

**POLICE RESIDENTIAL REQUIREMENTS:
AN EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS**

BRIAN R. JOHNSON
Grand Valley State University, Michigan

GREG L. WARCHOL
Bemidji State University, Minnesota

VIC W. BUMPHUS
Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond

ABSTRACT

This research examined the prevalence of residential requirements and police officers attitudes toward residential requirements in the state of Michigan. Through the collection of qualitative information, a survey was distributed to a medium-sized police agency in southwestern Michigan to record officers' concerns and attitudes toward their agency's residential requirement. Later, a statewide phone survey was also conducted. The research found the majority of police agencies sampled had residential requirements. Likewise, the data revealed opposition to residential requirements for a variety of personal issues. Traditional reasons posited by police administrators for the existence of a residential requirement were also refuted through the attitudinal questionnaire. This raises the question of the impact of these policies in the collective bargaining process and contemporary human resource management.

The American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California recommends financial and housing incentives to encourage the 83 percent of the LAPD officers who currently live outside Los Angeles to move into the city [1]. Mayoral candidates for the City of Boston Campaign for stronger residency requirements for municipal employees [2]. An editorial in *The New York Times* [3] calls for police recruits to live in the city to enhance deployment strategies. The city of Chicago fires twenty-four municipal employees for violation of the city's residential

requirement [4]. Meanwhile, 100 officers of the Joliet, Illinois, Police Department stage an informational picketing session in opposition to the city's residential requirement [5]. These events, and many others across the nation, illustrate the controversy regarding police residential requirements.

This study provides a comprehensive analysis of police residential requirements in the state of Michigan through interviews and survey research on the prevalence of, and officers' attitudes toward residential requirements. By gaining an understanding of the issues and controversies related to residential requirements in Michigan, the findings can be compared and applied to other states and municipalities, forming a contemporary understanding of police residential requirements. Through this greater understanding, sound integrative policies can be developed, leading to improved labor relations between the municipality and police officers.

Residency requirements are rules or regulations promulgated by city council ordinance, charter provision, or administrative rule, which state that local public employees must live within the boundaries of the municipality [6]. Relaxed residential requirements are regulations that require officers to live within a prescribed boundary determined by mileage or some other physical boundary. These rules are generally imposed on police officers and firemen, occasionally on teachers, and in rare instances, on all municipal employees [7].

Generally, there are two types of residential requirements. A durational residency requirement requires an individual to live in a municipality or county for a designated time before s/he may be considered for employment. The U.S. Supreme Court has determined this type of residency standard to be barred by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments [8]. There is the continual or bona fide residency requirement. This requires the employee, when hired, to move within the established residential boundary and to remain there through the length of his/her employment [9]. This study will concentrate on the bona fide or continual residential requirement.

THE HISTORY OF RESIDENTIAL REQUIREMENTS

The exact origins of residential requirements are not known. It can be inferred, however, that residential requirements may be as old as the existence of cities and towns. The records of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1652 indicate that members of the watch (forerunners of our modern day police) were composed of inhabitants of the constable's jurisdiction [10]. Other authors such as Lane [11] indicated that members of the watch were recruited from their towns to perform early law-enforcement duties.

According to Eisinger [6], residential requirements were an outgrowth of the machine era in local politics that existed in the large cities in the mid-nineteenth century. Residential requirements, according to Anderson [12], were related to the central idea in the spoils system—namely, that “public employment's are rewards

for past service" [12, p. 465]. In the machine political system, the ward aldermen or bosses were responsible for the hiring of personnel in law enforcement and other municipal positions that served two purposes. First, the aldermen could depend on the employees to later vote and campaign for them since the employees' jobs depended on the aldermen's reelection. Second, aldermen in the case of police and detectives, could rely on these individuals to be the "bagmen" collecting bribes and protection money from businesses in the ward, whereas the public employees would be rewarded for their dedicated service to the aldermen with possible "kickbacks" and job security [12].

With the emergence of the Progressive Era in the twentieth century, machine politics and residential requirements came under assault by reformers. Besides the elimination of overt corruption by police and the belief that the elimination of the residential requirement would lessen the power of the aldermen, it was also felt that residency requirements contributed to the officers' inability to control working class strikers [13]. As early as the 1920s, police reformers such as Fosdick [14] called for civil service systems to be free to select the best individuals regardless of residency. The Wickersham Commission [15] also indicated residential requirements were the third greatest problem in police officer selection because they limited the number of qualified applicants. The commission stated that "complete elimination of the residence rules will at once offer a simple solution to the dearth of available timber and will have a great tendency to break down the political grasp on the force" [15, p. 64].

Although the progressive movement was an impetus to eliminating police residential requirements, overall changes in urbanization may also have been a factor. After the Civil War, the United States saw the growth of major metropolitan centers [16]. This resulted in the expansion of the central business districts in the cities which kept forcing residents to move outward where land prices were relatively low, increasing the number of those who could afford new homes. These two factors called for new forms of transportation, such as the horsecars or streetcars whose use expanded in the 1880s [17]. Consequently, urbanization, better living conditions in the suburbs, and mass transportation led to the decrease of residential requirements. By the late 1960s only Philadelphia, Buffalo, Milwaukee, and a few other large cities retained the residency requirement [18].

In the late 1960s and early 1970s there was a revival of the residential requirement. The corrupt activities that had prevailed in the large cities were now better controlled due to progressive public administration reforms and an increased control of city officials. According to Eisinger [6], this was a "startling revival," as administrators dismissed or failed to accept orthodox public administration reforms and reverted to the old system. Residential requirements were also instituted to combat the "white flight" of public employees and the general citizenry from the city to the suburbs. This flight occurred in many large cities. Between 1960 and 1967, for instance, Newark, New Jersey, experienced a loss of 70,000

white residents, including police who started to circumvent residential requirements by having two addresses [19].

The civil unrest in major cities in the late 1960s also called for the enforcement and rebirth of residential requirements. As indicated by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders [20], the police bore a responsibility for making the needed changes. If the vast segment of the community felt threatened by the police and perceived them as an occupying force, change would be very slow. Hence, this perception of the police as an occupying force motivated police administrators and city officials to reestablish residency requirements [21].

Employee associations or unions have indicated resistance to residency requirements through the collective bargaining process or by lobbying for state legislation prohibiting such measures [22]. An early account of efforts of this nature was discussed by Skolnick and Bayley [19], who indicated that in 1962 the PBA (Police Benevolent Association) for the Newark, New Jersey, police officers won a court decision allowing officers to maintain two addresses—one in the city and one outside. Later, in the 1970s, Newark police teachers and firemen successfully lobbied the state legislature to outlaw residency requirements. The authors concluded that Newark was now [as of 1986] policed by a force of outsiders.

There are also more contemporary efforts to eliminate residential requirements. In April 1991, Michigan state senators introduced Senate Bill No. 271, entitled "A bill to prohibit governmental entities from requiring individuals to live within certain geographic areas as a condition of employment or promotion in certain public service positions" [23, p. 1]. This bill was intended to prevent a public employer from requiring firefighters or police officers to live within a specified geographic area as a condition of employment or promotion in an agency, with the only exception being that the individual must live within the state.

BENEFITS OF RESIDENTIAL REQUIREMENTS

Proponents of residential requirements have indicated many beneficial results or aspects of residential requirements. One rationale for the establishment of residential requirements was to protect the "public coffer." The "public coffer" rationale takes the stance that municipal workers who live within a jurisdiction's boundary will enhance its revenues through both the taxes they pay and their participation in the local economy through spending [24]. This may be a strong rationale, as public salaries command between two-thirds and three-quarters of the municipal budget [6].

Similar to the "public coffer" concept, other individuals have supported residency requirements on the basis of increased employment opportunities for citizens of the municipality. According to Eisinger [6], as the large concentrations of unemployed and underemployed are found in the inner cities, a residential requirement may inadvertently produce employment opportunities for the most

needy. The requirement could then serve also as a job-rationing strategy, as prospective nonresident employees are restricted from the labor market [7]. As competition for jobs will be reduced while employment levels increase, demands placed on social services may also be reduced [24].

Besides the economic factors, other advocates such as Rubin [25] have indicated that employees who live in the city have a greater stake in its quality of life. This would then lead to an increase in pride in their work, increasing employee identity with the municipality, while ultimately promoting or enhancing confidence in the local government. Because of the increased pride in their work and their geographic location to the workplace, absenteeism and tardiness may also be reduced [26].

Others have discussed residential requirements as a crime control measure. The principal argument here is that police will be more familiar with the community and neighborhood problems, subsequently improving the delivery of the police services [27]. Requirements may also have a deterrent effect on crime due to additional sources of information collected [28]. As officers live in the community they serve, the emergency response pool is enlarged, while response time to emergency situations could also be improved [21, 29].

Besides the factors related to economics, employment, and crime control, others such as Kruger [21] and Fremont [30] have indicated that requirements are necessary to achieve racial and ethnic balance. Other reasons or justifications for residential requirements appear to push their justifications to the extreme. Portland, Oregon, instituted a residential requirement to reduce the energy used by city employees in traveling to and from work [31].

OPPOSITION TO RESIDENTIAL REQUIREMENTS

There is also opposition to residency requirements. Eisinger [6] indicated residency laws are a weak policy response to the massive economic decay of American cities. Eisinger also stated that requirements are unproven, as their effects on the economy of the municipality are unsubstantiated. Dorschner [32], in his analysis of the problems experienced by the Miami Police Department, determined that residential requirements contributed to the decline of the quality and competency of the police force because the department had a very limited pool of applicants from which to select. Coupled with the effect that residential requirements have on the labor pool, Myren [33] indicated residential requirements should be eliminated to enhance the career mobility of the officers. Because of residential requirements, individuals will be less free to move from agency to agency to improve their careers in law enforcement. Residential requirements may also increase the potential for individuals not joining or quitting the municipal labor pool [24].

Residential requirements may be discriminatory in nature. Typically, residential requirements apply only to police and firefighters, while other public

employees are free to live where they wish [30]. In a response to the claim that such requirements infringe on the rights of individuals, police in various cities filed suits against municipal residential requirements on the basis that they were unreasonable and violated state and federal equal protection laws [34]. These challenges, however, have not been successful as the courts have sided with the municipalities taking the position that residential requirements were a necessary municipal policy.

Another interesting concept for the abolishment of residential requirements is that the officer's quality of life may be affected by residential requirements. Officers and their families may fear for their safety, as large cities may be hazardous places to live. They may also have to live in expensive or substandard housing that will not appreciate; services provided to the residents could be substandard or deficient; and their children may have to attend lower-quality schools [29].

Other opponents have indicated that changes in technology and city governance no longer necessitate the residential requirement. Modern transportation, communication systems, and mutual aid agreements between municipalities render residential requirements obsolete [35].

RESEARCH IN RESIDENTIAL REQUIREMENTS

Limited research has been conducted toward the impact of residential requirements on police officers. Two studies were conducted by Hirsch and Rufolo [24, 36] to investigate the economic effects of residential requirements in terms of labor supply and demand. In their 1985 study of seventy-two municipalities, the authors found residential requirements increased the supply and demand of labor rather than decreasing it. This is the opposite of what had been expected, as a residency rule had been anticipated to reduce the number of individuals in the labor pool. It was also found that the bargaining power of the two parties was altered. Since wage setting was not conducted under pure economic conditions, wages could be lower while employees' bargaining power could be further reduced, as employees would be reluctant to strike against their own city where family and friends could be affected. The authors also indicated that, as workers may be less qualified, they may be less adept at bargaining, which could eventually affect their compensation levels [24].

In their 1986 study, Hirsch and Rufolo examined the effect of residency laws and unionization on the compensation levels of firefighters. Consistent with their 1985 study, it was found residential requirements did not restrict the supply of labor. Requirements, however, were found to alter bargaining relationships by reducing the union's effectiveness which was measured through reduced compensation levels in jurisdictions that had residency requirements [36].

In addition to the studies by the Hirsch and Rufolo, Mehay and Seiden [27] found, in the case of police and firefighters, the gain in productivity appears to be lost when one considers that public employee groups tend to be high demanders who have a greater tendency to support expenditure increases. Compounded by the restrictions imposed on the mobility of the employee, Mehay and Seiden concluded that the social cost of such a requirement exceeds the social benefits, as residency requirements tend to exert a disproportionate impact on local budgetary decisions.

Other research concentrated specifically on law enforcement. In an early study by the Ohio Department of Economic and Community Development in 1976, it was found that 71 percent of the 241 reporting jurisdictions required their officers to meet a residency requirement [37]. Another national study of approximately 1000 cities reported 51.7 percent had residency requirements, requiring sworn personnel to live within the city limits. This was a reported increase of 12 percent from 1982 [38]. Another study was conducted by the California Commission of Peace Officer Standards and Training [39]. The commission concluded that by the year 2000, police agencies may have difficulty in the use of employee callbacks for unscheduled events and emergency situations because of the growing opposition to residency requirements. A 1994 report published by the American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California [1] also found only 17 percent of the Los Angeles Police Department officers (and very few of the high-ranking command officers) lived in the city.

Only one study investigated the relationship between residency and officers' attitudes toward the community. Examining 712 officers in twenty-nine municipalities, Smith [40] found "resident" officers are slightly more likely to agree that citizens in the community cooperate with the police. Meanwhile, officers who lived outside the jurisdiction were slightly more critical of political influences on their departments. Although none of the agencies in the study had mandatory residency, Smith determined residential requirements could produce a higher clearance rate for crimes because of the officers' greater understanding of the community.

DATA AND METHODS

The review of literature indicates a deficiency in understanding residential requirements as a viable municipal policy and its impact on the collective bargaining process. This deficiency is apparent in the lack of research directed toward those individuals affected by the policy in terms of officers' attitudes toward residential requirements. No current information on the frequency of the use of residential requirements exists in the state of Michigan. It is the purpose of this exploratory research to fill this void by gaining a preliminary understanding of the extent of residential requirements and officers' attitudes toward such requirements.

Questionnaire Construction and Survey Population

The investigation of residential requirements began with personal interviews with labor union representatives, police administrators, police officers, and labor arbitrators. Arbitration cases from the state of Michigan were also examined to gain additional information on issues related to residential requirements that were raised during arbitration proceedings by the municipality and police officers.

On the basis of the interviews and the review of arbitration cases, a preliminary questionnaire was constructed consisting of forty-eight statements. This questionnaire was pretested in 1993 in a small police department in northern Michigan. Comments and additional interviews resulted in a modification of the existing questionnaire to seventy-one statements. The format of the final questionnaire was close-ended and focused primarily on ordinal-level data in a Likert-style format. Nominal-level, open-ended questions regarding the respondents' demographics were also included. The questionnaire was also divided into categories or sections related to labor relations/union aspects, issues related to the delivery of police services, and personal issues.

The agency selected for this research was randomly selected from the *Directory of Law Enforcement Agencies in Michigan* [41]. The first agency identified as having a residential requirement cooperated in the research. This agency (name is confidential) is located south of a major metropolitan center in the state of Michigan. It has a population less than 25,000, a median income of \$41,000, and the majority of the citizens are white, with fewer than 500 minority citizens. FBI Uniform Crime Report data for 1993 [42] indicated this jurisdiction had less than 500 Type I and less than 900 Type II reported crimes. As of September 1994, the department had forty-nine sworn employees.

Confidential and anonymous questionnaires along with a letter of introduction and a self-addressed stamped envelope were distributed to all sworn personnel in the agency. Officers had the option of mailing the survey to the research staff or returning the completed survey to the agency's union steward, who then mailed the surveys. Two distributions of the survey were conducted, resulting in twenty-nine complete and usable surveys being returned. This resulted in a 59.2 percent response rate.

Phone Survey

To determine the prevalence of residential requirements in Michigan, a systematic sample of all police departments in the state of Michigan was obtained from the *Directory of Law Enforcement Agencies in Michigan* [41]. This directory was controlled for by selecting only municipal police agencies, excluding county sheriff's departments, campus and park police, agencies served by sheriff's departments, and state and federal agencies located in the state. From this sample, 458 police agencies were selected. Every tenth agency was selected for the phone survey portion of the study. If the selected agency would not participate or could

not be contacted, the following department on the list was contacted. This provided a sample of forty-eight agencies for this research. Additional qualitative information was also collected during the phone survey and was subsequently included in the research findings.

FINDINGS

Perceptions of Residential Requirements

Cooperation with the dissemination of the questionnaire provided insight into the degree of controversy that residential requirements generate in some agencies. Although the first agency contacted agreed to participate in the study, additional agencies showed varying levels of resistance. One chief indicated he would not cooperate in the research as the agency had just completed arbitration proceedings where residential requirements were in the forefront of the labor dispute. Because of the sentiment that was associated with the residency issue, this individual did not want to reopen the debate or provide the police union with documentable proof of the officers' attitudes toward the requirement, as this could compromise the agency's position in future contract negotiations.

Another police administrator of a large metropolitan police agency declined to participate in the survey, stating that residential requirements have been an emotional issue since the 1960s. It was also indicated that documented attitudes toward residential requirements could possibly impair management's bargaining position in upcoming contract negotiations. Another police administrator who originally approved the distribution of the survey later retracted the offer after consulting with the city labor representative. Again, it was stated that residential requirements were too controversial an issue and the results from the survey could impair future contract negotiations. One police administrator flatly refused to even meet and discuss the possibility of the survey as it was too controversial an issue in the department.

Police administrators of smaller agencies were more cooperative. One chief of police indicated that no meaningful results would be found, as residential requirements were perceived not to be a controversial issue. This was attributed to the fact that the city was a pleasant place to live, with suitable housing, good public services, schools, parks, and a low crime rate. Interviews with another agency revealed similar attitudes, where it was stated that officers could afford to live in the city. Although there were some high crime areas in this municipality, there was sufficient housing and the quality of life of the community was satisfactory to the degree that the residential requirement was not a large concern of the officers. Of interest with these two agencies was that neither administrator could explain the origin of the residential requirements or provide a rationale for their existence.

Interviews with line officers also provided insight into residential requirements. Some officers failed to realize they had residential requirements and simply assumed it was normal to live in the municipality. Some, however, indicated concern or discontentment with the requirement. Generally, these concerns were related to quality-of-life issues, as one officer indicated he was preparing for retirement and wanted to build a retirement home outside the community. Other officers indicated that, because of residential requirements, their spouses had to travel longer distances to their occupations outside the municipality's boundary.

Concern over the citizens of the community knowing where officers lived was verified as important, since it was indicated this could lead to potential problems (i.e., harassment and neighbors calling for assistance) for themselves and their family. Besides concern over privacy, other officers indicated cost of living was a factor, since living in the jurisdiction was more costly than living in surrounding areas. To illustrate this concern, one officer during the phone survey stated: "Let me pose the question to you—the average income of our city is \$85,000. . . . Now, does our agency have a residential requirement?"

Some general findings can be interpreted with these observations. First, residential requirements appear to be more controversial in large cities. This is supported or substantiated by the reluctance or resistance of police administrators to allow research because arbitration was an issue in arbitration proceedings for some of these agencies. Administrators also perceived varying degrees of resistance to residential requirements by officers. There appears, however, to be less resistance to requirements in smaller municipalities. This was based on the administrators' view toward requirements and on the officers' perceptions of quality-of-life issues, including safety, privacy, and concern for the well-being of their families.

The Frequency of Residency Requirements

Along with the qualitative information collected from interviews, the frequency of residential requirements in the state of Michigan was determined. The prevalence of residential requirements is reported in Table 1. From the phone survey, 54.2 percent reported the existence of a residential requirement. Requirements varied from those who were required to live within the defined boundary of the municipality (30.8%) to relaxed residential requirements where officers were required to live within a prescribed distance in miles from the municipality (65.4%). A high degree of variance in mileage requirements was also reported, as requirements varied from two to thirty-five miles. Only one agency reported a residential requirement that allowed officers to live within the county (3.8%) where the agency was located. Of these departments, the majority indicated requirements are strictly enforced (69%), while 31 percent of the responding agencies indicated that residential requirements were a concern for the agency's officers. No pattern was found as to the size of the agency that reported

Table 1. Michigan Residential Requirements

	Yes	No		
Existence of a Resident Requirement	26 (54.2%)	22 (45.8%)		
Size of Agency				
0-10 officers (35.4)	8	9		
11-25 officers (27.1)	7	6		
26 or more officers (37.5)	11	7		
Type of Requirement	Municipality	County	Mileage	
	8 (30.8)	1 (3.8)	17 (65.4)	
Length of Residential Requirement by Agency Size ($n = 26$)	Size of Agency			
Number of Years	Percent	0-10 Officers	11-25 Officers	26 or More
0-10 years	(30.7)	4		4
11-20 years	(26.9)	3		4
21-30 years	(11.5)	1	1	1
31-40 years	(00.0)			
41-50 years	(3.8)		1	
51-60 years	(23.1)		4	2
61-70 years	(00.0)			
Over 80 years	(23.1)		1	

residential requirements. Eight small (0-10 officers) agencies (35.4%), seven medium (11-25 officers) agencies (27.1%), and eleven (over 25 officers) large agencies (37.5%) had requirements.

Requirements for new hires' compliance to the requirement were also examined. The most common requirement was twelve months to comply. However, it could be as short as three or six months. Two departments also indicated they were flexible for new hires. This period of twelve months could be indicative of pattern bargaining across jurisdictions by police unions or simply a norm established by jurisdictions. The phone survey also supported the literature that indicated a revival of the residential requirements in the 1970s (see, for instance, [6]). Fifteen agencies reported they have had requirements for less than twenty years, while seven agencies have had requirements for more than fifty years, suggesting residential requirements may be based on tradition in those agencies.

Tables 2 through 6 report officers' attitudes toward residential requirements from the survey research. Responses from the Likert-scale questions were

Table 2. Labor Issues
(N = 29)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Because of residential requirements, the union receives better wages as a tradeoff.***	41.4%	41.4%	3.4%	13.8%	0.0%
	(82.8%)			(13.8%)	
Because of residential requirements, the union receives better fringe benefits as a tradeoff.***	41.4%	34.5%	10.3%	13.8%	0.0%
	(75.9%)			(13.8%)	
Unions are weaker in cities that have residential requirements.*	13.8%	51.7%	13.8%	10.3%	10.3%
	(65.5%)			(20.6%)	
A residential requirement should be a condition of employment.***	58.6%	31.0%	0.0%	10.3%	0.0%
	(89.6%)			(10.3%)	

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ Table 3. Delivery/Quality of Police Services
(N = 29)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
The effectiveness of the police department will be diminished if the residential requirement is eliminated.***	48.3%	44.8%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%
	(93.1%)			(6.9%)	
The elimination of the residential requirement will impede the department's response to mobilize officers in emergencies.***	34.5%	44.8%	3.4%	17.2%	0.0%
	(79.3%)			(17.2%)	
The elimination of the residential requirement will attract better-qualified applicants.	13.8%	37.9%	10.3%	13.8%	24.1%
	(51.7%)			(37.9%)	

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 4. Quality of Life Issues
(N = 29)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
Since I live in the city, I have a better feel for the problems experienced by the community.	24.1%	27.6%	3.4%	41.4%	3.4%
	(51.7%)			(44.8%)	
Residents of the community feel more secure when police officers live in the community.	3.4%	31.0%	17.2%	41.4%	6.9%
	(35.4%)			(48.3%)	
The residential requirement is a traditional job requirement that brings loyalty to one's department and community.***	34.5%	48.3%	3.4%	13.8%	0.0%
	(82.8)			(13.8%)	
The residential requirement leads to the stabilization of neighborhoods where police officers live.**	20.7%	48.3%	3.4%	27.6%	0.0%
	(69.0%)			(27.6%)	
Concern for the community necessitates a residential requirement.***	34.5%	55.2%	0.0%	6.9%	3.4%
	(89.7%)			(10.3%)	
Because of residential requirements, I have a greater personal stake in the community.	20.7%	34.5%	0.0%	44.8%	0.0%
	(55.2%)			(44.8%)	

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

collapsed and dichotomized into disagreement/agreement categories for statistical analysis. Chi-square tests of significance were then performed on the responses to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences in attitudes toward statements related to labor issues, the delivery and quality of police services, quality of life, personal, and economic issues.

Labor Issues

As indicated by Kruger [21], the residential requirement may be used as a trade-off for better wages and/or fringe benefits. As illustrated in Table 2, however, the majority of officers (82.8% combined) indicated the residential requirement did not result in an increase in wages or fringe benefits (75.9% combined). Although significant, respondents provided mixed opinions of their perceptions that their union was weaker because of the residential requirement. Officers also

Table 5. Personal Issues
(N = 29)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
I support residential requirements.***	17.2%	82.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	(100.0%)			(00.0%)	
My personal rights are infringed upon because of residential requirements.***	3.4%	10.3%	6.9%	24.1%	55.2%
	(13.7%)			(79.3%)	
It is a fundamental right to have a choice of where to live.***	0.0%	10.3%	3.4%	27.6%	58.6%
	(10.3%)			(86.2%)	
The residential requirement is one way to control an officer's off-duty behavior.	24.1%	34.5%	6.9%	13.8%	20.7%
	(58.6%)			(34.5%)	
Relaxation of the residential requirement would create a mass migration of officers from the city.***	20.7%	69.0%	0.0%	10.3%	0.0%
	(89.7%)			(10.3%)	
As a paramilitary force, police officers require greater regulation than other city employees.	17.2%	31.0%	3.4%	48.3%	0.0%
	(48.2%)			(48.3%)	
Residential requirements heighten marital tensions.*	13.8%	34.5%	27.6%	10.3%	13.8%
	(48.3%)			(24.1%)	
Spouses'/significant others' attitude toward residential requirements.***	41.4%	37.9%	6.9%	3.4%	10.3%
	(79.3%)			(13.7%)	

Explanations for the Residential Requirement:	High Importance	Medium Importance	Low Importance
Tradition	10	0	0
Minority Representation	15	9	5
Financial Reasons	2	4	11
Increased Police Response Time	6	7	5
Community Attachment	5	6	8
Control of Off-Duty Behaviors	10	7	3

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 6. Economic Issues
(N = 29)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
The majority of my income is spent within the city limits.	24.1%	34.5%	6.9%	31.0%	3.4%
	(58.6%)			(35.4%)	
I would be more inclined to support higher taxes and expenditure increases than the average citizen.***	24.1%	69.0%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%
	(93.1%)			(00.0%)	
The residential requirement enhances the local economy because I spend the majority of my income within the city limits.*	17.2%	51.7%	6.9%	24.1%	0.0%
	(68.9%)			(24.1%)	

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

disagreed (89.6% combined) that the residential requirement should be a condition of employment.

Quality of Police Services

Table 3 examines those issues related to the quality of the delivery of police services. One issue raised by municipalities in arbitration cases is that police services would be adversely affected if residential requirements were eliminated. In terms of effectiveness of the police agency, a significant difference was found, as the majority of respondents disagreed (93.1% combined) that the effectiveness of the department would be diminished with the elimination of the requirement. This could be attributed to the officers' positive attitudes toward law enforcement, the perceived quality of the department, and the fact the agency has mutual aid pacts with the surrounding municipalities.

Other responses related to the quality of police services had mixed findings. The majority of the officers indicated disagreement that the elimination of a residential requirement would impede the mobilization of the department (79.3% combined). Responses were mixed, as 51.7 percent (combined) indicated disagreement that requirements would not impede the quality of applicants or police candidates, while 37.9 percent (combined agreement levels) indicated better qualified applicants could be recruited if there was not a residential requirement.

Quality of Life Issues

The perceived effects of residential requirements on the municipality are reported in Table 4. Proponents of the residential requirement have claimed the quality of life for the citizens of the community would improve with the institution of a residential requirement, as officers would have a greater comprehension of the needs of the community. Of interest in Table 4 is that the only statistically significant finding was that officers indicated disagreement that a residential requirement does not increase their concern for the community.

Further analysis of Table 4 indicates some positive aspects of having officers live in the community they serve. Although there were no statistically significant findings related to officers having a better feel for problems in the community, residents feeling safer with officers living in the community, and the stabilizing effect a police officer could have when living in the community, responses were mixed. When analyzed with the finding that 44.8 percent (combined) of the officers indicated they have a greater personal stake in the community because of the requirement, the secondary or tertiary positive effects of requirements discussed by Smith [40] may have some merit for municipalities having residential requirements. These perceptions, however, may be a proxy value or measure for the officers delivering more effective law enforcement services.

Personal Issues

As residential requirements may have their greatest impact on the individuals themselves, Table 5 examines the officers' personal attitudes toward requirements. Respondents unanimously showed levels of disagreement or nonsupport toward the residential requirement. Respondents also indicated their spouses/significant others were opposed to requirements (79.3% combined) and that the requirement leads to increased marital tensions.

Related to opposition of the residency requirement, the majority of respondents indicated it was a fundamental right to have a choice of where to live (86.2% combined), while 79.3 percent (combined) indicated their personal rights were infringed because of the requirement. Yet, the majority of respondents also indicated that if the requirements were eliminated, a mass migration of officers leaving the city would not occur, suggesting the majority of respondents were satisfied with their current quality of life. Respondents also indicated mixed responses toward the notion that the residential requirement is a means to control off-duty behaviors. Responses were also mixed to the statement that police officers needed greater forms of regulation than other municipal employees.

Officers were also asked to rank order, from one (most important) to six (least important) the reasons their municipality had residential requirements. These responses or priorities were later collapsed into categories of high importance (those ranked first or second), moderate importance (those ranked third or fourth), and low importance (those ranked fifth or sixth). Minority representation was

considered to be the major reason for the residential requirement, followed by controlling off-duty behavior and tradition equally ranked as the second and third reasons for the residential requirement. Officers were also given the opportunity to provide their own explanations for residential requirements that were not included on the list. Two officers ranked political factors as their first reason or explanation for the requirements.

Economic Issues

One reason why municipalities may have residential requirements is to preserve the public coffer (see, for instance, [24]). That is, officers will return a significant amount of their income back into the community, enhancing the economic health of the community. Findings related to this economic position are not supported through this research. Table 6 reports that 58.6 percent (combined) of the officers disagreed that the majority of their income is spent within the municipality. Officers also indicated disagreement (68.9% combined) with the statement that they spend the majority of their income within the municipality's limits. In terms of whether public employees are more demanding for services and increases in public expenditures, the findings did not support this statement, as 93.1 percent (combined) disagreed that they would support such activities. This finding appears to be valid since support for increased expenditures would mean an increase in taxes and lost income for the officer.

CONCLUSION

Contemporary debates over the appropriateness and/or feasibility of police residential requirements involve a great deal of controversy. Those on both sides of the debate present compelling rationales concerning this public policy and collective bargaining issue. As a consequence, this requirement or policy may lead to emotionally charged positions at the bargaining table, a poor labor-management relationship, and reduced quality in the delivery of agency services.

A careful review of the literature suggests much irony in this area. Police reform movements over time have viewed both the expansion and the elimination of residential requirements as primary goals. These residential requirements are not based entirely on tradition. Many agencies have implemented requirements over the last twenty years, suggesting that residency requirements are a contemporary municipal policy. This exploratory research also indicated that there is a myriad of operational and personal issues that need to be examined and understood in the context of residential requirements.

The current research has systematically categorized the major areas of contention between the opponents (mainly law enforcement personnel and their unions) and the proponents (primarily local governments) of police residential

requirements. The major factors or issues concern quality of police services, quality of life issues for both the community and the public employee, economic incentives, and other personal factors. By examining these factors, law enforcement administrators, municipal policy makers, and labor organizations can establish a more sound rationale for such requirements.

Regarding the quality of police services and the question of whether physical proximity equates to increased responsiveness, some evidence suggests that the technological changes in transportation and communication have decreased the need for law enforcement personnel to be restricted to a certain geographical area. Additionally, the evolution of mutual aid pacts between local governments has, in many cases, supplied a readily available supply of law enforcement. While officers may conclude that proximity does not impede the delivery of police services, citizens may believe otherwise. The question must then be addressed, "Do citizens generally feel better served in communities where their neighbors are law enforcement personnel?"

The quality of life issues for those officers and their significant others affected by requirements may indicate an unsafe or perceived intolerable living environment. This problem may be especially pronounced when officers feel they must live in areas they perceive as unsafe or unhealthy for their families. As discovered by this research, police personnel in smaller jurisdictions tend to view residential requirements in a much less disruptive manner. Yet, the requirement has an impact on their personal lives in terms of safety and privacy.

Economic rationales consider the loss of potential revenue when public employees live outside the municipality. The contention is that local governments are better served by the increased revenue in terms of spending and local municipal taxes. This observation may appear to have some external validity, but as substantiated by this research, it is not validated. Although the public-coffer rationale may be sound in some jurisdictions, this may not be the case with all police officers, serving as a poor rationale for a residential requirement in smaller jurisdictions that are economically stable or strong.

This exploratory research has opened up new areas of analysis to expand on the findings from this research, while improving the industrial relations environment. Quality of life, for instance, is not only important for police officers, but is also a concern for the community, since quality of services may best be decided and determined by the recipients of the service. Without including the actual beneficiaries of police services, a primary factor is excluded from the policy equation. Community surveys concerning attitudes toward the police may supply a rich source of data to answer questions regarding quality-of-service issues. Citizens may hold the perception that it is the public duty for essential-service employees to be residents of the community, based on philosophical or crime-control explanations. Research of this nature may also provide information on whether levels of perceived safety are enhanced in neighborhoods where law enforcement personnel live.

The findings also suggest some tentative conclusions. First, the findings of this research have illustrated that regardless of agency size, residency requirements are not an uncommon policy for police agencies in Michigan. The preliminary findings also refuted some of the conclusions determined by earlier research efforts, suggesting that some variables or factors related to residential requirements are site-specific. These may include economics, police-community relations, and the overall quality of life of the municipality. Municipal officials and police administrators should consider and examine the long- and short-term ramifications that policies of this nature would have on agency performance and on the quality of life of personnel and community residents.

By developing a sound rationale for the requirement, based on research and not emotionally charged positions, municipalities can illustrate the need for the residential requirements to officers. Through such policy analysis, administrators can triangulate the attitudes and concerns of all parties involved, using more information to determine their policy. Through the establishment of a demonstrated need for such policy, the negative attitudes, emotions, and levels of confusion engendered by such requirements could be mitigated possibly eliminating some of the controversies the policy arouses.

As residential requirements can be mandatory subjects of collective bargaining because they affect conditions and terms of employment, labor organizations should also be consulted or included in the evaluation process. Joint labor-management committees could examine the impact of the requirement on officers, significant others, and the community. This dialogue could also serve to illustrate some of the tradeoffs that occur when residential requirements are part of the actual contract negotiations, as some personal issues related to residency would be mitigated in exchange for better wages or benefits in lieu of the residential requirement being lifted.

In aggregate, the social and personal concerns of those affected by residential requirements surround issues of choice, safety, and independence. Quality of life, quality of police services, and economic rationales may deal, at least on some level, with the welfare of the entire community. To the extent that citizens feel safer in communities where officers live and where these communities are healthier socially and economically, residential requirements may be compelling enough to override other social and personal issues brought forth in the collective bargaining experience. Conversely, if the evidence suggests the opposite, the impositions of these requirements appear unconscionable. One rationale in itself can never be the panacea. The restrictive nature of the proposed policy must always be weighed against alternatives.

* * *

Brian R. Johnson is an Instructor with the School of Criminal Justice at Grand Valley State University, Allendale, Michigan. Johnson's interests lie in police management, labor relations, and human resource administration. He is currently

completing his Ph.D. in Criminal Justice at Michigan State University.

Dr. Greg L. Warchol is an Assistant Professor with the Department of Criminal Justice at Bemidji State University, Bemidji, Minnesota. His research interests are in police organizational development and human resource management.

Vic W. Bumphus is an Assistant Professor with the Department of Police Studies at Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, Kentucky. His research interests include police administration and process. He has published articles on police external review, police deviance, civilian attitudes toward the police, and privatization issues in criminal justice.

REFERENCES

1. *From the Inside In: Residency Patterns Within the Los Angeles Police Department*, American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California, 1994.
2. C. Black, 6 Mayoral Candidates Promise to Tighten Residency Rules, *Boston Globe*, p. 37, June 17, 1993.
3. Where New York's Finest Should Live, *The New York Times*, Sec. A, p. 18, col. 1, May 27, 1991.
4. J. Kass, City To Fire 24 Workers over Residency Laws, *Chicago Tribune*, Sec. 2c, p. 2, August 12, 1992.
5. J. Shnay, Joliet Cops Seek New Residency Rule, *Chicago Tribune*, p. 6, September 20, 1993.
6. P. K. Eisinger, Municipal Residency and the Local Economy, *Social Science Quarterly*, 64:1, pp. 85-96, March 1983.
7. R. A. Gonzalez, S. L. Mehay, and K. Duffy-Deno, Municipal Residency Laws: Effects on Police Employment, Compensation, and Productivity, *Journal of Labor Research*, 12:4, pp. 440-452, Fall 1991.
8. C. M. Hager, Residency Requirements for City Employees: Important Incentives in Today's Urban Crisis, *Urban Law Annual*, 18:197, pp. 197-222, 1980.
9. R. S. Rubin, The Battle over Residency Requirements: New Approaches by Public Employees, *Employee Relations Law Journal*, 4, pp. 257-267, 1979.
10. N. B. Shurtleff, *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England*, The Press of William White, Boston, Massachusetts, 1852.
11. R. L. Lane, *Policing the City: Boston*, Cambridge Press, Boston, Massachusetts, 1967.
12. W. Anderson, *American City Government*, Henry Holt, New York, 1925.
13. S. Bernstein, *The Iron Fist and the Velvet Glove*, Center for Research on Criminal Justice, Berkeley, California, 1977.
14. R. B. Fosdick, *American Police System*, Century Company, New York, 1920.
15. Wickersham Commission Reports, *Report on Police (Vol. 14)*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1931.
16. D. R. Johnson, *Policing the Urban Underworld*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1979.
17. E. C. Banfield, *The Unheavenly City Revisited*, Little, Brown and Company, Boston, Massachusetts, 1974.

18. R. M. Fogelson, *Big-City Police: An Urban Institute Study*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1977.
19. J. H. Skolnick and D. H. Bayley, *The New Blue Line: Police Innovation in Six American Cities*, The Free Press, New York, 1986.
20. *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*, The New York Times Company, New York, 1968.
21. D. L. Kruger, *Compilation of Lecture Notes from Collective Bargaining in the Public Sector*, unpublished raw data, East Lansing, Michigan, 1992.
22. J. Podgers, City Employees' Residency Rules: The Fight Goes On, *ABA Journal*, 66, p. 1354, November 1980.
23. *Michigan Senate Bill No. 271*, Lansing, Michigan, April 17, 1991.
24. W. Z. Hirsch and A. M. Rufolo, Economic Effects of Residence Laws on Municipal Police, *Journal of Urban Economics*, 17, pp. 335-348, 1985.
25. R. S. Rubin, The Battle over Residency Requirements: New Approaches by Public Employees, *Employee Relations Law Journal*, 4, pp. 257-267, 1979.
26. S. Hayford and W. Durkee, Residency Requirements in Local Government Employment: The Impact of the Public Employers' Duty to Bargain, *Labor Law Journal*, 29, pp. 343-351, June 1978.
27. S. L. Mehay and K. P. Seiden, Municipal Residency Laws and Local Public Budgets, *Public Choice*, 48, pp. 27-35, 1986.
28. C. R. Swanson, L. Territo, and R. W. Taylor, *Police Administration: Structures, Processes, and Behavior* (3rd Edition), Macmillan, New York, 1993.
29. J. Brown, *Interview with Jack Brown: President of the State Lodge, Fraternal Order of Police*, Detroit, Michigan, 1992.
30. J. Fremont, *Interview with Joel Fremont of the Michigan Municipal League: Ann Arbor, Michigan*, unpublished raw data, February 25, 1992.
31. *City of Portland, Oregon Ordinance No. 14852*, Portland, Oregon, City of Portland, Oregon, August 15, 1979.
32. J. Dorschner, *Dark Side of the Force*, in *Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings*, R. G. Dunham and G. P. Alpert (eds.), pp. 250-270, Waveland Press, Prospect Heights, Illinois, 1989.
33. R. A. Myren, *The Role of the Police*, U.S. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Washington, D.C., 1967.
34. M. F. Barnes, Municipal Police Residency Restriction—Remnant of Feudalism or Sound Public Policy? *St. Louis University Law Journal*, 18:2, pp. 214-234, Winter 1973.
35. Cities Adopt Resolutions Favoring Residency, *Michigan Public Safety Reporter*, Coalition to Improve Public Safety, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Winter 1992.
36. W. Z. Hirsch and A.M. Rufolo, Residence Laws and Unionization in Municipal Labor Markets: The Case of Firefighters, *Journal of Labor Research*, 7:1, pp. 42-58, Winter 1986.
37. J. A. Conser and R. D. Thompson, *Police Selection Standards and Processes in Ohio—An Assessment*, Ohio Department of Economic and Community Development, Columbus, Ohio, 1976.
38. Baseline Data Report: *Fire Personnel Practices*, ICMA, 1986.

39. D. L. Frandsen, *Staffing Employee Callbacks by the Year 2000*, California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, Sacramento, California, 1991.
40. D. C. Smith, Police Attitudes and Performance, *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 15:3, pp. 317-334, March 1980.
41. *Directory of Law Enforcement Agencies in Michigan, 1993-1994 Edition*, Ameritech Michigan, Redford, Michigan, 1994.
42. Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States, 1993*, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., 1994.

Direct reprint requests to:

Brian R. Johnson
Grand Valley State University
1 Campus Drive
Allendale, MI 49401-9403