

# C

# E



**Center for  
Effective  
Organizations**

---

**Quality Circles in a  
Metropolitan Police Department**

**CEO Publication  
G 84-12 (60)**

Susan Page Hocevar  
University of Southern California

Susan A. Mohrman  
Center for Effective Organizations

May 1994

The authors would like to acknowledge the support, time, and insights given by the following people: Captain Joe DeLadurantey and Sergeant Kip Meyerhoff of Wilshire Field Services Division; Chief Daryl Gates of the Los Angeles Police Department; Captain John Higgins, Chair of the Human Resource Development Committee; and all Wilshire Station personnel who participated in this project.

This research was supported by a grant from the ARCO Foundation and with additional resources provided by the Center for Effective Organizations, Graduate School of Business, University of Southern California.

**Quality Circles in a  
Metropolitan Police Department**

**CEO Publication  
G 84-12 (60)**

Susan Page Hocevar  
University of Southern California

Susan A. Mohrman  
Center for Effective Organizations

May 1994

The authors would like to acknowledge the support, time, and insights given by the following people: Captain Joe DeLadurantey and Sergeant Kip Meyerhoff of Wilshire Field Services Division; Chief Daryl Gates of the Los Angeles Police Department; Captain John Higgins, Chair of the Human Resource Development Committee; and all Wilshire Station personnel who participated in this project.

This research was supported by a grant from the ARCO Foundation and with additional resources provided by the Center for Effective Organizations, Graduate School of Business, University of Southern California.



## Biographical Statement

Susan Page Hocevar is a doctoral student in the Department of Management and Organization at the University of Southern California. Her interests include social issues in management, Quality of Work Life and participative management, and public/private sector cooperation.

Susan A. Mohrman is a research scientist in the Center for Effective Organizations at the University of Southern California. Her research focuses on innovations in human resources management and management style, and organizational design processes.



## QUALITY CIRCLES IN A METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

### Abstract

This paper describes the background and status of a quality circles program in one division of a large metropolitan police department. Data include attitude survey results, in-depth interviews, and observations of circle meetings and activities. The study describes the goals of the QC program, characteristics of participants, the accomplishments after one year, level of support, and perceived strengths and weaknesses. It also examines aspects of the organizational content and features of the program design which relate to program effectiveness. The potential values and problems in using a quality circles approach in a para-military organization are discussed.

## QUALITY CIRCLES IN A METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

This paper reports a study of the efforts of one large metropolitan police department to utilize an innovative management technique to address some of the morale problems which are confronting police departments in the 1980s. This innovation, a quality circle program, is an explicit attempt to supplement the strong top-down control characteristic of the para-military police organization with a mechanism for police officers to initiate upward communication and to draw organizational attention to the problems which they face in their day-to-day functioning.

Quality circles are participative structures consisting of small groups of employees who meet together, generally on company time, to identify and solve problems which they confront in performing their work. They receive training in problem-solving techniques and in group process. A leader, often the supervisor of the employees, receives special training in leading a group. Generally, the group has a facilitator, an individual specially trained to keep the group moving, assist it in problems which it encounters, and help it prepare its ideas to be presented to management for their consideration. The circle has the authority only to recommend solutions to management, except in the rare case where the issue under consideration impacts only those in the circle and does not require approval or resources from elsewhere in the organization.

The adoption of quality circle programs is based on the belief that participation in organizational decision-making is intrinsically satisfying to individuals. Further, the assumption is that the individuals who do the work have the best knowledge of the problems that

must be solved in order for them to be more effective, and that if given the proper training, they can solve the problems. In addition, it is widely believed that if employees have the opportunity to participate in the change process, they will be more committed to implementing changes and innovations which will improve organizational effectiveness.

Based partially on their successful use in Japanese industry, quality circles have been introduced into American companies at a rate which might qualify them to be called a "fad."<sup>1</sup> They have been used primarily in blue-collar industrial settings, although more recently service organizations and other white-collar settings have begun to adopt quality circle programs.<sup>2</sup> U.S. military organizations and government agencies have experimented a good deal with quality circles,<sup>3</sup> but we have encountered no accounts of their use in police settings. Special characteristics of that setting are described below.

#### The Police Organization

Much has been written about the para-military model of organization that characterizes police departments. Defenders of this organizational model mention its functionality in promoting quick response capability, conformance to standards, and unquestioning loyalty and obedience.<sup>4</sup> Others mention the suitability of this model given the expressed preferences of police officers for highly structured work environments and authority in interpersonal and law enforcement relationships.<sup>5</sup>

There is some suggestion, however, that the para-military model may not be congruent with other important aspects of the police context. Police officers perform many of their tasks in the field, far out of the view of their supervisors, a fact which gives them considerable discretionary power, often in the face of highly ambiguous situations.<sup>6</sup>

In addition, strong bonds of solidarity between officers and task interdependence in the face of dangerous and uncertain situations create conditions where peer group influence is a strong enforcer of behavioral norms, and peer support acts as a moderator of job stress.<sup>7</sup>

In a bureaucratic police setting, such peer influence may lead to a highly cohesive working unit characterized by alienation and counter-organizational norms.<sup>8</sup> Initial enthusiasm and commitment to the police force may change quickly to norms of "laying low" and "not making waves" during a heavily peer-influenced socialization process.<sup>9</sup> Perhaps most important, the behavioral norms which develop within highly authoritative police structures may prevent effective task performance. Authoritarian behavior may be generalized to dealings with the public, leading to an unfavorable image in the community;<sup>10</sup> and may stifle initiative and discretion, resulting in a highly reactive, crisis-oriented organizational mode of functioning.<sup>11</sup>

These contradictions inherent in the organization and nature of police work are exacerbated by operational problems, including tension between police and citizenry, low morale, pockets of counter-productive police behavior, and politicization of the role of the police in society.<sup>12</sup> In addition, police departments have faced funding shortages, service cut-backs, and pressures to become more efficient and effective in delivering police protection. So far, bureaucratization and technological innovation, particularly the computerization of large portions of police work, have been the key organizational response. These responses may have, in and of themselves, introduced tension between the "street-cop" and "management-cop" orientations.<sup>13</sup>

## The Study

The location of this study is the Los Angeles Police Department, which like many large urban departments, has suffered from all of the problems mentioned in the above paragraphs. To deal with some of these issues, a cross-sectional, representative standing committee, the Human Resource Development Committee (HRDC) was constituted. They were specifically charged with the development of management recommendations in response to employee attitude surveys which indicated morale problems. The HRDC made the following four recommendations:

1. Demonstrate and communicate true alignment on a common purpose.
2. Shift the emphasis in management style away from technology to that of the development of human resources and improving the quality of life for all employees.
3. Develop an expanded sense of responsibility for the Department, and for the community as a whole.
4. Increase the emphasis on participative management, open communication, trust, and the opportunity for self-expression.

At the time these recommendations were formulated, the Commanding Officer of the Wilshire Area Station along with one of his sergeants were members of HRDC. They decided to try a Quality Circle approach within their local station in an attempt to meet these objectives.

At first glance, it would appear that the use of such a participative structure would be incompatible with formal, top-down bureaucratic control. Likewise, the QC might be viewed as a manipulative device by police officers who feel alienated from their bureaucratic context. On the other hand, the QC offers a potential vehicle for officer input and efficacy in the organization, and may serve as a nucleus for the development of pro-organization cohesiveness. The reaction of organizational members and the response of police

management would partially determine the effectiveness of the QC process. In other words, some police contexts may be more hospitable to such a program than others.

This paper presents learning from an in-depth case study of an experimental quality circle program in the Wilshire Patrol Division of the Los Angeles Police Department. The study was jointly designed by the research team and members of the police department to provide information useful to the police department in understanding how quality circles operate. It focuses on the implementation problems which were confronted, how police officers responded to the technique, what kinds of issues were addressed by the groups and with what success, and whether the circles became institutionalized in the unit. One goal of the research is to learn about the elements of the QC program as well as organizational context which are important to the robustness and the effectiveness of this participative process. This paper does not attempt to evaluate quality circles; rather, it presents information about how they operate in the police context.

The study consists of four components: 1) Structured interviews were conducted with over 20 people from the Wilshire Station, including both quality circle participants and non-participants. 2) In-depth interviews were conducted with key informants--individuals who played a key role or are particularly knowledgeable about the quality circle program. 3) Written questionnaires were administered to a stratified random sample from the Wilshire Station including both participants and non-participants (N=87). The survey included sections concerning respondent demographics, general attitudes, and perception of the

general organizational context. These general organizational scales came largely from the Michigan Assessment of Organizations.<sup>14</sup> The survey also measured perceptions of the quality circle process.

4) Limited archival and observational data was gathered. Although not systematic, the observation of some meetings afforded the researchers the opportunity to get a "reality check" on the perceptions of the participants of the QC meetings. Data were collected in the summer of 1983--approximately 18 months after the initiation of the program.

#### The Experimental QC Program

Wilshire Station is comprised of uniformed patrol, detectives, and support personnel. They represent the first line of response for service to citizens on crimes and complaints. The area served by this station includes small businesses, light industry, and residential sections, a broad range in income levels and diverse ethnicity.

Within LAPD, Wilshire is among the top in number of calls and number of crimes, particularly robberies. At the same time, this area enjoys a very positive reputation among officers in the Department. Though the work load is heavy, Wilshire is often requested by officers seeking transfer, and the promotion rate for officers from this station is high. Wilshire also has a large and active support group within the community. Consistent with Wilshire's reputation, interviews of officers assigned there indicate high morale, good working relationships with both peers and supervisors, and a strong sense of cohesiveness and commitment.

There are currently three quality circles active in the Wilshire Patrol Division: a Supervisors' QC (all Sergeants), an Officers' QC, and a Training Officers' QC. Training officers are uniformed police who

are assigned to probationary police officers and provide training, guidance and evaluation in the field. Each of the three circles has a different constituency and thus varying activity emphases. The Supervisors' and Officers' circles were started about 1.5 years before this study was conducted. The Training Officers' QC had been in operation for a year. In forming these circles, potential members were solicited by a Sergeant who represented Wilshire on the HRD committee. He briefed prospective members on the HRDC recommendations and shared information on quality circles, their objectives, and techniques. After this initial awareness training by the Sergeant, all members received one day of skill training on group process and problem-solving techniques and spent another day establishing goals, by-laws, and procedures. In addition, the leader of each circle participated in a week-long, in-depth QE training program offered by a local aerospace company.

The three circles have between 6 and 10 members and usually meet once every two weeks. The three Lieutenant Watch Commanders constitute a steering committee; they do not meet formally, but act individually as resources and review QC recommendations. The Commanding Officer of the Field Services Division of Wilshire has taken managerial responsibility for QC activities. He is a strong advocate of quality circles in the Department, as well as in the station.

#### Quality Circle Participants

Though participation in QCs is voluntary, initial members were solicited by Wilshire's Commanding Officer and the Sergeant on the HRDC. Many of the original members continue to participate, and replacement members are usually recruited by existing membership. Thus, membership

may reflect the characteristics of informal leaders within the station. Participants come from all 3 shifts.

Using the survey data, QC participants (n=16) were compared with nonmember police officers (n=64) within Area A. Comparisons were made in terms of demographic variables, attitudinal variables, and degree of support for the QC program. Demographic variable comparisons indicate that QC members are significantly older ( $\bar{x} = 36.6$ ,  $t(34.81) = 2.42$ ,  $p < .5$ ), and have been with the Police Department significantly longer ( $\bar{x} = 10.9$ ,  $t(37.75) = 3.59$ ,  $p < .05$ ) than nonmember officers (mean age = 31.4; mean tenure = 6.9). This probably reflects the larger percentage of sergeants in the participant sample, since one entire circle was composed of sergeants. No differences were found for education or time in current job category.

Comparisons were also made on 28 attitude variables such as job satisfaction, supervisory characteristics, job characteristics, and commitment. All questions were scored from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). QC members are not unlike the general population of personnel at Wilshire in terms of general attitudes and perceptions of the organization. These data also support the earlier description of Wilshire as a cohesive organization with generally high morale and a positive climate. Only one variable indicates significant differences between members and nonmembers. "Area Involvement" measures how important Wilshire Station is to those who work there (coefficient alpha = .71). While both groups indicate fairly strong feelings of involvement, QC members scored significantly higher on this scale ( $\bar{x} = 6.3$ ) than nonmembers ( $\bar{x} = 6.00$ ,  $t(46.28) = 2.21$ ,  $p < .05$ ). This finding could be the result of the selection or self-selection criteria

for initial QC members. Alternatively, it may be an outcome of members' participation through the QC in addressing Area concerns.

#### Goals of the Quality Circle Program

Interviewees were asked questions about the goals of the QC program. A major overall goal mentioned by many of those interviewed is the increased involvement of officers in the management of their work, and the use of line personnel as resources for problem identification and problem solving. More specific goals included the improvement of: the quality and efficiency of work, morale, the work environment, quality of training of probationary officers, service to the community, and personal effectiveness.

One section of the written survey asked people to evaluate 15 items as to whether they should be goals of the QC program using a 3-point category--1 = a major goal, 2 = a minor goal, 3 = not a goal. Results are presented in Table 1. The pattern of survey results supports the interview findings in that increasing employee involvement and participation in problem solving are among the top ranked items, as are improving work systems and procedures, and trust. The percentage of respondents describing an item "a major goal" and the arithmetic mean scores are presented for each item. The range of means is from 1.29 for "improving work systems and procedures" to 2.01 for "enhancing employee benefits." Respondents believed in a wide range of goals for the QC process. Some areas, such as reduction of costs, improvement of benefits and reduction of absenteeism were viewed as less appropriate.

## Impacts and Accomplishments

Survey respondents were asked to evaluate the impact QC's have had on each of the same 15 items which were described in the discussion of goals above. The data reported in Table 2 represent the percentage of people who responded that there had been a positive impact, no impact, and a negative impact. Consistent with some of the literature on quality circles, the major positive impact that was noticed by people to date has been on the physical environment of the workplace. This reflects a particularly salient change in the decoration and equipment in the coffee room, as well as an emphasis on cleanliness of patrol cars. Many officers were unaware of QC responsibility for accomplishments in procedural areas. It is important to note, however, that three of the most important goals identified in Table 1 are among the top five ranked on program impact--involvement, participation in decision making, and improvement in work systems and procedures.

The mean rating for QC impact on the top-ranked item of workplace environment is 5.59; the second highest (feelings of involvement) is 4.97; and the lowest (employee benefits) is 4.21. In other words, with the exception of workplace environment, QC's are seen as having only a slightly positive impact even on the most highly ranked items. This is consistent with interview results which found several people, particularly QC members, expressing frustration that the QCs have not had as much of an influence on issues such as work systems and safety conditions as they would like. This may be because the circle program is relatively immature. Equally likely, however, is that such policy-type issues are not within the domain of influence of a quality circle within one Area of this highly centralized Police Department, making it difficult to get changes approved and implemented.

The QC program is not without recognized accomplishments. Both members and non-members provided a substantial list of specified tangible achievements which are listed in Table 3. Among the work system accomplishments described were improvements made in the radio-call response procedures. The physical environment of the work site was changed in several ways, including providing access to the weight room (previously in the men's locker room) to female officers. Several accomplishments in the training and development area were described, including the design of an orientation process for probationary officers newly assigned to the station.

The results were not without problems. For example, a proposed watch rotation policy was at least temporarily blocked by the Police Officers' League requiring a "meet and confer" as a contract issue. The new performance rating report procedures, although approved, were lagging due to insufficient support personnel to implement them. On the other side, the new radio call procedures had reduced citizen complaints and the amount of backlog carry-over between watches. The dummy designed for officers to practice the use of the Manadnock stick had been adopted by the local Police Academy as part of their regular training procedures.

In addition to the tangible improvements in the work environment and the safety and condition of equipment, several nontangible impacts were often mentioned. These include: improved morale, more social exchange among officers, increased feelings of responsibility, providing a forum for ideas, and improved attitudes toward work. Most of those interviewed stated that there have been no negative impacts of the program. However, a couple of respondents mentioned each of the

following: insufficient nonmember involvement, pulling people away from assignments for QC work, new demands on the Commanding Officer from Department management and other Station commanders, and not enough attention to truly important issues.

#### Program Effectiveness

Most interviewees viewed the QC process relatively positively. Survey measures were used to determine which aspects of the organizational context and of the QC program itself were related to perceptions of effectiveness. A correlation matrix and reliability coefficients for each of the variables appears in Table 4. Four outcome measures were used:

1. Impact: The 15 impact items referred to in the preceding section were averaged to give a measure of total program impact.
2. Permanence: A single item measured the extent to which respondents felt the QC program was permanent in the Area.
3. Recognition: This scale measured the extent to which quality circles were recognized and treated as important.
4. Program Effectiveness: This scale measured the respondent's perceptions of the quality circles' effectiveness in accomplishing important improvements.

These outcome perceptions were related to the following aspects of the organizational context: 1) innovativeness; 2) encouragement to make suggestions; 3) level of involvement of employees in problem-solving at Wilshire Station; 4) teamwork; and 5) participativeness of supervision. QCs would be expected to function more effectively in organizations

which have higher levels of these organizational qualities, since the QC model would be relatively congruent with existing organizational norms. An effectively functioning QC process would be expected to enhance these attributes.

Aside from contextual factors, the design aspects of the QC program itself could influence employee perceptions of the effectiveness of the circles. The design elements which were examined included: 1) membership opportunities--the extent to which people feel they had the opportunity to become members; 2) representative views--the extent to which employees feel that the quality circles are responsive to their ideas and represent the viewpoints of everyone in the Division; and 3) communication--the extent to which the activities of the quality circles are communicated to the rest of the facility.

The zero-order correlations (Table 4) indicate that the four outcome measures are significantly related to all of the contextual characteristics except Teamwork, and to Representation of Viewpoints and Communication in the Quality Circle program. In order to find out if the different outcomes were differentially related to these context and program variables, four regression analyses were performed, with the eight context and program variables as independent variables. Table 5 indicates which independent variables entered the regression equations with significance ( $p < .05$ ).

Perceptions of Program Effectiveness are most strongly related to the way the QC program is designed. People who feel there is good Communication and that Non-Member Views are represented feel the program is more effective. This makes good sense. Since the quality circle is, theoretically, a mechanism for employees to influence the decision

making process, it would not be viewed as particularly effective by employees who feel uninformed about its activities, or who feel that their viewpoints were not taken into account.

Program impact, on the other hand, is significantly predicted only by a contextual variable, Problem-solving Involvement. Since the quality circle process had been in operation for 18 months, it is highly likely that the impact variable reflects the degree to which participative problem-solving had been enhanced by the QCs. Interview respondents, however, indicated that a high involvement climate had pre-dated the quality circle process, making it easier for a program to take hold.

Permanence is predicted by a different set of variables. People are less likely to feel that the QC program is a temporary phenomenon if they perceive the organization to Encourage Suggestions, and if they feel that people have opportunity for Membership in a circle. Since the quality circle is, by its nature, a suggestion-type mechanism, with no formal authority to make decisions, it cannot continue to exist if the management hierarchy is not responsive to suggestions from below. In addition, if membership in a circle is not available to everyone, it will come to be perceived as an elite group, which will destroy its close linkage to its organizational peers.

Finally, four independent variables enter the equation predicting Recognition. The contextual variable, Involvement in Problem Solving explains the most variance. All three program design variables also enter with significance. Thus, if the quality circles are linked to their context through good communication and accessibility to employees,

and if the employees are involved in problem solving, the program is likely to receive attention and recognition.

#### Support for the Quality Circle Program

Overall, the mean scores for the supervisory personnel on the measures of the quality circle program were in general more favorable than those for line officers, although the differences did not achieve statistical significance. Supervision saw the program as more effective and more accessible to personnel. Although the middle management ranks have been found to be bottlenecks in some attempts to install quality circles in business settings, this did not appear to be a problem in this program. Sergeants, in particular, were explicitly involved in this QC program. This gave them an opportunity to address their own concerns, doubtless reducing their resistance to allowing officers to do the same.

Perceived support for the QC program was explicitly examined on the questionnaire by asking respondents to evaluate the supportiveness of individuals and groups within both Wilshire Station and the broader Los Angeles Police Department. Table 6 gives the mean ratings for each group. The most supportive group are the top managers of Wilshire. There is little difference among the perceived support from middle managers, supervisors (sergeants), the Chief of Police or self-ratings of the individual.

The most significant finding of this section, which was strongly supported by the interview data, is the low level of support ascribed to "Top Managers within the Department." These managers are above the rank of the Captains in charge of Wilshire and below the Chief of Police. Many of those interviewed expressed concern that the primary threat to

the future success and dissemination of QCs or other participative management efforts was the "middle management" level of the Police Department. These managers were described as viewing QCs as a potential threat to their authority and the established bureaucracy of the Department. This opinion was expressed primarily by QC members who were more aware of the opinions and reactions of Department managers.

In contrast, strong support from the management of Wilshire Station, and particularly from the Commanding Officer, was clearly perceived by the interviewees. As was evident from the contextual data described earlier, the climate at Wilshire was very favorable, particularly when compared to the overall Department climate, which was suffering serious morale and image problems. Interviews suggested that the leadership style in the unit was a major ingredient of the positive climate. There was a strong emphasis on the personal worth of the officers. The Commanding Officer appeared to consciously and effectively buffer the station from problems in the larger department. His handling of the QC process exemplified these values. He interfered little with the direction the groups took, and in fact allowed them to stub their toes on issues beyond their domain, in order that they might become aware of political and operational constraints. Meanwhile, he was very supportive of their efforts, and placed an umbrella of protection around their activities. In many cases he took their ideas to higher levels of the department, always with due credit to the group members. His positive attitudes toward QCs were shared by the Lieutenants and Sergeants in the Wilshire Field Services Division.

During the interviews, circle members and nonmembers were asked a general question about how they personally felt about the quality circle program. The majority response to this question was very positive. Some of the reasons given for this opinion include: the opportunity to participate, a feeling of involvement, more effective use of personnel resources, skill development, improved efficiency, and increased feelings of belonging and worth. They felt the QC program gave them a voice, a forum from which they could impact on the chain of command. This substantiates the notion that QCs might provide a buffer from the tight, top down control of a para-military organization.

When asked what they expect will happen to the QC program in the future, the majority response was again optimistic. Most of those interviewed stated that they expect the program to continue and grow at Wilshire, assuming continued local management support. Although several respondents hoped for dissemination of the QC process to other divisions, many were more pessimistic. Expansion of the QCs was viewed as contingent on demonstrated QC effectiveness, increased Department support, and fit with the management style of other division commanders.

#### Summary: Quality Circles and the Police Context

This paper has reported descriptive data concerning the operation of a quality circle program in one Field Services Division of the Los Angeles Police Department. After 18 months of functioning, the program is relatively stable, active and supported by division personnel. In fact, informal follow-up data collected in the summer of 1984 indicates that the circle process survived a change in division

command at Wilshire. It also indicated that several other divisions were showing interest in beginning a QC program.

The robustness of this quality circle process is interesting, given its delicacy in the private sector.<sup>15</sup> Several attributes of the police context would suggest that police departments might provide a less than satisfactory home for employee problem-solving groups. The reported orientation of police officers toward a highly-structured organizational setting, and their relatively strong socialization into patterns of conformity might make it unlikely that officers would use problem-solving groups to generate innovative ideas. Further, the strongly directive bureaucracy might be expected to respond slowly and cautiously to ideas which do emerge. Nevertheless, the police officers at Wilshire responded quite favorably to the opportunity to have a voice, and to take initiative in addressing their own problems. In fact, the longer-tenured officers, sergeants and, in some cases, the opinion leaders of the area, were among the most active participants.

The individual station or division may be the best level for a large urban police department to begin cooperative efforts to address many of the issues it is facing today. Through the problem-solving process, the members of Wilshire Division felt they could work together and have a voice, thus providing social cohesion as well as a sense of empowerment, however limited. This may be an effective approach to dealing with the stresses and difficulties of policing in the 1980s and the alienation which results. In the words of the Human Resource Development Committee of LAPD, it may provide a means to more positively align the goals of the department and the energies of its employees.

The unit we studied was perhaps not representative of the Department as a whole. It had managed to establish a positive climate despite the fact that it faced all the problems that are being confronted by police in urban settings. The success of this QC process does suggest that a bottom-up participative structure can exist harmoniously with the top-down bureaucracy, if adequately nurtured by the leadership of the unit and if designed to integrate well with the context. It remains to be seen whether this model can achieve more broadspread acceptance in the department.

#### Footnotes

1. See for example, Robert E. Cole, "Learning from the Japanese: Prospects and Pitfalls," American Management Review (September 1980); Ed Yager, "Examining the Quality Control Circle," Personnel Journal, Vol. 58 (1979), pp. 692-708; and The Wall Street Journal (September 22, 1981), p. 29.
2. J. D. Blair, S. L. Cohen, and J. V. Hurwitz, Quality Circles: Practical Considerations for Public Managers, Vol. 6 (1982), pp. 9-18.
3. See for example, Stephen Bryand and Joseph Kearns, "'Workers' Brains as Well as their Bodies: Quality Circles in a Federal Facility," Public Administration Review, (March/April 1982), pp. 144-150.
4. O. W. Wilson and R. C. McLaren, Police Administration, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972); J. A. Gazelle, "O. W. Wilson's Essential Legacy for Police Administration," Journal of Police Science and Administration, Vol. 2 (1974), pp. 365-375.
5. Joel Lefkowitz, "Industrial-Organizational Psychology and the Police," American Psychologist, Vol. 32 (5) (May 1977), pp. 346-364; and "Psychological Attributes of Policemen: A Review of Research and Opinion," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 31(1) (1975), pp. 3-26; also N. Cochran, "Authority Orientations of Police Officers," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 60 (1975), pp. 641-643.
6. M. K. Brown, "The Impact of Alternative Forms of Citizen Control on Police Organization and Police Discretion," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars,

- 1977; Gary W. Cordner, "Open and Closed Models of Police Organizations: Traditions, Dilemmas, and Practical Considerations," Journal of Police Science and Administration, Vol. 6(1) (1978), pp. 22-34; and Lefkowitz, op. cit., (1977).
7. J. B. House, Work, Stress and Social Support (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1981).
  8. Elizabeth Reuss-Ianni and Francis A. J. Ianni, "Street Cops and Management Cops: The Two Cultures of Policing," pp. 251-274 in M. Punch (ed.), Control in the Police Organization, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983).
  9. John Van Maanen, "Police Socialization: A longitudinal Examination of Job Attitudes in an Urban Police Department," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 20 (June 1975), pp. 207-228.
  10. John M. Jermier and Leslie J. Berkes, "Leader Behavior in a Police Command Bureaucracy: A Closer Look at the Quasi-Military Model," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 24 (March 1979), pp. 1-23.
  11. James H. Auten, "The Paramilitary Model of Police and Police Professionalism," Police Studies, Vol. 4 (1981), pp. 67-78.
  12. A. J. Reiss, "Police Brutality--Answers to Key Questions," pp. 333-342 in A. Niederhoffer and A. S. Blumberg (eds.), The Ambivalent Force, 2nd ed., (Hinsdale, IL: Dryden Press, 1976); S. Walker, "The Urban Police in American History: A Review of the Literature," Journal of Police Science and Administration, Vol. 4 (1976), pp. 252-260; Jermier and Berkes, op. cit.; and Robert Reiner, "The Politicization of the Police in Britain," pp. 126-148 in M. Punch, op. cit.
  13. Reuss-Ianni and Ianni, op. cit.

14. Edward E. Lawler III, David A. Nadler and Cortlandt Cammann, Organizational Assessment: Perspectives on the Measurement of Organizational Behavior and the Quality of Work Life, (New York: Wiley Interscience, 1980).
15. Edward E. Lawler III and Susan A. Mohrman, "Quality Circles: A Self-Destruct Intervention?" Harvard Business Review, (in press).



Table 2

## Quality Circle Program Impacts

<u>Item</u>	<u>Positive Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	<u>Negative Impact</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
The comfort and attractiveness of the physical work environment	88%	11%	1%	5.59
Employee feelings of involvement at work	70	30	0	4.97
Employee participation in decision making	67	31	1	4.84
Volunteer efforts	66	33	1	4.97
Work systems and procedures	64	35	1	4.81
Communication	55	44	1	4.86
Safety conditions	55	42	3	4.66
Productivity levels	52	42	6	4.63
Employee skills and ability	50	47	3	4.53
Quality of service to the community	48	47	5	4.64
Trust between employees and managers	47	47	6	4.56
The way supervisors treat employees	45	53	1	4.61
Costs	31	67	1	4.38
Employee benefits	27	65	8	4.21
Absenteeism	22	75	3	4.25

---

Note: The 7-point response categories were collapsed such that % Positive Impact includes categories 7, 6, 5; % No Impact represents category 4; % Negative Impact includes categories 3, 2, 1.

Table 3

Quality Circle Accomplishments

Physical Environment

- 2 voluntary car-washes of patrol vehicles
- improved coffee room
- access to weight room for female officers

Work System Changes

- modifications to radio-call response procedures
- improved mechanisms for rating reports
- revised watch rotation policy referred to Department

Training and Development

- orientation for probationary officers
- design of manadnock dummy for equipment use training
- training day for training officers

Intangible Accomplishments

- Increased communication with Supervisors and Captain
- increased morale
- increased awareness about QCs
- increased feeling of being involved; having an impact
- skill development through QC participation

Table 4

Correlations of Context and Program Characteristics and Program Outcomes

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.
<u>Contextual Characteristics</u>												
1. Innovation (.80)*												
2. Encouragement to make Suggestions (.77)	.58											
3. Problem-solving Involvement (.71)	.63	.78										
4. Teamwork (.87)	.53	.51	.54									
5. Participative Supervision (.78)	.64	.63	.63	.57								
<u>Program Characteristics</u>												
6. Communication (.61)	.43	.49	.43	.05X	.24							
7. Membership (.56)	.18X	.14X	.15X	-.13X	.09X	.36						
8. Representative Viewpoints (.51)	.38	.42	.33	.17X	.39	.53	.35					
<u>Outcomes</u>												
9. Program Effectiveness (.76)	.40	.39	.41	.09X	.25	.51	.26	.50				
10. Permanence (single item)	.35	.44	.38	.01X	.24	.40	.38	.24	.62			
11. Recognition (.78)	.47	.47	.52	.28	.39	.56	.12X	.55	.69	.40		
12. Impact (.90)	.46	.45	.51	.26	.32	.35	.14X	.39	.47	.39	.34	

Note: \*Coefficient alpha reliabilities are given in parentheses.

All correlations are significant with  $p < .05$  except those marked with X.  
 $59 > N > 74$  with pair-wise deletions.

Table 5

Regression of Contextual and  
Program Characteristics on Program Outcomes

<u>Dependent Variable</u>	<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>R<sup>2</sup></u>
1. Program Effectiveness	a. Representative Viewpoints	16.55	.24
	b. Program Communication	6.06	.33
2. Permanence	a. Encourage Suggestions	9.49	.16
	b. Membership	5.78	.25
3. Recognition	a. Problem Solving Involvement	49.76	.49
	b. Representative Viewpoints	10.19	.58
	c. Membership	3.99	.61
	d. Program Communication	4.18	.64
4. Impact	a. Problem Solving Involvement	21.22	.29

---

Note: Only independent variables with a significant F-to-enter are reported,  $p < .05$ .  
N = 50 in this analyses due to missing data.

Table 6

## Ratings of Support for the QC Program

<u>Item</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Me	5.34
Employees at this location	5.08
My supervisor	5.46
Middle managers at this location	5.43
Top managers at this location	5.66
Top managers within the Department	4.85
Chief of Police	5.37

---

Note: Mean score on a 7-point rating scale where 1 = strongly opposed, 4 = on the fence, 7 = strongly supportive.

n = 87