 1971, p. 10). The management process includes the efforts and

activities directed towards the accomplishment of goals through the utilization of people and equipment. The process also includes the functions of planning, organizing, motivating, problem solving, and making decisions (Kuykendall & Unsinger, 1975, p. 3). Management involves the creation of goals, the utilization of resources, and the direction of specific activities in an effort to maximize the successes of the organization. Management bears the responsibility of ensuring that the organization is run according to the standards that are set forth by the chosen managerial theory. The individual or manager becomes the focal point of responsibility by being entrusted with seeing that the objectives of the organization are met. The manager is a position of authority, responsibility, and accountability. Within any organization, the actions taken by the manager, in accordance with management and the managerial theory in application, will provide either great success or disastrous failure of the required task.

Historically, management knowledge began with the church and military. A more formal structure of management began with the rapid industrial expansion of the late 19th century. In 1911, Frederick Winslow Taylor's book, *The Principles of Scientific Management*, was published. Taylor's desire was to generate greater industrial efficiency through the systematic observation and measurement of work. He believed in standardizing work methods and conditions (Taylor, 1998). Taylor's theory of scientific management was responsible for the unification of the mechanisms of management and the creation of a management philosophy that dominated the American work force for many years (Leonard & More, 1982, p. 24).

Taylor believed that there was a need for a complete mental revolution (modern day paradigm shift) by both the management staff and the work force on how to increase productivity. Taylor believed that the workers had to revitalize their attitudes towards their work, co-workers, and employers (management). Taylor also suggested that management needed to change their attitudes toward their individual duties, the managerial staff, the employees, and the daily problems of the industry.

Taylor argued that the “Principle object of management should be to ensure the maximum prosperity for the employer, coupled with the maximum prosperity for each employee” (Taylor, 1998, p. 1). Taylor defined the situation as one in which both the employers and employees did not see the benefits of unity in the approach of goals. Taylor argued that both sides were blind when it came to visualizing that their interests were mutual. Taylor’s scientific management has at the very foundation, “the firm conviction that the true interests of the two are one and the same; that prosperity for the employer cannot exist through a long term of years unless it is accompanied by prosperity for the employee, and vice versa; and that it is possible to give the workman what he most wants (high wages), and the employer what he wants (a low labor cost for his manufactures)” (Taylor, 1998, p. 1).

Taylor established that management allowed the employees to complete tasks as the employees had traditionally been taught or shown. Taylor noticed that management did not have a way of incorporating the knowledge of hundreds of employees in an efficient manner. Each employee worked based upon his own initiative as he or she saw fit. At that time, the way to increase the workers initiative

was to provide a worthy incentive. Taylor coined the term *initiative and incentive* as a way of describing the potential effort received from an employee. Under the scientific management theory, the initiative of the worker is obtained with absolute uniformity. The role of management would increase to include the acquisition of knowledge possessed by the workers for conversion into rules, laws, and formula. The managers would in effect create a science in the way in which employees were directed (Taylor, 1998, p. 15).

Taylor's scientific management theory was heavily criticized for not considering people or the humanistic side of the organization and for his over-reliance on economic motives. Taylor's focus was viewed as a means of generating increased productivity for the industry rather than benefiting the needs of the employee.

Elton Mayo's 1968 published work, *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*, illustrates the complex nature of employees within an organization. Researchers with the National Research Council studied employees at the Western Electric Company (Hawthorne Works Plant, Chicago). The research found that employees are affected by more than just the formal structure within the organization. Mayo found that, "variations in output do effectively show 'the combined effect' of all the conditions affecting a group" (Mayo, 1968, p. 55). The study concluded that there is the presence of an informal structure which includes the rumor process, cliques, and informal status systems which increased or decreased productivity (Lynch, 1975, p. 13). Mayo's findings indicated that "man was influenced by factors other than the physical environment and presumably, financial incentives", and that

“additional factors included his work group or peer group and other’s expectations of his performance” (Kuykendall & Unsinger, 1975, p. 6).

In 1916, Henry Fayol, a French Industrialist, wrote *Industrial and General Administration*; however the work was not translated until 1929. Fayol’s work introduced the concepts of Functional Management. Fayol was the first major contributor to address administrative management theory. He stated, “At present, a man who is starting his career has neither theory nor methods of administration to help him, and many people remain in that condition all their lives” (Fayol, 1963, p. 16). Fayol recognized that the management process included the functions of planning, organization, command, coordination, and control. Fayol’s approach emphasized a structure that focused on top management whereas later theories would emphasize the individual.

The beginning of the human relations school of management (behavioral science approach) was created based upon a need for the inclusion of the human aspects of management. The behavioral studies approach resulted from the identification of many important factors that management should consider. It was suggested that managers consider “communication, motivation, leadership, and the value of increased participation by employees in organizational activities” (Kuykendall & Unsinger, 1975, p. 7). The theory opened the door for a more unified aspect of management with an emphasis on managers and employees collaborating on organizational task. Management theorists began to realize that organizational tasks are accomplished through people, and that human resources often have potential for

improving organizational performance. Some of the concepts of the behavioral science approach will prove beneficial in the evolution of many leadership principles.

While the scientific managing theory is not without error, the human relations approach would also have limitations. With the heavy emphasis being placed upon the employee, the role of the organizational structure and its importance became secondary. It was found that the employees came to expect more and provided less in return (Lynch, 1975, p. 14). By the 1960's, the scientific management and human relations approach began to merge to form the systems management approach. The systems management approach "fused the individual and the organization to assist the manager in using the employee in the most effective way, while reaching the desired production goals" (Lynch, 1975, p. 15). The systems management approach would emphasize true unity between the organization and the employee, rather than the divisional bias that was seen in the scientific management approach and the behavioral science approach.

Max Weber's theory of the ideal bureaucracy described how organizations should be structured and managed. The theory of bureaucracy has been instrumental throughout many industries in America, especially during the 20th century. Weber's concepts of bureaucracy will be addressed in length at a later point; however, bureaucracy has been the foundation on which law enforcement has operated in.

Modern management attempts to intertwine the systematic structure of management with the human aspects of management in order to provide a balance within organizations. The modern teachings have evolved through the contributions

of Taylor, Fayol, and Weber. The term management has often been used to illustrate the guidance in the private sector while the term administration has been used to describe the management of the public sector, such as law enforcement. The evolution and knowledge gained throughout history concerning management and management theory provides one with the essential foundation for understanding the evolution of police administration concepts.

IV

POLICE ADMINISTRATION

In the early 20th century Law Enforcement began to show an interest in police management. Early management pioneers such as Felix Fuld, Raymond Fosdick, and Elmer Graper emphasized special application techniques in regards to training, selection, and law enforcement distribution. These authors were instrumental in paving the way for the transition to management development and theory as the field of law enforcement began to transform into a professional entity. August Vollmer's study of the law enforcement profession, in Berkeley CA, led to the production of new ideas into the operation of police forces. The FBI began to convince the American people of the uniqueness of the field of law enforcement, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police developed the UCR (Uniform Crime Report) that forced the public's attention to issues regarding crime and the quality of life. The International City Management Association would recognize law enforcement as a distinct function, and in 1943 the organization published *Municipal Police Administration* (Kuykendall & Unsinger, 1975, p. 12). The publication became an essential tool for the police administrator and the theories of police administration would prove to be the driving force of how law enforcement is managed today. This chapter will explore the theories and describe the process in which they have evolved.

In 1909, Leonhard Felix Fuld published *Police Administration*. He emphasized the need for an elimination of politics in police management. He stressed clearly defined police duties and strong supervision. Fuld recognized the importance of the centrally appointed police commissioners in Brooklyn and New York. Fuld understood that administration was required in order for law enforcement to be more effective and he emphasized the partial centralization of police administration (Fuld, 1971, p. 26).

In 1915, Raymond B. Fosdick published *American Police Systems*. Fosdick discovered that police departments did not have a defined function, they did not have a purpose for their organization, and that law enforcement lacked capable leadership. With his publication, Fosdick made a plea for effective police management. Fosdick surveyed 72 American police services and suggested that law enforcement needed the “best possible brains to handle the most difficult public task”. Fosdick also contended that, “It is possible that public administration as a science will be at some period so far advanced in America that a training school for police administrators will be a practicable project” (Fosdick, 1969, p. 221). Fosdick was correct in his observation because law enforcement is more complex than it ever has been before. There is no question that highly trained administrative personnel are required to handle the many tasks that are required to run a police organization.

By the year 1921, E. Graper had published *American Police Administration*. Graper focused on some of the same essential principles as Fuld and Fosdick, noting that the police service needed more hierarchal control, tight supervision, and

discipline. Graper introduced the concepts of both the centralized and decentralized components of certain law enforcement activities. Graper also suggested that police personnel should be distributed according to a city's geographic layout (Graper, 1969, p. 129). Graper's work suggested a clear, structured plan for the police organization.

In 1940, Bruce Smith published *Police Systems in the United States*. Smith's work led to major reforms during the 1940's. The field of law enforcement was still dealing with the problems of partisan politics and restricted crime control. Smith focused on the primary need for police administration within the organization. Smith stated,

The broad principles of organization that have won such wide acceptance in military and industrial circles find ready application to the structure of police forces. In general, it is their purpose to simplify as much as possible the complex inter-relations of any large-scale human venture; to reduce them to some clear and systematic basis; and to contribute toward making the official leadership effective (Smith, 1960, p. 208).

Smith emphasized limited span of control, unity of command, and task specialization. Smith clearly understood that, in order for an organization to suppress crime, the organization had to have some form of administration. He then suggested the necessary attributes for those within the administrative level.

O. W. Wilson's *Police Administration*, was published in 1950. Wilson suggested that law enforcement should be designed and managed according to fundamental organizational principles similar to those of commercial, military, and industrial organizations. Wilson noted the following eight principles that were necessary for law enforcement:

1. Delegation of authority.

2. Unity of command.
3. Span of control.
4. Chain of command.
5. Organization for administration.
6. Direction and coordination.
7. Time division of command tasks.
8. Order of rank.

(Wilson, 1963, p. 63-84). Wilson's work elevated the requirements and specifics for police administration. These fundamental principles continued to grow with each pioneering work concerning police administration.

V.A. Leonard, in his 1951 publication, *Police Organization and Management*, paid close attention to police leadership, organizational structure and principles. Leonard's major contribution was in the designation of making a distinction between line and staff functions within the police profession. Leonard suggested that activities such as patrol, investigations, and traffic were line functions, whereas communications, records, planning, and personnel are staff functions (Leonard, 1951, p. 27). Law enforcement's organization and structure is clearly defined by the principles established by Leonard.

The 1960's saw considerable research being conducted that suggested that law enforcement had moved into the realm of social services and order-maintenance. It was recognized that law enforcement administration needed the skills necessary to deal with a broad range of complex social issues (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1990, p. 83). By the 1970's theorists began to look strongly at the classical bureaucracy of hierarchical structure that had been dominating the field of enforcement. J. E. Angell's article, "Toward an Alternative to the Classic Police Organizational

Arrangements”, suggested a move to a more democratic model of policing and administration. Angell cited the following criticisms of classical bureaucracy:

1. Classical theory and concepts are culture-bound.
2. Classical theory and concepts mandate that attitudes toward employees and clients be inconsistent with the humanistic democratic values of the United States.
3. Classically structured organizations demand and support employees who demonstrate immature personality traits.
4. Classical organizations are unable to cope with environmental changes; therefore they eventually become obsolete and dysfunctional (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1990, p. 84).

Angell believed that classical police management also caused potential negatives in respect to: 1) the state of police and community relations where well developed police bureaucracy exist, 2) the state of morale among police employees, and 3) the lack of communication and control in law enforcement agencies (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1990, p. 84). Angell’s work is important in respect to a change from the classical theory of management to a more democratic form of management or administration.

Angell received support from author A. J. Reiss who published *The Police and the Public* (1971). Reiss’ emphasis was that “all bureaucracies pose a problem for the exercise of professional discretion” (Reiss, 1971, p. 124). Roberg and Kuykendall (1990) suggest that “these problems are exacerbated for the police, who operate in what he [Reiss] refers to as a command bureaucracy, because they are expected to obey all the bureaucratic rules while exercising professional discretion” (p. 84).

Finally, in 1977 H. Goldstein, in *Policing a Free Society*, suggested “the organizational climate must change if it is to operate properly in a democratic

society” and “a police officer should be more involved in policy making and methods of operation”. Goldstein states, “They should have greater opportunities to realize their “full potential” in ways other than promotion” (Goldstein, 1977, p. 264).

Goldstein defended his work by suggesting that “it is not a substitution of some radical new style of management but instead, a gradual movement away from the extremely authoritarian climate that pervades police agencies toward a more democratic form of organization” (Goldstein, 1977, p. 264).

The historical progress that establishes the way in which law enforcement has been organized and structured has a major impact on the changes that have taken place and those that need to take place. The evolution of police administration through the 20th century will lay the groundwork for the potential change in the 21st century. Wilson and McLaren (1972) state that the “strength of the organization is dependent on the human needs of its members and the need for effective communications among them” (p. 124). They argue that the “thoughtful administrators have recognized for some time that an organization made up of human beings must be considered not as a collection of robots, but as a dynamic group of individuals with as many different combinations of capability, energy, motivation, attitude, and interest as there are people in the organization”(p. 124). The potential change from the classical bureaucracies is not to harm moral or lead to insubordination, but rather to lead officers to a high level of efficiency within the organization.

V

BUREAUCRACY

No other management theory has dominated the field of law enforcement as much as the theory of Bureaucracy. German sociologist Max Weber researched and wrote about bureaucracies in *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (Translated by Gerth and Mills, 1947). Weber has become the universally accepted founder of the term bureaucracy. Bureaucracy suggests that all elements of the organization should assist in the pursuit of the organizational goals. This chapter will attempt to describe Weber's ideal bureaucracy and illustrate how law enforcement came to accept the theory as practice. The deficiencies of the bureaucratic theory will be discussed which will be used as a pretext to the acceptance of change to a more modern theory of administration.

During the 1920's and 1930's, an intensive effort was made to bureaucratize the field of law enforcement. This action was in response to wide spread corruption in many, if not most, of America's police departments (Potts, 1983). Police administrators believed that the bureaucratic form could introduce a type of military discipline that should decrease the amount of political corruption that flourished within the existing organizations. The administrators believed that the bureaucratic style was unsurpassed for controlling both the human beings within an organization and the organization itself (Potts, 1983). Weber suggested that,

The purely bureaucratic type of administrative organization-that is, the monocratic variety of bureaucracy-is, from a purely technical point of view, capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency and is in this sense formally the most rational known means of carrying out imperative control over human beings. It is superior to any other form in precision, in stability, in the stringency of its discipline, and in its reliability. It thus makes possible a particularly high degree of calculability of results for the heads of the organization and for those acting in relation to it. It is finally superior both in intensive efficiency and in the scope of its operations, and is formally capable of application to all kinds of administrative tasks (Weber, 1947, p. 337).

With Weber's promises outlined within the bureaucratic theory, it is clear why the officials in the early 20th century chose to implement the bureaucratic style of management. Weber believed that legitimate authority is the most important component of bureaucratic theory. Weber described three different types of authority:

- Rational grounds-resting on a belief in the 'legality' of patterns of normative rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands [legal authority]
- Traditional grounds-resting on an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of the status of those exercising authority under them [traditional authority]
- Charismatic grounds-resting on devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him [charismatic authority] (Weber, 1947, p. 328)

The field of law enforcement embraces Weber's idea of legal authority. Legal authority is generally provided by the position of sheriff, police chief, or commissioner. Traditional authority is also adaptable to law enforcement as it is common that many positions in law enforcement are attained through promotional authority within the organization. M. L. Dantzker suggests that the charismatic

authority, or that which lies on the attachment of devotion, is rarely found in law enforcement (Dantzker, 1999, p. 23). Dantzker is correct in his opinion; however, there is the potential for implementation of charismatic leadership within law enforcement. Charismatic leadership will be discussed in detail at a later point. At this point, the term and topic is introduced, but it should be noted that it is not the 'authority' that is prevalent in the typical bureaucratic law enforcement environment.

With the topic of authority at the forefront of Weber's ideal bureaucracy, Weber describes seven elements of bureaucratic theory-of which all are identifiable in police organizations. These elements are:

1. A continuous organization of official functions bound by rules.
2. A specified sphere of competence.
3. The organization of offices follows the principle of hierarchy.
4. The rules that regulate the conduct of an office may be technical rules or norms.
5. In the rational type it is a matter of principle that the members of the administrative staff should be completely separated from ownership of the means of production or administration.
6. In the rational type case, there is also a complete absence of appropriation of his official position by the incumbent.
7. Administrative acts, decisions, and rules are formulated and recorded in writing, even in cases where oral discussion is the rule or is even mandatory. (Weber, 1947, p. 332).

Roberg and Kuykendall (1990) argued that through authority and the elements of bureaucracy, organizations would not be plagued with the "cruelty, nepotism, and subjective managerial practices common in the earlier stages of the Industrial

Revolution” (p. 68). Weber’s model called for the division of labor based upon a specified sphere of competency along with the hierarchy of authority where each lower office is under the immediate control and supervision of another.

Organizations needed a specified set of rules that would be applied uniformly throughout the organization. Weber insisted upon the maintenance of impersonal relationships, because the rational decisions should be made objectively and without emotions. Of great importance to the field of law enforcement is the notion of promotion based upon competence rather than other non-important issues (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1990).

Weber’s theory of bureaucracy-including the concepts of administrative regulations, rational legal authority, and criteria for individual office holders-has dominated the field of law enforcement in America. Weber emphasized that the rational legal administrative officials would be able to function in all sorts of contexts and situations (Weber, 1947, p. 21-22). Weber’s theory of managerial style became the tradition among contemporary police administrators. Most of today’s law enforcement administrators have operated in and been promoted within bureaucratic organizations. The organizations hold dearly the concepts of rationality, hierarchy, specialization, and positional authority (Leonard & More, 1982, p. 24). It is easily foreseeable that change from such a historical and solid theory would be extremely difficult. Change does not come easy, especially when many administrators possess their current position having matured in the bureaucratic style of organizational management.

Weber's bureaucracy theory was found to have deficiencies, as did previous management theories. William Bourns, in *Bureaucracy Adaptation: A Comparison of Classical Weberian Bureaucracy and Street Level Bureaucracy of Police Departments* (1994), found that Weber's theory lacked a relationship between the supervisor and the subordinate. He argued that the interaction was impersonal and objective. He contends, "Weber never took into consideration the support of the community because bureaucracies were rational-legal authorities on their own merit and standing" (Bourns, 1994, p. 129). Bourns suggested that bureaucracies did not allow administrators latitude in a personalized way to a specific case. Bourns' argument parallels the demise of previous theories in that they failed to provide primary consideration and concern for the employee. Bureaucracy and previous theories benefited the organization rather than the subordinates. Bourns contends that "Bureaucratic members possess the authority of office and cultivate a life long career" and "They operate the levers of power which often pit bureaucrats against citizens and politicians" (Bourns, 1994, p. 26"). Bourns' and Wilson's observations are crucial in the debate for change from the bureaucratic style of management. The important issue of citizenry involvement and their scrutiny placed upon law enforcement is one of the most vital topics in the change of managerial styles. Modern agencies and administrative officials must be able to work with and be trusted by the people. If the bureaucratic style of management cannot provide unity and understanding, another style must be implemented.

Lee Potts, in *Responsible Police Administration* (1983), continues the debate

by suggesting that the “police do, and must, exercise great discretion in executing their duties” (p. 73). He adds that discretion must be controlled. Potts contends that the bureaucratic style does not allow subordinates the responsibility to make decisions without the individual being subjected to direction from officials in the hierarchy above them. The argument is valid when line officers are heard stating, “the top has no idea what’s going on down here”. The decisions made by line officers may not express the decision made by those in administration. It does not mean that either side is correct, rather that there is no voice of the line officer in the bureaucratic style of management.

Potts is strong in his opinion that the bureaucratic practice precludes discretionary or innovative activity by low-level members of the organization. He argues that bureaucracy ignores the suggestions of the “informal organization and the ‘web’ of un-programmed relations and group norms that arrive from the shared experiences of everyday work” (Potts, 1983, p. 74). The view is that the line officer operates in an environment of initiative and discretion. These elements collide with the elements of bureaucratic management in that the line officer is held accountable to the authority of the administration. There is an established set of rules and guidelines in which the officer has to submit to and in some cases these decisions contradict each other. M. L. Dantzker, in *Police Organization and Management* (1999), states

Bureaucracies are grounded in rules and the legitimate exercise of hierarchical power in their application. Employees are expected to make decisions by a universal application of the rules in their domain of power. In theory, they

have no discretion in their application, and all decisions are open to review by superiors to whom they are accountable (p. 24).

Line officers need the full utilization of all tools offered to them by their position.

The officers should not be subjected to restriction based upon the potentially outdated bureaucratic style of management.

Many police science scholars (Bourne, Potts, and Wilson) agree that the benefits of the bureaucratic style of management may not be as effective as previously thought. That is not to say that the bureaucratic style is not functional, rather that law enforcement may be better served by some other means of operation. The deficiencies of bureaucratic management open the door for a new theory of management. Perhaps the change from management to leadership will resolve this issue. It could also be stated that the door is open for transformational leadership.

Leadership History

The study of leadership and its attributes are foundational elements within the study of administration. As noted by Stogdill (1974), "The study of leadership rivals in age the disciplines of psychology, which shaped the leaders as much as it was shaped by them." (p. 11). The study of leadership has been the study of leaders-what they did and why. (Stogdill, 1974, p. 11). Leadership principles emerged in the early stages of the development of the Egyptian, Egyptian

VI

LEADERSHIP

The topic surrounding the concepts of leadership is the first major focus of the thesis. Before one can argue the transition to a transformational leadership style of administration, one must first identify the characteristics of the term leadership.

Next, the major components of leadership must be identified, and the comparisons and contrasts to those concepts of traditional management must be addressed. This chapter will attempt to define leadership so that a workable definition can be utilized throughout the thesis. The concepts surrounding leadership vs. management will be discussed along with the application of situational leadership practices (contingency theory and path-goal leadership). This chapter will conclude with the investigation of transactional and charismatic leadership principles, which will be essential for the study of transformational leadership. The previously stated guidelines will prove to be crucial in the understanding of transformational leadership attributes.

Leadership History

The study into leadership and its attributes are foundational elements within the study of civilization. Bass and Stogdill contend, "The study of leadership rivals in age the emergence of civilization, which shaped its leaders as much as it was shaped by them. From its infancy, the study of history has been the study of leaders-what they did and why they did it" (Bass & Stogdill, 1990, p. 3). Leadership principles emerged in the early philosophical principles of the Egyptians. Egyptian

hieroglyphics established leadership (*seshemet*), leader (*seshemu*), and the follower (*shemsu*) over five thousand years ago. The Egyptians clearly defined a distinction between those leading and those following. The Chinese classics written in the early 16th century B.C. include advice to leaders concerning their followers. Confucius instructed leaders to set a moral example and to manipulate a system of rewards and punishments. "Taoism emphasized the need for the leader to work himself out of his job by making the people believe that successes were due to their efforts" (Bass & Stogdill, 1990, p. 3). The Greek concepts of leadership were illustrated in Homer's *Iliad*, where heroes inspired leadership along with law and order. The Greeks considered: 1) justice and judgment 2) wisdom and counsel 3) shrewdness and cunningness and 4) valor and activism as premier qualities; however, it should be noted that modern leadership no longer considers shrewdness and cunningness as leadership qualities. Plato considered the leader to be the most essential element in good government, and Aristotle noted the lack of virtue in leadership (Bass & Stogdill, 1990, p. 4). Machiavelli, in the *Prince*, stated "there is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success, than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things" (Bass & Stogdill, 1990, p. 4). Machiavelli established important tools such as steadiness, firmness, and concern, to which leaders must gain from the people. The only problem was that Machiavelli argued that if the support of the people could not be gained through those techniques, elements such as craftiness, deceit, threats, treachery, and violence were required. Obviously the previous elements are not positive tools for a democratic

society. G. F. Hegel's 19th century work, the *Philosophy of Mind*, argued "by first serving as a follower, a leader subsequently can best understand his followers" (Bass & Stogdill, 1990, p. 4). Hegel's thoughts are utilized in leadership theory today. Great importance is placed on first being a follower before one is a leader.

Leadership has been an elementary tool since the beginning of humankind. Leadership has also evolved through time as different scholars have added new concepts to the term. In some respects, concepts have been deleted in order to meet current trends or norms of society. The focal point is on the modern day democratic society and how leadership is viewed and defined.

Leadership Defined

James MacGregor Burns, in *Leadership* (1978) contends "One of the most universal cravings of our time is a hunger for compelling and creative leadership" and that "We fail to grasp the essence of leadership that is relevant to the modern age and hence we cannot agree even on the standards by which to measure, recruit, and reject it" (p. 2). Burns's comments open the door for the continued study of leadership principles and the application of those principles for a more effective and efficient means of guiding others through specific task. Arguably, it will only be through the continued research into leadership that more effective methods of operation are discovered. Burns (1978) suggests that leadership "over human beings is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse,

engage, and satisfy the motives of followers” (p. 18). The reason for this is to realize the goals mutually held by both leaders and followers. Leadership, like power, is relational, collective, and purposeful. Leaders are actual or potential power holders although not all power holders are leaders. Burns contends that a crucial variable in leadership is purpose. In this case, leadership is defined as “making followers do what followers would not otherwise do, or as leaders making followers do what the leaders want them to do” (p. 19). It would then appear as though leadership is the power by which things happen or get done. Even though this is a very simple concept, there is more to leadership than just this concept. Burns states “leadership is inseparable from followers’ needs and goals” (p. 19). Burns’s theory of leadership suggests a union between the goals of the leader and the follower. Burns states, “The essence of the leader-follower relation is the interaction of persons with different levels of motivations and power potential, including skill, in pursuit of a common or at least joint purpose” (p. 20). The interaction between the leader and follower has been the established basis for leadership theories. The question then becomes which concepts are the most beneficial or suitable for the organization or environment? Part of the rationale for this thesis is to investigate the probable transition from bureaucratic management to transformational leadership in the field of law enforcement. The concepts behind leader and follower relationships will prove to be critical in the investigation. For the purpose of this thesis, leadership will be defined as, “the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively, and the process of facilitating individual and

collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives” (Yukl, 2002, p. 7). Leadership is the act of intentional influence exerted by one person (the leader) over another (the follower) in order to guide the other person in structured activities within an organization. Jurkanin, Dowling, Hoover, and Ahmad (2001) found that in order for leadership to occur, “there must exist a sense of loyalty, confidence, and pride among the leader, those who follow and those who are served” (p. 31). There is no doubt that law enforcement officials are prideful, and in many respects loyal, at both the administrative and subordinate level. It could be argued that those who are served (citizenry) may or may not be prideful of or loyal to the law enforcement agencies within their jurisdictions. The issue will not be debated in this thesis, but the relevance of the concept is notable in establishing a change in the way in which law enforcement agencies have been lead and the way they are to be lead in the future. Public scrutiny has proved to be extremely powerful in the judgment of leadership within law enforcement organizations.

Leadership is associated with:

1. Influence- Process of altering, impacting, changing attitudes, behaviors, values, or beliefs.
2. Authority- The right to lead.
3. Power- The ability to lead or command, or more precisely, to influence others.
4. Politics- Organizational politics involves the use of power and authority to enhance or protect a person, a career, work unit, or department.
5. Conflict- Situations involving the perceptions of incompatible goals and the resistance or interference of one or both parties in attempting to achieve goals. (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1990, p. 192)

The concepts of influence, authority, power, politics, and conflict provide an important foundation for understanding leadership. These concepts are crucially important for the law enforcement leader since the concepts are inseparable from the everyday position of police administrator and street patrol officer. The police administrator will exercise the previous concepts within the organization, and the patrol officer will utilize the concepts in interaction with the public.

Leadership style can be viewed from three theoretical perspectives. The perspectives are: trait, behavioral, and situational or contingency. Certain individual traits are important for leaders, especially those within the field of law enforcement. Leaders should have vision or the creation of a desirable state of affairs that is inspirational. Vision will be instrumental in the recognition of change within the field of law enforcement and specifically for the proposed transition from bureaucratic management to transformational leadership. The leader will recognize the need and formulate the vision for the future. Leaders must also have great communication skills. Communication is the ability to present the vision clearly, effectively, and in a manner that enlists support. Not only will the leader be required to effectively communicate within the organization, but they must also be able to communicate with the public. Many times law enforcement activities come under public criticism. In many cases, there is simply a misunderstanding of how officers are trained to respond to a situation. With the administrators effectively communicating with the public, many of those scenarios could be resolved positively instead of negatively. Leaders must act in a persistent manner. They must never give up regardless of the

obstacles that they will encounter. Change does not come easily; however, administrators must be willing to work through the difficult times seeking answers and formulating resolutions. Leaders must have the ability of empowerment. Empowerment is the ability to design a system that will efficiently utilize the energy of others to accomplish the vision. As law enforcement visualizes the need for change, they must empower others to assist with the transition. Leaders must sell the vision to others, and they must incorporate the ideas of subordinates. Good leadership incorporates organizational ability. Leaders must have the capacity to oversee, learn from mistakes, and make use of what is learned to improve organizational performance. As mistakes are made, leaders will learn from those past mistakes and seek visionary improvements for the future. Leadership will be a must in order to make a change in the way in which law enforcement has been lead. More importantly for a law enforcement leader, administrators must have the characteristics of integrity, common sense, intelligence, open mindedness, self- control, and self-confidence (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1990, p. 198). The ability to be open minded should not only be the trait of the officer within the community in dealing with the public, but it should also be performed by administrators who lead within the organization.

Roberg and Kuykendall (1990) have identified four different types of leadership that are applicable for the field of law enforcement. Directed leadership allows the subordinates knowledge of what is expected of them. It maintains a standard of performance and expects compliance within those standards. Supportive

leadership is characterized by friendliness, approachability, and the concern for the needs of subordinates (p. 206). In many respects, approachability has been a major factor within the bureaucratic environment. Subordinates rarely feel as though they can contact administrative staff. Those barriers need to be removed for effective leadership. In law enforcement, subordinates need psychological and emotional support more so than expectations and clarification. Participated leadership allows for the consultation of subordinates by asking for suggestions and using employees input in making decisions. This technique will help employees understand what is expected of them, and it creates a greater commitment to goals (p. 206). Achievement oriented leadership incorporates setting challenging goals for subordinates and expecting them to strive towards the fulfillment of those goals. The technique allows the subordinate to feel more responsible, which generates more confidence in their ability to perform effectively. With subordinates performing more effectively, the organization can only run more efficiently.

Leadership attributes and style incorporates some very powerful concepts, which should be beneficial to any organization. The main goal is to establish a relationship between the administrator and the subordinate that will improve confidence at all levels and improve overall organizational efficiency. The act of comparing leadership traits and management traits will assist in illustrating the benefits of leadership.

Leadership vs. Management

Jurkanin et al. (2001) claim that leadership “is distinguishable from management in that leadership includes vision” (p. 31). Roberg and Kuykendall (1990) agree by suggesting that “Leadership may be considered more esoteric and abstract and primarily concerned with the future,” and that “Management may be identified with the more immediate and pragmatic concerns related to administering an organization, program, or work unit” (p. 189). It remains obvious that a person can be a leader without being a manager, and a person can be a manager without being a leader. The important factor is distinguishing the differences and illustrating the positive components of leaders as they can benefit and assist the efficiency of law enforcement.

Dantzker (1999) argues, “Probably one of the greatest misconceptions among police administrators is that management and leadership are synonymous” (p. 77). Management can be defined as an element that leads, directs, or manages the organization toward its goals. While leadership is that entity “which influences and motivates others to enthusiastically fulfill their roles” (p. 78). The transition to leadership by the law enforcement administrator will involve concepts of interaction with subordinates. Interaction with subordinates is necessary in order to motivate them to complete tasks with enthusiasm.

Managers seek stability, order, and efficiency. Leaders seek flexibility, innovation, and adaptation. There can be no question that law enforcement organizations require stability and order. The focus is that the organizations also

require innovation as the times change with technology advancements and social issues. Police administrators must be willing to adapt to societal changes along with changes in the beliefs of subordinates. Managers are more concerned with how things get done, and they try to get people to perform better. The leader is concerned with what things are priorities to people, and they try to get people to agree about the most important things to be done. Leaders, in effect, allow the subordinates to have a voice in the interaction process of completing task. Traditional law enforcement has been guided with the “by the book” philosophy curtailed by the “this is how it has always been done” mentality, both of which have proven to return negative results from subordinates. The gift of interaction and inclusion allows the subordinates to accept some form of blame if the tasks are not completed successfully. Yukl suggests “managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing” (Yukl, 2002, p. 5).

Management tends to seek predictability and order by: 1) setting operational goals, establishing action plans with timetables, allocating resources, 2) organizing and staffing, and 3) monitoring results and solving problems. Leaders, on the other hand, seek to produce organizational change by: 1) developing a vision of the future and strategies for making necessary changes, 2) communicating and explaining the vision, 3) motivating and inspiring people to attain the vision (Yukl, 2002, p. 6).

Strong management tends to discourage risk taking and innovation, and it can lead to bureaucracy (which law enforcement has existed in for over a century).

Leadership principles advocate the skills necessary for change and allow the

members to be critically involved in the change process. It is instrumental for both administrators and subordinates to recognize that they each have something mutually at stake. Collaborating on visionary ideas and working together should increase the chance for success. Situational theories will further assist in explaining the leader/follower relationship.

Situational Leadership

Situational leadership theories help to explain which leadership approach is appropriate for the given situation. In many cases, the way in which the leader interacts with the subordinate for a given situation will determine the outcome of the task. Leaders have the ability to create positive or negative results just by the way in which a given situation is handled. Situational theories help to determine how leader traits or behaviors are related to leadership effectiveness in different situations. F. E. Fiedler's contingency model will be discussed along with the path-goal leadership theory. The theories will assist in the understanding of transformational leadership, as the leader takes into consideration the needs of the follower and the impact of decisions that will be made for a given situation. It should be noted that these principles are designed for leadership development and the increased effectiveness of an organization through the use of positive interaction between the leader and the follower. These concepts in no way should interfere with the sometimes life saving decisions that are made by the street level officer in the performance of everyday tasks and duties. There should be no confusion with respect to these leadership

principles and the response that an officer has on a given call. These principles are designed to apply to the leader/follower relationship within the organization.

Contingency Theory

Research in the 1960's and 1970's sought to determine which leadership styles were the most effective in different types of situations. Contingency theory resulted from that research. Fiedler argues that, "a person may be a very effective leader in one situation but very ineffective in another" (Fiedler & Chemers, 1974, p. 73). Contingency theory is defined as that "which the performance of a group is *contingent* upon both the motivational system of the leader and the degree to which the leader has control and influence in a particular situation" (p. 73). Fiedler's contingency theory was a major contributor to the study of situational leadership approaches. Fiedler's approach was unique because it suggested that a leader's effectiveness could be improved through the use of structuring the job to fit his or her own personal style. Fiedler argued that it is easier to change a leader's work environment than it is to change his or her style or personality (p.96-97). With respect to law enforcement, many administrators are promoted up through the ranks by either direct staff promotion or testing. In many cases, these promotions are not personality focused but rather political or test oriented. Fiedler's model of changing the work environment is crucial in the proposed paradigm shift from the law enforcement bureaucratic style of management to the leadership traits of a transformational leader. By changing the work environment from bureaucratic to

transformational, it is expected that followers will have increased self worth, increased productivity, and essential skills for future leadership.

Fiedler's concept is a two-fold leadership style that emphasizes task organization and human relations (including individual goals and relationships among people). John Schermerhorn, Jr. (1996) argues "good leadership depends on a match between leadership style and situational demands" (p. 326). The successful leader has the ability to adjust their style depending on the readiness of followers to perform in a given situation. The foundation for positive leadership results rest in the fact that contingency theory allows room for consideration of the follower. As the transition is made from a strict organizational (only) focused style of management to a flexible environment of cohesive leadership, the organization has the potential for greater success in the completion of tasks.

Path-Goal Theory

Path-goal leadership is another important situational theory that needs to be addressed. Concepts within path-goal leadership will also be found in transformational leadership. Building upon an earlier version by M. G. Evans (1970), House (1971) formulated a theory that included situational variables. House argued that:

The motivational function of the leader consists of increasing personal payoffs to subordinates for work-goal attainment and making the path to these payoffs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing roadblocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction en route (House, 1971, p. 324).

The leader has the task of motivating subordinates, increasing their performance, and increasing their job satisfaction. The leader's effectiveness will be measured by the success in accomplishing these goals. Leaders must motivate subordinates by clarifying how goals are to be accomplished, including organizational and personal goals. The leader in effect nurtures the subordinate through the utilization of vision (understanding the current state and visualizing the path to success, both personally and organizationally).

Path-goal theory suggests "the effect of leader behavior on subordinate satisfaction and effort depends on aspects of the situation, including task characteristics and subordinate characteristics" (Yukl, 2002, p. 213). The situational variables can determine the potential for increased motivation and the way in which the leader must act to improve motivation. Motivation attributes are essential within the negative or "dark side" realm of day-to-day law enforcement task. Leaders must have the ability to motivate subordinates to function in an environment that can be hostile and, in some cases, fatal. The situational variables can also affect subordinate preference for a particular pattern of leadership behavior, which can influence the impact of the leader on subordinate satisfaction (Yukl, 2002, p. 213). With the focus of change on management to leadership and the change from a bureaucratic system to a transformational system, one can see the potential impact that the subordinates will have in the process. The subordinate will determine if the leader's behavior is either beneficial or non beneficial for them. In order for success to occur or for an organization to become more efficient, a style that is viewed positively by the

subordinate would be in the best interest of the organization.

The essential goal of path-goal leadership is to define specific leadership behaviors, which will contribute to the follower's successful completion of task. The leader is to "provide support to the follower; alleviate boredom and frustration with work, especially in times of stress; coaching; provide direction; and foster the follower's expectations that his or her efforts will lead to the successful completion of the task" (Bass & Stogdill, 1990, p. 627). The leader should only compliment what is missing in any given situation by enhancing the subordinates motivation, satisfaction, and performance. There should be an increase in the subordinates productivity or efficiency based upon the leader's clarity with the subordinate. Provided that the leader supports clear task and roles, followed by consideration, support, and attention to the subordinate's personal and interpersonal needs for satisfying relationships, the leader will undoubtedly provide the opportunity for increased productivity (Bass & Stogdill, 1990, p. 627).

Situational leadership theories provide for greater interaction among the leader and follower relationship. With the leader considering the factors (or variables) involved in a situation and having the ability to adapt to or apply a style that befits the situation, there exists a greater chance for a successful completion of the task. The leader/follower relationship tends to succeed when the leader motivates the follower and then the follower is given a clear vision of the path ahead. The leader's ability to grasp concepts surrounding contingency theory and path-goal leadership will provide necessary attributes for the transformational leader.

Transactional Leadership

It is important to briefly discuss transactional leadership before a comprehensive discussion on transformational leadership can occur. Transactional leadership is often used to describe leaders who combine the insights of both the leader behavior and situational theories, especially the path-goal theory (Schermerhorn, 1996, p. 332). The leader utilizes a variety of transactions with the followers and adjusts tasks, rewards, and structures to help followers meet their personal needs while working to complete organizational objectives (p. 332). Bernard Bass, in *Leadership Beyond Expectations* (1985), suggests the transactional leader “pursues a cost-benefit, economic exchange to meet subordinates current material and psychic needs in return for contracted services rendered by the subordinate” (p. 14). Bass (1985) extends James MacGregor Burns definition (exchanging one thing for another) of transactional leadership to include not only a general exchange but also the supervisory-subordinate relationship. Bass describes the transactional leader’s relationship with subordinates as follows: 1) Recognizes what it is we want to get from our work and tries to see that we get what we want if our performance warrants it, 2) Exchanges rewards and promises of reward for our effort, and 3) Is responsive to our immediate self-interest if they can be met by our getting the work done (Bass, 1985, p. 11). Transactional leaders “serve to recognize and clarify the role and task requirements for the subordinates” and “recognize what the subordinates need and want and clarify how these needs and wants will be satisfied” (p. 13). In many ways, managers are transactional leaders because they

tend to compare the subordinate's needs and set goals for them based on the subordinate's effort. The managers do not question the goals of the organization, and they focus on compromise, intrigue, and control. When these managers are viewed within an organization, they are often seen as "inscrutable, detached, and manipulative" (p. 13). In many respects within law enforcement, there appears to be a correlation between the managers of the bureaucratic environment and those managers who follow transactional leadership. Law enforcement officials have previously been defined as being detached from the needs of the subordinates and in some cases the community. There exists a need for improvement over transactional leadership. Transformational leadership will build upon the concepts of the transactional leader in order to form a style of leadership that is viewed more favorably by the subordinates.

Transactional leadership, having similarities with contingency theory, is best described as the exchange process that can occur between the leader and follower. Transactional leadership can also create an environment that closely relates to the bureaucratic environment. Bass (1985, p. 11) describes the transactional relationship between leader and follower:

1. Recognizes what is it is we want to get from our work and tries to see that we get what we want if our performance warrants it.
2. Exchanges rewards and promises of reward for our effort.
3. Is responsive to our immediate self-interest if they can be met by our getting the work done.

Transformational leadership will build upon the exchange process of transactional leaders by adding elements of transformation that lead to a deeper relationship between leader and follower. The topic will be explained further in the chapter concerning transformational leadership. Transactional leadership is introduced at this point so that there will be a foundation for further building in the next chapter.

Charismatic Leadership

The topic of charismatic leadership must be explored prior to discussing the topic of transformational leadership. The goal of explaining leadership topics and theories has been to illustrate the components of those theories and how they will assist in explaining the birth of transformational leadership. The processes of leadership training have also undergone an evolutionary process by which, new theories are comprised of elements from previous theories. In order to meet the changing demands of society and the subordinate force, one must be willing to change and adapt to new styles of leadership. Charismatic leadership will be the final theory discussed before investigating transformational leadership. Components of charismatic leadership will be crucial in understanding the deeply inspired relationship between the leader and follower in a transformational environment.

Max Weber (1947) described the charismatic individual as “an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers

or qualities” (p. 358). Weber argued that charisma was of a divine origin and that the individual who possessed it had a “duty” to recognize its quality and to act accordingly (p. 359). Weber described charisma as “the greatest revolutionary force capable of producing a completely new orientation through follower’s complete personal devotion to leaders they perceived as endowed with almost magical, supernatural, superhuman qualities and power” (Burns, 2003, p.25).

The characteristics of charisma are influenced by the leader and the follower. The charismatic leader develops special leader/follower relationships and inspires followers in extra-ordinary ways (Schermerhorn, 1996, p. 332). Bass (1985) contends that the “extent to which followers are ready to endow leaders with charisma depends on the personality of the followers as much as on their leaders” (p. 36). The relationship between the leader and follower in the charismatic environment is extremely strong. Charismatic leadership arises when the environment is in such crisis or chaos that traditional methods appear to have failed. Bass (1985) argues that organizational cultures in transition are ripe for charismatic leadership and that charismatic leadership arises when traditional authority, rational, and bureaucratic means have failed (p. 37).

The challenges facing law enforcement today and the imposed change from the bureaucratic system could open the door for such a charismatic leader. The problem is that “pure” charismatic leadership “distorts the constructive and mutually empowering leader-follower relationship” because “followers can become so loyal or obeisant, that even when measured in the millions, they can have little effect on the

leader beyond gratifying his own psychological hungers” (Burns, 2003, p. 26). A key point for law enforcement and for this study is that charismatic leadership is a “lopsided or exotic form of transforming leadership that does not exclude the subjective but integrates it with multiple other factors” (p. 27). Organizational scholars David A. Nedler and Michael L. Tushman contend that the strongest elements of charismatic leadership are “envisioning, energizing, and enabling”. The previous elements are more along the lines of the transformational leader, which is achieved not by enslaving followers but by “liberating and empowering them” (p. 27).

It is evident that the some of the characteristics of charismatic leadership will prove to be instrumental in the discussion of transformational leadership. The characteristic of charisma is obviously not beneficial in its pure form, but with respect to leader/follower interaction and in vision, motivation, and enabling. Different components of multiple leadership styles will be utilized in the definition of and the explanation of transformational leadership. By understanding the foundational components, it is hopeful that a structure of transformational leadership can be built upon the groundwork of leadership skills.

VII

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The second major focus of this thesis is to investigate the possible transition from a bureaucratic style of management in law enforcement to a leadership role in a transformational environment. Having discussed leadership in detail in chapter six, this chapter will explore the facets of transformational leadership. The focus will be on an explanation of what it is to be transformational and what the relevant attributes are for the transformational leader. Topics concerning *values* and *ethics* will be discussed as essential elements of the transformational leader. The chapter will conclude with the possible application of transformational leadership for the law enforcement community.

Transformational Process

The process of transformational leadership began with James MacGregor Burns's 1978 publication, *Leadership*. Burns compared and contrasted transactional leadership with what Burns defined as transformational leadership. Burns wanted to make a leadership distinction between power holding and brute power. He argued that most relationships between leader and follower were transactional in that,

Leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions. Such transactions comprise the bulk of the relationships among leaders and followers, especially in groups, legislatures, and parties. Transforming leadership, while more complex, is more potent. The transforming leader recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower. But, beyond that, the

transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents (p. 4).

Burns original work on transformational leadership had a strong political message.

Burns created an aspect of transformational leadership in which he entitled moral leadership. Burns established that leaders and followers raised one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Burns contends that transforming leadership “ultimately becomes *moral* in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both” (p. 20). Burns used Gandhi as an example of one who “aroused and elevated the hopes and demands of millions of Indians and whose life and personality were enhanced in the process” (p. 20). Burns’s final point was that, “Leaders address themselves to followers’ wants, needs, and other motivations, as well as to their own and thus they serve as an independent force in changing the makeup of the follower’s motive base through gratifying their motives” (p. 20).

To clarify, Burns’s transformational leadership appeals to the moral values of followers in an effort to raise their consciousness about ethical issues and to focus their resources on reform institutions, while transactional leadership motivates followers by appealing to their self-interest (Yukl, 2002, p. 241). Rivka Amado (1999) found that organizational vision could be found through both transactional and transformational leadership. The distinction was that in transactional leadership, “employees are ‘instruments’ who are expected to comply with leaders demands with

no regards to their own self-fulfillment or their own ideas for innovation” (p. 251).

Amado stresses that transactional leadership can be effective at times but it is not likely to enhance ethical concerns and the sense of responsibility that it implies.

Amado suggests that the transformational leadership process “attempts to bring an induced change in the follower’s beliefs and values to accomplish organization’s purpose” (p.251).

In 1985, Bernard Bass published *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, which built upon Burns’s transformational leadership theory and also contrasted the new theory to transactional leadership. Bass found that transformational leadership and transactional leadership were distinct but not mutually exclusive processes. Bass contended that transformational leadership was an extension of transactional leadership. Bass defined the transformational leader as one who “motivates us to do more than we originally expected to do” and that such expectation was based “on our original level of confidence in reaching desired, designated outcomes by means of our performance” (p. 20). Bass suggested that a transformation could be achieved in any one of three inter-related ways:

1. By raising our level of awareness, our level of consciousness about the importance and value of designated outcomes, and ways of reaching them.
2. By getting us to transcend our own self-interest for the sake of the team, organization, or larger polity.
3. By altering our need level on Maslow’s (or Alderfer’s) hierarchy or expanding our portfolio of needs and wants. (p. 20)

It should be noted that Bass's definition of transformational leadership differed in three ways from Burns's. Bass added 1) the expansion of the followers needs and wants, 2) what matters is that follower's attitudes and behavior were transformed by the leader's performance, and 3) most leaders will exhibit a variety of patterns of transformational and transactional leadership [Most leaders do both but in different amounts] (p. 22).

Schermerhorn (1996) states "that transformational leadership describes someone who uses charisma and related qualities to raise aspirations and shift people and organizational systems into new high performance patterns" (p. 332). He notes that transformational leadership is also inspirational because it guides followers to achieve extraordinary performance in a context of large scaled innovation and change (p. 332). Bass supports the addition of charisma in the transformational leadership process by contending that, "Charismatic leaders are transformational in that they, themselves, have much to do with the further arousal and articulation of such feelings of need among followers," because "Charismatic leaders have insight into the need, values, and hopes of their followers" (Bass, 1985, p. 46). Transformational leadership includes the characteristics of the charismatic leader. The information to this point suggests that transformational leadership includes characteristics of both the transactional and charismatic leader.

According to Schermerhorn (1996) transformational leader qualities include:

1. Vision-having ideas and a clear sense of direction; communicating them to others, developing excitement about accomplishing shared "dreams."

2. Charisma-arousing others enthusiasm, faith, loyalty, pride, and trust in themselves through the power of personal preference and appeals to emotion.
3. Symbolism- identifying “heroes” offering special rewards, and holding spontaneous and planned ceremonies to celebrate excellence and high achievement.
4. Empowerment-helping others develop, removing performance obstacles, sharing responsibilities, and delegating truly challenging work.
5. Intellectual Stimulation-gaining the involvement of others by creating awareness of problems and stirring their imagination to create high quality solutions.
6. Integrity- being honest and credible, acting consistently out of personal conviction, and meeting commitments by following through. (p. 332)

All of the above listed attributes will substantially raise the confidence, aspirations, and commitments of followers. One of the main reasons for suggesting a transfer to transformational leadership is to increase not only the efficiency of the agency (which is made up of followers), but to increase the feeling of inclusion among the officers. The transformational environment appears to describe the desired results that have been lacking in the field of law enforcement. Transformational attributes will be crucial for the 21st century law enforcement leader. Leaders within the transformational environment are embedded in integrity, honesty, credibility, and consistency into putting values into action. Leaders have the responsibility to set ethical standards to guide the behavior of followers (p. 334).

Transformational leadership, like all of the previously addressed and described leadership theories, also has some proposed deficiencies. Yukl (2002) addresses that the transformational leadership theory falters in that it has “ambiguous constructs, insufficient descriptions of explanatory processes, a narrow focus on

dyadic processes, omission of some relevant behaviors, insufficient specification of situational variables, and a bias toward heroic conceptions of leadership” (p. 262). Yukl explains that despite the theories positive features, it needs to be more descriptive in the underlying influence processes which is the reciprocal influence processes that occurs among the followers themselves. Yukl also contends that the theory does not explain how leaders build exceptional teams or transform organizations. Yukl suggests that the theory needs more attention in describing situational variables to determine whether charismatic or transformational leadership will occur. It could be argued that Burns and Bass address Yukl’s proposed deficiencies in their foundation literature, as stated at the beginning of this chapter.

Burns states that:

Our search has been for an explanation of the human role in change, of leadership conceived as a dynamic, fluid system of leaders and followers that has deep casual impact. We want to understand not only what has been but what might be. A theory, after all, draws upon the past, but is valued for its capacity to describe the future, for its powers of forecast. Yet a theory of leadership will never be precise in its predictions because its raw material is the most enigmatic of phenomena-human wants and other motivations, human beliefs and intentions and actions. We can indicate the principles and patterns of the leadership process, point out its origins and ends, mark out its stages, suggests its variations and also its universality-how it might work in an Indian village or a Wall Street brokerage, a revolutionary movement or a house of parliament. We can hope to provide a common frame, a basis for continuing investigations. What we cannot do is to give a final answer, to extinguish all the perplexities and paradoxes inherent in this most fateful of human actions (Burns, 2003, p. 214).

Yukl’s described deficiencies may or may not be a valid. The scope of this thesis is not to debate that argument, but rather to list the possible deficiencies. Interestingly, Burns does make a valid point in that no theory of leadership could possibly explain

all of the complex issues surrounding man and his ways of leadership. Perhaps the reason for this is that man and the leadership process is in a constant state of evolution. The thesis has described the evolutionary process that has taken place in the field of law enforcement, police administration, and leadership theory. As times change, the need for further inquiry and the establishment of new theories will assist man with techniques for success. Hence, the proposed paradigm shifts for leaders within the field of law enforcement. Not only from the standpoint of changing from manager to leaders but changing the practice of leadership from bureaucratic to transformational.

Leader Attributes

The personal attributes of the transformational leader are essential for establishing the transformational environment. Change must begin with the leaders themselves possessing the personal skills and attributes necessary for the transformational environment. Transformational leaders or *Self Defining* leaders are:

- Concerned about values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals.
- Self-contained and self- defining.
- Able to grant others autonomy and individuality.
- Concerned about others without feeling responsibility for their self esteem.
- Articulate clear long- term goals and standards.
- Bases decisions on broad view of the situation, not just immediate factors.

(Bass & Avolio, 1994, p. 20). The transformational leader has the ability to separate the “needs of individual followers from the needs of the leader and the team and, at critical times, align many of these needs to maximize both performance and development” (p. 20). Bass and Avolio (1994) contend that transformational leadership is based upon the compliance of the follower or the establishment of agreements: “It involves shifts in follower’s beliefs, values, needs, and capabilities” (p. 12).

Transformational leaders have at their very core the essence of values and ethics. Burns (2003) suggests that “leaders embrace values; values grip leaders” and “the stronger the value systems, the more strongly leaders can be empowered and the more deeply leaders can empower followers” (p. 211). The transformational environment, having been discussed, includes needs, wants, motivation, creativity, conflict and power. Burns argues, “at its heart lie values” (p. 211). One of the perplexing negatives facing law enforcement today is in the area of values (and ethics). The proposed shift to the transformational environment, which has values and ethics engrained, should cause a shift in the negative way in which law enforcement is viewed by the public and internally. Simply put, values strengthen the leader’s capacity to reach out to wider audiences and to gain support from broader arrays. Values are power resources for a leadership “that would transform society for the fuller realization of the highest moral purpose” (p. 213).

Joanne B. Ciulla, a leading scholar in the field of ethics, defines the study of

ethics as “what we should do and what we should be” (Ciulla, 2003, p. xi). She notes that:

Ethics is about right, wrong, good, evil and the relationship of humans to each other and to other living things. Leadership is a particular type of relationship, the hallmark of which are power/or influence, obligation, and responsibility (p. xi).

Ethics in leadership terms “are the criteria for the way leaders and followers interact as they attempt to influence one another and other people” (Burns, 2003, p. 28). It is beneficial to recall that Burns described transformational leadership as moral leadership. Bass and Steidlmeier (1998) suggests that the ethics of leadership rests upon three pillars: “1) the moral character of the leader 2) the ethical values embedded in the leader’s vision, articulation, and program which followers either embrace or reject and 3) the morality of the processes of social ethical choice and action that leaders and followers engage in and collectively pursue” (p. 2). Bass and Steidlmeier agree that transformational leaders set examples “to be emulated by their followers” and as Burns suggested, “When leaders are more morally mature, those they lead display higher moral reasoning” (p. 2).

The positive attributes of the transformational leader appear to have a transferability effect toward the followers. With the elements of values and ethics at the core of the transformational leader, it appears that law enforcement is ripe for the shift to a transformational environment. The foundational elements of transformational leadership, along with the attributes of the transformational leader, will be instrumental in the proposed shift in the law enforcement environment.

Law Enforcement Application

The study of leadership and the applicable style of transformational leadership are discussed in several literary police administrator sources. The sources describe the components of leadership along with the elements of transformational leadership. Whereas the sources contain an abundance of information on the topics of leadership and transformational leadership (in descriptive theory form), there is little empirical research concerning the application of those principles in the law enforcement environment. The purpose of this study is to suggest a shift in law enforcement from traditional management skills to those of modern leadership and to propose a change from the bureaucratic environment to one that is transformational. Support for the change from the bureaucratic environment to the transformational environment will come through the use of research that has been conducted by law enforcements nearest relative, the military. With the lack of application research material for the field of law enforcement, this study will utilize the research material conducted in the military environment that has several similarities to the law enforcement environment.

It was Leonard Fuld who suggested that, "Historically the police is the child of the military" (Fuld, 1971, p. 7). The American military and police services are currently both voluntary forces that are entrusted with the safety of American citizens from enemies both foreign and domestic. Current trends in international terrorism have brought the domestic police services and military into an even closer relationship. The forces share similarities in that they each perform very stressful and

dangerous duties. Each operates in a bureaucratic environment that generally includes the utilization of policies and procedures. The forces have a rank structure that supports the duty to follow orders. They each have a long history of heroism and honor that has been the stability of which these forces have existed. Although the forces are not exact matches, it is possible that their similarities are sufficient enough for the comparison of transformational leadership. It should be reminded that the study is focused on the adaptability of leadership principles and styles of leadership and not on the actual training or performance of street-level police work or military field duties. The focus of this study is on the relationship between leader and follower and how improvements in their relationship can bring about greater efficiency within an organization. This examination will utilize the transformational leadership research utilized by the military as a comparison for the imposed change to transformational leadership for law enforcement.

One of the primary responsibilities of the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) is the research and development of leadership. Edgar M. Johnson, Director, U.S. Army Research Institute, suggests that "Units perform well if leaders motivate their troops and instill a sense of cohesion" and that "the contribution of transformational leadership to unit commitment, involvement, loyalty, and performance helps units to cope with stress in crisis, emergencies, and the 'fog of war'" (Bass, 1998, p. vii). Johnson also suggests that the best of both military and civilian leaders display transformational leadership. Bernard Bass in, *Transformational Leadership: Industrial, Military, and Educational Impact* (1998),

contends that leadership is not the province of people at the top but inclusive of developing those who are below them. Bass argues that transformational leadership is not only applicable in the military, business, and educational arena; it is also applicable in the family, sport, and classroom environment (p. 2). It stands to reason that transformational leadership is applicable in law enforcement.

The Army recognized a need for change in its leadership based upon the changing views of society in war time or policing actions, a volunteer force with raised minimum educational and intelligence standards, an ever improving application of technology, diversity in race and sex, and finally a rise of moral relativism and the increased questioning of the values of honor, duty, and country (Bass, 1998, p. 2). The previous conditions describe the evolutionary process that law enforcement has undergone within the last century. If the research in transformational leadership suggests potential benefits for the military, it could be argued that the same benefits could be established in the field of law enforcement.

Bernard Bass's (1985) research into the augmentation of transactional and transformational leadership consisted of 176 military officers, who completed a leadership questionnaire describing their immediate supervisors. The goal was to analyze quantitatively 1) the transactional leader's emphasis on exchange with followers of benefits for compliance and 2) the transformational leader's emphasis on mobilization and direction of followers toward expanded, higher, or transcendental objectives. Bass set out to demonstrate that leaders defined as transformational would display more intensive leader behavior than leaders defined as transactional.

The study concluded that results did not support that transformational leaders were more intensive; however, transactional leaders were described as being significantly higher in intensity of consideration for the personal needs and feelings of subordinates (Bass, 1985, p.196). Bass's next step was to see if the items in the survey were identified as either clearly transformational or transactional. Bass found five factors to be relevant in the study. They are: 1) Charismatic Leadership [which is clearly transformational] 2) Contingent Reward [which is transactional] 3) Individualized Consideration 4) Management by Exception [which is centered on the leader who maintains until subordinates have deviated from expectations (situational or contingency)] and 5) Intellectual Stimulation [seen as an important aspect of transformational leadership] (p. 212). Bass noted that many of the subordinates were inspired by the factor of charismatic leadership, with "some slight degree of loyalty to the leader was also inspired by the leader's individualized consideration and contingent rewarding" (p. 214). He added that loyalty to the organization was enhanced by the three transformational factors: "charisma, consideration, and intellectual stimulation".

Bass continued working with the military research material that later included information from graduate students and managers within the business world.

According to Bass, the studies illustrated that

- five factors are required to understand transactional and transformational leadership; (which are previously stated)

- it is possible to measure each of these factors with high reliability so that widely differing profiles can be obtained from questionnaire descriptions of individual leaders;
- respondents describing the same leaders will produce similar profiles; and
- as proposed in the model, transformational leadership will contribute in an incremental way to extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction with the leader as well as to appraised subordinate performance beyond expectations that are attributable to transactional leadership. (Bass, 1985, p. 229)

The above is a summary of Bass's research with the full model available through the literary work, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations* (1985). The research is by no means conclusive. It is however supportive information for this descriptive study of transformational leadership. The research is used in this thesis to illustrate that research has been conducted, through military personnel and civilian groups, which supports the benefits of efficiency, effectiveness, and satisfaction in transformational leadership. If one agrees that law enforcement and the military are similar functions, then one could argue that transformational qualities would benefit law enforcement.

Organizational Change

In order for an imposed paradigm shift from bureaucratic management to transformational leadership to take place, one must have an understanding of the organizational transformation that must take place. Change is never easy; therefore, an understanding of the organization's current status must be understood, along with future plans and goals. A plan is essential in order for change to take place smoothly.

All involved must understand the potential advantages and disadvantages of the change. One of the primary attributes of the transformational leader is that they have the ability to set goals and see to it that followers understand those goals along with assisting them in achieving those goals. The law enforcement community must have an open mind to change in order for the evolutionary process to continue.

Leadership is a combination of qualities- some learned and some inherent, which combined can bring about positive results. The evolutionary process that has been taking place in law enforcement concerns the personal needs of the employee as well as those of the organization (Whisenand & Ferguson, 1989, p. 77). A simple framework can bring about a sense of the world and change as the world changes. Police administrators must establish such a framework in order to master change and effectively cope with the ongoing trends (p. 318). The framework must include the understanding of

1. The Current State-which describes the organization today, its current structure, and methods of operation and defines the units specifically involved in the planned change.
2. The Future State- which describes the desired organization, how it will look when the change is completed. In a very real sense this is the vision of the new organization or program that is planned.
3. The Transition State-which describes the organization during the period when it is moving from its current state to its future state. (p. 318)

Lee Potts in, *Responsible Police Administration* (1983), describes law enforcements current state by suggesting,

Judging by an outward appearance, the modern urban police force clearly approximates Max Weber's ideal monocratic bureaucracy. In theory;

therefore, if Weber is to be believed, police departments should be capable of attaining a high degree of efficiency. The facts of the actual police role and mode of operation bring such a conclusion into serious doubt (p. 87).

The bureaucratic environment has not generated the necessary efficiency, which suggests that the field of law enforcement must try something new. N. H. Stamper argued, "The need for establishing and supporting strong police leadership in the future is obvious" because

Police Chiefs in America are presiding over structures whose features function as formidable barriers to organizational effectiveness, communication, and morale, as well as a mutually satisfying relationship with the community (Stamper, 1992, p. 4).

Police administration scholars agree that the current mode of operation is not effective enough. Police organizations are becoming more sensitive to changes occurring in society. If those changes are to be dealt with properly; law enforcement must reflect innovative yet enlightened approaches (Leonard & More, 1982, p. 19).

Prior to and during the transition state, law enforcement administrators must be concerned with improving effectiveness. The task can be accomplished by the

1. Awareness of current management (leadership) theories.
2. Acknowledgement to importance of processes of management (leadership).
3. Consideration of conceptual aspects of organization with a commitment to administrative models.
4. Acquiring knowledge of the tactical and strategic consideration of resource utilization
5. The application of management (leadership) audit concepts to law enforcement agencies. (p. 19)

The end result of the transition phase is the knowledge of where the organization wants to be in the future and establishing how one is going to get there.

The future state is where the organization hopes to be. For the purpose of this thesis, the potential future state may include a paradigm shift to transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is expected to “contribute to an organization efforts to improve its operations and the best use of its human resources. The end goal is to develop a highly committed work force that is more eager and willing to take on the challenges...into the next millennium” (Bass & Avolio, 1994, p. 6).

In order for change to take place, the organization must consider the current state and its effectiveness or ineffectiveness. The organization must establish a plan through the steps of the current, transition, and future phases. By understanding that policing is changing along with theories concerning proper organization and management, administrators will come to recognize that change presents opportunity. The notion of change has materialized based upon “changes in the environment of policing, changes in managerial thought, and changes in our knowledge about the effectiveness of current approaches to policing” (Geller, 1991, p. 53). Imaginative leadership will be an instrumental element for success as police organizations evolve in the years ahead. It is suggested that transformational leadership will be the leadership style that carries law enforcement into the 21st century.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The investigation into the potential paradigm shift of manager to leader and bureaucratic management to transformational leadership, within the field of law enforcement, illustrates the continued evolutionary processes involved in law enforcement, police administration, leadership, and leadership style. From the early primitive societies to the modern day technologically advanced society, law enforcement has survived and evolved through the changing needs of society.

The American police system was created through an evolutionary process consisting of the transformation of early military systems in Europe, through the Anglo-Saxon and Norman periods, to the eventual London Police system created by Sir Robert Peel.

The early 20th century saw the creation of the American police administration system. Pioneers such as Feliz Fuld, Elmer Graper, and Raymond Fosdick assisted in establishing the early management techniques, which were created to establish rules of training and promotion selection. The goal was to elevate law enforcement into a professional entity. The 1943 publication of *Municipal Police Administration*, by The International City Management Association, would establish the American police system as a distinct function. The knowledge (management & police administration theories) contained in the publication proved to be essential in how police forces have been managed.

The field of law enforcement would become bureaucratized based upon the wide spread corruption in American police departments. With the belief that a military discipline would decrease the political corruption, Max Weber's style of bureaucracy dominated the field of law enforcement in managerial style throughout the 20th century and into the present day.

The basis of this investigation into leadership attributes and transformational leadership is based upon the suggested inefficiency of management principles in the bureaucratic law enforcement system. The first proposed research question of this thesis is **1) will a paradigm shift from the traditional teachings of management theory to the current philosophy of leadership benefit law enforcement in the future?** The research identified three major points of interest in answering the proposed question.

First, management was defined as an element that leads, directs, or manages the organization toward its goals. Leadership was defined as an entity that influences and motivates others. It was suggested that leadership includes vision and management does not. Managers seek stability, order, and efficiency, while leadership adds the concepts of flexibility, innovation, and adaptation.

Second, management seeks order by setting operational goals, establishing action plans, organizing/staffing, and solving problems. Leadership seeks to produce organizational change by developing a vision for the future, communicating and explaining the vision, and motivating and inspiring people to attain the vision. An argument for change is proposed with the assumption that law enforcement has

operated inefficiently (lack of societal support, police abuse of power). Societal influence and scrutiny has supported a change, in which the field of law enforcement conducts its function. Change can begin with leaders at the administrative level. The concept of organizational change is included as an aspect of leadership qualities. Leaders have the power to empower subordinates to accomplish a vision and assist with the transition element.

Third, leadership includes the needs and goals of the follower as well as the leader. Management tends to support concepts that are beneficial for the organization and those in power. Leadership is inclusive and supports a union of benefits for leader and follower. Leadership is supportive and characterized by friendliness, approachability, and concern for the needs of followers. It appears that certain leadership attributes can lead to a more productive environment. The environment will allow the subordinates to feel more responsible and will generate more confidence in their ability to perform effectively and efficiently, which is a benefit for the organization.

By sheer definition, leadership includes vital elements that can be argued as having benefits for law enforcement in the future. The evolutionary process that has already occurred in management principles within the field of law enforcement provides a foundational basis for the potential change to leadership principles. Changes in societal needs and the public's view of law enforcement are obvious considerations in the effect of change. If a change is generated from the concepts of management to leadership, one could consider a change in management theory

(bureaucratic) to leadership theory (transformational). The proposed change is the second research question: **2) will transformational leadership better support the law enforcement administrator in contrast to the traditional bureaucratic style of management?** If a shift is generated from management practices to elements of leadership, it is proposed that a shift be generated from the traditional style of bureaucratic management, which law enforcement has operated in since the 20th century to the modern day theory of transformational leadership. The research found four major points of interest in answering the proposed question.

First, Max Weber's bureaucracy described organizations that were not to be plagued by cruelty, nepotism, or subjective management. Weber's bureaucracy was based upon a level of efficiency, which was based upon a competent level of hierarchy where each lower office is under the immediate control and supervision of another. Weber supported that bureaucracy was superior to any other form of management in both efficiency and operation. The promises caused law enforcement to adopt such a method.

Second, deficiencies were found within the bureaucratic style of management. These deficiencies include: the lack of relationship between the supervisor and the subordinate, the lack of support from the community because bureaucracies are rational-legal authorities on their own standing, and the fact that administrators do not have latitude in a personalized way to a specific case. In bureaucracies, followers do not have discretion, with all decisions being open to review by supervisors. Some police science scholars argue that these deficiencies have been instrumental in the

lack of efficiency within the field of law enforcement.

Third, transformational leadership appeals to the moral values of the followers, and it is expected to raise the follower's consciousness about ethical issues. Ethics is a major component in the issue surrounding law enforcement officers and society. Examples of unethical behavior have been illustrated by the media, which are a topic of concern for society. The transformational leader is one that utilizes the components of vision, charisma, symbolism, empowerment, intellectual stimulation, and integrity. Ethics and values are at the core of the transformational leader.

Fourth, transformational leadership lacks empirical evidence that supports the many claims of transformational leadership. The thesis utilized descriptive research material that was based upon the military and civilian business institutions. The research material utilized for this thesis supports that transformational leadership, in law enforcement, is in its early stages.

The theory of transformational leadership utilizes some extremely positive and powerful components which appear to have value within many institutions, not only that of law enforcement. It can be argued that for the theory to have serious weight, in the field of law enforcement, empirical research must be conducted.

The potential shift from manager to leader and from the bureaucratic environment to one of transformation will reside upon the organizations that are open to new concepts. History illustrates that law enforcement, police administration, management theory, leadership theory, and leadership styles have evolved with time. The citizenry have played a crucial role in this evolutionary process and will probably

have an effect on change in the future. Leadership principles along with transformational leadership describe a very positive atmosphere that includes benefits for the leader, follower, and the organizations. Research into the application of transformational leadership and how it could be institutionalized into the field of law enforcement will undoubtedly require further investigation. It is hopeful that this thesis has generated an interest for that research.

Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1990). From Transactional to Transformational Leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, pp. 19-32.

Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational Leadership: Industry, Military, and Educational Impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bass, Bernard, & Steidlmeier, Paul. (1998). *Ethics, Character, and Authentic Transformational Leadership*. Center for Leadership Studies, School of Management, Yeshiva University, New York.

Bass, Bernard, & Stogdill, Ralph. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*. New York: The Free Press.

Brown, William. (1994). *Bureaucracy Adaptation: A Comparison of British, American Bureaucracy and Street-Level Bureaucracy of Police Organizations*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Oklahoma, Norman.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Burns, J.M. (2003). *Transforming Leadership*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Burns, Bernard. (2003). *The Ethics of Leadership*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth-Thompson Learning.

IX

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amado, Rivka. (1999). Bilateral Transformational Leadership: An Approach for Fostering Ethical Conduct in Public Service Organizations. *Administration & Society*, Vol. 31 No. 2.

Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass and Stodgill's Handbook of Leadership*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1990). From Transactional to Transformational Leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, pp. 19-32.

Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational Leadership: Industry, Military, and Educational Impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bass, Bernard, & Steidlmeier, Paul. (1998). *Ethics, Character, and Authentic Transformational Leadership*. Center for Leadership Studies, School of Management Binghamton University, New York.

Bass, Bernard, & Stogdill, Ralph. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*. New York: The Free Press.

Bourns, William. (1994). *Bureaucracy Adaptation: A Comparison of Classical Weberian Bureaucracy and Street-Level Bureaucracy of Police Departments*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Oklahoma, Norman.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Burns, J.M. (2003). *Transforming Leadership*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Ciulla, Joanne. (2003). *The Ethics of Leadership*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning

Dantzker, M.L. (1999). *Police Organization and Management. Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow*. United States: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Fayol, H. (1963). *General and Industrial Management*. London: Pitman.

Fiedler, Fred, & Chemers, Martin. (1974). *Leadership and Effective Management*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Fosdick, Raymond B. (1969). *American Police Systems*. Montclair, New Jersey: The Century Company.

Fuld, Leonhard Felix. (1971). *Police Administration*. Montclair, New Jersey: Paterson Smith Publishing.

Geller, William A. (1943). *Local Government Police Management*. Washington DC: International City Management Association.

Germann, A.C. (1962). *Police Executive Development*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Goldstein, H. (1977). *Policing a Free Society*. United States: Ballinger Publishing.

Grafer, Elmer. (1969). *American Police Administration*. Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith Publishing.

Hanna, Donald, & Gentel, William D. (1971). *A Guide to Primary Police Management Concepts*. Springfield, Illinois: Bannerstone House.

House, R.J. (1971). A Path-goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16.

Hunt, Derald. (1989a). *California Criminal Law Manual*. 7th ed. Edina, MN: Burgess Publishing Company.

Hunt, Derald. (1989b). *PC 832 Concepts II: Peace Officer Required Training*. Placerville, CA: Custom Publishing Company.

Jurkanin, Thomas, Dowling, Jerry, Hoover, Larry, & Ahmad, Janice. (2001). *Enduring, Surviving, and Thriving as a Law Enforcement Executive*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles Thomas Publisher.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1996). *The structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 3rd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kuykendall, Jack, & Unsinger, Peter. (1975). *Community Police Administration*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Law Enforcement Series.

Kuykendall, Jack, & Roberg, Roy R. (1990). *Police Organization and Management*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Leonard, V.A. (1951). *Police Organization and Management*. New York: Foundation Press.

Leonard, V.A., & More Jr., Harry W. (1982). *Police Organization and Management*. 6th ed. Mineola, New York: The Foundation Press Inc.

Lynch, Ronald. (1975). *The Police Manager*. Boston: Holbrook Press, Inc.

Mayo, Elton. (1968). *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. New York: Viking Press.

Potts, Lee W. (1983). *Responsible Police Administration*. University, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press.

Reiss, Albert J. (1971). *The Police and the Public*. United States: Yale University Press.

Roberg, Roy, & Kuykendall, Jack. (1990). *Police Organization & Management Behavior, Theory, and Processes*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Inc.

Schermerhorn Jr., John. (1996). *Management*. 5th ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Smith, Bruce. (1960). *Police Systems in the United States*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Stamper, N.H. (1992). *Removing Managerial Barriers to Effective Police Leadership*. Washington DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Taylor, F.W. (1911). *Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Row.

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. London: Oxford University Press.

Weber, M. (1949). *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*. New York: Free Press.

Whisenand, Paul, & Ferguson, Fred. (1989). *The Managing Police Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Wilson, O.W. (1963). *Police Administration*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wilson, O.W., & McLaren, Roy Clinton. (1972). *Police Administration*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Yukl, Gary. (2002). *Leadership In Organizations*. 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

This volume is the property of the University of Oklahoma, but the literary rights of the author are a separate property and must be respected. Passages must not be copied or closely paraphrased without the previous written consent of the author. If the reader obtains any assistance from this volume, he must give proper credit in his own work.

I grant the University of Oklahoma Libraries permission to make a copy of my thesis upon the request of individuals or libraries. This permission is granted with the understanding that a copy will be provided for research purposes only, and that requestors will be informed of these restrictions.

NAME _____

DATE _____

A library which borrows this thesis for use by its patrons is expected to secure the signature of each user.

This thesis by DAVID D. LYONS has been used by the following persons, whose signatures attest their acceptance of the above restrictions.

NAME AND ADDRESS

DATE