

3

Police Leadership

The leader must lead from the front—exposing him or herself to the same dangers and hardships as the cops in the field while monitoring whether the department's tactics and strategies are being carried out and whether or not they're working.

Jack Maple, *The Crime Fighter* (1999, p. 244)

Learning Objectives

1. To define leadership in policing.
2. To identify the elements of leadership styles.
3. To define the attributes of transformational leadership.
4. To identify the elements of the Leadership Challenge Model.
5. To identify the elements of servant leadership.
6. To identify the elements of situational leadership.

Introduction

Leadership is the key force behind the creation of effective organizations. In policing, leadership can energize and become a dynamic force in the agency—invigorating change and sponsoring professionalization. Leadership motivates individuals to perform the tasks that can move the organization forward. Effective leaders motivate their followers to do what is best for the organization. They accomplish this by creating a sense of purpose that both motivates and directs followers so they voluntarily make meaningful contributions to the department. Thus a leader is a source of both guidance and inspiration. In this chapter, we will provide a review of relevant theories of leadership that apply to policing.

The elements of police leadership are a vital concern and provide a sign of what is important. Leadership is not found only at the executive/administrative level of the police organization. It can be exercised at any level of the department. For example, Haberfeld (2006, p. 3) defines police leadership as “the ability to make a split-second decision and take control of a potentially high-voltage situation that evolves on the street.” She also asserts that line officers are “the true leaders on the streets, using their leadership skills in daily encounters with the community, and police executives and policy makers need to realize

it” (Haberfeld, 2006, p. 3). Baker (2006, p. 41) contends that effective leadership is exercised by police managers in different ways, depending upon their rank in the department. Senior executive leadership should develop and share their vision for the organization, charting the path to the accomplishment of this vision by establishing strategic objectives and practicing collaboration and delegation of tasks. Police middle managers operationalize the vision through coordinating and planning, mentoring and coaching, building teams, and empowering and rewarding their subordinates. First-line supervisors who are the closest managers to department’s employees provide leadership by example, supervising, training and developing teams while evaluating performance.

It is vital that all levels of the department are mobilized and involved to ensure successful police leadership. Coaching and mentoring of the people doing day-to-day operations ensures the leader’s vision for the department is realized and that the organization will succeed. Leadership is most effective when it is aware of the need and expectations of subordinates. Villiers (2003, p. 33) notes that police leaders motivate their followers to:

- Transcend self-interest for the sake of organizational goals and values.
- Raise their need level up from security and safety to self-esteem or autonomy.
- Share with the leader a common vision of the importance of the leader’s goals or values to the future of the organization.

Motivated followers can achieve more than they thought possible, strengthen their commitment to, and raise departmental performance.

There are three related ideas about administration that guide our definition of leadership. First, leadership is a process that cannot be conceptually separated from achieving organizational objectives. Second, leadership can be learned by people in administrative positions in organizations. Much of the leadership literature assumes that effective leadership can be taught. Third, the leadership process is a group process. To accomplish organizational objectives, leaders must identify and influence a significant number of people who must do the work necessary for success. According to Gladwell’s (2006) Tipping Point Leadership theory, once the beliefs and energies of a critical mass of people are engaged, conversion to a new idea will spread, bringing about fundamental change quickly. The process of leadership must be examined in light of how leaders get people to achieve the tasks necessary for organizational existence and survival.

Effective leadership is grounded upon the direction and guidance provided by the leader through four styles of leadership. **Directive leadership** emphasizes the expectations of the leader and the tasks to be performed by subordinates. The leader emphasizes important organizational rules and regulations and their relationship to task performance. The leader provides guidance to subordinates and motivates them to accomplish the tasks required by the organization. **Supportive leadership** is an employee-centered process. Supportive leaders are approachable and friendly with their employees. Their primary concern is to accomplish the tasks of the organization while meeting the needs of their subordinates. **Participatory leadership** emphasizes collaboration between the leader and the subordinates. The leader seeks to involve subordinates in the decision-making process while assuring their importance in the organization. **Achievement-oriented leadership** is concerned with producing results. The leader expects that workers will attempt to do their best and is confident they will achieve stated goals. Each style can create an effective organization.

■ Studies of Police Leadership

The literature on police leadership reveals that distinct styles have been exercised in different ways. In an early study of 155 police managers, Kuykendall and Unsinger (1982) reported that “salesman” was the most commonly reported leadership style. The respondents noted that they viewed themselves as team managers who avoided “risky” styles. They avoided delegating high-level tasks to their subordinates. Apparently, these police managers lacked both trust and confidence in the abilities of their followers. However, in a similar study, Bruns and Shuman (1988) surveyed 365 law enforcement officers in 10 managerial training programs in Arizona from 1978–1982 and found that the respondents supported a highly participative management style for police leaders.

Girodo (1998) surveyed police chiefs from departments around the world, characterizing their leadership style under four categories. Transformational leaders were considerate, charismatic, and personable. Bureaucratic leaders identified with the management of a police organization structured by its rules. Social contract leaders felt that their approach was professional. Most of the police chief respondents identified with the Machiavellian model that stressed manipulating subordinates to achieve management ends. Girodo felt that the paramilitary structure of police departments helped create an authoritarian leadership style.

The bureaucratic structure of police departments is another major source of police organizational authoritarianism. Mayo (1985, p. 411) asserts that police chiefs spend too much of their time directing the daily operations of their departments because they have little faith in the talents and loyalties of their subordinates and fail to pay attention to long-term, strategic issues facing their departments. Archambeault and Weirman (1983) contend that the bureaucratic model of police departments results in a work environment that discourages productivity, initiative, and commitment among its workforce members. Bureaucracy also promotes the pursuit of individual self-interest and adversarial relationships between police managers and their employees, encouraging “game playing,” resulting in an impersonal work climate.

The competency and background of police executives influences their leadership reputation. Krimmel and Lindemuth's (2001) analysis of 205 municipal managers in Pennsylvania revealed that these managers ranked the performance of police chiefs who managed a union shop, had some college credits, who were graduates of the FBI National Academy, and who were promoted from within consistently higher than those who did not possess these attributes. Similarly, Rowe's (2006) ethnography of British police officers determined that superiors who had direct experience with and maintained their ties with the street where “real police work” was done were considered the best leaders. Those management supervisors who moved up the ranks without such experience were viewed with suspicion and were less likely to be accepted.

Several studies have analyzed assessments of the leadership attributes and performance of police managers. For example, Stamper (1992) surveyed 52 police chiefs and 92 of their immediate assistants and found that their self-assessments and those of their subordinates revealed a discrepancy between belief and practice among these chiefs. The chiefs felt they placed a premium on sharing their vision of the future, practicing openness and honesty, fostering teamwork by helping their employees get the work done, and recognizing excellence in performance. Externally, these chiefs said that they promoted questioning of agency policies while working closely with the members of their community. They professed the adoption

of an intuitive and creative approach to their work while taking a stand against discriminatory practices. The chiefs also believed that their leadership functions were most deserving of their time and attention on the job. However, their immediate assistants did not perceive that the behavior of the chiefs was consistent with their expressed beliefs about leadership. In their opinion, the chiefs were much more involved in the technical and procedural aspects of management than their leadership functions. These findings led Stamper to conclude that leadership had been “structured out” of police administration. Like Mayo, he surmised that police chiefs spent too much time and attention to management concerns and failed to lead their departments.

Recent studies assessing the state of police leadership have been more positive. Densten (2003) surveyed 480 Australian senior police officials. He reported that the effectiveness of a police leader was a function of leader reputation and followers’ satisfaction with job performance of their leaders; impression management and image building by leaders; how dependent followers are on direction and resources from the leaders and how dependent leaders are upon the follower’s completion of activities to achieve success (Densten, 2003, p. 412).

Similarly, interviews with 150 British officers revealed that they wanted leaders to make them feel proud of their work and their contributions. Effective leadership involved offering high-quality service, maintaining high personal and professional standards, empowering staff, and possessing relevant knowledge and skills. The way officers feel about how they are treated by the organization affects both the quality of their performance and the service they provide to the community (Dobby, Anscombe, & Tuffin, 2004).

A case study examined the implementation of participatory management in a suburban police agency through the construction of a Leadership Team. The team established and enhanced collaborative relationships between all levels of the department and the community. Officers felt that the opportunity to take part in agency decisions increased and that their input and opinions were seriously considered. They noted increased pride in the agency—a zero officer turnover rate during the period in question. Noted empowerment factors included the participation of all ranks in the decision-making process, management seeking feedback from all levels of the department, and consistent and reliable support of employee decisions by management. Finally, the officers noted that they were motivated to implement Community Policing as they saw fit and they displayed greater motivation to engage in discretionary conduct (Steinheider & Wuestewald, 2008). The study documents how participatory leadership can improve introducing innovations by increasing the motivation of workers at all levels of the department.

Fischer’s (2009) interviews with 25 American police chiefs determined that police leaders must be both honest and transparent in their dealings with their subordinates, set a good example of performance and integrity, be a change agent that moves the agency forward, support and honor the performance of their charges. They should be “consensus builders” who should follow a democratic leadership approach (Fischer, 2009, p. 10). Results from Isenberg’s (2010) survey of 26 American police chiefs mirrors these opinions. These chiefs also stressed the need for leaders to be optimistic role models who breed confidence in their agency and the community it serves. They should be unafraid to set goals that involve risk (Isenberg, 2010, p. 42). They recommended the use of a leadership style that is inclusive and seeks the support of all members of the organization (Isenberg, 2010, p. 44).

Support for the change to this police leadership style has grown. A survey of police managers attending the Southern Police Institute examined their attitudes concerning

ideal leadership behavior. Andreescu and Vito (2010) found that gender and race played a significant role in structuring leadership preferences. Both males and females expressed a preference for task-centered and structured leadership. Yet, women and African Americans seemed to prefer transformational leaders who favored a democratic, work-oriented style and allowed subordinates freedom of action while responding to the concerns of followers.

Schafer (2010b) surveyed 1,000 police supervisors to determine their opinions regarding the traits, habits, and effective practices of police leaders. They ranked honesty and integrity as the most important characteristic. In addition they noted that personality and interpersonal skills (caring, communication, and work ethic) were more significant than technical aspects (decision making, competency, knowledge) in determining effective police leadership (Schafer, 2010b, p. 651; see also Schafer, 2013). While these officers considered the achievement of key goals as significant, they also gave weight to the “interpersonal dynamics of the workplace” including accessing the growth and development of subordinates, maintaining morale, and the leader’s maintenance of positive standing within the agency (Schafer, 2010b, pp. 652–653). These mid-level managers also suggested that the best way to achieve police leadership development was through a mixture of education, practical application, and constructive feedback. Young officers should be exposed to leadership via mentoring and observation of positive role models (Schafer, 2009).

These studies illuminate the strong consensus that police leadership should be democratic. Officers want their leaders to be positive role models who seek their opinions and wish to foster their improvement and development. There is strong sentiment for the abandonment of the “command and control” model of police management and its replacement with an inclusive style of leadership. These empirical findings provide a basis for our review of three influential theories of leadership that have been applied to policing—Tipping Point, Transformational, and Servant Leadership.

Tipping Point Leadership

Tipping point leadership consists of a four-step process to bring about rapid, dramatic, and lasting change with limited resources. There are four “hurdles” that change agents must typically overcome in any organization (Kim & Mauborgne, 2003, p. 64). It can be applied to reveal the implementation problems that both Community Policing and Compstat have faced.

1. **The cognitive hurdle:** *Put managers face to face with problems and customers. Find new ways to communicate.*

Community Policing faces a “model muddle.” Hunter and Barker (1993, p. 157) define this muddle as layers of “BS” in that Community Policing “seeks to be all things to all people under the umbrella of community involvement.” As a result, departments have great difficulty implementing the model because no one really knows whether it is a program, a philosophy, or both.

In both New York and Los Angeles, Bratton perceived this as meaning that he had to get the department and its leadership to recognize that they were failing in their crime control mission and had been for several years.

2. **The resource hurdle:** *Focus on “hot spots” and bargain with partner organizations.*

Departments implementing Community Policing have been hampered by resource limitations and the need to integrate handling high service demand resulting from calls for service with community problem solving (Kessler, 1993).

As Bratton notes, the public sector has never had a vast surplus of resources. At the LAPD, he removed all personnel from special duties and placed them back on the street. In the Lowell (MA) Compstat implementation study, it was noted that flexibility in reassigning personnel was not accomplished due to the department's responsibility to be fair to its employees, respond to unpredictable situations, and be equitable to its citizens while meeting political demands of powerful constituents (Willis, Mastrofski, Weisburd, & Greenspan, 2004, p. 482).

3. **The motivational hurdle:** *Put the stage lights on and frame the challenge to match the organization's various levels.*

Despite all the attention given to Community Policing, performance measures based upon its delivery have not been developed by police departments. By retaining traditional measures (like arrests and citations), departments implementing Community Policing have violated a fundamental maxim of organizational development: “*What gets measured, gets done!*”

Bratton stresses that accountability is the key to Compstat. In particular, he feels that police officers must be controlled because of the vast power they hold over the citizenry. He also states that while he often must “lead from behind,” he stresses inspiration and positive motivational techniques in his change efforts. Despite this description, one of the “urban legends” surrounding Compstat is that accountability becomes confrontational, personal, and ultimately, demeaning. Although they did not experience such treatment directly, Lowell line officers believed that Compstat sessions were forums where officers “had their balls ripped off,” were “someone's punching bag,” and were “sometimes kind of humiliated, or embarrassed in front of other people.” Like Bratton, the Lowell chief noted that, while he did use Compstat sessions to reward or punish his officers, he was averse to humiliating them, preferring to ask questions and foster a supportive environment (Willis et al., 2004, pp. 477–478).

4. **The political hurdle:** *Identify and silence internal opponents; isolate external ones.*

Although Community Policing typically enjoys support among political leaders and local officials who wish to appear progressive and responsive to the needs of citizens, Community Policing has been relegated to “innovation ghettos”—specialized units who provide services (see Toch & Grant, 1982). It has rarely been implemented on a departmental basis. In the meantime, the majority of the police department's service delivery strategy continues to be a response to citizen-generated calls for service and pressures brought by civic and political leaders.

Bratton (1998) addressed this problem by downsizing one managerial level of NYPD between the executive staff and the operational precincts. He abolished divisional commands and placed the Inspectors and Deputy Inspectors assigned to these units in command of precincts. These are appointed ranks that serve at the pleasure of the Police Commissioner. If they failed to meet their outcome-based command leadership requirements, they could be demoted back to their civil service rank of

Captain and removed from command by order of the Commissioner. Internally, he recruited a top NYPD commander, John Timoney, to audit the responses of the top staff toward Bratton's concept of order maintenance-policing and identify those who would support and those who would oppose the premise. Externally, support was provided for this organizational direction by then Mayor Rudolph Giuliani who had considerable influence in the courts, district attorney's office, and jail due to his reputation as an effective federal prosecutor (Kim & Mauborgne, 2003, p. 69).

Bratton's use of the tipping leadership style described above energized the bureaucratic structure of police organizations he commanded. These organizations were changed through the introduction of an entrepreneurial spirit and the establishment of accountability measures that accurately determine levels of both production and performance. Instead of abandoning their citizen partners as in the past, they also recognized that citizens are partners in policing with responsibilities to their communities for assisting in the solving of crime and disorder problems (see Osborne & Gaebler, 1993; Osborne & Plastrik, 1997).

■ Transformational Leadership

Burns (1978) argues that individuals in an organization may be influenced and motivated by leaders via two methods: transformational and transactional leadership. Each of these types of leadership has different ways to influence attitudes and motivation. Transactional leadership relies on the reciprocal and deterministic relationship between a leader and their subordinates (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Here, leaders engage in a bargaining process with subordinates to motivate them. The leader regulates the bargaining process so that benefits may be issued and received to continue positively valued behavior. Officers are rewarded by their supervisors when they engage in and perform their duties in the manner prescribed by the rules and regulations of the organization.

Transactional leadership is characterized in multiple ways. First, a transactional leader uses contingent rewards (e.g., work for pay or time off) to underlie the arrangements for explicit or implicit agreement on goals to be reached to get the desired rewards or behavior. Second, the transactional leader monitors subordinate performance to ensure effectiveness. Third, transactional leaders are passive and only take action when a problem arises. It results in a mutually beneficial exchange that leads to goal achievement. Unfortunately, this exchange may only garner short-term commitment. Instead of creating a more sustainable performance change in officers, it creates reward-seeking behavior that ceases when the rewards end.

Transformational leaders seek to change the organizational status quo and take the organization on a new and effective path. Instead of maintaining traditional forms of command and control and reacting to crime, transformational police leaders develop a proactive strategic vision of their department's operational performance. They recognize the fluid context in which their departments operate. They also understand that there are forces to which police organizations must adapt and evolve to remain effective in a changing world. It is these forces that are creating new models for conducting the business of policing (Batts, Smoot, & Scrivner, 2012). The strategic policing methods they practice involve the effective use of intelligence and developing flexible strategies to meet public safety needs. They seek to

instill in their departments a set of organizational values focused on effectiveness, crime prevention, community engagement, information management, organizational and managerial accountability, ethics, and the control of crime (Moore & Trojanowicz, 1988).

Transformational leaders are present in today's police organizations. In his assessment of leadership in the Los Angeles Police Department, Reese (2005, p. 132) identified Chief William Bratton as a transformational leader due to his intellectual vision, empathy for his officers and the community, his personal charisma and communication skills. Empirically, transformational leadership has been a focus of studies on police leadership. Murphy and Drodge (2004) interviewed 28 Royal Canadian Mounted Police officers on their views of police leadership within the framework of transformational leadership theory. They describe that at the center of transformational leadership theory is the "Four I's" (Murphy & Drodge, 2004, pp. 2–3):

1. *Idealized influence*: The leader stands for something that followers aspire to.
2. *Inspirational motivation*: A sense of collective identity inspired by the leader's vision.
3. *Intellectual stimulation*: challenges followers to examine ways to enhance their productivity.
4. *Individualized consideration* to followers.

The RCMP officers stressed that leaders can emerge at all levels of the organization and that leadership skills can be learned. They stressed the significance of the "Four I's" and how leaders must be genuinely concerned with the needs of followers.

The impact of transformational leadership was the subject of an ethnographic study of one department. Through interviews and observations, Murphy (2008) found that officers stressed that leadership was linked to shared values. Leaders must personify these values and demonstrate consistency, honesty, and fairness in their supervisory decisions. These officers felt an emotional attachment to leaders who inspired them by standing for their values, even when their attempts to implement change were blocked by upper management.

A study of German police officers found that transformational leaders exerted a direct, positive influence on shared leadership and an indirect, positive influence on follower job satisfaction through their capacity to clarify organizational goals (Masal, 2015).

In South Australia, Mazerolle, Darroch, and White (2013) examined the implementation of and outcomes from problem-oriented policing in South Australia. Using a time series design, they found that POP generated an overall drop in crimes per 100,000 population—particularly in property crime. These results were attributable to the transformational leadership style of Commissioner Mal Hyde who drove the innovation by supporting those who attempted to create new operational ideas. Through his top-down approach to implementation, Commissioner Hyde oversaw the POP agenda and changed the police culture.

Sarver and Miller (2014) surveyed 161 Texas police chiefs with scales designed to measure their leadership attitudes and aptitudes. They found that the chiefs were evenly split across several leadership styles: Transactional, Transformational, and Passive/Avoidant. Several attributes were identified as strongly related to the Transformational Leadership style as compared to the others, including extra effort, effectiveness, satisfaction, extraversion, openness, and conscientiousness. In terms of performance, chiefs who adopted the Transformational Leadership style were more successful in motivating their subordinates to make the extra effort on the job. Their followers were more satisfied with their leadership

style than chiefs in the other groups. They also received fewer formal complaints than their counterparts.

However, several studies have noted the limitations of transformational leadership. Cockcroft (2014) suggests that transformational leadership is incongruent with the culture of policing where street-level and management cops possess different and sometimes opposing views of their world of work (see also Niederhoffer, 1969; Reuss-Ianni, 1983). He argues that much of police work relies upon “the transactional demands of command” and that one form of leadership will not be appropriate for every set of organizational relationships (Cockcroft, 2014, p. 12). Research by Swid (2014) shows that transformational and transactional leadership are not mutually exclusive and that both can be practiced by the same individual. Both are necessary for organizational growth and maintenance but subordinates preferred transformational leaders who provided opportunities for growth experiences (Swid, 2014, p. 590).

Yet, transformational leadership theory states that such leaders possess the ability to convey a sense of vision and mission in a way that transforms the follower’s sense of the possible. Transformational leaders motivate their followers to:

- *Transcend self-interest for the sake of organizational goals and values.*
- *Raise their need level up from security and safety to self-esteem and autonomy.*
- *Share with the leader a common vision of the importance of the leader’s goals or values to the future of the organization.*
- *Achieve more than they thought possible.*
- *Strengthen their commitment to the organization.*
- *Induce feelings of trust, admiration, loyalty and mutual respect.*

(Villiers, 2003, p. 33)

Transformational leaders are change agents who renovate the organization through the empowerment of their followers and getting their commitment to a new vision for the organization. In Chapter 5 we further discuss transformational leadership and the management of organizational change.

The Leadership Challenge Model

Transformational leadership serves as the basis for the Leadership Challenge Model (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). It comprises five practices that effective leaders demonstrate:

1. *Model the way* (setting a personal example).
2. *Inspire a shared vision* (envisioning, articulating, and sharing a new future).
3. *Challenge the process* (willingness to question and confront the status quo).
4. *Enable others to act* (nurture and empower the development of followers).
5. *Encourage the heart* (recognize and celebrate the accomplishments of followers).

Each of the Five Practices include Ten Commitments that illustrate the performance of leaders in their accomplishment.

For example, under “Model the Way,” Commitment 1 states that leaders find their voice by communicating their values. Leaders must express their values to empower and motivate others. Values are significant because they influence how leaders respond to followers. Genuine beliefs sponsor passion and strengthen moral principles among colleagues. Modeling the way is also linked to competence. Commitment 2 states that leaders must align their values with their actions. Successful leadership performance is tied to their ability to act upon their stated values. It enables them to both set an example and to build consensus among followers. To reinforce these values among their followers, leaders not only teach and tell stories but they give them life through their personal example. Murphy (2008, p. 176) directly observed that officers admired transformational leaders who “walked the talk” but saw they invoked fear and insecurity among upper management who constrained them from getting results when it meant breaking the rules.

Inspiring a shared vision involves a recognition of the challenges and opportunities facing the organization while working toward their realization. Thus, Commitment 3 finds that leaders envision the future by imagining exciting and ennobling possibilities via positive messages. By articulating their vision, leaders enlist others to share it, finding a common ground with their followers by speaking from the heart (Commitment 4). There are three components of leadership vision: (1) The Past—where we have been, the tradition of the organization; (2) The Present—where we are now, colored by realistic optimism; and (3) The Future—Where we are going, the promise of success.

Leaders challenge the process and move their followers to action. They proactively seize the initiative to improve organizational effectiveness in the long term. Commitment 5 states that leaders find innovative ways to bring change about. They create meaningful challenges for their followers and invite them to seek ways to make changes effectively. Leaders experiment and take risks, creating small wins that generate enthusiasm and support among followers. Initiative is rewarded, not punished because mistakes are viewed as learning experiences that will help move the organization forward (Commitment 6).

Leaders enable others to collaborate and act through these practices. Collaboration is fostered by creating a climate of trust in the organization and ability and competence of its personnel (Bratton, & Tumin, 2012). They enable their employees by trusting in their ability to successfully complete assigned tasks. Such leaders are servants of the organization who assume their roles and responsibilities to meet the needs of others—not through seeking power and status. They encourage their officers to seize the initiative and feel the need to do so. In Commitment 7, leaders build collaboration by promoting cooperative goals and building trust. By sharing their power with their employees, leaders increase their own. They train and mentor their employees so they can solve problems and implement solutions, thus inspire confidence and build competence. Due to these actions, employees make ready to assume responsibility for their actions and performance. Leaders strengthen their followers in this fashion, sharing power and discretion with followers (Commitment 8).

Leaders encourage the hearts of followers by recognizing and celebrating their accomplishments. They promote high standards and holding followers accountable for their performance. Recognition is personalized when individual performance is commendable and outstanding. Rewards are creatively constructed, personalized, and recognized in a public setting. Commitment 9 finds leaders recognizing contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence. Celebrating successful performance reaffirms values and creates a spirit of community within the organization (Commitment 10).

Kouzes and Posner (2012) assertatively conclude that leadership is a skill that can be learned through the study of these practices and commitments. They have been demonstrated in the past by effective leaders. Leaders who learn and practice them can make a positive difference in their organization, its members, and its clients. The Leadership Challenge Model is a construct that reflects the ideals and practices of transformational leadership (Carless, 2001). Transformational leaders make organizations more effective and successful by defining the values that embrace the enduring principles of a people. Transforming values lie at the heart of transformational leadership (Burns, 2008, p. 307).

Evidence of the Five Practices of the Leadership Challenge Model in policing is documented by Fischer's interviews with police chiefs. Under "Modelling the Way," Fischer's respondents advised new chiefs to keep in mind that actions speak louder than words when they are trying to gain the confidence of their officers (Fischer, 2009, p. 46). Chiefs must be open, honest, transparent, sincere, and have a strong work ethic. They should be accountable, and acknowledge the mistakes they make. "The measure of the character of a police chief is the ability to exercise constraint in the use of the awesome power we have" (Fischer, 2009, p. 18).

Transparency means being honest and open about both good and bad news in the police department. Accessibility means having mechanisms in place to ensure that reporters can get answers to their questions in a timely way (Fischer, 2009, p. 97). Particularly, these chiefs value "Management by Walking Around" (MBWA): "You have to get off your butt, get out of your office, ride the streets, go to meetings, and see for yourself what the situation really is. This helps you identify problems before they occur" (Fischer, 2009, p. 84).

When "Inspiring a Shared Vision," Fischer's police chiefs noted that the vision itself is likely to be popular—who would object to visionary goals, such as making a city safer and providing a responsive, committed police department? But the decisions that a chief makes to *achieve* a vision can be controversial. Doing the right thing requires making difficult decisions that may be unpopular with politicians, the rank and file, or with the public (Fischer, 2009, p. 6). It is important that a good leader makes it clear what his or her vision is, and attracts those who believe in that vision to the leadership team (Fischer, 2009, p. 37). The chiefs also felt it was their job to sell their vision to their bosses. They advised that getting your bosses to buy into your vision for the department *before* you take the job is a key determinant in how you will fare as chief, and failing to get "buying in" should be a deal breaker when you are considering a job as chief (Fischer, 2009, p. 80).

To challenge the Process, the chiefs remind us that every chief is hired as a change agent. The test for a chief is to understand what changes to make, how much change is needed, and how much the department and elected officials can tolerate (Fischer, 2009, p. 5). They stressed the limited term of a police chief as cause for action: "You know the chief's job is not going to last forever. You have to be up for that kind of challenge. If survival is an issue, you shouldn't be chief. If you can't take the risks, get out of the business" (Fischer, 2009, p. 22). Be tough, confident, and decisive in your role as a change agent, and get moving on your plans for change early in your administration, when the department and the community are *expecting* changes to happen (Fischer, 2009, p. 120).

"Enable Others to Act" is concerned with the empowerment of subordinates. Most chiefs said that they were "consensus builders" and that they followed a democratic approach to leading their departments (Fischer, 2009, p. 10). "The real work is done by the young men and women who drive the radio cars, who answer the phone, who talk to the public. Our job is to make their job possible. It's not about you, it's about the officers who do the real work"

(Fischer, 2009, p. 13). The strategy for your vision “can’t work unless the troops on the street do it” (Fischer, 2009, p. 39). “You can make mistakes here, but you can’t lie, and you can’t be dishonest. It’s a tough job, but I want you to succeed, and you wouldn’t be here if I didn’t think you can succeed” (Fischer, 2009, p. 43). Chiefs have an obligation to consult with and empower their command staff; to give the members of the staff opportunities to show what they can do; and to help command staff members develop their leadership skills (Fischer, 2009, p. 51). “The chief needs to defend the department and its officers when they come under unwarranted criticism from elected officials. It sends a message to the other elected officials that the chief is not afraid to strike back” (Fischer, 2009, pp. 79–80).

Finally, these chiefs acknowledged the significance of “Encouraging the Hearts” of subordinates. “A chief’s focus should always be to make folks as good as they can be, and then recognize them for their accomplishments” (Fischer, 2009, p. 24). “If you wanted everyone to like you, you should have been a circus clown, not a police supervisor. The job is about business” (Fischer, 2009, p. 35). Succession planning must include the encouragement of subordinates to undertake and successfully complete difficult assignments. They are the future of the department.

■ Servant Leadership

Servant leaders are those who provide direction, encourage participation, sponsor mutual respect between leaders and followers while fostering their independence (Gardner & Reece, 2012). This treatment leads to the achievement of high-quality organizational results. Servant leaders put the needs of their followers before and above their own concerns. They practice an ethical form of leadership that does not take advantage of followers. Jesus Christ is cited as the first teacher of the concept of servant leadership. He set the example by washing the feet of his disciples and taught that a leader’s greatness is measured by a total commitment to serve fellow human beings (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002, p. 59).

There are several distinct attributes attributed to servant leadership. For example, Greenleaf (1977) believed leaders should serve their followers and focus upon satisfying their needs. Servant leaders are less concerned with their personal power and devoted to leadership through providing service to others. Servant leaders put the needs of their followers above their own. It is an ethical style of leadership. The purpose of the organization is the welfare of its members, not to gratify the ego or reputation of the leader. The servant leader would never take advantage of followers.

Servant leadership is based upon five basic principles:

1. *Concern for people.*
2. *Stewardship of the organization.*
3. *Equity (or justice).*
4. *Indebtedness* (the Rights of Followers) including the right to: be needed and involved, a covenantal relationship, to understand (the organization and its goals and objectives), affect one’s own destiny, be held accountable for performance, appeal decisions, and make a commitment to the organization.
5. *Self-understanding (or awareness):* the creation of an ethical climate for others by questioning the motives of organizational leaders and members.

One of the most crucial attributes of servant leaders is *agape*—an unconditional love of others without regard for their due or desert. It is a love of behavior and choice, not a romantic feeling. It is demonstrated by the servant leader through the following attributes:

- *Patience*: exercising self-control.
- *Kindness*: giving attention, appreciation and encouragement.
- *Humility*: authentic feelings without pretense or arrogance.
- *Respectfulness*: treating others as important.
- *Selflessness*: meeting the needs of others.
- *Forgiveness*: forgoing resentment when wronged.
- *Honesty*: freedom from resentment of others.
- *Commitment*: sticking to your choices and honoring your agreements.

(Hunter, 1998, p. 100)

As a result, the servant leader sets aside their own wants and needs and seeks the greatest good for others (see also Russell & Stone, 2002, pp. 145–147; Spears, 2002, pp. 27–29). The servant leader is committed to the growth of the organization and works to build community within them. In their research on police managers' attitudes toward leadership styles, Vito, Suresh, and Richards (2011) found that police managers attending the Administrative Officers Course at the University of Louisville's Southern Police Institute identified a marked preference for the principles of servant leadership.

Advice from the Dalai Lama

In his book, *The Leader's Way*, the Dalai Lama (2009) offers examples of servant leadership that are especially relevant to police leadership. His advice on decision making is pertinent to policing where the use of deadly force is an issue. For every decision, the goal of the leader is to take into account the interests of the organization and all of the people affected by it. The benchmark for the decision is that it must cause no harm to others or if harm is inevitable, to reduce the harm as much as possible. Leaders should question their motives and recognize how their actions can have an effect on other people—both within and outside the organization. They should serve the needs of the entire organization and those of individual workers.

The Dalai Lama lists his three stages of the decision-making process. First, make your initial decision and check whether there is harm to anyone and if there is none, proceed. If harm is present, apply your creativity to find another solution that eliminates the harm. If the harm is impossible to avoid, make certain that the harm is justified because it avoids a much greater harm or because it results in huge benefits to other people.

The Dalai Lama (2009, pp. 37–41) also lists “The Six Perfections” that mirror the attributes of servant leaders.

1. *Generosity*: A good leader is generous in giving credit where it is due.
2. *Ethical discipline*: Leaders must withstand temptation—greed, self-centeredness, lust, anger, hatred, fear, lack of self-confidence.
3. *Patience*: Must be cultivated. It makes it possible for the leader to deal with provocative circumstances (hostility, criticism, or disappointment) and improves judgment.

4. *Enthusiastic effort*: Displays your belief in the importance of the goals and motivation to achieve them.
5. *Concentration*: The ability to focus mental energy on one issue.
6. *Wisdom*: The ability to see things as they are.

Cultivating the Six Perfections can reap several benefits for the servant leader. They increase the ability to deal with a crisis. They improve decision making and executing decisions. Other advantages are improved relationships with followers, heightened creativity, and increased enthusiasm for the job. Yet, the main theme is that the leader is a servant whose main concern is the welfare of others.

Good to Great

In *Good to Great*, Jim Collins (2001) led a team of researchers to examine 11 large companies that were particularly successful over a 15-year period.¹ Collins (2005) also took pains to show how these ideas could apply to the public sector in a second monograph—*Good to Great and the Social Sectors*. The Police Executive Research Forum showed how Collins's business model applied to police management in a monograph—*"Good to Great" Policing: Application of Business Management Principles in the Public Sector* (Wexler, Wycoff, & Fischer, 2007).

One major finding was that charismatic and transformational leaders were not the norm in the rise of these companies. Instead, they were led by persons who knew the business and rose up from the ranks. They were characterized as "Level 5" leaders—executives who built greatness that endured, blending personal humility with professional will. Specifically, Level 5 leaders:

- Were quiet, reserved, shy, gracious, mild-mannered and understanding.
- Were ambitious, but they put the needs of the organization first.
- Were modest, self-effacing, and understated in their personal style.
- Were driven by the need to produce sustainable results.
- Were concerned about the future of the organization and set up successors for effectiveness.

(Collins, 2001, pp. 30–31)

While they were exceptionally modest, Level 5 leaders were determined to do what was necessary to make the organization great. They were disinterested in setting themselves up as heroes. Typically, they were ordinary individuals who let their company's results speak for themselves. In the PERF monograph, Level 5 leaders in policing believed in maintaining a "command presence" during a "defining moment"—a crisis where the police chief must speak to the public to maintain credibility with both the community and members of the department (Wexler et al., 2007, p. 17). Level 5 leaders exhibited the attributes of servant leadership.

In particular, Level 5 leaders used the "Window and the Mirror" to achieve results. They maintained humility in times of success, attributing it to good fortune or factors outside their control. Yet they took direct responsibility for failure, taking stock of problems by

looking within the organization. Leaders succeed by attracting and keeping the right employees by following three practical rules:

1. When in doubt, do not hire—keep looking. You need the right people to implement change.
2. Act on the need to change personnel. The best people need guidance, not management. They are self-motivated and are driven to produce the best results.
3. Put your best people to work on the biggest opportunities, not on the biggest problems. Opportunities allow people to become great.

(Collins, 2001, pp. 33–35)

Here, Collins uses the analogy of “getting the right people on the bus.” The executives who ignited these transformations focused on getting the right personnel. The *Good to Great* leaders assembled their teams before deciding where the company should go. The PERF monograph recognized that this principle would be difficult to apply in policing because almost all of the personnel are inherited by the chief upon assumption of the office (Wexler et al., 2007, p. 20).

Truth telling is a major component of the *Good to Great* process. The Level 5 leader is particularly adept at “confronting the brutal facts”—any bad news (hazards) facing the organization (Collins, 2001, pp. 65–69). A primary task in taking a company from good to great is to create a culture wherein people have a tremendous opportunity to be heard. “Red flag” mechanisms and other tools are present that highlight information too perilous to be ignored. This leader takes care to tackle challenges without losing faith in the ability of the organization to overcome them. Here, the PERF monograph called attention to the Compstat process and problem-oriented policing (see Chapter 13) as examples of using data to confront the brutal facts in policing (Wexler et al., 2007, pp. 32–33).

The *Good to Great* companies were adept at determining just what they could be the best in the world at—what Collins termed “The Hedgehog Concept.” Leaders must help organizations reflect on:

1. What the organization is passionate about. They did only those things that ignite the passion of organizational members, thus eliminating the need for motivation.
2. What the organization can be best in the world at. This recognition enables the organization to maintain a laser like focus on its core competencies and reason for being.
3. What drives the organization’s economic engine? What element is crucial to maintaining economic efficiency?

(Collins, 2001, pp. 94–97)

The Hedgehog Concept simplifies the mission of the organization and provides a unifying principle to guide operations. The focus upon crime reduction was identified as an example of this principle at work in police administration (Wexler et al., 2007, pp. 36–37).

The *Good to Great* companies had a “culture of discipline” (Collins, 2001, p. 124). The focus upon implementing the Hedgehog Concept enabled employees to be diligent and intense in their thoughts and actions. Employees exercise self-discipline. They had greater freedom

and responsibility to do their jobs. They were fanatical in the pursuit of excellence and greatness. Therefore, bureaucratic rules and tyrannical leadership, for the purpose of control, were unnecessary. Again, the PERF monograph urged police leaders to “take a long, hard look at the facts about the organization, and then act on those facts” (Wexler et al., 2007, p. 39).

Technological fixes were not essential to the rise of these companies. They were not the key to success. The lesson is that leaders should not seize on every technological fad out of fear of being left behind. Avoid the tendency to overreact in such a fashion. Rather, they should use technology selectively to speed up momentum that already exists and that is consistent with the Hedgehog Concept (Collins, 2001, pp. 152–153). In the PERF monograph, the use of a new data management tool in the Chicago Police Department (Citizen Law Enforcement Analysis and Reporting—CLEAR) is an example of how technology can speed up change (Wexler et al., 2007, p. 41).

Organizations should avoid the trap of the “Flywheel and Doom Loop” (Collins, 2001, pp. 174–180). There was no single defining action, no grand program, no one killer innovation, no solitary lucky break, no wrenching revolution or miracle that led to dramatic success. The *Good to Great* companies shunned the “Doom Loop”—the inconsistent and failed efforts resulting from chronic restructuring and management fads. Sustained momentum toward success was not the result of following an easy road. The PERF monograph described how crises in police agencies can become major catalysts for “widespread organizational change.” This occurred in New Orleans in the mid-1990s when Chief Richard Pennington confronted severe and widespread corruption, implemented significant changes, established problem-oriented policing and Compstat programs (Wexler et al., 2007, p. 45).

Finally, the *Good to Great* companies aimed high in their goals. They set “big, hairy and audacious goals” (BHAGs). Their leaders exercised strategic thinking, setting goals that were extensive, comprehensive, and able to sustain long-term success for their organizations. BHAGs were clear, simple, and united to the core values of the organization (Collins, 2001, p. 203). In policing, Collins cited William Bratton’s management of the New York City Police Department as an example of this concept—setting “audacious output goals, such as attaining double-digit annual declines in felony crime rates” via the Compstat process (Collins, 2005, p. 4). The PERF monograph noted that in public sector organizations “achieving greatness often is about ‘overcoming obstacles’” (like the constraints imposed by budgets and labor agreements) (Wexler et al., 2007, p. 51). Taken together, the inclusive methods used by the “Good to Great” companies as identified by Collins and the attributes of methods practiced by Level 5 leaders support the premises of servant leadership.

■ Selecting a Leadership Style

The selection of a leadership style is affected by several factors. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) developed a continuum of leadership that comprises seven different leadership styles, ranging from the full use of leadership authority to the allowance of complete freedom to subordinates to determine tasks and goals to follow. Under the first “autocratic” style, the leader makes a decision and announces it. In policing, this style is most appropriate when the leader wishes to maintain operational control such as in an emergency (Walsh, 1983). With the second style, the leader takes the additional step of “selling” the decision (such as a new organizational policy) to subordinates who now have minimal involvement.

In the middle of their continuum, Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) cover the participative approach to leadership. The leader acts after getting suggestions and advice from followers. The leader still makes the final decision but it is made in consultation with the staff. Through this interactive process, trust is built, providing that the leader informs subordinates of the reasons behind the decision and provides feedback on whether their input was utilized or not. If not, this style may be viewed as manipulation. Collaboration is another step toward the empowerment of subordinates. The leader maintains control over the decision-making process by defining the limits of the situation and asking the group to make the final decision. Thus, the consultative process does not give complete control to the group. The leader still is the decisive factor.

Using a participatory style is more likely when the leader requires the services of a qualified subordinate who possesses valuable knowledge and skills. For example, a police supervisor may seek the advice of line officers before establishing a new patrol method in their area (Walsh, 1983). The recognition they know their beat and the resulting consultation by the supervision is a morale builder. Such inclusion leads to support for the policy they helped to establish. Other beneficial attributes include sharing responsibility, development of mutual trust, personal commitment, and developing the potential of subordinates. However, the use of a participatory style requires mature subordinates and a leader willing to be honest and candid with followers.

The selection of a style is affected by three forces—those: (1) within the leader; (2) within the group; and (3) within the situation. The forces in the leader include their value system and the level of confidence they have in their subordinates. What are their leadership inclinations? Someone who feels they are the “Boss” is unlikely to engage in democratic leadership. What is their tolerance for ambiguity? Are you comfortable with turning decision-making power over to subordinates when you are unsure of what decision they will make? Overruling a democratic decision-making process after you gave permission to use it will have disastrous consequences.

The forces in the subordinates also help determine what type of style is in order. Participatory, democratic leadership is more likely when subordinates are independent, ready to assume responsibility for decision making, have their own “tolerance for ambiguity,” are interested in the problem faced, have a high level of knowledge and experience, and expect to be consulted and involved in decision making.

The forces in the situation contribute to the selection of a leadership style in several ways. First, what is the type of organization under consideration? Police departments have typically been dominated by a “command and control” style that is not conducive to participatory leadership. In addition, what is the level of effectiveness of the group? A task force of experienced officers is more likely to be consulted than a group of newcomers to patrol. What is the nature of the problem itself and its level of complexity? Leaders seek help with complex problems. Subordinates are not interested in providing input to simple management decisions that do not affect their work life. Finally, the pressure of time itself is a crucial consideration. Consultation takes time. If a quick decision is required, the leader may not have the luxury of seeking time-rich consultation.

Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) conclude with the recognition that participatory, democratic leadership is a function of these factors and forces. It is not a matter of being strong or permissive—it is a matter of insight and flexibility. The successful leader knows the

forces that are most relevant to decision making. They know and understand the competency and commitment of their people. They are ready to call upon the talents of their subordinates and sponsor their growth and development. They are flexible and analyze the situation to determine which style is most appropriate. If direction is in order, it is provided. If participatory management is called for, they can provide it.

Situational Leadership

Another variation on this question is provided by Hersey and Blanchard (1977) in their development of situational leadership. They describe leadership as composed of both a directive and a supportive dimension that should be applied appropriately in a given situation. To determine an appropriate style, the leader must evaluate subordinates and assess how competent and committed they are to perform a task. Leaders then adapt their style accordingly between directive or supportive methods to meet the changing needs of their subordinates. Leaders engage in directive behaviors by setting goals, establishing methods of evaluation, setting time lines, defining roles, and showing how goals should be met. Supportive behaviors are used to help subordinates feel comfortable about themselves, their colleagues, and their situation.

These methods are also presented along a continuum that parallels that provided by Tannenbaum and Schmidt that depends upon the talents and readiness of the followers along with the situation. Directing involves providing specific instructions and close supervision by the leader to achieve organizational goals. In the coaching mode, the leader explains his or her decision while providing the opportunity for questions about it to clarify meaning and purpose. Taking part gives subordinates control over decision making while the leader remains available to facilitate problem solving. In delegation, the leader turns decision making over to subordinates for implementing the solution and taking the responsibility to achieve it.

The abilities, willingness, and readiness of followers are also determining factors in the selection of a leadership style. Followers at Level 1 of readiness are unable or unwilling to engage in decision making. Often, they are new to the work and inexperienced. Level 2 followers have gained confidence but have lost some of their initial motivation for the work. At Level 3, followers have developed the skills to do the job but they are uncertain and lack the confidence to do the job on their own. Level 4 followers are fully developed, committed, and motivated to complete work successfully. Leaders must adapt their style to these levels to be effective.

Again, this theory illustrates that leaders cannot use the same style in all situations. Their choice is constrained by the competence level and experience of their subordinates and the situation they face. Therefore, leaders must show a great flexibility in their choice and adoption of their leadership style. No style is always relevant to meet the situation and the level of competence of both the leader and the followers.

Bad Leadership

Development of leadership ability can also benefit from negative examples—the mistakes that leaders make in temperament and execution. Kellerman (2004) offers seven ideal types

of bad leadership. The first three are bad because they are ineffective while the last four are examples of unethical behavior.

The first ineffective behavior is incompetent leadership. The leader lacks the will or skill to be effective and fails to create positive change. With some leaders, their failure is due to absence of practical, academic, or emotional intelligence. Instead, ineffective leaders are often careless, dense, distracted, slothful, or they are easily undone by uncertainty and stress—unable to communicate, educate, or delegate.

The second category of ineffective leadership is rigid leadership. Here the problem is that the leader is stiff and unyielding. Although they may be competent, they are unable or unwilling to adapt to new ideas, new information, or changing times. They are “wooden headed” and will not be moved by facts or logic.

Intemperate leadership is the third form of ineffectiveness. Here, the leader lacks self-control and is aided and abetted by followers who are unwilling or unable to intervene. Intemperate leaders fail to control their impulses and fall victim to lust and drug and/or alcohol abuse.

The second group of ideal bad leadership types is characterized by their ethical lapses. The callous leader is uncaring or unkind. The needs, wants, and wishes of subordinates are ignored or discounted. Corrupt leadership is characterized by lying, cheating, or stealing and is typically motivated by power and greed. Unlike the servant leader, they put their self-interest ahead of the public interest. It features bribery, selling of favors, embezzlement, cutting corners, bending rules, and breaking the law.

The insular leader minimizes or disregards the health and welfare of both followers and persons that the organization serves. They ignore the needs of both groups. Evil leadership commits atrocities. Such leaders use pain as an instrument of power and commit acts of severe harm—physical, psychological, or both. Their intent is not only to terrorize but to prolong suffering.

Schafer's (2010a) analysis of police managers attending the FBI National Academy also identified the attributes of ineffective police leaders. They listed five acts of commission (conscious errors in leadership): (1) focus on self over others (“careerism”); (2) ego/arrogance; (3) closed-mindedness; (4) micromanagement (emphasizing autocratic control); and (5) capriciousness. They also recognized five acts of omission (failing to take appropriate leadership actions): (1) poor work ethic (loss of enthusiasm for and commitment to the job); (2) failure to act (due to fear of the consequences of their decision); (3) ineffective communication (inability to engage in a two-way dialogue with subordinates, refusal to explain key decisions, failure to accept input and criticism); (4) lack of interpersonal skills (failure to establish human relationships with members of the department and the community); and (5) lack of integrity (past actions that led to the loss of trust and respect). Thus, bad leaders showed behaviors that undermined the followers' sense of trust, legitimacy, and confidence.

Schafer (2010b) raised the interesting question that policing may be responsible for the creation of ineffective leaders due to the constraints upon the organization and failing to develop and sponsor true leaders. The five largest commissions charged with investigating and solving problems in American policing from 1931–1973 noted the lack of strong leadership and effective administrative practices as contributing factors tied to corruption, abuse of authority, use of force, police crimes, and civil rights violations (Schafer, 2009, p. 239).

■ Conclusion

This review of leadership theories and research findings documents the promise and productivity of forms of democratic leadership. Autocratic leadership is ineffective and harmful to subordinates. The transformational and servant leadership styles are the wave of the future. The needs and wishes of subordinates must be met and their inclusion must be ensured to achieve organizational change.

In their literature review, Pearson-Goff and Herrington (2013, p. 17–18) reported research findings that listed the following attributes of police leaders:

1. Ethics: a sense of integrity and honesty.
2. Trust: generating a sense of trustworthiness among subordinates and with members of the community.
3. Legitimacy: the need for leaders to be seen as “good coppers” that the leader can pound a beat and do the job of a frontline officer.
4. Model the way: understanding their responsibility as a role model.
5. Communication: at all levels of the department, with the community, in government.
6. Competent decision making: be able to make decisions that lead to goal achievement. Involving subordinates in decision making.
7. Effective thinking ability: critical, strategic and creative.

This review also revealed that police leaders engaged in the following activities:

- **Create a shared vision:** creates a sense of purpose for followers.
- **Engendering organizational commitment:** providing support to subordinates, promoting collaboration, giving subordinates a voice in decision making.
- **Care for subordinates:** seek and provide opportunities for staff, take responsibility for their well-being, coaching and mentoring.
- **Driving and managing change:** managing the status quo while enacting change or reform.
- **Problem solving:** proactive and collaborative to address interdependent and unforeseen problems.

(Pearson-Goff & Herrington, 2013, p. 18)

These research findings are based upon officer perceptions rather than objective measures of police leadership performance.

A veteran police administrator and scholar, Robert Wasserman, has admonished police leaders to keep in touch with the lives of their subordinates, both on and off the job. They should be sought out—listen to what they say and think about their situation. Leaders must keep in touch with the needs of a changing workforce to understand their world and how they view it. Here, empathy will facilitate communication.

Wasserman also cautions police leaders (especially Chiefs and Sheriffs) to be aware and mindful of their political environment. When they first enter the job, they should be both thoughtful and careful—“listen and learn.” They should pay attention to the “Issues of Complexity”: race, homeland security, use of force, crime control strategy,

ethics, public opinion and media, technology, and labor. They attempt to recognize and identify which of these issues will have “legs” and get out in front of certain key issues.

This advice and the leadership lessons provided in this chapter should help police leaders to be more effective. The autocratic, “command and control” methods of the past are not relevant to all aspects of police administration. Followers need to be empowered and a more inclusive style is necessary to practice strategic policing.

KEY TERMS

Achievement-oriented leadership

Cognitive hurdle

Directive leadership

Leadership Challenge Model

Motivational hurdle

Participatory leadership

Political hurdle

Resource hurdle

Servant leadership

Situational leadership

Supportive leadership

Tipping point leadership

Transformational leadership

Note

1. The 11 *Good to Great* companies were Abbott, Fannie Mae, Kimberly Clark, Nucor, Pitney Bowes, Wells Fargo, Circuit City, Gillette, Kroger, Phillip Morris, and Walgreens.

References

- Andreescu, V., & Vito, G.F. (2010). An exploratory study on ideal leadership behaviour: The opinions of American police managers. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, 12(4), 567–583.
- Archambeault, W., & Weirman, C. (1983). Critically assessing the utility of police bureaucracies in the 1980s. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 11, 420–429.
- Baker, T. (2006). *Effective police leadership: Moving beyond management*. Flushing, NY: Looseleaf Law Publications.
- Bass, B., & Riggio, R. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Batts, A., Smoot, S., & Scrivner, E. (2006). *Police leadership challenges in a changing world. New Perspectives in Policing Bulletin*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Bratton, W. (1998). *Turnaround: How America's top cop reversed the crime epidemic*. New York: Random House.
- Bratton, W., & Tumin, Z. (2012). *Collaborate or perish! Reaching across boundaries in a networked world*. New York: Random House.
- Bruns, G., & Shuman, I. (1988). Police managers' perceptions of organizational leadership styles. *Public Personnel Management*, 17(2), 145–157.

- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Burns, J.M. (2008). The power and creativity of a transforming vision. In J. Gallos (Ed.), *Business leadership* (pp. 305–311). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carless, S.A. (2001). Assessing the discriminant validity of the leadership practices inventory. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74, 233–239.
- Cockcroft, T. (2014). Police culture and transformational leadership: Outlining the contours of a troubled relationship. *Policing*, 8(1), 5–13.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great*. New York: Harper-Collins Books.
- Collins, J. (2005). *Good to great and the social sectors*. New York: Harper-Collins Books.
- Dalai Lama. (2009). *The leader's way*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Densten, I. (2003). Senior police leadership: Does rank matter? *Policing*, 26, 400–418.
- Dobby, J., Anscombe, J., & Tuffin, R. (2004). *Police leadership: Expectations and impact*. London, UK: The Home Office.
- Fischer, C. (2009). *Leadership matters: Police chiefs talk about their careers*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Gardner, B., & Reece, J. (2012, June). Revolutionizing policing through servant-leadership and quality management. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 25–32.
- Girodo, M. (1998). Machiavellian, bureaucratic, and transformational leadership styles in police managers: Preliminary findings of interpersonal ethics. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 86, 419–427.
- Gladwell, M. (2006). *The tipping point: How little things can make a big difference*. New York: Little, Brown.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Haberfeld, M. (2006). *Police leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hunter, J. (1998). *The servant*. New York: Crown Books.
- Hunter, R., & Barker, T. (1993). BS and buzzwords: The new police organizational style. *American Journal of Police*, 12, 157–168.
- Isenberg, J. (2010). *Police leadership in a democracy: Conversations with America's police chiefs*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Kellerman, B. (2004). Thinking about leadership: Warts and all. *Harvard Business Review*, 40–45.
- Kessler, D. (1993). Integrating calls for service with community and problem oriented policing: A case study. *Crime & Delinquency*, 39, 485–508.
- Kim, W., & Mauborgne, R. (2003, April). Tipping point leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 60–69.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2012). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Krimmel, J., & Lindemuth, P. (2001). Police chief performance and leadership styles. *Police Quarterly*, 4, 469–483.
- Kuykendall, J., & Unsinger, P. (1982). The leadership styles of police managers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 10(4), 311–321.
- Maple, J. (1999). *The crime fighter: Putting the bad guys out of business*. New York: Doubleday.
- Masal, D. (2015). Shared and transformational leadership in the police. *Policing*, 38(1), 40–55.
- Mayo, L. (1985). Leading blindly: An assessment of chiefs' information about police operations. In W. Geller (Ed.), *Police leadership in America* (pp. 397–417). New York: Praeger.

- Mazerolle, L., Darroch, S., & White, G. (2013). Leadership in problem-oriented policing. *Policing*, 36(3), 543–560.
- Moore, M.H., & Trojanowicz, R. (1988). *Perspectives on policing—Corporate strategies for policing*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Murphy, S., & Drodge, E. (2004). The four I's of police leadership: A case study heuristic. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, 1–15.
- Murphy, S.A. (2008). The role of emotions and transformational leadership on police culture: An autoethnographic account. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 10(2), 165–178.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1993). *Reinventing government*. New York: Plume.
- Osborne, D., & Plastrik, P. (1997). *Banishing bureaucracy: The five strategies for reinventing government*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Niederhoffer, A. (1969). *Behind the shield: The police in urban society*. New York: Anchor.
- Pearson-Goff, M., & Herrington, V. (2013). Police leadership: A systematic review of the literature. *Policing*, 8(1), 14–26.
- Reese, R. (2005). *Leadership in the LAPD*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Ruess-Ianni, E. (1993). *Two cultures of policing: Street cops and management cops*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Rowe, M. (2006). Following the leader: Frontline narratives on police leadership. *Policing*, 29, 757–767.
- Russell, R., & Stone, A. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organizational Development*, 23(3), 145–157.
- Sarver, M., & Miller, H. (2014). Police chief leadership: Styles and effectiveness. *Policing*, 37(1), 126–143.
- Schafer, J. (2010a). The ineffective police leader: Acts of commission and omission. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 737–746.
- Schafer, J.A. (2009). Developing effective leadership in policing: Perils, pitfalls and paths forward. *Policing*, 32(2), 238–260.
- Schafer, J.A. (2010b). Effective leaders and leadership in policing: Traits, assessment, development and expansion. *Policing*, 33(4), 644–663.
- Schafer, J.A. (2013). *Effective leadership in policing: Successful habits and traits*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9, 57–64.
- Spears, L. (2002). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *Journal of Virtues and Leadership*, 1(1), 25–30.
- Stamper, N.H. (1992). *Removing management barriers to effective police leadership: A study of executive leadership and executive management in big-city police departments*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Steinheider, B., & Wuestewald, T. (2008). From the bottom-up: sharing leadership in a police agency. *Police Practice and Research*, 9(2), 145–163.
- Swid, A. (2014). Police members perception of their leaders' leadership style and its implications. *Policing*, 37(3), 579–595.
- Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review*, 1–12.
- Toch, H., & Grant, J. (1982). *Reforming human services: Change through participation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Villiers, P. (2003). Philosophy, doctrine and leadership: Some core beliefs. In R. Adlam, & P. Villiers (Ed.), *Police leadership in the twenty-first century: Philosophy, doctrine and developments* (pp. 15–33). Winchester, UK: Waterside Press.
- Vito, G., Suresh, G., & Richards, G. (2011). Emphasizing the servant in public service: The opinions of police managers. *Policing*, 34(4), 674–686.
- Walsh, W.F. (1983, November). Leadership: A police perspective. *The Police Chief*, 26–29.
- Wexler, C., Wycoff, M.A., & Fischer, C. (2007). “Good to Great” policing: *Application of business management principles in the public sector*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services and Police Executive Research Forum.
- Willis, J., Mastrofski, S., Weisburd, D., & Greenspan, R. (2003). *Compstat and organizational change in the Lowell police department*. Washington, DC: The Police Foundation.