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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Local law enforcement agencies are essential in preparing for, responding to, and preventing terrorism (Murray, 2005). The Office of Domestic Preparedness (2003) and the Department of Homeland Security (2002) published several guidelines to help federal, state, and local agencies prevent terrorism. Further, Homeland Security Presidential Directive 5 maintained that first responder responsibilities largely fall within the domain of state and local law enforcement agencies. The federal government maintains that local agencies must help with anti-terrorism efforts. Unfortunately, the roles of local police are not clearly defined in the federal documents. Local law enforcement agencies lack clear guidance because the federal government has not been specific about how local law enforcement should help in executing homeland security goals (Randol, 2011; White, 2004). If these roles are defined, local police can work on preparing for, responding to, and preventing terrorist acts more effectively. In this paper, an inquiry is made as to whether local Texas police chiefs understand their roles in homeland security.

Before exploring the preparation, response, and prevention roles at the local level, however, it is useful to review the evolution of local policing practices in order to understand the relationship between policing and homeland security. The history of American policing can be broken down into three distinct eras: the political era, the reform era, and the community era (Kelling & Moore, 1988). Each era has its strengths and weaknesses. First, the primary police function during the political era (1840s-1900s) was to provide a variety of social services for the public. Local police officers formed relationships with the community through foot patrols. However, political corruption and inefficiency of police services were evident as the failure of
this policing strategy. The second era of policing was the reform era (1900s-1970s), which emphasized crime control, rapid response, criminal investigations, measuring arrests as an indicator of performance, and preventive patrol in order to professionalize police departments. On the other hand, a major drawback of professionalism was that the police failed to reduce crime rates. This, in turn, led to the emergence of the community policing era, which focused on maintaining order, improving police and community relations, and addressing the root causes of crime.

However, new threats to public safety have created a need for local police to undergo another change, taking on new responsibilities. Following the September 11, 2001 (9/11), terrorist attacks, local agencies were called on to adopt an array of homeland security initiatives, including building counterterrorism efforts by collecting information and intelligence more routinely, conducting post-event investigation, and mitigating the damage caused by terrorist acts and disasters (Deflem, 2010). Oliver (2007) holds that American policing entered into a new era—one wherein homeland security was the most emphasized function and leading strategy.

The RAND studies (1995) note that counterterrorism includes analyzing and monitoring terrorist threats and responding to any terrorist attacks that occur (Riley & Hoffman, 1995). Effective counterterrorism is not possible without the involvement of local law enforcement agencies (Waxman, 2009). A report from the Justice Department’s Bureau of Justice Statistics of 2007 shows that local police departments far outnumber federal agencies. The number of full-time sworn police officers in state and local agencies was 731,903 in 2004 (Maguire & King, 2011); this dramatically exceeds the 13,000 special agents that federal agencies employ (Waxman, 2009). Because local departments employ more officers than the federal government does agents, federal authorities need the assistance of local agencies to execute homeland security.
security goals. Another benefit of federal-local collaboration is the increased understanding of federal authorities of the various local environments. Furthermore, Kelling and Bratton (2006) argue that both local and federal authorities can obtain invaluable information about potential terrorist threats by seeking help from local Arab community leaders. They can identify terrorist issues in local communities, collaborate with citizens, and apply crime control strategies to identify terrorist networks (Bayley & Weisburd, 2011). In short, the role of police in homeland security is important to study, and the primary issue of concern here is whether local police chiefs understand their departments’ role in homeland security.

Statement of the Problem

The ability of local law enforcement to multitask—maintaining their traditional roles of crime control, order maintenance, and service while preparing for a new role in homeland security—is a growing concern for several reasons. First, collaboration between federal, state, and local agencies is imperative in preparing for terrorist threats, but several factors prevent these groups from collaborating. Studies have identified a lack of collaboration between federal and local law enforcement agencies (Stewart, 2011), a lack of coordination (Marion & Cronin, 2009), and a lack of information-sharing (Carter & Carter, 2009; Murphy & Plotkin, 2003) as the weaknesses of local homeland security preparedness activities. Local agencies are not willing to coordinate with regional, state, and federal agencies on tasks beyond their routine duties of police work (Kettl, 2006). Another study has found that mistrust at all levels further inhibits cooperation (International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP); 2005). The failure to maintain cooperative relationships can impede local preparedness and response efforts.

Second, guidelines put forward by the Center for Domestic Preparedness, formerly known as the Office of Domestic Preparedness, and its umbrella organization, the Department of
Homeland Security, have been less than successful thus far because the responsibilities of local police officers remain unclear. For example, local police agencies, according an array of federal plans, are expected to be involved in preventing and preparing for terrorism, but these federal documents do not provide them with a clear procedure for performing their new tasks. For instance, the Office of Domestic Preparedness Guidelines (2003) does not provide a clear way to assess and evaluate how the roles of local police are being performed (Pelfrey, 2009; Randol, 2011). The National Strategy for Homeland Security includes several security practices that help facilitate the transition for homeland security, but it lacks clarity, specific requirements, and objectives for local law enforcement to fulfill their duties (Stewart & Morris, 2009).

Finally, although the role of local police in connection to homeland security is evolving, many researchers question the definition of the new homeland security duties (Oliver, 2004, 2007; White, 2004) and whether local agencies know what to do without those clear guidelines (Stewart & Morris, 2009). This thesis fills a gap in the homeland security-policing literature by providing information on whether police understand their roles in homeland security.

Purpose of the Study

Federal guidelines regarding preparedness efforts have confused local police agencies as to their exact roles and responsibilities in homeland security. Research has failed to resolve fully the ambiguities in roles and responsibilities of the local agencies and has failed to assess the local police chiefs’ understanding. It is important then to examine the attitudes of police chiefs. They are tasked with overseeing the day-to-day operations of police departments and are ultimately responsible for carrying out policy. To address this discrepancy, the current study set out to determine if police chiefs believe they understand their roles and responsibilities in homeland security. It also determined if chiefs believe they understand what homeland security means in
terms of their actual everyday police work. Finally, this study determined what chiefs think their officers know about what is expected of them concerning homeland security.

This study is based on secondary analysis of data collected from a 2007 survey of 208 Texas police chiefs, which measured attitudes and initiatives concerning homeland security. Specifically, the research examined the extent to which Texas police chiefs’ understand their departmental homeland security roles and responsibilities and the factors that influence their understanding (i.e., homeland security initiatives, preparedness, threat of terrorism, type of agency, and size of agency). Identifying what factors influences the chiefs’ attitudes will help us understand why local agencies act as they do, how the attitudes will affect police roles, and what they think their jobs and their roles.

Significance of the Study

By examining whether homeland security roles and responsibilities are clearly understood by chiefs of local police agencies, this thesis provides insight into an area rarely examined. Although some researchers draw a distinction between roles and responsibilities of local law enforcement agencies (DeLone; 2007; Foster & Cordner, 2005), this study uses the two terms interchangeably. Further, the findings here provide information on the level of disaster preparedness in Texas. While reviewing the history of American policing to gain an understanding of how policing has evolved from the 1840s to the present day, the paper addresses the advent of homeland security and its relationship to the police institution. Moreover, the literature review examines policing tactics that have been developed, or updated, in the era of homeland security. The research also includes recommendations for improving the homeland security capabilities of local agencies.
Unlike most of the previous research using qualitative data analysis to examine the role of local police in homeland security (Lum, Haberfeld, Fachner, & Lieberman, 2011; Ortiz, Hendricks, & Sugie, 2007; Pelfrey, 2009; Thatcher, 2005), this study includes a quantitative component to ensure the reliability of gathered data. This study uses survey data drawn from a sample of 208 Texas police chiefs to analyze the opinions of police chiefs regarding their understanding toward departmental roles and responsibilities. To gain a better knowledge of the influences, the current study shows which independent variables such as homeland security initiatives, preparedness, threat of terrorism, type of agency, and size of agency influence chiefs’ understanding of homeland security roles and responsibilities.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter discusses the concepts of homeland security in relation to the roles and responsibilities of policing. First, using Kelling and Moore’s (1988) three era scheme, the chapter includes a brief history of policing in the United States. Second, the chapter addresses the possibility of a new era emerging following the events of 9/11—one wherein homeland security has become a core function of policing. Third, the chapter describes three main research areas that identify homeland security initiatives, strategies, and the necessary responsibilities of law enforcement agencies following a terrorist attack or natural disaster. That is, the discussion includes changes that have occurred in law enforcement in response to the nation's homeland security needs.

Evolution of American Policing

When examining the roles and responsibilities of the American police institution, it is important to understand its evolution throughout history. According to Kelling and Moore (1988), American policing has undergone three distinct eras: the political, reform, and community eras. Each era can be distinguished by emphasized core functions, organizational structure, and overall police strategies.

Political Era

Though the police function during the political era, which ran from approximately 1840s to the early 1900s, entailed preventing crime and maintaining order, it primarily involved providing broad social services (Kelling & Moore, 1988). For example, police officers performed duties such as setting up soup lines, finding lodging for the homeless, and assisting
newly arriving immigrants with job searches. These service-oriented tasks were, for the most part, the result of political influence on the department. Local ward politicians hired the police, so the police provided social services to the politicians’ supporters. In short, the police received their authority from politicians rather than the law. Police departments of this era entailed a highly decentralized organizational structure (Kelling & Moore, 1988). They were particularly decentralized compared to today’s police because each precinct operated similarly to a distinct police department—with the precinct commander holding a position tantamount to chief of an entire department. Another reason researchers consider the departments of this era decentralized is the lack of communication technology. As a result, individual precincts, as well as the officers walking their beats, wielded a tremendous amount of discretion in the way they policed their jurisdictions. However, by the end of the political era, the availability of call boxes enabled the police institution to become more centralized (Kelling & Moore, 1988).

In this first era of policing, police earned citizen support by preventing riots and by helping immigrants find jobs while acclimating to their new communities. The strengths of this policing strategy were neighborhood integration, public cooperation, and community services (Kelling & Moore, 1988). On the other hand, the close relationship between police, their communities, and political leaders resulted in inefficiency, disorganization, discrimination, corruption, and abuse of authority (Jones & Supinski, 2010; Kelling & Moore, 1988). These drawbacks ultimately caused the police to move toward the reform era, which emphasized professionalism in police practices.

Reform Era

The reform era, spanning from the early 1900s to the 1970s, came about as a reaction to police corruption and inefficiency. The reform era sought to remove politics from policing while
it focused on police professionalism. During this time, the average police organizational structure followed a paramilitary style, in which a hierarchal arrangement, a cornucopia of written rules and regulations, and a strict chain of command increased centralization, governed police actions (Kelling & Moore, 1988). The role of a centralized bureaucratic organization employed a limited span of control, record keeping, and supervision that allowed central administrators to control directly police activities in an organization (Kelling & Moore, 1988).

According to Kelling and Moore (1988), patrol work in the reform era was routinized and standardized in order to limit police discretion. Also, criminal law and professionalism—both of which served as the basis of police legitimacy—characterized the second era of policing. Police in the professional era focused on crime control with a heavy reliance on criminal arrests as a means of crime fighting. The efficiency of policing strategies was improved by emphasizing preventive automobile patrols and rapid response to calls for service (Kelling & Moore, 1988). Instead of walking patrols, police enforced the law and engaged in preventive patrol via automobile units. With the advent of the two-way radio, the communications network was complete; citizens could call the police department for assistance, and, using the two-way radio, the department could dispatch officers accordingly. Moreover, it was during this era that policing became what has been referred to as 9/11 driven.

During the reform era, the central organizational design attempted to reduce police corruption through increased controls and promote professionalism in police departments (Kelling & Moore, 1988). One of the challenges with the use of technology, however, was an increase of the distance between the police and the public. Furthermore, professionalism failed when police could not prevent crimes, did not reduce citizens’ fears of crimes, and discriminated
against minorities (Kelling & Moore, 1988). These issues and public mistrust of the police work led to the community problem-solving era.

**Community Problem Solving Era**

The policing strategy of the reform era failed because the professional model did not result in a lower crime rate, and it also deemphasized a close community-police relationship. Furthermore, research suggested that what the police institution was doing in the reform era was not working. As a result of these problems, the community problem-solving era emerged in the late 1970s to the early 1980s.

In this era, policing entailed the use of techniques, such as geographical information systems, to determine the causes of problems and solve them rather than just deal with the effects. The police derived their authority from law, community support, and professionalism (Kelling & Moore, 1988). Most importantly, citizen involvement and support in solving community problems have been essential to the success of community policing (Kelling & Moore, 1988). This community involvement directly contrasts with bureaucratic policing, which allows for greater alienation between police and the community.

A policing philosophy that emerged during this era, community policing, focused on the order maintenance function. Community policing emphasizes building positive, collaborative relationships between the police and the community in attempt to reduce fear, disorder, and crime (Kelling & Moore, 1988). One community policing tactic involves foot patrols in fixed beats. It was believed that assigning officers to fixed beats will increase their familiarity with community, feel obligated to prevent public disturbances and other crime in their assigned geographical area—that is, a greater sense of job responsibility and ownership over an area results. In order to facilitate the implementation of the expanded role of police departments, a
decentralized organization was employed; substations were created; and officers were provided more discretion, since it was recognized that they were the most important decision makers—providing services directly to the people and acting as community diagnosticians (Kelling & Moore, 1988). In short, community policing tactics allow police to interact with the citizens in their community.

As previously mentioned, in the decentralized organization, the main decision making occurs at the lower-levels of the police department because daily police work requires the officers to play an active role in responding to community and neighborhood problems. With that said, police officers must work on identifying issues of concern and discussing solutions to specific problems. Under a community policing approach, police officers who become familiar with their neighborhood beats can be expected to reduce crime, to spend most of their hours on their beats, and to respond to citizen concerns (Clarke & Newman, 2007). According to Kelling and Wilson (1982), police need to stop minor neighborhood disorders, such as broken windows and public intoxication, because these types of issues are the signs of problems in a community, which can send a sign to criminals in the area that apathy reigns and no one cares. This theory, broken windows, holds that minor signs of public disorder lead to more serious crimes, which results in increases in citizens’ fears of crimes and neighborhood decay.

In short, the community problem-solving era focused on the causes of crimes and gave special attention to reducing citizens’ fears. It also emphasized the maintenance of order though conflict resolution and problem solving. It also strengthened the police role in controlling and preventing crime by attempting to improve the quality of life and satisfaction of the citizenry.
Homeland Security Policing Era

It was not until after the 9/11 terrorist attacks that preventing and preparing for future terrorist strikes became critical national security goals (Murray, 2005). Scott (2010) argued that it is important to examine the authority, function, and principles of community policing in order to recognize the effectiveness of its strategies, because a current challenge facing community policing includes whether or not policing might need to change in response to the new needs raised by homeland security. As a result, changes in the current policing strategies might be necessary. Building on the Kelling and Moore (1988) scheme, Oliver (2004) wrote about the possibility of a new era in his article entitled “The Homeland Security Juggernaut: The End of the Community Policing Era?”

Oliver (2006) held that police in the homeland security era obtain their authorization from law, professionalism, and national and international threats while citizens grant police legitimacy to focus on terrorism. Oliver (2006) also highlighted the importance of intergovernmental law, such as cooperation between agencies. Unlike the community-policing era, police work now includes new intelligence gathering, counterterrorism activities, and preparedness training, which are designed to protect communities in the event of an attack (Office of Homeland Security, 2002). Police gather intelligence through a variety of methods, including criminal law and traffic enforcement. Policing for homeland security emphasizes centralized decision making to facilitate sharing of information between federal, state, and local agencies; however, execution is decentralized to allow line officers more flexibility in carrying out their tasks (Oliver, 2007).

The 9/11 attacks permanently changed preparation, performance, and communication among law enforcement organizations throughout the country. Local law enforcement is
expected to enhance intelligence collection efforts, strengthen relationships with the citizenry, increase inter-agency cooperation, and bolster its capacity to respond to terrorist threats and domestic emergencies (Friedmann & Cannon, 2007). Rather than operating in reactive mode, such as using foot patrol and responding to calls for services, police in the Homeland Security Era adopt both proactive policing strategies and advanced technologies to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks (Brown, 2007; Vardalis & Waters, 2010). Oliver (2009) described the current era of American policing as one wherein the main function of police is a return to crime control with the added responsibilities of intelligence gathering and counter- and anti-terrorism.

Despite these policy shifts and reform strategies, police work continues to focus on service delivery, crime control, and maintaining order (Kelling & Moore, 1988; Stewart & Morris, 2009; Zhao, He, & Lovrich, 2003). Although a shift in the political, reform, and community-policing paradigms has enhanced the effectiveness of law-enforcement professionals and criminal-intelligence agencies, this shift has had limited impact on national security. The 9/11 attacks require a new policing strategy that goes beyond traditional roles of police in patrolling neighborhoods, making criminal arrests, and providing emergency response (DeLone, 2007). Taken together, police still primarily focus on crime control, order maintenance, and service, but their duties have expanded to include homeland security, terrorism prevention, response, recovery, and investigation (Bellavita, 2005; Davis et al., 2004; Maguire & King, 2011).

Over the last decade, the relationship between homeland security personnel and local law enforcement has been the focus of extensive debate. However, most literature addressing the challenges facing law enforcement professionals includes a broad but cursory review of homeland security roles and responsibilities. Therefore, in order to better understand changes in
law enforcement officials’ duties and responsibilities since 9/11, the first step is to conduct a thorough literature review of the relationship between homeland security and the local police. A literature review is used to examine what actions and activities local agencies took to prevent and respond to disasters and terrorism, how local agencies should respond to terrorism, and how homeland security tasks will impact the roles of local law enforcement agencies in the future. Finally, using secondary data analysis of a survey of 208 Texas chiefs of police, the author identifies the variables that contribute most to police chiefs’ understanding of their departments’ roles and responsibilities in homeland security.

Requirements of Homeland Security Strategies

Law enforcement agencies were given strategies for understanding, developing, and fulfilling the goals of homeland security in the form of the National Strategy for Homeland Security. According to the National Strategy for Homeland Security, terrorism prevention, risk reduction, and catastrophe mitigation are the foundation of homeland security. Homeland security is a unified national effort, which includes a shared responsibility and a partnership among federal, state, and local governments and citizens in preventing terrorism, in lowering the country’s vulnerability to terrorist attacks, and in recovering from the damage inflicted by acts of terrorism in the United States (Office of Homeland Security, 2002). Simply stated, homeland security is not the responsibility of any single agency; it requires all agencies responsible for domestic security, public and private, at all levels of government, to work together.

Other federal documents have outlined a variety of activities for local police departments as part of homeland security responsibilities as well. For instance, the National Response Framework (NRF) highlights the importance of partnership engagements, local-level responses, response adjustments, unified commands, and prepared and cohesive responses to an emergency
Moreover, the 2007 National Strategy focuses on preventing and thwarting terrorist attacks; protecting citizens, U.S. infrastructure, and resources; and responding to and recovering from any events that occur to organize the nation’s homeland security efforts. The document also adds a new goal—fortifying the security system—to establish and change homeland security needs (Homeland Security Council, 2007).

In particular, the local efforts to strengthen homeland security preparedness are guided by the National Incident Management System (NIMS). President George W. Bush issued the Homeland Security Presidential Directive Number 5 (HSPD-5), which required all personnel in emergency management to adopt NIMS, a national, standardized approach that facilitates collaboration among all relevant agencies in order to prepare for, respond to, and recover from domestic terrorism and natural disasters (FEMA, 2008). A component within NIMS is the Incident Command System (ICS), which details the specific command structure, as well as roles and functions management, necessary to mount a successful standardized response. NIMS and the complementing ICS allow local police departments to better prepare themselves for an emergency response to issues of homeland security.

In addition, the Office of Domestic Preparedness (2003) identified threat awareness, risk management, and interruption, among other things, as strategies for enhancing terrorist prevention. As part of their duties, law enforcement agencies are expected to be involved in intelligence sharing, to maintain close contact with emergency services, to keep careful watch over neighborhoods, and to engage in prevention of and response to terrorism and WMD incidents (Maguire & King, 2004; Pelfrey, 2005a). As a strategy to curb terrorism, De Guzman (2002) pointed out that at the very minimum, police should perform target-oriented patrol,
conduct proactive investigation, regulate strict traffic control, and shift the philosophical idea of community policing to counterterrorism. Also, it is believed that state and local law enforcement agencies can be more efficient in their preparedness to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks by engaging in intelligence activities with one of the many FBI Joint Terrorism Task Forces (JTTFs; Burruss, Giblin, & Schafer, 2010; Riley, Treverton, Wilson & Davis, 2005). Through the JTTFs, federal, state, and local law enforcement agents work together as partners in a task force and share intelligence information in order to collaborate more closely (Stewart, 2011).

Homeland Security Initiatives

The changes in the American policing industry were largely seen as an increase in the responsibility of police departments. Local and state agencies have shared responsibilities with federal agencies, but little study has been focused on changes in state and local agencies after 9/11 (Marks & Sun, 2007). One way to look at what changes have occurred in state and local agencies is to look at mission statements. As noted by DeLone (2007), mission statements shape the goal and direction of an organization. They also serve as useful communication tools that influence an individual’s perception of an organization.

Morreale and Lambert (2009) conducted self-administered questionnaires of police agencies across New England to examine whether the agencies change their mission statements in support of homeland security. The findings revealed that law enforcement officers hold the view that agencies have changed their mission statement, but they do not have a well-defined homeland security role for their police officers. Findings further revealed that many have not performed homeland security activities. Additionally, a study by Riley et al. (2005) found that the larger the organization, the more likely it was that it participated in a risk assessment activity. In essence, this meant that size of the organization has a significant effect on whether or not local
police participated in homeland security activities.

Recent research indicates that local law enforcement efforts in homeland security initiatives since the 9/11 attacks differ across departments. Using content analysis of 1,552 articles from two police practitioner magazines that were published from 1999 to 2004, Marks and Sun (2007) examined the impact of 9/11 on organizational changes between state and local agencies. Their analysis of data reveals that changes in departmental procedures in federal agencies have improved the relationship between different agencies in their efforts to fight terrorism. Nevertheless, Marks and Sun (2007) noted that local police departments are not inclined to change their organizational structure unless they are given financial incentives to do so. Indeed, evidence exists that large departments have changed policies and procedures, but this same evidence does not show change in smaller departments. However, Marks and Sun (2007) argued that this does not mean that the smaller departments are not changing. Change may in fact be taking place. This is consistent with previous research by DeLone (2007) who found that, as of 2006, Washington, DC adopted the new concept of terrorist activity prevention into its mission statement. None of the fifty states have done so; however, a majority of other states have created counterterrorism and homeland security units.

Another study shows that departments respond to homeland security initiatives by focusing on homeland security training and exercises. Marion and Cronin (2009) conducted a survey of 466 Ohio police chiefs to examine whether state and local police agencies make any changes to comply with the homeland security requirements. The police chiefs reported that the significant changes in communication, training, and funding levels have occurred in 90% of large and medium cities and 78% of the small cities. Marion and Cronin (2009) noted that the larger the department, the more training officers receive. Finally, the researchers conclude that
factors that influence the level of participation in anti-terrorist activities are the amount of funding, the size of the police departments, and the type of community (rural or urban).

Using inferential analysis in his case study of 290 South Carolina law enforcement agencies, Pelfrey (2007) found that the impacts of agency type, training, education, and community oriented policing on agencies’ terrorism-preparedness efforts are weak. Nevertheless, agency size, the presence of federal funding and a SWAT team, accreditation status, and technology are strong predictors of preparedness levels. The study’s findings are consistent with the RAND report (2002) showing differences in state levels of terrorism preparedness. As Gerber, Cohen, Cannon, Patterson, and Stewart (2005) clearly noted the availability of resources is restricting the consistency in preparation.

Using six variables such as federal collaboration, homeland security initiatives, preparedness, threat perceptions, type of agency, and agency size, Stewart and Morris (2009) explored factors that influence Texas police chiefs’ attitudes (such as agreement with homeland security) toward the philosophy of homeland security policing. Stewart and Morris (2009) noted that collaborations between federal and local agencies, levels of readiness, and threat perceptions (such as the likelihood of attack) are the best predictors of chiefs’ perceptions of the local role in homeland security.

With few exceptions, there have not been many national surveys of the nation’s efforts in terrorism preparedness (Reddick, 2008). However, the RAND study addressed how local and state law enforcement agencies handle new demands of homeland security requirements of the states. According to a 2002 national survey of 209 local and state law enforcement agencies conducted by the RAND Corporation, perceived risk, jurisdiction size, and federal funds should be considered when deciding if an agency should participate in specific preparedness activities.
(Davis et al., 2004). The RAND study discovered that perceived risk had a greater impact on federal funds than jurisdiction size. Jurisdiction size has no effect on perceived risk and federal funds. Another RAND Corporation report in 2002 discovered that whether or not local law enforcement agencies participate in the JTTF activities, such as information sharing, practical training, resource allocation, and specific plans and procedures to deal with possible disasters or terrorism, depends on the size of their organizations (Riley et al., 2005). These two reports indicate that efforts in preparedness for homeland security, support needs, and jurisdiction sizes make a difference in homeland security initiatives.

Since 9/11, local and state agencies have undertaken different types of preparedness activities. In particular, Eisinger (2004) cited checking of the water supply and implementing hardware detection devices to strengthen biological and chemical surveillance, emphasizing first responders-reinforcement training, and shifting gears toward interoperable communications systems between fire and police departments as the actual tasks that officers have performed. Henry (2002) further pointed out that the skills used in responding to terrorism involve more than crime-fighting skills. To bridge the gap, police must focus on training programs, such as joint training that emphasizes the importance of developing skills for intelligence collection (Strom & Eyerman, 2007).

Finally, several studies find conflicting results in the relationship between perceptions of the police and the level of preparedness. Vardalis and Waters (2010) found that Texas sheriffs who perceive a higher threat level are unhappy with their preparedness, believing that they lack training, proper funding, and equipment. On the other hand, another study found that the higher the threat, the more prepared the officers feel (Schafer, Burruss, & Giblin, 2009). In short, the past literature indicates that the role of police in homeland security has a limited definition;
researchers have not reached a consensus about the impact of preparedness activities on perceptions of the police.

**Homeland Security Strategies**

As discussed earlier, the effective national security strategies and plans emphasize the value of local first responders, collaborative efforts, adequate resources, and full participation from federal, state, and local governments. However, there has been a significant challenge to local law enforcement agencies to be in compliance with homeland security measures. Some organizations and authors, such as the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) (2005), Pelfrey (2005b), and Maguire and King (2011), have criticized preparedness definitions that appear in the National Strategy for Homeland Security for their lack of clarity. An understanding of emergency preparedness definitions could better prepare local responders for local emergencies and all types of hazards. To further define the term “preparedness,” Pelfrey’s (2005b) review of the cycle of preparedness stated that the cycle consists of four parts: prevention, awareness, response, and recovery. According to Pelfrey (2005b), the term “prevention” refers to the process of identifying potential risks that disrupt the community's order and welfare to remove and reduce threat. Awareness of a terrorist event when it does happen can help to ensure the correct response (Pelfrey, 2005b). Consequently, collaboration, awareness, and appropriate response can help to reduce the threat of terrorism and ensure a strong recovery (Pelfrey, 2005b).

Pelfrey (2005b) stressed that collaboration and information sharing are the core elements of prevention strategies. Carter and Carter (2009) argued that collaboration among agencies is needed, but there has been a lack of guidance on how agencies should implement information sharing. Pelfrey (2005b) pointed out that collaboration requires agencies to work with one
another in order to foster mutual trust and achieve clarity and adherence. Pelfrey (2005b) concluded that efforts at information sharing require collaboration in developing the process of collecting, evaluating, forwarding, and compiling information and intelligence among federal, state, and local governments as well as citizens.

In a recently published study, Stewart (2011) conducted self-administered surveys on federal-local collaboration by examining Texas police chiefs’ perceptions regarding this collaboration. Stewart (2011) found that preparedness perceptions and homeland security strategy perceptions have emerged as significant predictors of interagency collaboration. However, it is worth noting that most chiefs view federal-local collaboration as poor.

Though homeland security stresses collaboration and coordination, the decentralized and fragmented nature of American law enforcement undermines national security. The fragmentation of law enforcement was particularly prevalent before 9/11. When combating the emerging terrorist threat, the Defense Department, the Justice Department, the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency sometimes maintained cooperative working relationships with other agencies but other times failed to even establish these relationships (Kayyem, 2003). Therefore, the most important issue that the law enforcement community must solve is alleviating possible friction between federal and local agencies. Training local police to collect intelligence data, conducting risk assessments, and detecting terrorist threats could be a way to prevent this problem (Maguire & King, 2011). Additionally, the information that local police gather on terrorism must be standardized to ensure uniform communications between local and federal agencies (Maguire & King, 2011).

In response to the persistent criticism over the ineffectiveness of the National Strategy for Homeland Security, the IACP created a project, the Taking Command Initiative of 2004, with
law enforcement leaders to improve the effectiveness of law enforcement agencies in national security efforts. The IACP claims that because terrorist acts occur locally, it is the first responder’s responsibility to be able to respond, recover, and, significantly, prevent. The IACP recommends that homeland security plans and strategies should be developed from collaborative partnership that involves full participation from communities, public safety agencies, and federal, state, and local governments. Equally important, the IACP notes that police should have skills and resources necessary to carry out their expanded antiterrorism responsibilities.

Given the weaknesses in the national security strategy document, other studies found that local law enforcement agencies face significant challenges to meet both state and federal agencies’ identified security tasks. Based on an executive session and a national survey of law enforcement leaders in regard to a strategy in the fight against terrorism, the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF; 2003) discovered that local and federal agencies do not collaborate or communicate effectively. The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services funded the PERF project, which resulted in numerous reports from 2003 to 2005. PERF observed that local police face numerous challenges posed by terrorism, such as the ineffectiveness of joint partnership and the friction between people in different agencies. Law enforcement chief executives reported that lack of trust among agencies contribute to communication problems and information withholding. The problem of information exchange and sharing is that they usually result in one side having more information than the other (Murphy & Plotkin, 2003). Chief executives also reported that federal agencies often provide no constructive feedback on progress to the local police (Murphy & Plotkin, 2003). According to PERF, numerous local chief executives believe that federal agencies cite local agencies’ inability to hold security clearances as a reason for not sharing necessary information. In addition to the issue of withholding
information, other studies found that jurisdiction and differing organizational structures are significantly related to federal-local collaboration as well (Greene, 2011).

Some researchers have argued that although police prevent and respond to local crime, they should not be involved in and would not be effective at counterterrorism (Lum et al., 2011; Morreale & Lambert, 2009). For example, several researchers found that the lack of adequate training has emerged as a problem for small agencies (Caruson, 2004; Schafer et al., 2009; Vardalis & Waters, 2010). Most of the law enforcement agencies in Illinois perceived that training is the action of preparing for and responding to future terrorist attacks, but most small agencies express their need for more resources and training to help them prepare for a terrorist attack (Schafer et al., 2009). Other researchers also raise concerns about the inability of police to recognize the indicators of terrorism. Henry (2002) observed that many police officers have no expertise in identifying potential indicators of terrorist activity. Morreale and Lambert (2009) reported that the vast majority of police agencies receive no training on terrorist-specific observable behaviors. Overall, the lack of resources and training hinders local law enforcement agencies in building counterterrorism efforts.

In short, one challenge to implementing homeland security measures has to do with how local law enforcement agencies carry them out. Another issue is that local agencies do not fully trust other agencies. The ultimate question, then, includes whether or not local police departments, under the leadership of their police chiefs, can embrace the new strategies, given their distrust of other agencies and the unclear definitions and plans that they get.

**Promising Strategies for Local Law Enforcement**

Effective strategies in handling emergency events allow law enforcement agencies to execute safe and effective responses when dealing with terrorists. In particular, Burruss et al.
(2010) pointed out that part of the success of counterterrorism strategies involves a firm understanding of how the current system is supposed to function within homeland security. Therefore, this section further examines policies that will help police deal with local terrorism.

As emphasized by Kemp (2003), strategies for achieving the best practices for terrorism prevention can help local law enforcement improve their counterterrorist efforts thereby minimizing threats and vulnerabilities. In 2003, the International City and County Management Association (ICMA) released a set of twenty-four articles on the best practice recommendations for local government that hold responsibilities for carrying out emergency management duties. It is recommended that local law enforcement can use their skills in collecting evidence and investigation to help emergency managers when forming a terrorism task force (Kemp, 2003). The ICMA claims that local police should be able to identify potential threats of terrorism, to recognize environmental characteristics, and to understand the police role in responding to terrorism since these responsibilities are critical to successful threat assessment. Finally, the ICMA and other studies also point out that agreeing on the definition of terrorism helps law enforcement agencies in recognizing threats of terrorism.

Despite researchers sharing a common belief that a shift toward homeland security can help mitigate the challenges to U.S. national security (De Guzman, 2002; Oliver, 2009; Sloan, 2002), Ortiz et al. (2007) argued that covert intelligence gathering and the immigration enforcement approach to the problem have a negative impact on the relationship between police and citizens. Other researchers also disagreed with this aggressive approach by arguing that abuse of authority is the underlying issue. It would create racial profiling in police stops and discrimination based on racial stereotyping (Brown 2007; Jackson & Brown, 2007). In short,
this information suggests that aggressive policing strategies create more conflict rather than preventing terrorism.

Given the disadvantages of using an aggressive approach, other studies offer alternative strategies that police may use to interdict terrorism at a local level. Lum and Koper (2011)—in their article “Is Crime Prevention Relevant to Counterterrorism?”—offered some support for the possibility of a positive relationship between crime prevention strategies and counterterrorism. Their findings also are supported by a number of studies (Alexander & Mors, 2007; Chappell & Gibson, 2009; The 9-11 Commission, 2010). For example, the 9-11 Commission report revealed a significant relationship between terrorist acts and criminal offenses. Chappell and Gibson (2009) found that 85% of the officers agreed that the community-based strategy and the homeland security strategy are in many ways complementary. Finally, Sloan (2002) argued that because local agencies have been successful in using criminal intelligence gathering techniques and analytical techniques in investigating crimes committed by gang and drug cartel members, local police intelligence units can prevent terrorism by applying these techniques to locate suspected terrorists.

Several studies reveal that community policing is important to the success of policing terrorism because it helps make the local police stronger and better at fighting terrorism. For instance, Greene (2011) asserted that community and problem-oriented policing is one type of policing that is more responsive to the needs of local community. Scheider and Chapman (2003) contended that community policing that allows external partnerships, problem solving, and a decentralized decision-making process could help not only prevent and respond to terrorist threats, but also reduce public fear of terrorism. As Lyons (2002) noted, once local police have built a positive relationship with the community, they can then use this positive bond to create
intelligence-gathering networks. Based on the analysis of qualitative data, Thacher (2005) argued that protecting specific locations through target hardening, precautionary patrols on the areas that might be targeted, and enhancing emergency response to sustain their legitimate use of authority and to maintain community trust are promising strategies for responding to local terrorism. This approach also corresponds to the community-policing model described by Kelling and Moore (1988).

Using the model of community policing, Pelfrey (2005a) further argued that police will pay attention to repeat offenders and to early cues of terrorism. Pelfrey (2005a) suggested that instead of launching a new program, law enforcement can shift strategies from existing community policing practices to help prevent terrorism. Law enforcement should use existing programs to observe suspicious activities, to focus on repeat offenders, to catch the warning signs of terrorism, and to enhance collaboration between federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies. According to Pelfrey (2005a), the most effective programs for preventing terrorism are Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), targeting repeat offenders, and Early Warning Systems (EWS).

On the other hand, other researchers argued that the 9/11 attacks have revealed the need for change in policing core philosophy to emphasize the importance of proactive policing. De Guzman (2002) argued that other counterterrorism measures have already undermined the trust between police and communities, so it is not feasible for police to form partnerships with communities anymore. De Guzman (2002) further argued that community policing is ineffective at deterring terrorists because police cannot reason with them. In order for homeland security policing to work, police need to take preventive action to implement strategies that support their commitment to homeland security (Stuntz, 2002). Reconsidering the police role in homeland
security, De Guzman (2002) described the role of local police as behaving more cautiously, exhibiting a more legalistic style, and taking more proactive steps approach to detect and investigate terrorist acts.

More recently, Stewart and Morris (2009) and Lee (2010) showed the effect of homeland security on local priorities. Stewart and Morris (2009) found that most chiefs rank homeland security as a high priority, while Lee (2010) showed that there are fewer officers and less money for community policing when homeland security planning is given priority. Given the importance of the movement toward homeland security policing, Stewart and Morris (2009) proposed that in terms of federal response, local law enforcement is expected to increase policing roles relating to immigration enforcement and the use of paramilitary police units.

In short, the previous research addresses the limitations of community policing. Although community policing is useful for preventing crime, it has had limited impact on counterterrorism measures. If this is the case, community policing strategies are not necessarily the most effective police response to terrorism. The existing literature demonstrates mixed results for best practices to better prevent local terrorism; therefore, this study fills the gaps in the literature so that police become more efficient and better at preventing local terrorism.

Conclusion

A number of studies show that police are engaging in a philosophy that includes homeland security, yet traditional community policing has not been abandoned after the terrorist attack of 9/11 (Lee, 2010; Ortiz et al., 2007; Scheider & Chapman, 2003). Local police have to work with the Department of Homeland Security to prevent and respond to terrorism in addition to arresting criminals and answering calls from individuals for help. Local police officers who make routine contact and develop rapport with local populations can get better access to
community information that is critical to their terrorism investigation. It is not surprising that local police are on the front lines of defense against terrorism (Bayley & Weisburd, 2011; Foster & Cordner, 2005). Local police and other law enforcement agencies take initiatives to decrease response time and prevent future terrorist attacks.

In addition, it may be hard for local law enforcement agencies to comply with homeland security measures because the instructions and definitions of strategy for homeland security are not clear. However, state and local agencies can improve efficiency by working with the JTTFs. This cooperation will lead to sharing and collaborating, which will improve the quality of work. Thus far, local efforts have been focused on gathering intelligence, securing the flow of information, and identifying and locating potential terrorists in order to enhance public safety.

Limitations of the Review of the Literature

The primary limitation of previous research is that homeland security research has so far been limited to state-level case studies, and future research needs to be expanded to include all the other states to obtain a fuller picture of local law enforcement’s role in homeland security (Marion & Cronin, 2009). Similarly, Vardalis and Waters’ (2010) studies are limited to the county rather than to the entire state and the opinions are limited to the county sheriffs. Because the study is limited to a smaller area, expanding it would help everyone better understand the practices. The present study further explained how Texas police chiefs perceive their departmental roles and responsibilities that are associated with homeland security, since other research has not been focused on this area. By finding out what successful organizations and chief executives do, other departments can discover what works and what they need to do.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter includes a discussion the research methods used to examine whether Texas police chiefs understand their roles and responsibilities in homeland security. The section includes discussions concerning the data source, sampling procedures, and the survey instrument. In particular, the thesis examines the relationship between the independent variables of interest (i.e., departmental strategy shift, federal collaboration, and preparedness attitudes) and the dependent variable of interest (i.e., homeland security roles and responsibilities). The last part of this chapter discusses the analysis plan for this study and the limitations of using secondary data.

Data Source

The present study utilizes the analysis of a secondary source as the main method of data collection. The original researcher, Stewart (2009), administered a survey to Texas police chiefs who participated in the Texas Police Chief Leadership Series (TPCLS) and the New Chief Development Program (NCDP) in order to obtain their opinions regarding issues of homeland security. Specifically, new police chiefs must attend the NCDP, and all Texas police chiefs are required to participate in the TPCLS for leadership and management training once every 2 years in different locations. Both training programs, which are administered by the Bill Blackwood Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas (LEMIT), are 5-day sessions and 40-hour management courses. The LEMIT aims to develop the management and organizational skills of current and future Texas police chiefs.

The present analysis included 271 police chiefs who participated in TPCLS and NCDP during a 5-month period in 2007. Of the 271 police chiefs, 242 completed the survey with an
overall response rate of 89%. Out of the participating local police agencies in the state of Texas, more than three fourths of the chiefs ($n = 157$) came from municipal police departments. About 15.4% of the chiefs ($n = 32$) were from Independent School District (ISD) police departments. The other 9.1% of the chiefs ($n = 19$) were from university and college police departments. It is important to note that 29 respondents did not provide a valid answer to the question. The final sample of 208 police chiefs provided valid and usable surveys, which accounted for slightly greater than 19% of the state’s total law enforcement population. According to Stewart (2011), local law enforcement agencies in Texas have 1,052 police chiefs who serve in municipal, school district, and university police departments. Therefore, the participating police chiefs should be fairly representative of the total chiefs population whose responsibilities include the day-to-day operations of police departments.

**Sampling Procedure**

The present study included a survey which employed a simple random sampling procedure (Fowler, 2009; Walker & Maddan, 2009). As mandated under state law, Texas police chiefs are required to go through the two training programs; therefore, each participating chief has an equal chance of being randomly selected for a study. In addition, this research employed a non-probability sampling method in which chiefs could participate equally in the survey. Participation in the survey was voluntary, and the chiefs could make their own decisions about when they participated in the programs during the 2-year period.

**The Survey Instrument**

The self-administered questionnaire consists of 10 pages with 47 questions, each having approximately 3 to 4 subitems, intended to measure the attitudes of police chiefs toward issues of homeland security. Of the 47 questions, 4 were particularly designed to measure the opinions of
police chiefs and their understanding of their departments’ roles and responsibilities in homeland security. Despite the fact that the instrument did not include many items that used the term “homeland security” and the instrument did not include a conceptual definition for respondents, the chiefs were supposed to respond according to what homeland security meant to them.

The original researchers assured the confidentiality of participant responses to the survey questions, except for anonymity. As a result, the limitation of survey research is that some chiefs may have provided dishonest responses if they felt insecure answering the questions. It is important to note, however, that the original researcher overcame this limitation by replacing the police chiefs’ real identities with unique numbers in order to protect the identity of the respondents.

Measures and Variables

Independent Variables

To examine factors indicating the understanding of homeland security roles and responsibilities at the state level, this thesis looks at nine variables identified in the prior literature as an important factor in predicting the attitudes of Texas police chiefs. The first independent variable is “type of agency” (i.e., municipal departments, independent school districts, university/college campuses). The next variable, “agency size,” is classified as very small-sized agencies (1 to 5 officers), small-sized agencies (6 to 25 officers), medium-sized agencies (26 to 50 officers) and large-sized agencies (more than 50 officers). The original researcher adopted the classification scheme used by the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Standards and Education (TCLEOSE; see Webb, 2007). Agency size, which is measured by the number of sworn officers in each police department, is coded as an ordinal categorical variable. The third variable addresses homeland security initiatives, which is used to
measure whether the local department’s homeland security initiatives could potentially affect inter-agency partnerships between local and federal agencies. The present study measured this variable by asking chiefs to identify any of the 10 initiatives that local agencies have taken to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks and natural disasters since 9/11.

The next two variables were used to measure departmental strategy shifts by asking chiefs if they agree or disagree that the departments’ dominant strategy is homeland security and the police institutions’ dominant strategy is homeland security. Following that, levels of perceived threat and levels of departmental preparedness were included in the secondary analysis as the factors that may shape the chiefs’ attitudes toward issues of homeland security. In particular, the survey asked chiefs to indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree about whether the likelihood of terrorist incidents will occur in their jurisdictions or regions during the next 5 years and the degree to which they believed their departments were prepared to respond to domestic emergencies.

Two final variables measure federal homeland security funds and security clearances by asking chiefs if their departments were awarded homeland security grants and if they have security clearances. Federal homeland security funds and security clearances were coded as dummy variables indicating receipt of funding and federal security clearances. Thus, the survey measured whether departments received homeland security grants and whether departments obtained security clearances with a score of “1” if they did and a score of “0” if they did not.

**Dependent Variables**

The present study measures the police chiefs’ understanding of homeland security roles and responsibilities with four questionnaire items. For example, the chiefs were asked whether:

(a) they had a clear understanding as to their department’s role in homeland security; (b) they
had a clear understanding as to their departments’ responsibilities in homeland security; (c) they had a clear understanding as to what homeland security means in practical terms; and (d) whether the officers in their department knew exactly what was expected of them concerning homeland security. For each statement, the response options were strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Higher values indicated more understanding of homeland security roles and responsibilities, whereas lower values indicated less understanding of homeland security roles and responsibilities.

Plan of Analysis

First, descriptive statistics were examined in order to identify the characteristics of survey participants. Then, the ordinary least squares (OLS) regression was used to identify the predictors of the chiefs’ understanding of homeland security roles and responsibilities. The variables which were measured via a series of survey items (i.e., the dependent variable as well as a few of the independent variables) were ultimately converted into factors scores for OLS purposes.

Limitations of the Present Study

This section focuses on limitations of using secondary data that may affect the findings of the present analysis. First, the disadvantage of using survey research is that the survey format offers only a few generalized responses such as strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree (Babbie, 2010). The chiefs likely have to simplify their responses in order to fit into one of the response categories. If the survey offers more nuanced responses across the board, the survey will probably be more accurate than the survey used in this study.

Although the use of secondary data is a useful collection method for assessing the attitudes of police chiefs toward homeland security issues, the analysis of secondary sources
limits the depth of data collected. For example, in order to maintain the respondent’s interest in completing a survey, the original researchers keep survey questions short; however, this method may affect the appropriateness of the data collected. As emphasized by Babbie (2008), when the researchers tried to make complex questions overly simplified, it limited the amount of data collected, meaning that the researchers sometimes did not receive enough detailed data that they needed for the study. An open-ended question would give the researchers more information about chiefs’ attitudes toward homeland security.

Kempf (1990) and Pope, Lovell, and Brandl (2001) further point out a limitation of using secondary data by arguing that the purposes of the primary and secondary researchers may not be identical, which in turn would make the variable measurements helpful to the first researcher but not necessarily helpful to the secondary researchers. In this study, the survey includes the subjective interpretation of homeland security. Consequently, the information about the chiefs’ understanding of their roles and responsibilities might be less reliable due to different interpretations of homeland security.

Another limitation involved in analyzing a secondary data source is that the present study utilizes a state-level dataset; as a result, the results of a secondary analysis have limited generalizability to chiefs in other states who may have different interpretations of homeland security roles and responsibilities. Finally, previous studies show that other factors, such as the kinds of communities and the level of education, could influence chiefs’ perceptions and homeland security responsibilities as well. For example, Marion and Cronin (2009) use the same measurement procedures by asking questions of police chiefs and found the relationship between the type of community and the level of participation in homeland security-related activities. Using a different measurement of local preparedness efforts, Pelfrey (2007) found an inverse
relationship between educational background and emergency preparedness efforts. Therefore, it is plausible that these two factors may contribute to the link between chiefs’ attitudes and their understanding of responsibilities. Here the educational level of the respondent was not measured but type of department as well as size was recorded, which could be interpreted as a proxies for type of community.

Although the secondary data sources have certain limitations, secondary data analysis is preferable to a survey approach for two reasons. First, the use of secondary data is more cost-effective than collecting original data. As Babbie (2008) and Fowler (2009) note, the advantages of using secondary data are that this approach allows the researchers to save both time and resources because the data has already been collected and is readily available for analysis.

Second, the secondary data analysis, rather than the analysis of primary data, is the preferred method for examining the chiefs’ attitudes because the suitability of the secondary data is useful for answering research questions. The assessment tools that are used in the secondary data sets are appropriate for the present analysis. The response items in this study are based on an ordinal scale, in which the items are ranked as the most positive (strongly agree) to the most negative (strongly disagree). According to Babbie (2008), this type of measurement is commonly used for measuring the degree of attitudes possessed by individuals. Through secondary data analysis, the present study examines attitudinal differences among police chiefs who are employed at local law enforcement agencies that vary in organizational cultural attitudes toward homeland security. As noted by Reddick (2008), knowing the mind of respondents is important, not because of its relation to reality, but because of its place in determining what actions they take to be prepared for preventing terrorism. It is important therefore to point out that although there is a difference between each police chief’s survey response and each police
chief’s actual understanding, knowing the beliefs among police chiefs help to predict how the chiefs will act when the time comes that they are prepared to respond to terrorism effectively.
CHAPTER 4
ANALYSES

This chapter presents the results of the analyses of the secondary data. Descriptive statistics are examined first, followed by the results of the ordinary least squares (OLS) regression model wherein the factors influencing police chiefs’ understanding of their departmental roles and responsibilities are analyzed.

Descriptive Analysis

As mentioned previously, out of 242 selected participants, 208 subjects were ultimately included in the analyses—34 subjects were excluded due to incomplete survey data. As shown in Table 1, in the sample, 75.5% of the participating local police chiefs oversaw municipal police departments ($n = 157$). Approximately 15% of the chiefs oversaw ISD police departments ($n = 32$). The remaining 9.1% of the respondents were chiefs of university and college police departments ($n = 19$). Among the 208 police chiefs surveyed, 43.5% were executives of “very small” sworn officer populations ($n = 91$), 38.9% directed “small” sworn officer populations ($n = 81$), and the remaining chiefs supervised “medium” ($n = 17; 8.2\%$) and “large” ($n = 19; 9.1\%$) departments.

As indicated in Table 1, police chiefs have implemented on average 3.9 of the possible 10 homeland security initiatives listed on the survey instrument. Further, a mean score of 1.39 suggests that chiefs believe little collaboration occurs between their departments and federal authorities. Recall that scores range from 1 to 4, with larger scores representing higher levels of agreement. Also, the descriptive statistics reveal that the chiefs are less likely to believe that the
A department has adopted homeland security as their dominant strategy (1.11) than to believe that the police institution has done so (2.11).

The survey instrument also polled respondents as to their preparedness perceptions as well as to the likelihood that a terrorist attack would occur within their jurisdictions within the next 5 years. Results reveal that the chiefs hold generally low perceptions of preparedness (1.04) but also feel that the likelihood of an attack is relatively low (1.21). Concerning the receipt of funding, 34.1% of respondents report that their departments received a homeland security-related grant since 9/11. Further, only 13.5% of the chiefs maintained that they had a security clearance. Regarding the dependent variable, the descriptive analysis shows a high percentage of chiefs reporting a general level of disagreement as to their understanding of homeland security roles and responsibilities (1.74).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics: Dependent and Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Type of agency</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeland security roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland security initiatives</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-HS</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>University/college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal collaboration</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI-HS</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of attack</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Common sense might dictate that agency size explains most of the variance of homeland security innovation. That is, larger agencies, operating in jurisdictions with higher populations
and other targets attractive to terrorists, might naturally innovate more than agencies in smaller
jurisdictions wherein there are fewer potential targets. To get a clearer picture of the attitudes of
Texas police executives and the extent of homeland security initiatives adopted in Texas police
departments, then, it was decided to examine many of the relevant variables across agency size
(see Table 2).

A series of analysis of variances (ANOVAs) was conducted to determine whether chiefs
of various sized agencies differed on relevant variables. Table 2 shows that chiefs of larger
departments indeed scored higher on the federal collaboration index, implemented more
homeland security initiatives, were more likely to feel that their departments were prepared to
respond to major emergencies, and reported higher scores on the roles and responsibilities index
than their smaller agency chiefs counterparts. In addition, the analysis shows that the number of
sworn officers has a significant effect on the receipt of homeland security grants. That is, a
majority of large agencies (89.4%) received grant money, while fewer proportions of medium
(64.7%), small (29.6%) and very small (20.8%) agencies reporting receiving a homeland
security-related grant.

In sum, the number of sworn officers makes a significant difference in four of the
attitudinal indexes and funding; the size of the agency has a significant impact on federal
collaboration ($\rho < .001$), homeland security initiatives ($\rho < .001$), preparedness ($\rho < .001$),
homeland security roles and responsibilities ($\rho < .01$), and homeland security grants ($\rho < .001$).
Table 2

Means and Percentages of Select Variables Across Sworn Officer Population (N = 208)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sworn officer population</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal collaboration</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland security initiatives</td>
<td>1.11 (.77)</td>
<td>1.47 (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-HS</td>
<td>3.27 (2.1)</td>
<td>3.97 (2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI-HS</td>
<td>1.15 (.58)</td>
<td>1.05 (.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td>2.08 (.55)</td>
<td>2.09 (.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of attack</td>
<td>0.92 (.53)</td>
<td>1.00 (.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland security roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>1.66 (.52)</td>
<td>1.69 (.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received homeland security grant</td>
<td>19 (20.8)</td>
<td>24 (29.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has security clearance</td>
<td>7 (7.69)</td>
<td>9 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01; ***p < .001.
~ Two cells had expected counts of less than 5.

Ordinary Least Square (OLS) Regression

Table 3 presents the results of the OLS model. The OLS regression model was used to examine the relationship between the independent variables and homeland security roles and responsibilities. Of the ten different independent variables that were initially put into the OLS regression model, only five were retained using the stepwise method of selection. The remaining five independent variables explained approximately 24% of the variance in the chiefs’ understanding of homeland security roles and responsibilities.

Only four independent variables are statistically significant predictors of whether chiefs understand their homeland security roles and responsibilities. Perceptions of an institutional shift in strategy have a positive impact on chiefs’ perceptions of homeland security roles and responsibilities ($\rho < .01$). In other words, chiefs who believe homeland security is the dominant strategy for the police institution are more likely to report a greater understanding of homeland
security roles and responsibilities. The perceived quality of collaboration that is occurring between the chiefs’ departments and federal agencies was positively related to understanding homeland security roles and responsibilities at the .01 level as well.

The last attitudinal variable to be significantly related to outcome measure concerns that regarding preparedness. The preparedness attitudes were found to be positively correlated with the role of local police in homeland security; chiefs who have higher scores on the preparedness attitudes index demonstrate a greater degree of homeland security understanding ($\rho < .05$).

Finally, homeland security initiatives were positively correlated with the chiefs’ understanding of homeland security roles and responsibilities. This result indicates that chiefs of departments that have adopted more homeland security initiatives are more likely to have a higher score on homeland security roles and responsibilities index than chiefs of departments that have implemented fewer initiatives. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the complete list of initiatives can be found in the appendix.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLS Regression Model</th>
<th>Homeland security roles and responsibilities</th>
<th>Robust SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal collaboration</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-HS</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness attitudes</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland security initiatives</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 208$. *$\rho < 0.05$; **$\rho < 0.01$.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Introduction

In the post-9/11 policing literature, researchers cite the need for clarity regarding the role of local law enforcement in information sharing, collaboration, threat recognition, WMD response, and risk management (Maguire & King, 2004, 2011; Pelfrey, 2005b; Stewart & Morris, 2009). That is, it is argued that the federal government has not clearly delegated which roles or actions should be covered federally and which should be covered locally (Oliver, 2004, 2007; White, 2004). Federal documents provide local law enforcement agencies with general guidelines on how local police should fulfill their roles, but the guidelines do not address specific procedures for performing their roles in preparing for, responding to, preventing, and recovering from terrorist attacks (Pelfrey, 2009; Randol, 2011). The lack of clear guidelines makes it difficult for local police to carry out their new homeland security mission. Therefore, the present study adds to the literature on homeland security by assessing the extent to which Texas police chiefs understand their departmental roles and responsibilities in homeland security.

This chapter presents the conclusions concerning the attitudes of Texas police chiefs toward their departmental roles and responsibilities in homeland security. Specifically, this study analyzed data from a 2007 survey in order to measure the current perceptions of 208 Texas police chiefs regarding issues of homeland security as well as the extent of homeland security innovation present in their respective departments. Moreover, a goal was to determine what factors are associated with whether chiefs understand their roles and responsibilities in homeland security. This section discusses the policy implications of the research findings described in the previous chapter.
Principal Findings

The vast majority of the literature suggests that local law enforcement agencies do, in fact, have new roles in the post-9/11 world, but the results here reveal that not all police executives understand these new roles. The descriptive findings reveal that most of the study participants had a generally poor understanding of their roles and responsibilities in homeland security, with chiefs of larger agencies more likely to report a greater understanding than their smaller agency counterparts—a disconcerting finding if the police institution has indeed entered into an era of homeland security. One could argue, however, that fundamental strategic change takes time and that the findings should not be considered too alarming. As described by Lee (2010), every change in the police world happens slowly and with difficulty. Lee (2010) points out an example by stating that the community-policing model took a long time to become dominant. The same is true for the adoption of homeland security policing and the understanding of its impact on law enforcement. It can be argued that policing is an area that is difficult to change, and it might take a very long time for changes to happen within local police agencies in Texas. In other words, it is likely that Texas law enforcement agencies are in the process of changing their strategies at the local level. Future studies should revisit this question to determine if attitudes change over time.

While analyzing the descriptive statistics, it was determined that examining relevant variables across agency size would be more useful than simply summarizing them across the entire sample—primarily because that the academic literature and popular press have intimated that size drives much of an organization’s level of innovation. Also, it was believe that, here, agency size might be related to an array of attitudes. Specifically, agency size was found to be related to attitudes toward federal collaboration. That is, chiefs of larger agencies were more likely to rate quality of their collaboration with federal agencies higher than chiefs of law
enforcement agencies in very small departments. Furthermore, chiefs of larger agencies were more likely score higher on the preparedness index, reported more homeland security innovation, and were more likely to receive homeland security grants in relation to chiefs of smaller police departments. The relationship between agency size and these measures should not be surprising. Chiefs of larger agencies operate in more complex environments, particularly when compared to chiefs overseeing 1 to 5 person departments. Larger departments are more bureaucratized; that is, they are highly specialized (i.e., units) and formalized (i.e., written rules). Thus, if a particular sized department is going to be more likely to innovate, it is in most cases going to be a larger department—typically those with the most resources.

And the findings communicated here showing that larger departments were more likely to receive grants is evidence that they indeed have a greater capacity to implement homeland security initiatives, which in turn could be impacting preparedness perceptions—that is, chiefs of larger agencies reporting that they were more prepared to handle major emergencies than chiefs of other sized agencies. The sample as a whole reported having limited abilities concerning homeland security preparedness; however, when agencies grew larger in size, chiefs’ attitudes increased toward greater levels of preparedness. Overall, the result here somewhat coincide with the work of Pelfrey (2007), Giblin, Schafer, and Burruss (2009), and Marion and Cronin (2009), who found agency size and the presence of funding were to be predictive of terrorism preparedness.

It also should be noted that chiefs of larger agencies operate in a different political environment. When policy makers are heralding a change in policing, it is typically the chiefs of the larger departments, overseeing most of the country’s population, that are more likely to feel the pressures to act. Further, because of the size of the jurisdictions they oversee, which
potentially house more suitable terrorist targets, these chiefs are in frequent contact with federal agencies, thought by much of the public to shoulder most of the responsibility of homeland security, and thus have more opportunities to improve upon such relationships—potentially explaining why chiefs of larger agencies reported “better” relationships with federal authorities.

After communicating the descriptive results and examining many of the variables across agency size, an OLS regression model was computed, examining which factors were associated with homeland security roles and responsibilities. The results of the model show four significant predictors of the chiefs’ understanding of roles and responsibilities in homeland security: federal collaboration, homeland security initiatives, preparedness attitudes, and departmental strategy shift.

As shown here, chiefs of departments that have a stronger grasp on homeland security roles and responsibilities, tend to report higher levels of collaboration with the federal agencies. This result could be due to the fact that increased collaboration with federal agencies encourages local chiefs to adopt homeland security policies as central departmental goals. As communication and trust between the local departments and federal agencies increase, chiefs are more likely to embrace and understand the necessity of departmental shifts towards homeland security.

Because of the discovered relationship between federal collaboration and the outcome measure, police executives and policy makers should focus on improving those relationships, if indeed they view homeland security to be a worthy function of local law enforcement. The onus of bolstering these collaborations might fall predominately within the federal sector, however. That is, federal authorities need to reach out more to local agencies, specifically smaller ones. With federal monies increasing being geared toward homeland security, smaller agencies might
feel abandoned. Federal authorities should not forget that many critical infrastructures are housed in small, rural communities. Further, most of the 9/11 hijackers lived in small towns— even more of a reason for feds to work with locals, perhaps in trying to identify extremists.

Though size was not predictive of understand roles and responsibilities, recall that it was related to federal collaboration, and, in the agencies that are more rural (typically small), the culture of the police department can be categorized as less trusting of outsiders (Stewart, 2011). As previously mentioned, larger agencies have to deal with more complex issues, which require resources that are not often found in smaller districts. Vardalis and Waters (2010) recognize that Texas has a real risk of terrorist attacks because it has urban centers, industries, border territories, and agriculture. More importantly, Vardalis and Waters (2010) find that rural sheriffs do not fully understand this threat because they think urban areas are the only targets for terrorist attacks; however, rural areas could be considered targets because they can be found near borders and house agricultural products. This information is important because most small law enforcement agencies in this study are located in more rural areas while some small agencies are found in suburbs (Stewart, 2011). More specifically, of the 208 survey respondents, chiefs of small police departments account for 43.5% of all law enforcement agencies, while chiefs of very small agencies account for 38.9%.

The relationship between homeland security initiatives and the outcome measure is not surprising. Homeland security innovation undoubtedly exposes chiefs to homeland security in general, facilitating their understanding of the concept and strategy. Since the current study is cross sectional rather than longitudinal, though, it is not entirely clear if understanding roles and responsibilities in homeland security is a direct byproduct of increased initiatives. The two are correlated, however. But if one wanted to increase homeland security understanding of local
chiefs, the results here suggest that increasing their opportunities to implement homeland security initiatives might assist such an endeavor. Although not depicted in the previous chapter, but included as an item in the homeland security initiatives index, 6% of the police chiefs reported assigning at least once officer to a JTTF. It should be noted that this percentage is significantly lower when compared with a 2002 national survey that showed 36% of departments participating in a JTTF (Riley et al., 2005).

Those opportunities to implement homeland security initiatives could be achieved with training exercise that also target preparedness attitudes. Exposing the officers to simulated situations that give them relevant experience in terrorist situations would also make them feel more prepared in the event of an actual terrorist attack. With this confidence and experience might also come a clearer understanding of the department’s homeland security roles and responsibilities; that is, an increase in preparedness should have an impact on the understanding of roles and responsibilities. Medium and large departments that have access to more funding would likely have an easier time conducting effective training exercises, thereby increasing preparedness. Smaller departments may have a harder time effectively implementing these training exercises, but perhaps by working with other small departments in their proximity, or even joining with nearby larger departments, they can participate in training exercises and by sharing expenses, being more efficient.

Attitudes concerning a police institutional shift toward homeland security were also found to be related to the understanding of homeland security roles and responsibilities. That is, those chiefs more likely to agree that the police institution as a whole has shifted toward a more domestic security-oriented role since 9/11, are more likely to report higher levels of homeland security understanding. Policy maker, then, if interested in facilitating the understanding of
homeland security by local police chiefs should also focus on those factors influencing attitudes concerning an institutional shift—which have been identified (see Stewart & Morris, 2009).

And finally, previous researchers have examined how the type of the agency and the number of sworn officers relate to police chiefs’ attitudes toward the roles of police agencies (Marion & Cronin, 2009; Stewart, 2009, 2011). In fact, elementary statistics computed here reveal bivariate relationships between size and some of the variables. The results of the regression model, however, fail to establish a relationship between the size of the agency and the chiefs’ understanding of their homeland security roles, holding all other factors constant. Agency size is undoubtedly relevant when considering homeland security plans for agencies, but it was not found to be predictive of understanding homeland security as operationalized here.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

It is important to note that the current findings are based on a single state-level case study. Police executives in other states could be quite dissimilar in their attitudes toward homeland security roles and responsibilities. Future research studies should focus on comparing law enforcement agencies across multiple states. Additionally, future studies should consider all measures of preparedness, such as prevention, awareness, and recovery (Bellavita, 2005; Davis et al., 2004; Pelfrey, 2005b). Here, with the exception of the homeland security initiatives index, the researchers only collected data on attitudes of preparedness. As police improve their efforts to conform to homeland security standards, their roles expand to encompass more aspects of preparedness, necessitating their further study. Future studies should also take into account the regional differences in terrorism perceptions brought on by more tangible, real world experiences or more probable scenarios. For example, chiefs of jurisdictions bordering Mexico and Canada,
because of the possibility of terrorists entering the U.S. through these countries, might have different homeland security concerns than chiefs who are less likely to be exposed to those issues.

Also concerning border-related issues, one future issue for police departments is their roles concerning immigration. Potentially local departments will be forced to play larger role in immigration law enforcement, an area that has traditionally been dealt with under federal jurisdiction. If local police are required to play a greater role in enforcing immigration law, it will necessitate a greater collaboration with the federal agencies responsible for deportation and prosecution of federal law. The role local police are expected to play, and the tactics and strategies they will be required to use in their new role, will have a significant impact on departmental budgets and resource allocation (Gerber et al., 2005; Riley et al., 2005; Schafer et al., 2009). If a greater emphasis is placed on detention and prevention of illegal immigrants, it will require a shift of funds from areas that are more traditionally emphasized, and may have unpredictable effects on the community. In short, future research should focus on the area of immigration and its relationship to homeland security.

Conclusion

The results from the current study have implications regarding how to improve the understanding of homeland security policing responsibilities—some of which have already been discussed. But to summarize, first, the findings stress the need for more collaborative work between local agencies (particularly the small ones) and federal agencies. The best efforts in homeland security preparedness will begin with collaboration. Since the results of the current study show that collaboration is effected by the size of the agency, there should be a guide for the varying agencies regarding collaboration, threats, and challenges.
Second, because of the relationship between preparedness and the outcome measure, the author proposes a preparedness approach similar to the one posed by Pelfrey (2005b) via his cycle of preparedness model. To begin with, Pelfrey’s (2005b) points out that collaboration means working together and sharing information. Pelfrey (2005b) notes that collaboration helps local police identify risks. Further, the more local agencies who are involved in the collaborative process, the better the preparation and planning. According to Pelfrey (2005b), higher quality and increased collaboration leads to greater awareness. Consequently, if local agencies have greater awareness, they will have more than likely considered their response. If their response is quick and well-executed then their recovery will be more successful. Finally, Pelfrey (2005b) stresses that any breakdown in the collaboration, awareness, response, and recovery chain will make it more difficult to prepare for responding to terrorism.

Third, since belief in homeland security as a major policing strategy was related to understanding homeland security responsibilities, perhaps a campaign could be implemented, emphasizing the importance of homeland security. Much of this is related to the discussion presented at the outset of this chapter—that is, the federal government is not clearly communicating to local and state agencies their roles and responsibilities in homeland security. The author recommends an effort to simplify the federal literature and national plan in such a way that roles and responsibilities become clearer. One could start with eliminating the confounding cornucopia of documents and schemes such as the 2002 National Strategy for Homeland Security, the Office of Preparedness Guidelines (2003), the National Preparedness Goal (2005), the 2007 National Strategy for Homeland Security, the National Response Plan which later became the National Response Framework, as well as the 24 Homeland Security Presidential Directives issued by President George W. Bush. All of these documents present
different definitions of homeland security along with different missions, impeding a coherent national strategy.

Lastly, increased exposure to homeland security initiatives appears to be related to homeland security understanding. As mentioned previously, money is most likely the driving factor behind innovation. If policy makers are interested in increasing the understanding of homeland security, more homeland security-related grant funding should be allocated to local agencies, particularly the smallest jurisdictions since they were discovered to be the least likely to receive federal grants.

Though homeland security responsibilities exist at every level of government and even extend into the private sector, local police are perceived to be operating on the front lines in the struggle against extremism and serve as first responders to any major emergency. The findings here fill a void in the literature and can be used to facilitate the understanding of homeland security.
APPENDIX

SURVEY INSTRUMENT
Homeland Security Roles and Responsibilities Index

1. I have a clear understanding as to my department’s role in homeland security.
2. I have a clear understanding as to my department’s responsibilities in homeland security.
3. I have a clear understanding as to what homeland security means in practical terms.
4. The officers in my department know exactly what is expected of them concerning homeland security.

*a eigenvalue = 3.03; α = .86; possible responses on each item ranged from strongly agree to disagree.

Part A

Federal Collaboration Index

1. How would you rate the level of cooperation between your department and federal agencies?
2. How would you rate the level of communication between your department and federal agencies?
3. How would you rate the level of information sharing between your department and federal agencies?
4. How would you rate the level of trust between your department and federal agencies?

*a eigenvalue = 3.46; α = .92; possible responses on each item ranged from very good to poor.

Part B

Homeland Security Initiatives Index

1. adopted the National Incident Management System (NIMS)
2. changed its mission statement to reflect homeland security responsibilities
3. broadened the role of an existing intelligence unit to include counterterrorism
4. signed/updated formal mutual aid agreements with other jurisdictions (since 9/11)
5. initiated, expanded, and/or participated in disaster response exercises
6. ensured interoperable radio emergency communications with other agencies in others jurisdictions
7. ensured interoperable radio emergency communications with other agencies within your jurisdiction
8. linked your offense report system to TDEx
9. conducted a local risk assessment
10. personnel assigned to one of the FBI-led Joint Terrorism Task Forces

*a eigenvalue = 4.63; α = .75. Respondents were asked about other homeland security initiatives implemented within their departments since 9/11, such as whether they changed deadly force policies to deal with suicide bombers, formed a counterterrorism investigative unit other than criminal intelligence, reassigned personnel on a full-time basis to functions related to counterterrorism or homeland security, and formed an intelligence unit focused on counterterrorism; however, less than 5% of the sample responded in the affirmative to these initiatives.

TDEx, the Texas Data Exchange Program, is an information sharing system available to Texas agencies. It is operated by the Texas Department of Public Safety Crime Records Service (CRS) and amasses “law enforcement incident records and non-intelligence criminal justice information” (Texas Department of Public Safety, n.d., para 1)—such as arrest reports, bookings, citations, incident reports, persons of interest, probation/parole records, and
Part C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Shift Index (D-HS)$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Homeland security is the overriding strategy of my department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Countering terrorism is a top priority for my department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Investigating terrorist activity is a top priority of my department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Institution Shift Index (PI-HS)$^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. September 11, 2001 was a turning point for American law enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Policing has entered into an era of homeland security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Homeland security is a very important strategy for policing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$eigenvalue = 2.47; $\alpha = .83$.  
$^b$eigenvalue = 2.41; $\alpha = .79$.

---

Preparedness Perceptions Index$^a$

| 1. My department is well prepared to respond to a major natural disaster. |
| 2. My department is well prepared to respond to a terrorist attack involving WMDs. |
| 3. The officers in my department have received sufficient homeland security training. |
| 4. My department has the equipment necessary for homeland security. |
| 5. In the event of a major emergency, my department can mount an effective response. |

Threat Index$^b$

| 1. Nuclear |
| 2. Chemical |
| 3. Biological |
| 4. Radiological |
| 5. Cyberterrorism |
| 6. Conventional Explosives |
| 7. Military-grade weapons |
| 8. Agroterrorism (food contaminants) |
| 9. Agroterrorism (animal disease) |

$^a$eigenvalue = 3.39; $\alpha = .83$; possible responses on each item ranged from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.”  
$^b$eigenvalue = 6.06; $\alpha = .92$; respondents were asked to indicate the likelihood of the following major terrorist incidents occurring within their jurisdiction or region within the next 5 years; possible responses ranged from very likely to very unlikely; this scale was adapted from Davis et al. (2004).

---

warrants—into a central data base for the purpose of information sharing across jurisdictional boundaries (Texas Department of Public Safety, n.d.; “TDEx Works,” 2007).
REFERENCES


