

**The Bill Blackwood
Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas**

Revolutionary and Evolutionary Change in Law Enforcement

**An Administrative Research Paper
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
Required for Graduation from the
Leadership Command College**

**By
Lawrence Lujan**

**El Paso Police Department
El Paso, Texas
July 2008**

ABSTRACT

Understanding evolutionary and revolutionary change is relevant to law enforcement because law enforcement management/leaders and employees are faced with change on a daily basis. The ability to manage and apply the polar positions of evolutionary and revolutionary change to the police environment is paramount to the success of law enforcement agencies.

The purpose of the research is to better prepare the law enforcement organization to manage, implement, and apply change in daily and strategic operations. The research will examine if the nature of change, as found in revolutionary and evolutionary change, is understood and properly applied in Texas law enforcement agencies. This requires the researcher to identify whether law enforcement officers feel that there is a need to understand the nature of revolutionary and evolutionary change. Lastly, this research is to influence both law enforcement managers/leaders and employees through the research conclusions.

The intended method of inquiry included: a review of scholarly and contemporary articles, periodicals, journals, and internet sites. In addition to and to compliment the listed methods of inquiry, a survey was distributed to law enforcement managers/leaders and employees throughout the state of Texas.

It was discovered that the research supported the author's belief; there is, a failure in understanding and teaching the nature of revolutionary and evolutionary change.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	
Introduction	1
Review of Literature	4
Methodology	13
Findings	16
Discussions/Conclusions	17
References	22
Appendix	

INTRODUCTION

The issue to be examined considers whether or not the nature of evolutionary and revolutionary change is understood by law enforcement. On a daily basis, law enforcement manager/leaders implement strategic change efforts in response to their environment. However because change efforts may be in the form of revolutionary (drastic/sudden/immediate change), or evolutionary (gradual implementation of change), it is important to examine if law enforcement is properly managing these methods.

The relevance of researching the effects of revolutionary and evolutionary change to the field of law enforcement will be the identification of a problem that plagues their day-to-day change efforts and the proper management of change. These types of change affect not only the manager/leader but also the employee and the community stakeholder on a daily basis. The ability to manage and apply the polar positions of evolutionary and revolutionary change in the law enforcement environment is paramount to the success of daily operations and strategic goals for the law enforcement organization.

The purpose of this research is to examine if the nature of change, as found in revolutionary and evolutionary change, is understood. In addition, research will be conducted to identify if the tensions of both extremes are understood and synthesized to the benefit of the organization and employee. Also, research will be conducted to see if law enforcement officers feel that there is a need to understand the nature of revolutionary and evolutionary change. If it is discovered that the nature of these types

of change are not understood, the research will examine if the manager/leader and employee believe that it should be addressed.

The research question to be examined focuses on whether or not law enforcement understands the nature of evolutionary and revolutionary change as it applies to their day-to-day and strategic operations. Because each position is diametrically opposed, there needs to be an understanding of how to synthesize each one to the benefit of its primary stakeholders, manager/leaders and employees, and also to its secondary stakeholders: the citizenry.

The research places focus on law enforcements' primary stakeholders, employees at all levels of the law enforcement organization. For the purpose of this research, employees are defined as sworn employees, which are licensed law enforcement officers. While there does exist a non-sworn employee in law enforcement, which are civilian assistants, they will not be a focus of this research. Law enforcement management is the other stakeholder and focus group of the project. Combined, sworn employees and law enforcement managers form the primary stakeholders for this research. Also, the public, the citizens, are stakeholders to the law enforcement agency, and in this study, they will not be examined other than to identify that they are the recipients of good or poor change management.

Employees in law enforcement organizations consist of sworn personnel who are licensed to fulfill their law enforcement duties. To a great degree, law enforcement non-management personnel conduct their duties in what is referred to as the "field," where there is minimal supervision. This majority does not have a formal office, and they conduct the bulk of their duties from their squad car.

A separate and minority portion of sworn personnel conduct their duties from an office setting where there is more supervisory interaction due to the proximity to their immediate supervisors and to their chain of command. These two groups work together under the direction of their immediate or first line supervisor. It is these sworn employees who are most impacted by change efforts.

Management in policing agencies consists of sworn personnel who have typically worked and tested their way up the ranks to management positions. The organizational hierarchy or chain of command, as it is referred to in policing, typically begins with the rank of sergeant and progresses to the chief of police. It is an organizational structure similar to the military command and control chain of command. This is also known as the scalar principle of the French management pioneer Henri Fayol (Miner, 115).

Manager/leaders of law enforcement agencies remain sworn and licensed peace officers. Management positions are a part of the hierarchy that moves from a broad base up to a narrowing pinnacle. Each progression up this chain of command provides greater authority to the individual and a larger span of control. It is at the manager/leader level that most organizational change efforts are born. In addition, it is at management/leader levels where a lack of training in change efforts most affects the non-management employees.

The intended method of inquiry includes: a review of scholarly and contemporary articles, periodicals, journals, internet sites, and a survey distributed to law enforcement manager/leaders and employees throughout the state of Texas. The method of inquiry will apply the path-goal model of Robert House (1971) that the manager's role is to clarify and remove obstacles while guiding workers to choose the best paths for

reaching goals, where best is judged by the accompanying achievement of organizational goals. This project aims to review change management efforts in the law enforcement organization with the goal of providing direction to achieve efficiency in attaining organizational goals.

The intended outcome or anticipated findings of the research may or may not support the author's belief that there is failure in understanding and teaching the nature of revolutionary and evolutionary change. It is anticipated that law enforcement personnel do not understand how to manage these types of change. In addition, it is anticipated that participants will gain a better understanding of the role of revolutionary and evolutionary change in law enforcement organizations and, in turn, be able to utilize tactics to capitalize the benefits of these types of change.

The field of law enforcement will benefit from the research or be influenced by the conclusions. This, in turn, could assist the law enforcement organization to better prepare, manage, implement, and apply change in their daily and strategic operations. The citizens, which are served by these agencies, will also benefit from a law enforcement agency that is better prepared and unified in their response to change. The research will provide a method for law enforcement agencies to improve their internal stakeholder relations while also benefiting their external stakeholders through better service.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this review of literature is to examine what experts in law enforcement management, law enforcement training, strategic leadership, and management fields have written about the issue being investigated. The literature

review allows for an examination of how experts, authors, and academics address and view the issue of change management.

This section begins with an overview of law enforcement structure and the management and planning beliefs that affect change in the organization. It then proceeds to the modern academic thought on change management. This will also include corporate and law enforcement on change management. It concludes with academic thought on the tensions created by the implementation of change.

Law enforcement, like any business organization, has a structure and an organization. There is no model or regulation that requires a law enforcement organization be structured according to one style. However, as a whole, most law enforcement agencies are quasi-military in structure, and for the most part, share the hierarchical structure of the military. It is a command and control bureaucratic structure whereby there exists a recognized “chain of command” in the classic pyramid structure. This structure mirrors in style French management pioneer Henri Fayol’s scalar principle. Miner (2006) described the scalar principal as a line of authority that extends from the bottom to the top of the organization.

Johnson (1994) stated that law enforcement agencies tend to adhere to vertical organizational structures, while O’Conner (2004) found law enforcement agencies to be quasi-military in nature. Mays and Winfree (2002) highlighted that Max Weber is one of the organizational theorists most frequently associated with the bureaucratic management school. Mays and Winfree (2002) also identified that bureaucracies are based on controls established through the organizations rules. Mouzelis (1947) discovered that bureaucracies created weaknesses that reduced employee initiative

and created inflexible operations. Moore (1997) discovered an innate weakness of bureaucracies to be the inherent inability to respond to rapid or unexpected changes. Cordner, Scarborough and Sheehan (2004) identified the bureaucratic leadership style to be rigid, and operated according to policy, procedure, rules, and regulations. They found inflexibility and that it limited the ability of leaders to adapt to change which was a shortcoming of bureaucratic leadership.

Law enforcement management's view on managing change is addressed and taught formally in academic settings. These include formalized training sessions for first line-supervisors and senior managers. Local courses that address these types of issues are offered through individual law enforcement agencies with foresight, which create or offer management training either before a person promotes into management or shortly thereafter.

Texas Administrative Code-Title 37 Public Safety and Corrections (2007) created a rule that mandates supervisory training. The Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education (TCLEOSE) is the agency that manages and regulates this formalized education standard for law enforcement agencies. Section 1701.352 of the current rules of TCLEOSE (2007) at Continuing Education Programs subsection (d) established that all first line supervisors must take a 40-hour management course within the twenty-four month period after the date of appointment.

The Texas Occupations Code § 1701, Texas Education Code § 96.341, and TCLEOSE Commission Rules have also established mandatory training for newly appointed or elected Chiefs of Police. The Education Code, Section 96.641 *et seq*; stated, in part, that police chiefs must receive at least 40 hours of continuing education.

The requirements of state mandates can also be met at the individual officer's agency or, in the case of the Chief of Police, free at the Bill Blackwood Institute, Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University.

So, a new first-line supervisor receives 40 hours of management training and is not required to take any other supervisory training for the rest of their career until they become the Chief of Police or unless they seek a higher education grounded in management, leadership, and administration, through individual university study or by applying to the Bill Blackwood Institute.

The planning and the implementation of change typically occurs at the three most commonly recognized levels of law enforcement management: the chief administrative level, the command level, and the supervisory level (Cordner, Scarborough, & Sheehan, 2004). Cordner et al. highlighted that planning is the ongoing process of ends analysis, forecasting, means analysis, implementation, evaluation, and more planning. Cordner et al. (2004) also discerned the reality that law enforcement agencies are diverse in methodology and identified that, for the most part, law enforcement agencies have four basic types of plans. These plans all affect change and apply to revolutionary and evolutionary change. The four identified types of plans are: reactive, contingency, operational efficiency, and strategic plans.

Florentine statesman and political philosopher Niccolo Machiavelli identified:

"It must be realized that there is nothing more difficult to plan, more uncertain of success, or more dangerous to manage than the establishment of a new order of government; for he who introduces it makes enemies of all those who derived

advantage from the old order and finds but lukewarm defenders among those who stand to gain from the new one.” (Donno, 1966, p.31)

And so, the difficulties of affecting strategic change remain and have changed little since Machiavelli made his observation. De Wit and Meyer (2005) identified that strategic change impacts the organizational structure, the organizational processes, and the organizational culture. In addition, they identified that change, the scope of the change, and the amplitude of the change impacts its acceptance. Scope identifies which parts of the organization were impacted and amplitude identifies the magnitude to which they are affected, both of which create tensions for the manager to overcome.

Lawler (2003), in the Treat People Right, Principal #4, stated “organizations must design work that is meaningful for people and provides them with feedback, responsibility and autonomy.” He also recognized that it is necessary to understand the factors that determine what makes work involving, challenging, and rewarding for people. Ulrich, Zenger, and Smallwood (1999) discovered the need for change to be accepted. They identified that the dynamic and constantly changing characteristic of business is mirrored in their desired results. They also found that the organizations must be capable of managing short and long-term results and change through leaders that are able to communicate trade-offs, priorities, values, and connections.

Sample (2002), identified that judgment is a key element of effective leadership. Sample believed that judgment should always be informed by fact and analysis and, in most decision-making situations, the facts and analyses available to the change agent are at best incomplete and at worst completely wrong. This, then, causes the leader to rely on personal judgment and that of advisers when managing a change effort. Howe

(2005) identified the key to consistent success in small and large-scale operations to rest on the team leader. He felt that the teams performance, training, motivation, and attitude are a direct reflection of the team leader's drive and professionalism. Further, his experiences taught him to not overcomplicate the command and control or checks and balances, instead, to focus on simplicity rather than on over-complication. On the role of great manager catalysts, Coffman and Buckingham (1999) identified that the catalyst sets expectations and defines desired outcomes but does not necessarily dictate the required steps. Instead, when providing employee motivation, the great manager catalyst's focus on individual strengths, and not on their weaknesses.

For the purpose of this research project, evolutionary change means the gradual implementation of change efforts. The labeling for this type of change originates and includes incremental (Johnson, 1987; Quinn, 1980a), evolutionary (Nelson & Winter, 1982; Tushman & O'Reilly, 1996) and operational (de Wit & Meyer, 2005). For this research project, Greiner's (1972) terminology was selected for the definition of evolutionary change.

Gallivan, Hofman, and Orlikowski (1994) felt that the implementation of radical change is best implemented in an evolutionary manner. Gardner (1990) recognized that the mature organization is orderly, clearly defined, burdened with rules, had a pecking order, and exhibited turf syndrome. He further identified learning, innovation, and going anywhere except where the tracks lead is stifled in the mature organization. Green (2000) highlighted that everyone understands the need for change in the abstract, but, on the day-to-day level, people are creatures of habit. Also, too much innovation is traumatic and will lead to revolt. Green felt that when change is necessary, it should be

accomplished in a way that makes the affected parties feel like it is an improvement to the past. Dwyer (2006) identified those organizations that are able to build a culture of evolutionary change, often cope with external shocks without the need for revolutionary change. He discovered that these organizations tend to have flat organizational structures, controlling people's actions through data and a transparent performance management system rather than position. Dwyer (2006) proposed that these organizations see evolutionary change as a positive.

For the purpose of this project, revolutionary change means drastic, sudden, and immediate change efforts. This type of change is recognized in organizational behavior literature (Greiner, 1972; Tushman, Newman, & Romanelli, 1986). It also has been referred to as disruptive, frame-breaking change (Baden-Fuller & Stopford, 1992; Grinyer, Mayes, & McKiernan, 1987), radical (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996; Stinchcombe, 1965), revolutionary (Nelson & Winter, 1982; Tushman & O'Reilly, 1996) and strategic (de Wit & Meyer, 2005). For this research project, Greiner's (1972) terminology was selected for the definition of revolutionary change.

Gardner (1990) referred to change as an opportunity for renewal and the opportunity to lose or gain. He demonstrated that when an organization is in flux, that there is flexibility, motivation, a willingness to try new things, and the capacity to respond quickly. He also found a negative, being task accomplishment becoming disorderly and haphazard. Maple (1999) discussed revolutionary change efforts and highlighted the importance of responding with a supervised team rather than individually. He believed that this is the basic building block of the effective police organization. He also promoted that when police commanders identify a crime or

serious quality-of-life problem in their community, they should never be satisfied to just maintain the status quo; rather, they should immediately respond with adequate manpower. He also discovered that weekly informational meetings such as COMSTAT/COMPSTAT (Computer Statistics or Comparative Statistics) or its variants were seen as revolutionary change efforts when they were first established and were received with resistance. However, over time, the value of this specific change effort was recognized and appreciated. Maple also felt, that when the opportunity to participate in change occurs, not all recipients are going to accept it or put out the effort to embrace the means. So then, manager/leaders are tasked with forcing the learning and change process.

Kouzes and Posner (2002) identified that leaders need to take charge of change and instill adventure in others as a way to seek ways to radically alter the status quo. They also felt that the change agent should be on constant lookout for novel ideas and searching for opportunities to do what has never before been done. They stated that, in order to stimulate innovation and or change, the effort must be fast and responsive. Green (2000) identified that authority could be created through bold acts. He felt that these bold actions make the change agent appear larger and more powerful than they really are, oftentimes inspiring fear. Teerlink and Ozley (2000) discovered that if a recognized crisis were absent, then a dramatic departure from the status quo would not occur unless it was imposed on the employee. Dwyer (2006) recognized that revolutionary change is often required of an organization. However, he felt that it might be indicative of poor management. He also believed that it illustrated that the organization has been unable to instill a culture of evolutionary change. James O'Toole

(1996) provided several reasons why people resist change in his *Thirty-Three Hypotheses on Why People Resist Change*. Some of the major themes from his hypothesis included that change is not a natural condition, that most people like things the way they are, that people fear the unknown, that the minority has a greater stake in preserving the status quo than the majority has in changing, and that the belief that people are right and those who want people to change are wrong.

Rampersad (2003) identified reaction and resistance to change frustrates the change process. He also identified six phases to resistance to change and expressions of negative reactions:

“passivity-reserved and uncertain reactions to new plans; denial-skepticism and the denial of the appropriateness of the plans; anger-when the plan continues, people withdraw and react angrily; negotiation-attempts at compromise through minimizing and partial acceptance of plans; depression-passive behavior resulting from the change having to occur and leading to depression; acceptance-change becomes part of the work process.”

Rampersad's (2006) research also identified two types of individuals and their reactions to change. The first types were those individuals who think they will become victims of change and who, therefore, resist, become angry, and get depressed. The second groups were those who completely support, design, and plan the change.

Personal individual feelings such as defensiveness, refusing to accept change and feedback, as well as not understanding, are one of the most common reasons why people do not accept change McCall (1997). Morgan (1997) identified, that, in times of change, plans and planning often proved ineffective because they created barriers and

internal rivalries. In addition, he felt that ineffective plans could solidify the beliefs of those who do not agree with the proposed change; all of which interfere with organizational efficiency. Teerlink and Ozley (2000) recognized that groups often times see change as capable of improving their current situation; however, the process could be uncomfortable. They further identified that change instituted by manager/leaders creates anxiety and the feeling that that the manager/leader is being forced to change.

In conclusion, de Wit and Myer (2005), identified stakeholder response to revolutionary and evolutionary change efforts. They identified revolutionary change as being disruptive, pressured, confused, and shock therapy (p. 411). They also identified evolutionary change as not noticed, non-dramatic, steady progress, and a gradual change.

METHODOLOGY

The research question to be examined will consider whether or not a problem in law enforcements ability to implement change exists. This research will contribute theory to the body of knowledge that currently exists on the topic of revolutionary and evolutionary change (Coghlan & Brannick, 2005). Kolb (1984) identified four skills necessary for continuous learning: concrete experience, reflection, theorizing, and experimenting. In law enforcement, there are actions that contribute to change occurring on a daily basis, and these actions provide a basis for attaining concrete experience. Therefore, the methodology used in this research project will seek answers that address continuous learning for law enforcement organizations.

The researcher hypothesizes that the action research will identify a deficiency in law enforcement agencies in the area of managing and affecting change efforts as they

relate to revolutionary and evolutionary change. The hypothesis will be tested and researched through a thorough method of inquiry. This method of inquiry will prove or disprove the hypothesis.

The intended method of inquiry will include: reviews of scholarly and contemporary articles, periodicals, journals, internet sites, and a survey distributed to law enforcement manager/leaders and employees throughout the state of Texas. The method of inquiry survey instrument will allow for reflective observation of change efforts from the projects participants and will allow the participant to express their views about revolutionary and evolutionary change efforts as well as the nature of change. It will also extract quantifiable data that can later be used for experimentation with change efforts. This qualitative and quantitative instrument integrates the participant with the research. The method of inquiry will also include a literary review and deconstruction in order to theorize on, understand, and gain knowledge and skill on the nature of change efforts (Coghlan & Brannick, 2005).

The survey will consist of twenty-one questions, distributed to both manager/leaders and employees (patrol officers/detectives/deputies) from thirty-one law enforcement organizations throughout the state of Texas. This survey instrument will be distributed to the primary stakeholders in law enforcement that are directly responsible for directing change efforts: manager leaders. In addition, the same survey will be distributed to those who are directly affected by change efforts: the employee. The survey instrument will be distributed via e-mail through interdepartmental mail at the participating law enforcement organizations. The survey instrument will be distributed in this manner to account for employee and manager/leader responses.

The survey instrument will be designed to provide the participant with an understanding of the purpose of the research. The style and phrasing of the questions incorporated the use of open-ended questions as well as questions with two choices and multiple-choice questions. In order to ensure reliability of data collected, the survey instrument will be completed in private by the evaluatee and when requested, input will be limited to the clarification of a survey question.

Russ-Eft and Preskill (2001) describe the type of survey instrument used in this action research project as an employee satisfaction or organizational climate type survey. This type of survey questions the impact of learning, performance, or change effort on employee satisfaction and organization climate. The response rate to the survey instrument will be limited to one hundred responses from manager/leaders and one hundred responses from employees.

The information obtained from the survey will be analyzed by seeking credibility and transferability of the analyzed data. The core participants will be divided into two groups: employees that is, non-supervisory employees and manager/leaders, that is, sergeants, lieutenants, captains and deputy chiefs and chiefs. The structure of the survey will be created to enhance the rigor of the research collection and to provide direction on whether the issue requires effort on behalf of law enforcement agencies.

The survey instrument will be issued without a due date in order to not pressure the evaluatee in providing hurried responses. Once a measurable response of 100 from the employee and manager/leader groups is received, the interpretation of the instrument will begin.

The value of this research is that the data gathering activity will provide a basis for understanding the effects of change efforts on management and employees. This will allow law enforcement agencies to strategically implement techniques that will balance the tensions created by revolutionary and evolutionary change efforts in law enforcement. Staying true to the action learning approach to action research, the transferability of the research back to the participants will be designed to aid in developing the involved parties.

FINDINGS

The purpose of this section is to provide the results of the collected data. This information is presented for clarity in table form and through text. This section demonstrates moments of revelation and insight that resulted from the data collection. In addition, this section provides form and substance to the research project.

The collected data revealed similarity in the thought process of both employee and management in certain areas. Manager/leaders and employee's both agreed that change is a large part of law enforcement. However, 77% of manager/leaders and 93% of employee's reported that they had not received training on managing change.

Table I. Training on managing change.

	Manager/Leader	Employee
Have not received training on managing change.	77	93

Manager/leaders and employees both stated that they understood the nature of evolutionary and revolutionary change, and the data demonstrated that 73% of employees and 83% of manager/leaders preferred evolutionary change to revolutionary change. While there was a demonstrated preference by both groups for evolutionary change, both groups overwhelmingly found benefit to both methods of change

management. Ninety-seven percent of both groups stated that they would individually benefit from an understanding the nature of evolutionary and revolutionary. Lastly, eighty-three percent of management/leaders and 93% of employee's reported that training in both evolutionary and revolutionary change would better help their department to manage change.

Table II: Does training aid the law enforcement organization?

	Manager/Leader	Employee
Believe training in evolutionary and revolutionary change will aid the law enforcement organization.	83	93

The purpose of this section was to provide the results of the collected data in a manner that was easy to comprehend and to reflect upon. This was accomplished data interpretation and through the use of tables. The collected data provided areas of revelation and insight. The collected data provides form and substance to the research project, survey instrument participant, and to the reader.

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS

The problem or issue examined by the researcher considered whether or not law enforcement manager/ leaders and employees understood and knew how to manage the nature of revolutionary and evolutionary change. The purpose of this research was to conduct research that would either support or disprove the theory that revolutionary and evolutionary change was not understood by law enforcement.

The research question that was examined focused on whether or not law enforcement understands the nature of evolutionary and revolutionary change as it applies to their day-to-day and strategic operations. Because each position is diametrically opposed, the researcher believed that there needed to be an

understanding of how to synthesize each one to the benefit of its primary stakeholders, manager/leaders and employees, and also to its secondary stakeholders: the citizenry. Because law enforcements primary stakeholders, are employees at all levels of the law enforcement organization, employees were defined as *sworn employees* that is, licensed law enforcement officers. Law enforcement management is the other stakeholder and focus group of the project. Combined, they form the primary stakeholders for this research. Also, the public/citizens are stakeholders to the law enforcement agency, and, in this study, they were not examined other than to identify that they are the recipients of good or poor change management.

The researcher hypothesized that the action research would identify a deficiency in law enforcement agencies. The researcher hypothesized that in the area of managing and affecting change efforts as they relate to revolutionary and evolutionary change, law enforcement agencies are deficient. In addition, the hypothesis stated that law enforcement agencies would desire training in this area of change management.

The researcher concluded from the findings that change has many shapes and forms. In and of itself, it can be applied, managed, and/or responded to. By reacting to a challenge in either a revolutionary or evolutionary manner, the goals of the agency can still be achieved. However, it is important for the change agent to recognize that each method is at the polar extreme of the other. The response to a revolutionary change effort will differ from the response to an evolutionary change effort. The response by shareholders and other managers will be greatly impacted when the change agent does not take the polar positions into account.

In addition, differing from corporate models, law enforcement supervisors and chiefs do not always formally attend leadership schools to prepare for their duties and responsibilities as leaders. In the case of the participating agencies that took part in this study, first line supervisors and executives do so only in a limited fashion and because the state legislature has mandated it. And when they do take part in leadership studies, state mandated training does not address the issue of dealing with change. Also, where management change efforts are reduced to two categories, revolutionary and evolutionary, there is even less understanding about how to utilize the best of both for strategic success.

The findings of the research supported the author's hypothesis. The statistics demonstrated that both groups have not received training on managing change. They also showed that both groups believe that training in these two areas of change efforts would better help their agencies. Individual comments and most importantly, the belief by both groups that training in managing revolutionary and evolutionary change is necessary, also demonstrates how the hypothesis was supported by the research.

The reasons why the findings did support the hypothesis are probably due to format of the survey. The survey presented the issue of change and asked the participant to conceptualize on how much change affects the organization, from the manager/leader and the employee perspective. It introduced them to the concepts of evolutionary and revolutionary change, allowed for personal comment, and then allowed them to demonstrate their preferences. In addition, it also asked the participant if they believed that there was a need for this type of training. The survey instrument also

allowed the participant to recognize that revolutionary and evolutionary changes have polar responses and goals that affect daily and strategic law enforcement operations.

Looking at revolutionary change efforts, McNamara (2005) states that unplanned change usually occurs because of a major, sudden surprise to the organization and that it causes its members to respond in a highly reactive and disorganized fashion. This example of revolutionary change is supported and echoed by the participants of the survey. Both manager/leaders and employees commented on the “reactive and disorganized” characteristics of revolutionary change. Specifically, managers stated, “It’s chaos and stress may outweigh the proposed benefits”, it is a “Knee jerk response to situations as opposed to carefully thought out and well planned change”, and that it creates “Disruption of employee lives”. Employee’s also provided similar comments: it’s a “disruption of personal life”, it is “confusing”, and “If it is not properly applied, chaos is the result”.

Limitations that might have hindered this study resulted from the author not being a member of the agencies that he sought assistance from. These limitations, while existing, were, in the author’s opinion, greatly reduced through the fact that a member of the Bill Blackwood Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas conducted the research. The author sought assistance from and sent the survey to alumni of the Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas. They, in turn, assisted by forwarding the survey to employees and manger/leaders in their agency.

The study of change management with a focus on evolutionary and revolutionary change is relevant to contemporary law enforcement because change in law enforcement agencies can be something as minor as a change in letterhead to

something as drastic as creating a twenty member unit to address a serious crime trend. Having law enforcement manager/leaders and employees who are trained to implement, apply, and respond to change not only benefits the law enforcement organization but also their constituents, the general public.

REFERENCES

- Buckingham, M. & Coffman, C. (1999). *First break all the rules*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Burke, R. J. (2006). Why leaders fail: Exploring the dark side. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27, 91-100.
- Coghlan, D., & Brannick, T. (2005). *Doing action research in your own organization*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications.
- Coleman, J.L. (1995). *Operational mid-level management for police (2nd edition)*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.
- Cordner, G.W., Fraser, C. B., & Wexler, C., "Research, Planning Implementation," in *Local Government Police management*, third edition, W.A. Geller, ed. (Washington, DC: International City Management Association, 1991), pp. 333-362.
- Cordner, G. W., Scarborough, K.E., & Sheehan, R. (2004). *Police Administration: Fifth Edition*. Dayton, Oh: Anderson Publishing.
- de Wit, B. and Meyer, R. (2005). *Strategy synthesis: Resolving strategy paradoxes to create competitive advantage (2nd edition)*. London, England: Thomson Butterworth Heinemann.
- Dwyer, K. (2006). *Change evolution or revolution*. Retrieved on May 19, 2007 from http://EzineArticles.com/?expert=Kevin_Dwyer
- Donno, D. (1981). *The Prince*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Johnson, R. A. (1994, June). Police Organizational Design and Structure. The FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin.

- Gallivan, M., Hofman J.D., & Orlikowski, W. (1994). *Implementing radical change: Gradual versus rapid pace*. Vancouver, British Columbia: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Gardner, J.W. (1990). *On leadership*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Green, R. (2000). *The 48 laws of power*. New York, NY: Penguin Press.
- Howe, P.R. (2005). *Leadership and training for the fight: A few thoughts on leadership and training from a former Special Operations soldier*. Bloomington, IN: Authorhouse.
- House, Robert, J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321-339.
- Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kouzes, J.M. & Posner B.Z. (2002). *The Leadership Challenge*. San Francisco, Ca: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. E. (2003). *Treat people right: How organizations and individuals can propel each other into a virtuous spiral of success*. San Francisco, Ca: Jossey-Bass.
- Maple, J. (1999). *The crime fighter*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- McNamara, C. (2005). *Field guide to consulting and organizational development: A collaborative and systems approach to performance, change and learning*. Minneapolis, MN.: Authenticity Consulting LLC.
- McCall, M.W. (1998). *High flyers: Developing the next generation of leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Miner, J. (2006). *Organizational Behavior 3*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.

- More, H.W., Wegener, W. F., & Miller, L.S. (1999). *Effective police supervision* (3rd edition). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Morgan, G. (1997). *Imagin-i-zation: New mindsets for seeing, organizing and managing*. San Francisco, CA: Berret Koehler.
- Motivation and Management Vroom's Expectancy Theory*. Retrieved November 11, 2007 from Value Based Management Web site:
http://www.valuebasedmanagement.net/methods_vroom_expectancy_theory.htm
- Mouzelis, N.P. (1967). *Organisation and bureaucracy: An analysis of modern theories*. Hawthorn, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- O'Conner, T., (2004). *Police organization, megalinks in criminal justice*. Retrieved on May 19, 2007 from
<http://www.apsu.edu/oconnert/http://faculty.ncwc.edu/toconnor/html>
- O'Toole, J. (1996). *Leading change: The argument for values-based leadership*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.
- Rampersad, H.K. (2003). *Total performance scorecard: Redefining management to achieve performance with integrity*. Burlington, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Russ-Eft, D., & Preskill, H. (2001). *Evaluation in organizations*. Cambridge, MA: Basic Books.
- Sample, S. (2002). *The contrarian's guide to leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Teerlink, R., & Ozley, L. (2000). *More than a motorcycle*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education. (2007).

Commission Rules: Effective 03/01/07. Retrieved May 19, 2007, from

http://www.tcleose.state.tx.us/Commission_Rules/Comm%20Rules.htm

Ulrich, D., Zenger, J., & Smallwood, N. (1999). *Results based leadership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Whisenand, P.M. (1976). *Police supervision theory and practice (2nd edition)*.

Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-hall, Inc.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Do you Understand Change?

Rank: _____
Law Enforcement Agency _____
Type of Agency: () Police () Sheriff

1. How much is change a part of law enforcement?

() 0-50% (x) 50-100%
2. Have you been given training on managing change?

() Yes () No
3. How much of change in your organization is a result of internal tensions (changes in internal strategies, changes in work strategies, reorganization, etc.)?

() 0-50% () 50-100%
4. How much of change in your organization is a result of external tensions (media pressures, city hall pressures, federal pressure, community, etc.)?

() 0-50% (x) 50-100%
5. As a supervisor/manager in your organization do you understand the difference between revolutionary and evolutionary change?

() Yes () No
6. As an employee/subordinate in your organization, do you understand the difference between revolutionary and evolutionary change?

() Yes () No
7. Where revolutionary change means drastic/sudden/immediate change and evolutionary change means gradual implementation, which do you prefer?

() Revolutionary (x) Evolutionary

8. If revolutionary change efforts were explained by giving reasons for it, would its impact be seen in a more positive manner? (For example, we are having to shift resources to this other department and change hours immediately "so that"...).

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

9. Do you find any benefits to revolutionary change?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

10. If you feel revolutionary change is beneficial, what are its benefits?

11. If you find revolutionary change not to be beneficial, what are its disadvantages?

12. Do you find any benefits to evolutionary change?

☐ Yes ☐ No

13. If you feel evolutionary change is beneficial, what are its benefits?

14. If you do not see benefit in evolutionary change, what are its disadvantages?

15. Do you believe your employees/subordinates understand the difference between revolutionary and evolutionary change?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

16. As a employee/subordinate in a police agency, does understanding the differences between revolutionary and evolutionary change matter.

☐ Yes ☐ No

17. Would it benefit your employees/subordinates to understand revolutionary and evolutionary change?

☐ Yes ☐ No

18. Do you believe that your supervisors/managers understand the difference between revolutionary and evolutionary change?

☐ Yes ☐ No

19. As a supervisor/manager in a police agency, does understanding the differences between revolutionary and evolutionary change matter.

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

20. Would it benefit your supervisors/managers to understand revolutionary and evolutionary change?

☐ Yes ☐ No

21. Would training in revolutionary and evolutionary change better help your department to manage change?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Appendix 2

Participating Law Enforcement Agencies:

Abilene PD	Friendswood PD	Shenandoah PD
Allen PD	Galveston PD	Spring ISD PD
Alvin ISD PD	Gillespie County SO	Texarkana PD
Angleton PD	Harris County SO	Tomball PD
Austin ISD PD	Irving PD	Trophy Club PD
Bryan PD	Luling PD	UT Austin PD
Bexar County SO	Mesquite PD	Uvalde PD
College Station PD	University of North Texas PD	Victoria PD
Decatur PD	Pflugerville PD	Weatherford PD
Floresville PD	Rowlett PD	
Flower Mound PD	Sherman PD	

