University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-2011

Louisville-Jefferson County police consolidation : officers' perception of organizational justice.

Joseph Sterling Grant 1962-
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Grant, Joseph Sterling 1962-, "Louisville-Jefferson County police consolidation : officers' perception of organizational justice." (2011). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 524.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/524>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

LOUISVILLE-JEFFERSON COUNTY POLICE CONSOLIDATION:
OFFICERS' PERCEPTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

By

Joseph Sterling Grant
B.S., Indiana University, 1996
M.S., University of Louisville, 2001

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University of Louisville
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Urban and Public Affairs
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

May 2011

Copyright 2011 by Joseph S. Grant

All rights reserved

LOUISVILLE-JEFFERSON COUNTY POLICE CONSOLIDATION:
OFFICERS' PERCEPTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

By

Joseph Sterling Grant
B.S., Indiana University, 1996
M.S., University of Louisville, 2001

A Dissertation Approved on

February 23, 2011

By the following Disseratation Committee:

Cynthia Negrey
Dissertation Director

Steven Koven

Hank Savitch

David Imbroscio

George E. Higgins

Richard Tewksbury

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to: my father and mother, Robert (1922-1999) and Myrtle Grant; my wife, Rhonda Grant; my children, Amanda Lyons, Bryan Grant, and Kyle Lyons; my grandchildren, JaKobe Grant, Nicholas Carrier, Brandon Carrier, and Jaylen Grant; my brother and sister and their families, Michael “Tony” Grant and Sylvia Jamies; and to my aunts and their families, Mary Morehead, Myrna Roach, and Myra Davis. Thank you all for your unconditional love and support throughout my life and believing in me when I did not believe in myself.

Someone once said that, “Success is not the key to happiness. Happiness is the key to success.” I am not successful because I have completed this journey; I am successful because of the happiness I share with my family. My accomplishments are not a reflection of what I have done, but a reflection of the love you have shown me. Thank You!

“Where there is love, there is life.”

~Mahatma Ghandi

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my Chair, Dr. Cynthia Negrey, for her guidance and patience throughout this process. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Dr. George Higgins, Dr. David Imbroscio, Dr. Steven Koven, Dr. Hank Savitch, and Dr. Richard Tewksbury, for their comments and assistance over the past three years. Each of you has given me the opportunity to reach beyond myself only to find what lay dormant within. To Dr. Gennaro Vito, thank you for co-signing for my academic future. To Mrs. Linda Bently, thank you for rekindling my passion to learn. To Dr. Mary Ann Baker, thank you for helping to keep the fire burning. To Sandy Wade, Melanie Hughes, Ginger Brown, Kim Hendricks, and the employees of LMPD Human Resources, thank you for your skills in helping me complete this study. To Dr. Deborah Keeling, thank you for giving me the opportunity to be a part of the University of Louisville and the Department of Justice Administration family. To the other faculty and staff in the Department of Justice Administration, thank you for your support and making me feel at home. To Margret and Steve Shaffer and Rodney Hanger and family, thank you for being a part of my extended family. To Dennis Hopewell, John Reed, William Wiley, Dawn Elston and family, Buddy Dumeyer, Pete McCartney, Dion Dodson, Jeff Sherrard, Mona Francis, Ramie Martin-Galijatovic, Dr. Wayne Usui, Dr. J. Price Foster, Dr. Ron Holmes, Dr. Ron Vogel, Dr. Jasmine Farrier, Dr. Thomas Keil, Dr. Sara Coffin, Dr. Peter Meyer, my friends at Indiana University and the University of Louisville, and

my friends at Mick's Lounge, thank you for your years of support. To former Mayor Dale Orem and former Chief of Police Jerry Priest, thank you for giving me the opportunity that started my career and to serve the citizens of Jeffersonville. To my brothers and sisters on the Jeffersonville Police Department and the Louisville Metro Police Department, thank you for allowing me the privilege to serve with you. To the Louisville Metro police officers who participated in this study, thank you—this moment would not have been possible without your assistance. And, to Chief Robert White, thank you for having the courage and wisdom to allow me the opportunity to do this study.

“I’ve learned that people will forget what you said, people will forget what you did,
but people will never forget how you made them feel.”

~Maya Angelou

ABSTRACT

LOUISVILLE-JEFFERSON COUNTY POLICE CONSOLIDATION: OFFICERS' PERCEPTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

Joseph Sterling Grant

May 13, 2009

This study focuses on how the 2001 consolidation of the Louisville Division of Police (LPD) and Jefferson County Police Department (JCPD) impacted police officers' perception of fairness of the process. To accomplish this, the study asked four research questions: 1) How do police officers view a just department?, 2) How do police officers' justice judgments affect their reaction to the organization and supervisors?, 3) How do police officers form overall perceptions of fairness?, and 4) How do LPD and JCPD officers differ in their perceptions of fairness of the consolidation?

A systematic random sample with replacement was used to invite police officers from the newly established Louisville Metro Police Department (LMPD) to participate in this study. Officers were selected based upon their former agency (i.e., LPD or JCPD) and their rank (i.e., patrol officer or supervisor—including the ranks of sergeants and above). Forty police officers from a population of 903 former LPD and JCPD members, still on LMPD at the time of this study, agreed to participate. Police officers hired post-consolidation (295 officers) were not included in the population for this study.

The findings in this study indicate that: 1) police view a just or fair department based upon justice rules (i.e., equality, accountability, and flexibility/discretion) and interpersonal (i.e., comparisons made between officers on the same department) and interdepartmental comparisons (i.e., comparisons made between departments); 2) justice judgments can result in negative reactions directed toward the administration, but that an officer's sense of professionalism or lack of control of the situation could influence how he/she reacts; 3) police officers form overall perceptions based upon a value assessment of justice component and justice source; and 4) LPD and JCPD officers differed on their perceptions of fairness, based in part upon the issue of parity (i.e., pay and benefits).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of Study	1
Statement of Problem.....	3
Research Questions	5
Expectations.....	5
Significance of the Study.....	6
Outline of Remaining Chapters.....	8
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Metropolitan Government: City-County Consolidation	9
Versions of Metropolitan Government: Monocentric and Polycentric	10
Pros and Cons of Both Perspectives	12
Police Consolidation.....	16
Consolidation Perspective	18
Public Choice Perspective.....	21

The Dilemma of Law Enforcement Consolidation	23
The Dynamics of Consolidation.....	26
Structural Changes: Complexity and Control	27
Types of Consolidation	28
Stages of Consolidation: Transitional Events	29
Summary of the Dynamics of Consolidation	31
Organizational Justice	32
Conceptualizing Organizational Justice	32
Organizational Justice in the Workplace	34
Individual Biases	36
Workplace Deviance	37
Organizational Culture	37
Benefits of Organizational Justice	38
Importance of Organizational Justice	39
Dimensions and Model of Organizational Justice.....	40
The Distributive Justice Wave	41
The Procedural Justice Wave	42
The Interactional Justice Wave	43
The Integrative Justice Wave	45
Fair Process Effect Model	46
Summary of Dimensions and Model of Justice	47
Organizational Justice and Police Consolidation	50
Distinguishing Between Public and Private Organizations	53

	Organizational Justice and Private M&As.....	54
	Context-Based Studies	55
	Perception-Based Studies	57
	Reaction-Based Studies	59
	Summary of Literature Review	61
III.	HISTORY OF LOUISVILLE METRO POLICE DEPARTMENT	65
	Consolidation of LPD and JCPD	67
	Pre-Consolidation Stage	68
	Initial Planning and Formal Combination Stage	71
	Operational Combination Stage.....	73
	Stabilization Stage	74
IV.	METHODOLOGY	76
	Case Study as Methodology.....	78
	Case Study Design	80
	Data Collection Technique	83
	Interview Format	84
	Sample Selection	87
	Demographics.....	91
	Analysis of Data.....	92
V.	FINDINGS	
	Introduction	93
	Research Question 1	94
	Equality and Respect: Merit and Work Productivity	95

Accountability: Clarity, Consistency, and Predictability	96
Flexibility and Discretion: Policies and Practices	97
Comparisons: Interdepartmental and Interpersonal	99
Summary of Perceptions of a Fair Department	103
Research Question 2	103
Pre-Consolidation Stage	104
Support or Opposition to Consolidation	104
Consolidated Departments	105
Fear of Change	108
Rumors	109
Commanders: Jockeying for Positions	110
City and County Officers Working Together	112
Parity	114
Fear of Takeover	117
Reactions: Retirements, Displeasure, Anger, and Resentment	118
Summary of Pre-consolidation Stage	119
Restructuring Stage	120
Resistance, Confusion, Chaos, and Tension	120
Planning of Consolidation	122
Selection of the Chief/Command	124
Policies and Procedures	127

Decentralization: Redistricting	128
Decentralization: Reassignments	130
Fear of Takeover: A Reality	131
Reactions: Retirements and Decreased Work Productivity	132
Reactions: Keep Doing Their Jobs	134
Summary of Restructuring Stage	135
Stabilization Stage	136
Advantages of Consolidation	137
Working Together	137
Increased Opportunities	139
City Officers Obtaining Parity	141
Disadvantages of Consolidation	142
Constant Change	142
Lack of Leadership	143
Parity: County Officers' Loss of Benefits	145
Loss of History	145
Hope for the Future	147
Summary of Stabilization Stage	148
Research Question 3	150
Justice Sources	150
Justice Components	151

	Fairness of Consolidation: Justice Sources and	
	Components.....	152
	Restructuring	152
	Planning	155
	Selection of Chief of Police/Command Staff	158
	Parity	159
	Benefits to Department	160
	Benefits to the Community	162
	Individual Benefits	164
	Multiple Perspectives	164
	Summary	169
	Research Question 4	169
	Comparing City and County Officers' Perceptions.....	169
VI.	DISCUSSION	172
	Introduction	172
	Expectation #1	173
	Expectation #2	179
	Expectation #3	183
	Expectation #4	186
	Policy Implications	190
	Limitations of Study	194
	Future Studies	197
	Conclusion	200

REFERENCES	204
APPENDICES	235
CURRICULUM VITAE	237

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of Study

In 2003, The City of Louisville and Jefferson County in Kentucky consolidated governments creating the newly formed and named, Louisville Metro government. Louisville's consolidation, the first in the United States in more than thirty years, has triggered a renewed interest in this controversial policy in addressing metropolitan problems (i.e., socioeconomic disparities, concentrated poverty, crime) through governmental restructuring (Savitch and Vogel, 2004a). As a result of this consolidation, Louisville Metro moved from sixty-seventh to the nation's twenty-sixth largest city (Infoplease, 2008)—challenging the conventional wisdom and infeasibility of the aforementioned policy (Downs, 1994; Altshuler, Morrill, Wolman, and Mitchell, 1999). This consolidation has stimulated similar interests in other cities such as Cleveland, Buffalo, San Antonio, Memphis, Milwaukee, and Albuquerque (Savitch and Vogel, 2004a).

Government consolidations are complex phenomena. Each is unique in its issues and circumstances—differing in reasoning behind the consolidation, expectations, as well as the degree to which departments will be integrated (International Association of Chiefs of Police, 2003). Therefore, each consolidation will, more than likely, have different impacts on different departments and different perceptions and responses from its

employees. One department of particular interest in regards to this study—due in part to its role as representative of the civil power of government—is the police department (Dempsey and Forst, 2010).

A byproduct of Louisville Metro’s consolidation was the consolidation of the city and county police departments. With an overall strength of 723 sworn officers and 324 civilians for Louisville Police Department (LPD) and 450 sworn officers and 247 civilians from Jefferson County Police Department (JCPD) (Louisville-Jefferson County Crime Commission, 1998), the newly formed Louisville Metro Police Department (LMPD) entered the rare status of state and local law enforcement agencies (0.4%) with 1,000 or more sworn personnel (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2007).

Police consolidation is not a new idea. As early as 1920, advocates of consolidation recognized the potential problems (i.e., duplication of services) associated with fragmented local law enforcement agencies (Fosdick, 1920). Grounded in the debate between consolidation and public choice, researchers have produced numerous studies arguing the effectiveness and efficiency of both schools of thought—unfortunately, with inconclusive results. However, over the years, consolidations continue to occur primarily between smaller police agencies—though this rarely involves government consolidation (IACP, 2003). Still, given its potential adverse effects on an organization and its employees, consideration should be given to issues other than those based on its economic strengths and weaknesses. One such approach is to view consolidation based upon its employees’ or sworn police officers’ perception of justice of the process.

Organizational justice has been defined as people's perceptions of fairness in organizations (Greenberg, 1987a). Although studies on organizational justice generally identify a three-dimensional concept (distributive, procedural, and interactional), others have introduced a four-dimensional concept by expanding the dimension of interaction into two distinct justice concepts—interpersonal and informational (Greenberg, 1993a; Colquitt, 2001). Despite disagreements on its conceptualization, organizational justice has not only been identified as fostering legitimacy of organizational authorities (Tyler and Lind, 1992) and promoting acceptance of organizational change (Greenberg, 1994), it provides individuals with a sense of esteem or respect and belonging within the organization (Lind and Tyler, 1988).

During consolidations or transition events (i.e., layoffs, downsizing, mergers and acquisitions commonly associated with private organizations)—situations in which rules are made, broken, changed, interpreted or applied to organizational activities or practices—justice decisions arise (Sheppard, Lewicki and Minton, 1992). Perceptions of these events can have a wide range of organizational outcomes both beneficial and detrimental to the organization (Greenberg and Colquitt, 2005). These events have increasingly been understood as a significant reason for merger failures in private organizations (Cartwright and Cooper, 1993).

Statement of Problem

Prior to the consolidation, the Louisville-Jefferson County Crime Commission (LJCCC) (1998) conducted a survey on the perceptions and attitudes of members of both Louisville and Jefferson County police personnel. According to their report, 82.1% of Louisville's sworn personnel were in favor of the consolidation while 89.9% of Jefferson

County's sworn personnel were opposed to consolidation. Unfortunately, since the consolidation, there have been no known studies focusing on officers' perceptions and attitudes toward the restructuring.

Since the passing of the referendum in 2001 and the beginning of the actual consolidation in 2003, the LMPD has moved well into the stabilization stage—the final stage of the consolidation process. However, given the initial strong attitudes by officers both in favor of and against the restructuring, it is likely that the “process” of the consolidation continues to elicit emotional responses and influence perceptions of the organization and its administrators—both good and bad.

Few studies have applied justice concepts to police officers in the context of these transitional events. Those studies that use justice concepts associated with the police generally address issues related to citizens' perception of police encounters (Tyler, 2001a, b). However, studies on transitional events in private organizations provide some insight into justice judgments and responses. Despite the similarities between public and private organizations—in terms of structural complexity (MaGuire, 2003) and structural control (Robbins, 1987)—the differences between the two, in terms of their fundamental objectives (Rainey, 2003), provide a contextually different environment to the study of organizational justice.

Given their role in promoting public safety, responding to emergency situations, maintaining order, and fighting crime, it is surprising that organizational scholars would pay so little attention to the effects consolidation has on police officers. Therefore, this study will focus on the consolidation of Louisville City and Jefferson County Police Departments and the impact this process had on police officers' perception of fairness.

Research Questions

The consolidation case selected for this study provides a unique context in which “overall” justice judgments can be used to understand and describe how these perceptions are made. Using the three-dimensional concept of overall justice (i.e., distributive, procedural, and interactional) (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng, 2001; Greenberg 1993) perceptions of the fairness of the consolidation process can be identified. Using the fairness process effect model, reactions (i.e., attitudes and behaviors) to fairness judgments can be identified (Walker, LaTour, Lind, and Thibaut, 1974; Folger, Rosenfield, Grove, and Corkan 1979). Therefore, the following research questions will be the focus of this study:

Question #1: How do police officers view a just department?

Question #2: How do justice judgments affect police officers’ attitudes and behaviors toward the organization and supervisors?

Question #3: How do police officers form overall perceptions of justice in a consolidation process?

Question #4: How do former city and county police officers compare in perceptions of justice of the consolidation?

Expectations

In general, qualitative research is hypothesis generating. In other words, it does not start out with preconceived notions. A hypothesis is a specified testable expectation about empirical reality that follows from a more general proposition (Berg, 2004). However, certain expectations regarding the findings can be made based upon the

literature review. Therefore, the following expectations can be made regarding this study:

Expectation #1: Police officers view a just department as based, in part, upon personal and professional expectations of the department and the perceived fairness of the department's procedures, policies, and practices.

Expectation #2: Both the organization and supervisors will be affected by police officers' favorable or unfavorable justice judgment. In other words, fair judgments will solicit favorable reactions and unfair judgments will solicit unfavorable reactions toward the organization and supervisors.

Expectation #3: Police officers form overall perceptions of justice based upon a collective assessment of distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational concepts of justice.

Expectation #4: Differences in perceptions of justice will be seen between former city and county police officers, and between the different ranks of police officers.

It is not the intention in stating these expectations to predict or foreshadow the findings in this study. The purpose here is to provide an empirical foundation of understanding that will allow the researcher, through a qualitative methodology, to probe further the depths of how overall perceptions of justice are made in a police consolidation.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is threefold. First, regardless of what type of justice is being examined, or from which source that justice originates, the *context* in which fairness is to be judged is important (Colquitt and Shaw, 2005). Despite studies on

justice judgments in transitional events in private organizations, little research has addressed the impact that this type of organizational change has on employees' (police officers') perceptions in public organizations. As stated earlier, given the role of police officers in society, reactions by police officers can have a significant impact on the organization, its supervisors, and the community.

Second, most of the research on perceptions of justice is *event or context specific*—focusing on one particular event. For example, context specific studies have been used in identifying the perceived fairness of corporate relocation (Daly and Geyer, 1994), layoffs (Brockner, Wiesenfeld, Reed, Grover, and Martin, 1993) and drug testing (Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991). A less common approach is to use *entity* measures that examine fairness across multiple decision-making events. For example, appraise the fairness of a supervisor or organization as a whole (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, and Rupp, 2001; see also Sweeny and McFarlin, 1997). Entity measures, therefore, measure the aggregate of an employee's experience in the form of a more global judgment of the situation. Justice judgments are the product of multiple factors that ultimately shape an individual's perception of justice. The entity measures approach provides an opportunity to reflect the complex, multi-dimensional nature of justice decisions missing in most research.

Finally, the primary focus of justice research has been on quantitative methods used to identify the unique variance accounted for by each type of justice and the differential effects of the different types of justice. These approaches have contributed significantly to the understanding of justice perceptions. However, they have also produced a situation where justice research has become self-interested—focusing on

“within justice” questions using multiple types of justice as predictors and assessing the effect of those on multiple outcomes or mediating variables (Greenberg, 2001).

Arguably, justice judgments are made “holistically” and researchers have neglected this overall sense of justice (Ambrose and Arnaud, 2005). It is believed that more can be gained by focusing less on the differences between justice types and more on how these conceptually distinct forms of justice contribute to an employee’s overall sense of organizational fairness (Ambrose and Arnaud, 2005). More can also be learned about how these perceptions of fairness influence employees’ attitudes and behaviors.

Although it is not outside the capability of quantitative methods to address this issue, a qualitative method or case study provides an additional opportunity to explore “life-worlds” or naturally emerging languages and meanings individuals assign to this particular experience (Berg, 2004).

Outline of Remaining Chapters

This section outlines the remaining chapters of the study and details their content. Chapter II contains a review of relevant organizational justice literature and related studies that are associated with government consolidations. Chapter III will provide a brief synopsis of the Louisville-Jefferson County Police Department consolidation and consolidation process. Chapter IV discusses the methodology used in this study. Chapter V will identify the findings in this study. Chapter VI will discuss the expectations for this study, as well as the study’s limitations, suggestions for future studies, policy implications, and the final remarks or conclusion to this study.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Metropolitan Government: City-County or Government Consolidation

Identifying an exact cause and developing solutions to problems in metropolitan areas is a difficult process and not always agreed upon by scholars (Wyly, Glickman, and Lahr, 1998). To some, the problems of metropolitan areas have been attributed to the inability of local governments to address important regional issues (i.e., sprawl, socioeconomic disparities, and concentration of poverty) (Rusk, 2003, 1999; Wyly, Glickman, and Lahr, 1998). As a result, some scholars believe that a regional government or governance (i.e., annexation, municipal consolidation, city-county consolidation, etc.) is necessary to effectively address and solve the problems of the metropolis (Jones, 1942; Rusk, 2003, 1999).

Of these structural reform possibilities, city-county or government consolidation is among the most often discussed, but least-implemented structural reforms in local government body (Johnson and Leland, 2000). Since World War II, more than 100 referenda on the government consolidation question have been voted on nationwide. Reflecting the more recent focus on reform, more than 80 referenda since 1970, and nearly 20 since 1990 alone have been put to voters. At present, 32 regions have consolidated or otherwise combined city and county governments. Among the most prominent are New York City, New York; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; New Orleans, as

well as Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Lexington-Fayette, Kentucky; San Francisco, California; Anchorage, Alaska; Columbus, Georgia; Boston, Massachusetts; Indianapolis, Indiana; Nashville, Tennessee; Jacksonville, Florida; and most recently Louisville, Kentucky.

Despite these examples, the implementation of government consolidation is considered the exception—not the rule. Advanced as a good government reform to promote efficiency, equity, accountability, and to reduce growing disparities between central cities and suburbs (Rusk, 1999, 2003), its ability to fulfill these objectives is oftentimes questioned. Still, government consolidation remains a viable alternative to advocates of metropolitan reform—but not an alternative preferred by all.

Versions of Metropolitan Government: Monocentric and Polycentric

Two prevailing points of view dominate the literature on what type of regional government, if any, should be developed—monocentric versus polycentric government. First, advocates of a monocentric government or consolidation, argue that each urban area should be governed by a centralized single-government (see Taylor, 1911, Goodnow, 1900; Wilson, 1885, 1887). In other words, a centralized or general-purpose government based upon the efficiency and effectiveness principles of scientific management should provide all local public services (Stephens and Wikstrom, 2003).

Based upon these principles, advocates of consolidation believe that metropolitan areas, with their many fragmented local governments, result in service duplication, diseconomies of scale, and other inefficiencies—making it virtually impossible to effectively solve municipal problems common to all (Studenski, 1930). Also, the inability of core cities to expand their borders ensures continued economic decline and an

inability to enhance a regional perspective and cooperation in economic development (Rusk, 1999, 2003), as well as being competitive in an ever increasing global economy (Peirce, 1993).

Although the concept of consolidation dominated social science research from the mid-1950s until the mid-1970s, an alternative perspective was later introduced—*polycentric* or public choice. Based more on economic-seasoning than on the traditional public administration concerns that structured consolidation (Schneider, 1986), public choice advocates argued that local control is important to citizens and lower costs are not likely to result from consolidation. This perspective challenged the basic principle of consolidationists that “bigger and fewer” administrative units would provide more cost-efficient, specialized and improved services (Bish and Ostrom, 1974; Ostrom, 1971).

Advocates of public choice argue that the competition among jurisdictions results in homogeneous communities, with residents that all value public services similarly. In equilibrium, no individual can be made better off by moving, and the market is efficient—not requiring a political solution to provide the optimal level of public goods (Tiebout, 1956). Therefore, competition between a variety of local producers of public services is eliminated, and when faced with poor quality or higher taxes, recipients can “vote with their feet” choosing the services that best suit their needs (Tiebout, 1956). This results in more responsive and efficient levels of service provision (Ostrom, Tiebout, and Warren, 1961).

Issues related to effectiveness and efficiency dominate the literature on metropolitan consolidation. Although there appears to be a lack of empirical evidence supporting or denying the effectiveness and efficiency of one form of local government

over another—due in part to the normative perspective in which these arguments are conducted—there appears to be at least a general acknowledgement that local governments cannot handle all regional problems. Therefore, it is believed that some type of regional government or governance is needed to address regional issues (Ostrom, Tiebout, and Warren, 1961).

Most present day scholars of urban affairs predisposed toward metropolitan governmental reform endorse a federative, two-tier type of metropolitan governmental structure—one providing regional or system-maintenance services (i.e., water, sewers, and mass transportation), and the other consisting of retaining existing cities and towns, providing lifestyle services (i.e., elementary and secondary public education) (Stephens and Wikstrom, 2000). Still, as Banfield and Grodzins (1958) caution, distinctions should be made between the problems that exist in metropolitan areas and the problems that exist by virtue of the inadequacies of the governmental structure in metropolitan areas.

Pros and Cons of Both Perspectives

Although the debate between consolidation and public choice advocates will more than likely continue, both sides have their pros and cons. For example, consolidation of Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Miami, Florida; Nashville, Tennessee; Jacksonville, Florida; Indianapolis, Indiana; and the limited regional governmental structures of Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota and Portland, Oregon have been credited with accomplishments which include (Stephens and Wikstrom, 2000):

1. Promoting a sense of regional identity and introducing a regional factor into the local policy process.

2. Promoting economic development and attracting large companies to their region, resulting in substantial private investment and additional jobs.
3. Implementing a substantial degree of governmental modernization, administrative centralization, and functional integration, resulting in service efficiencies and savings in governmental operations.
4. Providing more uniform and better quality system-maintenance services throughout their regions and promoting more orderly regional development and growth.
5. Credited with being innovative in their operations (i.e., Indianapolis being in the forefront in incorporating the concepts of competition and privatization into the delivery of public services; Jacksonville developing structures to facilitate citizen participation in government; and all five metropolitan governments having made novel use of taxing and service districts).

At the same time, advocates of consolidation have faced some criticism. For example, the consolidated governments of Baton Rouge, Miami, Nashville, Jacksonville, and Indianapolis have been criticized for (Stephens and Wikstrom, 2000):

1. Implementing only partial consolidations—allowing for the continuing existence of a variety of local governmental units.
2. Failing to encompass the entire socioeconomic metropolitan region.
3. Increasing government expenses and taxes paid by citizens over the years despite promoting metro as a way of enhancing local governmental efficiency.
4. Its marginal ability to redistribute wealth in response to the economic and social problems of the disadvantaged.

On the other hand, public choice has played a major role in structuring the current debate on metropolitan governance—advancing a number of important insights contributing to a better understanding of metropolitan governance. These contributions include (Stephens and Wikstrom, 2000):

1. Moved the attention away from the structure of the metropolitan government towards the focus on individual needs and preferences.
2. Eroded the legitimacy of totally consolidated metropolitan government—endorsing instead a sort of federative or two-tier governmental structure.
3. Widened the debate by stressing the positive features and consequences flowing from the polycentric character of government in the metropolis.
4. Noted the maximization of economies of scales in terms of service delivery requires governmental units of varying geographical size for the provision of various services.
5. Provided a more sophisticated understanding of the functional operation and service-rendering role of government.
6. Pointed out that the most important need in the metropolis is not the establishment of a regional government, but rather, the institution of neighborhood governments—being able to have an impact and express policy preferences on a neighborhood level.

At the same time, public choice has been criticized for (Stephens and Wikstrom, 2000):

1. Too much emphasis on the belief that citizens are rational and make decisions based upon self-interest.

2. Does not provide a way in which citizens can directly communicate their public policy preferences to elected officials.
3. Placing too much emphasis on individuals' ability to "vote with their feet"—not taking into consideration constraints placed on individuals.
4. Does not consider the deed for redistributive politics in the metropolis, whereby the more affluent sectors of the metropolitan area provide a financial subsidy to fund services for citizens dwelling in disadvantaged areas.
5. Argument of efficiency and effectiveness of services not necessarily substantiated.
6. Excessively parochial—downplay the regional responsibilities.
7. Place too much faith in local government to deliver services and, in its defense of polycentrism, fails to acknowledge the bewildering maze of service arrangements and the undermining of accountability.

Still, there are three generalizations that can be made regarding consolidations (Stephens and Wikstrom, 2000). First, service problems (i.e., sewer, water, fire and police protection, and/or primary and secondary public education) generally served as a catalyst for promoting the concept of and need for city-county consolidation. Second, consolidations are usually incomplete—not including all government agencies. For example, the consolidation of Indianapolis with Marion County in 1970 did not include its police department—which later consolidated in 2008 due in part to service issues and fiscal restraints. Also, the consolidation of Louisville and Jefferson County in 2003 excluded more than 80 small municipalities (Savitch and Vogel, 2004a). Finally, consolidations generally have strong government support from the mayor and council.

This support is important in developing government and community support for the policy.

The degree to which governments consolidate can vary from one jurisdiction to the next—each unique in its issues, circumstances, expectations, and degree to which integration occurs (see IACP, 2003). As a result, each consolidation, potentially, impacts each department and its employees differently. Still, somewhat surprisingly, studies have focused more attention on issues of effectiveness and efficiency—especially in private organizations (see Cartwright and Cooper, 1993) than on the impact consolidation has on the integration process of departments and employees. One department of particular interest, due in part to its role as representatives of the civil power of government (Dempsey and Forst, 2010), is the police department.

Police Consolidation

Since the 1950s, many forms of police consolidations have occurred in communities ranging from small towns to large cities (IACP, 2003). However, some consolidations have occurred in larger cities (IACP, 2003). For example, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department began contract services to the adjoining city of Lakewood as early as 1954. The Las Vegas, Nevada, Police Department and the Clark County Sheriff's Department went further, joining forces to establish the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department in 1973. In Florida, the city of Jacksonville and Duval County went so far as to totally combine their governments, including their respective police departments, to form a single agency under the name, the City of Jacksonville in 1968. Similarly, in Kentucky, the city of Lexington and Fayette County merged their governments, as well as their respective police departments, in 1974. In 1993, the city of

Charlotte, North Carolina, combined with the Mecklenburg County Sheriff's Department to create the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department. Most recently, in 2003, as a result of a government consolidation, the city of Louisville, Kentucky, combined with Jefferson County to create the Louisville Metro Police Department.

In the beginning, police departments in the United States were formed, in part, in response to social issues and served at the discretion of the dominant political institution of the time (O'Brien and Marcus, 1979). As a result, the structure of local law enforcement agencies has arguably become nothing less than complex and extremely autonomous and uncooperative units. The state of existence of local governments and the services they provide, including police services, brings into question the necessity of duplicated services and the effectiveness and efficiency of the current system.

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) (2007), an estimated 17,976 state and local police agencies operated in the United States in 2004. Of these agencies, about half employed fewer than 10 full-time officers and nearly a third (31%) employed fewer than 5 officers. Only 6% of law enforcement organizations employed 100 or more officers with 12% employing just one full-time or only part-time officers. Nearly all local police departments, 98% were operated by a single municipality. The remainder were operated by a county or tribal government, or served multiple jurisdictions under a regional or joint arrangement.

For over 50 years, many political scientists, urban planners, and other social scientists writing about urban areas have agreed that a major urban problem is the existence of a large number of independent jurisdictions within a single metropolitan area (Dye, 1988). Some argue that the majority of fragmentation-related problems are

problems because of the fiscal restrictions under which units of local government must function. Underlying many of the problems is a lack of resources necessary to provide an adequate level of service (Dolan, 1990).

Although police consolidation is not a new idea, adopting such policies remains controversial. Over the years, some police agencies have successfully combined agencies (i.e., Glencoe, Illinois and Sunnyvale, California) while others have failed (i.e., Brisbane, California; Mercer Island, Washington; Fresno's Yosemite International Airport; and Winston-Salem, North Carolina)—opting at times to deconsolidate their agency (IACP, 2003). Unfortunately, the degree of separation between the various expectations versus the actual reality of consolidation outcomes makes the success or failure of a consolidation contextually based (see IACP, 2003).

For the most part, arguments for consolidating continue to revolve around efforts to produce and provide services more efficiently and effectively. Given the problems facing contemporary police agencies (i.e., fiscal strain, limited resources, and crime), consolidation is still viewed as a viable solution (IACP, 2003).

Consolidation Perspective

As early as 1920, advocates of consolidation recognized the potential problems associated with fragmented local law enforcement agencies (Fosdick, 1920). Fosdick (1920) argued that police consolidation in metropolitan areas would undoubtedly produce beneficial results in the United States. Proponents of consolidation continued the discussions by citing various arguments in support of the concept of consolidation (Smith, 1940). The generalized issues of jurisdictional isolation and economics, such as

the need for each agency to maintain its own police facilities, potentially add to the complexity, confusion, and destructive rivalries arising out of overlapping jurisdictions.

Advocates of consolidation make the argument that the fragmentation of local law enforcement agencies is ineffective and inefficient in providing and delivering services to their constituents (Rusk, 1995)—especially smaller agencies and their governing bodies (IACP, 2003). According to Herley (1989) and Wickum (1986), the foundation of this argument is based on the assumptions that:

1. Many small municipalities cannot afford to support their own police forces at an adequate level of funding. Those attempting to do so risk their capacity to provide adequate public services in other areas of responsibility.
2. Small police departments cannot recruit, train, and retain highly qualified personnel. There is a tendency to lose these officers to larger, better paying organizations where opportunities for advancements and skill development abound.
3. Small police departments are sometimes not sufficiently professional and modernized to serve the needs of the community.
4. Supervision and administration are sometimes inadequate in small police agencies, thereby adding to the liability costs of the jurisdiction.
5. The existence of many small forces, for example in a metropolitan area, can lead to confusion among citizens about jurisdiction and to professional jealousy.
6. Formal and informal coordination among multiple police departments is generally lacking or insufficient.

Jurisdictions undertaking consolidation activities may anticipate an outcome that will produce a higher volume of police services, lower response time, reduce overtime, mitigate duplication of effort, and lower overall operating costs, as well as saving money, producing greater efficiency and flexibility in response to crime, and providing greater opportunities for advancement for sworn and civilian personnel (IACP, 2003). Consolidation proponents also assume increased agency status, resources, and capacity (IACP, 2003).

Also, the quality of policing is expected to rise under consolidation as a result of more efficient and coordinated use of manpower, more flexibility to meet hours of peak demand, enhanced training opportunities, and improved management and supervision (IACP, 2003). Proponents also argue that the consolidations of police services will (IACP, 2003):

1. Increase efficiency through a reduction of duplicate services.
2. Increase effectiveness by eliminating political tampering.
3. Lessen the ability of criminal activity to move from one jurisdiction to another.
4. Increase professionalism, and lower turnover rates by providing more opportunities in the merged agency.

Consolidation is especially attractive to city and county decision-makers in regions with numerous smaller police agencies, where fragmentation or redundancy in policing may be present and where fiscal challenges exist (IACP, 2003; Wickum, 1986).

Support for consolidation has come from various national commissions (see National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement (Wickersham Commission), 1931; President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967;

National Advisory Commission on Goals and Standards, 1973); comparative studies (see Koepsell and Girad, 1979; Krimmell, 1997; Lyons and Lowery, 1989; Dowding and Hindmoor, 1997); as well as studies based in California supporting the consolidation movement (see Wickum, 1986; Herley, 1989). Still, consolidation is not without its critics.

Public Choice Perspective

Advocates of *public choice* fear the loss of community independence, and reduced oversight and supervision of a consolidated police department spanning several towns or cities. They assume that the personal nature of policing in their community will be lost, that response times may not be lowered, the desires and values of the citizens will be minimized or disregarded entirely, and that costs to the smaller community may increase (Ostrom, 1971). Expectations versus the actual reality of consolidation outcomes may vary greatly depending upon many factors. In any event, public choice theorists view the tens of thousands of units of government and jurisdictions in the United States as many different public firms or public enterprises (Bish and Ostrom, 1974)—producing an economy which exists to provide citizens with public goods and services including the provision of public safety.

Public choice advocates also make a distinction between public and private goods. With private goods (i.e., clothes, jewelry, cars, etc.) one can choose how many of these items to consume. On the other hand, public goods (i.e., police services), once provided, are provided to everyone—available for anyone to enjoy (Bish and Ostrom, 1974). Therefore, these services are provided on a routine basis to individuals in the area served and do not represent a duplication of services.

Grounded in the belief that police services are best provided in small governmental jurisdictions, in their study Ostrom and Smith (1976) attack the issue of consolidation by arguing that: 1) size did not matter on most indicators of effectiveness and efficiency, 2) smaller departments rate higher than their larger counterparts in community relations, and 3) the education level of officers in the smaller departments—a possible indicator of professionalism in an agency—was no less than that of others in the larger departments during this time period. Also, McDavid (2002), in examining the 1996 consolidation of three departments in Halifax, Canada, found that, after consolidation, the number of sworn officers decreased—resulting in higher workloads for sworn officers. The study compared data from surveys, interviews, and budget and manpower reports three years before and four years after the consolidation. Expenditures on police services increased primarily due to union negotiations which included substantial salary increases. Consolidation did not affect crime rates. Citizens were also surveyed on their perception of the quality of police services before and after consolidation. The majority of respondents (78.1%) in each year surveyed believed that the quality of police services stayed the same (McDavid, 2002).

Ironically, in answer to their own question about small departments being viable, Ostrom and Smith (1976) did not eliminate the possibility that some smaller agencies should be eliminated and combined into medium-sized agencies. Still, during a study in the Chicago metropolitan area—with nearly 350 locally maintained agencies—police agencies, regardless of size of financial resources, regarded themselves as capable of providing adequate law enforcement within their boundaries (Bollens and Schmandt, 1982)—reinforcing advocates position on public choice.

The Dilemma of Law Enforcement Consolidation

In any community, almost all stakeholders enter into discussion of consolidation with preconceptions (both positive and negative) about the value of merging agencies. The dilemma facing policy makers and police administrators is twofold. On the one hand, national advisory commissions and state advisory boards, along with police administration experts, advocate that more effective, efficient, and less costly law enforcement is feasible only if numerous small, local departments are eliminated. Yet, police chiefs of small departments argue that small departments provide the personal type of police services necessary and requested in the communities they serve.

Negative preconceptions and a possible source of resistance could potentially follow a proposed consolidation. These include (see IACP, 2003; Herley, 1989; Wickum, 1986; Hogan, 1980; Ostrom and Whitaker, 1973):

1. Senior, supervisory, and line officers alike may be threatened by consolidation and aggressively resist change.
2. Consolidation is likely to increase costs, particularly because of the start-up costs of reorganization, planning, and standardizing equipment, and possible need for a new building to house the combined agencies.
3. Officers in line for promotion or advanced assignment in one agency may find they are outranked for these opportunities by their peers in the other agency.
4. Loss of identity.
5. Distrust between departments and inter-agency jealousies.
6. Issues of parity between officers of different merged departments who had different compensation and benefit packages.

7. Impersonal service.
8. A negative effect on service levels.
9. Viable methods of cost sharing would be difficult..

Also, governance of the newly created agency, once consolidation has occurred, may face other challenges such as (see IACP, 2003; Herley, 1989):

1. Loss of control by smaller communities.
2. Confusion on the part of citizens about how and where complaints are sent.
3. Loss of personal interaction by the community with local law enforcement.
4. Fragmented oversight of the newly combined law enforcement agency by local community councils and mayors.
5. Recruitment and retention issues.
6. Promotional opportunities.
7. Insurance costs.
8. Training costs.
9. Costs of technology (i.e., combining communication systems).
10. Investigative services provided
11. Purchasing orders (i.e., new cars, uniforms, etc.).

Administrators of a consolidation may also have to contend with the attitudes of officers opposing the consolidation. For example, McAninch and Sanders (1988) conducted a survey of 102 police officers (the entire population of officers) in Bloomington and Normal, Illinois and found that the majority of the officers believed that a consolidated department would operate more economically, more effectively address local crime, and eliminate duplicate services and equipment. However, in another study,

conducted by the Louisville-Jefferson County Crime Commission (Kentucky) (1998), 82.1% of LPD's sworn personnel were in favor of the consolidation while 89.9% of JCPD's sworn personnel were opposed to the consolidation.

Debate still exists about whether fragmentation actually produces an unacceptable number of harmful side effects. Across the country, officials in communities facing increasing degrees of fiscal stress and decreasing levels of service delivery are arguing the pros and cons of consolidating units of government or centralizing the provision of services as a possible solution (Dolan, 1990). However, three factors have provided the contextual basis of most consolidations which includes: 1) occurring between very small cities or one considerably larger than the other, 2) occurring when cities face a severe population decline, and 3) occurring when delivery and/or financial problems were present (Halter, 1993). Also, Wickum, (1986) identified high costs, liability concerns, and a lack of police credibility as elements leading to discussions of consolidation.

The findings in studies regarding consolidation—much like those on government consolidations—are inconclusive. To some degree, this could be attributed to the contextually unique differences in circumstances and issues surrounding each consolidation—making it difficult to generalize the findings in studies. For example, in a study of police services in Michigan, Gyapong and Gyimah-Brempong (1988) found—using number of arrests as the measure of output—that their estimate of economies of scale positively indicated increasing returns to scale, but was not statistically significant. In an earlier study Gyimah-Brempong (1987) found statistically significant diseconomies of scale (average costs increasing as the number of arrests increase) in the average police department in Florida using 1982 and 1983 data from 256 departments in municipalities

with populations of 5,000 or more. Dividing the sample to test for economies of scale in small, medium, and large cities, he found that police departments in large cities (41 of the 256 cities in the dataset) experienced statistically significant diseconomies of scale for police services, while police services in small and medium cities did not exhibit significant economies or diseconomies of scale.

Given the political and bureaucratic realities of consolidation, caution must be exercised in not focusing on one variable to the exclusion of others (i.e., cost savings masking deterioration of service quality) (Staley, 2005). The success or failure of consolidation cannot and should not be determined solely on the basis of economics. The context—including how well local governments match; the flexibility of decision-makers to implement necessary changes; who is elected to the new government; and the implementation decisions of the policy makers—are all contributing factors in a consolidation (Durning and Nobbie, 2000).

Also, consideration should be given to the employees' issues and concerns. Employees represent one the most powerful or, at least, influential constituencies in an electoral process and whose influence should be taken into account when implementing public policy (Staley, 2005). With these considerations in mind, the dynamics of a consolidation become important in the understanding of its potential impacts.

The Dynamics of Consolidation

The dynamics of a consolidation consist of three important factors—the degree of structural change, the types of consolidation, and the stage of the consolidation. Depending on the circumstances and issues surrounding the consolidation, each of these factors can vary from one consolidation to the next.

Structural Change: Complexity and Control

Consolidation necessarily involves structural change, integrating some or all parts of each of the original organizations' functions and activities (IACP, 2003). This could include changes in both the structural complexity and structural control of an organization.

Structural complexity, according to Robbins (1987), is the extent of differentiation within the organization. This includes the degree of specialization, or division of labor, the number of levels in the organization's hierarchy, and the extent to which the organization's units are dispersed geographically. Thus complexity has three basic components: 1) vertical differentiation—which focuses on the nature of the hierarchy within an organization; 2) functional differentiation—which measures the degree to which tasks are broken down into functionally distinct units; and 3) spatial differentiation—the extent to which an organization is distributed geographically (Langworthy, 1986; Bayley, 1992).

Structural coordination and control (MaGuire, 2003) are the means by which an organization achieves a level of control within the organization. This includes: 1) administration intensity (also known as administrative overhead or administrative density), the relative size of an organization's administrative component (Langworthy, 1986; Monkkonen, 1981); 2) formalization, the extent to which an organization is governed by formal written rules, policies, standards, and procedures (Hall, Hass, and Johnson, 1967); and 3) centralization, the degree to which the decision-making capacity within an organization is concentrated in a single individual or small select group (MaGuire, 2003).

Regardless of the consolidation, these factors are going to be influenced to a lesser or greater degree—depending on the type of consolidation.

Types of Consolidation

The degree of the organizational change can vary substantially across consolidations because the motives and types of consolidations differ widely.

Consolidation is a matter of degree. The different variations of consolidation include (IACP, 2003):

1. Functional—two or more agencies combine certain functional units, such as emergency communications, dispatch, or records.
2. Cross Deputization/Mutual Enforcement Zones / Overlapping Jurisdictions—agencies authorize each other’s officers to pool resources and improve regional coverage, for example, permitting a city police officer to make arrests in the county and a sheriff’s deputy to make arrests in the city.
3. Public Safety—city or county governments may unite all police, fire, and emergency medical services agencies under one umbrella.
4. Local Merger—two separate police agencies form a single new entity. The agencies may be in small communities or metropolitan areas.
5. Regional—a number of agencies combine to police a geographic area rather than a jurisdictional one.
6. Metropolitan—two or more agencies serving overlapping jurisdictions join forces to become one agency serving an entire metropolitan area.
7. Government—a city and surrounding county consolidate their entire governments, creating a “metro” form of government for all citizens.

Although no one form of consolidation is superior to others—the type selected for implementation depends on the needs, expectations, and degree of cooperation among the stakeholders in each particular jurisdiction (IACP, 2003). Therefore, the type of consolidation can have a different impact on different stakeholders (i.e., administrators, citizens, and employees) depending on the needs for the consolidation and the degree or level of intrusion of the consolidation.

Still, regardless of the type of consolidation, each consolidation must go through various stages of implementation.

Stage of Consolidation: Transition Events

Organizational transition or “transition events” have been defined in the literature on organizational change in private organizations as situations where continuity is threatened or changed—where internal or external conditions necessitate a rethinking of the organizational structure, functions, and/or role constellations and change (Kranz, 1985). Thus, the change is not targeted to individuals, but to groups, work units, divisions, or those with certain organizational standing. These transitions become events when changes are publicly announced or when a starting date or timeline for the change is either formally announced or widely anticipated.

These transition events, which can include mergers and acquisitions (M&As) in private organizations and consolidations in public organizations, occur in stages. According to Seo and Hill (2005), in their analysis of M&As, four stages of implementation have been identified—the premerger stage, the initial planning and formal combination stage, the operational combination stage, and the stabilization stage.

The premerger or pre-consolidation stage starts with the examination of a possible merger and ends with the official announcement of the merger. This stage includes planning and discussions among top managers and executives regarding a possible merger (Garpin and Herndon, 2000) and emerging rumors about the possible merger among employees (Ivancevich, Schweiger, and Power, 1987). The organizations are still likely to be relatively stable during this phase (Buono and Bowditch, 1989).

The initial planning and formal combination stage starts after the M&A has been announced and ends once the former organizations have been legally dissolved and a new organization, often with a new name, has been created. This stage involves the creation of a new vision, new goals for the combined organization, and joint committees and teams to make decisions regarding management changes, staffing plans, and new organizational structure.

The operational combination (or restructuring) stage involves actual integration of organizational functions and operations. Interactions between the members of the combined organizations are extended from top management and joint committees to general work units and day-to-day operations (Garpin and Herndon, 2000). During this phase, budgets, space, work assignments, and reporting responsibilities are realigned. Employees are pushed to learn new ways of doing things, meet new performance standards, and adopt new value and belief systems (Marks and Mirvis, 1992). Because this phase impacts virtually all aspects—procedural, cultural, and role related—of the combined organization, it usually takes much longer than managers typically expect, sometimes years (Buono and Bowditch, 1989). It is in this stage that structural complexity and structural control are changed.

Lastly, the stabilization stage is the final stage of the consolidation process, as the operational integration is completed. Although changes and adjustments may continue throughout this stage, organizational stability occurs, and norms, roles, and organizational routines are stabilized.

Summary of the Dynamics of Consolidation

As stated earlier, consolidation necessarily involves various degrees of organizational change. The impact of these changes can vary from one consolidation to the next—depending on multiple factors such as the context of the consolidation, the type of consolidation, and the decisions that are made at the various stages of the consolidation.

In general, studies on police consolidation have been plagued with inconsistent and inconclusive findings—leaving researchers wondering about the economic feasibility of consolidation versus public choice. However, as mentioned earlier, public choice has shifted the focus from structure alone to individual needs and preferences (Stephens and Wikstrom, 2000). From this perspective, the argument is made that, not only should the impact of consolidation be measured in terms of its economic impact (the primary focus of most studies in M&As) (see Cartwright and Cooper, 1993), but also on its human impact. The significance of understanding the dynamics of consolidation is that they provide the background in which this human experience can be observed in a process. One human experience of interest in this study is the varying perceptions of organizational justice.

Organizational Justice

The evolution of the organizational justice concept has shifted from a philosophical perspective to a more normative perspective. This conceptual shift has contributed to the organizational behavior literature by not only providing a foundation in which perceptions of fairness can be studied, but by also by identifying its benefits and importance in the workplace.

Conceptualizing Organizational Justice

The concept of justice has interested scholars over the millennia. Dating back to antiquity, Plato identified “justice” (i.e., a just state, a just society, a just city, or a just agency/organization) as the *summum bonum*, the principle of the highest good (Souryal, 1998). This theme was rejuvenated in the 17th century by Locke’s (1698/1994) writings about human rights and Hobbes’ (1651/1947) analysis of valid covenants, and was revisited in the 19th century by Mills’ (1961/1940) classic notion of utilitarianism. Despite some differences, these philosophical approaches share a common prescriptive orientation, conceiving of justice as a normative ideal. Contemporary philosophers, such as Rawls (1999, 2001) and Nozick (1974), take more of a social science approach—conceptualizing justice based upon what people perceive to be just or fair (terms that tend to be used interchangeably).

The construct of organizational justice first appeared in organizational behavior literature in the early 1970’s, and most recently in the social science literature (Greenberg, 1987a; Homans, 1961; Thibaut and Walker, 1975; Bies and Moag, 1986). Organizational justice has generally been defined as peoples’ perceptions of fairness within an organizations (Greenberg, 1987a; see also Koys and DeCotiis, 1991). From

this perspective, organizational justice refers to employees' perceptions of fair treatment by their employing organization. For some, justice is the first virtue of social institutions and is of fundamental importance in the workplace (Rawls, 1999). Organizational justice can also be considered the framework through which employees' feelings of trust and mistrust can more fully be explained and understood (Saunders and Thornhill, 2003).

Organizational justice consists of three components—distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. Distributive justice considers the perceptions of fairness of outcomes (i.e., the fairness of resource distributions, such as pay, rewards, promotions, and the outcome of dispute resolutions) (Homans, 1961). Procedural justice emphasizes the importance of fairness of the decision-making procedures that lead to these outcomes and understanding how and why they come about (i.e., decision criteria, voice, control of process) (Thibaut and Walker, 1975). Interactional justice is based on the perceived fairness of the interpersonal treatment received (i.e., the nature of the interpersonal treatment received from others, whether those involved are treated with sensitivity, dignity and respect, and the nature of the explanations given) (Bies and Moag, 1986; see also Greenberg, 1993a). Each of these components reflects a different facet of an employee's working life.

The basic premise behind the concept on organizational justice is that fair treatment is important to people and is a major determinant in their reactions to decisions. Researchers have found that people care not only about the outcomes of decisions, but also the procedures used to make these decisions (Korsgaard, Schweiger, and Sapienza, 1995). Individuals may be affected by the perceived fairness of procedures used in

making decisions regardless of the final decision itself (Folger and Konovsky, 1989a; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992).

Organizational Justice in the Workplace

Organizations are social units (or human groupings) deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek specific goals (Amitai, 1964). In the late 1950s, researchers began to conceive of organizations as more than just rationally-derived mechanisms for the production of goods and services, but as entities worthy of understanding for what they are in addition to what they produce. Organizations are greater than the sum of their parts—expanding and contracting, rising and falling, and taking on a life of their own (Savitch and Vogel, 2004a). Organizations, like individuals and social groups, do not only act, but are acted upon as well. They are influenced, shaped and constrained by a complex interaction of political, social, economic, cultural, and institutional forces. Organizations, including cities and counties, also encompass the rules, procedures, norms, and institutions of governance—shaping expectations about behavior, identifying decision makers, establishing decisional parameters, and formulating outcomes (Savitch and Vogel, 2004a).

This descriptive orientation has been of keen interest to social scientists from many disciplines focusing on a wide variety of issues and contexts (Cohen, 1986). Concerns about fairness, for example, have been featured prominently in treatises on the acquisition and use of wealth and political power (Marx, 1875/1978), opportunities for education (Sadker and Sadker, 19995), and access to medical care (Daniels, Light, and Caplan, 1996). Fairness issues also are discussed in research on methods used to resolve disputes (Brams and Taylor, 1996), the interpersonal dynamics of sexual relations

(Hatfield, Greenberger, Traupmann, and Lambert, 1982), and even the evolution of humans (Sober and Wilson, 1998).

Although attention to matters of justice in the workplace was of at least passing interest to classical management theorists such as Frederick Winslow Taylor (Kanigel, 1997) and Mary Parker Follett (Barclay, 2003), it was not until the second half of the 20th century—when social psychological processes were applied to organizational settings—that insights into people’s perceptions of fairness in organizations gained widespread attention. Fueled by early conceptualizations such as balance theory (Heider, 1958), cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957), psychological reactance (Brehm, 1966), and the frustration-aggression hypothesis (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, and Sears, 1939), the expanding fields of organizational behavior and human resources management found the conceptual tools required to investigate the fundamental matter of justice in the workplace.

A review of the organizational research supports the idea of a relationship between an individual’s reactions to organizational policies and practices and his or her perceptions of organizational justice or fairness (Cropanzano, 2001). Social scientists have long recognized the importance of the ideals of justice as a basic requirement for the effective functioning of organizations and the personal satisfaction of the individuals they employ (Moore, 1978; Okun, 1975). Social scientists also believe that employees’ perceptions of justice likely have a profound effect upon a wide range of organizational outcomes (Conlon, Meyer, and Nowakowski, 2005). Moreover, many organizational justice scholars over the years believed that emotions, especially anger and hostility, are

associated with low justice perceptions or injustices (Barclay, Sckarlicki, and Pugh, 2005).

Several studies have linked organizational justice with organizational trust and organizational commitment (Aryee, Budhwar, and Chen, 2002; Korsgaard, Sapienza, and Schweiger, 2002; Korsgaard et al., 1995; Pillai, Schriesheim, and Williams, 1999). Niehoff and Moorman (1993) have suggested that employees are concerned with fairness and justice in outcomes, treatment, policies, and procedures, and that perceptions of fairness influence their day-to-day behaviors and attitudes (i.e., unfair treatment leading employees to simply “putting in their time” rather than extra efforts that would benefit the organization).

Still, other studies in organizational justice have evolved to include other conceptual ideas in order to further understanding perceptions of fairness in the workplace. These concepts include: 1) individual biases, 2) workplace deviance, and 3) organizational culture.

Individual Biases

Despite efforts by members of an organization to foster a sense of fairness within the organization, perceptions of fairness in the workplace are not without “individual biases” (Tornblom, 1997). For example, research has shown that individuals may view outcomes that are biased in their favor as fair and outcomes that are more beneficial to others as unfair in what is known as self-serving or egocentric bias (Diekmann, Samuels, Ross, and Bazerman, 1997; Greenberg, 1983). Various studies of attitudes toward organizational parental leave policies (Grover, 1991), the acceptance of a workplace smoking ban (Greenberg, 1994), compensation for research participation (Greenberg,

1987b), and court verdicts (Thibaut and Walker, 1975) have demonstrated how these biases have influenced the perception of fairness or unfairness of these policies and practices. Therefore, self-serving bias should be addressed when individual perceptions of fairness are involved.

Workplace Deviance

Injustice perceptions can often lead to various forms of “workplace deviance” (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Greenberg, 1990a; Skarlicki and Folger, 1997). Workplace deviance, which has also been referred to as counterproductive work behavior (Brock-Lee and Spector, 2006), organizational retaliatory behavior (Skarlicki and Folger, 1997), and antisocial behavior (Giacalone and Greenberg, 1997), was defined by Robinson and Bennett (1995) as “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both” (p. 556). Workplace deviance can take many forms, such as theft (Greenberg, 1990a), withholding of effort (Kidwell and Bennett, 1993), aggression (Fox and Spector, 1999), absenteeism (Kohler and Mathieu, 1993), and turnover (Mobley, 1977). Regardless of which term is used or how it is demonstrated, workplace deviance can be detrimental to organizations in ways such as losses in productivity or negative effects on organizational functionality.

Organizational Culture

Another key factor of the workplace is its “culture.” Organizational culture has been defined as the traditions, shared beliefs, and expectations about how individuals behave and accomplish tasks in organizations (Cartwright and Cooper, 1993). All organizations have a culture, an interrelated set of beliefs, shared by most of the members

of the organization about how people should behave at work and what tasks and goals are important (Baker, 1980). The culture also includes and is shaped by the pattern of successful internal responses to adapt to external threats and issues (Gordon, 1991). Because the culture is a result of past successes, it will resist change even though a change in the environment (i.e., consolidation) might necessitate a change in the culture (Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, and Sanders, 1990). Research has not only suggested that individual emphasis on justice varies across cultures (Mueller and Wynn, 2000), but that the degree to which justice is valued by individuals is important in understanding their reactions to justice and injustice (Markovsky, 1985).

Benefits of Organizational Justice

Emphasizing justice could lead to a positive outcome for the organization, such as increased employee satisfaction (Folger and Konovsky, 1989b), organizational commitment (Sweeney and McFarlin, 1993), group cohesion, cooperation, and productive resolution of disputes within and between groups (Cobb, Folger, and Wooten, 1995). For the past two decades, human resource managers have recognized the importance of the relationship between organizational justice and organizational effectiveness (Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1996).

Justice research has shown that organizations and leaders perceived as being fair elicit loyalty, commitment, and trust from their employees—leading to perceptions of legitimacy of both the leaders of the organization and the organization itself (Sheppard, Lewicki, and Minton, 1992). Individuals in these organizations are also more likely to engage in pro-social and organizational citizenship behavior, otherwise known as voluntary effort by employees extending beyond regular job duties (Cobb et al., 1995).

Conversely, the absence of justice can lead to negative outcomes and undesirable costs to the organization, such as employee dissatisfaction and theft (Greenberg, 1990a), workplace aggression (Beugre, 1996) and employee turnover (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990).

Beugre (1998), Greenberg (1990b), and Sheppard et al. (1992) identified three reasons why organizations strive for justice: 1) to enhance positive attitudes in their employees in order to improve work performance; 2) to enhance cooperation within the organization in order to create a sense of community, identity, and membership within the organization; and 3) to ensure a sense of individual dignity and humanness amongst employees in order to imply a degree of respect that the organization has for the individual. From these perspectives, justice or fairness becomes a means to an end. In other words, it serves the purpose of the organization in obtaining its goals and objectives.

Importance of Organizational Justice

Organizational justice is important to people because it provides legitimacy of organizational authorities (Tyler and Lind, 1992), discouraging various forms of disruptive behavior (Greenberg and Lind, 2000) and promoting acceptance of organizational change (Greenberg, 1994). It also reinforces perceived trustworthiness of authorities, reducing fears of exploitation and providing an incentive to cooperation with one's coworkers (Lind, 2001). On an individual level, fairness satisfies several personal needs (Cropanzano et al., 2001), such as the need for control (Thibaut and Walker, 1975), the need for esteem and belonging (Lind and Tyler, 1988), and behaving in ways to satisfy individuals' interest in fulfilling moral and ethical obligations (Folger, 1998).

Therefore, understanding organizational justice becomes a critical element in improving the process, operations, and effectiveness and efficiency of an organization.

These objectives for pursuing organizational justice may also help to improve interpersonal relations among organizational members, improve the quality of work life, and develop positive attitudes towards the organization. Sheppard et al. (1992, p. 103) state that, “perceptions of justice enhances the legitimacy of the system or decision, where perceptions of justice lead to perceptions of legitimacy, which in turn lead to compliance with the system.”

Organizational justice has been linked to organizational strategic decision-making. Korsgaard et al. (1995) found that procedural fairness in strategic decision-making, such as fostering cooperation and positive attitudes, can be accomplished without sacrificing the quality of decision-making and can be implemented even in established work teams. This results in commitment from group members towards organizational decisions and the organization’s leaders (Sheppard et al., 1992).

Individual commitment to a strategic decision ensures that mutual and consensual choices that are necessary for coordinated and cooperative effort will be made, whereas a lack of commitment places a major constraint on the range of decision-making options (Deutsch, 1957). As strategic decisions are often interlinked and integrated with one another, the lack of commitment to a decision generally affects other organizational decisions.

Dimensions of Organizational Justice

The concept of organizational justice has evolved significantly over the last 50 years. A historical overview of this evolution provides insight into the major dimensions of intellectual thought that have led the field to where it is today. This evolution has been

identified as occurring in four different waves, including: 1) the distributive justice wave, 2) the procedural justice wave, 3) the interpersonal wave, and 4) the integrative wave (Colquitt, Greenberg, and Zapata-Phelan, 2005).

Distributive Justice Wave

The distributive justice wave, which occurred in the 1950s through the 1970s, focused on fairness in the distribution of resources. Early studies on distributive justice focused on relative deprivation—highlighting the idea that individual reactions to outcomes depend less on the absolute level of those outcomes than on how they compare to the outcomes of others against whom people judge themselves (Stouffer et al, 1949).

Other researchers also contributed to the evolution of the distributive justice concept. First, Homans (1961) introduced the concept of social exchanges—the process by which an actor’s behavior influences the activities of at least one other individual. From a social exchange perspective, perceptions of justice are judged based upon the perceived gains and losses of an exchange (see also Blau, 1964 for expansion on social exchange concept). Second, Adams’s (1965) equity theory focused on the perceived ratio of outcome (i.e., pay, rewards intrinsic to the job, satisfying supervision, seniority benefits, fringe benefits, job status and status symbols), and a variety of formally and informally sanctioned prerequisites and inputs (i.e., education, intelligence, experience, training, skill, seniority, age, sex, ethnic background, social status, and, of course, the effort he expends on the job) (also see Walster, Berscheid, and Walster, 1973 for expansion on equity theory). Lastly, Leventhal (1976) shifted focus from the reactions of reward recipients to the behavior of reward allocators—noting that an allocator uses rewards to direct individuals’ efforts toward the fulfillment of group goals. Those

rewards are the subject of an allocation norm, defined as “a social rule which specifies criteria that define certain distributions of rewards and resources as fair and just” (Leventhal, 1976: p. 94).

Research related to distributive justice has looked at topics such as the effect of high status job titles on performance (Greenberg and Ornstein, 1983) and theft rates following pay cuts (Greenberg, 1990a). In studying pay cuts, Greenberg (1990a) found that employee theft greatly increased following pay cuts. One reason offered was that, as the result of pay cuts, employees perceived an inequity and engaged in theft to address this.

The Procedural Justice Wave

Beginning in the mid-1970s, the focus of much justice research shifted to the processes associated with organizational decision-making. Although researchers alluded, at least in passing, to what later became known as procedural justice, pioneering work can be credited to Thibaut and Walker (1975) for introducing the construct.

Thibaut and Walker (1975), in their combination of social psychology and law, researched two broad categories of legal procedures 1) the adversary system (used in the United States and Great Britain), in which a judge controls the decision but not the presentation of evidence, and 2) the inquisitorial system (used in continental Europe), in which a judge controls both the outcome and the procedure. Their findings indicated that process fairness mirrored the study of outcome fairness. In other words, what is fair depends on what is perceived to be fair. In their subsequent theory of procedure (Thibaut and Walker, 1978), the authors also distinguished between two specific forms of control: decision control (the degree to which a disputant can unilaterally determine the outcome

of a dispute) and process control (the degree to which a disputant can control the development, selection, and presentation of the evidence used to resolve the dispute).

Folger and Konovsky (1989b) studied procedural justice by surveying employees regarding pay raise procedures. By measuring specifics such as process control, consistency, and accuracy they found that procedural justice in the decision-making processes led to higher levels of commitment and trust. In 1996, Brockner and Wiesenfeld conducted a review of 45 procedural justice studies. The consistency in the findings led them to conclude that procedural justice has a significant effect on how outcomes are perceived and received by employees. Also, Leventhal (1980) identified specific procedural rules that could be used to evaluate procedural components, which include: 1) consistency, 2) bias suppression, 3) accuracy, 4) correctability, 5) representativeness, and 6) ethicality (see also Lind and Tyler, 1988).

Interactional Justice Wave

Until the mid-1980s, little attention was paid to the interpersonal nature of justice procedures. Focus was placed primarily on the structural characteristics of formal decision-making procedures. Bies and Moag's (1986) introduction of the fairness of interpersonal communication spearheaded the wave of interactional justice.

Bies and Moag (1986), studying PhD students' complaints of unfair treatment of rude faculty members, explained that interactions and interpersonal treatment are conceptually distinct from the structuring of procedure. They identified four rules that govern fair interpersonal treatment, which included: 1) truthfulness, 2) justification, 3) respect, and 4) propriety.

Additional research by Greenberg (1993a) and Shapiro, Buttner, and Barry (1994) found support for the idea that interactional justice likely consisted of two distinct but closely related dimensions that had independent effects. The first dimension, informational justice, consists of factors that enhance individual perceptions of the efficacy of explanations or information provided by organizational agents—including perceptions of organizational agent truthfulness and justification (Colquitt, 2001; Bies and Moag, 1986). Specifically, informational justice addresses whether information is timely, accurate, adequate, and offers explanations for decisions (Bies and Moag, 1986; Shapiro, Buttner, and Barry, 1994). The second dimension refers to the perceived respect and propriety that the organizational agent displays towards the individual. Interpersonal justice deals with respectful, proper, and/or appropriate treatment of individuals and the extent to which actions are perceived as such (Bies and Moag, 1986).

Multiple studies have demonstrated that truthfulness, justification, respect, and propriety have an effect on employees' perceptions and actions (Bies and Shapiro, 1987). For example, Bies and Shapiro (1987) found that justification (or lack of justification) regarding a leader's actions had significant effects on perception of fairness and leader approval. Brockner, DeWitt, Grover, and Reed, (1990), in their study of layoff survivors who remained motivated and committed following downsizing in their organization, found that the presence of a justification was related positively to organizational commitment and work effort among layoff survivors. Bies (1987) found that when asking employed individuals to recount critical incidents in which they made a request to their boss that was denied, along with how much respect and sincerity was shown, justification and respect each had unique effects on fairness judgments. Additionally,

Brockner, Konovsky, Cooper-Schneider, Folger, Martin, and Bies (1994) found that interactional justice was a predictor of employee support for the organization. In validating a four-factor measure of justice, Colquitt (2001) demonstrated that interpersonal and informational justice had distinct effects, thus supporting separate measurement of each dimension.

The Integrative Wave

The integrative wave of organizational justice has emerged through models and theories that examine combined effects of multiple dimensions of justice (e.g., Folger and Cropanzano, 1998; Lind and Van den Bos, 2002; Tyler and Blader, 2000). Colquitt et al. (2005) identified three approaches to integrative justice. First, counterfactual conceptualization explains justice perceptions in terms of “what might have been.” For example, an individual might perceive a situation to be unfair if an alternative, more favorable situation can easily be imagined. Second, group-oriented conceptualization conceives of justice in terms of the importance of acceptance by identifying with the groups to which individuals belong. Finally, heuristic conceptualization focuses on the nature of the mental shortcuts used in forming and using psychological judgments of fairness. For example, people rely on a fairness heuristic to decide whether to accept or reject the directives of people in positions of authority (Lind, Kulik, Ambrose, and de Vera Park (1993) or to remove uncertainty related to an authority figure’s trustworthiness (Lind and Van den Bos, 2002).

For the purposes of this proposed study, emphasis will be placed on the first three waves of development of justice concepts. These three waves form the basis for conceptualizing overall justice using a three-dimensional model (i.e., distributive,

procedural, and interactive justice). However, in order to better understand how justice judgments are made, a model will be identified allowing for the conceptualization of the justice judgment process.

Fair Process Effect Model

In many ways, the research model of organizational justice is similar to the model used to conceptualize stress. Mohahan and Farmer's (1980) model conceptualizes stress as a process containing sources, effects, and coping behaviors. Sources are found in the subjective experience in the world, or as a product of internal personality process, or both. Sources, in this sense, follow the state-trait concepts (Speilberger, 1966). Once a person experiences a source, an effect is produced and is seen as emotional reactions (anger, frustration, and so on) or somatic complaints (headaches, increased heart rates, and so on) or a combination of the two. Finally, the person must find a way of coping with both the sources and the effects, and this is usually seen in terms of coping behavior. Coping behaviors may have objectively positive, neutral, or negative long- or short-term health consequences.

Similarly, justice judgments can be conceptualized as following a similar model. Based upon the fair process effect, illustrating how a particular event leads to a perception of a certain level of procedural fairness leading to a person's reaction (see Walker, LaTour, Lind, and Thibaut, 1974; Folger, Rosenfield, Grove, and Corkan 1979), justice judgments can be conceptualized as a process of event/context (the condition, event, phenomenon, etc. that creates a situation for a justice decision to be made), perception (the justice judgment), and reaction (the attitude and behaviors that precipitate the justice judgment). In other words, a situation or "event" takes place in which an

individual must make a judgment as to its fairness. Fairness is determined by the dimension of justice (i.e., distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational). Based upon the derived perception (being fair or unfair), the individual responds to the event/context through their attitude and behavior.

The significance of this model is that it both provides a basis for conceptualizing how justice judgments are made and provides a foundation for understanding how researchers have studied organizational justice. Unfortunately, the model cannot provide a totally accurate depiction of the process. It is virtually impossible to illustrate accurately a complex and dynamic human phenomenon such as perceptions of justice in a two dimensional model. However, as stated earlier, it does provide a conceptual framework in understanding how justice decisions are made and the subsequent responses to these decisions.

Summary of Dimensions and Model of Justice

The evolution or waves of the dimensions of justice have been both beneficial and limiting to research. As a benefit, these dimensions have illustrated the complexity in making justice judgments. They also illustrate that individuals are concerned about fairness for various reasons, judge fairness from several aspects of decision-making events, and use fairness perceptions to guide a wide range of key attitudes and behaviors relevant to an organization (Colquitt et al., 2005).

Another benefit has been that, through these various waves, researchers have been able to identify the importance of perceptions of justice in various contexts (i.e., work, family, relationships, etc.), as well as how the different dimensions and measurements of

justice contribute to justice perceptions—each in its own unique way (Colquitt et al., 2005).

Lastly, researchers have benefited from past studies that illustrate the fact that different types of justice can originate in different sources of justice (Blader and Tyler, 2003; Cobb, Vest, and Hills, 1997; Colquitt, 2001; Rupp and Cropanzano, 2002). For example, scholars have long understood that justice was the responsibility of both formal justice (organization-originating) and informal justice (supervisor-originating) (Folger and Bies, 1989; Tyler and Bies, 1990). In other words, justice judgments can originate from the actions of the organization and/or managers and supervisors.

Despite these benefits, the literature regarding organizational justice has some limitations or gaps, three of which are identified in this study. First, despite the advances made in the conceptualization of justice and the studies conducted to validate the independence of each construct, there has been surprisingly little attention devoted to overall justice perceptions—given its place in early theorizing and more recent justice models (Ambrose and Arnaud, 2005; Leventhal, 1980; Lind, 2001). Although researchers, using quantitative methodology, make distinctions between the various dimensions of justice, develop distinct justice rules, and identify the outcomes of justice measurements, a need exists for more studies on overall justice perceptions (Greenberg, 2001; Shapiro, 2001). For example, victims of injustice are unlikely to worry about whether there are two, three, or four types of justice—reacting instead to their general experience of injustice (Shapiro, 2001). Tornblom and Vermunt (1999) suggest that the components of fairness are only meaningful in relation to the overall fairness of a given situation. Based upon these perspectives, simpler more practical approaches to justice

may be more valid than those that focus on different types of justice (Hauenstein, McGonigle, and Flinder, 2001). Aside from addressing issues of correlation between the dimensions of justice, an overall justice perspective could provide a more “holistic” perspective of justice.

Second, as stated earlier, different types of justice can originate in different sources of justice (i.e., formal and informal justice) (Blader and Tyler, 2003; Cobb, Vest, and Hills, 1997, Colquitt, 2001; Rupp and Cropanzano, 2002). Byrne and Cropanzano (2000) used the term “multi-foci” to refer to the multiple sources from which justice can originate (see also Rupp and Cropanzano, 2002). Although this is not entirely new, what is new is the explicit understanding that type and source can be fully crossed—that one does not dictate the other. In general, most studies attempt to use one or the other (Colquitt and Shaw, 2005). For the purposes of this study, recognition of the influences of both will be taken into consideration—especially in the analysis of the data.

Finally, regardless of what type of justice is being examined, or from which source that justice originates, a critical question is the context in which fairness is to be judged. For the most part, justice research has examined justice in the context of one particular event termed context specific (see Colquitt and Shaw, 2005). For example, field studies have examined the perceived fairness of corporate relocations (Daly and Geyer, 1994), layoffs (Brockner, Wiesenfeld, Reed, Grover, and Martin, 1993), and drug testing (Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991). Similarly, laboratory studies of justice have tended to bound fairness perceptions in the specific event created by the experimental setting. For example, Colquitt and Chertkoff (2002) examined the perceived fairness of the procedures used to add new members to an experimental group.

A less common approach is to examine fairness across multiple decision-making events. For example, Sweeney and McFarlin (1997) asked a sample of federal employees about the procedural and distributive fairness of a number of events, including performance evaluations, promotions, policy changes, disciplinary actions, and grievances. Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, and Rupp (2001) refer to such measures as entity measures, because they instruct employees to appraise the supervisor or organization as a whole. Such measures essentially sample all of the events experienced by an employee in aggregate, in the form of a more global judgment.

As illustrated, organizational justice perceptions have been assessed using a variety of approaches employing various models that have caused much debate over the years. However, one area that has not received much attention has been in the consolidation of police organizations.

Organizational Justice and Police Consolidation

Many of the organizational transition events (i.e., mergers and acquisitions of private organizations and consolidation of public organizations) parallel those in an individual's life (i.e., births, deaths, divorce, residence relocation, departing home to become independent, career changes, etc). Transition events inevitably entail many changes, which employees often judge as unfavorable and threatening, and this, in turn, may lead to uncertainty and reduced post-merger identification and rejection of the imposed common in-group identity (van Leeuwen, van Knippenberg, and Ellemers, 2003). This suggests that procedural justice considerations should be included in both planning and implementing organizational acquisitions (Citera and Rentsch, 1993).

Announcements of transition events are often preceded by rumor (Marks and Mirvis, 1985), accompanied by emotional paralysis, depression and other intensely emotional reactions (Sinetar, 1981). These rumors often include statements of justification which attempt to manipulate the target of blame and type of resolution employees will experience (Buono Bowditch, and Lewis., 1985; Schweiger and Denisi, 1991).

Justice judgments arise whenever rules are made, broken, changed, interpreted or applied to organizational activities or practices (Sheppard, Lewicki and Minton, 1992). Employees may perceive a change as illegitimate or unfair or they may view it as legitimate and fair—necessary for the corporation’s survival and long term competitive advantage—depending on the context and process in which changes are made.

Researchers have recently been interested in applying organizational justice concepts to transition situations—once the similarities between layoff and other change situations were noted to parallel studies conducted by interpersonal justice theorists (Brockner, Grover, Reed, DeWitt, and O’Malley, 1987). Justice research traces how individuals react to incidents and victims of injustice (e.g., Adams, 1965; Lerner and Lerner, 1981). For example, justice or fairness perceptions have been implied as predictors of an employee’s reactions in merger and acquisitions actions (Schweiger and Walsh, 1992) and found to influence attitudes and behavior following layoffs (e.g., Brockner, et al., 1987), plant closings (Martin, 1992), and facility relocation (Daly, Geyer, 1994).

Unfortunately, few studies exist on the impact police consolidations have on perception of justice. Four possibilities exist that create this situation. First, given the

rarity of such events, few opportunities exist to study this phenomenon. Second, consolidations are highly political and information is hard to obtain (Meyer, 2001). Third, studies generally focus on the economic issues (i.e., issues related to efficiency and effectiveness) of consolidations. And, finally, although social scientists have studied the police for nearly four decades, the majority of these studies have focused on police officers and police work (i.e., Peter Manning's (1977) *Police Work: The Social Organization of Policing*; and James Q. Wilson's (1968) *Varieties of Police Behavior*), rather than police organizations (MaGuire, 2003).

Still, a number of studies involving the police have focused on perceptions of justice. However, these studies generally address issues related to citizens' perceptions of police encounters including: citizen complaints (Reiss, 1971); perceptions of fair treatment in the criminal justice system (Tyler, 2001a, b; Tyler 1997a, b); compliance with the law and attitudes towards police (Tyler, 2001a); citizens' compliance with the police (Mastrofski, Reisig, and McCluskey, 2002; Mastrofski, Snipes, and Supina, 1996; McCluskey, Mastrofski, and Parks, 2000); domestic battery victims' perception of treatment by police (Paternoster, Brame, Bachman, Sherman, 1997); minority perceptions of treatment by the police (Smith, Tomaskovic-Devey, Zingraff, Mason, Warre, Wright, McMurphy, and Felton, 2003); respondents' perceived treatment by police following traffic stops (Hoover, Dowling, and Fenske, 1998); and citizens' expectations of police behavior, (Johnson, 2004). In each of these studies, perception of justice played a significant role in citizens' perception of police actions.

Given their role in promoting public safety, responding to emergency situations, maintaining order, and fighting crime, it is surprising that organizational scholars would

pay so little attention to the effects of transitional events on police officers' perceptions of justice. However, studies on mergers and acquisitions in the private sector have provided insight into how these types of transitional events can affect an organization and its employees.

Distinguishing Between Public and Private Organizations

Understanding the dynamics of public administration or public organization is a key factor in eliminating some of the skepticism associated with public organizations. Oftentimes public administration is portrayed as being ineffective and/or inefficient—compared to private organizations. Although both are inherently similar—in terms of delivering of goods and services to its constituents, and similar in structural complexity and structural control—fundamentally they are different in the fact that private organizations have a primary responsibility of making a profit while public organizations have a primary responsibility of serving the welfare of the community (Rainey, 2003) and delivering services within a specified budget.

Furthermore, according to Rainey (2003), unlike private organizations, most public organizations do not sell their outputs in economic markets. Hence, the information and incentives provided by economic markets are weaker in or absent from them. This reduces incentives for cost reduction, operating efficiency, and effective performance. In its absence, public organizations use legal (i.e., courts, legislatures, and executive branch) and formal constraints to impose their will whereas private organizations must induce consumers to engage willingly in exchanges with them. Government or public organizations are more monopolistic, coercive, and unavoidable than private businesses, with a greater breadth' of impact, and it requires more constraint.

In general, the government acts to correct problems that markets themselves create or are unable to address (i.e., monopolies, the need for income redistribution, and instability due to market fluctuations, and to provide crucial services that are too risky or expensive for private competitors to provide). Therefore, government organizations operate under greater public scrutiny and are subject to unique public expectations for fairness, openness, accountability, and honesty (Rainey, 2003)—arguably placing more attention on the process of delivering services and less on issues of effectiveness and efficiency.

The significance of the similarities and differences between public and private organizations is that there exists enough of a commonality between the two that makes the studies on organizational justice and transitional events in private organizations relevant to this study. On the other hand, there exists enough of a difference that makes this study unique—less emphasis placed on issues related to effectiveness and efficiency and more on issues related to fairness.

Organizational Justice and Private M&As

Over the years there has been a sharp increase in organizational changes. As the corporate environment has become more competitive and demanding, organizations are being compelled to find new ways of increasing their efficacy and competitiveness. One method has been through organizational mergers and acquisitions.

Despite the widespread popularity of such measures, research has indicated that a large number of mergers never achieve their objectives (Cartwright and Cooper, 1993). According to Marks and Mirvis (1986), 50 to 80% of mergers fail to meet expectations, no matter what criteria of success are used. Thus, questions concerning the factors

affecting the success and effective management of mergers are becoming increasingly important.

According to Cartwright and Cooper (1993), research on organizational M&As has been traditionally dominated by the economic approach. According to this view, M&As are understood mainly as financial and strategic alliances, and their human side has not been of interest. Recently, however, researchers have begun to devote more attention to the psychological processes involved. Consequently, it is now well-acknowledged that mergers and acquisitions may have many harmful effects on employees' wellbeing and behavior, including high levels of stress, increased staff turnover, lowered job satisfaction, and reduced organizational identification (Cartwright and Cooper, 1993). These negative consequences, using the organizational justice concepts, are increasingly being understood as a significant reason for merger failures.

In general, studies on organizational transition have varied in terms of: 1) the event or context in which the study was conducted, 2) the perceptions of justice identified, and 3) the various reactions (i.e., attitudes and behaviors) following justice judgments.

Context-Based Studies

In part, due to the substantially high failure rates of M&As, justice or fairness perceptions have been implied as predictors of employees' reactions in these transition events (Schweiger and Walsh, 1992) and found to influence attitudes and behavior following layoffs (e.g., Brockner, et al., 1987), plant closings (Martin, 1992), facility relocation (Daly and Geyer, 1994), dismissals (Luthans and Sommer, 1999; Spreitzer and Mishra, 2002), effects of downsizing on survivors (Hopkins and Weathington, 2006;

Allen, Freeman, Russell, Reizenstein, and Rentz, 2001; Baruch and Hind, 1999;), and employees' responses to an organizational merger (Lipponen, Olkkonen, and Moilanen, 2004).

The context in which these transitional events occur is important to formulating justice judgments (Colquitt and Shaw, 2005). In many cases, these transitional events involve decisions regarding reselecting and displacing employees. For example, organizational justice theories provide important theoretical insights regarding how these decisions can affect the surviving employees' perceptions and behavior. When workers see themselves as being treated fairly, they are more likely to develop attitudes and behaviors in support of change, even under conditions of adversity and loss (Cobb, Wooten, and Folger, 1995).

Much research has been dedicated to the topic of organizational justice and transitional events (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Harvey and Haines, 2005). In part, the value in examining the effects of these events is that they consist of a series of events in which victims and survivors evaluate the fairness of the procedures (Konovsky and Bruckner, 1993)—impacting their attitudes and behaviors in those organizations (Blader and Tyler, 2005). Through these various transitional events, employees base their perceptions of justice on the fairness of exchange they experience with the organization (i.e., rewards and procedures within the organization) (Hendrix, Robbins, Miller, and Summers, 1998). This provides a framework through which feelings of trust or mistrust can be more fully explained and understood (Saunders and Thornhill, 2003).

During M&As in private organizations, employees pay close attention to how people are treated in terms of distributive, procedural, and interactional fairness (e.g.,

Greenberg, 1987a). For example, in M&As, researchers have consistently found that employees' perceived fairness of how both surviving and displaced employees were treated during the postmerger integration period substantially influenced their attitudes (i.e., psychological withdrawal) and behaviors (i.e., turnover) (e.g., Fried, Tiegs, Naughton, and Ashforth., 1996; Gutknecht and Keys, 1993).

Perception-Based Studies

Studies focusing on perceptions of justice focus on one or two of the dimensions of organizational justice (i.e., distributive, procedural, and interactional). In these studies, researchers generally attempt to distinguish between and explain the attitudes and behaviors associated with various dimensions of justice.

As stated earlier, distributive justice refers to an employee's perceived fairness of outcomes (Colquitt, Greenberg, and Zapata-Phelan, 2005). When employees believe the outcome of a decision is unfair, they may engage in counterproductive work behavior. Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) stated that "when employees perceive distributive injustice, they might hurt the organization to make the outcome or input ratio less negative from their perspective" (p. 287). One determinant of distributive justice evaluations by survivors involved in a layoff is the manner in which the organization treated the employees who were dismissed (Brockner and Wiesenfeld, 1996). The better the dismissed employees are treated, the more likely it is that survivors will perceive the distributions as fair. Perceptions of fairness may, in turn, decrease the likelihood of withdrawal behaviors such as turnover intentions (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Koys, 1991).

Procedural justice was defined earlier as perception of fairness of the decision-making process leading to specific outcomes (Thibaut and Walker, 1975). When an unfavorable outcome is matched with the perception of an unfair decision, employees are likely to feel resentment toward the organization and those who made the decision (Brockner and Wiesenfeld, 1996). Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) stated that "to the extent employees perceive their organization to be unfair because it uses unfair procedures for resource allocations, employees will develop negative attitudes towards the organization" (p. 287). Konovsky and Brockner (1993) also stated that resentment is often directed toward the organization and its managers after a downsizing. Brockner (1990) found a negative effect of adverse justice perceptions on survivors' organizational commitment and their turnover intentions. McFarlin and Sweeny (1992) found that procedural justice was an important predictor of organizational commitment and trust in the evaluation of an organization and its representatives by an employee. Accordingly, resentment directed at the organization and its managers may manifest itself as lower organizational commitment, lower organizational satisfaction, and an increased likelihood of voluntary turnover.

Finally, interactional justice was defined earlier as the interpersonal treatment received from others—especially key organizational authorities (Bies and Moag, 1986). Despite the conceptual disagreement, however, researchers have agreed that both procedural and interactional justice have an important impact on employee behavior and attitudes, such as organizational commitment, extra-role behavior, and turnover intentions (see Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng, 2001, for reviews). Procedural and interactional justice may have differential effects on

attitudes and behavior. More specifically, it is suggested that procedural justice is a better predictor of organization-related outcomes, whereas interactional justice is a better predictor of supervisor-related outcomes (e.g., Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, and Taylor, 2000). Specifically, given that organizations often establish general formal procedures, procedural justice perceptions tend to have the organization as a whole as their source. Interactional justice perceptions, in contrast, tend to focus on the interpersonal behavior of one's immediate supervisor (e.g., Masterson et al., 2000). As a result, procedural justice perceptions generally relate to reactions towards the organization as a whole (i.e., organizational commitment), whereas interactional justice perceptions relate to reactions towards one's supervisor (i.e., satisfaction with one's supervisor) (Cropanzano et al., 2001, 2002; Masterson et al., 2000). Several studies have provided support for these claims (e.g., Cropanzano, Prehar, and Chen, 2002; Masterson et al., 2000).

Reaction-Based Studies

A substantial amount of the empirical literature has focused on the various reactions of employees' responses to transitional events. Negative consequences (i.e., attitudes and behaviors) in response to transitional events are increasingly being understood as a significant reason for merger failures (Citera and Rentsch, 1993; Lind, 2001; Novelli, Kirkman, and Shapiro, 1995). Some of these reactions include:

1. Resentment—occurring toward the organization and those who make the decisions when unfavorable outcomes are matched with the perception of an unfair decision (Brockner and Wiesenfeld, 1996; see also Brockner, 1990;

Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Konovsky and Brockner, 1993; McFarlin and Sweeny, 1992).

2. Organizational Commitment—changes in the degree of acceptance of organizational goals and values, willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, and desire to maintain membership in the organization (Brooke, Russell, and Price, 1988; see also Brown. 1996; Meyer and Allen, 1991: Pinder, 1998; see also Armstrong-Stassen, 2004; Brown, 1996; Hendrix et al., 1998; Meyer and Allen, 1991; Spreitzer and Mishra, 2002; Somers, 1995)
3. Organizational Satisfaction—a change in the way individuals feel (affective component) and hold beliefs and thoughts (cognitive component) about the organization (Hopkins and Weathington, 2006, Schleicher, Watt, and Greguras, 2004).
4. Job Satisfaction—changes in the degree to which a person's work is viewed as being useful for satisfying their needs (Judge, Parker, Colber, Heller. and Hies, 2002; Pinder, 1998; see also Coben-Charasb and Spector, 2001)
5. Turnover Intentions—the likelihood of employees seeking employment with other organizations because of the unstable environment caused by organizational transition (Spreitzer and Mishra, 2002; Krausz. Yaakobovitz, and Caspi. 1999; see also Saunders and Thornhili, 2003; Spreitzer and Mishra, 2002; see also Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Brockner, 1990).
6. Organizational Trust—changes in the “psychological contract” between employer and employee—consisting of one’s expectations, assumptions, or beliefs about the likelihood that another’s future actions will be beneficial,

favorable, or at least not detrimental to one's interest (Robinson, 1996; Mishra and Spreitzer, 1998; see also Brockner, 1990; Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Hosmer, 1995; McFarlin and Sweeny, 1992).

Unfortunately, there appears to be a great deal of focus by researchers on the negative reactions to organizational transition events. Much like stress, transitional events are not inherently bad. Therefore, organizational change can be viewed as a necessary means to address organization problems. Although any change within an organization is probably going to be met with mixed responses in terms of perception of fairness, it is not beyond belief that these events can also produce positive responses (i.e., viewed as being necessary for the organizations survival).

Summary of Literature Review

The problems facing metropolitan areas are both complicated and multifaceted. In general, the problems of metropolitan areas have been attributed to inability of fragmented local governments to address important regional issues such as sprawl, socioeconomic disparities, and concentration of poverty. As a result, some scholars argue that some form of regional government or governance (involving some degree of consolidation or cooperation between local governments) is necessary to effectively address and respond to the problems of the metropolis (Jones, 1942). However, this issue is not without controversy.

Two prevailing points of view dominate the consolidation literature—monocentrism or consolidation and polycentrism or public choice. Advocates of consolidation make the general argument that the fragmented nature of local government results in a duplication of services—making it ineffective and inefficient, and incapable

of addressing metropolitan problems common to all (Rusk, 2003, 1999; Peirce, 1993; Studenski, 1930). On the other hand, advocates of public choice make the general argument that single unit governments decrease competition for services—making them unresponsive, cumbersome, ineffective, and inefficient in delivering services (Bish and Ostrom, 1974; Tiebout, 1956), 2). However, when consolidations do occur, service problems are present, they are usually incomplete, and are strongly supported by a mayor and council (Stephens and Wikstrom, 2000).

Although research on which form of local government is more economical—the focus of most studies—there appears to be some agreement among urban scholars that local governments are unable to handle all of the problems in a metropolitan area (see Stephens and Wikstrom). Unfortunately, little attention has been devoted to the impact government consolidation has on departments and employees of the integrating agencies. One such department is the police force.

Advocates of consolidation argue that it would produce a higher volume of police services, lower response time, reduce overtime and duplication of effort, and lower overall operating costs, as well as, saving money, producing greater efficiency and flexibility in response to crime, and providing greater opportunities for advancement for sworn and civilian personnel (IACP, 2003). Opponents of consolidation (public choice advocates) fear a loss of community independence and reduced oversight and supervision of a consolidated agency (IACP, 2003; see also Ostrom, 1971).

Like government consolidations, studies on police consolidations have focused primarily on economic factors. Like government consolidations, studies on police consolidations have also been inconclusive in their findings as to which system wide

structure of local law enforcement agencies is most effective and efficient in addressing the needs of its constituents. Also, there appears to be a consensus that smaller agencies—representing the majority of police consolidations—should consolidate (Ostrom and Smith, 1976; see also Bollens and Schmandt, 1986). However, when police consolidations occur, they generally involve very small agencies, occur when cities face population decline, and occur when delivery and/or financial problems are present (Halter, 1993). Other factors include identified high costs, liability concerns, and a lack of police credibility as elements leading to discussions of consolidation (Wickum, 1986)

Consolidations are contextually based—involving organizational change that requires the integration of some or all parts of the original organizations’ functions and activities—varying in degrees from one type of consolidation to the next (IACP, 2003). Understanding the contextual bases or dynamics in which a consolidation occurs (i.e., structural complexity and structural control, type of consolidation, and stages of a consolidation) can provide insight into how the “process” of consolidation impacts the organization and its employees’ perceptions of justice or fairness (see Colquitt and Shaw, 2005).

Organizational justice has generally been defined as people’s perceptions of fairness in organizations (Greenberg, 1987a; see also Koys and DeCotiis, 1991). Matters of justice in the workplace have been identified as an important element in developing a healthy work environment and leading to perceptions of legitimacy of the organization (Sheppard, Lewicki, and Minton, 1992).

Quantitative studies on organizational justice have been beneficial in conceptualizing justice, as well as identifying the various contexts, dimensions, and

reactions involved in justice judgments. Unfortunately, little attention has been devoted to describing and understanding perceptions of justice across multiple decision-making events (entity measures) (see Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, and Rupp, 2001; Sweeney and McFarlin, 1997) or measuring overall justice perceptions (Greenberg, 2001; Shapiro, 2001).

Studies on perception of justice in police settings generally involve the public's perception of fairness in police encounters. However, studies on M&As in private organizations do provide some insight into the impact these transitional events have on employees. Despite the similarities between public and private organizations (i.e., in terms of delivering services to their constituents and structurally), their fundamental differences (i.e., private organizations' focus on profit and public organizations' responsibility of serving the community) (Rainey, 2003) warrant exploring sworn police officers' reaction to consolidation.

CHAPTER III

THE HISTORY OF LOUISVILLE METRO POLICE DEPARTMENT

In 1998, the Louisville-Jefferson County Crime Commission conducted a survey of city and county residents. The objective was to develop a sample that would approximate combined city-county demographic representation but which would additionally and more importantly provide for equal input from residents of both jurisdictions.

The survey was conducted via telephone calls to respondents. Calls were made at varying times over an approximate five-week period during late spring of 1998. Calls were made until a proportionate sample containing approximately half of the respondents from each jurisdiction was achieved. The final sample consisted of 1,873 completed surveys with 951 (50.7%) completed by residents of the City of Louisville and 922 (49.3%) completed by individuals residing outside the city limits of Louisville but within the borders of Jefferson County.

According to Louisville-Jefferson County Crime Commission Report (1998), most respondents to the survey (69.7%) reported that they were aware that a consolidation of police departments was being considered. Jefferson County residents (73.2%) were more likely than Louisville City residents (66.4 %) to report awareness of the consolidation issue. Overall, approximately half of all residents (52%) supported consolidation, 8% opposed consolidation, and a relatively large proportion (39.9%) was

undecided. City residents (55.7%) were more likely than county residents (48.3%) to support consolidation. Opposition to consolidation was greater (11.3%) within the county than in the city (4.9%).

After three failed attempts in 1956, 1982 and 1983, citizens in Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky, voted to consolidate their governments in November 2000 by a vote of 54% to 46% (Jefferson County Kentucky Clerk's Office/Election Center, 2000). This consolidation, oftentimes referred to by local residents and politicians as merger, was the first successful consolidation in a major metropolis in three decades. The unification of these two governments increased the size of Louisville—vaulting it from the 65th largest city in the country to the 26th (Infoplease, 2008).

Opponents argued that consolidation would adversely impact suburban and urban residents, especially in predominately minority communities in the urban areas, due to the power realignment resulting from structural changes (Savitch and Vogel, 2004a, b). Advocates, on the other hand, promoted the consolidation on the argument that it would enhance economic development in the area—viewing the city and county government agencies as being in conflict causing economic development efforts to be ineffective.

The success of the November 2000 attempt was attributed to the “lowering of expectations” that helped to garner support from every past and present Louisville mayor and Jefferson County judge-executive (Allegheny Institute, 2005). Also, as a result of consolidation, more than 80 small municipalities were exempted from any dissolution—a necessary compromise for the merger to take place. Only the city of Louisville would be absorbed into the larger consolidation.

One thing that was not a focal point in pre-consolidation talk was the consolidation of services, departments, or authorities in an effort to save money (Allegheny Institute, 2005). The law authorizing the referendum, H.B. 647 (see Commonwealth of Kentucky, 2000), left intact all former county level offices (County judge-executive, justices of the peace, and County commissioners) even though it limited their powers. Also, the consolidated government did not affect fire protection districts, sanitation districts, water districts, and any other special taxing or service districts of any kind. These services would continue to be funded by the new government and have the same power and duties as before the consolidation.

In this consolidation, no promises were made to consolidate departments or functions to save money. The only promise made was that taxes would not increase nor would services decrease as a result of the merger. Unfortunately, post-consolidation results indicate that the promises of an increase in economic development—the basis on which this consolidation was constructed—has not materialized or at least remains questionable (Allegheny Institute, 2005).

Consolidation of LPD and JCPD

Perhaps the most notable departmental merger in this government consolidation was between the Louisville Division of Police (LPD) and Jefferson County Police Departments (JCPD). Both departments have a long history of dedicated service to Louisville and Jefferson County respectively. LPD had been in operation since 1806. Prior to consolidation, LPD had an authorized strength of 723 sworn officers (69.0%) and 324 civilians (31.0%) personnel. JCPD had been in operation since 1868. Prior to consolidation, JCPD had an authorized strength of 450 sworn officers (67% sworn) and

225 civilians (33.0%) personnel. While the departments have remained independent prior to consolidation, several units within the departments had been combined, including the Crimes Against Children Unit (1987) and the Metro Narcotics Unit (in 1990) (Louisville-Jefferson County Crime Commission, 1998).

Unfortunately, documentation on the actual consolidation process after 2003 is unavailable or at best limited. However, information obtained from the Louisville-Jefferson County Crime Commission report in 1998 and a copy of a presentation given by former LMPD Lieutenant Colonel Terri Winstead-Wilfong (2009) on the consolidation of LPD and JCPD, a brief synopsis of the various issues, decisions, and events of the consolidation can be provided.

Pre-Consolidation Stage of LMPD

Prior to consolidation, the Louisville-Jefferson County Crime Commission conducted a six-month fact-finding study in 1998 to determine the fiscal, administrative, and operational implications of consolidating LPD and JCPD. Part of this study included a survey to determine the perceptions and attitudes of departmental personnel. The survey population consisted of the 1,722 sworn and civilian personnel of LPD and JCPD. From this total, 1,210 completed surveys were returned for analysis—a 70% response rate. Of those responding, 685 (57.4%) were from LPD and 508 (42.6%) were from JCPD. The discrepancy in the total numbers reflects the number of persons responding to a particular question.

Although this report did not directly identify the rumors regarding the consolidation, it did provide insight into topics and issues of concern to police officers regarding the possibility of consolidation.

One question that was posed in the survey assessed the support officers had for the consolidation of LPD and JCPD. Based upon the survey findings, it was determined that 82.1% of the LPD sworn personnel were in favor of consolidation (39.0% very strongly in favor of a consolidation, 30.4% mostly in favor of a consolidation, and 12.7% mildly in favor of a consolidation). Conversely, 89.9% of the JCPD sworn personnel were opposed to consolidation (74.7% strongly opposed to a consolidation, 11.2% mostly opposed to a consolidation, and 4.0% mildly opposed to a consolidation).

The survey also assessed perceptions on how consolidation would affect the officer in the following areas: 1) pay, 2) uniform and equipment expenses, 3) promotion opportunity, 4) health insurance, 5) access to take-home vehicle, 6) supervision, 7) training, 8) pension, 9) safety, 10) access to specialized assignments, and 11) pride in the job. LPD personnel believed that most items would remain about the same under a merged department. LPD rated no item as worsening under a merged department and listed only two items as possibly being better: pay (77.2%) and health insurance (57.3%). JCPD personnel believed that most items would worsen under a merged department, including their pay (59.7%), uniforms and equipment expenses (61.8%), promotional opportunity (62.7%), health insurance (76.0%), access to take-home vehicles (63.8%), supervision (52.7%), access to specialized assignments (59.0%), and pride in job (60.3%). JCPD personnel rated no items as potentially being better under a merged department and listed only three items (training, pension, and safety) as likely to remain about the same.

Finally, the survey asked how the operations (i.e., cost of running the police department, efficiency of running the police department, coverage of all high crime areas,

leadership, cooperation among units, training resources, and forensic resources) would be affected in a consolidated department. The majority of LPD personnel rated two operations as likely to improve under a consolidated department: cost of running the police department (55.9%) and efficiency of running the police department (55.1%). LPD rated no operations as worsening under a consolidated department and listed two areas as likely to remain about the same, leadership (59.5%) and forensic resources (57.6%). JCPD rated all operations as likely to worsen under a consolidated department with two exceptions, training resources and forensic resources.

Also included in the survey, respondents were asked to rate the importance of certain outcomes of a police consolidation. Personnel from both departments rated improved access to information as the most important possible outcome (87.1%), followed by elimination of duplication of service (81.0%), unified law enforcement service delivery (77.9%), and elimination of jurisdictional disputes (74.0%). When asked to rate the importance of issues which needed resolution in order for consolidation to work, personnel from both departments rated reconciling pay disparity (92.2%), reconciling radio communications and other technological differences (91.2%), and reconciling Union/FOP contract differences (89.2%) as most important.

As illustrated, the findings from the survey revealed significant differences in how each department perceived the proposed police consolidation. As stated earlier, although it does not address or identify specific rumors it does provide a foundation on which rumors or concerns of consolidation could be based.

Initial Planning and Formal Combination Stage

Following the November 2000 passage of consolidation, it was stated that Louisville and Jefferson County governments would consolidate, along with their respective police departments, in 2003. On November 5, 2002, Mayor Jerry Abramson was elected into office. In January 2003 Louisville Metro was born. After a nationwide search, Chief Robert White was selected and sworn into office on January 5, 2003 as the chief executive of LMPD.

One of the first steps in planning for the consolidation of LPD and JCPD was the request from Chief White for all commanding officers to submit position papers. The purpose of this paper was to identify the two biggest challenges facing consolidation and to identify what direction the department (LMPD) needed to take. Following interviews with commanding officers, a project manager was selected to oversee the consolidation along with the selection of a command staff—consisting of three Assistant Chiefs holding the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. Later, an organizational chart was created to identify the tentative structure of LMPD. This structure consisted of four major functional branches—Chief's Office, Administrative Bureau, Patrol Bureau, and Support Bureau.

This new command staff inherited certain situations that presented challenges to consolidation efforts. First, no plans for consolidation had been made in the two years prior to the actual consolidation. Second, two budgets were inherited—each expiring within six months. Third, two of everything were inherited (i.e., police departments, radio rooms, fleet services, swat teams, training units, etc.). Fourth, two different sets of rules and policies, and ten union contracts (i.e., FOP Lodge 6—two contracts; FOP Lodge 14—two contracts; Teamsters—three contracts; American Federation of State,

County, and Municipal Employees—one contract; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers—one contract; and School Guard Association—one contract). Finally, consideration had to be given to the type of uniform (i.e., patch, badge, hats, etc.), weapons and tools that were to be used by officers (i.e., guns, batons, etc.), as well as the design of markings for fleet vehicles (i.e., logos, etc.).

In order to help facilitate these decisions and changes, committees were formed consisting of sworn and non-sworn personnel and experts in the area of inquiry. As part of a strategic plan to assist in identifying issues, the committees were responsible for making recommendations regarding specific issues, identifying costs associated with the changes, and identifying priorities within ninety days. The issues considered by the committees included:

1. Development of the Department's mission statement and values
2. Legal and contractual considerations
3. Budget and funding considerations
4. Organizational structure
5. Operations (including patrol and investigations)
6. Facilities
7. Specialty units
8. Recruitment and training
9. Workload analysis and personnel development
10. Communications
11. Information technology
12. Policy/General Directive Manual changes

13. Community outreach/involvement/education

Other issues taken into consideration included:

1. The makeup of the original staff (initially half city and half county)
2. A review of existing units
3. Impact of organizational change
4. Degree of decentralization of the department
5. Development of a strategic planning process
6. Development of a Standard Operating Procedure for the department
7. Identifying cultural differences
8. Integrating the payroll system
9. Developing a Standard Operating Procedure for Metro Government

Human Resources

Operational Combination Stage

The operational combination stage of LMPD's consolidation began with the decision to move toward a decentralized department. Under this structure, the districts would need to be self-sufficient in terms of having the resources needed to prevent, respond to, and investigate criminal activity. Also, centralized investigative units would be reviewed so that an informed decision could be made regarding which units would remain and which would be decentralized to the district.

As a result of this decision, several units were decentralized (i.e., Stolen Property and Recovery Squad Unit (SPARS)—LPD, Major Case Squad—JCPD, Domestic Violence Units—JCPD, and Street Crimes Unit—LPD), while other units were downsized (Criminal Investigation Division—which includes all specialized investigative units such

as Homicide, Sex Crimes, Robbery, Crimes Against Children, etc.). Both of these actions resulted in about 100 police officers being reassigned into the districts (Courier Journal, 2003). Also, the Community Relations Unit, the Training Division, and the Police Academy were geographically relocated. Two additional units, Vehicle Impoundment and the Police Garage, were transferred to the Public Works Department. According to Chief White, officers needed to focus on preventing crime and establishing relationships with the community (Courier-Journal, 2003). As a result of this restructuring, more police officers would be placed on the streets.

Another major undertaking by LMPD involved the redrawing of police districts. Prior to consolidation, LPD operated with six districts while JCPD operated with four. The restructuring of boundaries resulted in eight patrol districts covering the Louisville Metro area—each commanded by a Major. As a result, some of the officers in each of the former city and county districts were reassigned—following voluntary requests for reassignment—to the new districts in order to accommodate the personnel needs in those districts. The consequences of this reassignment meant that some former city officers were assigned to former county areas and some county officers were assigned to former city areas.

Stabilization Stage

Documentation on this stage of the consolidation is limited. Therefore, determining exactly, or even approximately, when this stage occurred is difficult to identify. However, early accomplishments of the consolidation include:

1. The departmental reorganization of many centralized criminal investigation units were downsized or eliminated and their investigative responsibilities and personnel were reassigned to the patrol districts.
2. Standard Operating Procedure were developed allowing for one set of operating rules for the officers of LMPD.
3. Improved Fleet Management—the two former departments' fleets were merged and streamlined. A number of vehicles were taken out of service while at the same time assigning vehicles to more officers. The net result has been lower fleet costs.

These accomplishments in no way indicate that the department was not without concerns or problem issues related to the consolidation. One important issue was the “all time low” morale of police officers following the consolidation (Courier-Journal, 2004).

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

This proposed case study will attempt to describe and understand the impact that the consolidation process of the Louisville City and Jefferson County Police Departments had on police officers' perception of justice or fairness. Four research questions have been previously identified and provide the foundation for this qualitative inquiry. These questions are:

Question #1: How do police officers view a just department?

Question #2: How do police officers form overall perceptions of justice in a consolidation process?

Question #3: How do justice judgments affect police officers' attitudes and behaviors toward the organization and supervisors?

Question #4: How do former city and county police officers compare in perceptions of justice of the consolidation?

By its nature, qualitative research is hypothesis generating. Quantitative research, on the other hand, is hypothesis testing—examining specified testable expectations about empirical reality that follow from a more general proposition (Berg, 2004; Babbie, 2001). Qualitative research, therefore, does not begin with preconceived notions nor does it attempt to test a hypothesis. The researcher's findings should be based upon developing unbiased themes from the data. Unfortunately, it is unrealistic to expect a researcher to

be totally unbiased. For this reason, this study identifies expectations to offset or, at least, minimize potential biases.

The identification of expectations serves two purposes. First, it provides an empirical foundation in which additional inquiries can be made. Second, identifying expectations can also help us identify our potential biases or predispositions. In other words, by identifying what is expected to be found in the study, based upon the body of knowledge on the topic, the researcher establishes a basis to probe deeper to find more of an understanding of a phenomenon. Therefore, the following predictions have been made regarding this study:

Expectation #1: Police officers view a just department based, in part upon personal and professional expectations of the department and the perceived fairness of the department's procedures, policies, and practices.

Expectation #2: Police officers form overall perceptions of justice based upon a collective assessment of distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational concepts of justice.

Expectation #3: Police officers' attitudes and behaviors will be based upon formal (organization-originating) and informal (supervisor-originating) justice sources.

Expectation #4: Differences in perceptions of justice will be seen between former city and county police officers, and between the different ranks of police officers.

A case study methodology was determined to be the best method for developing in-depth data regarding the participants' perceptions, justice judgments, and reactions to the consolidation process. The data was collected through in-depth interviews with

LMPD police officers who served on either LPD or JCPD prior to the consolidation. Police officers on LMPD who were hired following the consolidation, will not be included in the interviews. Thus, conceptually, the study is like a quasi-experimental design in which officers were asked to discuss, post-consolidation, their experiences of consolidation by reflecting on the periods prior, during, and after consolidation.

The remaining sections will focus on case study as methodology, case study design, other factors influencing the study, data collection technique, interview format, sample selection, and analysis of the data.

Case Study as Methodology

Even though the virtue of qualitative research is seldom questioned in the abstract, its practice is sometimes criticized for being nonscientific and, thus, invalid (Berg, 2004). Specifically, case study methods involve systematically gathering enough information about a particular person, social setting, event, or group to permit the researcher to effectively understand how the subject operates or functions (Berg, 2004). Despite the criticism oftentimes directed towards case studies, perhaps the most significant issue regarding any method's design is the research question of inquiry and which methods best allow the researcher to answer that question.

Two main paradigms, positivism and naturalistic, provide the foundation of scientific inquiry. Positivist inquiries rely on empirical methodologies borrowed from the natural sciences to investigate phenomena (i.e., cause and effect relationships). Quantitative methods serve this positive-science ideal by providing rigorous reliable and verifiably large aggregates of data and the statistical testing of empirical hypotheses (Berg, 2004). Naturalist inquiries, associated more with qualitative methods, focuses less

on hypothesis testing and more on hypothesis generating. In other words, naturalists view reality as a product of an individual's social experience—a product of human conceptualization (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). From this perspective, understanding a social phenomenon requires more than just identifying causal relationships, but also requires viewing it through the complex lens of interconnected human activities (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). This includes emotions, motivations, symbols and their meanings, empathy, and other subjective aspects associated with naturally evolving lives of individuals and groups (Berg, 2004). Many of these elements are directly observable and as such may be viewed as objective (Schwartz and Jacobs, 1979). Nonetheless, certain elements of symbolism, meaning, or understanding usually require consideration of the individual's own perceptions and subjective apprehensions.

The naturalistic paradigm, associated with qualitative research, should be considered an alternative perspective, not a replacement, to the more traditional positivist approach (Berg, 2004; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Understanding our social world requires not only rigorous hypothesis testing associated with quantitative methods, but also an in-depth understanding of the meanings people have constructed for their experiences (Merriam, 2001) and the hypothesis generating capabilities of qualitative methods.

Based upon the research questions asked in this study, a qualitative methodology or case study was utilized. The following sections in this chapter will include: 1) discussion on the advantages and disadvantages of a case study design, 2) identification of other factors that may influence the study, 3) a discussion on how data will be

collected, 4) a discussion on the interview format, 5) a discussion on how the sample will be selected, and 6) a discussion on the analysis of the data.

Case Study Design

The purpose of this research is to describe and understand police officers' perceptions of organizational justice in a police consolidation. Therefore, a qualitative method or case study would be appropriate for understanding the meaning of justice from the viewpoint of officers selected for this study (Maxwell, 1996; Merriam, 2001). Using a qualitative approach involves analysis of a phenomenon (i.e., consolidation) from the perspective of those individuals involved in the culture being studied (i.e., officers' perception of justice). Therefore, in-depth one-on-one interviews are a preferred method for extracting information or data (Lofland and Lofland, 1995). However, in order to fully understand the boundaries of this methodology, we must first discuss its advantages and disadvantages.

One of the advantages of the case study approach is that it attempts to explain a phenomenon—providing an opportunity to gather extremely rich, detailed, and in-depth information (Berg, 2004). By concentrating on a single phenomenon, individual, community, or institution—focusing on holistic descriptions and explanations—the researcher is able to capture nuances, patterns, and more latent elements that other research approaches might overlook (Berg, 2004). From this perspective, case studies are a preferable method of inquiry when “how” or “why” questions are being explored. Case study method is also a useful technique for researching relationships, behaviors, attitudes, motivations, and stressors in organizational settings (Berg, 2004). Perhaps one of the most important benefits of the case study method lies in its ability to open the way for

discoveries (Dyer and Wilkins, 1991; Shaughness and Zechmeister, 1999). It can easily serve as the breeding ground for insights and even hypotheses that may be pursued in subsequent studies (Berg, 2004).

The disadvantages of case studies involve two concerns, subjectivity and generalizability. First, the “subjective” nature of a case study and the potential for biases on the part of both the participant and interviewer could lead to difficulties in establishing the reliability (i.e., the ability of the study’s finding to be replicated) (Maxwell, 1996) and validity (i.e., the findings in the study reflecting the concept under consideration) of the study (Berg, 2004). Second, is the difficulty in generalizing results (Berg, 2004). It can be difficult to extrapolate from the results of single-case research into a larger context. In other words, the findings only apply to those or the entities that were in the study (Higgins, 2009). However, if the case study is properly undertaken, it should not only provide understanding of a specific phenomenon, but should provide a general understanding about similar phenomenon (Berg, 2004).

These disadvantages of case studies do not imply that the methodology lacks validity. First, the subjective nature or lack of objectivity of a case study is closely related to its reliability or reproducibility. In other words, objectivity could be considered to rest on the ability of the researcher to articulate what the procedures are so that others can repeat the research themselves—corroborating or disproving the original findings (Berg, 2004). Therefore, the methodology of a case study must be articulated with a precision that will allow the study to be replicated.

Second, biasing effect—preconceived notions, founded or unfounded, held by both the interviewee and interviewer as to the role the interviewer plays in the interview

process—can adversely affect the validity of a study (Babbie, 1995; Chadwick, Bahr, and Albrecht, 1984). For example, the participants selected for this study have been acculturated, prior to consolidation, into an organization that had strong historical significance. It would be unrealistic to assume that the influences of both past work and personal experiences, in some way, will not manifest themselves in their responses. Also, biases may be present in the interviewer. Interviewer bias, opinions or prejudices on the part of the interviewer, could potentially have negative effects on the collection, analysis, and reporting of the data. Like participants, the interviewer (in this case, a former police officer with one of the agencies involved in the consolidation) is subject to the same types of biases. Unfortunately, it is virtually impossible to rid any study, quantitative or qualitative, of all subjective or bias influences (Berg, 2004). However, an argument can be made that it is the presence and influences of these factors that will enrich this study by identifying the subjective nature (i.e., emotions, motives, symbols and their meanings, etc.) of individual and group experiences (Berg, 2004).

Finally, the inability of case studies to generalize findings to a larger population has been attributed, in part to its potential lack of representativeness and rigor in its methodology (i.e., identifying a sample group and the collection, construction, and analysis of the material). As such, Hamel, DuFour, and Fortin (1993) believe no judgment can be made relative to the representativeness of the findings. Still, representativeness can be improved based upon the methodology used to select the sample group (Babbie, 1995). However, representation and generalizability are not necessarily synonymous. For example, in this study, systematic random sampling with replacement will help to ensure representation. In other words, it helps to ensure that the

sample is representative of the population of LMPD officers. However, given the small number of potential interviews, it would be a fallacy to suggest that the responses given by participants could be “generalized” to a broader population of police officers.

Overall, in the eyes of some advocates of positivist inquiry, very little credibility is added to this study by addressing the disadvantages of qualitative research. Also, other methods (i.e., triangulation—using multiple sources to corroborate findings) are difficult to apply due to the limited or unavailable documentation of the subject matter and the fact that it is a past experience being studied. However, the strength of this methodology does not lie within its ability to be subjective or generalizable. The true strength of this methodology lies within its ability to expand our understanding of a particular phenomenon or event. Qualitative research provides the foundation and building blocks for theoretical advancements, refinements and even initiations (Tewksbury, 2009). In other words, it is not the intention of this study to produce the “hard data” associated with quantitative methods, but to produce the “soft data” that provides a descriptive understanding, richness, color, and depth to the research topic—the birthplace of new hypotheses.

Data Collection Technique

Interview methods are an integral component in the collection of respondents’ perceptions—especially in case study methodology (Berg, 2004). To understand complicated problems, one must be able to explore the topic with the interviewee (Rubin and Rubin, 1995). Three categories of interviews are generally identified. These include; 1) the standardized approach, 2) the nonstandardized approach, and 3) the

semistandardized approach (Berg, 2004; Babbie, 2001). For the purposes of this study, a semistandardized approach will be utilized.

The semistandardized interview—unlike the “standardized” interview (which is very rigid in structure and inflexible) (see Merriam, 2001; Schwartz and Jacobs, 1979) or “unstandardized” interviews (extremely flexible—relying more on spontaneous responses)—involves the implementation of a number of predetermined questions and special topics. These questions are typically asked of each interviewee in a systematic and consistent order, but the interviewers are allowed freedom to digress; that is, the interviewers are permitted (in fact, expected) to probe far beyond the answers to their prepared standardized questions.

Three advantages to this approach can be identified. First, it permits the researcher to approach the world from the participant’s perspective (Berg, 2004). In other words, it provides the participant the opportunity to describe, in more detail, a phenomenon (in this case consolidation). Second, it allows the researcher the flexibility to adjust the language of the questioning in order to capture specific detail from the participant (i.e., adjusting questioning to reflect the differences in police jargon between city and county police officers; or using the term “merger”—most often used by locals instead of consolidation). Finally, it provides the researcher the opportunity to ask probing questions—necessary for enhancing the richness and details of the participant’s responses.

Interview Format

An interview instrument was designed and formatted for this study to guide the researcher through questions with a sample of LMPD police officers. This instrument

was also designed to facilitate the participants' recall of information, as well as generate responses necessary for addressing the research questions. In this instrument, 11 questions, along with probing question, were divided into four sections.

The first section of questions will be warm-up questions (i.e., name, rank, etc)—designed to create an environment and atmosphere in which participants are comfortable in responding to questions. These questions are also designed to help generate a relationship of mutual trust between the interviewer and the participant necessary for generating quality responses—especially to potentially sensitive questions. The second section will address issues related to officers' perceptions of their former police departments. The third section will address officers' perceptions on the city-county police consolidation. The fourth section will address officers' perceptions on the future of LMPD. Lastly, demographic information will be collected on participants.

Probing questions will be utilized to obtain more specific and detailed responses. This line of questioning will be particularly important in probing overall perceptions of fairness (i.e., types or dimensions and source). Probing questions will also be used as follow-up questions that provide the hallmark of qualitative interviewing by allowing for the pursuit of themes that were discovered, encouraging the elaboration of responses exploring the implications of what was said (Rubin and Rubin, 1995). This line of questioning will be extremely useful when exploring the context of this study.

It was determined that only one interview instrument would be used for both patrol officers and sergeants and above. Although an argument can be made that experiences and perceptions of merger may differ based upon rank, it is the experience of

merger that is common to both. Therefore, probing questions become important in identifying the differences in those experiences and the perceptions that follow.

Every interview was conducted by the researcher face-to-face. This allows immediate feedback (i.e., through nonverbal cues) when questions were posed. Also, interviews were conducted in locations that help to protect the participant's confidentiality or privacy (i.e., coffee shop, researcher's office, etc.). Interviews were avoided in or around the participant's place of employment, unless privacy can be ensured at that location (i.e., private office or other secure locations not readily accessible to the public or other officers). On average, the interviews took between 1.00 to 1.25 hours. Pilot interviews were conducted and the interview questions and format were revised as necessary in order to fulfill requirements and objectives of this study.

In order to assure the reliability of the information, while preserving all of the data collected, responses to the interviews will be tape recorded with the consent of the respondent. All recorded interviews will be transcribed, by someone other than the interviewer, and assigned a number in order to produce a written record.

Also, in order to determine whether the interview questions and format are generating the desired responses necessary to address the research questions, practice interviews will be conducted with retired LMPD police officers. Using a purposive sample, these individuals will be selected based upon their knowledge of consolidation, affiliation as former LPD or JCPD police officer, and their rank at the time of retirement. These practice interviews provide an opportunity to address any potential problems and oversights in the interview questions and/or interview format. Also, by using this

method, the integrity of the systematic sampling methodology used in this study will not be compromised.

Although there are definite advantages to collecting data through interviews, there are also disadvantages. Given the controversy surrounding consolidation of police organizations, it can be expected that emotions may be high. Therefore, both personal and professional biases are likely to be present. Each participant will most likely have their own perceptions regarding the fairness of the consolidation. The established history of the two former agencies and potential loss of that identity, due to the consolidation, could contribute to these biases. However, as stated earlier, it is the presence of these biases that potentially enriches the data in this study.

Sample Selection

In order to conduct this study, a written request was submitted to LMPD's Chief of Police. The purpose of this request is to gain access into the organization in order to conduct this study. In this request, permission was asked to interview sworn police officers on LMPD regarding merger. In this request, permission was asked to receive electronic mailing addresses of those police officers listed on the roster. The Chief of Police was advised that the information obtained from this would be confidential, but that the results would be made available upon request with participants' identifying information removed.

Following the Chief of Police's written approval of this study, a roster of LMPD's current police officers was obtained. This roster provided information on the officers' names, ranks, dates of hire, and code numbers. Although it could not be determined what rank and position/assignment an officer had at the time of consolidation, the code

numbers provided information on whether the officer was a former city officer (a code number beginning with a 2), a former county officer (a code number beginning with a 6), or an officer hired after consolidation (a code number beginning with a 7). Using the information provided in this roster, systematic random sampling with replacement was used to obtain the 40 interviews needed to gather the necessary data for this study. This method was chosen because it proved to be one of the better methods in capturing the key demographic characteristics necessary for in-depth data collection. These characteristics include, 1) an officer's former department (i.e., former LPD or JCPD), and 2) their rank (i.e., patrol officer or supervisors).

For example, an officer's affiliation with his/her former department could influence their perceptions of fairness of the consolidation process. As cited earlier, the Louisville-Jefferson County Crime Commission Report (1998), a survey conducted five years before consolidation, stated that 82.1% of LPD officers favored consolidation while 89.9% of JCPD officers were in opposition. These preconceived notions could impact an officer's perception of the fairness of the actual consolidation process. Also, an officer's rank could influence perception. The consolidation of two major law enforcement agencies, as a result of a much larger government consolidation, involves extensive structural changes. These changes require integrating some or all parts of the original organizations' functions and activities (IACP, 2003). Therefore, depending on the degree of integration, perceptions of fairness could be influenced differently by individuals based upon their responsibilities within a given department or unit.

Based upon these two characteristics, four categories have been constructed in order select a sample group. These categories include: 1) former LPD patrol officers, 2)

former JCPD patrol officers, 3) former LPD supervisors, and 4) former JCPD supervisors. These groups were constructed using the information available on the original roster and represent the current ranks of officers and not necessarily their rank at the time of consolidation. Given the relatively small number of police officers that hold the ranks above sergeant (i.e., lieutenants, captains, majors, lieutenant colonels, and colonels), and in order to protect the confidentiality of participants, these individuals along with sergeants, were included in the category of “supervisors.”

Of the 1198 police officers on LMPD’s roster, 599 were former LPD officers, 2) 304 were former JCPD officers, and 3) 295 were officers hired after consolidation. The sample for this study was selected from the 903 current LMPD police officers who were employed by either LPD or JCPD at the time of the consolidation. These 903 LMPD sworn officers consisted of 1) 450 former LPD patrol officers, 2) 227 former JCPD patrol officers, 3) 149 former LPD supervisors, and 4) 77 former JCPD supervisors.

The 295 LMPD sworn officers hired after consolidation—none of which have been promoted beyond the rank of patrol officer—were not a part of the sample. Although this group may have had some knowledge and/or vicarious experience of the consolidation, they would not have been present throughout the entire consolidation process. Nor was it likely that these individuals would have had firsthand knowledge of either LPD or JCPD. These two factors would have made it difficult for this particular group to provide responses that would have enhance the quality of insight and understanding attempted in this study.

Based upon a target of 40 interviews, 10 participants were needed from each group. Anticipating a 50% response rate, 20 invitations were sent to each group. Using

the systematic random sampling method, every 22nd name was chosen from the list of former LPD patrol officers, every seventh name was chosen from the list of former LPD supervisors, every 11th name was chose from the list of from former JCPD patrol officers, and every third name was chosen from the list of former JCPD supervisors.

Following the development of these groups, an email was sent to potential participants inviting them to take part in this study. This invitation included the researcher's name, affiliation, purpose of the study, and the procedures that would take place in the study. Potential participants were advised that their department had approved this study and that their participation was voluntary. Participants were advised that although total privacy would not be guaranteed, their privacy would be protected to the extent permitted by law. The invitations also advised participants that there were no foreseeable risks other than possible discomfort in answering personal questions, but, that there may be unforeseen risks. The invitation advised participants that although they might not directly benefit from this study, the information learned in the study could be helpful to others. Participants were also advised that there would be no compensation for their time, inconvenience, or expenses for their participation. Finally, the invitations advised participants that the study had been approved by the University of Louisville's Institutional Review Board.

Once a police officer agreed to be a participant in this study, an interview was arranged. The majority of these interviews were conducted at the University of Louisville. The other interviews were conducted in various locations throughout the Louisville Metropolitan area. These locations were carefully selected in order to protect the confidentiality of the participants.

Unfortunately, the initial sample did not produce the desired number of responses. Replacements were selected systematically by choosing the next name on the roster following one of the original selections. Overall, 40 additional invitations (10 in each group) had to be sent to acquire the 40 required participants. Therefore, a total of 120 interviews were sent and 40 interviews were completed, yielding a 33.3% return rate.

Demographics

For this study, 40 police officers participated in this study; 20 held the rank of patrol officers (10 LPD and 10 JCPD) and 20 held the rank of supervisor (ranks consisting of sergeants, lieutenants, or majors) (10 LPD and 10 JCPD). Of the supervisors, only six held a rank higher than a sergeant (one LPD and five JCPD). Of the 40 participants, 21 were White males (11 LPD and 10 JCPD), 12 were Black males (six LPD and six JCPD), five were White females (two LPD and three JCPD), one was a Black female (LPD), and one was a male other than Black or White (JCPD). The average tenure of all of the participants, at the time of this study was 17.25 years of service. The average tenure of LPD officers was 16.0 years of service (highest years of service 23, lowest years of service 9). The average tenure of JCPD officers was 18.5 years of service (highest years of service 32, lowest years of service nine).

Of the 40 participants in this study, 25 were in the patrol division (i.e., assigned to a platoon as a patrol officer or supervisor, or assigned to district detectives) and 15 were assigned to other units (i.e., Training, Homicide, Crimes Against Children Unit, Robbery, and Narcotics). Of the 40 participants, 27 had changed ranks or position since the consolidation (14 were promoted and 13 made lateral changes) and 13 had remained in their current position. Of the 14 police officers who had changed ranks, eight were

promoted from patrol officer to sergeant (six LPD and two JCPD), and the other four promotions took place above the rank of sergeant.

Analysis of Data

To begin the process of analysis, all interviews were transcribed. All transcriptions were done by the same individual. The transcripts were compiled into a single document for coding purposes consisting of three stages—initial reading of transcripts, initial coding, and focused coding (Lofland and Lofland, 1995).

The initial reading of transcripts is the first stage of the coding process. During this stage, the transcripts are read without any attempts to code. This allows the researcher to revisit each interview and generate a feeling for the responses given by the participants.

During the initial coding stage, codes are assigned to the responses that are related. At this point, there are no concerns regarding the variety of categories. Because codes are not always mutually exclusive, a piece of information might be assigned several codes.

Finally, focused coding is a review and elimination of less useful codes, combining smaller categories into larger ones, or if a very large number of responses have been assigned the same code, subdividing that category. At this stage, repeated ideas can be organized into larger themes that connect different codes.

These themes will provide the foundation for an in-depth description and analysis of the officers' perceptions of fairness regarding the consolidation of the Louisville City and Jefferson County Police Departments.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

Introduction

The themes derived from the responses of police officers provide the basis for understanding; how police officers identify or define a fair department (research question 1), how police officers reacted to fairness judgments (research question 2), and how fairness judgments are formed by police officers involved in a consolidation process (research question 3). The findings in this study also identify the differences in perception of fairness between LPD and JCPD police officers (research question 4). Chapter 5 provides a more in-depth discussion of these findings.

In order to provide additional understanding and clarity to the findings in this study, it is necessary to identify two general characteristics that will be utilized throughout this chapter. First, each of the participants in this study was assigned a code number—100 numbers representing former city patrol officers, 200 numbers representing former city supervisors, 300 numbers representing former county patrol officers, and 400 numbers representing former county supervisors. These code numbers will appear at the beginning of each response to help identify from which category the responses were generated. Also, “former city” and “former county” officers will be referred to as “city” and “county” officers respectively.

Second, in order to place the themes into perspective, four terms must be defined:

1) “a large percentage,” 2) “about half,” 3) “several,” and 4) “a few”. “A large percentage” indicates that more than three quarters of the participants made similar responses. “About half” indicates that approximately one-half of the participants made similar responses. “Several” indicates that approximately one-fourth of the participants made similar responses. “A few” indicates that approximately one-eighth of the participants made similar responses. For example, the statement, “A large percentage of police officers identified a fair department as being one that treats each officer equally,” indicates that of the 40 police officers, approximately three-quarters of them identified “equal treatment” of officers as being a characteristic of fairness. This statement also implies that the number of city and county police officers reflecting this theme is relatively the same. In another example, the statement, “Only a few county police officers believed this to be true.” indicates that of the 20 county police officers, approximately one-eighth of them agreed with the given statement. Situations where there are only one or two responses will be identified accordingly.

The purpose in defining these terms is to provide a basis for identifying and understanding the frequency of the responses given by LMPD officers. In other words, they provide a basis for understanding how many police officers, overall, referenced the same point or theme. At the same time, these terms help in identifying and reporting differences in responses between city and county police officers.

Research Question #1

Research question #1 asks, “How do police officers view a fair department?” In general, both LPD (city) and JCPD (county) police officers view a fair department based

upon four characteristics: 1) equality, 2) accountability, 3) flexibility/discretion, and 4) interdepartmental and interpersonal comparisons.

Equality and Respect: Merit and Work Productivity

First, a large percentage of police officers define a fair department as a department that treats its officers equally and respectfully—regardless of the officer's race, sex, rank, position, or affiliation. In other words, there is no discrimination. From this perspective, police officers believe that in a fair department, everyone has the same opportunity to succeed or fail—being judged or evaluated based upon their *merit* and *work productivity*. Equality is also expected to be reflected in the manner in which the department treats its citizens—protecting and serving the interest of the community. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

106-A fair department would have been something that I guess treats every officer the same.

208-Fair meaning it is equal for everybody. It was fair, it was impartial, and nobody was treated unfairly or unequally.

206- Well you know we as police officers, you understand when you come into this line of work that it's a political position, it's not so much about enforcing laws as it is about protecting the people. So in essence while you work the chief and the mayor, you actually work for the people so we have to have rules in our society which are laws and we have to rules within the department that protect the people.

302-Number one, a level playing field by that I mean judge me by my work performance, my attendance, my appearance. When it comes time for promotional exams make the exams fair. Stick with one system. I think on the county we had a system called banding which nobody liked. If you made the band everybody was equal. The chief could go into that band, if there were five people in band A so to speak, that was good to a point. If there were minorities in there he could pick them and if there was somebody he favored he could pick them over the minorities. That's what I mean by being fair. Make the rules apply

to everybody all across the board. ...Keep everything on the up and up that's what I feel is the meaning of fair.

303-Well I think when an organization is fair it creates an environment where not only the community is treated fairly, your officers are treated fairly and your commanders are treated fairly.

405-To me it means that everybody has an equal opportunity to succeed or fail. An equal opportunity to advance and the discipline is applied in a uniform manner—is applied equally, fair, and reasonably.

Accountability: Clarity, Consistency, and Predictability

Second, about half of the police officers define a fair department as a department that holds all of its officers accountable for their actions—including its administrators and commanders. In other words, if the administration and commanders are going to hold police officers accountable for how they treat citizens, then they should be held accountable for the way they treat their officers. In exchange for being held accountable, police officers expect clarity on the part of the department as to what is expected of them (i.e., clearly defined policies). Police officers also define a fair department as a department that is consistent in its processes (i.e., hiring, promotional, and disciplinary processes)—providing a degree of predictability that helps guide an officer's actions. In other words, this consistency helps officers identify which actions are acceptable and unacceptable. This provides a degree of predictability as to expected consequences for their actions—both good and bad. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

109-Just treat me the way that you say in policy I should treat others. As a department, as a command staff, as department wide, treat me that way. If you want me to be upholding and upstanding and accountable to the community, as a department you need to be accountable and held to what you do as a department

201-Fair is where you know the consequences of your actions. If you department has been clear with you on what they expect from you and you know as a condition of your employment that A, B, C exist and you're held accountable for that, that's fair. If a department chooses not to communicate with you and then tries to hold you at a standard that comes maybe out of left field or you're not sure where it came from it think that's their fault. That's incumbent upon them to be clear with you about what fair means.

301-For me it means you're treated fairly through your hiring process, your training process, and through your term of employment you're treated fairly. You're not singled out for any reasons male, female, black, white, Asian it doesn't matter you're treated as an officer.

308-I just think that when I say it was fair every officer had the same shot, everybody was on the same level when it came to promotions or putting in, say if you put in for a unit everybody had a shot at that unit.

403- An organization being fair in my mind means that there are a certain set of rules, codes of conduct that apply to everybody. Overall I felt like that if I did a violation of policy more than likely I was going to get the same punishment this guy over here got. I wasn't going to be treated easier I was going to get the same treatment; I thought I could count on that.

Flexibility and Discretion: Policies and Practices

Third, in identifying the values of a fair department, a large percentage of police officers expected a degree of flexibility and discretion within the formal written policies of the department, and the informal practices of the department. Participants viewed policies as a written set of formal guidelines, codes of conduct, and established rule that governed their actions. Practices, on the other hand, were viewed as the informal ways in which policies were administered or managed. In a fair department, police officers expect formal policies to be written in such a way that it allows them the flexibility to make decisions and accomplish their duties effectively—without the fear of unwarranted punishment (i.e., due to policies that are too restrictive). Nor do they expect policies to be governed or dictated by small groups of individuals (i.e., “signature policies”—

restrictive policies written due to the actions of a single or a few officers). In the practices of the department, participants expected supervisors and administrators to use good judgment or discretion in making decisions regarding a police officer's actions—especially regarding issues of minor policy violations. In other words, police officers did not believe that it was fair for administrators and supervisors to follow the letter of the wording in policies. Instead, they expected these individuals to take into consideration the fluid and dynamic nature of police work and make decisions on a case-by-case-basis—taking into consideration the potentially dangerous and unique situations in which police officers are placed and then forced to make difficult decisions (i.e., dealing with persistent felons). The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

307-Fairness to me is governing, disciplining officers impartially and fairly and that's what that means to me. To be partial and to govern with some intelligence, you know don't allow one officer or even a handful of officers to dictate the entire policy of the department. I tend to see that now; a handful of officers will make a mistake and all of the sudden that will institute a change in a certain policy.

102-Well, I think a fair department is going to treat everybody with the same considerations. A fair department is going to handle disciplinary problems with the parties that are responsible as opposed to blanket statements or policies made throughout the entire department.

207-A fair department is a department that lays down general guidelines; general rules for officers to follow and then goes by those rules on a case by case basis. There are so many things on the street that factor into what an officer does. It could be something he sees, something hears, something he touches so many things. It could be something he heard third party but that's factoring into his mind as far as officer safety and how he conducts himself. A fair department would look at all those things and say okay I see where you were coming from, here's what policies is but I see where you're coming from it makes sense, I can see where you thought your safety might be in jeopardy or you thought a suspect might have been able to escape, something like that based on your actions and they go on a case by case basis. That's what I consider a fair department.

108- That everyone is treated equally that what applies to me applies to everyone else. I think you have to look at things yeah (*officer's name*) may have done this and (*officer's name*) may have done that. But, look at (*officer's name*) history, this is about the fifth or sixth time that (*officer's name*) has done this and this is the first time that (*officer's name*) has done this. They've both been on for ten or twelve years or whatever the case may be. But yet, this seems to be a pattern with (*officer's name*) and not with (*officer's name*). So, we need to look at that if I get in trouble for something or rewarded for something.

206- You know what the department don't realize is that sometimes the world will put you into a bad situation and you've got to do stuff and it may not be exactly as it's spelled out in a book but the person's heart, mind and soul was in the right place to do the best that they could and it may not match what your rules say to the tee but his heart was in the right place, his head was in the right place, he was trying to do a good thing so you be fair to that guy and you don't slam him because he violated policy 8.2.4 paragraph 3 subsection 261. He did what he thought was best in that situation and any normal reasonable person could have done what did in that situation too. Even though it doesn't match exactly to the policy that you go so be fair, do the right thing and take care of him. So that's what I consider to be fair. Back in the city, the district captains took care of their guys.

301-When you do make mistakes a fair department realizes you make mistakes but when you make mistakes sometimes there are consequences for making mistakes. They don't try to ruin your career because of a mistake, a small or medium mistake they don't try to ruin your career for that and that's one thing about merger there are guys that are in command now that have made mistakes but they look past those mistakes and say this guy has done this so you know they'll go on and promote him.

Comparisons: Interdepartmental and Interpersonal

Several police officers formed their perceptions of a fair department based upon two types of comparisons—interdepartmental comparisons and interpersonal comparisons. Interdepartmental comparisons—comparisons made between other law enforcement agencies—have been alluded to as a basis of fairness. In other words, what is fair is based, in part on what other departments, of similar characteristics (i.e., geographic proximity, size, pay, benefits) are doing in similar situations. From this perspective, some police officers look at the actions of other police departments and

compare them to their own. This other department provides a reference point for the expectations and perceptions of their own department. In the consolidation between LPD and JCPD, comparisons between the differences in pay and benefits, among other things, were part of the basis of what was perceived to be fair by members of each of the two departments. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

208- Liked my former department. I came from NYPD, I was just in the academy I was never on the street at NYPD but having come from a law enforcement background my dad was a police officer and I was familiar with the situation. I really liked the city police department. Then again it was somewhere that I was used to. I mean that's where I came into that whole situation I did my internship with them. I was familiar with them and I did like the department itself as a whole.

106T-I think of course pay is important. There's no way I'm going to be doing the same job out here and you're getting paid more than I am, it ain't going to happen.

402-They were going to get a great big pay raise, we were probably not going to see for a long time and we're going to get the short end of that stick. I think that was more it than anything.

404-What's really sad is we really don't have a good patrol, we've got a little small substation the old water company building that's about to fall apart and we have headquarters and as everybody knows at headquarters there's really not any patrols there. There's really not a full service patrol division right downtown, here you have all of this development, all of these wonderful amenities like the new arena and Fourth Street Live but you don't really have a high profile police presence. You know there really needs to be a patrol station downtown that people can walk in visitors or whatever that's open 24 hours a day, seven days a week, if they need help if they have questions. You go to a lot of major cities and you see that they don't have that here. You go down to Memphis right on Beale Street there's a police station you walk in the door it's open around the clock and it's sad that we don't have that. I think some of the visitors here try to find the police and they have a rough time.

306-We're not progressing I mean look at other departments, look at Cincinnati, Nashville, Columbus, Ohio, you look at other departments, the state police you know. How do you say you're progressive when you've got one helicopter that

barely works? How do you say you're progressive when they say crimes down and we don't have gangs and we don't have drugs but every summer we have a part-time task force, a violent crimes task force that goes away after every summer and then there's new people brought in.

304-I love the job, I love doing the job it's what I've always wanted to do. I've been to DC about four times and when I go down there I talk with officers across throughout nation and you hear the stories that they have about their department and I even tell the guys now I understand, I'm bitching there with you I want it better too but you know the thing that keeps me humble is I think about the guys that I've talk to from other states and to hear what they what they've gone through and hear what they don't have and the stuff that they've gone through in their department, we've got it pretty freaking good.

Police officers seem to also imply an interpersonal comparison that takes place between police officers within the same department. This comparison is interpreted in their explanation of the presence of a "good old boy system" within their respective departments. The good old boy system is a practice in which certain individuals, golden boys, receive preferential treatment in the hiring, promotional, and disciplinary processes within the department. Preferential treatment is generally given to these individuals based upon their personal or professional connections or affiliations. Although police officers from both the city and county identified this practice as occurring on a regular basis, within their respective departments, there is an indication that these practices are not considered systemic, but a reflection of a select group of individuals that have political power or influence in the right places. In general, there is some indication that these individuals are perceived as being different from everyone else, and therefore, expectations are that they will be treated differently. As a result, what is perceived to be fair for the officer is not in comparisons with how these individuals are treated, but how they are treated in comparison to other police officers they perceive as being like

themselves. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

103-The short time on the city there were a few times that you would see that. If you put in for a job there was some politics behind that. More or less what I saw was fair. They would give you your work ethic and your policing skills, that would be how you would get a job and that's how I thought it would be fair. There were a few times when we looked and thought wow I wonder how they got there, overall it's been very fair.

110-I think they were it depends upon who those policies were being applied to. There were certain individuals that they were like Teflon. No matter what they had done, if they did get in trouble it wasn't bad. Then there was some officers that spoke their mind, and said what was on that mind and did what was on that mind. You know they got the whole bowl thrown at them. So it just depends on who that individual was determined his disciplinary action. ...Personally to me it's equal all across the board it doesn't matter if you're white, black, green or purple, male or female, it don't make no difference we need to all get treated equally and fairly and if there is a system in place for that, I don't see it.

201-You know you hear things and again this is just water cooler type things where people have gotten an exorbitant amount of days of suspension that you're pretty sure someone else has gotten less for the same reason. Maybe that didn't seem to be fair.

404-I think for the most part they were I think there were times when I saw people do things wrong and there were times when someone they knew or someone they were related to and didn't get quite the same punishment as somebody else had gotten and that wasn't quite fair. I don't think it was extreme but I saw a little bit of favoritism occasionally and that still exists in this department but it wasn't anything that I would consider out of control or anything, that's going to happen I think anywhere to a certain degree it shouldn't theoretically, but it's going to happen. There's going to be people because of associations are going to get preferential treatment, the question is just how blatant and how egregious it is. I don't think it was anything that was too extreme.

306- Like I said man people get mad when I say this, my dad was a city cop and I knew county cops and city cops they were a little bit wild, a little bit more playful a little bit more just kind of roughneck I guess. The county guys seemed to me a little bit more professional, a little bit more reserved you know it wasn't just running and gunning, the city guys were running and gunning. They had good intentions in their heart it's not like they had bad intent but they were just a little bit wilder and you know just having more of a party atmosphere and the county guys were more of a rank and structure atmosphere. That's just what I saw.

Summary of Perceptions of a Fair Department

Equality, accountability, flexibility/discretion, and interdepartmental and interpersonal comparisons have been identified by police officers as being characteristics of a fair department. These characteristics appear to be the foundation upon which officers set expectations for how they are treated by their department and the basis for their fairness judgments. In other words, police officers expected their department to treat everyone equally—not showing signs of favoritism in the processes of the department. Police officers expected to be held accountable for their actions and, at the same time, expected commanding officers to be held to the same standards of accountability. Police officers also expect that the department’s formal policies and informal practices provide them with a degree of flexibility and the discretion necessary for them to do their duties safely and effectively. Finally, police officers expected to be treated the same as others to whom they feel they are worthy of comparison. Whether it is a comparison made between other departments or a comparison made between individuals within their own department, officers expected parity for the work that they did. Although police officers appear to be accepting of some levels of inequality within their departments (i.e., favoritism given to the “golden boys”), the characteristics of a fair department still provide the basis for fairness judgments.

Research Question 2

Research question 2 asks, “How do justice judgments affect police officers’ attitudes and behaviors toward the organization and supervisors?” In order to answer this question, the “fair process effect” model, developed by Folger et al. (1979) and Walker et

al. (1974), was applied to the various decisions made during the different stages of consolidation. These stages included: 1) the pre-consolidation stage—which focus on the time period before consolidation and the period right after its legal passing, 2) the restructuring stage—which focuses on the planning and organizational restructuring of the new agency, and 3) the stabilization stage—represented by the time period indicating the completion of the integration process.

The format for this section is designed to provide a chronological synopsis of the decisions, issues, concerns, judgments, and reactions identified by police officers, throughout the consolidation process. Although the responses given in this section reflect a collective perspective based on the responses of all of the participants, differences in perceptions between city and county police officers are identified based upon the frequency of responses.

Pre-Consolidation Stage

Support/Opposition of Consolidation

Before consolidation officially passed, it was already an emotional and divisive issue—pitting city police officers against county police officers, the former more in support and the latter more opposed to consolidation. Of the 40 participants involved in this study, 35% (14) of the police officers supported consolidation—12 city and two county, 60% (24) opposed consolidation—six city and 18 county, and 5% (two) police officers, both LPD, were indifferent.

Of the 20 city police officers, 60% (12) supported consolidation—25% (five) were patrol officers and 35% (seven) were supervisors; 30% (six) opposed consolidation—20% (four) were patrol officers and 10% (two) were supervisors; and

10% (two) were indifferent—one was a patrol officer and one was a supervisor. Of the 20 county police officers, 10% (two) supported consolidation—one was a patrol officer and one was a supervisor; and 90% (18) opposed consolidation—45% (nine) were patrol officers and 45% (nine) were supervisors. Table 1 illustrates these findings.

Table 1

Police Officers' Position on Consolidation

Position on Consolidation	City Patrol Officer	City Supervisors	Total City Police Officers	County Patrol Officers	County Supervisors	Total County Police Officers	Total
Supported	5 (25%)	7 (35%)	12 (60%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	14 (35%)
Opposed	4 (20%)	2 (10%)	6 (30%)	9 (45%)	9 (45%)	18 (90%)	24 (60%)
Indifferent	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (5%)

Consolidated Departments

Some of the issues and concerns identified by police officers during this period included: 1) the practicality of consolidating departments, 2) the fear of change, 3) the rumors surrounding consolidation, 4) commanding officers “jockeying” for positions, 5) concerns as to whether city and county officers could work together, 6) the issue of parity, and 7) the fear of a possible takeover of one department by the other. Many of these concerns helped form the basis of police officers’ positions (i.e., support or opposition) on consolidation.

For a few police officers, the plan to “consolidate” the two departments was a good idea. Very few county officers took this position. The officers who supported

consolidation believed that a consolidated department would be bigger and better—providing more opportunities and resources for police officers to fight crime countywide and eliminate the jurisdictional boundaries that oftentimes inhibited their efforts to protect and serve the community. Some of these officers also believed that the consolidation of city and county governments would be beneficial to citizens in the Louisville Metro area by addressing some of the fiscal crises city government was having. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

102- I thought it was a good idea to join the two departments, all the crime in Louisville and Jefferson County happened in city and county, while I was with the gang squad we worked as much in the county as we did the city and I thought it was a good opportunity to have just one department focus on the entire community.

208- because it made sense that we had two good departments and we could make one really good department, one great department. There were some really good officers on both sides on the county side and the city side and with the resources that were available; putting it all together I thought we had a chance to do something really super, above and beyond.

204- was for the concept of one government I could not see a point really in duplicating services within the confines of a specified geographic area like Jefferson County. Why do you need two departments that have the same powers basically, you know a county officer could go in the city, a city officer could go in the county and enforce the laws, why did you need two departments? So I thought then and I think now it makes sense it's the implementation of it that is problematic and I don't care who would have come in here and do it, it was going to be a tough job, period.

306- My father was a city police officer and I was a county police officer so I saw both sides of it and I thought for the future of the city if we want to get bigger and progress I thought it was a good idea to mix the two departments. I thought it was kind of crazy to have two fairly large departments in such a small area and I thought it would be better, I thought it would be more efficient.

404- Overall I think merger was good for the community I think if you look at Louisville and Jefferson County as political entities there was no doubt the city

was going under I mean probably if the city had not merged with the county it would probably be in dire financial straits.

Still, several county police officers believed that the concept of consolidated departments simply would not work and opposed consolidation. For these officers—two of whom had already experienced a consolidation at their former department—consolidating governments or departments did not necessarily produce a more effective and efficient department. County officers also believed that there were no substantial benefits to county residents—in terms of services provided or the elimination of duplicated services. One city officer, although believing that the city and county governments should consolidate, believed that the two police departments should have remained separate. The following quotes reflect the response of the one city officer and a sample of the responses given by county police officers conveying these notions:

206-You know initially I was for merger. I then realized though it may not be the best thing for our department. It may be the best thing for the City, for Jefferson County. I'd hoped that maybe if they merged the two governments and stuff maybe there wouldn't be a need to merge the two departments. I think they still needed to operate as two separate entities operating under Metro Government. But after some insight I realized that just financially it just made more sense to put the departments together. So I had some apprehension, some worries about how things were going to work out especially since we were kept in the dark. But as far as actually merging of governments of Jefferson County and City of Louisville, I was actually for that I understood that's what the city and the county needed to do to be vital as a large government in the US.

301-I actually voted against merger at the time. I lived in the county. I voted against it. I was more against it as a citizen than I was a police officer. So as a citizen I was against it because of what's still going on today. People in the city they get their trash picked up. People in the county they still pay to get their trash picked up.

303- Well I always thought the police needed parity, the city didn't make as much as the county did and I'd like to see parity for those officers. But it's just hard to bring two separate departments together. We did it in (*name of department*) and we only merged twelve people and it was still a division of resources. They never

could quite get the mix. They're just now getting to where it's one department and what has that been ten, eleven years.

407-I came from a merged government before we merged the city and county. There's a lot of bureaucracy with merger. Merger was initially sold as a consolidating, streamlining government, streamlining waste and processes, and my experience with merged government, I saw, was the exact opposite.

405-I didn't think it would benefit the people of Jefferson County and I still don't think it has. I don't see the people of Jefferson County are any better off now. They sold us a bill of goods about how they were going to be no more duplication of services and all of this silliness and it didn't come to pass. Taxes are as high as ever. We merged in 03. So, six years, right? You think they could have found a way to lower taxes if it was better or increase service, it's not.

Fear of Change

For several officers of both the city and county, the thought or "fear of change" threatened to take them out of their comfort zone. This change also represented a potential loss of identity and pride associated with their former departments. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

104-I don't know if I was afraid of the unknown or liked what I had and didn't want to change. I think I liked what I had and didn't want to go through a huge change. I was little more than half way up. I think when merger started I had eleven years on, close to twelve. I kind of just wanted to ride it out and not have to go through the process. Change takes work. And then I thought maybe if they just hold off a few years I could just ride this out. So I think it was just selfish. I'm not afraid of change. I don't think it's been very successful.

101-I would say generally most sides were against it I mean officers on that level just because you don't know, you're comfortable, and everybody was comfortable they knew how things ran. So I think the guys that I hung around with had the same apprehension of what's going to change, what good is going to be taken away from it instead of potentially what could be better with this merger.

210-The biggest fear was just change I think it's very human to be fearful of change and adapting to that change so the biggest fear was the unknown going into merger.

304-I wasn't too comfortable with it just for the fact in my mind I want to be in the county police. This is going to be the department where I work. I at least had an idea of what the department was like somewhat from being in training and hearing the guys that worked the county and hearing their stories. Now you're bringing in a whole new element a whole new department and you know a new four or five hundred guys, you know and I was curious very curious of how this all was going to pan out.

310-Nobody wanted it I mean nobody wanted merger on the police department that I knew of either city or county, well city the only reason these folks wanted it was for the benefits that we received and won through contract negotiations and thought this was going to be great for them. Anytime you have change people freak out and people like to stay in what's comfortable to them so it's the fear of the unknown for most people.

410-I was happy. I don't want to change. If it's not broke don't fix it and as far as the county police is concerned, I didn't think it was broke. I thought it was a professional well run organization. I think it was known countrywide for being a great organization and the city police, I don't think had the same reputation.

Rumors

During this stage, rumors, coupled with limited reliable information, fueled several of the officers' concerns as to what the future would hold (i.e., where they were going to work, what would happen to their pay and benefits, etc.). As a result, these police officers stated that they began the consolidation process confused—fearing the possibility that their way of policing was facing extinction. Although there were marginal attempts made to control the “rumor mill,” officers viewed these attempts as hopeless—believing that there were more important issues to be concerned about other than what was being discussed in rumors. According to these officers, what information was available was obtained from either watching the local news or reading about it in the local newspapers. This left these officers feeling that whatever was going to happen was out of their control. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

208- I think they tried to control rumors. I mean a lot of them from the front office, the administration they tried and they did the best that they could.

206-We caught changes about our police department on the evening news. We got policy changes, units disbanding and stuff like that. We didn't hear that from our bosses, we didn't hear that from him or our majors, we got that on news announcements at five and six watching channel three and channel eleven. And I don't care what business you're in big or small, making cookies or saving lives that is not the way to get changes.

405-No nobody knew what was going on, nobody had any answers. When you've got people speculating what their pay is going to be in three years and nobody has decided anything there's nothing to combat. You combat a rumor with the truth. That's the only thing you've got for it. You know I mean you can't, people are going to talk, especially if it's going to directly affect them. If they're speculating and talking about what's going to happen, if you don't know what's going to happen there's nothing you can do. Yeah I don't know either.

408-I mean everybody was anxious they did not know, the unknown, about what's going to happen, where they're going to be working, who's working here and of course you've got all of the rumors which nobody knows what's true. If you wanted to know what was going on in the department you had to watch the news, they put nothing out to the troops and that was ridiculous.

Commanders: Jockeying for Positions

Whatever other changes were going to take place, several police officers felt certain that the command structure as they knew it was going to change. Although both city and county officers indicated that many of their commanders began "jockeying" for positions in the new administration, county officers appeared to be more displeased or upset by these actions. County officers indicated that, in the dawn of consolidation, they felt betrayed by their commanders as they "shut down"—taking interest only in themselves and doing nothing to aid or prepare county officers and the department for consolidation. This perception, along with the perception that the city was mass promoting officers, left many county officers resenting their commanders. These perceptions left county officers feeling as though the power to influence key decisions

during consolidation would rest squarely with the city. As a result of the uncertainties facing police officers, the lack of reliable information and the actions taken by commanding officers, there is some indication of a “closing of ranks” within each department. In other words, officers became more unified, within their own departments—distancing themselves from their respective commands—as battle between city and county lay on the horizon. The following quotes reflect a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

102-Right and that was kind of to be expected. Both departments knew that after merger the upper department command structure was not going to be the same. So I think they were less concerned about rumor control than what they were going to do in their future lives.

108- I think the department as far as you know officers on LPD I think we kind of closed ranks and got closer because then it turned into and LPD/Jefferson County PD battle it was like city versus county. So you know where there was some distance and some voids before on the city, former city it definitely, I think the ranks definitely closed and we got a lot closer.

201-I trust anybody I worked with directly. Now loyalty was started to fade because people were seeing the forest for the trees. There were a handful of people, commanding officers, who saw this as an opportunity of a lifetime.

403- No, because of course on the county police department we were just hearing that the city was promoting left and right both sergeants and lieutenants and getting ranked heavy in anticipation of merger and I don't really know for a fact if that was true or not but I do know that the county police was not promoting people. They weren't filling slots. As a matter of fact, the thing that I think upset a lot of us the most was just as merger in November and December of 02 leading up to January 03 everybody bailed. All the captains, majors, chief, assistant chiefs, they all left, I can understand the chief leaving but everybody else left so we were left with one or two majors in the county department and the heavily ranked city police department and we were kind of left at their mercy. I felt like they just hung us out to dry. Like the upper command was just kind of looking out for themselves, good luck guys we'll see you later. I think the officers were feeling left out, angry and frustrated.

407- If I can preface this a little bit. Most of the county officers rallied against merger, they openly lobbied against merger. I think if you look at the dynamics

before merger I think those are very important because you had most of the former city administrators appointed positions. They left right before merger they knew they didn't get a shot at being chief, so, they abandoned ship. So that organization was in chaos, you had almost all of the county staff that were appointed positions, other than basically three people, that abandoned ship so they left and said; Hey we're not going to have a shot at being chief or being part of the new administration, so, we're leaving.

410-We'd heard all along that the city people were promoting right and left so that when you merged you would have a higher level of city command to run the show. And the county command, on the other hand, had the ability to promote some people and gain some control to balance it out because everybody could see the writing on the wall and he didn't do so. So my biggest fear was you know you've got a lot of animosity between the two police departments. The city police didn't respect the county and vice versa, for the most part. And my biggest concern was that we were going to be another city police department with the county guys getting the short end of the stick on everything. I was concerned it wouldn't be fair treatment towards the county guys because you're going to have a higher number of city commanding officers running the show.

City and County Officers: Working Together

Perhaps one of the most frequently identified concerns and a basis for opposing consolidation of police officers on both sides was whether city and county police officers could “work together.” About half of the city and county police officers recognized the differences in policing styles and philosophies between the two departments. These differences were reflected in the stereotypical nicknames police officers had for each other—“pretty boys” and “thugs.” City officers oftentimes referred to county officers as “pretty boys.” “Pretty boys” were perceived by city officers as being soft and lazy (i.e., carrying mousse on their utility belts instead of pepper spray). City officers also believed that pretty boys had a fear of policing in the city and could not survive working in a city district. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city police officers conveying these notions:

103-Being a young officer the concerns that I had was you hear the old school guys from the city and you hear the old school guys from the county oh it's going to go downhill because the county did this or the city did this. They're going to do it this way and that way. My concern was there was a lot of cut throat stuff that was going on between the ranks, as far as sergeants, lieutenants and officers. There was always a persona that the county was better than the city, the county carried mousse instead of mace, the city they were drunks you know and it was just back and forth.

210-I think just the philosophy on how different people policed was a concern. Having a boss that was former county that could not understand some of the issues you had in areas you worked and how would they deal with that was really concerned about was how well we would fit together. Am I going to be able to go to a county district and they treat me as fair and if they came to our district would we treat them fair. That was my main concern.

107-There was a lot of apprehensions I guess because what do you want to call it pride in your organization or lack of understanding of the other organization you're merging with. I mean the city and the county police had pretty distinct reputations, the city police officer already referred to the county police officer as lazy and the pretty police you know they would have a can of mousse in their holders instead of their OC spray. And the county always referred to us as a bunch of cowboy drunks you know when we got out of the academy we were issued a gun, a badge and a flask. That's where the reputation is, and there was always that sort of rivalry between us.

110-My only thing was and then again it didn't matter to me one way or the other, but I think a lot of guys tend to have a misnomer that the city cops were nasty they did underhanded things. They weren't up front and some of the city guys thought the county guys didn't work. They didn't have to work. The types of jobs they were doing the policing was different you know you just have a different set of problems. I think a lot of the guys were thinking, the first thing that was said to me is are we going to merge with these pretty boys and then I heard one of the county guys say we're merging with these thugs. You know it was it seemed like a love hate relationship, actual reality, we needed each other.

County officers oftentimes referred to city officers as "thugs." "Thugs" were perceived by county officers as being a bunch of drunken cowboys—graduating from the academy with a gun, a badge, and a flask. County officers also believed that the "thugs" were incapable of policing in the county districts. By not having the luxury of backup, they would have to learn to talk to people instead of relying on brute force. There was

also the impression by county officers that the “thugs” did not have a good reputation with the community, the media, or their government and fear that this same relationship would carry over into the new administration. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by county police officers conveying these notions:

307-I started what we thought the city mindset was, was basically running and gunning, rag tag type perspective I had of those guys. The way the county did things we just had a hodge podge of different personalities. We have guys that would run and gun, we had guys that were lazy, and we had guys in the middle. I think the county way was that you tend to handle situations by yourself where they try to handle situations together. For instance on a particular traffic stop you might find three or four LPD patrolmen there. In the county we try to handle things like the state troopers do. You tend to handle things by yourself, we tend to cancel back-up more. So, I guess the county mentality was we're kind of like lone rangers, go ahead and cancel back-up, I'm okay you know we handle what might tend to be a four man run with two guys. So we tend to handle things with less officers.

406-I was not for merger, I was not pro-merger at all, I didn't want to merge with the city to be honest with you, and they had a lot of issues down here. They had a lot of race issues. They had a lot of respect issues, a lot of this and a lot of that. I knew a lot of the city officers down here and there wasn't a whole lot of, I didn't perceive a lot of professionalism. Since then I found out that that wasn't exactly the truth. There were a few, just like everyone has, a few bad apples. Those are the ones that I knew about. So, I was not for merger whatsoever.

303-Well just quite honestly city government never treated the policeman very well. My dad was a city officer for almost thirty years and after he retired after twenty nine years and in 1986 his salary was \$25,500. They didn't see the same money, the same benefits. I had a feeling that city government, that side of our government, was never going to treat our police fairly and well. They weren't on the same page.

Parity

If the ability to work together was the most frequently identified concern of police officers, “parity”—police officers receiving the same pay and benefits (i.e., health insurance, take home cars)—was perhaps the most divisive issue. The issue of parity was perhaps the one issue where there was going to be a winner and a loser. In other words,

in order to equalize the disparity between city and county police officers, someone was going to make gains and someone was going to experience a loss in pay and/or benefits—to some degree.

Most city police officers viewed consolidation as an opportunity to receive the same pay and benefits as county officers—capitalizing on the county's larger tax base. These officers felt as though they were doing the same job as the county and, therefore, should receive parity. However, there is some indication that, although many city officers were for parity, they were not necessarily for consolidation. These officers feared that what would possibly be gained through consolidation, in terms of pay and benefits, would not be worth the possible losses, especially the identity of their department. Still, there is some indication that city police officers believed that, with LPD being the larger department, not much would change for them. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city police officers convey these notions:

103- I was for merger only because it gave you the opportunity to police anywhere in Jefferson County. Our pay got brought up. The benefits were made better than what we had. Our take home cars, when I first came on the police department you had to wait three years to get a car. With the county police I think you waited a year.

105- Was I for merger? Yes I was and like I said, it was more financial. Pretty much, I don't want to say the merger was going to happen no matter, it wasn't like manifest destiny. I think there were a lot of community leaders saw it as a necessity and whatever else ambitions or politics that's beyond my realm.

110- Well yeah mainly because it gave me the ability to receive and upgrade in pay for one. I feel like I'm doing the same job as the county officer but I'm making less pay. I believe I was a good police officer before merger, I believe I was a good police officer during merger, and I'm a good police officer now. So I think I should have gotten the same rewards or received the same rewards as the county officers and I still feel that way that I should make as much as the J-town officers, but that's not the case anymore.

209- One it allowed the police department, the LPD officers to finally make some money. LMPD had been behind the eight ball for many, many years due to tax base. County had a large tax base. Because we did not have the benefits, we did not have the insurance. We did not have the things that larger departments of our size had. So, we were always a day late and a dollar short when it came to contract negotiations.

108- I was for parity I wasn't so much for merger. I was for everybody getting equal pay. People were really against merger.

On the other hand, about half of the county police officers viewed consolidation as a no win situation—believing that they had nothing to gain. At best, city officers would be brought up to their level and county officers would remain stagnant—not receiving any additional pay or benefits. Many of these officers went into consolidation expecting to lose—it was just a matter of how much. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by county police officers convey these notions:

310- I was not excited about it at all. I had signs in my yard, anti-merge signs when they went to vote. I was not excited about it at all. I knew there were benefits that were going to be lost.

309- No, I knew it was coming because you see that's the political climate. You see departments merging all over the country getting everybody under one umbrella. Well we knew it was coming we just braced for it. We just didn't know how bad we were going to get jammed up. We knew we were going to get it—we just didn't know how badly.

405-Oh yeah, well longevity and stuff really wasn't an issue the big issue was pay. We knew we had a better deal than our urban brethren and there was a lot of back and forth and speculation of how that would play out—whether they would freeze our pay and let them catch up that was a big theory. What came to pass in my opinion is they brought them up to where we were, but then they held everybody back.

408-I felt like we'd get the short end of the stick, city officers wanted to merge for parity which I never had an issue with them having parity, we do the same job basically work in the same area we should make the same amount of money but also realize that we did make considerably more money and once everybody got up to that we weren't going to get anything that would be the end of that.

410-You know the people I was around were very similar. They were concerned we were going to get screwed over; everybody was looking out for themselves.

Fear of Takeover

As alluded to earlier, the fear of a possible “takeover” concerned several county and only a few city police officers. The questions of “Who was going to be the chief?” and “How are policies going to be changed?” were on the minds of many. Police officers from both departments expressed a great deal of pride in their respective departments. The fear of losing their identity and their way of policing placed more emphasis on what former agency would emerge as the dominant and most influential force in the consolidation. However, this concern appeared to be expressed more frequently by county officers. From the county perspective, the fact that the city was the larger department and the Metro mayor was the former city mayor—not to mention the actions of their commanders during the early stages of consolidation—made it a reasonable assumption that the city would have more influence in the consolidation decision-making process, and the county would have to conform to the “city way” of doing things. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers convey these notions:

205-I think some of our concerns were that it wouldn’t go as planned. You know that whoever got in there, just like the county officers were concerned about a takeover, we were concerned about a takeover as well so.

209-The smaller police departments swallow the larger police department.

305-Oh it was a fear. It was you know who’s going to be our chief? Who’s going to be put in charge? Are we going to have to work for them are we going to have to adapt to a lot of their policies? Because I think a lot of guys were seeing it, wasn’t a merger. The county government, the county way, the county lifestyle was all being dissolved.

402-I think fear of the unknown and fear of a potential takeover. Because they had the people we didn't. They were going to get a great big pay raise. We were probably not going to see for a long time. And we're going to get the short end of that stick. I think that was more it than anything.

404-I think my biggest concern was will this be a total city takeover. Obviously they were the bigger agency. The mayor of the new metro government was going to be the former mayor of the city of Louisville and this was going to be a city police takeover.

Reactions: Retirements, Displeasure, Anger, and Resentment

Facing an uncertain future, fueled by perceptions of limited available information, police officers on both sides expressed positive and negative “reactions” to the passing of consolidation. About half of the county officers tended to express negative reactions toward consolidation—expressing displeasure, anger, and resentment. City officers, on the other hand, tended to express positive reactions toward consolidation—expressing excitement and positive anticipation. On one extreme, both city and county officers indicated that there was a mass exodus of police officers retiring. Based upon the responses, these officers simply did not want to go through the changes—choosing to leave the department under the banner of their respective departments. At this point, very few officers on either side indicated that there was any decrease in job productivity. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers convey these notions:

207-I was excited. When I heard it was coming, I really was, I was very excited. Because I was thinking well here's the kind of policing I've been doing or I have been able to do in the past with seven hundred and fifty men. You know the possibilities are almost unlimited when you add another four hundred and fifty officers to the mix.

208- It was a lot of anxiety because of the unknown. There was a lot of rumors, a lot of things that we weren't sure of. I mean it was change. It was something

we'd never been through. It wasn't bad because in the background, what we were all thinking, is it can't get much worse for us.

103-They were a lot of the younger officers, the old city guys and the old county guys said no I'm not going through this merger stuff, I'm out of here and a lot of them retired. Kind of the younger guys they don't really care they just wanted to police.

305-Oh you had mass exits on both sides. You had people retiring left and right. People that were waffling and wanting to stay and do 25-30 years said no I'm gone, I'm not even going to stay around to put up with it.

308- In my division no one liked it. Everybody was pretty much on edge wondering what was going to happen, how it was going to happen. I can't think of anyone who was happy merger was going to take place.

308-I don't think so and I was on mid watch so I only knew what mid watch was doing but we were still out there taking care of business. I don't think there was any less productivity you know we still made our runs we still policed.

306-I was actually hopeful, I was excited about it, had some enthusiasm. Okay things are going to improve and we're going to get bigger and things are going to get more efficient. We're going to kind of put ourselves on the map. People will look to us kind of like a flagship department. You know be progressive, follow what we do as we set standards kind of things. You had a lot of good things on the city and a lot of good things on the county.

Summary of Pre-consolidation Stage

The pre-consolidation stage was a very tense and emotional period for police officers on both departments. Police life, as they knew it, was surely going to change. The issues and concerns identified by officers with regard to this period included; 1) the practicality of consolidating departments, 2) fear of change, 3) various rumors surrounding consolidation, 4) commanding officers "jockeying" for positions, 5) concerns as to whether city and county officers could work together, 6) the issue of parity, and 7) the fear of a possible takeover of one department by the other. Of these seven, concerns as to whether officers from the city and county could work together were

the most frequently identified by officers on both departments. Although not the most frequently identified, the issue of parity was clearly the most divisive. Parity represented one of the few issues where the outcome was going to benefit one group of officers (city) more than the other (county).

Faced with a questionable future and limited available information on what was going to take place next, city and county police officers expressed both positive and negative reactions to the passage of consolidation. Anxious anticipation, hard feelings, displeasure, resentment, fear, and anger were reactions expressed by city and county officers. However, city officers tended to express more frequently positive reactions while county officers tended to express more frequently negative reactions toward consolidation. Yet, officers on both departments indicated that there was a mass exodus of police officers retiring from their department following the passage of consolidation, but also indicated that there was very little decrease in job productivity. For the most part, these reactions were directed primarily toward the organization with very little, if any, indication of these reactions directed toward supervisors. The reasoning regarding these findings will be discussed in more detail in chapter five.

Restructuring Stage

Resistance, Confusion, Chaos, and Tension

The restructuring stage of consolidation was a very unsettling time for several police officers—marked by reactions of resistance, confusion, chaos, and tension. The rapid changes, inconsistencies, and lack of information available to officers left many officers on both sides wondering what was going to happen next. The “new way” of doing things was quickly replacing the old. Officers, who once knew the names, or at

least recognized the faces, of their peers, were confronted with running into and working with officers they had never seen. As changes were being made and with reliable information in short supply, the consistency and predictability of policing, as well as the old bonds of camaraderie formed between police officers on their respective departments were beginning to fade. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers convey these notions:

105-Confusing, it was very confusing. Every day you didn't know what was going to happen when you came to work. You didn't know if your unit was going to be there. You didn't know if the people you work with are going to be there. It was very frustrating. It was very uh I don't want to say scary. Scary is not the right word. It's the uncertainty of the whole thing. Nothing was set in stone. Before, I'm sure it was like this on both side, both departments have been around a long time there was a framework of machinery. People were comfortable with it. Whether you could work with it or not work with it, it was there, you understood. After merger, I think we're still trying to figure out the framework of things and it's bits and pieces. But change is so constant right now, no one feels comfortable in their footing.

106-Yes, well that's a yes and no question. Like I said everyone resisted the change like everyone resisted the merger. They wanted to keep their own little world safe but with merger change came. And all these little kingdoms and chieftains of people things change, they couldn't keep them. Cops don't like change. People would get mad about the car situation. Someone would get mad because someone was driving a silver car over a white car, silly things.

107-One of the things was I thought as we expanded and more and more officers were coming in, we would lose the camaraderie because you wouldn't know everyone. It's a lot easier to know six hundred officers' than it was fourteen hundred officers. You're not going to know everybody on that personal level. You might recognize them and say hey how are you. They're more of an acquaintance not a friend. And I think the camaraderie was more important because if we're in a fight for our lives or running into a burning house, you really want to know that person that's going in there with you.

306-If you're consistent and you're fair in your actions and your decision making then I'm more stable on how I'm going to respond or react—whether I like it or not. I'm not saying everybody is going to like you. You know my mom always told me you can't please everybody but you can have people respect your

consistency. Not everybody is going to like you, but they know what's expected of them. Then there's stability.

407-I think because there was no communication from the top down I think that a lot of people felt like that we may have been making a change just to make the change, and either a) you don't need to know what's going on because we're not important enough or b) we're making the change and that's just the way it is.

Planning of Consolidation

During this stage, some of the decisions made by administrators included: 1) the planning of consolidation, 2) decisions made on the selection of the chief of police, 3) decisions made to change policies, and 4) decisions made in the decentralization of the new department—redistricting and reassignment of police officers. As a result of these changes, the fear of a takeover, for several officers had become a reality.

Overall, about half of the police officers viewed consolidation as being poorly “planned.” For the most part, planning was perceived as lacking the adequate information and input from officers on key decisions (i.e., redistricting). Police officers also believed that more time should have been taken in planning the department's restructuring. Although several officers indicated that they were on consolidation committees (i.e., committees to design uniforms, badges, colors and markings on vehicles, etc.) they believe these committees only addressed “cosmetic” changes and issues. In those decisions that most impacted police officers (i.e., officer safety, radio communication between officers, training facilities, restructuring and redistricting, etc)—the issue with the radios being the most frequently identified issue—most officers felt as though they had little or no voice. For the most part, these officers felt as though the administration was more interested in consolidating the two departments than they were in the interests of police officers. Few efforts were made to encourage officers to buy

into or have significant input into the consolidation process. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers convey these notions:

108-Jefferson County officers, former Jefferson County officers had ownership in their department and that was their department they wanted to take care of it they wanted it to be good, former Louisville officers had ownership in their department they owned it they wanted it to be good. When the two departments merged nobody really knew it wasn't anybody's department and so they didn't have a vested interest really in the new department so nobody really knew how to act, how to operate, how to think, what's going to happen and those that have been on for awhile have gone, since gone a lot of them, those that hadn't been on maybe a year to five years those officers are just now starting to come up you know and take some ownership in this new merged department.

210-Training, we don't even have a proper training facility for our people. Where do we drive? Anywhere we can find. What do we teach our recruits when we drive, oh well we're in a parking lot. We're not actually on a track. We don't have the facilities that the biggest police department in the state of Kentucky should have.

203-It is April 2010 for the last roughly nine or ten days we are finally using a merged, new radio system that should have happened right at merger time, cost or not it should've happened. It should not be a thing where I have to have a radio built to talk to my, again we'll go back to that re-structuring, I'm on an urban band, I'm on a suburban band but I can't talk to you I don't know what's going on over there with you. Here it is 2010 we finally get a radio system

305-Take their time; make a list of priorities that have to be merged immediately and what things we can merge down the road. I think were just slim slammed together—like our cars, our patch. I mean within a week, no within a month after they announced they were going to merge the metro government, we're out at the FOP lodge voting on what are cars our going to look like and what our badge is going to look like.

307-I think they listened to the officers on the external changes, meaning the uniform, how it's going to look like, the patch and the badge, but the internal workings; no I don't think they did enough listening to the officers.

409-People will be more cooperative if they buy into it, talk to them a little bit more instead of communication being forced fed downward. Let some of it come up because this is their police department too.

Although most police officers felt as though consolidation was poorly planned, at least one officer believed that consolidation took place at about the right pace. For this officer, taking more time would have potentially allowed those individuals, on both the city and county sides—who strongly resisted the idea of consolidation—to entrench themselves in their corner of the world and strategically present obstacles that would impede the successful completion of consolidation. For this individual, there was no other way to complete the consolidation but to make drastic and rapid changes. The following quote is the response given by this city officer conveying this notion:

205-I think he did a good job in immediately merging people together. If you were getting promoted, if you were in the eighth division he wouldn't pull you out and put you in the fourth, but if you were an officer and you came out of the eighth division you were going to the city. If you were a city officer before merger you were going to the county as a sergeant or a lieutenant. Whichever way, you were getting promoted. So I think he did a good job. We're going to start integrating these people because if not what you would have had the fourth division guys would have been held in their own containment area holding the fort down for the old city. County would have been out there full of county guys holding it up for the county guys.

Selection of Chief/Command

Another decision that was made during this period was the selection of the chief of police and his command. For several police officers, the selection of an outside chief was one of the better decisions made by the mayor. This decision symbolized an unbiased predisposition—favoring neither department—on the part of the administration. A chief chosen from either department would have been perceived as a potential power shift fueling perceptions of one department taking over the other. The selection of an outside chief also represented a change from the “good old boy” system. The fact that the chief was Black represented, to a few, an attempt to improve the perceived strained

relationships that LPD had with the Black community and, at the same time, disclosed some of the hidden biases of some police officers. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

104-I don't know if they actually knew what would happen until they got a chief in place. I know Robert White is well known for being a change agent and I think you did need a chief like that that's a change agent. I think it would have been extremely dangerous to go with a chief from either department. I think that would have poo poo'd a lot of people early on. I think as soon as it began to take place there needed to be less secrecy. I think people feel a lot more comfortable when you say this is what's going to happen the first year, this is what's going to happen the second year, and this is what we're working towards. Eventually we are going to get there but everybody has to climb on board.

110-I think some of the steps they made worked out well for all us. When they hired the chief, I think that's a direction that we hadn't tried in several years since I've been in Louisville and definitely since I've been a police officer. I think it was time for someone else to hold the reins for a while.

207-Well I'll start at the top the process of putting in a new chief. I don't think either department liked it because each department was looking for one of their guys to be chief and head this thing. But from a mayoral point of view, I think it had to be an outside guy because if he would have appointed a chief from either department whatever department he didn't come from they would say the hell with him. You know you would have problems that horse would get out from underneath him right away. So I think he had to go outside. I don't think it should be that way with the next chief because we've been merged long enough to have a chief from within.

403-I think the decision to bring in an outside chief was good. If you would have used one of the chiefs from either department, I think that would have caused too much strife.

301-Wherever he would have pulled from and old county or an old city part of the department would say oh man he's playing favoritism. So they did do that one right. I think he looked for a black chief to smooth things over in the Black community.

Not all officers agreed with this selection. Several officers on both sides believed that the chief should have been selected from inside, or at least been a respected retired former city or county commander. A candidate selected from this group was believed to

have more of a vested interest in the department, would have a better understanding of the history between the two departments, and would have a better relationship with officers. Also, a few of these officers did not agree with the selection based upon the assumed loyalty the he would have to the mayor—an individual not perceived as being a strong supporter of the police. Distrust for this selection was also indicated by the perception of outside influences in the selection of the chief. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

108-First of all, who was going to take the helm, who was going to lead the ship? It was really, really disappointing when they went outside of both departments to select somebody to lead the merged departments. The other thing that I thought was disappointing were some of the people they had in the running were retired and they were trying to bring them back in. No, you've got people that are well qualified from both departments that's you need to be looking at. If anybody is going to trust it's going to have to be somebody from either side versus someone coming from the outside, which is exactly what happened. Somebody came from the outside and they were somebody's boy you know.

203-So our chief who was an instructor for (*name of institution*) from time to time—fine. But he right off the bat names his number two guy as a guy who was involved in the interview process and the selection process of chief of police. So I didn't like that, my own personal thought. Again, no control over that process. It doesn't make me mad. It's not so much that I was angry or upset or anything it's just the fact that it was just hinky. I didn't like the fact that our departments weren't involved in the selection process.

301- Honestly, no. I think the chief was brought in to do a job. His loyalty is to mayor, his two first Lt. Colonels were sell outs. They were going to go with whatever. I don't think they stepped up—one was former city and one was former county. I don't think they every stepped up and said we've always done it like this and it always worked.

304-I think I would have tried like I said promote a chief from within one of the two departments and went that route. I think it might have went a little smoother for the officers just for the fact they would have known this guy, at least had an idea of who he was and whether they were able to expressly trust him. If they would have had a guy that everybody trusted and was a good guy they would have had no reason to not respect or accept him as chief. Now who would that have been I don't know. I think that did a lot for morale when he brought in an

outsider but then again it brought both sides together now we're both going to hate this guy.

302-I think so I don't think it's to the same degree. It kind of the more things change the more they stay the same type thing. I can't say for sure I knew when Chief White came here being an African American that all the good ole boys from the former city and the former county were going to resent him number one because he was black. I knew he had a tough thing to do coming here being an outsider coming here trying to put two police departments together with two different cultures.

Policies and Procedures

Another decision that that drew officers' attention during this stage was the development of policies and procedures for the new department. This process, for several officers, was nothing short of a nightmare. At one point during the consolidation, it was indicated that three sets of policies were circulating throughout the department at the same time—LPD's SOP (Standard Operating Procedures), JCPD's GDM (General Directives Manual), and LMPD's policies (a work in progress). The constant changing and revision of policies made it difficult, if not impossible, to know what actions were in line with departmental policies or which set of policies was being used. With city officers working in county districts under county supervision and management and, county officers working in city districts under city supervision and management, police officers feared that their inability to know which policies were being applied would lead to unfair disciplinary actions. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

104-Just constant changes you know I think you need to take one change at a time and make sure it's successful before you change every policy or let's go to wireless and let's do this. It's almost like we don't get one thing working very well before we're into something else.

204-We're bombarding with policy updates, now on the computer and you go check it and you might have five or six policies that you have to go through. Then there will be a revision to that because there was some mistake or there's something else that has changed. It gets to the point where along with all the other email you're supposed to keep track of it just becomes noise and there's no human that can keep up with the volume of information that we are expected to be accountable for.

203-We had the county's general orders, our policies and procedures and we had SOP that came out. It was a mess. I didn't know the county's general orders, had no clue. I had never seen them, never read them. I mean you've got mass confusion. Am I going to get gigged, am I going to get written up because I violated a general order on you're the county side? Are you going to get in trouble because you violated a policy and procedure that you never read and never saw?

405-Well it was an interesting time to be on either department. They were trying to cram these SOP and GDM together. So daily there were policy changes you had to keep up with.

305-I think the way it is now our policy and procedure manual is more of a you shall. We even have it on our email. You have to log in and you have to read the new policies and you have to submit your name saying you actually read the new policy. You don't sign off on anything anymore. It's everyday and becomes a hassle where you have to do a revision, to the revision, to the revision and these guys that are studying for the sergeant's test and the lieutenant's test they honestly don't know what policy questions are going to be asked because there's been twenty revisions since they announced the test. It's just little things instead of combining and taking the best of the city and the best of the county and making that the norm they're just like okay we'll take a little bit of this and a little bit of that and we'll see what happens and we'll do twenty revisions on it until it comes out the way we want it. There were so many things, they rushed it. They came out hey yeah we won the vote merger. Let's make it happen overnight. Merging something like that I mean corporate businesses are not merged overnight.

Decentralization: Redistricting

Several police officers indicated that the new structure of LMPD was based upon the philosophy of decentralization. "Decentralization," in the context of this study, is based upon the idea of focusing more resources (i.e., manpower and investigative responsibilities) back into the districts; more police officers are reassigned back into the

districts and on the streets. In order to accomplish this task, the overall structure of the department would have to change. Two changes identified most frequently by police officers included, 1) redistricting of divisions, and 2) downsizing or elimination of certain units and reassignment of police officers.

The consolidation of LPD and JCPD left the new department faced with the decision on how to structure its existing 10 divisions/districts (6 former LPD divisions and 4 former JCPD districts). The decision was made by LMPD administrators to merge the 10 divisions/districts into 8 divisions—resulting in boundary changes to individual beats (areas within a division assigned to patrol officers). Several city and very few county officers expressed their confusion and displeasure over how these divisions were designed. Although it was indicated that studies had been conducted to help in construction of these divisions, police officers believed that, with their knowledge and expertise in these areas, they should have had more input in this decision making process. According to officers, the decision to redistrict the division was counterproductive to evening out the workload across divisions and their ability to provide adequate services and protection to the community. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

103-Like I said before, they need help in designing divisions and how much coverage you should have within a division, how many miles, square miles in a division to either shorten them or expand them. I probably would have explained a little bit more on how this was going to take place.

201-No one thought that those were proper. To this day people cannot understand why a beat pattern exists in the way that it does, why some divisions go to the points that they do.

207-Now with the restructuring of the districts that was a nightmare. They brought in this outside agency to give them advice on how the districts should be

restructured and why and there was some public outcry because some of the neighborhoods that were getting split up as far as what police district would service them and from an internal point of view. We looked at how they came out with these districts. I think there were four county districts and six city districts so there were ten districts. They went from ten districts to eight districts. The districts got a lot bigger and the officers were like how can we do this. I don't care if the district gets bigger but, if the district gets bigger you have to have a lot of small beats. The beats didn't get any smaller; the districts got bigger the beats got bigger. So the officer you've got assigned to this beat was thinking well how do I patrol this? They spend most of their time in transit, driving back and forth. Where if you make a bunch of small beats the officers can actually focus on who lives on their little small piece of geography and focus on being reactionary and proactive at preventing crime and if a crime does occur find out who did it and get them put in jail. But when the districts got so stretched out going from ten to eight it became a problem.

404-That's the only thing that bothers me as far as the eight divisions I understand the need for that, and a lot of people say we should have ten divisions, but I think you have to be a financial realist it would have been hard because you would have been adding two more sets of command staff and there's a lot of money involved in that and we can barely maintain the buildings we have. So I'm okay with that. I don't understand the way they drew some of the lines, the divisions right there in the city just really don't make sense to me.

Decentralization: Reassignments

At the same time the department was restructuring divisions and beat boundaries, officers were being reassigned to different divisions and units. For some officers, these "reassignments" were problematic—officers were simply unsure where they were going to end up. Of those decisions made to decentralize the department, the disbanding of LPD's Street Crime Unit and the subsequent reassignment of those officers was identified as an area of concern by several city and a few county officers. For these officers, the Street Crimes Unit fulfilled a need to effectively address street level crimes. In their minds, the disbanding of the unit created a void in their crime-fighting capabilities. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

101-You know everybody complains about the street crimes unit got disbanded and all of that. I don't know how effective they were, but if there is not a unit that is addressing what they were doing now you know there's a void there.

202-Well I knew it was going to have to happen. We all knew it was going to have to happen. It took awhile for them to do it and then the chief came in with decentralization and I didn't particularly care for what it was he was doing. As far as the movement of the officers in the different divisions and trying to mix and merge stuff I mean you knew it had to be done, but the decentralization part which was the chief's plan you know part of it for merger, I didn't like.

206-Well, the chief came in and he said his big thing was decentralization, decentralization, decentralization. We have too many specialized units that handle problems throughout our county. We shouldn't have that, we should bust those officers up, do away with those units and move them back to their divisions, let their expertise be in the divisions so the divisions can handle the problems. Which on the surface it sounds like a good thing, but it doesn't work like that. Those guys or gals who were in what used to be street crimes or metro intelligence, narcotics or vice or whatever unit he disbanded when he came in, they don't go out into the divisions and start serving as a small crimes unit or a small vice intelligence unit. They put on a uniform again and they start riding a beat and they work from hour A to hour B and they're gone because they're on a street platoon they're not plainclothes detective now. That alters their schedule based on the problems that are going on in the division, the divisions already had those they were called flex units or impact platoons.

301-I mean he started breaking up like the street crimes unit and things like that. As a chief I disagreed with some of those things. You've still got to be aggressive. Criminals are aggressive you need aggressive police officers. When you do away with units that have had positive numbers in reducing crime and don't replace them in any way shape or form, saying well patrol will pick that up. Well patrol is tied to that radio they can't sit and watch the corner drug dealer until he does a hand to hand.

406-I was getting bounced around from place to place. A lot of people were in places they had never been before, didn't want to be there... I think it was kind of chaotic because we didn't know where we were going to end up.

Fear of Takeover: A Reality

As a result of the changes during this stage of consolidation, several county and a few city officers' fears of a "takeover" was becoming a reality. In other words, these officers perceived everything went either the city's way or the county's way. These

officers believed that the decisions made to change policies, restructure the command, and the influences over the general practices of the department favored one department over the other. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

107- I've always thought that I've never known of any other merger where the smallest unit takes over the biggest unit. I mean 660 merge with 420, it seemed to be that most of the command staff came from the county, but in hindsight, I never thought about it but that county command staff was picked under the judge executive and then Armstrong was a judge executive so he would be more in line with their thinking anyhow. The police chief is given a lot of latitude in whom to pick but it's ultimately going to be up to the mayor. So I always thought it was more the county side. The policies and procedures and command structure went the county's way. It was commonly referred to as a hostile takeover I mean we wanted the county's monetary contracts but and don't change anything else. I'm a professional. You just adapt and overcome and continue doing your job. It's not going to change the way I police nor change the way I look at things.

302-When we merged yeah my worst fear came to be it wasn't a merger it was more like we were absorbed into the city. Everything went to the City of Louisville way. No more county anything. Payroll, everything was done the way the city did it. The policies and procedures kind of shifted to their level. The city at the time we merged had three policy and procedure manuals, the county had one General Directives Manual to use as a guideline.

403-I don't know if I can answer that objectively. I feel like it wasn't fair. I feel like every time I turned around I was looking at a city commander who was molded towards the city way of doing things which didn't mean it always was the best way, not that the county way was the best way I just felt like this is the way it's going to be and you have to deal with it.

406-To a degree I do believe that it was a takeover. I can say this, the administration that came in attempted to do things fairly by including both sides and bringing both sides to the table

Reactions: Retirements and Decreased Work Productivity

Police officers reacted to the decisions made during restructuring in different ways. Several police officers indicated that the morale of the department was extremely low. City and county officers expressed feeling of unhappiness, anger, and resentment

toward the administration. These officers also indicated that everyone was looking for someone to blame for the problems within the department. As a result, some officers chose to retire—however, not at the same rate as during the pre-consolidation stage. In part, decreases in officers' work productivity were attributed to the low morale. These decreases were identified by officers as ranging from very little to officers shutting down. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

102-Well, before it didn't matter if we liked the chief or not. We were going to make the chief look good. It was that sense of family. We argued just like any family would, but in the end we were all headed toward the same goal. That's gone. Like I said I'm very close to a lot of the majors, colonels in my department but those top three I would not offer them a seat on a row boat to get off of a sinking ship.

105-Everything plummeted, morale plummeted, production plummeted, a lot of finger pointing. COs were pointing at each other, lieutenants were pointing at sergeants, sergeants pointing at lieutenants, lieutenants pointing at majors and vice versa all the way up and down. It's a blame game.

106-There was a lot of resentment I think on both sides. You know when you have an officer that retires and his last day going into court he goes back to his old uniform when he goes to court, that's just making a statement. We've already gone into metro uniform and his last day retirement he goes into court; he wears his old city uniform, stripe the whole nine yards.

306-I love my job, I love what I do like I said I've left and tried to do other things but I still come back to it, I love my job. I don't like the department.

310-I don't know that morale has ever been the same since merger. I mean we all get along but I don't hear people say how much they love to come to work. We used to say it all the time, man I love coming to work this is so much fun, I love working with these people. I think a lot of people have bad attitudes about it still and it still lingers and you're like quit your bitching, you know it's been seven years, I mean you don't think about it as merger but I think it's a result of merger that people are still complaining about stuff.

410-You get people with five years on acting like they've got thirty five years on hating their job. I think you've got a low amount of productivity because people are unhappy.

Reactions: Keep Doing Their Jobs

Despite the reports of low morale and decreases in work productivity, several of the participants indicated that police officers "kept doing their jobs," but did nothing more than the minimum required of them. Although these respondents indicated that there were many unhappy officers on the department, the sense of professionalism kept them focused, for the most part, on their duties. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

108-I just kept doing what I was supposed to do. Some stuff I was alright with other things I didn't necessary agree with but I'm a professional you just adapt and overcome and continue doing your job. It's not going to change the way I police, you know. No changes changed the way I police or look at things.

203-No I can't say that anybody like slacked off or laid down because of merger. I mean it was what it was. I mean the community voted for this. Even if you were against it and you had a no merger sign in your yard it didn't matter, it was going to happen, it's happening and it happened.

306-So you're putting somebody who had been comfortable now in an uncomfortable position which is not necessarily a bad thing. I saw a lot of unhappy people. I was fairly new so I didn't have a lot of experience on how things ran, what departments did what and such. I was young, excited and eager to ride the streets. I mean I just think you can't force feed adults they're going to rebel against you; they might not do it out in the open but behind closed doors they're not going to eat what you're feeding them. They got lazy and didn't want to go out and do stuff, they would just spin and grin is what we called it, just out riding around in their cars spinning their tires and just grinning.

408-Some responded better. I mean you've still got a lot of officers that are very professional and will always be professional whether they like what's going on or not. They've got a job to do and that's what they're going to do. But then you've got others that are crying malcontent that were probably never really happy before we merged and never going to be happy. Well of course the work slows down when all you want to do is get together and fuss. It wasn't about locking up bad guys anymore they were just angry.

404-Yeah I think there were some people who laid down and quit working, I mean there were some people of course who retired, they were able to retire, without a doubt no matter what you do it's going to happen whenever you have change. I think for the most part people stayed focused and did their job and moved on with it but there were a lot of people yeah it definitely affected their work product.

Summary of Restructuring Stage

The restructuring stage of LMPD's consolidation was identified by police officers as a period of rapid change and the reality that a new way of policing was drawing near. The lack of reliable information regarding these changes left some officers confused—wondering what was going to happen next. During this stage, participants identified four primary decisions made by administrators that reflected the concerns and reactions of police officers during this period.

First, most police officers viewed the “planning” of consolidation as being poor. These officers also indicated that they had little voice in those decisions affecting their lives. Second, several officers viewed the selection of an outside chief of police as being one of the better decisions made by the administration—symbolizing a change from the “good old boy system” prevalent on their respective departments. Still, several officers indicated that the chief should have been selected from a group of retired LPD or JCPD commanders—believing that such a selection would have generated more respect from the officers for this person. Third, several officers mentioned the nightmarish experience police officers endured during the changing of the department's policies. At one point during the stage, three sets of policies were circulating—the SOP of LPD, the GDM of JCPD, and the new SOP of LMPD. The constant revisions and not knowing what policies were being used left some officers feeling fearful of unfair disciplinary actions.

Fourth, several city and a few county officers indicated that the redistricting and reassignment of police officers was problematic. Specific attention was given to the restructuring of the districts and the disbanding of LPD's Street Crimes Unit. In general, these officers expressed confusion on how these changes were made and felt that the administration should have solicited the advice of officers before making their final decisions. Finally, for several county officers and a few city officers, the fear of a takeover had become a reality. For these officers, the decisions made during this stage reflected the dominance one agency had over the other in influencing the changes that had occurred within the department.

In general, several officers indicated that some officers were unhappy and angry about the changes that occurred during this stage. Along with morale being down, some police officers stated that there was a decrease in work productivity—to varying degrees. Despite these responses, several officers indicated that, out of a sense of professionalism, most officers continued to do their job—although doing only the minimum that was required of them.

Stabilization Stage

As LMPD began to come into its own, the identity of the department began to take shape. Although changes and adjustments continued to occur, the foundation was well established—a degree of stabilization had arrived. However, the effects of the consolidation were still fresh in the minds of many officers. After all was said and done, officers identified what they perceived as being the advantages (i.e., the ability to work together, more opportunities, and parity) and disadvantages (i.e., the constant change,

lack of leadership, parity, and loss of history of the two departments and police experience) of the consolidation and predicted challenges facing the infant department.

Advantages of Consolidation

Working Together

One advantage of consolidation identified by a large number of police officers was that the “thugs” and the “pretty boys” could actually work together. Now that officers on both sides have had the opportunity to work with each other, most police officers realize that their concerns and fears regarding the differences in styles and philosophies of policing and their predispositions regarding reputation of the others were, for the most part, unwarranted. Over time, each has proven that they are deserving of the reciprocal giving and receiving of respect, trust, and camaraderie of the other. City and county officers have come to a realization that there are good and bad officers from both sides. They have come to realize that their stereotypical perceptions of each other were a reflection of their own overgeneralizations, biases, and prejudices. Although there continue to be “jokes” reflecting these old perceptions, in some ways, they are now a reflection or acknowledgement of the ignorance that they both shared.

Police officers, now having worked in both former city and former county districts, have also developed a degree of understanding as to why there were differences between the two departments in policing styles and philosophy (i.e., based on geographic makeup of their respective jurisdictions, population, levels of crime, etc.). Although a few diehard former city and county officers remain adamantly opposed to the changes, a new camaraderie has emerged from the battle of consolidation. Overall, consolidation has not only benefited the individual officer (by diversifying their experiences and

opening their eyes to their own biases and prejudices), but has diversified and improved the department—giving it better tools, in the form of better police officers to serve the community. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers convey these notions:

103-Ah it's smooth. You know we're kind of at a point where we been in merger so long, you still have the county and city jokes oh your code numbers starts with a six man watch out, oh your code number starts with a two. You know they're county/city code numbers but, you know everybody now. I think everybody works well together. You know you've got lazy people that were once county police officers and lazy people that used to be city police officers, then you've got your metro, guys that came in at metro are lazy too. The climate that we work in I don't think anybody holds anything over anybody's head of who you are or where you came from as far as jokes that's probably the only thing they say anymore. Oh man you still carry mousse are you still drinking on duty.

104- The advantages are I think people don't want to exert the energy to change, but I think I was kind of put in that position to change and I think merger has allowed me to learn a lot about where my own bigotry lies. Am I the bigot that doesn't like somebody just because there a county officer or just a city officer? Am I a person that can't work through that? So, I think merger has forced me and a lot of other people to work through the uncomfortable situations that makes you grow. I think if you can work through that uncomfortableness, personally, you can be more effective in somebody else's home trying to help them work through something. I think that's a huge advantage.

207-I believe my thought process shifted because I was seeing a lot of heads up county guys who were wanting to go out there and get after it and once they were given the opportunity to they were chop, chop. I was really impressed with a lot of county guys.

302-I think so I think because of merger a lot of the former county guys went downtown and a lot of the former city guys came out here so we each got to see the culture and what they had to go through. So I think that helped us understand them a little more and vice versa.

410-Maybe a little more acceptance from one to the other, maybe a little more tolerance, you know It's inevitable it's going to happen you can fight it or go with it. I mean I've always respected what the city guys did. You know you had a different style of policing. The city I think policed in a lot rougher areas and there was a lot more potential for violent actions. But at the same time they had back-up within two minutes. You could have thirteen cars there backing you up where

on the county beat you'd be out there all by yourself. You had a whole different way you had to police you had to be able to talk with your mouth and your brain. You had to be a little more diplomatic than the city did. I think maybe the city guys that work way out in the county had a little better appreciation for that and I think the county guys that went to the city had a little bit more appreciation of what they went through.

310-It is what it is we're metro now. I mean we'll poke fun a little bit. You know next door to us is guys in fraud and there's a city guy and there's a county guy in there and there's a dry erase board and they'll write stuff or they'll talk or they'll make fun. Are you going to 60 and 841 today and that kind of thing because that was the way the county used to call streets and interstates back there and ten codes and that kind of stuff. So that kind of stuff still hangs around but for the most part we all feel like we're on the same department now.

What was once viewed as a battle between city and county has evolved into a battle that has unified city and county police officers against a common enemy—Louisville Metro Government. In part, this perception could be attributed to the initial resistance by officers on both departments to consolidate, the displeasure of some officers regarding the decisions made during consolidation, or to the perceived antagonistic relationship that existed between former LDP officers and their city government—a concern identified earlier by a few county police officers. As one county officer stated:

305-It's funny now I think it went right at merger from us versus them right after merger it went to us versus the government, us versus who we work for. I think a lot of it is just because some of your people that were just so miserable to be around, I hate city, I hate county, I think those people have all since retired.

Increased Opportunities

Another advantage of consolidation, according several officers, has been the increased “opportunities” within the department. In other words, the larger LMPD has increased the size of some units, provided more opportunities for promotions, created more opportunities to make lateral moves throughout the department, developed more resources for the department (i.e., money, equipment, information sharing, and

manpower), and increased the effectiveness of fighting crime by eliminating the boundaries that divided city and county. At the same time, the department and its officers have been held more accountable to the public by the administration. For a few officers, consolidation has provided an opportunity to identify the flaws of the former departments and has redefined the police officer's role within both the department and the community. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

101-I think so I think there's been a, I said this at the beginning when you asked something about change as far as was it good or bad. I think there's an accountability that's here now even in the last I don't know six or seven months with this court change and all of that, it's been good you know and a lot of people when they're friends they want to say all of these changes, this court stuff its crazy and I think you have to hold people accountable. If you never set the standards out of the gate then people are never going to comply. Another advantage is strictly for the citizens. You don't have any debate on county/city lines; the debate now is it on J-town or is it St. Matthews?

210-Merger has identified the flaws of each agency as it pertains to officers understanding their role in the community.

207-The advantages well the supposed advantages or what I was thinking of when I was so excited about merger coming in the first place. You basically double your man power, instead of seven hundred and fifty you've got twelve hundred and fifty or whatever it came up to. You've got an air unit that can cover the whole city all of the time. You've got a mounted patrol that will go anywhere in this city. You've got a homicide unit that you can draw on the experience of county homicide people and city homicide people. And those units can each individually get better because you know one department may have been weak, another department is strong you put them together and they get better.

401-Well I think one of the advantages across the board for people at least initially more it opened up a lot more job opportunities for officers and it's the little things that could affect it. A lot of times it was beneficial for the city, they didn't have an air unit, they got an air unit, they didn't have a river patrol, and they got a river patrol. They've got river boats now so it's job opportunities for the officers that wanted to go to be pilots, ride horses, ATV's, get on bikes because the county police didn't have a big bike platoon, didn't have the halo platoon and different things like that. So I think it opened up some different

opportunities for people to work in different areas, explore different things and take different career paths, but at the same time they also decentralized a lot of the detective positions.

303-Wow I think the advantages of merger is it took two departments that were middle of the road and shook things up and put a new face on things.

City Officers Obtaining Parity

Finally, for a few city officers, consolidation has proven advantageous in that it has provided them the opportunity to achieve parity—being put on the same level as county officers in terms of pay, benefits, and take-home car privileges. For these officers, consolidation afforded them the long-term benefit of improving the quality of their lives and increasing the return on their pensions. None of the county officers mentioned parity as an advantage of consolidation. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city police officers conveying these notions:

103-Advantages for us being the city guys was the health insurance, the pay, we started to get uniform allowances, we are now one of the largest departments. I think we are the largest department in Kentucky. Those are the advantages. We got to step up to what the county guys were making and we're all across the board, same.

202-The advantages for us has been more money. More money makes your pension better.

110-Well like I said for me the advantages have been more money. I got my car, better insurance and the ability to go to an area and work in an area of town that I would not have if we didn't merge.

108-Obviously, on a personal level, initially was higher pay. Has that stayed that way? No, we probably taken a pay cut when you look at things. Yeah, we got a nice pay raise, we got parity with county.

Disadvantages of Consolidation

Constant Change

Despite these advantages, consolidation has not been without its perceived disadvantages. About half of the officers, both city and county, indicated that one of the disadvantages of consolidation is still “constant change”—especially when it comes to policies. The perceptions of frequent changes and more restrictions made in policies—many of which are perceived as being knee-jerk reactions due the actions of a few officers, have resulted in many officers feeling frustrated. These changes have left officers to feel as though they are being handcuffed and unable to do their jobs effectively, and may face undeserving punishment as the department attempts to hold itself and its officers more accountable to the public. However, there is some indication that this accountability is perceived to only apply to police officers and not commanding officers. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

105-Stop the constant change. If you're going to do policy and procedure, do it once a year. Let them learn what they need to learn before you change it again.

204-For instance we have a court policy now that is out of control. You had some officers who missed court legitimately or not we've created a whole new bureaucracy to take care of those. We now have a lieutenant in charge of the court liaison office and you have several hoops you have to jump through to verify you went to court. And then you have some hoops you have to jump through on the way out the door, what time you signed out, what the disposition was, the whole nine yards. I think there's always a danger in becoming too caught up in the specifics of a policy as opposed to a general guiding set of principles. And to me it's as big a difference as treating someone as a child and treating someone as a professional.

301-Get rid of the SOP go with a GDM instead of an SOP. That to me the SOP is so binding. No matter people are going to make mistakes. There are always going to be one or two bad guys that slip through the process. But the SOP, like I

said, there's new rules constantly. You know you almost feel hobbled. There's been guys that have said man I'm scared to go out and do anything, hell you can get in trouble for anything

404-The policies are knee jerk reactions. They talk about accountability. The chief said in a meeting that accountability was going to be the key word for the year. Well the only thing that I've seen was that they're holding their officers accountable, but they're not holding their command staff accountable. I don't care what the chief says, accountability is very important, but I think that one thing he's forgotten is that accountability starts at the top and works its way down, not the other way around. They'll set a comp stat and they'll hammer officers for low activity, but I never hear them say a word the district commander.

Lack of Leadership

Another perceived disadvantage of consolidation, identified by a few city and several county officers, has been the lack of leadership. Although most of these officers indicated that they felt consolidation was managed well, they perceive that there has been a lack of leadership, respect and support, and that the administration has been out of touch with its officers throughout the process. Although there are attempts to hold officers accountable for their actions, a few officers believe that the administration fails to hold its commanders accountable for their actions. These perceptions are believed to be a contributing factor in the distrust officers have for the administration and the low morale problem of the department. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

110-They're just not happy with the administration because from what I understand, it looks like the administration is more so trying to fire them rather than trying to help them. That's just like this court stuff we're going through now. Everybody's getting these days and 48 hour notices and writing letters and stuff because the news media wrote an article and got everything stirred up.

105-We need strong leadership, we need focus. You know this could be a great department as one because we had two good departments taking care of business each way and ended up fighting each other. You know I mean just staring at each other, being angry with each and then finding out hey look we're all cops let's just

go on. We need to find focus, come together and move on. It's somewhat there right now, but we need to stop the constant changes. If the constant change stops, I think more people will get more grounded, feel secure where they are in their footing in their job that they will be okay. With LMPD, they're vast potential but there's also vast potential for disaster still.

208-I think our future is strong again I like the idea Louisville Metro Police, I like what we have going on. I do think the administration; we do need some new leadership. I think the administration was good for what it did, the change but I don't see them being leaders where we need to go in the future. I think that they were here and the decisions they made were the ones that we needed to get made back then, the hard choices but to that aspect I think we need some leadership in the future.

306-That's what I'm saying there's just that lack of respect. You know what I think this would fix a lot of things, there are a lot of little things I've done to make the department merge better but I think this is number one. If we had a leader like the mayor's office or something like that somebody that supported us and said these are my guys, these are my girls, this is my police department then we would do whatever they asked.

308-One of the biggest headaches on the department would have to be is how they disperse the disciplinary. What applies to officers don't apply to them.

407-I think that first leader that comes in after merger is going to be crucial that first leader has to be able to relate to the people of both cultures in both organizations and has to analyze things and look at people for their knowledge, skills and abilities and put people in their right places. Do we have someone that can do that do we have someone that can lead us five, ten years down the road? I think the uncertainty and the ambiguity and the lack of communication on where this road was going was probably one of my biggest concerns.

404-The biggest disadvantage from what I've seen is that we've become a little more out of touch with our personnel because we've become such a big organization and I think we need to do more be more understanding of the officers out there, I think we've become a little bit less like a family and obviously the bigger your organization is the bigger the challenge. I think it's going to be rocky for awhile because of money I think money is going to be an issue for awhile I think you have to be realistic about that but I do think that we're at a turning point right now and I think if our new chief does not try to take into consideration the perceptions of the officers we're going to be in trouble because I think we're right there, we're right there

Parity: County Officers' Loss of Benefits

For several county officers, parity is still a very sensitive issue and is perceived as being one of the disadvantages of consolidation. For these officers, nothing was gained for them through consolidation. County officers indicate that the lack of a decent pay raise, increased cost of benefits (i.e., medical insurance), and changes in policies (i.e., take-home car policies) means they have actually lost money due to consolidation. None of the city officers mentioned parity as a disadvantage of consolidation. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by county police officers conveying these notions:

309-I didn't hear one officer say anything positive about the merger because the county officers we stood to gain nothing from the merger, absolutely zero. It showed after merger. We didn't get anything, not a raise or nothing. We got froze right where we were to bring the city up to where we were and there was nothing for us to gain out of merger and everything to lose.

304-I think the disadvantage I think if someone was just to ask I would say pay. you know when you had two different governments paying their officers they could pay what they want now that you have 1200 plus officers money becomes more of an issue, more of an issue because now it's determined on one department so you're only going to be allotted a certain amount so I think it hurts that way.

308-Advantages, I honestly can't think of one. I haven't had a decent pay raise since merger. They dinged us on our take home as far as taking out of pocket for take home vehicles, jacked our insurance.

408-Advantages I see none. Disadvantages, before county officers were happy they had money, the city was miserable and they had no money and now everybody is miserable and everybody is broke.

Loss of History

For a few police officers, consolidation has resulted in a loss of history and, more important, a loss of experience—perceptions more frequently identified by city officers.

For these officers, the loss of seasoned veteran officers—due in part to retirements and officers simply leaving the department—has resulted in a younger, inexperienced department. For these officers, the history of their old departments was not respected nor did it have any value in the new department—leaving some officers resenting the administration for not respecting the heritage of the two departments. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

106-Part of the disadvantage if you will, if you want to look at anything, both sides have gone through a certain walk through their history and in that period of walk in today's time is looked down on. Does that make sense?

102-Respect our culture? No, I don't think so. Just like the academy setting, we had to get rid of all former departments' memorabilia, anything that was former city or former county was replaced with anything post merger. I disagree with getting rid of the history of both departments.

203-I'll tell you what's been a huge disadvantage; you got people who have twenty-twenty-five year's experience that would have stayed or would stay if things were better and I mean not so much pay and benefits better but backing of their people that are retiring and leaving and going to work for other departments or just flat out retiring and they are losing all of that experience

206-Better, one thing that was a horrible outcome of merger is we got really young, really quick. Those guys who had been on had all of that experience and all of that knowledge when merger happened a ton of them left, I ain't dealing with this, I ain't dealing this ain't my department, I'm retiring see you

407-I think LMPD is in a very precarious situation right now to be honest with you; we're losing a lot of people, we losing a lot of experience. We don't value our employees as far as their knowledge, skills and experience and I hate to use this term but we're recruiting everyone and retaining no one. We have a lot of youth and inexperience, we have a lot of people that I think are craving leadership, we're not developing our people for long term plans as if we should, we're not developing first line supervisors or mid-level management.

Hope for the Future

Still, several police officers feel optimistic or hopeful for LMPD's future. As more Metro officers are hired in—replacing and coming close to out-numbering former city and county officers—city and county police officers believe that a new culture is emerging that will have no recollection of the old city-county ways. Although these officers feel that this will not occur until the last city and the last county officer is gone, the new Metro officers will have the opportunity to write their own history. Only when this occurs, in these officers' minds, will consolidation come to fruition. The following quotes are a sample of the responses given by city and county police officers conveying these notions:

102-Again, I'm hopeful. I see things swinging like a pendulum and we're just about to the point where the pendulum is going to swing back the other direction. So, again I see the more of the old that retire and replaced with the new it becomes its own entity and creates its own history.

101-The future is good. I would say we're such a young department I don't know the statistics but we're looking at a very young police department where a lot of that city/county view, he's city, he's county view has gone because if you've still got that in the back of your mind I'm city, he's county, how it going to work.

206-I am optimistic on our future. I think we have gone through some growing pains or merging pains if you want to call it that and there is one thing I know for a fact there are some good people on this department that have their hearts and their minds in the right place that want to do good by the citizens here and I look at that and I see that as our foundation and our foundation is good, and strong, and solid.

409-Merger will not truly take place until people like me from the city or the county move on and people who were hired after merger that's all of the agency they know, you know this is a merged department. I don't know nothing about the city I don't know nothing about the county

401-I think as a whole we've got a pretty young department, going back what was the question again, the atmosphere. I'm thinking a lot of folks now they don't know anything but a merged police department you know it's been five or six

years they were hired under it and eventually it's going to be not even be an issue anymore I don't think, you know they don't know any better.

Summary of Stabilization Stage

The stabilization stage of consolidation represents the period in which the new LMPD has begun to come into its own. Although changes continue to take place, the structure of the new department has been formed. Officers are not only able to look back on the changes and identify what they perceive to be the advantages and disadvantages of consolidation, but also able to identify what they see as the future of LMPD.

Police officers identified three advantages to consolidation. First, a large number of officers realized that, despite their differences, city and county police officers can work together. Consolidation has provided, for these officers, an opportunity to grow as individuals—exposing them to their own biases and prejudices. It has also provided an opportunity for officers to develop a mutual respect for the philosophical differences between city and county in policing styles. Second, several police officers indicated that consolidation has produced more opportunities for officers by increasing size of units, allowing more opportunities for lateral moves, providing more opportunities for promotion, and providing more resources (i.e., money, equipment, etc.). It has also helped improve the quality of services the department offers to the community by holding officers accountable for their actions and by improving the effectiveness of the department to fight crime by eliminating jurisdictional boundaries. Finally, several city police officers indicated that an advantage of consolidation has been parity—being brought to the same level of pay and benefits as county officers.

Police officers also identified four disadvantages to consolidation. First, many police officers indicated that they are frustrated by the restrictive nature and constant changes made in department policies. For these officers, these changes made it difficult to know and comply with the policies governing officers' actions and fuel their fear of receiving undeserving punishment for a policy violation. Second, several county and a few city officers indicated that the consolidation lacked leadership. Although they believed that the consolidation was managed well, they did not believe that the administration, in its decision making processes, showed respect and support for its officers. According to these officers, this has contributed to the current low morale on the department. Third, several county officers indicated that one of the disadvantages of consolidation was parity. For these officers, the lack of a decent pay raise, increases in the cost of benefits, and changes made in the take-home car policies, meant that they have actually lost money. Finally, a few of the participants indicated that the consolidation has resulted in a loss of history of the two former departments and a loss of experienced police officers from the department.

Still, several police officers indicated that they are optimistic for LMPD's future. As more Metro officers are being hired, a new culture is emerging—one that is unaware of the city or county ways of policing. For these officers, consolidation will not be complete until the last city and county police officers are gone. Only then can the Metro officers write their own history.

Research Question 3

Research question 3 asks the question, “How do police officers form overall perceptions of justice in a consolidation process? Perceptions of the overall fairness of consolidation were based upon two factors: 1) justice sources and 2) justice components.

Justice Sources

During the interviews, police officers were asked the question, “Was the consolidation process fair?” Participants were then asked to explain their answer. In this study, seven justice sources were identified by the respondents: 1) restructuring, 2) planning, 3) selection of the chief of police/command, 4) parity, 5) benefits to the department, 6) benefits to the community, and 7) benefits to the individual officers. Several officers based their responses on an assessment made between two or more of the previously mentioned justice sources.

Of the 40 participants, 25.0% (10) identified restructuring as a justice source (six city and four county officers); 17.5% (seven) identified planning as a justice source (two city and five county officers); 12.5% (five) identified the selection of chief/command as a justice source (one city and four county officers); 5.0% (two) identified parity as a justice source (one city and one county officers); 15.0% (six) identified the benefits to the department as a justice source (three city and three county officers); 5.0% (two) identified the benefits to the community as a justice source (two city officers); 2.5% (one) identified the benefits to the individual as a justice source (one city officer); and 17.5% (seven) used an assessment of two or more justice sources (four city and three county officers). Table 2 illustrates these findings.

Table 2

Justice Sources

Justice Sources	City Patrol Officers	City Supervisors	Total City Police Officers	County Patrol Officers	County Supervisors	Total County Police Officers	Total Police Officers
Restructuring	3 (15%)	3 (15.0%)	6 (30.0%)	3 (15.0%)	1 (5.0%)	4 (20.0%)	10 (25.0%)
Planning	1 (5.0%)	1 (5.0%)	2 (10.0%)	2 (10.0%)	3 (15.0%)	5 (25.0%)	7 (17.5%)
Selection of Chief	1 (5.0%)	-	1 (5.0%)	-	4 (20.0%)	4 (20.0%)	5 (12.5%)
Parity	1 (5.0%)	-	1 (5.0%)	1 (5.0%)	-	1 (5.0%)	2 (5.0%)
Benefits to Department	1 (5.0%)	2 (10.0%)	3 (15.0%)	1 (5.0%)	2 (10.0%)	3 (15.0%)	6 (15.0%)
Benefits to Community	1 (5.0%)	1 (5.0%)	2 (10.0%)	-	-	-	2 (5.0%)
Benefits to Individual	-	1 (5.0%)	1 (5.0%)	-	-	-	1 (2.5%)
Multiple Sources	2 (10.0%)	2 (10.0%)	4 (20.0%)	3 (15.0%)	-	3 (15.0%)	7 (17.5%)

Justice Components

In making their overall fairness judgment, distributive, procedural, and/or interactional justice components were identified in police officers' responses. Of the 40 participants in this study, 25.0% (10) used distributive justice to form their overall perception of fairness of the consolidation (six city and four county officers); 32.5% (13) used procedural justice (six city and seven county officers); 5.0% (two) used interactive justice (two county officers); and 37.5% (15) used a combination of procedural, distributive, and/or interactive (eight city and seven county officers). Table 3 illustrates these findings.

Table 3

Justice Components

Justice Components	City Patrol Officers	City Supervisors	Total City Police Officers	County Patrol Officers	County Supervisors	Total County Police Officers	Total POs
Distributive	2 (10.0%)	4 (20.0%)	6 (30.0%)	1 (5.0%)	3 (15.0%)	4 (20.0%)	10 (25.0%)
Procedural	3 (15.0%)	3 (15.0%)	6 (30.0%)	6 (30.0%)	1 (5.0%)	7 (35.0%)	13 (32.5%)
Interactive	-	-	-	-	2 (10.0%)	2 (10.0%)	2 (5.0%)
Combined	5 (25.0%)	3 (15.0%)	8 (40.0%)	3 (15.0%)	4 (20.0%)	7 (35.0%)	15 (37.5%)

In the following sections, all 40 responses by participants will be identified. Each of the responses will be categorized based upon the previously mentioned justice sources. For each justice source, the justice component identified in the officers' responses will be indicated.

Fairness of Consolidation: Justice Source and Components

Restructuring

Of the 40 participants, 10 based their fairness judgment of consolidation on "restructuring." Of these 10, six believed it to be fair, one believed it to be unfair, and three were unsure.

For three city and three county officers, the restructuring process of consolidation was considered to be fair. From a procedural justice perspective, administrators were perceived as trying to do the right thing to consolidate the two departments. Given the magnitude of the changes and the difficult challenge facing administrators during the consolidation, officers gave them the benefit of the doubt that

they were trying to be as fair as possible in their decision-making process—despite the lack of officers' input in this process. From an interactive justice perspective, no one was perceived as being mistreated or treated unfairly during the restructuring process. The following quotes are a reflection of these perceptions:

102-P: I may not agree with them but yeah I think it was fair. Fair can work both ways there. Like I said fair can work both ways, drought and famine are fair because they affect everybody equally, of course everybody is affected negatively. It was fair in that all officers were put on the same level of playing field. I don't think anyone department was held in higher regard than the other. There was no like extra point system for one department over the other, promotional exams and that sort of thing yeah; I'd say it was fair.

202- P: Yeah I think it was fair, probably as fair as you could get it, I didn't have a problem with the way they did it at all... People were moving slowly to different areas throughout the first year but until they reorganized and gave all of the divisions numeral numbers you really couldn't tell that we were merged yet.

208-P: I would have to answer that as fair as they could, nobody likes change and that's what merger is. I would never want Chief White and whoever made those choices that they did, I wouldn't want that responsibility because that was tough. You're going into a situation and you're changing a lot of things that have been there forever and nobody's going to like it. Now was it fair? What is fair? I mean I don't like the fact that they didn't use any input but then again how much input are you going to have? I mean you can't sit there and ask everybody what kind of uniform do you want? Everybody's got different opinions I think what I really liked about is they went with something and this is how it's going to be let's deal with it. So I believe that it was as fair as possible

310- P: Yeah, I do I think they were doing this in the best interest of the department. I don't think that they want us not to police. I don't think that they want us to not solve crime. They want us to do things the right way and I think this is their way of ensuring that we do the right thing you know. It's really up to the officers to comply with what they put on paper.

303-P: Yeah I think it is people would disagree with me. Merger is hard you're taking away two governments and making them one government you know basically and you've got all of these policies and practices and you know they're still sorting things out. Right before you retired you could see all of the emails that came out with policy changes every day. I don't think they can keep up with them. So it's a large animal and it's hard to get a hold of.

401-I: I think they did because I was never treated unfairly and none of our people were treated unfairly. It was a major undertaking for the people making those decisions because you can't please everybody. I think they tried to make the best decisions. You know it was an overwhelming task to say the least.

For one county officer, the restructuring process was believed to be "unfair."

From a procedural justice perspective, the disbanding and reassignment of police from the districts and specialized units lacked merit. In other words, these decisions were not based upon an officer's ability, productivity, and/or qualifications, but simply on whether the individual was a former city or former county officer. The following quote is a reflection of this perception:

308-P: No just as far as disbanded units or putting people out of units to bring other former city or former county guys in to make it fair, I didn't think that was fair at all. Let it continue the way it was and as those positions became available the best man gets the position that's the way it should be. I don't think they should put somebody in a position just because they were former city or former county.

Three city officers were unsure whether restructuring was fair or unfair. In general, these officers believed that the restructuring to the department was fair—giving the administration the benefit of the doubt given the difficulty of the task (a procedural justice component). However, the lack of information and lack of respect regarding some of their decisions (an interactive justice component), the lack of planning on the part of administrations (a procedural justice component), as well as a feeling that the events of consolidation were out of their control (a procedural justice component) left these officers questioning or feeling little regard toward the fairness of the process. The following quotes are a reflection of these perceptions:

105-DPI: There's going to be people that will tell you no because they lost jobs. In a sense they didn't lose a job they lost a position. They're still drawing retirement but they lost some status. The only thing they should have done was

pre-plan. As far as being fair, they wanted to get it done and get it done quick. As far as being fair, when the new chief came in at merger and decentralization was the main focus, it scared a lot of people because no one knew about or I should say the officers, the higher ranking officers knew but it totally changed the way LPD functioned. It went against everything we knew for years. The framework and the machinery we were used to, the comfort zone was gone. As far as being fair, it was just change.

108-PDI: I don't know. I think as fair as it could be. There's just a lot of different aspects to it because when I think about fair did we get treated the way everybody got treated you know we were all just kind of tossed in together and nobody really wanted to be together ... we were just kind of tossed in together. I don't think it was fair because they worried more about making sure everyone looked the same, uniforms and cars you know they put all of this money into everyone looking a certain way and not enough into making sure everyone could talk. I think that was a huge thing. You still had your county radio systems, you still had your city radio system and how do you expect people to start working together if they can't talk to each other.

203-P: I'm going to have to, it didn't matter. It doesn't matter if it's less fair or more fair it's out of our realm of control. It would have been nice to have put in some input but is it fair or not fair, I'm not going to say either way because I understand what my role was and still understand what my role is in the food chain and we're bottom feeders and you know it's very rare that someone is going to come to you and say what is your opinion on that?

Planning

Of the 40 participants, seven based their fairness judgment on the "planning" of consolidation. Of these seven, one officer believed it was fair, four believed it was unfair, and two were unsure.

The one city officer who believed that the planning process was fair credited the planning not to the administration, but to the unit commanders for taking the first steps in planning for the consolidation (a procedural justice component). The following quote reflects this perception.

304-P: You know that's a good question. For me I would say yes, but I would say a lot of the units did it on their own, a lot of lieutenants and sergeants, like metro narcotics they were always together anyways, but like SWAT prior we

were in academy, when we were in academy we really hadn't been merged yet but the SWAT teams were I remember them coming to the academy and they were already merging together the training. But actually the whole department itself I don't know I think they might have been a little behind on that you know from what I can see and from what I heard. It depends on who you ask you ask and old county guy and they'll say the city took over you ask a city guy and they'll say county took over. I think from the best that I can see and from what I remember it was as fair as I could see.

For one city and three county officers, the fairness of the planning of consolidation was believed to be unfair. From a procedural justice perspective, the planning of consolidation was considered to have been rushed and poorly put together (i.e., how units would be restructured and officers reassigned). From an interactive justice perspective, very little respect or consideration was given to officers' needs (i.e., officer safety and family needs). The following quotes reflect these perceptions:

107-PI: I think it was hurried, it would have been to. The specialized units, narcotics, were already a merged unit. CACU was already a merged unit. They could have merged like the robbery and the homicide units and the last step would have been to merge the districts. I think they kind of went at it backwards because they would merge the districts and then the specialty units. Smaller units would have been much easier. It was almost like this is what we've decided we're doing we don't care what your opinion is, so we're going to do it. I mean it took officer safety issues. It took what was it a month ago that we got a compatible radio system where we could all talk to each other. And if you've got a detail where you have to work out in the county and you were a city officer, your radio didn't work.

309-P: Not fair but it was necessary... How I am going to go through all of these policies and procedures, everything's changing every week so we're not worried about this city/county anymore we're worried about getting this policy thing straight what I can and can't do... The officer had no say so in anything, it was force fed down them, here's how it is. Don't question it even if you had a better idea your input was totally negated you know even if you had a better plan

407-P: I can't say it wasn't fair I think it was inept. From a fairness standpoint it don't think there has been anything "unfair", I think there has been favoritism in assignments and certain things based on who their boss is whether they're former city or former county, you're always going to have those issues I don't care what

organization you're involved with. Systemically I don't think it was unfair but I do think it was inept.

408-I: They didn't care I mean the chief came to public meetings and said and told family members, I don't care that you don't get to see your husband, I don't care about morale.

One city and one county officer were uncertain about the fairness of the planning of consolidation. From a procedural justice perspective, the planning of consolidation was rushed and not thoroughly thought out. The planning also did not involve the officers. At the same time, according to the city officer, there was a perception of a lack of respect from the administration. According to the county officer, he/she did not feel like they were unfairly treated during the process. These perceptions left these officers questioning the fairness of the process. The following quotes reflect these perceptions:

206-PI: You know, I think I have two minds on that I think the individual is concerned, the individual officer, the individual detective I don't think it was fair... they didn't involve them, it was just flat this is how it's going to be take it or leave it. It is what it is if you don't like it oh well tough, if you don't like my decisions tough. It is what it is and you know that's not fair period. But if I take a step back and look at how the two departments were I don't see any biases towards one side or the other. They did make it, this is the Louisville Metro Police Department. I don't care about the old city, I don't care about the old county, neither one of them is going

402-PI: I think it was rushed. I think a lot of things weren't thought through they were in such a rush to have this big merged department. But I think a lot of things weren't thought through and maybe in that way it wasn't fair. You know I can't really say that. I can't say that I felt like I was ever treated unfairly. I did feel like it was rushed. Like I said I was never treated unfairly and I don't even know if it was that because I think that they tried to do everything fair. But some people are just going to get booted back to the division because when you're merging two units together they're going to put people back on patrol. That's just part of it. So, I don't know if it was unfair, it was probably due to the fact that it was rushed, things weren't well thought through.

Selection of Chief of Police and Command Staff

Of the 40 participants, five based their fairness judgment on the selection of the chief of police and his command staff. Of these five, three thought the selection was fair, one thought it was unfair, and one was unsure of the selection.

One city and two county officers believed that consolidation was fair based upon the selection of the chief of police and his staff. From a procedural justice perspective, the selection of an outside chief, someone who did not have any allegiances to either of the two departments, was perhaps one of the best decisions made by the administration and represented a departure from the good old boy system. From a distributive justice perspective, this selection, along with the selection of the command staff, represented a balancing of power, to some degree, between the two agencies. The following quotes reflect these perceptions:

103-P: They didn't pick anyone from the old county or the old city and basically said hey this is a new department, put your team together here we go. So the fairness there you brought in an outsider that didn't know anybody from the county or the city. Put their team together and tried to make a department that they wanted.

404- PD: I believe they were fair I really do I think they did a good job of balancing between city and county and a lot of people criticized them for that because they basically divided the command staff in half, former city, former county but I think that was a good decision I don't think there was any other way they could have gone.

406-PD: Yeah it is and I would say it was designed to be fair and I think they wanted parties from both sides and equal number from each side. You had the Chief who was an outsider, a city and a county assistant chief, and a retired city commander as the other assistant chief.

For one county officer, consolidation was unfair based upon this selection. From a distributive justice perspective, it appeared, to this officer that selection of the

commanding officers favored the city and that they were making the major decisions regarding the restructuring of the new department. The following quote reflects this perception:

410-D: I would say no I don't have all of the inside knowledge but like I said earlier it seemed like a lot of your command was city guys making all of these decisions

For one county officer, the fairness of consolidation was questionable based upon this selection. Although the selection of an outside chief was believed to be a good decision made by the administration (a distributive justice component), the uncertainty of how the selection was made brought into question, for this officer, the fairness of this process (a procedural justice component). The following quote is a reflection of this perception:

409-PD: Well it's kind of hard for me to say because I don't know if it was fair because one of the things was mixing the commanders and I don't know how they sat down and did it. Another thing is when the new mayor came in he hired a chief from the outside, which I thought that was a smart thing to do because if somebody came in from outside of the city or the county he didn't have any allegiance to nobody except for the guy that hired him.

Parity

Of the 40 participants, two officers based their perception of fairness on the issue of parity. Of these two, one officer believed it was fair and one officer believed that it was unfair.

For one city officer, consolidation was fair based upon the issue of parity. From this officer's perspective, establishing parity between officers represented the opportunity to receive the same pay and benefits as county officers—despite the fact that county

officers most likely would not benefit from establishing this equality (a distributive justice component). The following quote reflects this perception:

110-D: I think it was as fair as it could be, I think that somebody was going to get slighted. I honestly think I got a raise and the county guys didn't get a raise but in order to bring equality somebody wasn't going to get a raise you know that was just the bottom line.

For one county officer, consolidation was unfair based upon the issue of parity. In his/her view, establishing parity meant that county officers would gain nothing from the consolidation. In other words, establishing parity would benefit city officers who would be brought up to county officers' level in terms of pay and benefits while county officers' pay and benefits would remain the same or would decrease due to increased costs of benefits (a distributive justice component). The following quote reflects this perception:

305-D: No, if you look at the word fair being equal, no because you can talk to any county officers and it has kind of become a joke, what did we get from merger, thirteen buttons and a Santa Claus belt from merger, that's what the county got out of it. We didn't get anything more, we didn't get anything more, we didn't get any new benefits, we got thirteen new buttons on our uniform and a big shiny belt buckle on our belt that's really all the county got out of it so if you look at fair being equal, no it wasn't fair.

Benefits to Department

Of the 40 participants, six officers based their fairness perception of consolidation on the benefits to the department. Of these six officers, three believed that it was fair, two believed that it was unfair, and one was unsure.

For three officers, two city and one county, consolidation was fair based upon the benefits it had on the department. From a distributive justice perspective, the outcome of consolidation, according to one city officer, has resulted in very little change in the chain

of command (i.e., who officers report to). According to the other city officer, it has contributed to an improvement in the culture of the police department—one different from the “heavy-handed” approach to policing by his former agency. Consolidation is also credited, according to the one county officer, for improving the fairness of the promotional process within the department. The following quotes reflect these perceptions:

201-D: I think so; I mean I think you make somebody ask the question of themselves. What was that culture, was it good, was it bad? It was what it was to borrow that term, you know everybody uses it. I can't say it was bad or good. I mean I certainly didn't feel like I was robbed of any kind of identity you know nobody wants to give up their stuff, but we knew we had to. We weren't losing each other that was good, you know we weren't being forced to, I mean we weren't being ripped from our platoons and forced to work with people we didn't know. We had the option to move out later on I guess but some people were I guess there were some CIS people that were forced to go back to the streets. I didn't feel horrible about it you know we were kind of all in it together. I didn't really feel like I had a culture with LPD, we were heavy handed in the city; we got in a lot of fights and we didn't back down from them we went out and looked for them and that was cultural for us, that was who we were and I think we worried about that when we merged.

205-D: The merger in a lot of sense didn't change anything. As an officer you still reported to a sergeant, a sergeant still reported to a lieutenant, a lieutenant still reported to captain/major, you know that part didn't change.

405-D: Department—Promotions are more fair. I think organizationally this department is more fair than the old county department, it doesn't matter where you came from, we're not even looking at race anymore, gender, I think when the chief looks at his promotion list he's color blind. I really do.

For two officers, both from county, the consolidation was unfair because it did not benefit the department. For one officer, consolidation did not live up to its expectations of taking two good departments and creating one better department. For the other officer, consolidation resulted in county officers' loss of their identity and their department/culture. The following quotes reflect these perceptions:

307-D: I say no. I think it starts at the mayor's office. I think it was more about him becoming mayor again then taking the best of two worlds and making them as one that unfortunately includes the police department. I thought they did the best they could as far as merging two policies together.

403-D: I just don't know if I could answer that objectively, my opinion is that no it wasn't fair because it wasn't smart that's how I see it. Obviously history will write the book on that. I don't believe it was fair and the reason I don't believe it was fair is because I don't believe it was smart. I don't think it was done well in my mind that makes it unfair. I'm not talking about pay and benefits and all of this other stuff I'm just talking about working environment where you feel like man lets go out there and lets fight some crime, let's make this a better place to live and I just don't think the guys are feeling that way, they're may be some out there. I don't feel that way.

For one city officer, the issue of whether consolidation resulted in a better department is questionable. From this officer's perspective, consolidation was supposed to save money, increase manpower on the street, and create a stronger government (a distributive justice perspective). Unfortunately, the degree to which these objectives were obtained is uncertain. The following quote reflects this perception:

104-D: I think it was to save money; the two governments were horribly expensive. I'd like to know if we saved any money, I doubt now at this point that we still saved any money. I get fearful when I think of things, they're going to cut back staff maybe, when I know the city went to the take home car program it allowed them to delete officers positions because we went from nine hundred and seventy five officers to eight hundred and fifty giving everybody a take home car. So I was fearful that merger would be a way to delete positions, a way to get rid of staff. I think we are still running fairly short which scares me, only for the people making the day to day runs. I worry about that a lot are we still holding vacancies to make some money back but I don't think their intentions were poor. I think, "One strong government?" I don't know if they succeeded

Benefits to the Community

For the 40 participants, two officers based their perception of fairness on whether consolidation benefitted the community. Of these two officers, one believed that it

benefitted the community and was fair. The other believed that it did not benefit the community and was unfair.

For one city officer, consolidation was fair based upon the benefits it had for the community. From this officer's perspective, the citizens wanted consolidation, the citizens voted for consolidation, and the citizens got a consolidated government and police department (a procedural justice component). The following quote is a reflection of this perception:

106-P: The process was fair in that the government was going to become one; there was no two ways or buts about it because per se the citizens voted it in. So you have to protect that area so when you do that you have to keep the police department going of course, and if you've got two different units that you don't need and you're trying to make them one, I think the way that they did it even though it was kind of dragged out and sudden if you will, it was still fair.

On the other hand, one city officer believed that consolidation was unfair because it did not benefit the community. From a distributive justice perspective, this officer believes that the citizens have not benefitted from consolidation in terms of police protection and services provided by the department. From a procedural justice perspective, this officer believes that the administration's lack of consideration for the community needs are a contributing factor to this problem. The following quote is a reflection of this perception:

207-DP: My basic definition of fair overall the floor that I stand on a policing point of view, is it going to benefit John Q Citizen who comes home and finds his window broken out and somebody has taken his stuff. If the police department doesn't respond to him, if it doesn't take care of him, if it doesn't take care of the soccer mom who's trying to get home with her kids safely, if it doesn't take care of a little old lady who's scared because there's dope thugs out you know sitting out in the court yard then we're a failure as an organization and the taxpayers money that's what drives everything else that I do and everything else that I think about as being a police officer. Based on that the officers are working hard they could be better and they will be better. The administration of the department is

failing the citizens I think because it's not doing the things that need to be done to protect those little old ladies and that blue collar working guy that comes home and finds that he's been burglarized. The administration is just not doing a good job of creating the atmosphere that takes care of those people so on the point of view of the officers they're out there trying and they'll get better as they get more seniority but the administration to me is more concerned with looking good and looking right then they are concerned about protecting the people. So to me that's a failure

Individual Benefits

Of the 40 participants, one city officer believed that consolidation was fair based upon the benefits—other than parity—it had for him/her personally. For this officer, the fairness of consolidation was based upon the simple fact of being able to continue to do the things that he/she wanted to do (a distributive justice component). In other words, the outcome of consolidation did little to alter his/her future plans within the department. From this perspective, fairness was based upon the degree in which the office was able to maintain a degree of comfort and achieve certain individual expectations within the department. The following quote is a reflection of this perception:

209-D: Again it goes back to as fair as, the rules apply to us all, the person depending on what side of the fence he's on will determine if it's fair or not, me I thought it was fair because I was able to continue to do things that I was wanting to do at that time.

Multiple Perspectives

Of the 40 participants, seven police officers based their perception of fairness on an assessment of two or more of the following justice sources: 1) restructuring, 2) planning, 3) selection of the chief of police/command, 4) parity, 5) benefits to the department, 6) benefits to the community, and 7) benefits to the individual officers. Of these seven, two officers believed consolidation was fair and the other five were unsure

whether it was fair or unfair. Given the range of the topics covered by each of these eight officers, each response will be addressed individually.

For one LPD officer, the fairness of consolidation was based on the belief that the administration did the best it could in restructuring the department (a procedural justice component). As a result of consolidation, officers benefitted from the knowledge and experience of other officers with whom they would have never had the opportunity to work (a distributive justice component). Although this officer indicated that he did not benefit personally from the attainment of parity, other city officers did (a distributive justice component). According to this officer:

101-PD: Yeah, I think it was fair. I don't know what you could do to change it. I think if you're going to say something is not fair you should have an example of what fair is in that situation and for me I guess I was in a good spot because nothing really affected me you know in a sense that my job didn't change, my pay didn't really change. A lot of the city guys got more money at merger but I was at that six or seven year mark where your pay stayed about the same. I think there were two groups that applied for and I was one so for me my working conditions didn't change, my pay didn't really change I just got a different name on my badge you know. You're also taking a lot of guys who had only worked in units you know the urban areas and putting them in the suburban areas and you're taking a lot of guys who only worked in the suburban areas and putting them in the urban areas. So I think as far as changing a police officer into a better individual and a better officer, that's great you're broadening their experience

For this second county officer, consolidation was fair in that it forced police officers to work together. In other words, it allowed for individual growth—providing officers the opportunity to learn and grow from the knowledge and experience of other officers with whom they would have never had the opportunity to work (a distributive justice component). For this officer, consolidation benefitted the department by making it more effective and more efficient (i.e., combining resources, creating one centralized police department, eliminating jurisdictional boundaries, etc.) (a distributive justice

component). As a result, the community is believed to have benefitted from consolidation (a distributive justice component). However, this officer also indicates that some communities, primarily in the county, may not have benefitted from consolidation due to the way manpower was distributed throughout the metro area. According to this officer:

210-D: Being one that feels like it's the right thing to do, it had to happen, I was forced to work with people that were from a different agency and I've done nothing but benefit from that experience, it's opened my eyes up to so many things I would have never known. It opened my eyes open to people that I would have never met... somebody was given something that was unmanageable and managed it. It was right to have one central command of a large city. It was right to have the lines of communication narrowed down to one chain of command of one process, less alienation of information done intentionally or non-intentionally, a shared goal in policing this city, a shared command structure. I think the citizens have benefited from merger. They've (*the county*) benefited from we went from seven hundred city and four hundred county to one agency so I believe the allocation of manpower was instantly changed. Was that fair, just how we allocate manpower I think some of that wasn't fair. I think there's probably areas of the county that lost.

Seven police officers, four city and three county, were unsure whether consolidation was fair or unfair based upon their assessments of multiple justice sources. In making their assessment, most of these officers identified both fair and unfair justice sources, but were unable to make a definitive statement regarding the fairness of consolidation.

For one unsure city officer, credit was given to the administration for its successful handling of the task in bringing the two departments together and giving the FOP (Fraternal Order of Police) some input into the process (a procedural justice component). However, this officer did not believe that the community benefitted from the consolidation. According to this officer:

109-PD: As far as like bringing them together without our input? I mean it is merger, I guess both FOPs had their say and what it is whether they liked it or not, their concerns. Again, I'm not going to say it was fair or unfair but it did help the community. It made them feel like that they had more officers when in reality they didn't it was the same amount of officers that were there before. I don't know if it was fair or not I don't know.

For this unsure city officer, credit was again given to the administration for ability to bring the two departments together (a procedural justice component). However, the planning of the consolidation was considered inadequate—placing a great deal of the fault of the latter on the former commanders of city and county. According to this officer:

204-P: I think that the prep work could have been a lot better, I don't know if that's Chief White's fault. I think the leadership of the old departments together should have stepped up and put the needs to the community first and got it done. That man had a job that I'm sure few chiefs would actually want to come into, you're an outsider first of all, and we've never had that and then number two you're going to do what. You're going to get rid of two police departments what? So you know you already start off in the hole. So the man had a tough job coming right out of the gate. So whether or not it was fair it was another human endeavor with all of its mistakes and frailties or what have you but we got through of it.

For this unsure county officer, given the difficult task of a consolidation of this magnitude, the administration was given the benefit of the doubt of being fair in bringing the two departments together (a procedural justice component). However, this officer does not believe that the consolidation, in term of creating a bigger and better department, has lived up to expectations (a distributive justice component). According to this officer:

301-PD: I think the process was fair like I said it's a daunting task having to take on that task being an outsider things were done the best way they could be done. I mean you almost have to be analytical about the way things were done, so I think it was done fairly. Did it live up to its expectations? No because you had two real good departments, each in their own right, good departments, we were both aggressive departments, the city may have been a little more aggressive but we were hard on crime and now it's almost like you've been told in not so many

words to back off, don't be as aggressive as you used to be. So something that had the potential to make one really superb department again has been taken down to where we're mediocre because we're ruled to death.

For this unsure county officer, the establishment of parity between the two departments was not fair (a distributive justice component). However, this officer did believe that the administration's ability to consolidate the two departments and the selection of the chief of police was fair (a procedural justice component). According to this officer:

302-PD: Monetarily, no. Our FOP was strong and they argued with county government and we got some good benefits. Their FOP was a weaker FOP and didn't quite achieve near what we had. When we merged all of them got raises, we got nothing because of the parity they were brought up to our level and that's pretty much how it went. I mean they still joke about that today, hey thank you all for the big raise we got while we got nothing. We lost our identity, our department, everything went the city way... I guess as fair (*procedurally*) as it could be it was basically you just had two departments one just happened to be a larger department and one was smaller. The thing that I was most concerned with was who was going to be the chief; I was hoping it was going to be somebody from the outside that was not tied to either department because like I said you had the good ole boy network on both sides and everybody wanted their boy in there so yeah I think the mayor made the right decision by bringing somebody in and the fact that Chief White is black I don't care if they'd brought in a white chief from outside it was still going to be chaos and people were going to bitch and moan.

For this unsure county officer, the consolidation of the two departments was fair (a procedural justice component). However, it did not live up to expectations in terms of being a more progressive department (a distributive justice component). This officer also did not believe that the process used by the commanding officers to select their assistants was fair—believing that the process used contributed to favoritism. According to this officer:

306-PD: I think yes and no. I think yes like I said I voted for merger I was pretty happy because I thought we were going to be progressive but I don't think that we

progressed. I think that was not fair, not fair how they did that. They had a county major pick a county lieutenant who then picked his assistant and that went from county to county to county instead of saying a major city or county is going to pick one city lieutenant and one county lieutenant and merge them together that would have been the fair thing to do. The way they did it was not fair.

Summary

In forming overall perceptions of fairness, police officers based their judgments on an assessment of justice sources and justice components. Of the justice sources, restructuring was identified most frequently by police officers (25.0%). This was followed by planning (17.5%), an assortment of multiple justice sources (17.5%), benefits to the department (15.0%), selection of the chief of police/command (12.5%), parity (5.0%), benefits to the community (5.0%), and benefits to the individual (2.5%). Of the justice components, a combination of distributive, procedural, and/or interactive justice was most frequently utilized by police officers (37.5%). This was followed by procedural justice (32.5%), distributive justice (25.0%), and interactive justice (5.0%).

Research Question 4

Comparing City and County Officers' Perceptions

Research question 4 asks, "How do former city and county police officers compare in perceptions of fairness of the consolidation?" In this study, one primary difference was found—that more county officers viewed consolidation as being unfair than did city officers.

In reviewing the justice judgments of police officers, we find that, of the 40 participants in this study, 40.0% (16) of the police officers believed that consolidation was fair (11 city officers and five county officers); 30.0% (12) of the police officers

believed that consolidation was unfair (two city and 10 county officers); and 30.0% (12) were unsure on whether consolidation was fair (seven city and three county officers).

Of the 20 city officers, 55.0% (11) believed consolidation was fair (25.0% (five) patrol officers and 25% (five) supervisors); 10.0% (two) believed that consolidation was unfair (5.0% (one) patrol officer and 5.0% (one) supervisor); and 35.0% (seven) were unsure whether consolidation was fair or unfair (20.0% (four) patrol officers and 15.0% (three) supervisors. Of the 20 JCPD officers, 25.0% (five) believed consolidation was fair (15.0% (three) patrol officers and 10.0% (two) supervisors); 50.0% (10) believed consolidation was unfair (20.0% (four) patrol officers and 30.0% (six) supervisors); and 25.0% (five) were unsure whether consolidation was fair or unfair (15.0% (three) patrol officer and 10.0% (two) supervisors). Table 4 illustrates these findings.

Table 4

Police Officers' Overall Fairness Judgments

Perception of Fairness	City Patrol Officers	City Supervisors	Total City Police Officers	County Patrol Officers	County Supervisors	Total County Police Officers	Total Police Officers
Fair	5 (25.0%)	6 (30.0%)	11 (55.0%)	3 (15.0%)	2 (10.0%)	5 (25.0%)	16 (40.0%)
Unfair	1 (5.0%)	1 (5.0%)	2 (10.0%)	4 (20.0%)	6 (30.0%)	10 (50.0%)	12 (30.0%)
Unsure	4 (20.0%)	3 (15.0%)	7 (35.0%)	3 (15.0%)	2 (10.0)	5 (25.0%)	12 (30.0%)

Based upon these findings, there is an indication that more than half of the city officers perceived consolidation as being “fair” and half of the county officers perceived consolidate as being “unfair.” The findings also indicate that a relatively similar number of both city and county police officers were “unsure” on whether consolidate was fair or unfair.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION:

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine how the consolidation of Louisville City and Jefferson County Police Departments impacted police officers' perceptions of fairness of the decisions made during this process. Forty LMPD police officers, employed by city (LPD) or county (JCPD) prior to consolidation, participated in interviews for this study. The data produced from these interviews provided the data necessary to answer the four research questions in this study. For each research question, expectations were identified based upon previous studies related to the topic of consolidations and organizational justice. These expectations provide the foundation for explaining, in more detail, the themes identified in the findings of this study and what these represent. These expectations also provide a basis for comparing the findings in this study with similar studies conducted in the past.

In this chapter, expectation #1 will discuss the foundation of police officers' expectations of a fair department. This section will also discuss the comparisons officers make in forming fairness judgments, as well as the level of tolerance police officers have for the injustices or unfair practices within their department. Expectation #2 will discuss the reactions police officers had toward the organization and supervisors related to unfair justice judgments. This section will also discuss the relationship between justice

responses and the reactions to these responses, as well as the role professionalism plays in this equation. Expectation #3 will discuss how police officers use justice component and justice sources as a basis for forming overall perceptions of fairness. This section will also discuss what is meant by overall perceptions of justice. Finally, expectation #4 will discuss the differences in perception of fairness of the consolidation between LPD and JCPD officers. This section will also discuss the roles that fear of working together, fear of a takeover, and parity played in creating these differences.

The sections that follow these will include a discussion on policy implications, the limitations of this study, suggestions for future studies, and closing remarks regarding this study.

Expectation #1

Police officers were expected to view a just department based in part upon their experiences (i.e., professional and/or personal) with their former department and the application of the new department's policies and procedures. Although there are some bases for these expectations, a more accurate conclusion suggests that police officers view a just or fair department based upon two factors—the expectations that they develop through their experience in the department and interpersonal and interdepartmental comparisons.

First, police officers seem to have a certain set of expectations of a department that helps form their basis of fairness. For a large number of police officers, these expectations include: 1) equality and respect; 2) accountability—clarity, consistency, and predictability; and 3) flexibility and discretion. Arguably, these expectations are a byproduct of an individual's personal and professional experiences. In other words,

throughout an individual's life, they develop an understanding or perception of what it means to be fair. As a result, police officers expect their department to reflect these characteristics within the formal policies and informal practices of their department. Based upon this perspective, these expectations serve three purposes. First, they provide the officer with an understanding of how he/she is to treat others and others are to treat him/her. Second, they provide a foundation for an officer to understand his/her purpose and role within the organization. Third, they provide an officer with a degree of predictability in determining the consequences of his/her actions.

Not surprisingly, these characteristics reflect many of the justice rules related to Leventhal's (1976) distributive justice rule (i.e., equity), Leventhal's (1980) procedural justice rules (i.e., consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness, and ethicality), and Bies and Moag's (1986) interactional justice rules (i.e., respect, propriety, justification, and truthfulness). Although the characteristics identified in this study are not conceptually identical, they do represent the presence of these justice rules in officers' definitions of a fair department under conditions of consolidation.

For example, equality, as identified in this study, can be interpreted to imply the distributive justice rule of "equity" (i.e., outcome being distributed in proportion to individuals' inputs) and can also imply the procedural justice rule of "bias suppression" (i.e., be neutral and free of bias). Respect, on the other hand, is identified as an interactional justice rule (i.e., treating individuals compassionately). Accountability can be interpreted to imply the procedural justice rule of "ethicality" (i.e., upholding ethical and moral standards). Clarity can be interpreted to imply the interactional justice rule of

“justification” (i.e., include adequate explanations of policies). Consistency is identified as a procedural justice rule (i.e., consistent across people and time). Finally, flexibility/discretion cannot only reflect the procedural justice rule of “ethicality,” but also the interactional justice rule of “justification” (i.e., include adequate explanations of decisions regarding an officer’s action based upon the facts of a situation). From this perspective, an argument can be made that, within the formal policies and informal practices of the department—which includes the process of consolidation—police officers expect these rules to be reflected in how they are treated by their agency. However, these justice rules are not the sole basis of fairness judgments.

A second factor in determining a police officer’s perception of a fair department is based upon two types of comparisons—interpersonal and inter-departmental. Interpersonal comparisons are comparisons made between officers within the same department. This type of comparison can be seen in police officers’ responses to the issue of favoritism within their respective departments. As illustrated earlier, within this informal “good old boy” network, preferential treatment is given to a select group of individuals based upon who they know or their personal and/or professional affiliations. These individuals are afforded certain privileges in the department’s hiring, promotional, and disciplinary processes. For example, several police officers indicated that although the department holds police officers accountable for their actions directed toward the public, some commanding officers are not held to the same accountability for how they treat their officers. Also, other officers indicated that certain individuals seemed to receive a harsher punishment than those officers who have connections. Although police officers view these practices as being unfair, none of them believed that they personally

were treated unfairly. Also, none of the officers in this study indicated that these practices were systemic or major problems facing their departments. Despite these injustices, none of the respondents viewed their respective departments, overall, as being unfair.

Interdepartmental comparison, on the other hand, represents those comparisons made between an officer's department and a different agency. The agency that is the basis of comparison is one that the officer identifies as sharing similar characteristics of their own. In this study, three factors can be identified as a basis for officers making comparisons between LPD and JCPD. First, the close proximity of the two departments (both being in Jefferson County and sharing overlapping jurisdictional boundaries) make a comparison between the two departments relatively convenient. Second, the two departments shared a common responsibility in addressing crime in the Louisville/Jefferson County area. Prior to 2003 consolidation, LPD and JCPD combined resources to create two units developed to address crime issues countywide—Crimes Against Children Unit (consolidated in 1987) and the Metro Narcotics Unit (consolidated in 1990) (Louisville-Jefferson County Crime Commission, 1998). These units provided the opportunity for city and county patrol officers and commanders to work together in an official capacity. Finally, although LPD was larger than JCPD in terms of the number of sworn personnel and JCPD was larger than LPD in terms of its geographic coverage (365 square miles versus 65 square miles respectively) (Louisville-Jefferson County Crime Commission, 1998), the two departments were perceived as being similar in size or, at least, similar in influence and power. This can be illustrated by the concerns officers on

both departments had—although identified more frequently by JCPD officers—regarding a takeover by the other department during consolidation.

The importance of these three factors is that it helps provide some understanding of the issues and comparisons made by police officers before and throughout this consolidation. Officers from both departments routinely compared themselves to one another in their responses to issues on consolidation—weighing the decisions based upon who was going to benefit more. For example, as stated throughout this study, parity was perhaps the most divisive issue between city and county police officers. Although the two departments operated under different governments and within two different geographic areas, comparisons were made by officers, of both departments, on perceptions of fairness based upon what the other department had or did not have. In general, city police officers believed that, given their workload, population, and level of crime, that they were deserving of the same pay and benefits as county police officers. County police officers, on the other hand, did not believe that it was fair for them to lose what they had gained in terms of pay and benefits—a result of years of successful negotiations with county government—simply to accommodate city officers and their perceived lack of ability to negotiate effectively with government. Interestingly, the issue of parity was not compared to any of the other law enforcement agencies within or around the Louisville Metro area. Another example of this type of comparison was also indicated by a few officers who had visited with or who had spoken with other police officers from departments outside the metro area. The information obtained from these experiences or encounters seems to provide, or at least imply, a basis of judging the fairness of their own department.

From these perspectives, consolidation was as much about city versus county and who was coming out on top as it was about what was fair and unfair. In other words, perceptions of fairness were based in part on both interpersonal and interdepartmental comparisons. As a city police officer stated illustrating this point, “I may not agree with them but yeah I think it was fair. Fair can work both ways there. Drought and famine are fair because they affect everybody equally.”

These comparisons are not surprising. They are consistent with a study by Stouffer et al. (1949) regarding distributive justice and relative deprivation, illustrate how employees compare themselves to other individuals in forming fairness judgments. In other words, people’s reactions to outcomes may depend less on the absolute level of those outcomes than on how they compare to the outcomes of others against whom people judge themselves (Colquitt, Greenberg, and Zapata-Phelan, 2005). From this perspective, the social comparison process may provide some understanding of how police officers view a just department and how officers formed fairness judgments regarding consolidation.

Overall, the findings in this study seem to indicate that police officers’ perceptions of a fair department are based, in part, upon the ability of a department to fulfill officers’ expectations (based upon certain justice rules) and upon interpersonal and interdepartmental comparisons made by officers. To some degree, these expectations and comparisons are relative to the officer’s experiences on their former department. Through their experiences, officers learn what to expect from their agency and make comparisons based upon identified formal and informal standards defined by their agency. As a result, officers take some comfort in being able to predict the consequences

of their actions and the reactions of the managers, supervisors, and administrators to these actions.

Although changes in expectations and comparisons are subject to occur within the normal operations of an organization, consolidation represents a cataclysmic phenomenon which places officers, administrators, and the organization in a heightened state of uncertainty. In other words, given the magnitude of the changes required in bringing two major law enforcement agencies together (i.e., policy changes, restructuring, reassignments, increase in manpower, changes in the power structure, changes in promotional and disciplinary policies, redefining of alliances, etc.), the ability to predict the outcomes of organizational activities can dramatically be reduced. Also, interdepartmental comparisons made between agencies prior to consolidation now become internal. As a result, cultural clashes (i.e., based upon differences in policing philosophies, pay, benefits, uniforms, etc.) become unavoidable and must be addressed in order to unify the agency.

Expectation #2

In this study, it was expected that fairness judgments would result in reactions (attitudes and behaviors) directed toward both the organization and supervisors. The findings in this study indicate that: 1) decisions made by administrators did result in reactions toward the organization (i.e., anger, hatred, decreases in work productivity, low morale, and retirements) and few were directed toward supervisors, 2) not all of the fairness judgments necessarily resulted in negative reactions, and 3) fairness judgments may not be that important in certain situations.

First, prior to the passage of consolidation and throughout the process, decisions were made by administrators that resulted in fairness judgments and reactions by police officers directed toward administrators and the organization. For example, during the pre-consolidation stage, police officers indicated that the actions or decisions of their commanding officers to neglect their responsibilities to their respective departments and their officers in preparation for consolidation resulted in resentment toward administrators. The decisions made during the restructuring stage (i.e., restructuring of districts, reassignment of officers, selection of chief of police, and changes to policies) resulted in officers' being displeased and angry over these decisions, drops in morale, decreases in work productivity, and retirements from the department. Finally, during the stabilization stage, the continuing changes in policies, disparities in disciplinary actions, and the perceived lack of leadership resulted in further decreases in morale and work productivity of officers.

Based upon previous studies, police officers would be expected to have some type of reactions, good or bad, toward the organization or administrators' decisions during a consolidation process. Negative reactions or consequences (i.e., attitudes and behaviors) in response to transitional events are well understood (Citera and Rentsch, 1993; Lind, 2001; Novelli, Kirkman, and Shapiro, 1995). For the most part, consolidation is an organizational phenomenon. Therefore, it would be reasonable to assume that the reactions to fairness judgments would be directed toward the organization. However, the lack of responses in this study indicating reactions toward supervisors should not be interpreted as meaning supervisors were not a source of fairness judgments and, therefore, were not the recipients of reactions directed toward

them by police officers. It would be difficult to argue, given the magnitude of this consolidation, that supervisors do not play a crucial role. This issue will be discussed further in the limitations section of this study.

Second, not all negative responses to fairness judgments result in negative reactions directed toward the organization. Unfortunately, few studies directly address this issue. In general, most studies tend to focus on unfair judgments and the negative reactions accompanying these judgments—a conceptual shortcoming of the fair process effect model (Van den Bos, 2005). However, as indicated by several respondents, a police officer's sense of professionalism could influence how they react to unfair judgments. In other words, a police officer's pride, integrity, sense of duty, and a sense of responsibility to the department, the community, and/or to themselves may override an individual's predispositions toward negative reactions resulting from unfair judgments. For example, some of the decisions made by the administration during consolidation were perceived as being unfair. Although several police officers indicated that there were negative reactions to these decisions, several other officers indicated that these unfair judgments did not result in a decrease in their work productivity. As one officer stated, "We're professional. We just kept doing our jobs."

Finally, a few of the responses given by officers indicated that fairness judgments, at least in certain situations, may not have been that important. Whether this lack of emphasis or importance of these fairness judgments was a product of the officer's apathy toward the situation or a coping mechanism used to deal with an overwhelming situation or situation they perceived was out of their control, the issue of fairness appeared to possess less meaning. As one officer stated, "So whether or not it was fair, it was another

human endeavor with all of its mistakes and frailties or what have you, but we got through it.”

Overall, what we can infer from this data is that the decisions made by administrators can produce negative reactions by police officers toward the organization. Based upon the findings in this study, reactions to fairness judgments can have adverse effects on the organization in terms of displeasure, resentment, low morale, decreases in work productivity, and officers leaving the department. However, a police officer’s sense of professionalism may be a determining factor in how he/she reacts to fairness judgments. In certain situations, fairness judgments may not be that important—bringing into question what factors, other than fairness judgments, impact police officers’ reactions and attitudes toward the organization?

Unlike a well established and relatively stable law enforcement agency, the birth of a new agency is faced with the difficulty of legitimizing itself. Not only must it prove its legitimacy and self-worth to its employees, but also to its constituents. For the most part, the new agency has no history. In other words, it has no basis from which anyone can predict its actions or its responses. Therefore, it must rely upon its present actions in order to establish a solid foundation necessary for future acceptance.

Consolidation represented the end of a way of life and the beginning of another. It meant letting go of a philosophy of policing that had been ingrained within an officer for years and letting go of an organizational culture that had existed well over a century. Therefore, many of the decisions made by administrators throughout the consolidation process represented more than just a simple or typical organizational change. Instead, it represented a slow and methodical death of an identity, a changing of the guard in terms

of status and power, a loss of cultural pride and reputation, and the death of a way of life. As a result, gaining officers' acceptance, compliance, and trust of the newly established administration and department carries with it an extra burden—the burden of proving its legitimacy. Also, decisions made by administrators would be viewed with greater skepticism and reactions to perceived unfair decisions would be intensified.

Expectation #3

In this study, a third expectation was that overall perceptions of fairness would be based upon a collective assessment of distributive, procedural and/or interactional justice. Although there appears to be some indication that this may be the case, a more accurate reflection of the responses in this study would be that overall fairness judgments are based not only upon assessment of justice components, but also the values placed on the justice source.

The first basis of overall fairness is the value placed on the justice component (i.e., distributive, procedural, and interactional justice). In other words, police officers, in judging the fairness of a particular decision, place a value on the outcome of the decision (distributive justice), the process in which the decision was made (procedural justice), and/or on interpersonal factors of the decision (interactional justice). For example, one police officer was “unsure” whether the process of selecting the chief of police was fair, but viewed the outcome of that selection as being “fair” (reflecting distributive justice). Another example can be seen, however, when two different police officers make a fairness judgment on one source (i.e., restructuring)—one believing that it was fair or unfair based upon the process and the other believing that it was fair or unfair based upon the outcome. These findings seem to indicate that individual officers place a value

judgment on the importance of outcome, the importance of the process, and/or the importance of interpersonal factors—not necessarily valuing each equally—in forming overall perceptions of justice.

In utilizing an overall justice measurement, these findings are expected and consistent with research that indicates that, in making these judgments, individuals make decisions based upon whatever information is both available and salient (Greenberg, 2001). Also, victims of injustice are unlikely to be concerned with whether the type of justice was distributive, procedural, or interactive, reacting instead to their general experience of injustice (Shapiro, 2001).

In making overall fairness judgments, police officers also place a value judgment on the source of that judgment. In other words, in forming an overall perception of fairness, police officers place a value on certain decisions that, to them, are important. For example, in this study, police officers formed their overall perceptions of fairness on one or more of the following sources—restructuring, parity, changing of policies, selection of a chief of police, and/or the concept of developing one department. However, these decisions do not reflect all of the decisions made by administrators during consolidation. Given the vast number of these decisions, it would be virtually impossible for officers to make an overall fairness judgment by evaluating every single decision. Therefore, the argument is made here that officers place more of a value on some decisions than they do others. These more valued decisions serve as a basis or a mental shortcut for officers' overall perceptions of fairness.

Although past studies have identified these mental shortcuts or fairness heuristics in terms of tools used to accept or reject the directives of people in positions of authority

(Lind, Kulik, Ambrose, and de Vera Park, 1993) or to address uncertainties about trust (Van den Bos and Miedema, 2000), this study refers to these shortcuts in terms of assessments placed on justice *sources* in forming overall fairness judgments. Therefore, the importance of this finding and what makes this study unique by comparison to previous studies is the weight given to a justice source in forming overall fairness judgments. For example, in the early stages of consolidation, officers indicated that the administration put together committees to decide on issues such as the design of the new metro uniforms, cars, badges, guns, and other “cosmetic” issues. Although, officers from both city and county departments were members of these committees, many of these officers indicated that they were only given a voice in those decisions that were insignificant and that they had little or no input on those issues important to the officers (i.e., the overall planning and restructuring of the new department).

Overall, there appears to be some indication, based upon the findings in this study, that police officers place a value on the justice components (i.e., procedural, distributive, and interactive justice). These values are based upon what information is available and salient to the officer. At the same time, officers also place a value on the justice source (i.e., the decisions made by the administration). These values are based upon the weight or importance an officer gave to a specific decision. Arguably, overall perceptions of fairness represent or reflect an officer’s assessment of these values. Given the number of decisions made during a consolidation of this magnitude, these assessments could provide officers with a mental shortcut or heuristic in forming overall perceptions of fairness.

Within any organization, numerous decisions are made daily by administrators that have some level of impact on employees. As a result, officers form perceptions of fairness of these decisions. It would be safe to assume that some of these decisions are of little interest to officers—placing a value on justice source. For the most part, these decisions and changes occur within a relatively stable environment and might not be considered catastrophic. However, consolidation introduces two additional factors when considering how officers form fairness judgments during a consolidation—the lack of organizational stability and the magnitude of the changes. First, the lack of organizational stability places a heightened awareness and importance on the decisions made during the restructure of the new organization. In other words, decisions made by administrators are judged with more interest by officers due to the possible consequences these decisions possess (i.e., loss of identity, culture, power and status, etc.), as well as the symbolic representation associated with those decisions (i.e., perception of a takeover, etc.). Second, the sheer number and magnitude of the decisions, not to mention the relatively short amount of time taken to complete the consolidation process, makes it virtually impossible to process the fairness of each decision independently. As a result of these two factors, consolidation accentuates the values placed upon justice sources and justice components in forming overall fairness judgments and potentially, given what is at stake, intensifies officers' responses to these judgments.

Expectation #4

In this study, differences in perceptions of fairness were expected to be seen between LPD and JCPD officers as well as differences between the different ranks of police officers. The findings in this study do indicate some differences in perception

between city and county officers, but very few differences were identified based upon rank. In this study, the one factor that appears to contribute most to these differences is the issue of parity. However, as will be discussed, parity alone does not explain all of these differences.

Parity was perhaps the one issue in which the differences in perception between city and county officers were the most obvious and divisive—city officers being on one side and county officers being on the other. As identified in the findings of research question #2, most city officers believed that they deserved the same pay and benefits received by county officers. Consolidation, for these officers, was viewed as a way of obtaining parity and improving their pay and benefits. However, a few city officers indicated that although they were for parity, they opposed consolidation—fearing that what would be gained by obtaining parity would not be worth the potential losses. Most county officers, although indicating that city officers deserved better pay and benefits, did not believe that they should lose what they had obtained through years of successful negotiations with the county government. The best that county officers could hope for was that city officers would be brought up to their level, in terms of pay and benefits, and that they would not lose anything. In general, county officers believed that consolidation offered them very few benefits. As identified throughout this study, parity was the one issue where there was going to be a winner and loser—or at least someone who was not going to gain.

Concerns or divisions caused by the issue of parity are nothing new to those involved in a consolidation and, as such, this study is consistent with past studies that have identified parity, as well as other factors (i.e., seniority, loss of identity, distrust

between department and inter-agency jealousies, etc.), as possible sources of negative preconceptions and resistance to consolidation (IACP, 2003; Herley, 1989; Wickum, 1986; Hogan, 1980; Ostrom and Whitaker, 1973). For example, in reviewing the officers' concerns regarding consolidation (identified in the findings in research question #2), county officers expressed more frequently than city officers a fear of a takeover. As indicated in their responses, county officers believed that by the city being the larger department and the Metro Mayor the former Mayor of the City of Louisville, the decisions made during the consolidation process would be heavily influenced by and favor the city department and officers. Although a few city officers did indicate that they feared a takeover by the county, the general sense was that the city was the larger department and would lose very little.

However, parity does not explain all of these differences. Differences in overall fairness perceptions could be seen between former city police officers and between former county police officers. In other words, not all former city police officers believed that consolidation was fair, nor did they base their overall perception of consolidation on the issue of parity. On the other side, not all county police officers believed that consolidation was unfair nor did they base their perception on the issue of parity. As illustrated in police officers' responses in voicing their perception of the overall fairness of consolidation, parity was only identified as a justice source by 5.0% of the participants (one LPD and one JCPD).

To some degree, these differences can be explained by the individual values placed upon justice sources. As stated earlier, police officers appear to make individually based, comparative values on justice decisions or sources—placing more emphasis, in

terms of forming overall perceptions of fairness, on one or more justice decisions over other decisions. For consolidation to be successful, parity had to be obtained. As one city officer stated, “There is no way I’m going to do the same work and not get paid the same. It’s not going to work.” Still, in identifying differences between former city and former county police officers, parity was the most prevailing theme. However, parity should not be identified as the only contributing factor in identifying differences in perceptions between city and county officers. Still, within the boundaries of this study, the issue of parity does provide some insight into the basis of these differences.

Inequalities in pay and benefits, however, were issues prior to consolidation—contributing to the oftentimes antagonistic and adversarial relationship between the city and county officers. Parity represented more than just an issue of equality in pay and benefits; symbolically, parity also represented status. Despite all of the comparisons made between the city and county—to determine which was the better department—parity was the one issue that gave a slight advantage to the county department. Prior to consolidation, many of the respondents from both city and county believed that parity would not be addressed and/or could not be obtained without consolidation. However, what was perceived as being unobtainable without consolidation became an unavoidable, divisive, and emotionally charged issue for the new administration. Without consolidation, the issue of parity would have, most likely, remained a moot point or, at best, a topic of general conversation and debate. With consolidation, it had to be addressed head on.

Policy Implications

In this section, the policy implications of this study will be identified. These implications include: 1) the importance of distributive, procedural, and interactional justices in preserving perceptions of justice; 2) the important role managers and supervisors play in preserving perceptions of justice during a transitional event; and 3) identifying the importance of justice rules in preserving perceptions of justice.

First, in this study, an overall justice concept was used to determine the fairness of the LMPD consolidation process. The responses provided by police officers identify the importance of distributive, procedural, and interactive justice in nurturing perceptions of fairness within an organization. From a distributive justice perspective, administrators must remember that employees enter into a consolidation with certain individual expectations—based upon personal (i.e., pay and benefits) and professional (i.e., officer safety issues, terms of pay, benefits, job status and positions, and operational resources) needs—values that, in general, are based upon comparative outcomes (see Stouffer, Suchman, DeVinney, Star, & Williams, 1949). In this study, the issue of parity was perhaps one of the most divisive and emotionally charged issues from both a monetary perspective and as a symbol of status and equality. Administrators of change should, therefore, devote considerable attention to understanding these needs and pay considerable attention to the disparities and potential consequences in the allocation of resources. From a procedural justice perspective, consolidation should not be viewed solely on the basis of outcome, but as a process. Process does not refer simply to the process of consolidation, but a process that symbolizes and attempts to institutionalize the concepts of justice in all of the practices and procedures of an organization (Tyler and

Bies, 1990). Providing employees with the opportunity to “buy-in” to the new department and administration, and to have a reasonable “voice” in the process helps, preserve the integrity of the organization by nurturing and reflecting perceptions of justice throughout the process. Had officers been given more of an opportunity to have a voice in more important decisions (i.e., redistricting)—beyond what was perceived as being superficial or cosmetic—some of the negative emotions and behaviors directed toward the administration could have been minimized and perception of fairness may have been more prevalent. From an interactional justice perspective, the context in which a consolidation takes place is unique to each situation. By understanding the issues and circumstances surrounding the consolidation, and the preconceived opinions and expectations of employees and facilitators of change, administrators can provide timely and accurate information in a manner that fosters perceptions of fairness. Obtaining information and distributing it effectively enables administrators to anticipate and respond to potential problems. Had administrators been more sensitive to the needs of officers to be informed firsthand about future changes—and not through local media and other second-hand sources—it would have demonstrated to the officers that they were respected by their administration. Therefore, administrators must develop a process (i.e., dialogue sessions, interviews, or various other assessment techniques) in which relevant information is collected, analyzed, and disseminated timely and accurately to all potential stakeholders—especially employees (McLean, 2006). Such efforts help to increase ownership of initiatives and ensure validity of information interpretation (Cummings & Worley, 2005; McLean, 2006)—fostering perceptions of justice.

Second, although this study falls short of reflecting the important role managers and supervisors play in a consolidation, to not mention their importance would be an even greater shortcoming. In order for this process to be effective, administrators must also obtain support from potential allies—managers and supervisors. Managers and supervisors play an integral part in the process of acquiring and disseminating information. Supervisors, in particular, play a crucial role in how that information is disseminated throughout the department. Buy-in from these individuals helps to protect and preserve the integrity and respect for the organization and the administration by nurturing the concept of interactive justice.

Finally, given all that was said and done within this study, it would have been easy to overlook one of the most fundamental factors—the rules of justice measure. Interestingly, these rules are rarely incorporated into justice measures (Colquitt and Shaw, 2005). However, this should not displace their importance. In the beginning of this study, police officers were asked how they defined a fair department. Their responses did not include concepts of distributive, procedural, or interactive justice, but reflected the “rules” that govern these concepts. Therefore, these rules should be identified as a final implication and as a reminder to those administrators of change of what employees think constitutes perceptions of fairness. These rules include:

1. Equity—outcomes should be distributed in proportion to an individual’s input
(Leventhal, 1976)
2. Process control—should offer opportunities for individuals to express views
(Thibaut and Walker, 1975)

3. Decision control—should offer opportunities for individuals to influence outcomes (Thibaut and Walker, 1975)
4. Consistency—decisions and actions should be consistent across people and time (Leventahl, 1980)
5. Bias suppression—decisions and actions should be neutral and free of bias (Leventahl, 1980)
6. Accuracy—decisions and actions should be based upon accurate information (Leventahl, 1980)
7. Correctability—mechanisms should be incorporated for appeals (Leventahl, 1980)
8. Representativeness—decisions and actions to be representative of all concerns (Leventahl, 1980)
9. Ethicality—decisions and actions should reflect ethical and moral standards (Leventahl, 1980)
10. Respect—communication should be conducted respectfully (Leventahl, 1980)
11. Propriety—refrain from improper comments (Leventahl, 1986)
12. Justification—adequate explanations should be provided (Leventahl, 1986)
13. Truthfulness—be truthful and candid (Leventahl, 1986)

It would be erroneous to suggest that administrators during this consolidation did not attend to these rules. However, based upon the responses and findings in this study, there is some evidence that some of these rules (i.e., process control and decision control in particular) were perceived by officers as being neglected by the administration. Had

the facilitators attended to these rules, the consolidation of LMPD might have been perceived by more officers as being fair in its process.

Limitations of Study

Due to the nature of this study, certain limitations exist. First, the qualitative methodology in this study makes it difficult to generalize these findings on two levels. On the first level, it cannot be assumed that the findings in this study would reflect the findings in other police consolidations. As stated earlier, each consolidation is unique in its degree of structural change, the types of consolidation, and the stage of its consolidation. Depending on the circumstances and issues surrounding the consolidation, each of these factors can vary from one consolidation to the next. For example, the birth of LMPD was the result of a government consolidation between the City of Louisville and Jefferson County—the first such consolidation in more than 30 years and perhaps the least common type of consolidation. Therefore, in comparison to other consolidations, LMPD could be considered an anomaly. However, this should not be interpreted to imply that the findings in this study are not relevant to other consolidations.

On the second level, it cannot be assumed that these findings represent the broader population of police officers of LMPD. At this level, the limitations of this study can be identified based upon several factors: 1) response rate, 2) officer's rank, 3) officer's unit at the time of consolidation, 4) officer's years of service, 5) officer's race, and 6) officer's gender. First, in this study a 33.3% response rate was obtained. The responses of officers who participated in this study may have been different from those who chose not to participate. Also, the population group selected for this study did not include 295 Metro officers who may have offered a different perspective on

consolidation. Second, very few officers above the rank of sergeant participated in this study. As a result, individuals with managerial or administrative responsibilities were underrepresented. Also, the sample included six sergeants who received their promotion at some point after the consolidation process began. Therefore, their recall of consolidation could have been, to some degree, based upon their perceptions as a patrol officer. Third, there was some indication that officers who were in units that were consolidated, decentralized, or disbanded may have had a different perception of consolidation. However, these issues did not emerge as prevalent themes in this study due, in part, to the underrepresentation of this group. Fourth, the average years of service of respondents was 17.5 years—reflecting an underrepresentation of officers who were new to either of the two departments before merger and may have offered a different perception of consolidation. Fifth, in this study, black police officers were underrepresented. Although there was some indication that black police officers may have had a different perspective on consolidation (i.e., a different perspective on the selection of the chief of police, and a different perspective on the relationship between police officers and the black community), their responses did not emerge as prevailing themes. Finally, in this study, there was a very small representation of female police officers. Although the findings indicate that females may have had a different perspective or experience regarding consolidation (i.e., the experiences of a county female sergeant taking command of a city platoon), these perceptions, unfortunately, did not emerge as prevailing themes.

Despite these limitations, efforts were made to represent the targeted population, using systematic random sampling, based upon officers' former department and their

rank. However, in duplicating this study, consideration should be given to increasing the sample size, as well as making comparisons between various types of consolidations in order to improve the generalizability on both levels.

Second, the timing of this study may be problematic. Approximately eight years have passed since the initial stage of the consolidation process. The ability of officers to recall information, specific to the consolidation, may be impaired or altered due to the integration of other knowledge or influences by more recent events (Berg, 2004). Although measures were taken to minimize these problems by designing the interview instrument in a way that would help facilitate the recall of information (i.e., focusing on key events instead of specific times), it is unrealistic to believe that the perceptions reported by respondents have not been altered, over time, in some form or fashion. For example, a “halo” error could occur when creating evaluative justice judgments. In other words, less favorable situations or circumstances may have occurred within the department (i.e., increases in benefits, a controversial issue such as an officer involved shooting, etc.) or outside the department (i.e., government cutbacks in funding, etc.) contributing to bias judgments (Colquitt & Shaw, 2005).

The third limitation involves the fair process effect model and the format of the interview questions. First, this study utilized the fair process effect model as a basis to identify the decisions made by administrators, the judgments made by officers about those decisions, and the reactions of officers directed toward supervisors and the organization. Unfortunately, this model has a tendency to overrepresent negative reactions to injustices (Folger, and Cropanzano, 1988). In other words, there is more of a tendency for participants to identify examples of unfair versus fair treatment. Second,

consolidation is an organizational process. Therefore, questions related to consolidation tended to focus more on formal (organization-originating) justice sources or decisions made by the administration. Therefore, very few of the officers' responses reflected reactions to informal (supervisor-originating) justice sources.

Finally, this study is limited by the possible negative influences of interviewing bias (Berg, 2004; also see Babbie, 2001). As a former JCPD police officer, consideration must be given to the possibility that the researcher's presence during the interviewing process may have altered the responses of some of the participants. These personal biases and prejudices also could have had a negative impact on the analysis and reporting of the findings. Although efforts were implemented to reduce the negative impact of these biases (i.e., conducting pilot interviews and asking balanced questions), it would be unwise to assume that they did not come into play. However, given the potentially sensitive nature of this study, it is believed that this study would have been a far more difficult challenge if the researcher had not been a member of either of the two departments.

Future Studies

While there are some limitations to this study, suggestions for future studies are provided—especially if plans are to duplicate this study. These suggestions are based upon the sources of justice, the context of justice, the measurement of justice, leadership, and the issue of perceptions.

First, future studies should focus on clearly identifying the justice sources when measuring overall perceptions of justice. Scholars have long understood that justice was the responsibility of both formal and informal sources. However, one does not

necessarily dictate the other (Colquitt and Shaw, 2005). Identifying the justice source is imperative especially when attempts are made to determine or identify individuals' reactions to fairness judgments—as illustrated in this study.

Second, future studies should also place more emphasis on “entity” measures—examining fairness across multiple decision-making events. By incorporating entity measures, assessments can be made on the influences of both formal and informal sources, and the justice components. As indicated by the findings in this study, throughout a consolidation process or any complex process, multiple decisions are made—originating from both formal and informal sources. Based upon these decisions, individuals form perceptions of fairness based upon the comparative values placed upon the outcome (distributive justice), the process (procedural justice), and interpersonal treatment (interactive justice). Arguably, overall perceptions of fairness are a result of the comparative values individuals place upon these factors. Entity measures could provide researchers an ability to better understand overall perceptions of fairness by understanding the values individuals place on these factors. Qualitative researchers are interested in how humans arrange themselves and their setting and how inhabitants of these settings make sense of their surroundings through symbols, rituals, social structures and social roles (Berg, 2004; also see Babbie, 2001). From this perspective, the values placed on these factors could help in understanding how employees make sense out of the complexities of a consolidation.

Third, more studies should focus on overall perceptions of fairness. As indicated earlier, more may be learned from an individual's overall sense of organizational fairness than from focusing on the difference between justice types or components (Ambrose and

Arnaud, 2005). However, in duplicating this study, consideration should be given to implementing direct or indirect measures (Lind and Tyler, 1988). “Direct” measures specifically ask respondents “how fair” the outcome, process, or interpersonal treatment was—asking the respondent to form a global evaluation judgment. An example of a direct measure, addressing procedural justice, would ask respondents, “How fair was the process in deciding how to reassign police officers?” “Indirect” measures, on the other hand, assess the rules that foster a sense of fairness. These types of questions would ask the respondent to rate particular characteristics of the event or entity in a more descriptive sense. For example, an indirect measure would ask respondents, “In deciding what policies to implement do you think that the Chief usually/sometimes/or seldom considers the views of all sides before making decisions?” This question references a descriptive judgment of the characteristics of a decision event, in this case Thibaut and Walker’s (1975) process control rule. In another example, the respondent would be asked, “Is he usually/sometimes/or seldom unbiased and impartial in making policy decisions?” This type of question taps into Leventhal’s (1980) bias suppression rule. Depending on the nature of the research these measurements can provide additional insight and understanding of overall fairness judgments and the rules governing distributive, procedural, and interactional justice.

Fourth, future studies should continue to further understand the role of leadership during a consolidation. As implied from this study, the characteristics of a good leader during drastic and dramatic transitional changes may not be the same characteristics of a good leader under relatively normal or stable conditions. Dismissing or ignoring people’s emotional responses to the change, failing to recognize cultural barriers during

the reconstruction of the organization, and failing to clearly establish the new rules and responsibilities of employees and the organization can impede the success of a consolidation. Therefore, the characteristics and abilities of a leader to manage these factors become a crucial variable in a consolidation process.

Finally, future studies should take great care in interpreting the data in these studies. Beyond the challenges involved in conceptualizing organizational justice concepts is the issue of perception. Although it might be possible to “derive rational-normative principles of procedural justice, and a possibility of an objective fair process effect, it should be understood that the fair process effect in essence is a psychological effect, constructed in the head of the recipient of the procedure” (Van den Bos, 2005: 278) and therefore can be defined in reference to objective standards of right and wrong (Hare, 1981). Thus, psychology of organizational justice and particularly research on the fair process effect should be treated with strong weight to the subjectivity of fairness judgments (Van den Bos, 2005: 278). In other words, caution should be used in interpreting individuals’ perceptions as being the truth. The fact that someone views something as being fair does not mean that everyone believes it is fair. At the same time, researchers cannot hide the fact that employees’ reaction to fairness judgments or perceptions could have an adverse impact on the organization and its supervisors.

Conclusion

In instituting change, organizations require not only managers, but also leaders. Administrators must remember that a consolidation of an organization is an integration of systems, people, and perceptions. A good manager is effective in integrating both the

organization's systems and people and their culture. A good leader, on the other hand, is effective in managing perception.

In this study, I attempted to answer four research questions—1) How do police officers view a just department?; 2) How do police officers react to justice judgments?; 3) How do police officers form fairness judgments?; and 4) How do LPD and JCPD police officers differ in the perceptions of fairness? Although these questions could have been posed without consolidation, the consolidation process identified in this study provides a unique opportunity to understand fairness judgments under more intense and extreme conditions. In making an analogy to stress, consolidation would be considered an “acute stressor” (a reaction to an immediate threat—unplanned, unexpected, and unavoidable) as opposed to a “chronic stressor” (day-to-day type stressors, for example dealing with your boss or members of the community) (Farmer, 1990). Although both types of stressors can impact the body physically and psychologically, more severe and unpredictable stressors (i.e., chronic stressors) can prompt more dramatic alarm reactions in the body (Selye, 1956). When faced with an acute stressor, the body reacts by going into a survival mode (i.e., increase in heart rate, increased adrenalin, increased respiratory)—commonly known as the “fight or flight response”—in an attempt to survive the threat (Selye, 1956). Although acute stressors or threats are generally short lived and pass, unresolved issues from the threat can become chronic and can have a detrimental impact on the body. Based upon this analogy, during a consolidation, officers are placed in an unavoidably unpredictable and sudden life changing situation. As a result, many officers felt as though their identity, their culture, their way of policing, and their way of life were being threatened or taken away—prompting more extreme reactions to decisions made by

administrators. Under these conditions, how officers perceived the fairness of the consolidation process is not only important to their immediate and future survival, but also to the survival of the organization as a whole.

Overall, the findings in this study indicate that police officers do place value on overall perceptions of fairness and that the reactions to these perceptions can have adverse effects on the organization—especially in a prolonged period of uncertainty, such as in anticipation of and during a consolidation of two previously autonomous agencies. Although an individual's attitude and behavior toward the organization and its supervisors may not be based solely upon perceptions of fairness, issues of fairness can be considered to be among the fundamental principles or virtues governing our social institutions and the workplace (Rawls, 1999) during periods of stressful, drastic, and dramatic change.

In closing, it is important to mention the contributions this study makes to the literature. First, this study contributes to the literature on organizational justice by illustrating the importance of justice rules. Throughout this study, these rules have been a constant reference by officers in forming fairness judgments. Unfortunately, these rules have not been the focal point of recent studies. Also, this study contributes to the literature on organizational justice by illustrating the importance of utilizing overall fairness measures. Although studies have been able to identify the various components of justice (i.e., distributive, procedural, and interactional justice) and have illustrated how each of these components contributes to fairness judgments, little attention has been given to overall fairness measures. Overall fairness judgments not only provide an opportunity to gauge the values placed on justice components and justice sources, they

also provide an opportunity, using direct and indirect measures, to reflect the justice rules—potentially expanding our understanding of fairness beyond its components.

Finally, this study contributes to the literature on consolidation by illustrating the important role leadership plays during this process. Leadership consists of the unification of individuals around a common goal—guiding and motivating them collectively toward achieving the desired goals of the organization—well beyond the stabilization stage of consolidation. From this perspective, leaders of consolidation attempt to develop an overall plan that focuses not only on the immediate changes and the perceptions of those changes, but also on the organization’s future. As stated earlier, not everyone is going to be pleased with the decisions made during the consolidation of an organization—regardless of how hard anyone tries. Efforts to try to please everyone will inevitably fail. Therefore, administrators of change, as part of their overall plan, should strive not to obtain an absolute consensus on fairness, but to preserve the perception of fairness by reflecting the rules of justice in their decision making process. By understanding the issues, the values placed on their decisions, and implementing the rules of justice in making those decisions, leaders are able to preserve the integrity of the organization and its administrators by fostering a perception of fairness in the smallest unit within their organization—its employees.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. 1965. Inequity in social exchange: In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Allegheny Institute for Public Policy. 2005 (June). *Merging governments: Lessons from Louisville, Indianapolis, and Philadelphia*, Allegheny Institute Report #05-04.
- Allen, T., Freeman, D., Russell, J., Reizenstein, R., & Rentz, J. 2001. Survivor reactions to organizational downsizing: Does time ease the pain? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74, 145-164.
- Altshuler, A., Morrill, W., Wolman, H., Mitchell, F. 1999. *Governance and opportunity in metropolitan America*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Ambrose, M. & Arnaud, A. 2005. *Are procedural justice and distributive justice conceptually distinct?* In J. Greenberg & J. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Justice* (pp. 59-84). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Amitai, E. 1964. *Modern organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Armstrong-Stassen, M. 2004. The influence of prior commitment on the reactions of layoff survivors to organizational downsizing. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9, 46-60.
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P., & Chen, Z. 2002. Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 267-279.

- Babbie, S. 2001. *The practice of social research* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomas.
- Baker, E. 1980. Managing organizational culture. *Management Review*, July.
- Banfield, E., & Grodzins, M. 1958. *Government and housing in metropolitan areas*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Barclay, L. 2003. *Following in the footsteps of Mary Parker Follett: Exploring how insights from the past can advance organizational justice theory and research*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.
- Barclay, L., Skarlicki, D., & Pugh, S. 2005. Exploring the role of emotions in injustice perceptions and retaliation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 629-643.
- Baruch, Y., & Hind, P. 1999. Perpetual motion in organizations: Effective management and the impact of the new psychological contracts on survivor syndrome. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 295-306.
- Bayley, D. 1992. *Comparative organization of the police in English-speaking countries*. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (eds.), *Modern policing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berg, B. 2004. *Qualitative research methods: for the social sciences* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Beugre, C. 1996. Analyzing the effects of perceived fairness on organizational commitment and workplace aggression (Doctoral dissertation, Rensselaer Polytechnic University, 1996). *Dissertation Abstract International*, DAI-A 57/10. (UMI No. AAT 9708901).

- Beugre, C. 1998. *Managing fairness in organizations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Incorporated.
- Bies, R. 1987. Beyond voice: The influence of decision-maker justification and sincerity on procedural fairness judgments. *Representative Research in Social Psychology*, 17, 3-14.
- Bies, R., & Moag, J. 1986. Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In J. Lewicki, B. Sheppard, & M. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Bies, R., & Shapiro, D. 1987. Interactional fairness judgments: the influence of causal accounts. *Social Justice Research*, 1, 199-218.
- Bish, R., & Ostrom, V. 1974. *Understanding urban government: Metropolitan reform reconsidered*, (Vol. 14-15). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Blader, S., & Tyler, T. 2003. What constitutes fairness in work settings? A four-component model of procedural justice. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13, 107-126.
- Blader, S., & Tyler, T. 2005. How can theories of organizational justice explain the effects of fairness? In J. Greenberg & J. Colquitt, *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 329-354). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Blau, P. 1964. *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Bollens, J., & Schmandt, H. 1982. *The metropolis: Its people, politics and economic life* (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Brams, S., & Taylor, A. 1996. *Fair division: From cake-cutting to dispute resolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Brehm, J. 1966. *A theory of psychological reactance*. New York: Academic Press.
- Brockner, J. 1990. Scope of justice in the workplace: How survivors react to co-worker layoff. *Journal of Social Issue*, 46, 95-106.
- Brockner, J., DeWitt, R., Grover, S., & Reed, T. 1990. When it is especially important to explain why: Factors affecting the relationship between managers' explanations of a layoff and survivors reactions to the layoff. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 26, 389-407.
- Brockner, J., Grover, S., Reed, T., DeWitt, R., & O'Malley, M. 1987. Survivors' reactions to layoffs: We get by with a little help for our friends. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32, 526-541.
- Brockner, J., Konovsky, M., Cooper-Schneider, R., Folger, R., Martin, C., & Bies, R. 1994. Interactive effects of procedural justice and outcome negativity on victims and survivors of job loss. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 397-409.
- Brockner, J., & Weisenfeld, B. 1996. An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decisions: Interactive effects of outcomes and procedures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 189-208.
- Brockner, J., Wiesenfeld, B., Reed, T., Grover, S., & Martin, C. 1993. Interactive effect of job content and context on reactions of layoff survivors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 187-197.
- Brooke, P., Russell, D., & Price, J. 1988. Discriminate validation of measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 139-145.

- Brown, R. 1996. Organizational commitment: Clarifying the concept and simplifying the existing construct typology. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 230-251.
- Bruk-Lee, V., & Spector, P. 2006. The social stressors-counterproductive work behaviors link: Are conflicts with supervisors and coworkers the same? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11, 145-156.
- Buono, A., & Bowditch, J. 1989. *The human side of mergers and acquisitions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Buono, A., Bowditch, J., & Lewis, J. 1985. When cultures collide: The anatomy of a merger. *Human Relations*, 38, 477-500.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2007). *Census of state and local law enforcement agencies, 2004*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Byrne, Z., & Cropanzano, R. 2000. Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. Bollen & J. Long (Eds.). *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136-162). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cartwright, S., & Cooper, C. 1993. The role of culture compatibility in successful organizational marriage. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7, 57-70.
- Chadwick, B., Bahr, H., & Albrecht, S. 1984. *Social science research methods*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Citera, M., & Rentsch, J. R. 1993. Is there justice in organizational acquisitions? The role of distributive and procedural fairness in corporate acquisitions. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management*, 211 – 230. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Cobb, A., Folger., & Wooten, K. 1995. The role justice plays in organizational change. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 19(2), 135-152.
- Cobb, A., Vest, M., & Hills, F. 1997. Who delivers justice? Source perceptions of procedural fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386-400.
- Cobb, A., Wooten, K., & Folger, R. 1995. Justice in the making: Toward understanding the theory and practice of justice in organizational change and development. In W. Pasmore & R. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (Vol. 8, pp. 243-295). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Cohen, R. 1986. *Justice: Views from the social sciences*. New York: Plenum.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., Spector, P. 2001. The role of justice in organizations. *A Meta-Analysis: Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278-324.
- Collie, T., Bradley, G., & Sparks, B. 2002. Fair process revisited: Differential effects of interactional and procedural justice in the presence of social comparison information. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 545-555.
- Colquitt, J. 2001. On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
- Colquitt, J., & Chertkoff, J. 2002. Explaining injustice: The interactive effects of explanation and outcome on fairness perceptions and task motivation. *Journal of Management*, 28, 591-610.
- Colquitt, J., Conlon, D., Wesson, M., Porter, C., & Ng, K. 2001. Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425-445.

- Colquitt, J., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan. 2005. What is organization justice? A historical overview. In J. Greenberg & J. Colquitt Eds.). *Handbook of Organizational Justice* (pp. 3-56). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Colquitt, J., & Shaw, J. 2005. *How should organizational justice be measured?* In J. Greenberg & J. Colquitt. *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 113-152). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Commonwealth of Kentucky, Legislative Research Commission, H.B. 647. 2000.
- Conlon, D., Meyer, C., & Nowakowski, J. 2005. How does organizational justice affect performance, withdrawal, and counterproductive behavior? In J. Greenberg & J. Colquitt. *Handbook on organizational justice* (pp. 310-354). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cropanzano, R. 2001. *Advances in organizational justice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z., Bobocel, D., & Rupp, D. 2001. Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 164-209.
- Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C. & Chen, P. 2002. Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group and Organization Management*, 27, 324 – 351.
- Cummings, T. & Worley, C. 2005. *Organization development and change* (8th ed.). Madison, WI: Thomson South-Western.

- Daly, J., Geyer, P. 1994. The role of fairness in implementing large-scale change: Employee evaluations of process and outcome in seven facility relocations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 623-638.
- Daniels, N., Light, D., & Caplan, R. 1996. *Benchmarks of fairness for health care reform*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dempsey, J., & Forst, L. 2010. *An introduction to policing* (5th ed.). Clifton Park, NY: Delmar Cengage Learning.
- Deutsch, M. 1957. Trust and suspicion. *Conflict Resolution*, 2, 265-279.
- Diekmann, K., Samuels, S., Ross, L., & Bazerman, M. 1997. Self-interest and fairness in problems of resource allocation: Allocators versus recipients. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 1061-1074.
- Dolan, D. 1990. Local government fragmentation: Does it drive up costs of government? *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 26(1), 451-463.
- Dollard, J., Doob, L., Miller, N., Mowrer, O., & Sears, R. 1939. *Frustration and aggression*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dowding, K., & Hindmoor, A. 1997. The usual suspects: Rational choice, socialism and political theory. *New Political Economy*, 2(3), 451-463.
- Downs, A. 1994. *New visions for metropolitan America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Durning, D., & Nobbie, P. 2000. Post-transition employee perspectives of city-county unification: The case of Athens-Clarke County. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 24(2), 140-168.
- Dye, T. 1988. *Politics in states and communities*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Dyer, W., & Wilkins, A. 1991. Better stories, not better constructs, to generate better theory: A rejoinder to Eisenhardt. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(3), 613-619.
- Farmer, R. 1990. Clinical and managerial implications of stress research on the police. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 17(3), 205-218.
- Festinger, L. 1957. A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7, 117-140.
- Folger, R. 1998. Fairness as a moral virtue: In M. Schminke (Ed.), *Managerial ethics: Morally managing people and processes* (pp. 13-34). Nahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Folger, R., & Bies, R. 1989. Managerial responsibilities and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2, 79-89.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. 1998. *Organizational justice and human resource management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. 1989a. Relative deprivation and referent cognitions: Distributive and procedural justice effects. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 22, 531-546.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. 1989b. Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 115-130.
- Folger, R., Rosenfield, D., Grove, J., & Corkan, L. 1979. Effects of voice and peer opinions on responses to inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 2253-2261.
- Fosdick, R.B., 1920. *American police systems*. New York: The Century Company.

- Fox, S., & Spector, P. 1999. A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 915-931.
- Fried, Y., Tiegs, R., Naughton, T., & Ashforth, B. 1996. Managers' reactions to a corporate acquisition: A test of an integrative model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 7, 401-427.
- Garpin, T., & Herndon, M. 2000. *The complete guide to mergers and acquisitions: Process tools to support M&A integration at every level*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Giacalone, R., & Greenberg, J. 1997. *Antisocial behavior in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gillespie, J., & Greenberg, J. 2005. *Are the goals of organizational justice self-interested?* In J. Greenberg & J. Colquitt Eds.). *Handbook of Organizational Justice* (pp. 179-213). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Goodnow, F. 1900. *Politics and Administration*. New York: Macmillan.
- Gordon, G. 1991. Industry determinants of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(2).
- Gorden, R. 1987. *Interviewing* (4th ed.). Chicago: Dorsey Press.
- Greenberg, J. 1983. Overcoming egocentric bias in perceived fairness through self-awareness. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 46, 152-156.
- Greenberg, J. 1987a. A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 9-22.
- Greenberg, J. 1987b. Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 55-61.

- Greenberg, J. 1990a. Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of paycuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 561-568.
- Greenberg, J. 1990b. Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.
- Greenberg, J. 1993a. The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In Cropanzano, R. (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Greenberg, J. 1993b. Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54, 81-103.
- Greenberg, J. 1994. Using socially fair procedures to promote acceptance of a work site smoking ban. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 288-297.
- Greenberg, J. 2001. Setting the justice agenda: seven unanswered questions about what, why, and how. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 210-219.
- Greenberg, J., & Bies, R. 1992. Establishing the role of empirical studies of organizational justice in philosophical inquiries into business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11, 433-444.
- Greenberg, J., & Lind, E. 2000. The pursuit of organizational justice: From conceptualization to implication to application. In C. Cooper, & E. Locke (Eds), *Industrial and organizational psychology: Linking theory with practice* (pp. 72-108). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

- Greenberg, J., & Ornstein, S. 1983. High status job title as compensation for underpayment: a test of equity theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 285-297.
- Grover, S. L. 1991. Predicting the perceived fairness of parental leave policies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 247-255.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. 1994. Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gutknecht, J., & Keys, J. 1993. Mergers, acquisitions and takeover: Maintaining morale of survivors and protecting employees. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7, 26-36.
- Gyapong, A., & Gyimah-Brempong, K. 1988. Factor Substitution, Price Elasticity of Demand and Returns to Scale in Police Production: Evidence from Michigan. *Southern Economic Journal*, 54(4), 863-878.
- Gyimah-Brempong, K. 1987. Economies of Scale in Municipal Police Departments: The Case of Florida. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 69(2), 352-356.
- Hall, R., Haas, J., & Johnson, N. 1967. Organizational size, complexity, and formalization. *American Sociological Review*, 32, 903-912.
- Halter, G. 1993. City-city consolidations in the United States. *National Civic Review*, 82(3), 282-289.
- Hamel, J., DuFour, S., & Fortin, D. 1993. *Case study methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hare, R. 1981. *Moral thinking: Its levels, method, and point*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Harvey, S.. & Haines. V. 2005. Employer treatment of employees during a community crisis: The role of procedural and distributive justice. *Journal of Business and psychology*, 20. 53-68.
- Hatfield, E., Greenberger, D., Traupmann, J., & Lambert, P. 1982. Equity and sexual satisfaction in recently married couples. *Journal of Sex Research*, 18, 18-32.
- Hauenstein, N., McGonigle, T., & Flinder, S. 2001. A meta-analysis of the relationship between procedural justice and distributive justice: Implications for justice research. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 13, 39-56.
- Heider, F. 1958. *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Hendrix, W.. Robbins. T., Miller, J., & Summers, T. 1998. Effects of procedural and distributive justice on factor predictive of turnover. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 13, 611-633.
- Herley, P. 1989. *How can the consolidation of functions between small California police departments ensure the departments' viability by the year 2000?* Sacramento, CA: Commission on Police Officer Standards and Training.
- Higgins, G. 2009. Quantitative versus qualitative methods: Understanding why quantitative methods are predominant in criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Criminology*, 1(1), 23-37.
- Hobbes, T. 1947. *Leviathan* (M. Oakeshott, Ed.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell. (Original work published 1651).
- Hofstede, G., Neuijen, D., Ohayv D., & Sanders G. 1990. Measuring organizational culture: A qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35.

- Hogan, W. 1980. A look at local control and efforts toward police consolidation. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 8(1), 1-12.
- Homans, G. 1961. *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Hoover, L., Dowling, J., & Fenske, J. 1998. Extent of citizen contact with the police. *Police Quarterly*, 1(3), 1-18.
- Hopkins, S., & Weathington, B. 2006. The relationships between justice perceptions, trust, and employee attitudes in a downsized organization. *The Journal of Psychology*, 140(5), 477-498.
- Hosmer, L. 1995. Trust: the connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 379-403.
- Infoplease. (2008). [Illustrates the Top 50 Cities in the U.S. by Population Rank]. *Infoplease Data Source from the U.S. Census Bureau*. Retrieved from <http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0763098.html>
- International Association of Chiefs of Police. 2003 (May). Consolidating Police Services: An IACP Planning Approach.
- Ivancevich, J., Schweiger, D., & Power, F. 1987. Strategies for managing human resources during mergers and acquisitions. *Human Resource Planning*, 10(1), 19-35.
- Jefferson County Kentucky Clerk's Office/Election Center. (2000). Statement of Votes Cast *General Election 2000 Unofficial Results*. Louisville, KY: Urgan Government Center.

- Johnson, G., & Leland, S. 2000. *Stealing back home: How one city and county beat the odds and successfully consolidated their governments*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.
- Johnson, R., 2004. Citizen expectations of police traffic stop behavior. *Policing*, 27(4), 478-497.
- Jones, V. 1942. *Metropolitan government*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Judge, T. Parker. S., Colber, A., Heller, D., & Hies, R. 2002. Job satisfaction: A crosscultural review. In S. Ones & N. Anderson (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 25-52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kahn, R., & Cannell, C. 1957. *The dynamics of interviewing*. New York: Wiley.
- Kanigel, R. 1997. *The one best way: Frederick Winslow Taylor and the enigma of efficiency*. New York: Viking.
- Kennedy, M. 1979. Generalizing from single case studies. *Evaluation Quarterly*, 3(4), 661-678.
- Kidwell, R., & Bennett, N. 1993. Employee propensity to withhold effort: A conceptual model to intersect three avenues of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 429-456.
- Koepsell, T., & Girand, C. 1979. *Small police agency consolidation: Suggested approaches*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. U.S. Department of Justice.

- Kohler, S., & Mathieu, J. 1993. Individual characteristics, work perceptions, and affective reactions influences on differentiated absence criteria. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 515-530.
- Konovsky, M., & Brockner, J. 1993. Managing victim and survivor layoff reactions: A procedural justice perspective. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: A procedural justice perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Konovsky, M., & Cropanzano, R. 1991. Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 698-707.
- Korsgaard, M., Sapienze, H., & Schweiger, D. 2002. Beaten before begun: The role of procedural justice in planning change. *Journal of Management*, 28(4), 497-516.
- Korsgaard, M., Schewiger, D., & Sapienza, H. 1995. Building commitment, attachment, and trust in strategic decision-making teams: The role of procedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 60-84.
- Koys, D. 1991. Fairness, legal compliance, and organizational commitment. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*. 4. 283-291.
- Koys, D., & DeCotiis, T. 1991. Inductive measures of psychological climate. *Human Relations*, 44(3), 265-276.
- Kranz, J. 1985. Group process under conditions of organization decline. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 21, 1-17.
- Krausz, M., Yaakovovitz, N., & Caspi, T. 1999. Evaluation of coworker turnover outcomes and its impact on the Intention to leave of the remaining employees. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 14, 95-107.

- Krimmel, J. 1997. The Northern York County Police consolidation experience: An analysis of the consolidation of police services in eight Pennsylvania rural communities. *Policing: an International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 20(3), 497-507.
- Langworthy, R. 1986. *The structure of police organizations*. New York: Praeger.
- Lerner, M., & Lerner, S. 1981. *The justice motive in social behavior*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Leventhal, G. 1976. The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations: In L. Berkowitz & W. Walster (Eds), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 9, 91-155). New York: Academic Press.
- Leventhal, G. 1980. What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, & R. Willis, R. (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum Press.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. 1985. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lind, E. 2001. Fairness heuristic theory: Justice judgments as pivotal cognitions in organizational relations. In Greenberg, J. & Copanzano, R. (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 56-88). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lind, E., Kanfer, R., & Earley, P. 1990. Voice, control, and procedural justice: instrumental and noninstrumental concerns in fairness judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 952-959.

- Lind, E., Kulik, C., Ambrose, M., & de Vera Park, M. 1993. Individual and corporate dispute resolution: Using procedural fairness as a decision heuristic. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 224-251.
- Lind, E., & Tyler, T. 1988. *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Lind, E., & Van den Bos, K. 2002. When fairness works: Toward a general theory of uncertainty management: In B. Staw & R. Kramer (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 181-223). Boston: Elsevier.
- Lipponen, J., Olkkonen, M., & Moilanen. 2004. Perceived procedural justice and employee responses to an organizational merger. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 13(3), 391-413.
- Locke, J. 1994. *An essay concerning human understanding*. New York: Prometheus. (Original work published 1698).
- Lofland, J. & Lofland, L. H. 1995. *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Louisville-Jefferson County Crime Commission. 1998. Study conducted at the request of County Judge/Executive David L. Armstrong and Mayor Jerry E. Abramson to study the elements necessary for police consolidation in December 1997 as part of the renegotiation of the 1986 City Cooperative Compact Agreement. Louisville, KY: The Strategic Planning Implementation Team.
- Luthans, B., & Sommer, S. 1999. The impact of downsizing on workplace attitudes. *Group and Organizational Management*, 24. 46-71.

- Lyons, W., & Lowery, D. 1989. Government fragmentation vs. consolidation: Five public choice myths about how to create informed, involved and happy citizens. *Public Administration Review*, 49(6), 533-543.
- MaGuire, E. 2003. *Organizational structure in American police agencies: Context, complexity, and control*. New York: State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Manning, P. 1977. *Police work: The social organization of policing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Markovsky, B. 1985. Toward a multilevel distributive justice theory. *American Sociological Review*, 50, 822-839.
- Marks, M., & Mirvis, P. 1985. Merger syndrome: stress and uncertainty. *Mergers and Acquisitions*, 20, 50-55.
- Marks, M., & Mirvis, P. 1986. The merger syndrome. *Psychology Today*, 3, 36 – 42.
- Marks, M., & Mirvis, P. 1992. Rebuilding after the merger: Dealing with survival sickness. *Organizational Dynamics*, 21(2), 18-32.
- Martin, J. 1992. *Cultures in organizations: Three perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marx, K. 1978. Critique of the Gotha program. In R. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engles reader* (2nd ed.), 42-56. New York: Norton, (Original work published 1875).
- Masterson, S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B., & Taylor, M. 2000. Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 738 – 748.

- Mastrofski, S., Reisig, M., & McCluskey, J. 2002. Police disrespect toward the public: an encounter-based analysis. *Criminology*, 40(3), 519-556.
- Mastrofski, S., Snipes, J., & Supina, A. 1996. Compliance on demand: the public's response to specific police requests. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 33(3), 269-305.
- Mathieu, J., Zajacm D. 1990. A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171-194.
- Maxwell, J. 1996. *Qualitative research design: A interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McAninch, T., & Sanders, J. 1988. Police attitudes toward consolidation in Bloomington and Normal, Illinois: A case study. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 16(2), 95-104.
- McCluskey, J., Mastrofski, S., & Parks. 2000. To acquiesce or rebel: Predicting citizen compliance with police requests. *Police Quarterly*, 2(4), 389-416.
- McDavid, J. 2002. The impacts of amalgamation on police services in the Halifax regional municipality. *Canadian Public Administration*, 45(4), 538-565.
- McFarlin, D., & Sweeney, P. 1992. Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 626-637.
- McLean, G. 2006. *Organization development: Principles, processes, and performance*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

- Merriam, S. 2001. *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Meyer, C. 2001. Allocation processes in mergers and acquisitions: An organizational justice perspective. *British Journal of Management*, 12, 47-66.
- Meyer, J., & Allen, N. 1991. A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
- Mikula, D., & Wenzel, M. 2000. Justice and social conflict. *International Journal of Psychology*, 35, 126-135.
- Mill, J. 1940. *Utilitarianism, liberty, and responsive government*. London: J.M. Dent. (Original work published 1861).
- Mishra, A., & Spreitzer, G. 1998. Explaining how survivors respond to downsizing: The roles of trust, empowerment, justice, and work redesign. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 567-589.
- Mobley, W. 1977. Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2, 237-240.
- Moore, B. 1978. *Injustice: The social bases of obedience and revolt*. White Plains, NY: M. E.
- Monahan, L. & Farmer, R. 1980. *Stress and the police—a manual for prevention*. Pacific Palisades, CA: Palisades.
- Monkkonen, E. *Police in urban America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mueller, C., & Wynn, T. 2000. The degree to which justice is valued in the workplace. *Social Justice Research*, 13, 1-24.

- National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement. (1931). *Lawlessness in Law Enforcement*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. (1973). *Report on Police*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Newman, J., & Krzystofiak, F. 1993. Communication during a merger: Experience of two banks. *Human Resource Planning*, 18, 390-410.
- Niehoff, B., & Moorman, R. 1993. Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-557.
- Novelli, L., Kirkman, B. & Shapiro, D. 1995. Effective implementation of organizational change: An organizational justice perspective. In C. Cooper & D. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in organizational behavior* (pp. 15–36). New York: Wiley.
- Nozick, R. 1974. *Anarchy, state, and utopia*. New York: Basic Books.
- O'Brien, J., & Marcus, M. 1979. *Crime and justice in America*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Okun, A. 1975. *Equality and efficiency: The big tradeoff*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Ostrom, E. 1971. Institutional arrangements and the measurement of policy consequences. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 6(4), 470-471.
- Ostrom, E., & Smith, D. 1976. On the fate of lilliputs in metropolitan policing. *Public Administration Review*, 36(2), 192-200.

- Ostrom, E., & Whitaker, G. 1978. *Patterns of metropolitan policing*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Ostrom, V., Tiebout, C., & Warren, R. 1961. The organization of government in metropolitan areas: A theoretical inquiry. *American Political Science Review*, 60, 831-842.
- Paternoster, Brame, Backman, & Sherman, L. 1997. Do fair procedures matter? The effect of procedural justice on spousal assault. *Law & Society Review*. 31(1), 163-198.
- Patton, M. 1990. *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Peirce, N. 1993. *Citistates: How urban America can prosper in a competitive world*. Washington, D.C.: Seven Locks Press.
- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C., & Williams, E. 1999. Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformation and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25(6), 897-933.
- Pinder, C. 1998. *Work motivation in organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. 1967. *Task force report: the police*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Rainey, H. 2003. *Understanding and managing public organizations* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Rawls, J. 1999. *A theory of justice* (Revised Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Rawls, J. 2001. *Justice as fairness: A restatement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Reiss, A. 1971. *The police and the public*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Robbins, S. 1987. *Organization theory structure, design, and applications* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Robinson, S. 1996. Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 574-600.
- Robinson, S., & Bennett, R. 1995. A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 555-572.
- Rubin, H., & Rubin, I. 1995. *The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rupp, D., & Cropanzano, R. 2002. The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89, 925-946.
- Rusk, D. 1995. *Acting as one: A report on regional strategies for the Michigan City Management Association*.
- Rusk, D. 1999. *Inside game, outside game: Winning strategies for saving urban America*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Rusk, D. 2003. *Cities without suburbs: Census 2000*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. 1995. *Failing at fairness: How America's schools cheat girls*. New York: Scribner.
- Saunders, M., & Thornhill, A. 2003. Organizational justice, trust, and the management of change. *Personnel Review*, 32(3), 360-375.

- Savitch, H., & Vogel, R. 2004a. Suburbs without a city: Power and city-county consolidation. *Urban Affairs Review*, 39(6), 758-790.
- Savitch, H., & Vogel, R. 2004b. Merger in Louisville/Jefferson. In S. Leland & K. Thurmaier (Eds), *Case studies of city-county consolidation: Reshaping the local government landscape*, Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Schlricher, D., Watt, J., & Greguras, G. 2004. Reexamining the job satisfaction-performance relationship: The complexity of attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 165-177.
- Schneider, M. 1986. Fragmentation and the growth of government. *Public Choice*, 48.
- Schwartz, H., & Jacobs, J. 1979. *Qualitative sociology: A method to the madness*. New York: Free Press.
- Schweiger, D., & Denisi, A. 1991. Communication with employees following a merger: a longitudinal field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 4, 110-135.
- Schweiger, D., & Walsh, J. 1992. Mergers and acquisitions: An interdisciplinary view. In K. Rowland & G. Ferris (Eds.). *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management* (Vol. 8, pp. 41-107). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Selye, H. (1956). The stress of life. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Seo, M., & Hill, N. 2005. Understanding the human side of merger and acquisition: An integrative framework. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 41(4), 422-443.
- Shapiro, D. 2001. The death of justice theory is likely if theorist neglect the “wheels” already invented and the voices of the injustice victims. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 235-242.

- Shapiro, D., Buttner, E., & Barry, B. 1994. Explanations: What factors enhance their perceived adequacy? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 58(3), 346-368.
- Shaughnessy, J., & Zechmeister, E. 1999. *Research methods in psychology* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sheppard, B., Lewicki, R., & Minton, J. 1992. *Organizational justice: The search for fairness in the workplace*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Sineta, M. 1981. Mergers, morale and productivity. *Personnel Journal*, 60, 863-867.
- Skarlicki, D. & Folger, R. 1997. Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434-443.
- Smith, S. 1940. *Police systems in the united states* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.
- Smith, H., Tyler, T., Huo, Y., Ortiz, D., & Lind, E. 1998. The self-relevant implications of the group-value model: Group membership, self-worth, and treatment quality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 34, 470-493.
- Smith, W., Tomaskovic-Devey, D., Zingraff, M., Mason, H., Warren, P., Wright, C., McMurray, H., & Felton, C. 2003. *The North Carolina highway traffic study: Final report*, National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC.
- Sober, E., & Wilson, D. 1998. *Unto others: The evolution and psychology of unselfish behavior*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Somers, M. 1995. Organizational commitment, turnover, and absenteeism: An examination of direct and interaction effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 49-58.

- Souryal, S. 1998. *Ethics in criminal justice: In search of the truth*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company.
- Speilberger, C. 1966. *Anxiety and behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Spreitzer, G., & Mishra, A. 2002. To slay or to go: Voluntary survivor turnover following an organizational downsizing. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 23. 707-729.
- Stake, R. 1994. Case studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Staley, S. 2005. *The effects of city-county consolidation: A review of the recent academic literature*. A report prepared by the Indiana Policy Review Foundation, Fort Wayne, Indiana.
- Stephens, G., & Wikstrom, N. 2000. *Metropolitan government and governance: Theoretical perspectives, empirical analysis, and the future*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stouffer, S., Suchman, E., DeVinney, L., Star, S., & Williams. 1949. *The American soldier: Adjustment during army life* (Vol. 1). Clinton, MA: Colonial Press.
- Studenski, P. 1930. *The government of metropolitan areas in the United States*. New York: National Municipal League.
- Sweeney, T. 2003. *Patrol*. In W. Geller & D. Stephens (Eds.), *Local government police management* (4th ed.) (pp. 89-133). DC: International City/County Management Association.

- Sweeney, P., & McFarlin, D. 1993. Workers evaluation of the ends and the means: An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55, 23-40.
- Sweeney, P., & McFarlin, D. 1997. Process and outcome: Gender differences in the assessment of justice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 83-98.
- Tang, T., & Sarsfield-Baldwin, S. 1996. Organizational types, commitment and managerial action. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 19, 289-312.
- Tesch, R. 1990. *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools*. Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Tewksbury, R. 2009. Qualitative versus quantitative methods: Understanding why qualitative methods are superior for criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Criminology*, 1(1), 38-58.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. 1975. *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. 1978. A theory of procedure. *California Law Review*, 66, 541-566.
- Tiebout, C. 1956. A pure theory of local expenditures. *Journal of Political Economy*, 64, 416-424.
- Tornblom, K. 1977. Distributive justice: Typology and propositions. *Human Relations*, 30, 1-24.
- Tornblom, K., & Vermunt, R. 1999. An integrative perspective on social justice: distributive and procedural fairness evaluations of positive and negative outcome allocations. *Social Justice Research*, 12, 39-64.

- Tyler, T. 1997a. Citizen discount with legal procedures. *American Journal of Comparative Law*, 45, 869-902.
- Tyler, T. 1997b. Procedural fairness and compliance with the law. *Swiss Journal of Economics and Statistics*, 133, 219-240.
- Tyler, T. 2001a. Public trust and confidence in legal authorities: What do majority and minority group members want from the law and legal institutions? *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 19(2), 215-35.
- Tyler, T. 2001b. Obeying the law in America: Procedural justice and the sense of fairness. *Issues of Democracy*, 6(1), 16-21.
- Tyler, T., & Bies, R. 1990. *Beyond formal procedures: the interpersonal context of procedural justice*. In Carroll, J. (Ed.), *Applied social psychology and organizational settings* (pp. 77-98). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tyler, T., & Blader, S. 2000. *Cooperation in groups: Procedural justice, social identity, and behavioral engagement*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Tyler, T., Boeckmann, R., Smith, H., & Huo, Y. 1997. *Social justice in a diverse society*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Tyler, T., & Lind, E. 1992. *A relational model of authority in groups*. In Zanna, M. (Ed), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25) (pp. 115-119). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Taylor, F. 1911. *Shop management*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Van den Bos, K. 2005. *What is responsible for the fair process effect?* In J. Greenberg & J. Colquitt Eds.). *Handbook of Organizational Justice* (pp. 273-300). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Van den Bos, K., & Lind, E. 2002. Uncertainty management by means of fairness judgments. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 34, pp. 1-60). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Van den Bos, K., & Miedema, J. 2000. Toward understanding why fairness matters: The influence of mortality salience of reactions to procedural fairness. *Interpersonal Relations and Group Processes*, 79, 355-366.
- van Leeuwen, E., van Knippenberg, D., & Ellemers, N. 2003. Continuing and changing group identities: The effects of merging on social identification and ingroup bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 679 – 690.
- Walker, L., LaTour, S., Lind, E., & Thibaut, J. 1974. Reactions of participants and observers to modes of adjudication. *Applied Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 4, 295-310.
- Walster, E., Berscheid, E & Walster, G. 1973. New directions in equity research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 25, 151-176.
- Wickum, T. 1986. *Year 2000—California city police departments—a dying tradition*. Sacramento, CA: California Commission on Police Officer Standards.
- Wilson, J. 1968. *Varieties of police behavior: The management of law and order in eight communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wilson, W. 1885. *Congressional government: A study in American politics*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Wilson, W. 1887. The study of administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2, 197.

- Wyly, E., Glickman, N., and Lahr, M. 1998. A top 10 list of things to know about American cities. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 3(3), 7-32.
- Yin, R. 1981. The case study crisis: Some answers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 1-10.

Appendix A:

Interview Instrument: Patrol Officers and Sergeants and Above

Section #1: Warm-up Questions

1. How long have you been a police officer?
2. What rank do you currently hold?
3. How long have you held your current rank?
4. Were you a former city or county police officer?
5. What rank/position did you hold with your former department prior to merger?
6. Has your rank/position change following merger?
7. Were you involved in the merger process? If so, in what way?

Section #2: Former Police Department

8. Prior to merger, how did you feel about your department?

Probes:

- What did you like and dislike about your former department and officers?
- What was the climate (i.e., levels of group cohesion and cooperation) like, between officers, in your former department?
- Do you feel that your former department's policies and practices were fair?
- What does fairness mean for you?

Section #3: Police Consolidation

9. As a police officer, how did you feel when you learned that the two police departments were actually going to merge?

Probes:

- What were your concerns (i.e., new chief, pay, benefits, insurance, longevity, etc.) regarding the merger of the two departments?
- Did these concerns come true?
- What was the climate like, between officers, in your old department during this time?
- What reactions (i.e., resentment, commitment, job satisfaction, organization satisfaction, turnover intention, and trust) did you and others on your department have toward the merger?
- What was your perception of fairness on how decisions were being made during this time?

10. As a police officer, how did you feel when decisions were being made to actually merge (i.e., hiring of a new chief of police, reassignment of officer, restructuring of districts, changes in policies, changes in command structure, etc.)?

Probes:

- What reactions (i.e., resentment, commitment, job satisfaction, organization satisfaction, turnover intention, and trust) did you and other officers have toward these changes?
- What did officers treat each other during these changes (i.e., level of group cohesion and cooperation)?
- What was your perception of fairness on how these changes took place?

Section #4: Future of LMPD

11. As a police officer, how do you feel about the future of LMPD?

Probes:

- What concerns you most about the new department?
- What has been the advantages and disadvantages of merger?
- What is the climate like in the new department?
- What changes have you seen in the relationship between former city and county officers?
- Was merger fair?
- What does LMPD need to do for the future?

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME: Joseph Sterling Grant

ADDRESS: 3104 New Chapel Road
Jeffersonville, Indiana 47130

DOB: Jeffersonville, Indiana – September 10, 1962

EDUCATION
& TRAINING: B.S., General Studies
Indiana University
1996

M.S., Justice Administration
University of Louisville
2001

Ph.D., Urban and Public Affairs
University of Louisville
2011

PROFESSIONAL
EXPERIENCE: Jeffersonville Police Department
Jeffersonville, Indiana
1984-1998

Jefferson County Police Department
Louisville, Kentucky
1998-2008

AWARDS: Recognition of Valuable Contributions, Intergovernmental
Black History Committee
2009

Indiana University General Studies Alumni of the Year
2008

Louisville Metro Police Department's Officer of the Year
2004

Sons of the American Revolution Outstanding Service
Award
2004

Meadow Heights Woman's Club Officer of the Year
2004

Winner's Circle for Children Outstanding Service Award
2004

Indiana University Southeast Distinguished Alumni Award
2004

Winter Olympic Torchbearer
2001

Exploited Children's Help Organization Community
Volunteer of the Year
2000

Jeffersonville Indiana Jaycees' Distinguished Service
Award—Police Officer of the Year
1997

Jeffersonville United to Make Progress Distinguished
Service Award—Police Officer of the Year
1997

Greater Clark County Schools Certificate of Merit for
Recognition for Outstanding Commitment to D.A.R.E.
Program
1996

United States Presidential Recognition for Community
Service Award 1994

Indiana's Governor Exemplary Project Award (STAR-V)
1994