

12-2009

An Examination of the Tacit Culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement

Scott A. Beatty
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Follow this and additional works at: <http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Beatty, Scott A., "An Examination of the Tacit Culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement" (2009). *Theses and Dissertations (All)*. 1022.
<http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd/1022>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Knowledge Repository @ IUP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (All) by an authorized administrator of Knowledge Repository @ IUP. For more information, please contact cclouser@iup.edu, sara.parme@iup.edu.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE TACIT CULTURE OF THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE
POLICE, BUREAU OF LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Scott A. Beatty

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

December 2009

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
The School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of Sociology

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Scott Alan Beatty

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Steven Jackson, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science, Chair

Mary Jane Kuffner Hirt, Ph D.
Professor of Political Science

David Chambers, Ph D.
Associate Professor of Political Science

ACCEPTED

Timothy Mack, Ph.D.
Dean, School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: An Examination of the Tacit Culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of
Liquor Control Enforcement

Author: Scott Beatty

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Steven Jackson

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Mary Jane Kuffner Hirt
Dr. David Chambers

The purpose of this study is to investigate the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. This organization has created a bifurcated organizational structure that has created a different type of law enforcement officer.

A mixed methods approach was implemented, where a survey tool was used to create a baseline of data. This data was then used to elicit discussion during in depth interviews. Other data that was collected included a historical review of Pennsylvania Liquor Control Enforcement, which dates back to the Provincial Governor of 1710 to the present day. Additional data that was used to create a foundation for the study was gleaned from Pennsylvania Legislative Journals and media reports, which created a historical aspect of the study. Another component of the study included a brief examination of the Control States, which is a group of states that regulate the importation and sale of alcohol and malt or brewed beverages. The combination of these research methods provided a strong foundation for the study. The theoretical foundation for this study included research from Institutional School including Charles Perrow; General Systems theory and Ludwig von Bertalanffy and others including Downs, Sapienza and

Sackmann. The combination of these research methods provided a strong foundation for the study.

The study found that the organizational subculture exists primarily due to the organizational structure of the Pennsylvania State Police. The legislative move that placed a civilian law enforcement organization under the management of a paramilitary law enforcement organization created a “different” type of Pennsylvania State Police Officer in a dichotomous type of organizational environment. This study provides a glimpse into a model of liquor law enforcement unlike any other in existence.

The combination of paramilitary and civilian organization culture is unique and warrants further research. This type of organizational subculture has been recreated in Pennsylvania law enforcement in the Gaming industry through the creation of a civilian Gaming Officer, who is managed by the Pennsylvania State Police. It appears the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is creating a similar dichotomous subculture within Gaming as it did in liquor enforcement.

Acknowledgements

Until lions have their historians, tales of the hunt shall always glorify the hunters.
~African Proverb

To my wife Claudine, thank you for enduring the late night, early morning and weekend ramblings of a madman. This was a team effort. And to my son, Grayson; you need to know I never let this project or any other event come before you in any way. Please know that all of the hard work and frustration has paid off. Now on to the next thing...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER 1.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	1
Significance of the Study.....	2
Research Questions.....	2
Definition of Terms.....	3
CHAPTER 2.....	5
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	5
Introduction.....	5
History of Pennsylvania Liquor Control.....	5
High License.....	7
The Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board.....	10
Enforcement in the PLCB.....	11
Transfer of Enforcement and the Media.....	13
Legislative View on Liquor Control Enforcement.....	15
Organizational Culture.....	20
Tacit Culture.....	21
Subculture.....	23
Identifying Subcultures.....	24
Subcultures in a Police Organization.....	25
The Institutional School and General Systems Theory.....	26
Institutional School.....	27
General Systems Theory.....	28
Regulation and Control.....	29
Control States.....	30
Enforcement within the Control States.....	33
The Pennsylvania Hybrid Model.....	35
CHAPTER 3.....	37
METHODOLOGY.....	37
Introduction.....	37
Rational for the Choice of Methodology.....	38
Quantitative Research.....	39
Hypothesis Testing: ANOVA.....	40
Statistical Significance Limitations.....	41
Qualitative Research.....	42
Significance of Qualitative Data.....	43
Open Ended Interview.....	44
Contacting Participants.....	46
Participant Interviews.....	47
The Population.....	48
Integration of Methods.....	49
Data Collection Procedures.....	50

Piloting the Interview Questions.....	51
Validating the Accuracy of the Findings	51
History/Legislative Review	52
Data Trustworthiness	52
CHAPTER 4	54
FINDINGS	54
Quantitative Data	56
Core Research Question One	57
Core Research Question Two	61
Core Research Question Three	65
Core Research Question Four	69
Core Research Question Five.....	71
Core Research Question Summary	77
Interview Data.....	84
Qualitative Data	84
Participant One.....	85
Participant Two.....	90
Participant Three.....	94
Licensee/Manager Interviews	95
Participant Four.....	96
Participant Five	99
Participant Six.....	102
Analysis.....	105
CHAPTER 5	108
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	108
Introduction.....	108
Summary of the Study	108
Findings.....	111
Core Research Question One	111
Core Research Question Two	115
Core Research Question Three	118
Core Research Question Four	120
Core Research Question Five.....	122
Conclusions.....	127
Implications.....	131
Future Research	132
Summary.....	133
References.....	135
Appendices.....	144
Appendix A – Pennsylvania Liquor Law Response Form.....	144
Appendix B – Participant Letter.....	148
Appendix C – Informed Consent.....	149
Appendix D – Research Site Approval.....	150

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1	Liquor Control Enforcement is a Serious Criminal Endeavor, which must be Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police.....58
2	Because Liquor Control Enforcement is Managed by the Pennsylvania State Police, Liquor Enforcement Officers are Treated with the Same Respect as Pennsylvania State Troopers.....58
3	The “Unwritten Rules” Guiding the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement Encourages Liquor Enforcement Officers to Find Liquor Code Violations Whenever Possible.....59
4	Experienced Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Should be Eligible to Hold Management Positions within the Pennsylvania State Police.....60
5	My Workplace is “Cliquish.....61
6	Liquor Control Enforcement Officers should have the Same Powers of Arrest and Authority as Pennsylvania State Troopers... ..62
7	Liquor Control Enforcement Officers are a Respected Part of the Pennsylvania State Police..... 63
8	The Pennsylvania State Police View Liquor Control Enforcement as a Form of Revenue to Help Fund Other Areas of the Pennsylvania State Police 63
9	Do You Think Your Organization Cares About Your Position.....64
10	Do Feel Like a Part of Your Organization.....65
11	Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Treat Liquor License Holders and Their Employees with Respect..... 66
12	Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police . is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders..... 67
13	Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders Violate the Law More Than Other Pennsylvania Small Business Owners 67
14	Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders View Liquor Control Enforcement Officers as Liquor Control Board Agents 68
15	The Pa State Police Behave in an Adversarial Manner when Conducting Investigations 69

16	The Informal Culture of The Pennsylvania State Police Encourages Liquor Enforcement Officers to have an Adversarial Attitude Toward Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.....	70
17	Liquor Control Enforcement is More Politically Motivated than Based on Neutral Principles of Law Enforcement	71
18	Liquor Control Enforcement Could be Conducted Better by a Different Agency	72
19	The Current Method of Liquor Control Enforcement is the Best Way to Regulate the Liquor Industry in Pennsylvania	73
20	Liquor Control Enforcement Should be Conducted by Local Law Enforcement Personnel.....	73
21	Liquor Control Enforcement Should be Conducted by the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board.....	74
22	Liquor Law Enforcement is More Regulatory than Criminal in Nature.....	75
23	The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Holds Liquor Control Enforcement as an Important Law Enforcement Responsibility.....	75
24	Violations of Pennsylvania Liquor Laws are Serious Infractions of the Law	76
25	From an Organizational Perspective, Liquor Control Enforcement is a Good Fit with the Pennsylvania State Police	77
26	The Current Method of Liquor Control Enforcement is the Best Way to Regulate the Liquor Industry in Pennsylvania	79
27	Liquor Control Enforcement is a Good Fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.....	80
28	Liquor Control Enforcement Could be Conducted Better by a Different Agency	81
29	Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Treat Liquor License Holders and Their Employees with Respect.....	83
30	Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.....	83

31	The Current Method of Liquor Control Enforcement is the Best Way to Regulate the Liquor Industry in Pennsylvania	87
32	Enforcement is a Good Fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.....	88
33	Liquor Control Enforcement could be Conducted Better by a Different Agency	88
34	Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Treat Liquor License Holders and Their Employees with Respect	89
35	Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police . is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.....	90
36	The Current Method of Liquor Control Enforcement is the Best Way to Regulate the Liquor Industry in Pennsylvania	92
37	Enforcement is a Good Fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.....	92
38	Liquor Control Enforcement Could Be Conducted Better by a Different Agency	93
39	Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Treat Liquor License Holders and Their Employees with Respect	93
40	Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.....	93
41	The Current Method of Liquor Control Enforcement is the Best Way to Regulate the Liquor Industry in Pennsylvania	97
42	Enforcement is a Good Fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.....	97
43	Liquor Control Enforcement could be Conducted better by a Different Agency	98
44	Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Treat Liquor License Holders and Their Employees With Respect	98
45	Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police . is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.....	99
46	The Current Method Of Liquor Control Enforcement Is The Best Way To Regulate The Liquor Industry In Pennsylvania	100

47	Enforcement Is A Good Fit With the Pennsylvania State Police.....	100
48	Liquor Control Enforcement Could Be Conducted Better By a Different Agency	101
49	Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Treat Liquor License Holders and Their Employees With Respect	101
50	Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police . is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.....	101
51	The Current Method of Liquor Control Enforcement is the Best Way to Regulate the Liquor Industry in Pennsylvania	103
52	Enforcement is a Good Fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.....	103
53	Liquor Control Enforcement Could be Conducted Better by a Different Agency	104
54	Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Treat Liquor License Holders and Their Employees With Respect	104
55	Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.....	105

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

“Because the interchange of structure and function go on over time, a natural history of an organization is needed” (Perrow, 1986). Charles Perrow believes a historical perspective of an organization is needed because of the ebb and flow of structure and function; meaning, we cannot understand current crises or competencies within an organization without seeing how they were created and shaped. Therefore, organizationally speaking, the present is rooted in the past and the past must be explored to understand the present. Realizing this paradox, a study of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement requires historical research as a foundation that includes Pennsylvania Legislative Reviews, media reports from the time period and interviews with Pennsylvania Liquor Enforcement Officers and Pennsylvania Liquor License holders. These historical methods of research are crucial to understanding the development of the structure and evolution of the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement over time and will be explored in this study.

Purpose of the Study

Why study the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement? The purpose of this study is to examine the organizational culture as well as subculture of a civilian law enforcement organization attached to a paramilitary law enforcement organization. The research in chapter two will examine the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement using as

a theoretical framework the Institutional School of thought, including General Systems theory and focusing on the concept of tacit culture. A historical review will be presented to create a foundation for this study. The history of Pennsylvania Liquor Control Enforcement provides insight into the current organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement.

Significance of the Study

Understanding how culture influences organizational behavior is relevant, especially when we begin to explore the culture of law enforcement organizations. The significance of this research and topic stem from the fact that law enforcement impacts our lives one way or another and must be understood to provide checks and balances for the citizens. However, understanding the culture of law enforcement is not enough; examining the subcultures that ultimately create the tacit culture, or way things are done is paramount to gaining a true understanding of this type of organization. Therefore, the significance lies in the current organizational culture and structure of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and how this model of law enforcement may be applied throughout the Commonwealth.

This study will explore the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and how this culture impacts liquor control enforcement within the Commonwealth.

Research Questions

The following research questions will be used to guide this study.

- How does the organizational culture of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affect the subculture of the civilian Liquor Control Enforcement Officers?
- What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and members of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police?
- What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and Pennsylvania liquor licensees?
- How does the paramilitary culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affect the business owners they regulate?
- Are there alternatives to the current method of liquor control enforcement in Pennsylvania? If so, what are they?

Definition of Terms

Large organizations often use a variety of acronyms and terms to define and describe aspects of the operation and function. The Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement is no different. The following list of terms and definitions will be used throughout this study to assist with the clear understanding of this study.

Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement (BLCE) – Civilian law enforcement organization attached to the Para-military Pennsylvania State Police.

Control States – A group of 19 jurisdictions (eighteen states and Montgomery County, MD) that regulate the sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages as opposed to the 32 jurisdictions that do have state regulation of the sale or dispensation of alcoholic beverages.

General Systems Theory - A system is characterized by the interactions of its components and the nonlinearity of those interactions.

Institutional School - This school of thought takes a sociological view of organizations with the major conceptual framework following a structural-functionalism model. This framework indicates that functions determine the structure of an organization and structures can be understood by analyzing their functions.

Liquor Enforcement Officer (LEO) – A civilian law enforcement officer from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Liquor License Holder (Licensee) – Person who has met the requirements set forth by the prevailing governing body to sell liquor and malt or brewed beverages.

Organizational Culture - Composed of the norms, shared values and premises of its members. These constructs are reflected in the informal systems that emerge within the organization, such as the habits and routines that develop over time.

Paramilitary – A group or organization patterned after military forces.

Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board (PLCB) – Government organization that regulates the liquor industry within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Tacit Culture - The unspoken assumptions and beliefs of the employees within an organization that create the standard operating procedure of the organization.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The phrases ‘law enforcement’ and ‘organizational culture’ conjure up very different images; however, their place in the same conceptual framework is very important when examining the tacit culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. This review of literature will provide an examination of organizational culture as the theoretical foundation for this study into the tacit culture of a law enforcement agency.

A review of research conducted by Sites (1991) , Sackmann (1992), Perrow (1986) and others will be examined to provide a theoretical perspective into organizational culture and its role in law enforcement. Additionally, the research of Jermier, Slocum, Fry and Gains (1991) will be examined to explore the concept of culture in law enforcement organizations.

History of Pennsylvania Liquor Control

A brief history of liquor control within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will be offered to provide a beginning point to the study. Also, included is a brief Pennsylvania Legislative review that highlights the transfer of authority from the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board to the Pennsylvania State Police.

From 1919 to 1933 during Prohibition in the United States, Federal Agents and Pennsylvania State Police Troopers enforced liquor control within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. However, prior to 1920, research by Clement Sites (1968) points out that

Pennsylvania controlled liquor through a centralized licensing mechanism that provided very little control and no real enforcement of issues surrounding alcohol.

Sites detailed the structural aspects of liquor law administration in his book, *Centralized Administration of Liquor Laws* (Sites, 1968). His research was based on the concept that liquor control enforcement from an administrative control perspective took one of two forms: central administrative control and centralized administration. In central administrative control, the taxing and regulatory authority is granted to local officers, who report to the central administrative head, such as a commission or governor. In a centralized administration, authority is extended downward through appointees or employees to immediately perform the duties, which would otherwise devolve upon local law enforcement (Sites, 1968). The forms of administrative control sound similar; however, the concept of enforcement is the major difference. In central administrative control, the enforcement of the liquor laws are tasked to local law enforcement entities. In a centralized administration, an enforcement mechanism or agency is put in place to regulate and enforce the laws.

In the beginning, Pennsylvania employed a centralized administrative form of licensing authority. This manifested itself in 1710, when the Provincial Assembly passed an act that stated:

For preventing disorders and the mischiefs that may arise from multiplicity of public houses of entertainment, be it enacted, that no person or persons shall hereafter have or keep any public inn, tavern, ale-house, tipping house or dramshop, victualling house or public house of entertainment, in any county of this province or in the city of Philadelphia, unless such person or persons shall first be recommended by the Justices in the respective county courts, and the said city, in their Quarter Sessions or Court of Record for the said counties and cities respectively, to the Lieutenant-Governor for the time being his license for so doing, under the penalty of five pounds.' (Sites, p.37)

According to Sites, the formal centralization model continued through the colonial period of Pennsylvania into statehood when the Commonwealth Governor succeeded the Colonial Lieutenant as the grantor of liquor licenses. In 1794, a bureaucratic form emerged when County Treasurers began to issue liquor licenses that were signed by the Commonwealth Secretary to persons who were approved by the County Court Justices. In 1807, the Governor took control of the signing of the licenses until 1815 when all provisions for the signing of liquor licenses were repealed and Pennsylvania utilized a central administrative control method. Liquor control enforcement in Pennsylvania after 1815 vacillated between issues with local police, sheriffs and judges, who controlled the licensing and enforcement of the existing liquor laws in their counties as they saw fit (Sites, 1968). Research by Pennsylvania Prohibition historian, Earl Kaylor (1963) determined that this system became ripe with political corruption and the laws simply were not enforced to the degree that most citizens would have preferred, which created a need for some form of liquor enforcement.

High License

Liquor licensing research by Kaylor (1963) and Sites (1986) concluded that the High License is a reference to the artificially inflated cost of a liquor license. Prior to this concept, liquor licenses did not exist in many places and those who did receive official permission to sell liquor paid a very small price, excluding the bribes and payoff. It was believed that raising the cost of a liquor license would place them in the hands of proper gentlemen, who would enforce the liquor laws and add respectability to the liquor trade. This administrative response was viewed as an effort to appease the temperance agitators and thought to be a form of liquor control in that few people could afford the annual fee

to have a license and that the license would be prized and protected by upholding the laws.

According to Kaylor (1963), in Pennsylvania, the High License took the form of the Brooks law, which had strong support from the citizenry and more importantly, support from top-level politicians such as Governor Beaver, who was sympathetic to the temperance movement. This law also found favor with politicians and citizens who favored the liquor trade because it would certainly stop the debates and burgeoning support for Prohibition.

As found in the Pennsylvania Legislative Journal, the Pennsylvania State Legislature of 1887 had already debated and proposed a constitutional amendment to prohibit alcohol, but found stiff opposition to this idea. Therefore, when the Brooks law was introduced, Prohibition was put aside and the High License passed the House by a vote of 123 to 62 and the Senate 38 to 0. The Brooks law went into effect on June 1, 1888 and continued until 1919 with the advent of Prohibition. The solid support and political entrenchment of this law made it a popular alternative to Prohibition, at least for now.

Kaylor's review of this new law found that the Brooks law embodied no new principles of liquor control. It raised the license fees, increased fines for illegal sales and provided a more uniform regulation of liquor sales throughout the Commonwealth. The major provisions of the Brooks law as described in *The Prohibition Movement in Pennsylvania: 1865-1920* (1963) are as follows:

1. Licenses were granted by a Court of Quarter Sessions, which could issue whatever number of licenses it deemed necessary, with full power to revoke any, or all, at the end of twelve months.

2. Applicants had to be citizens of the United States and each petition had to be signed by twelve reputable electors certifying the necessity of a license and the good moral character of the applicant. Besides filing a personal bond of \$2000, each applicant had to supply the name of two freeholders, not engaged in the manufacture of liquor, who would go sureties to the same amount.
3. Persons licensed in cities of the first class had to pay \$1000 annually; second and third classes had to pay \$500 annually; those in other cities, \$300 annually; those in boroughs \$150 annually; in townships, \$75 annually.
4. To these clauses were added restrictions found in earlier statutes prohibiting sales on election days, Sundays, to minors, to habitual drunkards or to visibly intoxicated persons.

As described by Kaylor (1963), under the Brooks law, licensing and enforcement were now transferred back to the court. The fate of liquor control and enforcement thus fell into the hands of the court judge, who was now the absolute czar in the matter of granting licenses and revoking them if the licensee fell out of favor. The Brooks law remained the law of the land until national Prohibition made the law moot in 1919.

From 1919 to 1933, liquor control enforcement within the Commonwealth was the province of the Federal Government due to the Eighteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, more commonly referred to as the Volstead Act of 1919, which prohibited the possession, transportation, sale and dispensation of alcohol in the United States. The Federal Agents worked with the Pennsylvania State Police and local law enforcement to battle organized crime and to stop the illegal flow of alcohol. However, according to McGeary (1948), the Federal Agents limited their interaction with the Pennsylvania State Police and local law enforcement due to ‘tip offs’ associated with liquor raids. Pennsylvania liquor control enforcement began to take formal shape in November of 1933 with the creation of the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board, the Commonwealth’s response to the eventuality of the 21st amendment, the repeal of Prohibition.

The Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board

With the enactment of the 21st amendment, the regulation and enforcement of liquor in Pennsylvania was about to become a serious issue that involved more than a judge's signature on a liquor license. Because the issue of liquor control had been a political lightning rod since 1710, Governor Gifford Pinchot vetoed the re-instatement of the Brooks law in favor of a new method of liquor control. On November 13, 1933, the Governor stood before the legislature and outlined his proposal for controlling the sale of intoxicating liquors, ushering in the creation of the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board (PLCB).

McGeary (1948) recounts that the first days of the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board were hectic due to the constraints of time and personnel. The board was organized on December 1, 1933 with the sale of liquor to begin on January 2, 1934, therefore, other state agencies were ordered to assist in the licensing and inspection process until permanent PLCB employees were hired. According to McGeary (1948), the PLCB brought an innovation to Pennsylvania State government by being the first agency to hire based on a merit system. This civil service process was put in place to extinguish claims of favoritism and corruption that existed in previous liquor control models. The legislature prescribed that personnel were to be selected strictly on merit, based on civil service test scores.

With great fanfare, the State Stores opened and for the first time in fifteen years, Pennsylvanians could legally buy alcohol. Now with the alcohol flowing, the enforcement of the liquor laws would have to be considered.

Enforcement in the PLCB

The laws and regulations concerning liquor and malt or brewed beverages would be at best ineffective without enforcement personnel. Therefore, the PLCB created divisions for licensing and enforcement that acted as one entity designed to provide a comprehensive and seamless process for the enforcement of the liquor laws where licensing and enforcement worked in concert, sharing information and providing beneficial intelligence and services for the Commonwealth.

Setting up the Bureau of Enforcement within the PLCB entailed designing a specific organizational structure for enforcement. The PLCB based the structure of their new Bureau of Enforcement on a civilian model of law enforcement. This was a logical progression because of the dominance of the federal government in liquor control during Prohibition. Therefore, the PLCB initiated a civilian model of liquor control enforcement for confronting liquor law violations within the Commonwealth.

The agents and investigators of the PLCB would conduct open and undercover investigations into violations of the liquor code much in the same manner as the Federal Agents. According to McGeary (1948), in 1933 the PLCB authorized a compliment of 225 officers to be hired. These men were required to have at least two years experience with the Pennsylvania State Police or other law enforcement agency. The new liquor agents were seasoned law enforcement professionals with a considerable amount of investigative knowledge. It was recognized that this type of police work required investigative skills of the highest order and was not a job for the naïve (McGeary, 1948).

Once on the job, the new agents learned the integral aspects of the position in the field. Such skills as the proper methods of reporting and investigating were taught

through a field training process that gave the agent a front line perspective to liquor law enforcement, which included the critical component of undercover work.

Enforcement of the Liquor Code became a social, political, and economic issue in that alcohol was a permanent aspect of many people's lives from those who owned taverns to those who went to them to those who preyed on the patrons in them. It seemed that in some way, alcohol impacted most people's lives one way or another. Realizing that Enforcement Officers worked in an environment plagued with moral and social issues that usually resulted in crimes, the Enforcement Officers applied their now legitimate powers of arrest to the enforcement of the liquor laws and all others laws of the Commonwealth that occurred within their view.

This format of liquor control enforcement prevailed until 1987 with PL 32, No. 14, when the Enforcement Bureau of the PLCB was moved to the Pennsylvania State Police. Section 211 of this amended act removed the full police powers and Peace Officer status from the PLCB Enforcement Officer and placed Pennsylvania State Troopers in supervisory positions of the new Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. These Troopers would supervise the new civilian Liquor Enforcement Officers, who were stripped of their police powers. An interesting aspect to this move was that the Pennsylvania State Troopers, who supervise and manage the Liquor Enforcement Officers, would now also approve and sign violation letters and citations, however, these same Troopers do not have legal authority over the regulatory component of the Liquor Code to cite for these violations. Therefore, based on Title 40 of the Pennsylvania Crimes Code, the State Police cite liquor license holders for regulatory violations of the Liquor Code when they do not have the statutory authority to do so.

In June of 1987 a debate had been raging within the Pennsylvania Senate concerning liquor control within the Commonwealth. The Legislature had been debating what to do about liquor control for more than thirty months and could not determine how liquor control enforcement should be handled. Eventually, it was determined by the House and Senate that liquor control enforcement should be conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police.

Transfer of Enforcement and the Media

The transfer of enforcement from the PLCB to the State Police did not occur in a vacuum. The media played a significant role in creating the boundaries for the reform minded legislature through articles and editorials depicting statewide Prohibition and a “dry” Fourth of July weekend in 1987. Even with the media push on reform, a heated debate between Democrats and Republicans over the veracity of the state liquor monopoly system was at the center of House bill 1000. Realizing that major changes in the state monopoly of liquor sales was not going to be a part of this reform, the media and Legislature looked to the law enforcement aspect of the PLCB as a reform issue.

The ‘transfer of power’ story began on December 12, 1986 when Pennsylvania Revenue Secretary James Scheiner stated in the Harrisburg Patriot News, “Enforcement is going to be transferred. We have bipartisan support. It’s an idea whose time has come.” (Marshall, A1) Several days later an article appeared in the Harrisburg Patriot News with the title, “Holiday Spirits Endangered.” The article used the phrase a “holiday war of nerves” where Governor Thornburg’s attempt to privatize the state liquor system would result in the demise of the PLCB on December 31, 1986. The response was that there would be no liquor and no liquor laws as of 12:01 AM, January 1, 1987; meaning

Prohibition and no New Year's Eve parties. Realizing this, the media began touting the importance of transferring enforcement to the Pennsylvania State Police by saying, "The proposed transfer of liquor law enforcement powers to the state police is an example of real reform." (Reading Eagle, June 30, 1987) The public perception of this issue was simple: keep the liquor stores and beer distributors open. Therefore, to achieve this and have alcohol on New Years eve and for the several college football games on television, a six-month extension was given to the PLCB to allow further discussion on the issue.

Based on information found in newspaper articles from the Harrisburg Patriot News and the Reading Eagle, the PLCB reform movement was at an impasse with time running out for the June 30, 1987 deadline to reform the PLCB. According to articles and reports, if this issue could not be settled, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania would become a "dry" state operating under alcohol Prohibition. The media reported the issue in the form of articles titled "LCB tells bars, distributors they may have to shut down" and "State could go 'dry' or 'all wet.'" (Reading Eagle, June 27, 1987)

Interestingly, in the June 27, 1987 edition of the Reading Eagle, an Associated Press article appeared detailing how the bars and distributors would have to close their doors. On the same page appeared a story from Manila titled, "Tainted Alcohol Causes 17 deaths." Sensational titles like these began to worry citizens who wanted to have alcohol on the upcoming Fourth of July holiday and did not want to have to worry about buying tainted bootleg liquor. PLCB spokesman Robert Ford was even quoted as saying, "I'm throwing an extra case of beer in my basement, because I'm not going to sit on the Fourth of July weekend without a cold beer." (Reading Eagle, June 27, 1987) This sentiment, as reported by the media, fostered a sense of urgency, where citizens began

buying large amounts of alcohol and the lawmakers simply wanted to get past this situation.

The lawmakers and media reported how a reform in enforcement would benefit the Commonwealth, however, in a July 1, 1987 Patriot News article, Pennsylvania State Police spokesman Tom Lyon stated, “The same people will be doing the same job. The bottom line, basically, is the average consumer won’t see any changes” (Marshall, B3). Therefore; the transfer of enforcement to the state police was essentially the same as it was under the PLCB, creating no reform at all. While the media signaled that enforcement of the Liquor Code should be transferred to the state police, a very different debate was occurring in the Capital Building.

Legislative View on Liquor Control Enforcement

The media reported that enforcement of the Liquor Code was a natural fit with the Pennsylvania State Police; however, a very different argument was taking place in the State Capital building.

According to an examination of Pennsylvania Legislative reviews, House bill 1000 was debated in one form or another for more than 30 months in the House and Senate and was eventually passed on the final day before the bill would expire. A review of the Pennsylvania Legislative Journals from the House of Representatives and the Senate of 1987 illustrate a peculiar environment where the enforcement component of this law was discussed from several perspectives, creating a spirited debate. The dissention among the Senate concerning this bill, specifically enforcement, was heard on June 17, 1987 when Senator Clarence D. Bell stated,

But, to be specific, our liquor laws are so screwed up that an enforcement agent cannot arrest a person he observes selling dope in a taproom. They cannot arrest a prostitute that is operating in a taproom, but they can lay in the bushes outside of a booze store down in Delaware and pick up a little old lady who bought a gallon of wine and two quartz of booze, stop her after she comes into Pennsylvania, without a warrant and search her car without a search warrant... Again, I say it is outrageous when somebody can search without a search warrant, arrest without a warrant somebody who brings a bottle of booze into Pennsylvania, but cannot arrest a person peddling drugs in a taproom. (Pennsylvania Legislative Journal – Senate, June 17, 1987, p. 744-745).

During the same session, Senator Frank Pecora noted his objection to the bill's placement of enforcement by offering an amendment that grand-fathered newly hired Enforcement Officers as Pennsylvania State Police Officers. This amendment would place the full power of liquor enforcement in the control of the Pennsylvania State Police. What initiated this amendment was a letter from the Conference of State Police Lodges and the Fraternal Order of Police, which stated that the present legislation, which delegated three members of the State Police Commission to supervise the Liquor Enforcement Officers would be very difficult because of the "magnitude of the taverns and the problems within this Commonwealth." Senator Pecora's rationale was that the Pennsylvania State Police have special training in law enforcement, especially with drugs and alcohol. The State Police would probably be more qualified to operate this type of agency and create a system that would benefit the Commonwealth more properly through its existing framework. This amendment was defeated 39 to 9 (Pennsylvania Legislative Journal - Senate, June 1987), indicating that perhaps the State Police was not the best fit for liquor enforcement.

Opposition to this amendment came from Senator Hardy Williams who emphatically stated that the Pennsylvania State Police did not want the enforcement of the Liquor Code, which came in the form of a letter from the Fraternal Order of Police.

The Pennsylvania State Police would only permit acceptance of the Enforcement Officers if House bill 1000 was amended to include additional supervisory positions for Troopers, not the three man supervisory board as originally indicated in the bill. Furthermore, the Enforcement Officers were not to be part of the state police

The debate concerning enforcement went on for days and issues with the Senate amending the bill at the last minute caused some concern. Specifically, the issue of providing for the Commissioner of the Pennsylvania State Police to appoint Troopers as he saw fit in a supervisory capacity in the new Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement, while making it law that all other employees “shall be civilians.” This meant that Enforcement Officers were not Troopers and not part of the paramilitary organization. Therefore, they could not be promoted beyond first line supervisor and had no opportunity for advancement or lateral transfer. It was now a 25-year career consisting of sitting in bars until 2:00 AM. Nonetheless, this bill was given to the House for a vote on June 29, 1987, with the deadline for the bill being June 30, 1987. This created an issue for the politicians that manifested itself on the floor. Representative Stevens summed it up best when he said:

I must reluctantly support this bill and I say “reluctantly” because I believe that the Senate is engaging in some last minute blackball of this House to send this bill over to us in this manner, you know, just about 24 hours before the deadline in which this State would not have liquor laws. I think we owe it to the people of Pennsylvania to act responsibly and to have liquor laws, and I realize that any bill is going to be a compromise and we are not going to be happy with it. But I think the process has been less than perfect, and I hope this House will come back in the fall and that our committee will run the bills because I think the manner in which the Senate has acted here has put us really under the gun unfairly. (Pennsylvania Legislative Journal – House June 29, 1987, p. 1191.)

Based on statements from the Pennsylvania Legislative Journal, members of the House of Representatives voiced a sincere disapproval for the amendments in this bill and realized

the 11th hour was upon them. It was voiced several times that this law must be revisited and amended in the fall. With that, it was approved and moved to the Senate.

The Senate had issues with the enforcement aspect of this bill as well, but the sentiment was that it was still going to pass. The reason for the passage of this bill, even with the noted reluctance, was pedestrian and shockingly simple. As Senator Mike Fisher stated,

...to have hanging out here a controversy over whether or not the people of Pennsylvania will be able to buy beer, wine and liquor for the Fourth of July. At least in my district that appears to be the only thing that was on anybody's mind this weekend. I think that it imparts that today if, in fact, House Bill 1000 passes both the Senate and the House, that the people of Pennsylvania will be the big losers in the process. (Pennsylvania Legislative Journal- Senate June 29, 1987, p. 890)

Statements found in the Legislative Journal illustrate that it was clear the concern was not for the veracity of House Bill 1000 or tremendous changes in enforcement of the liquor laws, but rather that the law be passed so the citizens of Pennsylvania could have beer and whiskey with their hot dogs on the Fourth of July. However, some people realized that perhaps the Senate and the House were making a mistake. The concern for the impending legislation was voiced most succinctly in the Senate when Senator Vincent Fumo stated,

Mr. President, I rise to support the bill. However, I want my remarks very clear in the record because I foresee problems in transferring the enforcement bureau to the State Police in the new system we have setup. I am willing to put aside my resistance to that because of the lateness of the hour and the fact that it has become a fait accompli. I have been around on this floor and talked to many Senators, and I have talked to people in the House and everyone seems to agree that we should not send this enforcement phase to the State Police, but we have to do it because of the media perception. So we are going to do that. The State Police has written us, the lodge, I believe, has written to us and said they do not want it. They cannot afford to do it better than the LCB can do it, but for the sake of public relations we are going to send it there. I just want it to be clear, when they start having problems in the State Police with this, that at least one vote in this Senate

and one voice in this Senate predicted this to happen. (Pennsylvania Legislative Journal - Senate June 29, 1987 p. 893)

A review of the debates in the House and Senate illustrate the reluctance to move enforcement out of the PLCB to the Pennsylvania State Police. According to Senator Fumo, a combination of media pressure and the deadline for the liquor laws appeared to have forced the legislature to pass a bill they knew was flawed. Furthermore, it was clear the Pennsylvania State Police wanted nothing to do with liquor enforcement unless they were going to gain promotion positions as well as funding from this bill. This combination of factors produced a reform-minded environment, where the media heightened the concerns of the Commonwealth citizens and pushed the lawmakers to enact a law they knew was problematic.

The goal of PLCB reform originally was to dismantle the state monopoly system, however at this point, it appeared the lawmakers would settle for any kind of reform that would keep the voters happy and that meant transferring enforcement to the Pennsylvania State Police.

This transfer of power created a civilian Pennsylvania State Police Officer, who is not a 'member' of the paramilitary organization, but yet is supervised by Pennsylvania State Police Troopers, who do not have regulatory authority over the liquor code. This unique organizational structure ultimately affected the culture of Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement by creating an 'us vs. them' mentality within the organization.

The historical foundation for this study is important because it illustrates the structural and ultimately, the cultural shift that occurred in Pennsylvania liquor law enforcement.

Organizational Culture

Schein (1985) defined organizational culture as, “A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to these problems” (p.12). Eliot Jaques (1951) describes organizational culture with the description of the culture in a factory, “The culture of the factory is its customary and traditional way of thinking and of doing things, which is shared to a greater or lesser extent by all its members, and which new members must learn, and at least partially accept... Culture is part of the second nature of those who have been with the firm for a long time” (p. 251). Therefore, culture consists of the set of assumptions, values, norms, symbols, and artifacts within the organization that convey meaning to employees in relation to what is expected; thereby shaping individual as well as group behaviors (Enz, 1988; Hatch, 1993; Rousseau, 1990). Martin and Siehl (1983) viewed culture as the glue that holds an organization together by way of patterns of shared meaning. Therefore, organizational culture is expected to have an important bearing on behavior (Cooke & Szumal, 2000; Schein, 1985).

The core of an organization’s culture is composed of the norms, shared values and premises of its collective members, while the senior members of an organization tend to bound the culture (Vecchio, 1997). These constructs are reflected in the informal systems that emerge within the organization, such as the habits and routines that develop over time. These habits and routines become the standard operating procedures and the ‘unwritten’ understandings that people develop about how business gets done.

Sapienza (1985) believes that one of the underpinning components of organizational culture are shared beliefs, which influence decision-making. These beliefs are not readily observable to people outside of the organization. Therefore, to illustrate this theory, Sapienza engaged in a participant observation exercise and shadowed two managers in an organization. This enabled him to observe the shared beliefs that created the organizational culture from the perspective of the managers. It is important to realize the perceptions and beliefs of the workers that Sapienza chronicled created the boundaries for the conception of the organizational culture.

The concept of shared beliefs becomes evident when we examine the organizational culture of military organizations. As indicated by Ian Roxborough (2000), sociologists have often ignored the organizational dynamics of military organizations, which have been an under investigated area of organizational culture. In no other organization is the concept of shared belief more prevalent.

Military organizations respond and operate differently in times of war than in peace. They also respond to technology as a cultural component, which is an interesting contrast to the old aphorism that “there is only one thing harder than getting a new idea into the military mind, and that is getting an old one out.” This mind set has created a culture of change within the military management structure, creating the assumptions and beliefs that help to fuel the military culture.

Tacit Culture

A common factor in the research of organizational culture is the understanding that underlying assumptions and beliefs are powerful and influential components of culture. However, these assumptions and beliefs are not readily observable outside of the

organization. Therefore, Schein (1991) and Sackmann (1992) incorporated into their research on organizational culture methods for identifying tacit culture, or the assumptions and beliefs of the employees within an organization. Schein (1991) describes culture as having three levels, with the first consisting of visible organizational structures and processes such as facilities, procedures, and overt behaviors that can be observed. The second level consists of values manifested in the strategies, goals, and philosophy of the organization. While these values are not as visible as those in the first level, they can be acknowledged by observing the ways things are done in an organization. The third level consists of basic assumptions, unconscious beliefs, perceptions, thoughts, and feelings that are often taken for granted and invisible to the observer. An organizational member cannot reiterate the underlying assumptions of their organizations' culture, therefore, according to Schein (1991), asking members to describe organizational assumptions would be pointless. Schein (1991) instead contends that this tacit culture can only be understood through an inquiry interview method. This method involves asking organizational members open-ended questions that elicit natural stories about the organization. According to Schein (1991), these stories assess each person's thoughts and interpretations and reveal patterns of assumptions and beliefs about the organization.

Sackmann (1992) contends that organizational management is most effective when organizational culture is viewed as a dynamic construct, which develops over time and develops through social action and interactions. She further contends that knowledge is interpreted from the existing culture, but different cultural perspectives can result in different interpretations. This explains why people may respond differently to the same management technique. Further research by Sackmann (1992) suggests that it is the

cognitive component of culture that attributes meaning to cultural behaviors. These assumptions and behaviors serve as the basis for perceiving, thinking, feeling, and acting; therefore, they are influential in the interpretation of knowledge and the resulting actions.

To fully assess and understand an organization's culture and to utilize this culture to increase organizational effectiveness, one must uncover the cognitive component of assumptions and beliefs we utilize to create and understand organizational culture.

Sackmann (1992) conducted a study in which she tested the use of an open-ended, in-depth interview technique designed to reveal the assumptions of organizational members. The interview was unstructured, allowing the information to flow, where the issue "serves as a channel leading to cultural knowledge" (p. 306). This cultural knowledge provided a glimpse into the way people made sense of their environment and how they interacted with others.

Subculture

While it may be supposed the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police displays a common front to the public, the subculture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement will undoubtedly tell quite a different story. The subculture of an organization is very important in the context that the subcultures in smaller units of an organization grow in response to the shared experiences or the tacit culture, which occurs in these settings. According to Metz (1986), people who share these experiences develop a way of making sense of them as well as a way of relating to one another and the larger organization, which provides them some satisfaction. This behavior presents itself in many ways, however, a common scenario is when the subculture possess values opposing those of management, or even adopts as a

highly valued activity the frustration of managerial directives, thereby creating a subversive subculture.

A 1991 study by Jermier, Slocum, Fry and Gains examined the subcultures of a police organization and found that the subculture of such an organization plays an important role in the crime fighting aspects of law enforcement. This research indicated there have been few studies on subcultures stimulated by the current interest in organizational culture. However, there is a tradition of organizational research extending back to the Institutional School with Perrow (1986).

Trice and Beyer (1993) have written that “organizational subcultures consist of distinctive clusters of ideologies, cultural forms and other practices that identifiable groups of people in an organization exhibit” (p. 174.) This observation provides a glimpse into the subculture of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement, where an employees’ positional characteristics, such as occupational specialty, departmental assignment or even time of day worked can play a major role in the formation of a subculture and ultimately create the “second class” nature of the BLCE.

Identifying Subcultures

Anthony Down’s (1967) proposes that five behavior patterns exist within organizations. These behaviors could also be classified as behaviors that exist within organizational subsystems. In his book, *Inside Bureaucracy* (1967), Downs details the behavior patterns of "climbers," "conservers," "zealots," "advocates" and "statesmen," which are the five major ideal types of bureaucrats. Their behavior is created from a mixture of purely selfish and altruistic motives attributed to all people who work for a

living. These behaviors can be detailed as the “climbers,” or those who tend to be ambitious. The idealist, who tends to be a “statesman” or an “advocate.” A timorous or indifferent person tends to be classified as a “conserver;” and a fanatic tends to be a “zealot. “ Understanding that the identification of subculture classifications makes it possible to identify and navigate an organization’s specific subculture when investigating culture organizations such as the BLCE.

Subcultures in a Police Organization

The official culture of a police organization is designed to be militaristic, which manifests itself through official rank hierarchy, uniform dress and an authoritarian command system. The public perception of police organizational culture is to gain and maintain control over communities through a symbolic form of solidarity (Manning, 1977, Fry & Berks, 1983). According to Manning, issues within police organizations are often under reported or even not reported at all and replaced with outward displays of solidarity and uniformity.

According to Rubenstein (1979), police work is more varied than is popularly recognized. Based on his study, a uniform police culture does not exist. Several subcultures have been identified including ‘keeping the peace’ (Bittner, 1967), ‘maintaining order’ (Wilson, 1968), ‘providing social work and service’ (Manning 1971), ‘covering your ass’ (Van Maanen, 1974), ‘playing the underworld’ (Punch, 1982), and ‘street professionalism’ (Ianni and Ianni, 1983). These varied beliefs about the role of police in society represent the ideational foundation of alternative subcultures in law enforcement. The Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement is no different and falls within several of these categories. For example, it is has been

reported by J.O Wilson in *Varieties of Police Behavior* (1968), that some police officers, in the interest of efficiency and perhaps a disdain for paperwork, avoid procedural and ceremonial arrests in favor of street justice tactics when dealing with typical misdemeanor cases such as verbally warning violators instead of writing citations.

According to Vecchio (1997), the explanation for subcultures is not primarily in the formal structure of the organization, the announcement of goals and purposes or the output of goods and services. It lies largely in the myriad of subterranean processes of informal groups, conflicts between groups, dependencies on outside groups and constituencies and the striving for prestige.

In the process of uncovering the realities of subcultures, an institutional analysis exposes to scrutiny several deviations from the obvious. For example, organizations are often tangled in webs of relationships that prevent it from fulfilling its real goals. By examining this web, we can see how it deviates in its social systems. The Institutional School examines values and the way values are weakened and subverted through the organizational processes (Perrow, 1986). The institutional school offers several contributions to organizational theory; including the possibility that some organizations take on a life of their own, dominating other organizations in the process.

The Institutional School and General Systems Theory

According to Charles Perrow (1986), examining the culture of an organization requires the implementation of a multi-theory perspective such as those that have emerged from the Institutional School. This school of thought takes a sociological view of organizations with the major conceptual framework following a structural-

functionalism model. This framework indicates that functions determine the structure of an organization and structures can be understood by analyzing their functions. In order to perform such an analysis, an organization must be examined as a 'whole' by viewing organizations as natural and organic systems, ushering in the implementation of the Institutional School and General Systems theory approach to organizations.

Institutional School

The Institutional approach to organizational analysis looks beneath the surface and shows that "things are not as they seem" (Perrow, 1986, p.159). Working within this framework encourages researchers to look deeper, sweeping away the obvious and view organizations from a sociological perspective such as looking at the nonpolitical aspects of political behavior or even the non-economic aspect of economics. Perrow (1986) illustrated this concept when he stated, "The explanation for political behavior is not in the formalities of constitutions and elections, but in the submerged part of the iceberg – ethnic identity, social class, generational experiences and population changes" (p. 159). Organizational culture can also be examined by uncovering the realities and deviations of the internal system from the stated organizational goals and objectives.

According to Charles Perrow (1986), the Institutional School approach requires examining the organization as a whole. Analyzing specific processes is important, however, it is the nesting, or coupling of these processes into the whole of the organization that gives them meaning. For example, isolating a specific process such as communications and separating it from the organization without considering how it is

organically linked to the organization lessens its meaning to the organization when viewed separately.

Furthermore, Perrow (1986) believes a historical perspective of an organization is needed because over time the structure and culture of an organization can change. He believes we cannot understand current crises or competencies within an organization without seeing how they were created and shaped. Therefore, organizationally speaking, the present is rooted in the past. Examining the history of an organization illustrates how they grow in natural ways. This observation links the Institutional School to General Systems theory as way of analyzing and understanding organizations as organic systems.

General Systems Theory

General Systems theory was created by biologist Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1968), who diverged from the scientific method approach to systems analysis. Advocates of the scientific method believe a system could be broken down into its individual components, so that each component can be analyzed as an independent entity and the parts could be added in a linear fashion to describe the totality of the system (McNeill and Freiburger, 1993). Von Bertalanffy (1968) proposed these assumptions were wrong. Rather, he believed a system is characterized by the interactions of its components and the nonlinearity of those interactions. This observation was later applied to an organizational context. Katz and Kahn (1966) believed that General System theory is concerned with organizational problems associated with relationships, structures and interdependence. According to Rapert & Wren (1998), organizational structure provides a snapshot of organizational life; therefore, it embodies an enduring configuration of tasks and activities and provides guidance in determining who people interact with in conducting

organizational tasks. It is usually viewed as consisting of two frameworks: a framework for shaping behaviors and activities and a framework that directs the actuality of structural and communication processes in the organization (Rapert & Wren, 1998). The first framework is usually termed the formal structure that encompasses rules, prescription, division of labor, authority, and hierarchy of authority (Skivinton & Daft, 1991). The second framework is usually referred to as the informal structure that encompasses the patterns of interaction among organizational members (Skivington & Daft, 1991).

Regulation and Control

Another aspect of research for this study includes the functional perspective comparing Pennsylvania to other like jurisdictions from a liquor control perspective. To accomplish this, the control aspect of liquor was used as a static variable to compare and contrast liquor control models

The 21st amendment to the United States Constitution repealed alcohol Prohibition and gave individual states the authority to decide if they would sell alcohol and if so, how it would be regulated. According to research conducted at the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (2003), a variety of alcohol control systems have evolved, creating a patchwork of laws and regulations with wide variations across jurisdictions.

According to Shipman (1940), the fundamental premise of the state regulatory system is that alcohol is a potentially dangerous product and should be subject to special conditions not applied to other commercial products. These regulatory mechanisms are

based on the control concepts of revenue and enforcement, which were detailed by McGeary (1948) and Sites (1968), with the authority to sell or dispense alcohol being obtained through a licensing procedure granted by the respective states to persons who meet and satisfy specific statutory requirements as determined by the separate state legislatures and conciliatory boards or commissions. These requirements have been created in response to centuries of political, social and economic debate over the veracity of liquor as a social and economic hindrance to the United States to the point that all fifty states and the District of Columbia require some form of licensure to dispense alcohol.

The regulatory mechanisms and processes vary between states, however, several states, which could be categorized as ‘non-control’ states, do not restrict specific brands or types of alcohol, nor do they strictly regulate the sale or importation of alcohol to the public from an economic perspective. Instead, a citizen may secure a permit to buy and sell liquor within that state by way of a privately owned and operated liquor store or restaurant. These 32 ‘non-control’ jurisdictions (including the District of Columbia and Maryland) utilize a licensing system as a loose form of control, while the economic and social regulatory mechanisms are absent.

Conversely, several states banded together to create the ‘control states’ which regulate the sale of alcohol by selling it through state owned stores, thereby controlling the flow of alcohol (and reaping the profits). For the purpose of this study, we will focus on the practices of the control states.

Control States

According to researchers such as Rumbarger (1989) and Thornton (1991), controlling the sale of alcohol became a national concern after Prohibition. Many of the

states looked to licensing as a formal method of control but realized that simple licensing was not an adequate form of control. Post Prohibition America was searching for something with less corruption and more management. Out of this need, the control states were born.

Based on the climate and culture of violence that surrounded Prohibition and liquor as described by Timberlake (1963), it was evident that liquor control was a serious and dangerous business. So it began that after prohibition ended, the states were left to create and enforce their own liquor laws. Eighteen states and one county in Maryland understood the economic, social, and political ramifications of liquor control and liquor control enforcement enough that they decided to formally control and regulate the importation, sale, and dispensation of alcohol within their jurisdictions. These states became known as the 'control states' and in 1937 officially formed the National Alcohol Beverage Control Association (NABCA).

The eighteen states and one county (Montgomery County, MD), chose to regulate the importation and sale of alcohol for a variety of reasons; however, the major issues for control were due to social, political, and economic reasons.

It has been argued by Faust (1994), Kerr (1985), and others that regulation was necessary from a social perspective to ensure the responsible dispensation and consumption of alcohol, so that the 'saloon' concept would never take hold again. Social responsibility encapsulated the conceptualization that alcohol was an intoxicating beverage and must be regulated to ensure compliance with the laws.

From a political standpoint, regulation was a win/win situation for politicians who were caught between the 'wets' and 'drys.' For example, Prohibition was popular

enough to amend the constitution, meaning there was a strong voter base for this perspective. However, based on research by Mark Thornton (1991), Prohibition was a failure in that the crime rates skyrocketed and organized crime flourished, making heroes out of bootleggers and murderers, not to mention the large crowds of people who frequented speakeasies. This constituency wanted to drink alcohol and made their voices heard. For example, in Pennsylvania, seventy-six percent of thirsty voters pulled the lever to repeal prohibition (Kaylor, 1963); making liquor a serious platform issue. Therefore, citizens wanted to drink alcohol, but also wanted it regulated.

The third piece to regulation was profit. As reported by John Rumbarger (1989), the federal and state governments were losing millions of dollars during Prohibition, while organized crime was making millions of tax-free dollars, therefore, strict regulation would ensure a secure tax base while providing a product for the citizens.

Realizing that control meant state sponsored sales and licensing, the control states banded together and directly controlled the distribution and sale of alcoholic beverages within their borders. The control states are:

Alabama	Montana	Utah
Idaho	New Hampshire	Vermont
Iowa	North Carolina	Virginia
Maine	Ohio	Washington
Montgomery County, MD	Oregon	West Virginia
Michigan	Pennsylvania	Wyoming
Mississippi		

The control states share an understanding of the economic impact of alcohol sales management. In fact, two of the states' liquor commissions, Wyoming and Mississippi are housed within the Department of Revenue. Furthermore, all of these states educate their citizens concerning the social responsibility that must accompany alcoholic

beverages. Because of the social and economic factors, alcohol will always be a political issue.

This common sense of purpose among the control states is celebrated within their association. However, the similarities begin to break down when we examine liquor control enforcement within the control states.

Enforcement within the Control States

The nineteen control jurisdictions are often categorized together when revenue and consumption are the issues. But when enforcement becomes the topic, the group becomes divided. Liquor control enforcement among the control states can be examined from two main perspectives. The first method is examining the powers of arrest of each state and categorizing them as either Full Power of Arrest (A) or Limited Power of Arrest (B). Interestingly, a third category also exists, the No Power (C) jurisdictions. These groups have no authority to enforce the criminal laws of their states, which is left to local law enforcement, illustrating a central administrative control model; however, they do possess regulatory authority. Please note ten of the nineteen control states have full power of arrest, while six of nineteen have limited powers and three of nineteen possess no power of arrest at all.

A	B	C
<u>Full Power</u>	<u>Limited Power</u>	<u>No Power</u>
Alabama	Iowa	Montana
Idaho	Montgomery County, MD	Michigan
Maine	Pennsylvania	Wyoming
Mississippi	Oregon	
North Carolina	Washington	
Ohio	West Virginia	
Vermont		
New Hampshire		
Utah		
Virginia		

Another way to categorize liquor control enforcement in the control states is to examine their organizational structure in relation to law enforcement models. For example, in Idaho, liquor control enforcement is conducted by the Idaho State Police, which is a para-military organization. Based on information from an interview with an Idaho State Trooper, in Idaho, the liquor control enforcement position is a promotion position performed by Idaho State Troopers who have a minimum of three years experience and a proclivity for undercover work.

Conversely, the model for liquor control enforcement applied in the Commonwealth of Virginia is housed within the Department of Public Safety and performed by civilian agents. These agents possess full powers of arrest and conduct undercover operations into criminal violations of the Crimes Code as well as regulatory violations of the Liquor Code. Based on these observations, the control states can be categorized as:

Para-military

Alabama
Idaho
Pennsylvania*

Civilian

Maine
Iowa
Montgomery County, MD
Mississippi
New Hampshire
North Carolina
Ohio
Oregon
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
West Virginia
Montana
Michigan
Wyoming

The dominance of the civilian model of law enforcement is striking within the control states. Only three of the nineteen jurisdictions operate within a paramilitary model of law enforcement, with the remaining sixteen being civilian organizations. Perhaps this trend

can be traced to the storied history of liquor control enforcement by the federal government during Prohibition. Whatever the reason, civilian liquor enforcement, with full authority agents, appears to be the most popular form of liquor control among the control states with eight of the nineteen being civilian, full authority, compared to five of the nineteen being civilian limited power and sixteen of the nineteen being based on civilian models. Therefore, the civilian model is the most prevalent. One control state offers a unique model of paramilitary liquor enforcement, Pennsylvania.

The Pennsylvania Hybrid Model

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has created a system of liquor control enforcement that differs structurally from all of the others. Through legislation, Pennsylvania has placed a civilian agency within a paramilitary organization. This hybrid structure defies organizational theory in that a separate civilian agency is funded by a civilian revenue collection entity and managed by a paramilitary organization. The rules and regulations of the paramilitary organization are imposed upon the civilians, who gain none of the benefits of paramilitary membership.

This review of literature provides a sound theoretical foundation for this study by triangulating the concept of tacit culture within the boundary of organizational culture/subculture, and from a larger perspective, the research of Selznick (1965) and the Institutional school of thought as well as the implications from von Bertalanffy (1968) and General Systems theory. Additionally, the liquor control state perspective was examined as a means to further bound this study within the confines of known liquor control models.

By applying this theoretical framework to this study with the historical foundation, this researcher will have the ability examine the tacit culture and subcultures that exists within the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to understand the methods that were used to research civilian liquor law enforcement and how these methods measured the paramilitary law enforcement culture. Additionally, the subcultures that have been created within the organization will be examined. This will be viewed from the perspective of civilian liquor law enforcement employees of such an organization and the business owners who are affected by their actions. Through a mixed methods approach, utilizing a survey instrument and in depth interview process, this study will focus on the philosophies, beliefs, and assumptions of Liquor Law Enforcement Officers and liquor license holders within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This comparative process will undoubtedly illustrate the similarities and differences associated with aspects of liquor control enforcement within Pennsylvania. The data will be analyzed from an interpretive perspective using existing research as a framework to gain insight into commonalities and differences. The following research questions were investigated from the perspective of Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and Pennsylvania liquor license holders/personnel.

- How does the organizational culture of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affect the subculture of the civilian Liquor Control Enforcement Officers?
- What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and members of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police?
- What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and Pennsylvania liquor licensees?

- How does the paramilitary culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affect the business owners they regulate?
- Are there alternatives to the current method of liquor control enforcement in Pennsylvania? If so, what are they?

Rational for the Choice of Methodology

Patton (1990) compares the decision making process of research design to art, in that there is no single standard. Lee Cronbach (1982) stated, “There is no single best plan for an evaluation, not even for an inquiry into a particular program, at a particular time, with a particular budget” (p. 231). Keeping this in mind, Creswell (2003) writes that, “A mixed methods design is useful to capture the best of both quantitative and qualitative approaches” (p. 22). This approach may be used when a researcher wants to generalize findings to a population and develop a detailed view of the meaning of a phenomena or concept as it relates to specific individuals. For example, a researcher may choose to first survey a group; then follow up with a few individuals to understand their specific language and hear representative voices about the topic. In these situations, the benefit to collecting both closed end quantitative data and open ended qualitative data proves advantageous to understanding the research problem. (Creswell, 2003)

The mixed methods approach utilized in this study is a sequential exploratory implementation strategy with an emphasis placed on the qualitative inquiry. This strategy began with the implementation of a survey instrument, followed by an in depth open ended interview process. The decision to employ a survey tool was that the numeric analysis would provide a base line of for data from several members of the same group, creating data triangulation and providing for a standard to compare and contrast these groups as well as serve as points of discussion during the in depth interviews. Patton

stated that “Triangulation strengthens a study by combining methods” (p. 247).

Furthermore, according to Creswell (2003) a survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes and opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population. From the sample results, the researcher can then make generalizations about the population as a prelude to deeper discussion and understanding through qualitative inquiry.

The process for obtaining and understanding the assumptions and beliefs of the participants was emergent and discovery in nature. The vehicle for delivering this understanding took a phenomenological approach, where the core understanding of all phenomena came from the participants’ own perspectives.

Quantitative Research

A quantitative instrument will be implemented in this study. It is designed to create a base line of responses to bridge the inherent gap between quantitative and qualitative inquiry. The survey consists of 25 questions formatted to a six item Likert Scale (appendix 1). The survey questions were created by this researcher in an effort to gauge specific items including measures of organizational culture. The responses from the surveys will be tabulated using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program with an emphasis placed on the statistical technique used to test the null hypothesis

Hypotheses are statements of relationship among variables that a researcher intends to investigate (Wallen & Fraenkel, 1991). Hypothesis testing involves drawing conclusions about the general population based on observations of a sample group within

that population. This empirical evidence is used to determine if there is a significant difference between what is observed and the theoretically expected findings.

Hypothesis Testing: ANOVA

In hypothesis testing, the null hypothesis is the core idea of the study (Wallen & Fraenkel, 1991). The null hypothesis, or H_0 is written to say there is no difference between two groups of subjects or that variables are not related. This is illustrated as $X_1 - X_2 = 0$, or $r = .00$, meaning there is no relationship between the variables being studied. In contrast, the research hypothesis or alternative hypothesis, H_a , is generally the opposite of the null hypothesis.

There are several methods for testing the null hypothesis, including the analysis of variance ANOVA. The ANOVA yields a statistic called F, as well as degrees of freedom (df), sum of squares, mean square, and a p value, which indicates the probability that the null hypothesis is correct. By convention, when p equals .05 or less (such as .01 or .001), we reject the null hypothesis and declare the result to be statistically significant.

Researchers then test the null hypothesis against the alternative hypothesis, which is usually the opposite of the null hypothesis. Although the null hypothesis states there is no difference or no relationship, the intent of the researcher is to try to establish that a relationship does exist between variables or that a difference is evident between groups.

Null Hypotheses

1. The organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement does not affect the supervision and behavior of Liquor Control Enforcement Officers.
2. The supervision and behavior of the Pennsylvania State Police Liquor Enforcement Officers does not affect Pennsylvania liquor license holders by treating them in an adversarial manner for violations of the Pennsylvania Liquor Code.

Alternative Hypothesis

1. The organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement does affect the supervision and behavior of Liquor Control Enforcement Officers.
2. The supervision and behavior of the Pennsylvania State Police Liquor Enforcement Officers does affect Pennsylvania liquor license holders by treating them in an adversarial for violations of the Pennsylvania Liquor Code.

If no significant difference is observed, the null hypothesis is maintained.

However, if a significant difference does exist, the null hypothesis is rejected for the alternative hypothesis. Rejecting the null hypothesis increases the probability that the alternative hypothesis may be true.

Statistical Significance Limitations

Although significance helps researchers to rule in or to rule out chance as an explanation for an observed finding, several researchers indicate that statistical significance testing has several serious limitations. In particular, statistical significance testing is often subjected to misunderstanding, abuse, and misuse; stemming from the fact that many researchers do not understand the logic of what statistical significance tests accomplish (Cohen, 1995), therefore, significance values are sometimes presented incorrectly (Thompson, 2002). For example, some researchers believe that statistical significance indicates whether a result is true for a population and indicates the strength or size of an effect. An additional limitation of statistical significance testing is that all significance values represent a function of the underlying sample size. Therefore, if everything else is constant, the smaller the sample, the smaller the probability of obtaining a statistically significant result (Fan, 2001). However, according to Leech and Onwuegbuzie, the most serious limitation of statistical significance testing is that “not

only do most researchers not understand what information can be found through statistical significance testing, but policy makers and change agents are usually unable to glean helpful information from a reported p value of .05” (p. 8).

It is this researcher’s aspiration to ensure that the quantitative analysis in this study is accurate and illustrates its results in the best possible manner.

Qualitative Research

The qualitative aspect of this study took a phenomenological approach to study the topic of organization culture within the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. By examining the topic from an ontological perspective, we are able to create the framework for the research.

According to Connolly (1998), the goal of qualitative research is to obtain insights into social and organizational processes and practices that exist within a specific issue. Bogdan and Biklen (2003) state one feature of qualitative research is to define “how people negotiate meaning” (p. 6). To gain insights into a study, qualitative researchers extract meaning from their data through the assumptions and beliefs of respondents. That is, qualitative researchers study phenomena in their natural settings and strive to make sense of and interpret them with respect to the meanings people bring to them (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Enforcement Officers possess a wealth of knowledge about the organizational culture of the PSP, BLCE. Therefore, this research could make significant contributions towards addressing the organizational issues within the PSP, BLCE and would be helpful to lawmakers when creating and amending laws that pertain to civilian law enforcement within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Furthermore,

according to Patton (2002), a qualitative approach is exploratory and allows for the extraction of rich descriptions and in-depth information that may be difficult to obtain through quantitative methods.

Specific to this study, Schein contends that tacit culture can only be understood through an inquiry interview method. This method involves asking organizational members open-ended questions that elicit natural stories about the organization. According to Schein, these stories assess each person's thoughts and interpretations and reveal patterns of assumptions and beliefs about the organization.

Significance of Qualitative Data

From a qualitative perspective, the purpose of this study is the same as the quantitative perspective; however, the methodology is different. Through an in depth interview process, this aspect of the study focused on the philosophies, beliefs and experience of six people who have been associated with Pennsylvania Liquor Control Enforcement.

The interview data will be analyzed from an interpretive perspective using existing research as a framework which to shed light on commonalities and differences. The following research questions will be investigated from the perspective of the interview participants.

- How does the organizational culture of the PSP affect you?
- Is there a positive or negative relationship between the enforcement officers and the licensees?
- Is there a better way to perform Liquor Control Enforcement?

The totality of the interview data will be analyzed from an interpretive perspective using existing research as a framework through which to identify commonalities and differences.

The question of methodological appropriateness was derived from the purpose of the study. My focus of gaining a detailed understanding led me to use a mixed methods approach. In determining a research methodology, the question should define the methodology, not the methodology defining the question. Additionally, Michael Patton (1990) believes that methodological orthodoxy should be rejected in favor of methodological appropriateness.

The specific method of procedure utilized was phenomenological inquiry, where human experiences were examined through detailed depictions of the people being studied (Creswell, 1994).

Open Ended Interview

Qualitative inquiry is a process beginning with the assumption that the perspective and knowledge of the person being interviewed is meaningful for the purpose of the study. This process is essentially an inductive strategy for generating a theory, theme or story that emerges from close involvement and direct contact with the empirical world (Patton, 1990).

For this research I interviewed six people who have extensive knowledge of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and/or the Pennsylvania Liquor Industry. These individuals agreed to participate in this study under strict confidentiality. Retaliation from either an employment or business perspective necessitated this level of confidentiality. While it may sound like extreme paranoia, the

threat of retaliation from the Pennsylvania State Police is a very real concern for this researcher and the participants of this study. It must be noted that several Liquor Control Enforcement Officers I approached refused to take part in the interview portion of this study. I asked one of the Fraternal Order of Police representatives to identify several Liquor Enforcement Officers from different areas of the state that would be interested in speaking with me. I was then supplied with a list of names of Liquor Control Enforcement Officers from Pittsburgh, Harrisburg and Philadelphia. Therefore, a method of convenience sampling was implemented when this group was identified and approached. While the concern associated with convenience sampling is that it is unlikely to be representative of the target population, in this instance all of the prospective participants are part of the same subgroup and have the same training and similar experiences in law enforcement. This mitigates the concerns associated with this type of sampling bias and error.

Siedman (1991) emphasizes that when in depth phenomenological interviewing is utilized with a group of participants who have experienced similar structural and social conditions, their stories take on powerful meaning.

The subjects for this research have the following characteristics in common:

1. They have knowledge of the Pennsylvania Liquor Code and its enforcement practices.
2. They possess knowledge of the policing techniques of the Pennsylvania State Police.
3. They have an understanding of the law enforcement culture associated with bars and taverns.

4. They have knowledge of the business culture associated with bars and taverns.

Contacting Participants

The participants were selected from a purposeful perspective, in that each person has an in depth knowledge of liquor control enforcement within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The participants were contacted approximately one week prior to the interviews where they were provided with a brief verbal introduction and overview of the study and asked for their interest in participating in the study. Each participant was contacted in September 2007 and asked to participate in the quantitative portion of the study. Additionally, it was stated that follow up would occur with selected individuals.

Patton (1990) suggests that the open ended interview is the process of drawing out the inner perspectives of the subjects. The primary purpose of the open ended interview process was to explore what was in and on someone else's mind. I used the open ended interview process as a vehicle to obtain participants views. Stake (1995) suggests two principle uses of this type of research technique: to obtain the descriptions and interpretations of others.

This study used an inductive model of reasoning. Cresswell (1994) suggests this type of process may lead to the emergence of a theory during the data collection and analysis phase of the research. Therefore, the search for meaning and understanding of the responses to the research questions will emerge as the study unfolds.

Borg and Gall (1983) discuss response effects that need to be present in the interview situation in order for the researcher to remain unbiased. Specifically, they refer

to C.H. Weiss' three sources of error, which are: predispositions of the interviewer; (2) predispositions of the respondent; and procedures used in conducting the study.

The first two issues were addressed through selection of the participants. The third was addressed in the construction of the interview questions and how the questions were posed. It is important to note participants were selected from a purposeful standpoint, not because of any preconceived notion of how they would respond to the interview questions. I had never met three of the six participants prior to the interview. I did not set out to prove or disprove a particular hypothesis, but explore an organizational issue. Therefore, it was possible to maintain evaluator objectivity throughout the interview process beginning with the construction of the interview questions and ending with the final interview.

Participant Interviews

The purpose of interviewing selected individuals is to gain an understanding of their beliefs, philosophies and assumptions. Since it was not my intent to prove or disprove a hypothesis, there was an opportunity to gather data from broad discussions focusing on the participants' real life experiences. These experiences will offer an insight into the tacit culture of their organizations.

As strange and even amazing as it may sound, all of the participants in this study requested anonymity due to the belief they could possibly be victims of retaliation from the Pennsylvania State Police. In fact, several people I approached to participate in the study refused because they did not want to be associated with any study examining the Pennsylvania State Police. Even a professor refused to be on my committee because of

the nature of this topic. The majority of participants would not participate if their names or identifiable characteristics were used at any point in the study. Some did not want to be seen speaking with me.

For the purpose of framing this study, the concept of organizational culture is the pattern of shared basic assumptions that a group has learned as method of dealing with organizational issues. The following interviews address the perceived organizational issues from interacting with the Pennsylvania State Police.

The Population

As indicated by Mertens (1998), the population for this study is referred to as “the experimentally accessible population, defined as the list of people who fit the conceptual definition for the study” (p. 255). For example, the experimentally accessible population for this study is individuals who are/were liquor law enforcement officers within Pennsylvania and individuals who are/were liquor license holders within Pennsylvania. Lists of people who belong to this population in Pennsylvania are available through the Pennsylvania Fraternal Order of Police and Pennsylvania Tavern Association. The Fraternal Order of Police, Pennsylvania Liquor Enforcement Association has agreed to provide full access to this researcher for the purpose of this study. While the Pennsylvania Tavern Association would provide a list of their members, the organization would not advocate this study nor provide unfettered access to their members.

Integration of Methods

A mixed methods research design uses an iterative strategy to integrate quantitative and qualitative methods, establishing an ongoing dialogue between the two approaches. By examining the subject matter from multiple perspectives, this researcher was able to use triangulation to verify that the research findings reflected the true relationship between organizational structure and organizational culture (Patton, 1990). Proponents of mixed methods studies indicate that this approach provides a much more comprehensive research design than do quantitative or qualitative research alone (Newman, Ridenour, Newman, & DeMarco, 2003). Because mixed methods research involves utilizing quantitative and qualitative approaches within the same inquiry, investigators using this paradigm are able to probe further into a dataset to understand its meaning and to use one method to verify findings stemming from the other method (Onwuegbuzie & Teddlie, 2003).

As a part of the integration process, preliminary research in relation to the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement was gathered before the survey tool was created and implemented. This initial work began the process of mapping differences between the civilian aspects of the organization and the paramilitary aspects of the organization. Other types of data collection included the development of the research hypotheses, data collection instruments, and secondary research including statistics, academic writings, newspaper articles, and Pennsylvania Legislative Reviews.

The survey tool and in depth interviews examine the same aspects for a deliberate purpose. This was designed to examine an issue from more than one methodological perspective, and thereby provide increased confidence that what we are finding is true

and that the inevitable bias built into the research method is not distorting the findings. Therefore, if we get the same answers to the same questions twice, using different methods and taking a different approach, we can be reasonably confident that the answers are as true and objective as possible.

Finally, the integration of methods addresses the breadth versus depth question that exists as a tradeoff between using a strictly quantitative or strictly qualitative approach. For example, qualitative inquiry allows us to examine an issue in great depth with careful attention to detail, context and nuance, where data collection is not constrained by predetermined analytical categories while quantitative inquiry asks standardized questions that limit responses to predetermined categories (Patton).

Data Collection Procedures

Bounding this study entails the inclusion of the historical background of Pennsylvania Liquor Control Enforcement, including a brief Pennsylvania Legislative review and media coverage concerning the transfer of liquor control enforcement authority during 1986-1987 time periods. Additional data to be considered includes responses to a survey tool addressing the tacit culture of specific populations and subcultures associated with liquor control enforcement and a review of in depth interviews from Liquor Enforcement Officers and Pennsylvania liquor licensees. For this study, those groups include liquor law enforcement personnel and liquor license holders from Pennsylvania. In addition to the survey, follow-up interviews will be conducted with individuals from both groups in order to gain a more concise understanding of the assumptions and beliefs associated with the tacit culture of each group.

Piloting the Interview Questions

In order to elicit meaningful and accurate responses, a small scale piloting exercise was conducted with two Pennsylvania liquor licensees and two Liquor Control Enforcement Officers who were Fraternal Order of Police Representatives. These interviews were conducted face to face and included a review of the survey tool that was to be used.

Seidman (1991) emphasizes that all researchers utilizing interviews should conduct pilot interviews prior to conducting research. Piloting helps to promote a strong research design as well as develop comprehensive interview techniques that ensure that the data collected will answer the research questions.

At the conclusion of each pilot interview, concerns were addressed and appropriate changes were made to the questions in scope and sequence based on recommendations from my committee chairperson.

Validating the Accuracy of the Findings

Validity, which is viewed as the strength of qualitative data will be addressed here. Validity validates the accuracy of the findings through several different strategies including triangulation; clarifying any bias the researcher brings to the study and the use of an external auditor to review the project. Other strategies include prolonged time in the field; thick, rich description, and peer debriefing.

This study was actively engaged in the process of triangulation by using a mixed methodology, where the same questions were asked in different ways and using multiple methodologies with the same population.

History/Legislative Review

It is sometimes difficult to move forward while looking back; however, in order to develop a full picture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement, a brief history of Pennsylvania liquor control was conducted along with a brief Pennsylvania Legislative Review, which was presented in the Review of Literature. The history and document analysis framed the historical and political aspects of Liquor Control Enforcement in Pennsylvania; and to a degree, illustrates why the current model of liquor control exists. This is important from a methodological standpoint because it provides a foundation for the study and directs the methodology.

Data Trustworthiness

The purpose of the qualitative interview was to examine the meaning behind the words; to understand the meanings that participants ascribed to their experiences (Warren, 1988). The epistemology of the qualitative interview is constructivist in nature, not positivist. Thus, the traditional measures of internal and external validity were not relevant. Instead, measures of data trustworthiness were used to gauge the information. Kincheloe and McLaren (1998, p. 288) identified two criteria of data trustworthiness: (a) credibility, and (b) anticipatory accommodation. Credibility refers to the portrayal of the constructed reality. The data constructions must be plausible for the data to be considered credible. Leininger (1985) described credibility another way, as the truth, value, or believability of the research findings. The researcher, through observations or participation, established with participants that the data were true, valuable, believable,

and thus credible. Any comment that did not seem credible was carefully explored with the participant and notations made for the record.

The second criterion, anticipatory accommodation, was more complex—the researcher gained knowledge from a number of comparable contexts and began to learn from the comparisons of the different contexts. For example, comparing the structure and function of the Pennsylvania State Police to other Liquor Control Enforcement models illustrated differences and commonalities in the data. What was known was reshaped to accommodate the unique aspects of what was perceived in the new context (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1998). Consequently, each interview was seen as a unique social encounter between the researcher and participant, therefore each interview was as distinctive as the individual and their social situation (Warren, 1988). The data were ultimately woven together in such a way that meaningful comparisons were made between the similarities and differences in the experiences so that a plausible and understandable view of the experience was derived.

The criteria of credibility and anticipatory accommodation identified by Kincheloe and McLaren (2000) were determined to be sufficient to establish data trustworthiness for this study. The researcher had an adequate opportunity to talk with and clarify any questions or concerns about the interview responses. Furthermore, the researcher was able to triangulate data findings in order to clarify areas that were unclear or inconsistent. There was also the opportunity to revise interview questions if there was a problem with participant interpretation of a question.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to understand the concept of organizational culture as it applies to the civilian Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement through an examination of the following core research questions:

- How does the organizational culture of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affect the subculture of the civilian Liquor Control Enforcement Officers?
- What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and members of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police?
- What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and Pennsylvania liquor licensees?
- How does the paramilitary culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affect the business owners they regulate?
- Are there alternatives to the current method of liquor control enforcement in Pennsylvania? If so, what are they?

This study employed a mixed methods approach that combined semi structured qualitative interviews with a quantitative questionnaire that investigated aspects of the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. In Addition to the interview data, historical research was used to frame questions and elicit responses based on historical fact as it relates to aspects of Pennsylvania Liquor Control Enforcement. Specifically, the design of the study enabled this investigator to describe 3 specific aims:

- (1) Identify the subcultures associated with the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and how these subcultures affect enforcement.
- (2) Examine the impact of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police management of the civilian BLCE; and

(3) Describe the liquor licensees' perceptions of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement.

The first phase of the study, which was quantitative in nature, involved the implementation of a survey tool given to Pennsylvania Liquor Law Enforcement personnel by representatives of the Fraternal Order of Police. Even though the survey instrument was implemented first, its overall importance to the study is secondary. These responses were used as a method to create discussion points and gauge how participants responded to a base line of facts and figures.

The survey data from the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement was collected by Pennsylvania District Fraternal Order of Police representatives and sent to the Sociology department at the Indiana University of Pennsylvania, where they were tabulated, and analyzed. The second phase included in depth interviews with individual Pennsylvania Liquor Law Enforcement Personnel. This same procedure was conducted with individuals who hold a Pennsylvania liquor license or manage licensed establishments. The methodological difference being that the survey was implemented by this researcher through a random procedure of contacting Pennsylvania Liquor License holders and personnel.

After all of the data was collected and analyzed, a final comparison and analysis was conducted in an attempt to identify similarities and differences in the tacit culture of liquor control between the Enforcement Officers and the Liquor Licensees/personnel. This data illustrates the median responses for each group to each question, providing a glimpse into the thought process for this survey.

Quantitative Data

The quantitative piece of this study culminated in a Likert style survey instrument that was implemented by officers of the Fraternal Order of Police to one hundred Pennsylvania Liquor Enforcement Officers. The survey was also sent via US Postal Service to one hundred Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees. The surveys returned were fifty-six from the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers (n=56) and thirty from the Liquor Licensees (n=30). These responses are detailed below in relation to how they were grouped with the core research questions. Each core research question has a subset of survey items associated with it. These survey items were used as a quantitative tool in this study and the findings have been presented in a review of each core research question. Each survey question has two components: responses from the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and responses from the Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees, which were used a tool to compare and contrast aspects of the core research questions. This study was guided by the following core research questions:

- How does the organizational culture of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affect the subculture of the civilian Liquor Control Enforcement Officers?
 - What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and members of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police?
 - What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and Pennsylvania liquor licensees?
 - How does the paramilitary culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affect the business owners they regulate?
 - Are there alternatives to the current method of liquor control enforcement in Pennsylvania? If so, what are they?
- In order to succinctly illustrate the findings for this study, the core research

questions were purposely grouped with several of the survey items in an effort to ask the

same questions in several different ways. The five core research question findings have been detailed below. These findings will articulate the responses which agree or disagree with a statement. The no opinion and neutral responses will not be commented upon as an indicator of organizational culture. While those responses are important, they will not add to the conversation associated with the interview process.

Core Research Question One

- How does the organizational culture of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affect the subculture of the civilian Liquor Control Enforcement Officers?

The first core research question was reflected in survey items numbers seven, ten, fourteen, fifteen, twenty and twenty-five. These questions investigated how the organizational culture of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affected the subculture of the civilian Liquor Control Enforcement Officers.

Survey item number seven presented the statement “Liquor Control Enforcement is a serious criminal endeavor, which must be conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police.” The responses to this statement, found in Table 1 illustrate that forty-three percent of the LCE respondents either agree or strongly agree with this statement and forty-one percent either disagree or strongly disagree with the same statement while seventy percent of the Liquor Licensees disagree or strongly disagree with the statement and none of the Liquor Licensees agree with the statement at all.

Table 1 *Liquor Control Enforcement is a Serious Criminal Endeavor, which must be Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police.*

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Neutral 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	No Opinion 6
LCE						
N = 56	7	17	8	18	5	1
	13%	30%	14%	32%	9%	2%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	9	8	13	0
	0%	0%	30%	27%	43%	0%

The findings for Table 1 indicate that almost half of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents believe Liquor Control is a serious area of law enforcement, while a vast majority of the Liquor Licensees do not believe Liquor Control is a serious criminal endeavor.

Survey item ten, (Table 2), made the statement “Because Liquor Control Enforcement is Managed by the Pennsylvania State Police, Liquor Control Enforcement Officers are Treated with the Same Respect as Pennsylvania State Troopers.” Eighty percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with this statement while eighteen percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree with the statement. Eighty-six percent of the Liquor Licensees either agree or strongly agree with this statement and none of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagree with the statement at all.

Table 2 *Because Liquor Control Enforcement is Managed by the Pennsylvania State Police, Liquor Control Enforcement Officers are Treated with the Same Respect as Pennsylvania State Troopers.*

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Neutral 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	No Opinion 6
LCE						
N = 56	0	10	1	28	17	0
	0%	18%	2%	50%	30%	
Licensee						
N = 30	13	13	4	0	0	0
	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%	0%

The findings associated with table 2 indicate that a majority of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents feel they are not treated with the same respect as Pennsylvania State Troopers. Conversely, a majority of the Liquor Licensees responded that the Liquor Enforcement Officers are treated the same as Pennsylvania State Troopers.

Survey item fourteen (Table 3) addressed the concept of quotas in law enforcement by stating, “The “unwritten rules” guiding the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement encourages Liquor Enforcement Officers to find Liquor Code violations whenever possible.” Not surprisingly, one hundred percent of the Liquor Licensees either agreed or strongly agreed. Surprisingly, eighty percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement with only four percent disagreeing.

Table 3 The “Unwritten Rules” Guiding the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement Encourages Liquor Enforcement Officers to Find Liquor Code Violations Whenever Possible.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	14	31	1	2	0	8
	25%	55%	2%	4%	0%	14%
Licensee						
N = 30	22	8	0	0	0	0
	73%	27%	0%	0%	0%	0%

The findings associated with Table 3 illustrate that only four percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers responded that there is not a quota system in place while a majority of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents and one hundred percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents think the Pennsylvania State Police encourage Liquor Control Enforcement Officers to find Liquor Code Violations whenever possible. These responses indicate that a subculture exists within the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement that does not agree with the policies of the organization.

Survey item number twenty spoke to the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police by looking at promotions within the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. Table 4 illustrates that ninety-three percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement “Experienced Liquor Control Enforcement Officers should be eligible to hold management positions within the Pennsylvania State Police.” Fifty-seven percent of the Liquor Licensees respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement as well.

Table 4 *Experienced Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Should be Eligible to Hold Management Positions within the Pennsylvania State Police*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N= 56	28	24	2	1	1	0
	50%	43%	3%	2%	2%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	6	11	6	2	1	4
	20%	37%	20%	7%	3%	13%

The findings from Table 4 also indicate that both groups disagree with the policies of the Pennsylvania State Police in relation to promotions within the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. A vast majority of the Liquor Enforcement respondents and majority of the Liquor Licensees agree that Liquor Control Enforcement Officers should hold management positions within the Pennsylvania State Police. Again, these groups share fundamental policy ideals associated with liquor control.

Survey item number twenty-five examined the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police by inquiring into the cliques associated with the organization (Table 5). Ten percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with this statement concerning cliques while seventy-two percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement.

Sixty percent of the Liquor Licensees agree or strongly agree and twenty percent disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 5 *My Workplace is “Cliquish*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	15	25	4	3	3	6
	27%	45%	7%	5%	5%	11%
Licensee						
N = 30	5	13	3	2	4	3
	17%	43%	10%	7%	13%	10%

The findings from Table 5 indicated that both groups believed cliques, or subcultures existed within the organization.

Reviewing the responses for the survey items associated with core research question one, the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents and Liquor License respondents disagreed more than they agreed on matters of culture within the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. This cultural divide could be expected when exploring people who regulate and control the behavior of others. What is more interesting are the survey items where the two groups agree. For example, the Liquor Licensee respondents agreed the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement is cliquish group as well as agreed that Liquor Control Enforcement Officers should be eligible for promotion positions in the Pennsylvania State Police. The most striking group of responses came from the survey item exploring the idea of quotas in liquor control enforcement. Both groups overwhelming believed quotas exist with the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement.

Core Research Question Two

- What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and members of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police? The second core research question asks for an understanding of the relationships between the officers of the LCE and the Pennsylvania State Police. These were explored in questions number six, sixteen, twenty-two, twenty-three and twenty-four.

Statement number six reads “Liquor Control Enforcement Officers should have the same powers of arrest and authority as Pennsylvania State Troopers.” The Liquor Control responses to the statement found in Table 6 were one-hundred percent for those who agree or strongly agree. The liquor Licensees had seven percent of the respondents strongly agree with the statement while fifty-seven percent disagree or strongly disagree with the Liquor Control Enforcement officers having expanded powers.

Table 6 *Liquor Control Enforcement Officers should have the Same Powers of Arrest and Authority as Pennsylvania State Troopers.*

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Neutral 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	No Opinion 6
LCE						
N = 56	35	21	0	0	0	0
	63%	37%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	2	0	1	3	14	10
	7%	0%	3%	10%	47%	33%

The findings associated with Table 6 address the powers of arrest that have been granted to the liquor Control Enforcement Officers. One-hundred percent of the Liquor Control respondents believe they should have full powers of arrest. Interestingly, a majority of the Liquor Licensees respondents believe the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers should not have full powers of arrest. The responses to this statement indicate that the Liquor Licensee respondents to not want the organization that regulates them to have even more authority over them.

Survey item number sixteen made the statement “Liquor Control Enforcement Officers are a respected part of the Pennsylvania State Police.” The responses in Table 7 indicate that eighty-nine percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while nine percent agree or strongly agree with the statement. Sixty percent of the Liquor Licensees also disagree or strongly disagree with the statement and forty percent agree or strongly agree with the statement.

Table 7 *Liquor Control Enforcement Officers are a Respected Part of the Pennsylvania State Police.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	1	4	1	28	22	0
	2%	7%	2%	50%	39%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	1	11	0	14	4	0
	3%	37%	0%	47%	13%	0%

The findings associated with Table 7 indicate that both groups believe the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers are not a respected part of the Pennsylvania State Police. The responses to this survey item indicate a dichotomy in the Pennsylvania State Police as an organization. It also indicates the Liquor Licensees perception of the Liquor Enforcement Officers is diminished in relation to that of the Pennsylvania State Police.

Statement number twenty-two, “The Pennsylvania State Police view liquor control enforcement as a form of revenue to help fund other areas of the Pennsylvania State Police” found in Table 8 found that forty-one percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement and thirty-four percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement. Eighty-four percent of the Liquor Licensees agree or strongly agree with the statement none of the respondents disagree with the statement at all.

Table 8 *The Pennsylvania State Police View Liquor Control Enforcement as a Form of Revenue to Help Fund Other Areas of the Pennsylvania State Police.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	5	18	3	10	9	11
	9%	32%	5%	18%	16%	20%
Licensee						
N = 30	2	23	4	0	0	1
	7%	77%	13%	0	0	3%

The findings for this survey item indicate that the Liquor Licensee respondents believe the fines and penalties levied against them are used to fund other areas of the

Pennsylvania State Police. The interesting aspect was the forty-one percent of Liquor Control Enforcement respondents who agreed with the Liquor Licensee respondents, indicating a mistrust of Pennsylvania State Police management.

Survey item number twenty-three, which is detailed in Table 9 asks “Do you think your organization cares about your position?” Six percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the question while fifty-three percent disagree or strongly disagree with the question. Ninety-four percent of the Liquor Licensees agree or strongly agree with the survey item.

Table 9 Do You Think Your Organization Cares About Your Position?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	1	2	23	26	4	0
	2%	4%	41%	46%	7%	0
Licensee						
N = 30	11	17	0	0	0	2
	37%	57%	0	0	0	6%

The findings for this survey item clearly indicate the Liquor Control respondents do not feel the Pennsylvania State Police cares about their position. This sentiment helps to create aspects of subcultures associated with the Pennsylvania State Police.

Survey item twenty-four, illustrated in Table 10 asks, “Do feel like a part of your organization?” Fourteen percent of the LCE respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement and sixty-six percent disagree or strongly disagree with the survey item. Eighty-seven percent of the Liquor licensee respondents agree or disagree with this question while none disagreed at all with the survey item.

Table 10 *Do feel Like a Part of Your Organization?*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	1	7	6	21	16	5
	2%	12%	11%	38%	28%	9%
Licensee						
N = 30	15	11	4			
	50%	37%	13%			

The findings for this survey item overwhelmingly indicate the Liquor Control respondents do not feel like a part of the Pennsylvania State Police. This is another aspect of the dichotomous culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, where one group is considered members, while the others are employees.

This core research question asked the respondents to explore the relationship between members of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and the Pennsylvania State Police through five survey items. The core research question maintained the pattern where the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents and Liquor Licensee respondents disagreed on their responses to all but one survey item. Both groups agreed that the members of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement are not a respected part of the Pennsylvania State Police.

Core Research Question Three

- What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and Pennsylvania liquor licensees?

Core Research question three examines the relationship between the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and the licensees they regulate. Survey items one, two, five and twenty-one examine this aspect of organizational culture.

Survey item number one stated “Liquor Control Enforcement Officers treat liquor license holders and their employees with respect.” Sixty-six percent of the Liquor

Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement while twenty-seven percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents strongly disagree. None (zero%) of the Liquor Licensees agreed in any way with the statement while ninety-four percent either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 11 *Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Treat Liquor License Holders and their Employees with Respect.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	11	26	4	15	0	0
	20%	46%	7%	27%	0%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	2	20	8	0
	0%	0%	6%	67%	27%	0%

The findings for Table 11 indicate the overwhelming majority of Liquor Licensee respondents do not feel they are treated respectfully by the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers while a majority of the Liquor Control respondents believe they treat Liquor License holders with respect. It is interesting how the groups' responses oppose one another. However, the twenty-seven percent of the Liquor Control respondents who felt the Liquor Licensees are not treated fairly raise an interesting contradiction to this survey item.

Survey item number two stated "Liquor Control Enforcement, as conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police is fair to Pennsylvania liquor license holders." Fifty-four percent of the LCE respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement and forty-one percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree while eighty-eight percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement; with just ten percent agreeing with the survey item.

Table 12 *Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	9	22	1	20	3	1
	16%	39%	2%	36%	5%	2%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	3	2	10	15	0
	0%	10%	7%	33%	50%	0%

The findings for Table 12 mirror the sentiment for the previous statement on respect. The Liquor Licensee respondents overwhelmingly believe they are not treated fairly by the Pennsylvania State Police. And again, a majority of the Liquor Control Respondents believed they are fair to the licensees. However, this time, forty-one percent of the Liquor Control respondents believe they treat the Liquor Licensees unfairly, which begins to shed light on the dichotomous culture of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement.

Survey item number five states (Table 13), “Pennsylvania liquor license holders violate the law more than other Pennsylvania small business owners.” Nine percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agreed with the statement sixty-eight percent disagree or strongly disagree with the statement. Seventy-seven percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 13 *Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders Violate the Law More than Other Pennsylvania Small Business Owners.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	0	5	3	28	10	10
		9%	5%	50%	18%	18%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	2	10	12	6
	0%	0%	7%	33%	40%	20%

The findings for this survey item produced similar responses from both groups, who overwhelmingly disagreed with survey item, indicating that neither groups believe bar owners violate the law more than other small business owners.

Survey item number twenty-one reads “Pennsylvania liquor license holders view Liquor Control Enforcement Officers as Liquor Control Board Agents.” Ninety-two percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement while four percent disagree with the statement. Forty-three percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents agree or strongly with the statement. Fifty-seven percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents responded with neutral responses, which were found in Table 14.

Table 14 *Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders View Liquor Control Enforcement Officers as Liquor Control Board Agents.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE					
N = 56	15	37	2	2	0
26%	66%	4%	4%	0%	0%
Licensee					
N = 30	7	6	17	0	0
23%	20%	57%	0%	0%	0%

The findings from this survey item have many layers. An overwhelming majority of the Liquor Control respondents agree that Liquor Licensees view them as Liquor Control Board Agents. None of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagreed with the statement at all. The Liquor Control respondents appear to have some issues with their own self perception. Additionally, the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police offers a confusing identity for the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers.

Core research question three focused on the relationship between the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and Liquor Licensees. One of the interesting set of responses included the acknowledgement that Liquor Control Enforcement Officers, who

are sworn police officers for the Pennsylvania State Police are viewed as employees of the Liquor Control Board.

Core Research Question Four

- How does the paramilitary culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affect the business owners they regulate?

Core research question four was reflected in the responses to survey items number three, fifteen and eighteen, where it examined how the paramilitary culture of the bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affects the business owners that are regulated.

Survey item number three states, “The PA State police behave in an adversarial manner when conducting investigations.” Forty-nine percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement while Forty-two of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement. Eighty-three percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement and seventeen percent either disagree or strongly disagree.

Table 15 *The PA State Police Behave in an Adversarial Manner when Conducting Investigations.*

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Neutral 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	No Opinion 6
LCE						
N = 56	6	21	4	19	5	1
	11%	38%	7%	33%	9%	2%
Licensee						
N = 30	13	12	0	3	2	0
	43%	40%	0%	10%	7%	0%

The findings from this survey item indicate that the Liquor Licensee respondents believe the Pennsylvania State Police are adversarial when conducting an investigation. The Liquor Control respondents again showed a dichotomy in responses that could be a symptom a cultural problem.

Survey item number fifteen directly addressed tacit culture of the Pennsylvania State Police by stating “The informal culture of the Pennsylvania State Police encourages Liquor Enforcement Officers to have an adversarial attitude toward Pennsylvania liquor license holders.” Eighty-two percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement while forty-three percent of the Liquor Licensees agreed (Table 16).

Table 16 *The Informal Culture of the Pennsylvania State Police Encourages Liquor Enforcement Officers to have an Adversarial Attitude Toward Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	17	29	8	2	0	0
	30%	52%	14%	4%	0%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	13	14	3	0	0
	0%	43%	47%	10%	0%	0%

The findings for this survey item support the idea that an informal culture exists within the Pennsylvania State Police that encourages Liquor Control Enforcement Officers to treat Liquor Licensees in an adversarial manner. A majority of the Liquor Control respondents believed this to be true while forty-three percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents agreed with the statement.

Survey item number eighteen, Table 17, states, “Liquor control enforcement is more politically motivated than based on neutral principles of law enforcement.” Eight percent of the LCE respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement while Eighty percent of the Liquor Licensees agree or strongly agree with the statement. Seventy-four percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while none of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagreed with the statement at all.

Table 17 *Liquor Control Enforcement is More Politically Motivated than Based on Neutral Principles of Law Enforcement.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	2	2	5	23	19	5
	4%	4%	9%	41%	33%	9%
Licensee						
N = 30	15	9	2	0	0	4
	50%	30%	7%	0%	0%	13%

The findings from Table 17 indicate an overwhelming majority of the Liquor Control respondents disagree that Liquor Control Enforcement is politically motivated. On the other hand, a majority of the Liquor Licensee respondents agreed that Liquor Control Enforcement is based more on politics than principles of law enforcement.

This core research question explored the responses of Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees as they relate to the likelihood there is an adversarial relationship between members of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees. The responses indicate that both groups believe there is an adversarial element to the culture associated with both organizations.

Core Research Question Five

- Are there alternatives to the current method of liquor control enforcement in Pennsylvania? If so, what are they?

Core Research question five explored the respondents belief that an alternative organizational structure or method could exist to conduct Liquor Control Enforcement in Pennsylvania. This was illustrated through survey items four, eight, nine, eleven, twelve, thirteen, seventeen and nineteen.

Survey item number four (Table 18) made the statement “Liquor Control Enforcement could be conducted better by a different agency.” Eighty-three percent of

the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement while sixty percent of the Liquor Licensees agree or strongly agree with the statement. Conversely, ten percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement and thirty percent of the Liquor Licensees disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 18 *Liquor Control Enforcement Could be Conducted Better by a Different Agency.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	21	25	4	4	2	0
	38%	45%	7%	7%	3%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	9	9	3	7	2	0
	30%	30%	10%	23%	7%	0%

The findings from Table 18 indicate that both groups overwhelmingly agree that Liquor Control Enforcement could be conducted better by a different agency. The responses to this survey item indicate the organizational culture of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement is not the same as the culture of the Pennsylvania State Police.

Survey item number eight (4.19) stated “The current method of liquor control enforcement is the best way to regulate the liquor industry in Pennsylvania.” Twenty-four percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement while twenty percent of the Liquor Licensees agree or strongly agree with the statement. Sixty-four percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while seventy percent of the Liquor Licensees disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 19 *The Current Method of Liquor Control Enforcement is the Best Way to Regulate the Liquor Industry in Pennsylvania.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N= 56	2	11	3	19	16	5
	4%	20%	5%	34%	28%	9%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	6	0	7	14	3
	0%	20%	0%	23%	47%	10%

The findings from Table 19 indicate that both groups overwhelmingly agree that the current method of Liquor Control Enforcement in Pennsylvania is not the best way to regulate the liquor industry. The fact that Pennsylvania Liquor Licensee respondents and Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree on this type of organizational questions validates the dichotomous relationship in the Pennsylvania State Police.

Survey item number nine (Table 20) stated, “Liquor Control Enforcement should be conducted by local law enforcement personnel.” Thirteen percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement while one hundred percent of the Liquor Licensees agree or strongly agree with the statement. Eighty percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement with none of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagreeing at all with the statement.

Table 20 *Liquor Control Enforcement Should be Conducted by Local Law Enforcement Personnel.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	0	7	3	17	28	1
	0%	13%	5%	30%	50%	2%
Licensee						
N = 30	19	11	0	0	0	0
	63%	37%	0%	0%	0%	0%

The findings from Table 20 indicate that Liquor Licensee respondents overwhelmingly prefer the idea of local law enforcement conducted liquor control. This is likely because

they have existing relationships with local law enforcement and certain violations would be overlooked. The Liquor Control respondents overwhelmingly disagreed with the statement, most likely because they are thinking of job preservation.

Survey item eleven stated (Table 21), “Liquor Control Enforcement should be conducted by the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board.” Seventy-seven percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement and five percent either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement. Fifty-seven percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement while none of the respondents disagreed with the statement at all.

Table 21 *Liquor Control Enforcement Should be Conducted by the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE					
N = 56	11	32	8	1	2
	20%	57%	14%	1%	4%
Licensee					
N = 30	2	15	10	0	3
	7%	50%	33%	0%	10%

The findings for Table 21 indicate more than half of the Liquor Licensee respondents and more than three quarters of the Liquor Control respondents believe Liquor Control Enforcement should be conducted by the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board..

Survey item twelve (Table 22) made the statement, “Liquor Law Enforcement is more regulatory than criminal in nature.” Eighty-one percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement and eighty-seven percent of the Liquor Licensees agree with the statement. Six percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while

thirteen percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 22 *Liquor Law Enforcement is More Regulatory than Criminal in Nature.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
LCE						
N = 56	10	35	7	1	3	0
	18%	63%	13%	1%	5%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	3	23	0	4	0	0
	10%	77%	0%	13%	0%	0%

The findings for Table 22 overwhelmingly support the belief that Pennsylvania Liquor Control is more of a regulatory function than a criminal investigation. More than eighty percent of the respondents from both groups agreed with this sentiment.

Survey item thirteen (Table 23) made the statement, “The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania holds Liquor Control Enforcement as an important law enforcement responsibility.” Sixty percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement and none of the Liquor Licensee respondents agree with the statement at all. Seventeen percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while sixty percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 23 *The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Holds Liquor Control Enforcement as an Important Law Enforcement Responsibility.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
LCE						
N = 56	12	22	13	6	3	0
	21%	39%	23%	11%	6%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	7	7	11	5
	0%	0%	23%	23%	37%	17%

The findings for Table 23 present an opposing, but balanced set of responses. With sixty percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents believing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania does not view Liquor Control Enforcement as an important law

enforcement responsibility while sixty percent of the Liquor Control respondents believe Liquor Control Enforcement is an important aspect of Pennsylvania law enforcement.

Survey item seventeen (Table 24) states, “Violations of Pennsylvania liquor laws are serious infractions of the law.” Thirty-three percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement while none of the Liquor Licensee respondents agreed with the statement at all. Fifty-three percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement disagree or strongly disagree with the statement and sixty-seven percent of the Liquor Licensee disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 24 *Violations of Pennsylvania Liquor Laws are Serious Infractions of the Law.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
LCE						
N = 56	6	11	2	18	12	7
	11%	20%	4%	32%	21%	12%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	4	16	10	
			14%	53%	33%	

The findings from Table 24 indicate that more than fifty percent of both groups do not see violations of the Pennsylvania Liquor Code as serious infractions of the law.

Survey item nineteen (Table 25) stated, “From an organizational perspective, enforcement is a good fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.” Nine percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement while none of the Liquor Licensee respondents agreed with this statement at all. Ninety-one percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree with this statement while one hundred percent of the Liquor Licensees disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 25 *From an Organizational Perspective, Enforcement is a Good Fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
LCE						
N = 56	1	4	0	19	32	0
2%	7%	0%	34%	57%	0%	
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	24	6	0	
0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	0%	

The findings from Table 25 overwhelmingly indicate the Liquor Licensee respondents and Liquor Control respondents agree that Liquor Control Enforcement is not a good fit with the Pennsylvania State Police. In fact, one hundred percent of the Liquor Licensees responded this way and more ninety-one percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers agreed with them.

Eight survey items were used to explore core research question five, which explored the concept of alternative methods of liquor control enforcement in Pennsylvania. The clear indication in from this core research question is that while both disagree on a variety of survey items, they agree that the current method of liquor control enforcement is not the best method for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Core Research Question Summary

The grouping of survey items around the core research questions provided a method to ask several themed questions in different ways, providing multiple glimpses into the responses. These core research questions explored the tacit culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement by investigating relationships between groups and examining how these relationships impact the Liquor Control Enforcement Officer, Liquor Licensees and in some ways, the Pennsylvania State Police.

The responses to the core research questions represent a methodological approach to present the responses to the survey questions in a clear and concise manner. The findings, or results from this study indicate that the subculture associated with the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement does not support the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police as a whole.

The data was computed and analyzed using ANOVA to analyze the responses from both groups. This test provided differences between groups as well as the median responses for each group to each question. For example, question number twenty-four, “Do you feel like part of your organization” addresses the concept of organizational cohesion. The respondents from the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement had a median response of four, or Disagree with the statement while the Liquor Licensees had a median response of two, or Agreeing with the statement. The responses to this survey item revealed a disparate response with an organizational undertone. The median response from the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement participants indicated they did not feel like part of their organization, while the liquor licensees felt like a part of their organization. The importance of this underlying sentiment provides a tone for the study, where one group feels disconnected and dissatisfied while another group, even though competing with one another from a business perspective, is more united. Beyond the obvious items where the two groups would disagree lie the issues that define the culture of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. These survey items hold a deeper meaning, where two opposing groups with different agendas and ideologies agree on a premise. These items have been explored and noted below.

The survey responses to specific questions for each group were analyzed, producing a comparison and percentage for each response on the Likert scale. The calculated percentages for each question provided valuable insight into the responses and permitted deeper analysis. Several of the responses will be examined in detail. For example, sixty-two percent of the LCE respondents either Disagree or Strongly Disagree with the statement that “The Current Method of Liquor Control Enforcement is the Best Way to Regulate the Liquor Industry in Pennsylvania.” Interestingly seventy percent of the licensees either Disagree or Strongly Disagree with the same statement (Table 26).

Table 26 *The Current Method of Liquor Control Enforcement is the Best Way to Regulate the Liquor Industry in Pennsylvania.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N= 56	2	11	3	19	16	5
	4%	20%	5%	34%	28%	9%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	6	0	7	14	3
	0%	20%	0%	23%	47%	10%

The analysis of this statement indicates that the majority of both groups believe that the current method of Liquor Control Enforcement is not the best way to regulate the liquor industry in Pennsylvania. Therefore, for this item, we can say the two groups agree that a different method of liquor control enforcement should be implemented in Pennsylvania.

This technique was used to identify survey items the respondents agreed on as well as those survey items where they did not agree. Additionally, these responses were further analyzed by breaking them down by frequency of Likert responses. For example, statement number nineteen read “From an Organizational Perspective, Liquor Control Enforcement is a Good Fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.” This item produced a median response of five, Strongly Disagree, from the LCE and a median response of four,

Disagree, from the Liquor Licensees, thereby indicating both groups of respondents believe that Liquor Control Enforcement is not a good fit with the Pennsylvania State Police. This can also be viewed by examining the response percentages in the table illustrated below (Table 27). The Licensees responded with one hundred percent of the responses either Disagree or Strongly Disagree that From an Organizational Perspective, Liquor Control Enforcement is a Good Fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.

Interestingly, the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement response was ninety-one percent of the respondents either Disagree or Strongly Disagree with the same question.

Therefore, based on these responses, we can say that the majority of Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees who participated in this study do not believe Liquor Control Enforcement is a good fit with the Pennsylvania State Police. Please note, the nine percent, or five outliers who agreed with the statement represent the existing subculture within the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. This will be addressed at another point in the study.

Table 27 *Liquor Control Enforcement is a Good Fit with the Pennsylvania State Police*

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Neutral 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	No Opinion 6
LCE						
N = 56	1	4	0	19	32	0
	2%	7%	0%	34%	57%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	0	24	6	0
	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	0%

Furthermore, the statement that read “Liquor Control Enforcement could be conducted better by a different agency” produced similar responses (Table 28). For example, eighty-three percent of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement respondents either Strongly Agree or Agree with this statement with just ten percent either checking the Disagree or Strongly Disagree categories. The Liquor Licensees had sixty percent of

their respondents Strongly Agree or Agree with the statement. Again, the majority of both groups believe Liquor Control Enforcement could be conducted better by a different agency.

Table 28 *Liquor Control Enforcement Could be Conducted Better by a Different Agency.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
LCE						
N = 56	21	25	4	4	2	0
	38%	45%	7%	7%	3%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	9	9	3	7	2	0
	30%	30%	10%	23%	7%	0%

Reviewing the previous three survey items, it becomes clear both groups believe Liquor Control Enforcement in Pennsylvania is not being operated/managed in the best possible manner. This conclusion was reached by examining the responses to the survey items that examined beliefs associated with the organizational aspects such as the job function of the Liquor Control Enforcement being conducted by a different agency and the structural appropriateness of the Liquor Control Enforcement and Pennsylvania State Police.

Examining another core question, “What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and Pennsylvania liquor licensees?” We rely on survey items number one and number two with the statements “Liquor Control Enforcement Officers treat Liquor License holders and their employees with respect” and “Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders” These questions produced some surprising results in that while the Liquor Enforcement Officers overwhelmingly believed they treated the licensees with respect; a majority of the licensees thought they were treated in a disrespectful manner. For example, in statement one, “Liquor Control Enforcement Officers treat Liquor

License holders and their employees with respect,” the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement respondents had sixty-six percent of their respondents either Strongly Agree or Agree with the statement while the Licensees had ninety-four percent of their respondents either Disagree or Strongly Disagree with the statement. The surprising aspect was that thirty-four percent of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement respondents, or outliers creating the dissenting subculture did not agree with statement one.

Statement two, “Liquor Control Enforcement, as conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police is fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License holders,” had a more subtle response with eighty-three percent of the Liquor License respondents marking Disagree or Strongly Disagree and fifty-five percent of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement respondents with an Agree or Strongly Agree response. While the responses maintained the balanced trend, it is interesting that forty-one percent of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement respondents either marked Disagree or Strongly Disagreed concerning the idea of treating the licensees fairly, which clearly illustrated the existence of outliers, thereby adding to the dissenting subculture atmosphere.

There could be several reasons for this type response pattern. For example, it could be from the power dynamic created when one group holds regulatory power over another. The interesting aspect to this survey item was the twenty-seven percent of the respondents from the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement that disagreed with statement one (Table 29) and forty-one percent dissented with statement two (Table 30) concerning fair treatment of licensees. These outliers indicate organizational cohesion issues within the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement.

Table 29 *Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Treat Liquor License Holders and Their Employees with Respect*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	11	26	4	15	0	0
	20%	46%	7%	27%	0%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	2	20	8	0
	0%	0%	6%	67%	27%	0%

Table 30 *Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	9	22	1	20	3	1
	16%	39%	2%	36%	5%	2%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	3	2	10	15	0
	0%	10%	7%	33%	50%	0%

The responses to these survey items illustrate the existence of outliers, which appear as a stratification of personnel within each group. These groups represent subcultures that exist within the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. This prompted the categorization of respondents from the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement as one of three distinct subcultures which were labeled: COMPANY MAN (pro), ANTI (against) and GRAYS (undecided). Based on existing research in law enforcement found in the Review of Literature, Manning, Fry, Rubenstein et al, stated the creation of subgroups in law enforcement is common. With the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement the subgroups appear to take on a simple “pro” and “against” flavor with a few sitting on the fence.

The quantitative data in this study provided an excellent jumping point for the qualitative portion of the research. The quantitative markers created a conversational flow for the interview

Interview Data

It was my intent to have the participants share their insights. By telling their stories, they provided awareness and insight into the areas of organizational culture and the subcultures created in response. As the answers to the questions were examined, certain patterns emerged. Therefore, the data was organized to illustrate the meaning making process of organizational culture as it was described by members of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees.

Qualitative Data

Understanding the numbers sometimes requires listening to the words. In this case the words came from Pennsylvania Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and Pennsylvania Liquor License holders. Open ended interviews were conducted with three Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and three Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees/Managers. The open ended interviews were prompted by five sets of cards containing survey statements and the corresponding data; however, the questions and answers were exploratory in nature. Please note, all of those interviewed expressed some level of discomfort with the Pennsylvania State Police. When this discomfort was explored, retaliation from the State Police for participation was mentioned in every instance. Therefore, no names of Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement Officers or distinguishing characteristics will be used in this study. The Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees/Managers also requested anonymity, so, as they say...the names have been changed to protect the innocent.

Participant One

Participant One began the interview by talking about the changes that have occurred since signing on with the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. The most striking change in Participant One's opinion is the slow erosion of the Liquor Enforcement Officer position. When talking about "the old days," Participant One had a sparkle in the eye and enthusiasm in the voice. Then as Participant One described assimilation into the State Police, the excitement seem to vanish. The changes in the Liquor Enforcement Officer position varied from a decline in respect for the officers to being forced to work more closely with the Troopers in a subordinate role. This occurred by removing positions from Liquor Enforcement Officers and creating new criminal positions in the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement for Troopers. Participant One went on to say the problem could be addressed by simply removing the Troopers from the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and replacing them with Liquor Enforcement Officers or even removing the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement from the Pennsylvania State Police and creating a stand alone organization. Another idea was to give enforcement back to the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board. Participant One laughingly stated, "Everyone calls us the LCB anyway, it would probably be a surprise to most people we were part of the State Police."

We then began to discuss the organizational culture of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement by comparing Pennsylvania Liquor Enforcement to some of the other control states. Specifically, we discussed the civilian model in Ohio and the paramilitary model in Virginia and contrasted the Pennsylvania model where a paramilitary group manages a civilian group. Participant One used the phrases "red

headed step child” and “second class citizen” several times when referencing how the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement fit in with the Pennsylvania State Police.

Participant One then said “we are a square peg in a round hole. We just don’t fit in with these guys.” We then moved the conversation to the civilian vs. paramilitary aspect of the Pennsylvania State Police. This aspect of the conversation was very insightful because as a condition of employment, most people do not go through academy training. When this does occur, the militaristic overtones of the training are functional in the actual management and performance of the job. Participant One was quick to point out that Liquor Control Enforcement Officers are trained in a paramilitary environment and managed in a paramilitary manner, however, they are themselves deemed civilians by the Pennsylvania State Police and do not enjoy any of the benefits of being considered a member of the Pennsylvania State Police. At this time, Participant One was given five sets of index cards that had a survey item typed on it with a second card in the set that had the corresponding data. To initiate the discussion, Participant One received two 3 x 5 cards with a statement on one card and the tabulated responses on the other. The first statement we examined was “The Current Method of Liquor Control Enforcement is the Best Way to Regulate the Liquor Industry in Pennsylvania” The responses on the card (Table 31) detailed the responses to the statement.

Table 31 *The Current Method of Liquor Control Enforcement is the Best Way to Regulate the Liquor Industry in Pennsylvania.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N= 56	2	11	3	19	16	5
	4%	20%	5%	34%	28%	9%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	6	0	7	14	3
	0%	20%	0%	23%	47%	10%

As Participant One reviewed the data, The Likert style responses were explained, specifically what the numbers under each category represented. Participant One was given a few to moments to review the data. Participant One was somewhat surprised by the responses by saying, “See, everyone knows this system is messed up. Even the Liquor Agents know there is a better way to do this.” I pointed out a majority (sixty-two percent and seventy percent) either Disagree or Strongly Disagree with the statement. Then we looked to the figures agreeing with the statement. Participant one said, “This is good. It’s almost even on those who like the way it is now. And that is a pretty small number.” Participant One was then asked, “What are your thoughts on the twenty-four percent who agreed with the statement, Participant One responded, “They must be the new guys.” We then moved on to the next statement.

Again Participant One was given two cards. This time they contained statement two and the corresponding response data. Statement two (Table 32) was “Liquor Control Enforcement is a good fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.” When Participant One read the card, the response was, “Oh I can’t wait to see the results for this one.” Participant was then asked to speculate on the responses. Participant One replied “the Licensees would disagree and the Liquor Enforcement Officers would probably agree.” After reviewing the results, Participant One was surprised that only nine percent of the Liquor Enforcement Officers agreed with the statement and everybody else disagreed

with the statement. Participant One replied, “Wow, we get it, how come the State Legislators don’t get it?”

Table 32 *Enforcement is a Good Fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	1	4	0	19	32	0
	2%	7%	0%	34%	57%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	0	24	6	0
	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	0%

The third set of cards included the statement, “Liquor Control Enforcement could be conducted better by a different agency” and the corresponding data (Table 33).

Table 33 *Liquor Control Enforcement Could be Conducted Better by a Different Agency.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	21	25	4	4	2	0
	38%	45%	7%	7%	3%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	9	9	3	7	2	0
	30%	30%	10%	23%	7%	0%

After reviewing the cards, Participant One was very satisfied that eighty-three percent of the Liquor Enforcement Officers either agree with the statement. “This is great. I didn’t think a lot of the guys got it. But it looks like they do.” Participant One was asked to clarify. “Most of the guys won’t express their disgust with the Troopers.” When we discussed why not, the issue of retaliation came up. “These guys are so afraid to get in trouble or lose their jobs that they just take shit day after day. And the worst part about it is that if you do get sick of it and quit there are ten people waiting to get your job. This is the best job in the state.” While this response appears paradoxical, the Liquor Control Enforcement Officer position is competitive and highly regarded outside of the Pennsylvania State Police by many.

The fourth set of cards included the statement “Liquor Control Enforcement Officers treat Liquor License holders and their employees with respect” as well as the responses (Table 34).

Table 34 *Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Treat Liquor License Holders and Their Employees with Respect.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	11	26	4	15	0	0
	20%	46%	7%	27%	0%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	2	20	8	0
	0%	0%	6%	67%	27%	0%

The responses to this question were as expected except for the fifteen respondents or twenty-seven percent of Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement respondents who believed the Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees were not treated with respect. Participant One responded, “This makes sense. We have a bunch of new guys who think the bar owners are the bad guys instead of businessmen. They are taught in the police academy that they are bad guys.” Statement five took the “fairness” aspect of the study to an organizational level by stating, “Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.” Participant One chuckled while reading the statement and laughed while reading the responses. “How can we say the BLCE (Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement) mistreats the licensees in one question and say the State Police is fair in the next? I swear, these people are idiots.” Participant One was responding to the response card (Table 35) where ten percent of the licensees agreed with the statement and fifty-five percent of the BLCE respondents either agreed with the statement.

Table 35 *Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	9	22	1	20	3	1
	16%	39%	2%	36%	5%	2%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	3	2	10	15	0
	0%	10%	7%	33%	50%	0%

“This kind of stuff drives me crazy. All of us just can’t seem to get on the same page.”

Shortly after this line of discussion, the interview was concluded.

Participant Two

Participant Two was very adamant that his/her identity remain hidden to prevent any type of retaliation from the Pennsylvania State Police. The interview was conversational in nature and was intended to have an emergent quality. To follow the interview methodology, the five selected statements from the survey were presented to ensure a degree of consistency.

Participant Two began the interview by saying very plainly, “I hate the hats.” Hats is a nickname for the Pennsylvania State Police, referencing the campaign hats Pennsylvania State Troopers wear. When asked why there was a derogatory opinion of the Pennsylvania State Police, Participant Two gave several opinions ranging from their arrogance to the department’s backwards way of micromanaging. It was obvious participant Number Two did not like the Pennsylvania State Police, however, when asked why Participant Two continues to work for them, the response was, “Where else can a guy get paid \$40,000 to go to bars and drink beer?” After some probing, Participant Two told me about some of the perks of the job, specifically, the badge, gun and authority.

We then discussed the culture of the Pennsylvania State Police. I asked if there were cliques in the BLCE. Participant Two pondered the question and described a culture that consisted of a group who worked diligently for approval from management which Participant Two called “ass kissers” and a second group who worked at not working. Participant Two did not label this group. A three tier group that was identified by way of the surveys was discussed with Participant Two: grays, anti’s and company man. Participant Two laughed and stated, “Exactly! Is it that obvious?”

Participant Two was given the five sets of 3 x 5 cards with a statement on one card and the responses on the other. We then discussed the survey item and corresponding quantitative statistics, which angered Participant Two. When asked why Participant Two seemed a little agitated from the results, the response was, “These people are idiots. Anyone who works here and kisses ass just doesn’t get it. We are the red headed step children of the state police with the black eye, yet we keep going back to them and asking for another.” Participant Two was then asked why he stayed on this job? “Hey, things changed in ‘87; so why can’t it happen again? If we could get away from these guys (State Police) it would be awesome.” We then discussed the structure of the BLCE and asked for Participant Two’s thoughts on the subject. The response was insightful. “This will never work like they want. We have guys managing us who have never done this job...who by law can’t enforce Title 40 of the Liquor Code, but sign all of the violation letters. When you think about it, sometimes this job is a joke. We carry guns and have the same bargaining unit as the secretaries. But it is still the best job in the state.” At this point I asked Participant Two to review the five statements and responses and provide me with a reaction to each.

Participant Two’s response to statement one (Table 36) included “seventy percent of the Licensees know this is not the best way to control liquor. That is awesome! And sixty-two percent of our guys think the same way. Not too bad considering the spineless people in this organization.”

Table 36 *The Current Method of Liquor Control Enforcement is the Best Way to Regulate the Liquor Industry in Pennsylvania.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
LCE						
N= 56	2	11	3	19	16	5
	4%	20%	5%	34%	28%	9%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	6	0	7	14	3
	0%	20%	0%	23%	47%	10%

Statement two (Table 37) drew a similar response where the two organizations agreed that Liquor Control Enforcement is not a good fit with the Pennsylvania State Police. Participant Two began chuckling after reviewing the question and responses. “Everybody knows we should be with the Attorney General, even the bar owners. What a joke.” When asked, “Why the Attorney General?” Participant Two responded, “It is a civilian law enforcement organization. We are a natural fit with those guys.”

Table 37 *Enforcement is a Good Fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
LCE						
N = 56	1	4	0	19	32	0
	2%	7%	0%	34%	57%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	0	24	6	0
	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	0%

Statement three (Table 38) asked if “Liquor Control Enforcement Could Be Conducted Better by a Different Agency.”

Participant Two responded without reading the results, “Of course it could.” And then Participant Two looked at the responses. With a majority of the respondents

agreeing with this statement, Participant Two responded, “It looks like everybody knows what’s going on here. So why do think we are still with the State Police?”

Table 38 *Liquor Control Enforcement Could Be Conducted Better by a Different Agency.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	21	25	4	4	2	0
	38%	45%	7%	7%	3%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	9	9	3	7	2	0
	30%	30%	10%	23%	7%	0%

Participant Two’s response to statement four (Table 39) was not expected. Participant Two read the statement and read the responses...”These ungrateful idiots don’t realize we get paid to screw with them. I can find a violation in any bar I walk into and make their lives miserable and they don’t think they get treated with respect?”

Table 39 *Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Treat Liquor License Holders and Their Employees with Respect.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	11	26	4	15	0	0
	20%	46%	7%	27%	0%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	2	20	8	0
	0%	0%	6%	67%	27%	0%

If statement four upset Participant Two, statement five (Table 40) enraged him. “These people think they are treated unfairly? What a joke. We are the ones treated unfairly.” Participant Two then detailed how Liquor Control Enforcement officers are treated unfairly by bar owners and the Pennsylvania State Police.

Table 40 *Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	9	22	1	20	3	1
	16%	39%	2%	36%	5%	2%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	3	2	10	15	0

0%	10%	7%	33%	50%	0%
----	-----	----	-----	-----	----

As we discussed the new uniforms the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement had been assigned, Participant's Two received a phone call and had to leave, thereby ending the interview.

Participant Three

Interviewing Participant Three was enjoyable and challenging at the same time. The life experience and gristle of Participant Three provided a unique perspective on the State Police. Participant Three loved the job but had a real problem when the Legislators moved enforcement from the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board to the Pennsylvania State Police. Participant Three made an interesting observation by commenting that most people blame the State Police for the move. Participant Three just looked at me with an annoyed glare and said, "The State Police just took something that was offered. We are just a way to create more promotions and positions. If someone offered our union more positions and more promotions, we would take it too. It is not the State Police who fucked us, it was the State Senators." The next question asked was what were the major differences between management under the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board vs. Pennsylvania State Police? "It was just better under the Liquor Control Board. We got a little respect and there was none of this State Police military bullshit. Under the Liquor Control Board we had the opportunity for promotions, transfers to licensing and there was camaraderie on the job, we owned the night. Now, you can't even do the job like it's supposed to be done." Participant Three explained that prior to 1987 a Liquor Agent had to have a Bachelors degree and experience as an investigator. After 1987 the requirements for hiring were dumbed down to a GED. When asked why that happened, Participant Three responded, "the Troopers have a requirement of sixty college credits

and the LCE guys couldn't have higher standards than their bosses." When asked why he stuck around at a job he hated so much, his response was, "I like the job, what I don't like is what the Senators did and the State Police keep doing."

The survey responses were then presented to Participant Three, who read through the cards grunting and flipping back and forth as the format and data was explained. Participant Three replied, "This is stupid and means nothing." Participant Three was asked to explain what was meant by that response. "Everybody knows we don't fit with the State Police, but this is an entitlement to the State Police. Do you have any idea how much money the State Liquor Stores bring in? And with gambling coming, the money will be insane...all of the casinos will be licensed establishments, which means even more jobs and promotions for the State Police. So if you think your little survey is going to stop the State Police and the one billion plus dollars they make in the next ten years...then you are not very bright." At this point, Participant Three was asked to review the survey items, which he did. I asked for a response and he replied, "Weren't you listening. I already did." He did not want to discuss the topic any further and ended the interview.

Licensee/Manager Interviews

The next series of interviews are with Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees/Managers. These interviews were conducted in the same manner as with the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers. The survey responses were introduced at the beginning of the interview process. This would ensure the intent of the interview was able to be presented and responded to instead of answered with a non answer.

Participant Four

Interview four was with the manager of social club in the Eastern Pennsylvania. This manager was approached for the interview because it was known this establishment had been raided before and cited for several violations of the PA Crimes Code and PA Liquor Code.

Participant Four was asked to review specific survey data that was from a study being conducted on the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. Participant Four took the cards from my hand and responded “the LCB is a joke and the State Police are a bunch of thugs.” Participant Four was asked to expound on that statement. “Those assholes come in here and flash their badges and harass me and my customers. I don’t do anything that anybody else doesn’t do.” Participant Four realized the bar industry is regulated, however, Participant Four articulated that the State Police look for violations of the Liquor Code and PA Crimes Code in a very proactive manner when it comes to bars. “If they looked for drug dealers this way, (this town) would be a safe place. Instead they pick on bar owners who pay taxes and provide jobs.” It was then asked if Participant Four knew the difference between a Liquor Enforcement Officer and a Pennsylvania State Trooper. Participant Four answered, “Not really.” In fact, Participant Four referred to the Liquor Enforcement Officers as “LCB.” I explained that the Pennsylvania State Police enforced the PA Liquor Code and LCB did the licensing of bars and restaurants. Participant Four responded, “They are all the same; a bunch of assholes giving bars a hard time.” Participant Four responded several times that the LCB handled bars and the establishment received citations from the State Police, adding they were treated like criminals when the

state came in the club. Realizing we were going off course, Participant Four was asked about the survey responses, starting with the question and response cards. Participant Four received one set of cards at a time. The data was arranged where one card contained the survey statement and the second card contained the response data from each group.

Participant Four’s response to the first statement (Table 41) and data was as expected. “I could have told you people would disagree with this. Even the goddamn LCB agrees there is a better way to run this ship.” This statement was in response to the fact that an overwhelming majority of participants believe the current method of liquor control enforcement is not the best way to regulate the liquor industry in Pennsylvania.

Table 41 *The Current Method of Liquor Control Enforcement is the Best Way to Regulate the Liquor Industry in Pennsylvania.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	2	11	3	19	16	5
	4%	20%	5%	34%	28%	9%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	6	0	7	14	3
	0%	20%	0%	23%	47%	10%

The second statement and data set (Table 42) produced a similar response. “You’re telling me only nine percent of the LCB think they fit with the State Police? Amazing? I agree with them, but amazing.” Again, an overwhelming majority of respondents from both groups agreed that liquor control enforcement is not a good fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.

Table 42 *Enforcement is a Good Fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	1	4	0	19	32	0
	2%	7%	0%	34%	57%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	0	24	6	0
	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	0%

Statement three (Table 43) asked if Liquor Control Enforcement could be done better by a different agency. Participant Four agreed and found it comforting that a majority of the BLCE respondents and Liquor Licensee respondents agreed. He replied, “This is pretty cool. I can’t believe that even the LCB thinks someone could do a better job.”

Table 43 *Liquor Control Enforcement Could be Conducted Better by a Different Agency.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	21	25	4	4	2	0
	38%	45%	7%	7%	3%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	9	9	3	7	2	0
	30%	30%	10%	23%	7%	0%

Statement four (Table 44) produced an aggravated response from Participant Four.

“These guys have no respect for bars at all! They think they treat us fairly? I would love to be able to go to their place of work and take money from their pockets and criticize them.” This response was made due to the overwhelming majority of LCE respondents that believe they treat liquor licensees and their employees with respect.

Table 44 *Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Treat Liquor License Holders and Their Employees With Respect.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	11	26	4	15	0	0
	20%	46%	7%	27%	0%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	2	20	8	0
	0%	0%	6%	67%	27%	0%

The final survey item addressed fairness to the licensee (Table 45). “I think that I am more upset that ten percent of our people agreed with question than the fifty-five percent of the liquor people who answered the questions.” This was in response to the ten percent of the Licensees who agreed that they are treated fairly by Liquor Control Enforcement Officers.

Table 45 *Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.*

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
LCE						
N = 56	9	22	1	20	3	1
	16%	39%	2%	36%	5%	2%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	3	2	10	15	0
	0%	10%	7%	33%	50%	0%

After the survey items were addressed, this interview was concluded.

Participant Five

Interview five asked if he was in trouble with the “State.” I assured him I was not an agent of the state nor did I care if he broke any liquor laws. Participant Five stated that he stayed away from the big stuff like drugs, minors and after hours. Participant Five relied on the neighborhood crowd that drinks beer, eats wings and gambles. When asked about the poker machines Participant Five’s response was very insightful. “How can the state tell me I am breaking the law, when they are doing the same thing in their casinos? Uncle Ed (Governor Rendell) can have his poker machines, but I can’t have mine?” I then asked for an honest opinion of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. “The LCB comes in here looking for minors every once in a while, but they leave me alone for the most part. “ I then explained the difference between the LCE and the LCB. Participant Five’s response was, “Yeah, I know the LCE or something like that works with the cops, but they will always be the LCB to me.”

Participant Five was handed the survey statements and data to review for the interview. An explanation of how the data was tabulated and what the responses meant from a statistical perspective was provided. Participant Five’s response to statement one

(Table 46) was similar to the other licensee. It was really no surprise to this respondent that most people agreed that this is not the best way to regulate the liquor industry in Pennsylvania. “You see, as soon as the state gets involved, it stops working. If the Tavern Association regulated us, there would be no problem. In fact, if any private business regulated our activity, everybody would be better off.”

Table 46 *The Current Method Of Liquor Control Enforcement Is The Best Way To Regulate The Liquor Industry In Pennsylvania.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	2	11	3	19	16	5
	4%	20%	5%	34%	28%	9%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	6	0	7	14	3
	0%	20%	0%	23%	47%	10%

The second statement and data set (Table 47) produced a similar response. “Yeah, none of this surprises me. Cops and business don’t mix. People don’t like cops.” This response was based on the overwhelming majority of respondents that believe liquor enforcement is not a good fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.

Table 47 *Enforcement Is A Good Fit With the Pennsylvania State Police.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	1	4	0	19	32	0
	2%	7%	0%	34%	57%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	0	24	6	0
	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	0%

Statement three (Table 48) asked if Liquor Control Enforcement could be done better by a different agency. Participant Five agreed and again stated, “This is not ground breaking news, at least not to me. I remember when the LCB was in charge and I thought they sucked. Boy do I miss them.”

Table 48 *Liquor Control Enforcement Could Be Conducted Better By a Different Agency.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	21	25	4	4	2	0
	38%	45%	7%	7%	3%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	9	9	3	7	2	0
	30%	30%	10%	23%	7%	0%

Statement four asked if Liquor Licensees are treated fairly by the BLCE. Participant five reviewed the responses and said, “Of course these guys are going to answer this way. If they said they did not treat us fairly, then they would be admitting they were dicks. This is kind of a dumb question.”

Table 49 *Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Treat Liquor License Holders and Their Employees With Respect.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	11	26	4	15	0	0
	20%	46%	7%	27%	0%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	2	20	8	0
	0%	0%	6%	67%	27%	0%

The final survey item (Table 50) addressed the concept of fairness to the licensee. “I don’t think fairness matters. I run a business and want to make money. If I break the rules, fine. But the problem is these guys change the rules...like with gambling.”

Table 50 *Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	9	22	1	20	3	1
	16%	39%	2%	36%	5%	2%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	3	2	10	15	0
	0%	10%	7%	33%	50%	0%

I concluded this interview by asking if he had any questions or comments. Participant Five was angered by some of the questions and expressed a sincere dislike for the State Police and PLCB. I pointed out that the majority of BLCE Officers believe the current method of Liquor Control is not the best way to regulate the liquor industry in Pennsylvania. He responded, “Sure, but who’s to say whatever it changes to won’t be worse?”

Participant Six

Interview six occurred at a bar that hosts exotic dancers. It was a very interesting interview to say the least. I had asked Participant Six if the establishment had ever been cited by the Pennsylvania State Police for any Liquor Code violations. Participant Six told me they had been cited for a few things with the most serious being permitting prostitution in the bar. He light heartedly laughed say, “what I am supposed to do...baby sit these girls? If they want to do that kind of stuff, all of a sudden that’s my problem just because I serve alcohol?” Our discussion revealed that the licensee knew a great deal about the Liquor Code and even more about the BLCE. Participant Six was asked if this establishment was picked on by the Pennsylvania State Police because of the nature of the business. Participant Six stated that the deck was stacked against bar owners. “Between DUI’s, drunks and bartenders stealing from you...I have enough to worry about...the LCB is just an added headache. Their laws are stupid and really don’t mean that much. I mean who enforces a stupid law like you can only buy two six packs at a time?” Participant Six was referring to the law that states no more than 196 ounces can be sold in one sale, however, you can buy four (or as many as you want) at a time, as long as the sales receipt only shows two six packs in a single transaction.

At this point, Participant Six was asked to review five specific items and data from the survey. As Participant Six reviewed the data, the arrangement of the data on the cards was explained.

Statement one addressed the current method of Liquor Control Enforcement. “Of course these guys don’t think this is the best way to run liquor. They hate the State Police too. The best way is for us to govern ourselves and if somebody gets out of line, we would handle it ourselves, just like the cops do.” This was a reference to the internal affairs division associated with law enforcement that polices the police.

Table 51 *The Current Method of Liquor Control Enforcement is the Best Way to Regulate the Liquor Industry in Pennsylvania.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N= 56	2	11	3	19	16	5
	4%	20%	5%	34%	28%	9%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	6	0	7	14	3
	0%	20%	0%	23%	47%	10%

The second statement and data set resulted in a similar response. “I never really understood why the cops got involved with the business side of bars? Do they randomly go to pharmacies and try to buy drugs? No. What’s good for us, is the cops even know this is not a good fit” This was made clear by the responses, where ninety-one percent of BLCE dissented from the statement.

Table 52 *Enforcement is a Good Fit with the Pennsylvania State Police.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	1	4	0	19	32	0
	2%	7%	0%	34%	57%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	0	24	6	0
	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	0%

Statement three asked if Liquor Control Enforcement could be done better by a different agency. Participant Six thought about this and said, “Yes it could be done better, but involving any state agency is going to produce more of the same. This needs to be run like a privatized prison. Do you know how companies operate private prisons... we should do that. Hire someone to watch us.”

Table 53 *Liquor Control Enforcement Could be Conducted Better by a Different Agency.*

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Neutral 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	No Opinion 6
LCE						
N = 56	21	25	4	4	2	0
	38%	45%	7%	7%	3%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	9	9	3	7	2	0
	30%	30%	10%	23%	7%	0%

Statement four asked if Liquor Licensees are treated fairly by the BLCE. Participant Six reviewed the responses and laughed, “We are treated like criminals not businessmen. We get no respect from anybody, until it comes time to pay our taxes then everybody loves us.”

Table 54 *Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Treat Liquor License Holders and Their Employees With Respect.*

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Neutral 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	No Opinion 6
LCE						
N = 56	11	26	4	15	0	0
	20%	46%	7%	27%	0%	0%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	0	2	20	8	0
	0%	0%	6%	67%	27%	0%

The final survey item again addressed the concern of fairness to the licensee. “I will never be treated fairly until one of my own regulates me. Look at cops, they have internal affairs that keeps them in line and out of real trouble. We need a bar internal affairs office to keep us in line. That way, we would be treated fair.”

Table 55 *Liquor Control Enforcement, as Conducted by the Pennsylvania State Police is Fair to Pennsylvania Liquor License Holders.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LCE						
N = 56	9	22	1	20	3	1
	16%	39%	2%	36%	5%	2%
Licensee						
N = 30	0	3	2	10	15	0
	0%	10%	7%	33%	50%	0%

After we addressed the five survey items, I asked if there was anything he wanted to discuss specifically. Participant Six mentioned how surprised he was with the responses from the “LCB.” “It looks like the State needs to find a better way to do this” was one of Participant Six’s comments.

Analysis

A review of the interview data reveals there is some displeasure with the regulatory activity provided by the Pennsylvania State Police, however, most people/organizations in an authoritative role are going to have complaints lobbied against them. These interviewees were chosen because of their knowledge of the BLCE and interaction with the Pennsylvania State Police. The interview data was compared to the null hypothesis. By way of quantitative and qualitative analysis, it was determined that the null hypothesis was rejected for the alternative hypothesis in both instances:

Alternative Hypothesis

1. The organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement does affect the supervision and behavior of Liquor Control Enforcement Officers.
2. The supervision and behavior of the Pennsylvania State Police Liquor Enforcement Officers does affect Pennsylvania liquor license holders by treating them in an adversarial for violations of the Pennsylvania Liquor Code.

The first method of analysis that was used to compare the two groups was the ANOVA test. This test provided differences between groups as well as the median responses for each group to each question. For example, survey item number twenty-four (“Do you feel like part of your organization?”) addresses the concept of organizational cohesion. The respondents from the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement had a median response of 4 or Disagree with the statement while the Liquor Licensees had a median response of 1, or Strongly Agree with the statement. The responses to this survey item revealed a disparate response with an organizational undertone. The mean response from the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement participants indicated they did not feel like part of their organization, while the Liquor Licensees felt like a part of the organization. The importance of this underlying sentiment provides a framework for the study, where one group feels disconnected and dissatisfied. Using this technique, it was possible to identify questions the respondents agreed on and those that the groups did not agree on. Additionally, it was also possible to further analyze those responses by breaking down the responses by frequency of answers. For example, the question asking “Liquor Control Enforcement is a good fit with the Pennsylvania State Police” produced a median response of five (with a mean of 4.375) from the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents and a median response of four (with a mean of 4.20) from the Liquor Licensees, thereby indicating both groups of respondents believe that Liquor Control Enforcement is not a good fit with the Pennsylvania State Police. Another interesting aspect to these responses is the outliers, or those who disagreed with the response and deviated from the median. Within the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement ranks, five respondents believe the Liquor Control Enforcement is a good fit with the Pennsylvania

State Police while none of the Liquor Licenses shared that sentiment. The trending of the outliers helped to categorize the respondents.

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter will present the findings associated with this study of the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement followed by a *Summary of the Study*, which will review the core research questions and data collected through the survey items. Additionally, the Review of Literature will be detailed. The *Findings* from the statistical data will be presented followed by the *Conclusions* associated with the data. The *Implications* section will allow several practical suggestions to be offered in response to the issues that were researched. The *Future Research* portion of this chapter will make some recommendations for areas of further study followed by the *Summary*, which will review the content of the chapter.

Summary of the Study

From a micro perspective, this study examined the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. However, from a macro perspective it is about how people operate within organizations and create subcultures in response to their perceived environments.

The purpose of this study was to understand the concept of organizational culture as it applies to the civilian Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement through an examination of the following core research questions:

- How does the organizational culture of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affect the subculture of the civilian Liquor Control Enforcement Officers?
- What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and members of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police?
- What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and Pennsylvania liquor licensees?
- How does the paramilitary culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affect the business owners they regulate?
- Are there alternatives to the current method of liquor control enforcement in Pennsylvania? If so, what are they?

This study employed a mixed methods approach that combined semi structured qualitative interviews with a quantitative questionnaire that investigated aspects of the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. The survey instrument was given to 100 Pennsylvania Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and 100 Pennsylvania Liquor Licensee/Managers with a response rate of fifty-six percent and thirty percent respectively. In Addition to the interview data, historical research was used to frame questions and elicit responses based on historical fact as it relates to aspects of Pennsylvania Liquor Control Enforcement. Specifically, the design of the study enabled this investigator to describe 3 specific aims:

- (1) Identify the subcultures associated with the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and how these subcultures affect enforcement.
- (2) The impact of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police management of the civilian BLCE; and
- (3) The liquor licensees' perceptions of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement.

The Review of Literature for this study examined the theoretical research associated with organizational culture, specifically tacit culture and subculture. Research

in the field of organizational culture by Schein, Sackmann, Sapienza and others was examined to create a solid foundation for this study. A 1991 study by Jermier, Slocum, Fry and Gains that examined the subcultures of a police organization was used to bound the specific law enforcement attributes of the study, which was import in relation to the subcultures associated with law enforcement.

In addition to aspects of organizational culture, this Review of Literature examined attributes from the Institutional school of thought, specifically the writings of Perrow. Also, the theoretical concepts of Ludwig von Bertalanffy's General Systems theory were applied to the research. The reason for the inclusion of these two theoretical boundaries was that Perrow believed an analysis of an institution required viewing the organization as a whole and examining the nesting of the processes that give meaning to the organization. It is through coupling that culture is created. Additionally, Perrow believed that a historical analysis was an important part of understanding the origins of an organization.

Ludwig von Bertalanffy believed a system is characterized by the interactions of its components and the nonlinearity of those interactions, which was a break from the scientific method used to study organizations at that time. This observation was later applied to an organizational context, where it was believed that General System theory is concerned with organizational problems associated with relationships, structures and interdependence (Katz and Kahn).

Another component of the review of Literature included research focusing on the regulation and control of the Liquor Control States. Research by Shipman, Timberlake and the National Alcohol Beverage Control Association was used to detail the specific

make up of the Control States, which are a group of eighteen States and one county (Montgomery, MD) that choose to regulate the importation and sale of liquor and malt or brewed beverages. The models of enforcement were also detailed, which included civilian, paramilitary and a hybrid civilian/paramilitary model, which is exclusive to Pennsylvania.

Findings

The findings for this study provide responses to the five core research questions associated with this study, which used a mixed methods approach.

Core Research Question One

- How does the organizational culture of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affect the subculture of the civilian Liquor Control Enforcement Officers?

The first core research question was reflected in survey items numbers seven, ten, fourteen, fifteen, twenty and twenty-five. These questions investigated how the organizational culture of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affected the subculture of the civilian Liquor Control Enforcement Officers.

Survey item number seven presented the statement “*LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT IS A SERIOUS CRIMINAL ENDEAVOR, WHICH MUST BE CONDUCTED BY THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE.*” The responses to this statement, found in table 4.1 illustrate that forty-three percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents either agree or strongly agree with this statement and forty-one percent either disagree or strongly disagree with the same statement while seventy-one of the Liquor Licensees

disagree or strongly disagree with the statement and none of the Liquor Licensees agree with the statement at all.

The findings for survey item number seven indicate that almost half of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents believe Liquor Control is a serious area of law enforcement, while a vast majority of the Liquor Licensees do not believe Liquor Control is a serious criminal endeavor.

Survey item ten made the statement “*BECAUSE LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT IS MANAGED BY THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE, LIQUOR ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ARE TREATED WITH THE SAME RESPECT AS PENNSYLVANIA STATE TROOPERS.*” Eighty percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with this statement while eighteen percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree with the statement. Eighty-six percent of the Liquor Licensees either agree or strongly agree with this statement and none of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagree with the statement at all.

The findings associated with survey item ten indicate that a majority of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents feel they are not treated with the same respect as Pennsylvania State Troopers. Conversely, a majority of the Liquor Licensees responded that the Liquor Enforcement Officers are treated the same as Pennsylvania State Troopers.

Survey item fourteen addressed the concept of quotas in law enforcement by stating, *THE “UNWRITTEN RULES” GUIDING THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE, BUREAU OF LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT ENCOURAGES LIQUOR ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS TO FIND LIQUOR CODE VIOLATIONS WHENEVER*

POSSIBLE.” Not surprisingly, one-hundred percent of the Liquor Licensees either agreed or strongly agreed. Surprisingly, eighty percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement agreed or strongly agreed with the statement with only four percent disagreeing.

The findings associated with survey item fourteen illustrate that only four percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers responded that there is not a quota system in place while a majority of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents and one-hundred percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents think the Pennsylvania State Police encourage Liquor Control Enforcement Officers to find Liquor Code Violations whenever possible. These responses indicate that a subculture exists within the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement that does not agree with the policies of the organization.

Survey item number twenty spoke to the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police by looking at promotions within the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement where ninety-three percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement “Experienced Liquor Control Enforcement Officers should be eligible to hold management positions within the Pennsylvania State Police.” Fifty-seven percent of the Liquor Licensees respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement as well.

The findings from survey item number twenty also indicate that both groups disagree with the policies of the Pennsylvania State Police in relation to promotions within the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. A vast majority of the Liquor Enforcement respondents and majority of the Liquor Licensees agree that Liquor Control Enforcement Officers should hold management positions within the Pennsylvania State

Police. Again, these groups share fundamental policy ideals associated with liquor control.

Survey item number twenty-five examined the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police by inquiring into the cliques associated with the organization. Ten percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with this statement concerning cliques while seventy-two percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement. Sixty percent of the Liquor Licensees agree or strongly agree and twenty percent disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

The findings from survey item number twenty-five indicated that both groups believed cliques, or subcultures existed within the organization.

Reviewing the responses for the survey items associated with core research question one, the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents and Liquor License respondents disagreed more than they agreed on matters of culture within the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. This cultural divide could be expected when exploring people who regulate and control the behavior of others. What is more interesting are the survey items where the two groups agree. For example, the Liquor Licensee respondents agreed the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement is cliquish group as well as agreed that Liquor Control Enforcement Officers should be eligible for promotion positions in the Pennsylvania State Police. The most striking group of responses came from the survey item exploring the idea of quotas in liquor control enforcement. Both groups overwhelming believed quotas exist with the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement.

Core Research Question Two

- What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and members of the paramilitary Pennsylvania State Police?

The second core research question asks for an understanding of the relationships between the officers of the Liquor Control Enforcement and the Pennsylvania State Police. These were explored in questions number six, sixteen, twenty-two, twenty-three and twenty-four.

Statement number six reads “*LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS SHOULD HAVE THE SAME POWERS OF ARREST AND AUTHORITY AS PENNSYLVANIA STATE TROOPERS.*” The Liquor Control responses to the statement were one-hundred percent for those who agree or strongly agree. The liquor Licensees had seven percent of the respondents strongly agree with the statement while fifty-seven percent disagree or strongly disagree with the Liquor Control Enforcement officers having expanded powers.

The findings associated with survey item number six address the powers of arrest that have been granted to the liquor Control Enforcement Officers. One-hundred percent of the Liquor Control respondents believe they should have full powers of arrest. Interestingly, a majority of the Liquor Licensees respondents believe the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers should not have full powers of arrest. The responses to this statement indicate that the Liquor Licensee respondents do not want the organization that regulates them to have even more authority over them.

Survey item number sixteen made the statement “*LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ARE A RESPECTED PART OF THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE.*” The responses indicate that eighty-nine percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while nine

percent agree or strongly agree with the statement. Sixty percent of the Liquor Licensees also disagree or strongly disagree with the statement and forty percent agree or strongly agree with the statement.

The findings associated with survey item sixteen indicate that both groups believe the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers are not a respected part of the Pennsylvania State Police. The responses to this survey item indicate a dichotomy in the Pennsylvania State Police as an organization. It also indicates the Liquor Licensees perception of the Liquor Enforcement Officers is diminished in relation to that of the Pennsylvania State Police.

Statement number twenty-two, “The Pennsylvania State Police view liquor control enforcement as a form of revenue to help fund other areas of the Pennsylvania State Police” found that forty-one percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement and thirty-four percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement. Eighty-four percent of the Liquor Licensees agree or strongly agree with the statement none of the respondents disagree with the statement at all.

The findings for survey item number twenty-two indicate that the Liquor Licensee respondents believe the fines and penalties levied against them are used to fund other areas of the Pennsylvania State Police. The interesting aspect was the forty-one percent of Liquor Control Enforcement respondents who agreed with the Liquor Licensee respondents, indicating a mistrust of Pennsylvania State Police management.

Survey item number twenty-three, which is detailed in asks “Do you think your organization cares about your position?” Six percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement

respondents agree or strongly agree with the question while fifty-three percent disagree or strongly disagree with the question. Ninety-four percent of the Liquor Licensees agree or strongly agree with the survey item.

The findings for survey item number twenty-three clearly indicate the Liquor Control respondents do not feel the Pennsylvania State Police cares about their position. This sentiment helps to create aspects of subcultures associated with the Pennsylvania State Police.

Survey item twenty-four asks, “*DO FEEL LIKE A PART OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?*” Fourteen percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement and sixty-six percent disagree or strongly disagree with the survey item. Eighty-seven percent of the Liquor licensee respondents agree or disagree with this question while none disagreed at all with the survey item.

The findings for survey item number twenty-four overwhelmingly indicate the Liquor Control respondents do not feel like a part of the Pennsylvania State Police. This is another aspect of the dichotomous culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, where one group is considered members, while the others are employees.

This core research question asked the respondents to explore the relationship between members of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and the Pennsylvania State Police through five survey items. The core research question maintained the pattern where the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents and Liquor Licensee respondents disagreed on their responses to all but one survey item. Both groups agreed that the members of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement are not a respected part of the Pennsylvania State Police.

Core Research Question Three

- What is the relationship between the civilian enforcement officers and Pennsylvania liquor licensees?

Core Research question three examines the relationship between the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and the licensees they regulate. Survey items one, two, five and twenty-one examine this aspect of organizational culture.

Survey item number one stated “*LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS TREAT LIQUOR LICENSE HOLDERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES WITH RESPECT.*” Sixty-six percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement while twenty-seven percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents strongly disagree. None (zero%) of the Liquor Licensees agreed in any way with the statement while ninety-four percent either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

The findings for survey item number one indicate the overwhelming majority of Liquor Licensee respondents do not feel they are treated respectfully by the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers while a majority of the Liquor Control respondents believe they treat Liquor License holders with respect. It is interesting how the groups’ responses oppose one another. However, the twenty-seven percent of the Liquor Control respondents who felt the Liquor Licensees are not treated fairly raise an interesting contradiction to this survey item.

Survey item number two stated “*LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT, AS CONDUCTED BY THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE IS FAIR TO PENNSYLVANIA LIQUOR LICENSE HOLDERS.*” Fifty-four percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement and forty-one percent of the

Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree while eighty-eight percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement; with just ten percent agreeing with the survey item.

The findings for survey item number two mirror the sentiment for the previous statement on respect. The Liquor Licensee respondents overwhelmingly believe they are not treated fairly by the Pennsylvania State Police. And again, a majority of the Liquor Control Respondents believed they are fair to the licensees. However, this time, forty-one percent of the Liquor Control respondents believe they treat the Liquor Licensees unfairly, which begins to shed light on the dichotomous culture of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement.

Survey item number five states, “*PENNSYLVANIA LIQUOR LICENSE HOLDERS VIOLATE THE LAW MORE THAN OTHER PENNSYLVANIA SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS.*” Nine percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agreed with the statement sixty-eight percent disagree or strongly disagree with the statement. Seventy-seven percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

The findings for survey item number five produced similar responses from both groups, who overwhelmingly disagreed with survey item, indicating that neither groups believe bar owners violate the law more than other small business owners.

Survey item number twenty-one reads “*PENNSYLVANIA LIQUOR LICENSE HOLDERS VIEW LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AS LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD AGENTS.*” Ninety-two percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement while four percent disagree with the statement. Forty-three percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents agree or strongly with the

statement. Fifty-seven percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents responded with neutral responses.

The findings from survey item number twenty-one indicate that an overwhelming majority of the Liquor Control respondents agree that Liquor Licensees view them as Liquor Control Board Agents. None of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagreed with the statement at all. The Liquor Control respondents appear to have some issues with their own self perception. Additionally, the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police offers a confusing identity for the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers.

Core research question three focused on the relationship between the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and Liquor Licensees. One of the interesting set of responses included the acknowledgement that Liquor Control Enforcement Officers, who are sworn police officers for the Pennsylvania State Police are viewed as employees of the Liquor Control Board.

Core Research Question Four

- How does the paramilitary culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affect the business owners they regulate?

Core research question four was reflected in the responses to survey items number three, fifteen and eighteen, where it examined how the paramilitary culture of the bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement affects the business owners that are regulated.

Survey item number three states, “*THE PA STATE POLICE BEHAVE IN AN ADVERSARIAL MANNER WHEN CONDUCTING INVESTIGATIONS.*” Forty-nine percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement while forty-two percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents either disagree or strongly

disagree with the statement. Eighty-three percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement and seventeen percent either disagree or strongly disagree.

The findings from this survey item indicate that the Liquor Licensee respondents believe the Pennsylvania State Police are adversarial when conducting an investigation. The Liquor Control respondents again showed a dichotomy in responses that could be a symptom a cultural problem.

Survey item number fifteen directly addressed tacit culture of the Pennsylvania State Police by stating “The informal culture of the Pennsylvania State Police encourages Liquor Enforcement Officers to have an adversarial attitude toward Pennsylvania liquor license holders.” Eighty-two percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement while forty-three of the Liquor Licensees agreed.

The findings for this survey item support the idea that an informal culture exists within the Pennsylvania State Police that encourages Liquor Control Enforcement Officers to treat Liquor Licensees in an adversarial manner. A majority of the Liquor Control respondents believed this to be true while forty-three of the Liquor Licensee respondents agreed with the statement.

Survey item number eighteen states, “*LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT IS MORE POLITICALLY MOTIVATED THAN BASED ON NEUTRAL PRINCIPLES OF LAW ENFORCEMENT.*” Eight percent of the LCE respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement while eighty percent of the Liquor Licensees agree or strongly agree with the statement. Seventy-four percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents

either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while none of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagreed with the statement at all.

The findings from survey item number eighteen indicate an overwhelming majority of the Liquor Control respondents disagree that Liquor Control Enforcement is politically motivated. On the other hand, a majority of the Liquor Licensee respondents agreed that Liquor Control Enforcement is based more on politics than principles of law enforcement.

This core research question explored the responses of Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees as they relate to the likelihood there is an adversarial relationship between members of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees. The responses indicate that both groups believe there is an adversarial element to the culture associated with both organizations.

Core Research Question Five

- Are there alternatives to the current method of liquor control enforcement in Pennsylvania? If so, what are they?

Core Research question five explored the respondents belief that an alternative organizational structure or method could exist to conduct Liquor Control Enforcement in Pennsylvania. This was illustrated through survey items four, eight, nine, eleven, twelve, thirteen, seventeen and nineteen.

Survey item number four made the statement “*LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT COULD BE CONDUCTED BETTER BY A DIFFERENT AGENCY.*” Eighty-three of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with this

statement while sixty percent of the Liquor Licensees agree or strongly agree with the statement. Conversely, ten percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement and thirty percent of the Liquor Licensees disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

The findings from survey item number four indicate that both groups overwhelmingly agree that *LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT COULD BE CONDUCTED BETTER BY A DIFFERENT AGENCY*. The responses to this survey item indicate the organizational culture of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement is not the same as the culture of the Pennsylvania State Police.

Survey item number eight stated “*THE CURRENT METHOD OF LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT IS THE BEST WAY TO REGULATE THE LIQUOR INDUSTRY IN PENNSYLVANIA.*” Twenty-four percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement while twenty percent of the Liquor Licensees agree or strongly agree with the statement. Sixty-two percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while seventy percent of the Liquor Licensees disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

The findings from survey item number eight indicate that both groups overwhelmingly agree that the current method of Liquor Control Enforcement in Pennsylvania is not the best way to regulate the liquor industry. The fact that Pennsylvania Liquor Licensee respondents and Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree on this type of organizational questions validates the dichotomous relationship in the Pennsylvania State Police.

Survey item number nine stated, “*LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT SHOULD BE CONDUCTED BY LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.*” Thirteen percent of the

Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement while one hundred percent of the Liquor Licensees agree or strongly agree with the statement. Eighty percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement with none of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagreeing at all with the statement.

The findings from number nine indicate that Liquor Licensee respondents overwhelmingly prefer the idea of local law enforcement conducted liquor control. This is likely because they have existing relationships with local law enforcement and certain violations would be overlooked. The Liquor Control respondents overwhelmingly disagreed with the statement, most likely because they are thinking of job preservation.

Survey item eleven stated, “*LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT SHOULD BE CONDUCTED BY THE PENNSYLVANIA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD.*” Seventy-seven percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement and five percent either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement. Fifty-seven percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents either agree or strongly agree with the statement while none of the respondents disagreed with the statement at all.

The findings for survey item number eleven indicate more than half of the Liquor Licensee respondents and more than three quarters of the Liquor Control respondents believe *LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT SHOULD BE CONDUCTED BY THE PENNSYLVANIA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD.*

Survey item twelve made the statement, “Liquor Law Enforcement is more regulatory than criminal in nature.” Eighty-one percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with this statement and eighty-seven percent of the Liquor Licensees agree with the statement. Six percent of the Liquor

Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while thirteen percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

The findings for survey item number twelve overwhelmingly support the belief that Pennsylvania Liquor Control is more of a regulatory function than a criminal investigation. More than eighty percent of the respondents from both groups agreed with this sentiment.

Survey item thirteen made the statement, “The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania holds Liquor Control Enforcement as an important law enforcement responsibility.” Sixty percent of the LCE respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement and none of the Liquor Licensee respondents agree with the statement at all. Seventeen percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement while sixty percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

The findings for survey item thirteen present an opposing, but balanced set of responses. With sixty percent of the Liquor Licensee respondents believing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania does not view Liquor Control Enforcement as an important law enforcement responsibility while sixty percent of the Liquor Control respondents believe Liquor Control Enforcement is an important aspect of Pennsylvania law enforcement.

Survey item seventeen states, “Violations of Pennsylvania liquor laws are serious infractions of the law.” Thirty-three percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement while none of the Liquor Licensee

respondents agreed with the statement at all. Fifty-three percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement disagree or strongly disagree with the statement and sixty-seven percent of the Liquor Licensee disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

The findings from survey item seventeen indicate that more than fifty percent of both groups do not see violations of the Pennsylvania Liquor Code as serious infractions of the law.

Survey item nineteen stated, “From an organizational perspective, *ENFORCEMENT IS A GOOD FIT WITH THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE.*” Nine percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement while none of the Liquor Licensee respondents agreed with this statement at all. Ninety-one percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement respondents disagree or strongly disagree with this statement while one hundred percent of the Liquor Licensees disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

The findings from survey item nineteen overwhelmingly indicate the Liquor Licensee respondents and Liquor Control respondents agree that Liquor Control Enforcement is not a good fit with the Pennsylvania State Police. In fact, one hundred percent of the Liquor Licensees responded this way and more ninety-one percent of the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers agreed with them.

Eight survey items were used to explore core research question five, which explored the concept of alternative methods of liquor control enforcement in Pennsylvania. The clear indication in from this core research question is that while both disagree on a variety of survey items, they agree that the current method of liquor control enforcement is not the best method for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Conclusions

Examining organizational culture in a law enforcement organization presents several challenges, where, according to Rubenstein (1979), a uniform police culture does not exist. Based on an amalgamation of the Review of Literature and research from this study, the concept of organizational culture as described in the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement indicates a bifurcated culture does exist from the perspective of the Liquor Control Enforcement Officer and Pennsylvania Liquor licensee. The explanation for subcultures is not primarily in the formal structure of the organization, but lies largely in the myriad of subterranean processes of informal groups, conflicts between groups and dependencies on outside groups (Vecchio), which describes the culture associated with the Pennsylvania State Police.

While the research by Manning (1971) and Rubenstein (1979) indicates that several subcultures exist within law enforcement organizations, the two tiered culture of the Pennsylvania State Police is easily viewed when investigating the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement where you are either a member of the Pennsylvania State Police or you are an employee of the Pennsylvania State Police, thereby creating a second class Pennsylvania State Police Officer.

The analysis of the quantitative data revealed three distinct subcultures in the BLCE. The first group worked diligently within the accepted organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police. A second group exists that makes an effort to stymie the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police by not fully enforcing the regulations and belittling the management of the organization. Finally, a third group exists that is more or less neutral to the organizational culture. These groups have been

coined: COMPANY MAN, ANTI and GRAYS. These groups are similar to the classifications created by Anthony Downs with the Company Man being a Climber; the Anti being Zealot and the Gray being the Conserver. This was determined from the scoring of specific items in the survey. Specifically, questions number 8, 14, 15, 16, 19 and 24 were used as key indicators due to the nature and wording of the statements. These statements created an opportunity for the respondent to firmly stand on one side of a topic, indicating they were either for or against a key factor of the organizational functionality of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement.

Through an analysis of the survey data, the COMPANY MAN is the group that seeks justification by pleasing management and identifying closely with the Pennsylvania State Troopers to the point they actively seek arrests and violations of the Liquor Code to justify their position as well seek approval from Pennsylvania State Police management. This classification falls under the *maintaining order* (Wilson) and *keeping the peace* (Bittner) classification. Other explanations may exist for this classification such as attitudes towards the Pennsylvania State Police or even possibly a strong work ethic that exists within the American rustbelt.

The ANTI group has a disdain for the State Police authority over the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and works to limit arrests by not actively citing liquor licensees for violations of the Pennsylvania Liquor Code and section 18 of the Pennsylvania Crimes Code. This group has adopted the behavioral characteristic described by Metz (1986) where the member of the subgroup takes pleasure and even pride in frustrating management directives and creating a subversive culture.

The GRAYS are the middle group who will do as they are told, but complain within the safe confines of the ANTI group. This group falls under the classification of the covering your ass (Van Maanen, 1974) group. However, it can also be a collection of individuals that provided weak responses to the survey. The existence of the two opposing groups would indicate the likelihood of a between group where nothing is exactly black and white, but just a little gray.

The quantitative and qualitative research indicates that the subculture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement is derived from the bifurcated organizational structure that exists within the Pennsylvania State Police. With shared beliefs being a critical component to organizational culture (Sapienza), the differences existing between the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and the Pennsylvania State Police become problematic. While law enforcement officers of all walks share the basic responsibility of enforcing the laws within their range of authority, the blending of different cultural forms of law enforcement may prove too diverse to coexist within the same organization and have both succeed from a cultural perspective.

Examining the civilian arm of the Pennsylvania State Police, it becomes clear that its employees possess ideological differences that stem from structural differences with the main organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, yet exists as a part of the organization. It was interesting that based on the survey items, the Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees distinguished a difference between the Pennsylvania State Police and the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement, emboldening the bifurcated organizational structure. In fact, the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement was more aligned with Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board (LCB), creating a whole new set of issues that will

not be addressed in this study. The Liquor Control Enforcement Officers receive mixed messages from everybody involved from the Pennsylvania State Police management to the Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees to the public. They are ceremonially part of the Pennsylvania State Police, but by regulation, told they are not members of the organization, but employees, even though their badges, insignias and paychecks read Pennsylvania State Police.

As mentioned, the Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees refer to members of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement as the “LCB,” creating yet another facet to this multilayered schizophrenic culture. Through the interview process, it becomes clear the Liquor Control Enforcement Officer has a conflicted organizational identity. This conflicted identity becomes visible when specific survey items are examined. For example, the fact that ninety-one percent of the Liquor Enforcement Officers do not believe they are a good fit with the Pennsylvania State Police is a very telling statistic.

The amalgamation of the survey data, qualitative data and historical research tell a very compelling story and provides a glimpse into the dysfunction of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement. The data validates the existing subculture of the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement as a type of “second class” citizen within the Pennsylvania State Police.

The other facet to this study is the historical relevance of the Legislative Reviews when placed with quantitative and qualitative research. It appears that Pennsylvania State Senators, Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees all agreed that liquor control enforcement does not fit with the Pennsylvania State Police, yet nothing has been done to change the organizational structure

Implications

The implications have been mentioned one way or another in this study by state legislators back in 1987 or by interview respondents that questioned why things are like they are in Pennsylvania Liquor Control Enforcement.

One way to address the organizational issues within the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement is to remove the Liquor Control Enforcement Officer group from the Pennsylvania State Police and create a standalone agency that is managed by Liquor Control Enforcement Officers as a true civilian regulatory agency, much like the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) or a return to the model used in the days of Elliot Ness and the Untouchables, which was a branch of the civilian IRS.

Another way is to make all of the Liquor Control Enforcement Officers Pennsylvania State Troopers and make the position a true part of the Pennsylvania State Police. This would remove the civilian law enforcement aspect of the organization.

Another idea brought by a Pennsylvania Liquor Licensee was to have the Liquor Licensees create a board and regulate themselves much like the police do with an Internal Affairs Division. They could regulate and enforce the laws internally and if their members were caught by law enforcement breaking the laws, they would suffer stiff penalties that would make straying outside of the law very costly, which would be a return to the High License concept. This method would cost the taxpayer the least and provide the greatest amount of education and feedback to the Liquor Licensees.

To reiterate, some considerations would be to create either an all civilian model of Liquor Control Enforcement or an all paramilitary model of Liquor Control Enforcement; not the hybrid model that currently exists. Another idea was to let the bars regulate

themselves and allow local and state law enforcement to enforce the laws as they would with any other entity, such as a gas station or hair salon. This would create a tax savings and take state government out of the Liquor Control Enforcement business.

Future Research

While this research focused on the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and how the paramilitary management of a civilian law enforcement organization creates various subcultures, several additional avenues of research could stem from this research. For example, staying with the concept of paramilitary management of a civilian law enforcement organization, the Pennsylvania State Police have been granted authority over the law enforcement aspect of the recently created Pennsylvania Gaming Board. This entity has been organized in a similar manner to the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board. In this new organization, the Pennsylvania State Police manage the civilian Gaming Officers in the casinos as well as manage the surveillance systems in the casinos. They also conduct the background checks and investigations into the employees of the casinos and Gaming Board. The Gaming Board manages the licensing of the casinos, much in the same way that the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board manages the licensing of Pennsylvania establishments that sell liquor and malt or brewed beverages. What is striking is that in 1987 the Pennsylvania Senate objected to this organizational structure, but passed it to avoid prohibition with the understanding it would be revisited and changed in the fall of 1987, which never happened. Then in 2004, the Pennsylvania House and Senate voted to give the Pennsylvania State Police the same organizational authority over gaming, another civilian

business enterprise in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Comparing the Pennsylvania Gaming model to how Gaming Enforcement is conducted in Las Vegas would be an interesting study.

Another avenue of research could be to explore the organizational culture of a non-control state and how the liquor licensees in that jurisdiction respond to local or regional enforcement of the liquor laws. This form of central administrative control, where the taxing and regulatory authority is granted to local officers, who report to a central administrative head, is different from the centralized administration model that exists in Pennsylvania, where authority is extended downward through appointees or employees to immediately perform the duties. The commonalities and differences would be interesting as it relates to the organizational subcultures that are created in these organizations.

Finally, examining the relationships between the ANTI, Company Man and Grays in relation to Anthony Downs' classification system would provide an interesting bureaucratic perspective on the cultural interplay of the organization.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the organizational culture and subsequent subcultures of a civilian law enforcement organization attached to a paramilitary law enforcement organization. This was achieved by studying the organizational culture of the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Liquor Control of Enforcement. The initial phase of the research included a historical approach to the topic where Pennsylvania Liquor Control was examined dating back to the provincial governor of 1710 extending forward to 1933 and the end of Prohibition to the current face of

Pennsylvania Liquor Control Enforcement. In addition to the historical research, a thorough legislative review was presented that detailed the debates and reasons for the transfer of Pennsylvania Liquor Control Enforcement from the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board to the Pennsylvania State Police.

The methodology leading to the findings for this study included a mixed methods approach, where a survey was distributed to Pennsylvania Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees. Their responses were tabulated and compared to be used as a tool for the second phase of the research, which was a series of interviews with three Pennsylvania Liquor Control Enforcement Officers and three Pennsylvania Liquor Licensees. The interviews produced some interesting responses as well as ideas for addressing the issues within the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement.

The findings illustrated that the bifurcated culture of the Pennsylvania State Police has created a subculture within the Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement ultimately resulting in a second class citizen status of the Liquor Control Enforcement Officer within the Pennsylvania State Police.

References

- Brutto, C. (1987, June 23). *Delays charged on lcb bill Senate democrat blasts gop leadership*. The Patriot – News Harrisburg, p. A1.
- Beman, L. (1917). *Prohibition of the liquor traffic*. New York: The H.W. Wilson Company.
- Bittner, E. (1965). *The concept of organization*. Social Research, 32, 239-255.
- Bittner, E. (1967). *The police on skid-row: A study of peace keeping*. American Sociological Review, 32, 699-715.
- Bittner, E. (1983). *Legality and workmanship: Control in the police organization*, in M. Punch (2002). *Control in the police organization*, 1-11, Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theories and methods*. Boston: Pearson Education Group.
- Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1983). *Educational research: An introduction* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Chatman, J.A., & Barsade, S.G. (1995). *Personality, organizational culture, and cooperation: Evidence from a business simulation*. Administrative Science Quarterly, 40: 423-443.
- Cherrington, E. (1969). *The evolution of prohibition in the united states of america*. New Jersey: Patterson Smith Publisher.
- Connolly, P. (1998). *'Dancing to the wrong tune': Ethnography generalization and research on racism in schools*. In P. Connolly & B. Troyna (Eds.), *Researching racism in education: Politics, theory, and practice* (pp. 122-139). Buckingham,

- UK: Open University Press.
- Creswell, J. (1994). *Research design qualitative & quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cronbach, L. (1982). *Designing evaluations of educational and social programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, D. V. (1995). *Creating ethical work climates: a socioeconomic perspective*. The Journal of Socio-Economics, 24, 317-343.
- Cohen, P., Cohen, J., West, S., & Aiken, L. (2002). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Connolly, P. (1998). *Dancing to the wrong tune: ethnography generalization and research on racism in schools*. In P. Connolly & B. Troyna (Eds.), *Researching racism in education: politics, theory, and practice*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Conrad, E. (1987, March 5). *Trooper leader asks to do lcb enforcement, too*. The Patriot – News Harrisburg, p. B1.
- Cooke, R.A. & Szumal, J.L. (2000). *Using the organizational culture inventory to understand the operating cultures of organization*. In N.M. Ashkanasy, C.P.M. Wilderom, M. F. (2006). *Handbook of organizational culture and climate*: 147-162. Peterson. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Downs, Anthony. (1967). *Inside bureaucracy*. Little, Brown and Company. Boston.
- Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research*, Second Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Enz, C. (1988). *The role of value congruity in intraorganizational power*. Administrative Science Quarterly, 33: 284-304.
- Executive Journal. (2003). *Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation*. April (3).
- Fan, X. (2001). *Statistical significance and effect size in education research: Two sides of a coin*. Journal of Educational Research, 94, 275-282.
- Faust, John M. (1994). *Of saloons and social control: assessing the impact of state liquor control on individual expression*. Virginia law Review, 80 (3), 745-785.
- Fisher, I. (1930). *The noble experiment*. New York: Alcohol Information Committee.
- Forester, J. (1987, June 30). *PLCB still in business; some changes uncorked*. The Patriot-News Harrisburg, p. A1.
- Fry, L. W. and L. J. Berkes, (1983). *The paramilitary police model: an organizational misfit*, Human Organization, 42, 225-234.
- Hatch, M.J. (1993). *The dynamics of organizational culture*. Academy of Management Review, 18: 657-693.
- H.R. Rep. No. 112. 107th Cong. 1st Sess. 108 (1887).
- H.R. Rep. No. 10. 130th Cong. Extra Sess. (1246 (1933).
- H.R. Rep. No. 2437. 131st Cong. 1st Sess. 1246 (1935).
- H.R. Rep. No. 1000. 171st Cong. Extra Sess. 1941 (1987).
- H.R. Rep. No. 553. 177th Cong. 1st Sess. (1993).
- H.R. Rep. No. 1000, 171st Cong. Extra Sess. (1987).

- Jaques, E. (1951). *The changing culture of a factory*. London: Tavistock.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd edition). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kaylor, E (1963). *Prohibition movement in Pennsylvania, 1865-1920. volume I and II*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania.
- Kerr, K. (1985). *Organized for prohibition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kotter, J., & Heskett, J. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. New York: Free Press.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. L. (2000). *Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research*. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 279-314). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kyvig, D. (1979). *Repealing national prohibition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (in press). *A proposed fourth measure of significance: The role of economic significance in educational research*. Evaluation and Research in Education.
- Leininger, M. M. (Ed.). (1985). *Qualitative research methods in nursing*. Orlando, FL: Grune & Stratton.
- Liveright. Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Manning, P. K. (1971). "The Police: mandate, strategies and appearances," in J. D. Douglas (Ed.), *Crime and Justice in American Society*, 149-193. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

- Manning, P. K. (1977). *Police work: the social organization of policing*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, M.I.T.Press.
- Marshall, K. (1986, December 12). *Special panel pores over LCB's year-end demise*. The Patriot – News Harrisburg, p. A1.
- Marshall, K. (1986, December 16). *Holiday spirits endangered*. The Patriot – News Harrisburg. p. A14.
- Marshall, K. (1987, July 1). *LCB changes to come about slowly*. The Patriot-News Harrisburg, p. B3.
- McGeary, M. N. (1948). *Pennsylvania and the liquor business: A study of the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board*. State College, Pennsylvania: Penn Valley Publishers, Inc.
- McNeill, D., and P. Freiberger 1993. *Fuzzy Logic*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Mertens, D. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Newman, I., Ridenour, C. S., Newman, C., & DeMarco, G. M. P. (2003). *A typology of research purposes and its relationship to mixed methods*. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 167-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Teddlie, C. (2003). *A framework for analyzing data in mixed methods research*. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 351-383). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA:

Sage.

Perrow, C. (1986). *Complex organizations: a critical essay*, third edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Punch, M. (1982). "Developing Scandal: police deviance in amsterdam," *Urban Life*, 11, 209-230.

Rapert, M. and Wren, B.(1998). *Reconsidering organizational structure: a dual perspective of frameworks and processes*. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 10(3), 287-302.

Rousseau, D. (1990). *Quantitative assessment of organizational culture: the case for multiple measures*. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Frontiers in industrial and organizational psychology*, vol.3: 153-192. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rubinstein, J. (1973), *City Police*, New York: Ballantine.

Rumbarger, J. (1989). *Profits power and prohibition: alcohol reform and the industrializing of America 1800-1930*. New York: State University of New York Press.

S. Rep. No. 112. 107th Cong. 1st Sess. 108 (1887).

S. Rep. No. 553. 177th Cong. 1st Sess. (1933).

S. Rep. 1000, 171st Cong. Extra Sess. 14 (1987).

Sackmann, S. A. (1992). "Culture and Subcultures: An analysis of organizational knowledge." *Administrative Science Quarterly* (37), 140-161.

Sapienza, A. M. (1985). *Believing is seeing: how culture influences the decisions top managers make*. In R.H. Kilmann, M.J. Saxton, & R. Serpa (eds.), *Gaining*

- control of the corporate culture*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sathe, V. (1983). *Implications of corporate culture: A manager's guide to action*.
Organizational Dynamics, 12, 5-23.
- Sathe, V. (1985). *Culture and related corporate realities*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Schein, E. (1984). "Coming to a New Awareness of Organizational Culture." Sloan Management Review (Winter): 3-16.
- Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. (1991). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seidman, I. F. (1991). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Selznick, P. 1965. *Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation*.
Evanston: Row.
- Shipman, G. (1940). *State administrative machinery for liquor control*. *Law and Contemporary Problems*. Alcoholic Beverage, 7 (4) 600-620.
- Sites, C.M.L. (1968). *Centralized administration of liquor laws*. New York: AMS Press, Inc.
- Skivington, J.E. and Daft, R.L. (1991). *A study of organizational framework and process modalities for the implementation of business level strategic decisions*. Journal of Management Studies, 28(1), 45-68.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Swartz, M. & Jordon, D. (1980). *Culture: an anthropological perspective*. New York: JohnWiley.

- Thornton, M. (1991). *The economics of prohibition*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Timberlake, J. H. (1963). *Prohibition and the progressive movement 1900-1920*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Thompson, B. (2002). *Statistical, Practical, and Clinical: how many kinds of significance do counselors need to consider?* *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 80, 64-71.
- Trice, H.M. and J.M., Beyer. (1993). *The Cultures of work organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Towne, C.H. (1923). *The rise and fall of prohibition: the human side of what the eighteenth amendment has done to the United States*. New York: Macmillan Press.
- Van Maanen, J. (1974). "Working the street: A developmental view of police behavior," in H. Jacobs (Ed.), *Annual review of criminal justice: Vol. III: the potential for reform*; 83-130, Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Vecchio, R. (1997). *Leadership: Understanding the dynamics of power and influence in organizations*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory: foundations, development, applications*. London: Allen Lane.
- Wallen, W. & J. R. Fraenkel (1991). *Educational Research: A guide to the process*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Warren, C.A.B. (1988). *Gender issues in field research*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Wilson, J. O. (1968). *Varieties of police behavior*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Woodiwiss, M. (1988). *Crimes, crusades and corruption: prohibitions in the united states: 1900-1987*. London: Printer Publishers.

Appendices

Appendix A

Pennsylvania Liquor Law Response Form

Please place an X after the most appropriate answer for each question.

Background Information:

What is your age range?

- a. 21 – 29 ___
- b. 30 – 39 ___
- c. 40 – 50 ___
- D. 51+ ___

What is the highest level of formal education you have obtained?

- a. High School Graduate/GED _____
- b. Some College _____
- c. Associates, two year college degree _____
- d. Four year college degree _____
- e. Postgraduate degree started _____
- f. Postgraduate degree finished _____

How many years have you been associated with Liquor Control Enforcement?

- a. 1- 5 _____
- b. 6 – 10 _____
- c. 10-15 _____
- d. 15+ _____

Do you have any close relatives who work in law enforcement? (police officers, staff, dispatchers)

- a. Yes
- b. No

Do you have any close relatives working in the liquor Industry? (retail, wholesale, beer, restaurants with liquor licenses)

- a. Yes
- b. No

PLEASE CIRCLE THE MOST APPROPRIATE RESONSE FOR EACH QUESTION

1. LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS TREAT LIQUOR LICENSE HOLDERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES WITH RESPECT.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

2. LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT, AS CONDUCTED BY THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE IS FAIR TO PENNSYLVANIA LIQUOR LICENSE HOLDERS.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

3. THE PA STATE POLICE BEHAVE IN AN ADVERSARIAL MANNER WHEN CONDUCTING INVESTIGATIONS.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

4. LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT COULD BE CONDUCTED BETTER BY A DIFFERENT AGENCY.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

5. PENNSYLVANIA LIQUOR LICENSE HOLDERS VIOLATE THE LAW MORE THAN OTHER PENNSYLVANIA SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

6. LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS SHOULD HAVE THE SAME POWERS OF ARREST AND AUTHORITY AS PENNSYLVANIA STATE TROOPERS.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

7. LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT IS A SERIOUS CRIMINAL ENDEAVOR, WHICH MUST BE CONDUCTED BY THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

8. THE CURRENT METHOD OF LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT IS THE BEST WAY TO REGULATE THE LIQUOR INDUSTRY IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

9. LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT SHOULD BE CONDUCTED BY LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

10. BECAUSE LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT IS MANAGED BY THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE, LIQUOR ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ARE TREATED WITH THE SAME RESPECT AS PENNSYLVANIA STATE TROOPERS.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

11. LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT SHOULD BE CONDUCTED BY THE PENNSYLVANIA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

12. Liquor Law Enforcement is more regulatory than criminal in nature.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

13. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania holds Liquor Control Enforcement as an important law enforcement responsibility.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

14. THE "UNWRITTEN RULES" GUIDING THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE, BUREAU OF LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT ENCOURAGES LIQUOR ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS TO FIND LIQUOR CODE VIOLATIONS WHENEVER POSSIBLE.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

15. The informal culture of the Pennsylvania State Police encourages Liquor Enforcement Officers to have an adversarial attitude toward Pennsylvania liquor license holders.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

16. LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ARE A RESPECTED PART OF THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

17. Violations of Pennsylvania liquor laws are serious infractions of the law.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

18. LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT IS MORE POLITICALLY MOTIVATED THAN BASED ON NEUTRAL PRINCIPLES OF LAW ENFORCEMENT.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

19. FROM AN ORGANIZATIONAL PERSPECTIVE, LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT IS A GOOD FIT WITH THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

20. EXPERIENCED LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE TO HOLD MANAGEMENT POSITIONS WITHIN THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

21. PENNSYLVANIA LIQUOR LICENSE HOLDERS VIEW LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AS LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD AGENTS.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

22. The Pennsylvania State Police view liquor control enforcement as a form of revenue to help fund other areas of the Pennsylvania State Police.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

23. Do you think your organization cares about your position?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

24. DO FEEL LIKE A PART OF YOUR ORGANIZATION?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

25. MY WORKPLACE IS “CLIQISH?”

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree No Opinion
1 2 3 4 5 6

Thank you for participating in this study. Please place your completed survey inside of the addressed and stamped envelope. This envelope will be delivered to Political Science Department at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Appendix B

Participant Letter

Dear Participant,

You have been invited to participate in this research study. The research includes completing and returning the enclosed survey to the Political Science Department at Indiana University of Pennsylvania via U.S. Postal Service. Postage paid envelopes have been provided.

The project is an investigation into the culture of Liquor Law Enforcement personnel. This includes asking Liquor Law personnel as well as Liquor License holders to complete a questionnaire in order to record the assumptions and beliefs of people working in this field. The questionnaire will take between 10 and 15 minutes to complete. Please note, due to the anonymous nature of the questionnaire, there is no risk or threat of retaliation for participating in this study.

Several members of each group will randomly be asked to participate in a follow up interview to gain insight into the organizational culture of the organizations.

No compensation is available for participation in this study and participation in this study is voluntary. You can withdraw your consent and discontinue your participation in the project at anytime without any penalty. Completion of the survey implies informed consent. If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact the principal investigator or the Political Science Department at Indiana University of Pennsylvania:

Scott Beatty, Doctoral Candidate
127 Dogwood Drive
Bernville, PA 19506
610-488-6008

Political Science Department
103 Keith Hall Annex
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, PA 15705
724-357-2290

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724/357-7730)

Appendix C

Informed Consent (interview)

Dear Participant,

You have been invited to participate in the interview portion of this study. The research entails Liquor Law Enforcement personnel and Liquor Industry personnel to take part in an interview, which will be audio recorded and transcribed on to paper. The interview will take approximately 30 minutes to complete, however, it may be shorter or longer depending on the interviewee. The results will then be sent to the Political Science Department at Indiana University of Pennsylvania via U.S. Postal Service.

There is minimal risk involved with the interview portion of this study. Participants identities will only be known to the researcher and dissertation chairperson.

Please print and sign your name in the appropriate space. Printing and signing your name implies informed consent to participate in this study. Your identity and responses will be known only to the Researcher and Dissertation Chairperson.

Print Name _____

Signature _____

No compensation is available for participation in this study and participation in this study is voluntary. You can withdraw your consent and discontinue your participation in the project at anytime without any penalty. If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact the principal investigator or the Political Science Department at Indiana University of Pennsylvania:

Scott Beatty, Doctoral Candidate
127 Dogwood Drive
Bernville, PA 19506
Pennsylvania
610-488-6008

Political Science Department
103 Keith Hall Annex
Indiana University of
Indiana, PA 15705
724-357-2290

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724/357-7730)

Appendix D

Research Site Approval

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am requesting permission to conduct research with members of your organization, who are invited to participate in this research study. The research entails organizational members completing a survey and returning the survey to the Political Science Department at Indiana University of Pennsylvania via U.S. Postal Service. Postage paid envelopes have been provided.

The project is an investigation into the tacit culture of liquor law enforcement personnel. This includes surveying Liquor Law personnel as well as Liquor License holders in order to record the assumptions and beliefs of respondents.

The culture of an organization is an important factor that extends beyond the daily interaction of coworkers. This study will examine the attitudes and beliefs of Liquor Law Enforcement personnel and Liquor License holders to gain a better understanding of the bifurcated organizational culture associated with liquor control enforcement. This study intends to determine how this paramilitary culture impacts the civilian Bureau of Liquor Control Enforcement and Liquor License holders they regulate.

No compensation is available for participation in this study and participation in this study is voluntary. You can withdraw your consent and discontinue your participation in the project at anytime without any penalty. Completion of the survey implies informed consent. If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact the principal investigator or the Political Science department at Indiana University of Pennsylvania:

Scott Beatty, Doctoral Candidate
127 Dogwood Drive
Bernville, PA 19506
610-488-6008

Political Science Department
103 Keith Hall Annex
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, PA 15705
724-357-2290

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724/357-7730)