Contents

Professional Issues in Criminal Justice

Volume 3 Number 1 February 2008

Reviewers

Jose F. Anderson
    The University of Baltimore

Katherine Jean Bennett
    Armstrong Atlantic State University

Anita Neuberger Blowers
    University of North Carolina at
    Charlotte

Stephen A. Cernkovich
    Bowling Green State University

Mitchell Bart Chamlin
    University of Cincinnati

Adrian Derral Cheatwood
    The Ohio State University

John K. Cochran
    University of South Florida

Gordon Arthur Crews
    Washburn University

Walter S. DeKeseredy
    University of Ontario, Institute of
    Technology

Mary Dodge
    University of Colorado at Denver

William G. Doerner
    Florida State University

William Evans
    University of Nevada, Reno

David James Farabee
    University of California, Los Angeles

Randy R. Gainey
    Old Dominion University

Jill A. Gordon
    Virginia Commonwealth University

Michael K. Hooper
    California Commission on Peace
    Officer Standards & Training

Sung Joon Jang
    Louisiana State University

Paul Jesilow
    University of California, Irvine

Wesley W. Johnson
    University of Southern Mississippi

Paula M. Kautt
    University of Cambridge

William R. King
    Bowling Green State University

Jodi Lane
    University of Florida

Edward J. Latessa
    University of Cincinnati

Alan J. Lizotte
    The University at Albany

Daniel Mabrey
    Sam Houston State University

Cheryl Lee Maxson
    University of California, Irvine

David C. May
    Eastern Kentucky University

J. Mitchell Miller
    University of Texas at San Antonio

Kevin I. Minor
    Eastern Kentucky University

Scott M. Mire
    University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Godpower O. Okereke
    Texas A&M University-Texarkana

John L. Padgett
    Capella University

Susan E. Pease
    Central Connecticut State University

Mary E. Pelz
    University of Houston-Downtown

Jeffrey Ian Ross
    University of Baltimore

Reviewers

Eric L. Sevigny
University of Pittsburgh

Frank Shanty
The Cobra Institute

Kathleen Marie Littwin Simon
Appalachian State University

Barbara A. Sims
Penn State Harrisburg

Risdon Nichols Slate
Florida Southern College

Stephen G. Tibbetts
California State University, San
Bernardino

Sam Torres
California State University,
Long Beach

John E. Wade
Southeast Missouri State University

Lorenn Walker
University of Hawaii
School of Business

Julia F. Weber
Judicial Council of California

John L. Worrall
California State University, San
Bernardino

Jane A. Younglove
California State University, Stanislaus

Marvin Zalman
Wayne State University

Editor's Notes

PICJ, which started in 2005, has evolved from a newly established journal in criminal justice to an established peer-reviewed journal in the field. There are both good and bad points to becoming an established journal in a professional area. The most notable example is that the journal now receives more high quality, relevant articles than it can publish. The high quality of submissions allows the journal to be very selective in the articles published, but at the same time it means that not all publishable articles we receive appear in the journal.

The editor forwards submitted articles to external peer reviewers. *PICJ* has a distinguished panel of criminal justice professors from universities across the nation who have volunteered to be on the panel. The reviews are "blind." By "blind" we mean that the reviewers have no knowledge of the names or affiliations of the authors. Upon receiving an article back from the reviewer, the editor makes one of the following decisions: (1) to accept and publish, (2) to return the manuscript with a request that the author revise and resubmit the article, or (3) to decline to publish it. When an author resubmits an article after revising it, the review process begins anew. Prospective authors, if you have a manuscript or are in the process of developing one, please consider submitting it to *PICJ*.

Starting with this issue, several changes are underway, including the fact that the journal will be available online without charge to professionals, researchers, and students. If you are doing research on a particular issue or problem, you are invited to log on to the *PICJ* Web site at www.picj.org and review articles in present and past issues of PICJ. Free online access to *PICJ* ensures that the published articles will have a wider range of distribution and readership. Another change is that the journal will publish reviews of selected publications. Guidelines for preparing these reviews will appear in the next issue.

In the past, authors had to submit one copy of their article by email and mail a second, hard copy to the offices in Chicago. The new procedures require that authors send only a single copy: a Word document attached to an email to the editor. Another change that will be apparent when you visit the *PICJ* Web site is that the site is undergoing an upgrade, and the end results will be a more attractive Web site and one that is easier to use.

One of our forthcoming issues will be a special issue devoted to school violence. If you have research on this critical issue, please consider sharing it with us. You may submit comments, proposed articles, and other communications to the Editor-in-Chief at croberson@kaplan.edu .

Cliff Roberson, LLM, PhD
Editor-in-Chief, *PICJ*

Foreword

In the lead article, "The Citizens' View of Bias-Based Policing," Ralph Ioimo, Leslie A. Meadows, J. Bret Becton, Rachel S. Tears, and Michael T. Charles discuss their research on bias-based policing. The authors examined the issue by surveying citizens to determine their perception of bias-based policing practices occurring in Virginia police departments. They found that 21% of citizen respondents in Virginia believe that officers in the local police departments practice bias-based policing, and 25.9% believe that officers in other Virginia police departments practice bias-based policing. The authors conclude that the questionnaire provided insight into citizens' perception of how police departments in the Commonwealth of Virginia interact with the public. Their survey found that the majority of respondents believe police respond in a reasonable amount of time when summoned, 70% of respondents trust the police, and 90% are satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their local police departments. The authors conclude that the results indicate that the Commonwealth of Virginia police are keeping their citizens satisfied, in a broad sense, while building a rapport with the community. The authors note that all respondents reported that the officers were courteous when the citizens walked in to the department or stopped a police vehicle to make a complaint or to report a crime.

In "Community Policing: A Critical Analysis of a Small Police Department," Gregory Sumner presents a case study of community policing and operational practices of a small police department in the southeastern United States. Sumner contends that the hallmark of community policing is that the police serve the community's best interests; it is not just a buzzword to create better public relations. Sumner analyzed the mission statement, community policing policy and procedure, reports, and patrol officers' opinions of a small police department. He concludes that while the patrol officers believe they are practicing community policing, they do not fully understand its philosophy or implementation. Sumner employed a holistic case study design, based on normative sponsorship theory, and compared Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux's definition of community policing with practitioner assessments to determine whether the spirit of the department was in compliance with the definition of community policing and normative sponsorship theory. The study used three sources of data collection: asking questions, making direct observations, and examining written records. Sumner concludes that the patrol officers in the department believe they practice community policing because they have a mission statement and a policy that they make two citizen contacts a day. But they were not able to define community policing, probably, Sumner opines, because they have never

received any training in community policing, and, therefore, they cannot make an educated assessment of what community policing is and how it can benefit a community.

In the article, "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment Among Probation and Parole Officers: A Case Study," Seble Getahun, Barbara Sims, and Don Hummer examine job satisfaction and organizational commitment within community corrections agencies. Their study draws on prior research into job satisfaction of criminal system actors and looks at the explanatory power of these concepts for probation and parole officers from one county in a northeastern state. The authors conclude that employees are most satisfied when their occupational tasks are meaningful experiences into which they have input and are collaborative efforts with supervisors. They also conclude that background characteristics of officers have no influence on job satisfaction and opine that organizational culture and management style are the more important factors in explaining employee satisfaction and, possibly, retention.

Eric Lambert, in "The Effect of Job Involvement on Correctional Staff," contends that the driving force of corrections is the correctional staff. In his study, Lambert examined the effects of job involvement on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, life satisfaction, turnover intentions, family-on-work conflict, and work-on-family conflict. The results of his multivariate analysis indicated that job involvement had a statistically significant positive relationship with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and both forms of work-family conflict. He observed that job involvement had non-significant direct effects on correctional staff job stress, life satisfaction, and turnover intentions. Lambert concludes that a psychological identification with the job ultimately leads to an affective response of a person liking his or her job. He states that this relationship is probably due to the fact that greater job involvement increases the chances of the job meeting an employee's needs and desires. According to Lambert, correctional workers who are alienated from the job put forth less effort at work, ultimately leading to a smaller chance that the job will meet their emotional needs. Lambert also notes that higher job involvement leads to greater commitment with the organization and that this relationship probably occurs because the person identifies with the job and the organization that created and controls the job.

Curtis Blakely, in "Countering the 'Contagion' of Inmate Nonamenability: Prison Specialization and Recidivism," contends that the current "get-tough" approach to crime is causing penologists to consider alternative methods to prevent recidivism. He states that prison specialization is a method that is attracting considerable attention. Blakely notes that there are generally two groups of inmates—those that are amenable to therapeutic intervention and those that resist these measures. Under specialization initiatives, each prison would house either the amenable or nonamenable inmate, but not both. Blakely

notes that the intent of the separation is to protect the integrity of the treatment process by shielding amenable inmates from the corrupting influence of those inmates whose presence may impede rehabilitation. Blakely concludes that prison specialization is a necessary first step toward improving public safety. He also states that while the prison's traditional objective of promoting public safety remains intact, the manner by which it pursues that objective is open to debate and modification. According to him, practitioners and penologists must stop the indiscriminate mixing of inmates within the prison and boldly embrace innovative penal practices.

The study "Adult Probation Department Mental Health Unit: An Outcomes Investigation" by Kevin Jesse, David Bishop, Jose Thomas, and Jason Dudish-Poulsen examined the outcome of probation cases within the Cook County, Illinois, Adult Probation Department-Mental Health Unit (MHU) and followed the rates of recidivism among those cases. The study's goal was to identify specific program operation areas that needed improvement within the MHU. The study found that 39% of the cases did not re-offend in a three-year period. The authors conclude that the percentage that did not re-offend indicates a success and attribute a large part of the results to the case management style of probation officers and the state oversight of the MHU. To prevent criminal recidivism, according to the authors, the criminal justice system must make efforts to meet the needs of this special population by providing mental health treatment and related social services. The authors conclude that planned programmatic improvements can have a positive effect in supervision of the mentally ill.

Contributing Authors
Volume 3 Number 1, February 2008

David Bishop
Cook County (IL) Adult Probation Department

Curtis R. Blakely
University of South Alabama

J. Bret Becton
Winthrop University

Michael T. Charles
Auburn Montgomery Center for Government

Jason Dudish-Poulsen
Cook County (IL) Adult Probation Department

Seble Getahun
Pennsylvania State University

Don Hummer
Pennsylvania State University

Ralph E. Ioimo
Auburn University

Kevin Jesse
Cook County (IL) Adult Probation Department

Eric G. Lambert
University of Toledo

Leslie A. Meadows,
Alabama Training Institute

Barbara A. Sims
Pennsylvania State University

Gregory E. Sumner
Georgia Highlands College

Rachel S. Tears
Auburn Montgomery Center for Government

Jose Thomas
Cook County (IL) Adult Probation Department

The Citizens' Views on Biased Policing

Ralph Ioimo, Leslie A. Meadows, J. Bret Becton, Rachel S. Tears, and Michael T. Charles

Police departments all over the country address the issue of bias-based policing. Because bias-based policing undermines relationships between the police and the public, a considerable amount of research has been conducted to uncover and prevent its occurrence. Past research has focused primarily on assessing the level of bias-based policing that occurs during traffic stops; however, traffic stops are only one of the many ways police interact with the public. To broaden the assessment of bias-based policing, this research project surveyed citizens to determine their perception of bias-based policing practices in police departments, either theirs or others. The results of this research found that 21% of survey respondents believe that officers in their department practice bias-based policing, and 25.9% believe that officers in other Virginia police departments practice bias-based policing.

The issue of bias-based policing/racial profiling continues to be debated. The debate surrounds whether actions police officers take are a response to the race of the individual or the result of diligent police work. Much of the criminal justice system's assessment of the occurrence of racial profiling or bias-based policing focuses on police traffic stops. Too often police departments ignore the issue of bias-based policing or refuse to believe it is a problem until it rears its ugly head through a citizen complaint that captures the media's attention. This study reviews these issues from the perspective of both the officer and the citizens they serve. In this article, we address the citizen's view of bias-based policing.

Most people cannot define what constitutes bias-based policing (Malti-Douglas, 2002; Smith & Alpert, 2002). As we learned through citizen surveys, citizens often perceive officers as rude and confuse rudeness with racial bias. Obviously, the definition of rudeness is open to interpretation. A citizen might perceive an officer who does not engage in friendly chitchat with the citizen as rude when in fact the officer is not rude but simply sticking to business.

Defining bias-based policing practices is a difficult task primarily because there is no single accepted definition of bias-based policing. During our research, the authors were unable to identify a standard definition of racial profiling. Certainly, a police officer's open admission to stopping a Black person for no other reason than he was a Black man walking in an all-White neighborhood is a form of racial profiling. But if the situation was reversed and an officer stopped a White person walking in a Black neighborhood known to be a high drug trafficking area, is that racial profiling or good police work? Because no

universally accepted definition of biased policing or racial profiling exists, the authors created the following operational definition for use in this study: *bias-based policing includes practices of individual officers and supervisors, managerial practices, and departmental programs, both intentional and non-intentional, that incorporate judgments based on sex, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, economic status, religious beliefs, or age that are inappropriately applied*.

Until recently, research conducted on bias-based policing has focused on the review of secondary data, such as traffic citations or perceptions provided by citizens, and the source of this data was traffic stops (Lundman & Kaufman, 2003; Riksheim & Chermak, 1993; Sherman, 1980). Conclusions about the extent of racial profiling that occurs are based on this traffic stop data. Policing involves much more than traffic stops and has many other opportunities for bias to influence a police officer's judgment and actions. Newspaper columnist Vivian Martin summarizes the issue of bias-based policing quite well: "It's about a lot more than traffic stops; it's about a way of life" (1999, p. A11). The researchers involved in this project believe that attempting to determine the extent of bias-based policing or racial profiling through traffic stop data alone ignores all other areas and their potential for bias-based policing.

In assessing the citizens' view of biased-based policing, we developed a two-pronged approach: questionnaires and focus group interviews. First, we met with focus groups throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia to obtain the citizens' assessment of bias-based policing practices. From these meetings, we developed two separate questionnaires that we administered to both citizens and officers throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia. The citizens' questionnaire sought to obtain data on the citizens' experiences with police in a variety of different encounters of which a traffic violation stop was only one possible encounter.

While the entire Virginia study is extensive, this article focuses on the findings obtained when the citizens of Virginia were asked to provide their view of bias-based policing and racial profiling.

Literature Review

Past research relies primarily on citizen reports, and little research has been done that incorporates the police view (Lundman & Kaufman, 2003; Riksheim & Chermak, 1993; Sherman, 1980). Lundman and Kaufman argue that while secondary data and citizen reports are valid means of measuring the influence of race, ethnicity, and gender on traffic stops and police actions, these measures do not take into consideration other factors that might explain perceived bias-based police actions, such as the ethnic make of the neighborhood in which the stops were made. Lundman and Kaufman's recognition of the

limitations within current bias-based policing research led them to recommend a triangulated data collection process that uses police-reported data, citizen self-reports, and trained observers. Each of these data collection approaches has been used separately in the past (Lundman & Kaufman, 2003; Riksheim & Chermak, 1993; Sherman, 1980) but not triangulated as Lundman and Kaufman suggest. One important consideration missing from Lundman and Kaufman's work is that because police perform tasks other than traffic stops, bias-based policing has the potential to present itself in other areas of police work equally. As an example, bias can exist in how police treat minority citizens who become victims of crime. The question researchers must ask, therefore, is does disparity exist between how police treat minority victims of crimes and how they approach majority victims?

Researchers find traffic stops attractive for several reasons. Perhaps the most compelling reason relates to the "Driving While Black" (Harris, 1999; Rice, Reitzel & Piquero, 2004) syndrome where the driver has done nothing wrong but the police stop the vehicle simply because the driver is Black. This type of traffic stop often leads to negative encounters with minorities.

The war on drugs has resulted in many negative encounters between police officers and minority groups stemming from the false premise that minorities commit most drug offenses (Coker, 2003; Dateline NBC, 2004; for a counterview see MacDonald, 2001). Coker contends that police look for drugs primarily among Blacks and Latinos; therefore, they find a disproportionate number of these individuals with contraband (2003) then create a profile that results in more stops of minority drivers (Coker, 2003; Harris, 1999; Harris, 2002). Harris points out that Blacks constitute 13% of the country's drug users but 37% of those arrested on drug charges, 55% of those convicted, and 74% of all drug offenders sentenced to prison (1999).

The reliance on traffic stops as the sole means of measuring bias-based policing has caused state legislatures to take various forms of actions. In Texas, agencies are required to capture racial profiling data, but they are not required to report that data to anyone. The state of New Jersey has gone as far as making racial profiling by police a felony (An Act Criminalizing Deprivation of Civil Rights, 2002): the crime of official deprivation of civil rights makes it illegal for law enforcement officers to use race, religion, ethnicity, handicap, gender, age, or sexual orientation to discriminate against any individual ("New Jersey: New Law," 2003). This law, however, creates confusion because it does not specify when use of these elements is considered a legitimate part of an investigation and when it is considered a part of normal patrol functions.

Many researchers recognize that much of the research accomplished to date has major pitfalls (Fridell, Diamond, Kubu, & Lunney, 2001; Kruger, 2002). As Kruger writes,

"The simple collection of data will neither prevent so-called 'racial profiling' nor accurately document a law enforcement agency's activities as a means of protecting it from public criticism, scrutiny, and litigation" (2002, p. 8). It is difficult, if not impossible, to judge the motives involved in traffic stops, citations, and searches by individual officers (Farrell, McDevitt, Bailey, Andresen, & Pierce, 2004). If the research conducted on traffic stops is not methodologically sound it can lead to misrepresentations and further divide the police and the communities they serve (Gold, 2003; Kruger, 2002; Smith & Alpert, 2002; Wortley & Tanner, 2003).

Moving away from traditional policing methodologies and toward community-oriented policing can help alleviate the current focus on crime reduction as a measurement of success as agencies that establish a culture focused primarily on crime reduction are more likely to experience bias-based policing and increases in officer misconduct (Davis, 2001). When the attitude within an agency is to reduce crime by any means necessary, in many cases the outcome is targeting people based on race, biases, and stereotypes. The "War on Drugs," "War on Crime," "Scorched Earth," and "Zero Tolerance" strategies all have led to agencies focused on crime reduction. These programs may contribute to a culture of community intolerance and a "we versus them" mentality, which ultimately contributes to poor community relations (Davis, 2001). Harris (1999) also contends that blame for the rampant abuse of power may be laid at the feet of the government's War on Drugs program. Harris refers to this program as a fundamentally misguided crusade enthusiastically embraced by lawmakers and administrations of both parties at every level of government.

Most of the research completed to date focuses on Blacks and proclaims police bias. Hispanics also claim to experience a disproportionate number of stops, although they fall within a unique category. Hispanics have views more favorable toward the police than their Black counterparts have but less favorable than Whites have (Carter, 1983; Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Dunham & Alpert, 2001; Weitzer & Tuch, 2002).

A review of the literature reveals the need for more quality research if we are to gain a true perspective of the bias-based policing issues this country faces. While most of the research to date focuses on statistics and citizen self-reports, one study focused on Black officers' perceptions of bias-based policing and showed that Black police officers of the Milwaukee Police Department reported being victims of racial profiling (Davis, 2001). While the results of surveys intended to assess actions police chiefs have taken to alleviate biased policing practices are available (e.g., Fridell, Diamond, Kubu, & Lunney, 2001), surveys intended to measure officers' perspectives could not be located.

The literature review revealed another significant omission: research tends to focus on the police and ignores, almost entirely, the potential for other bias-based criminal justice practices among District Attorneys, Courts, and Corrections.

While the scope of this study did not allow us to investigate bias-based practices among other criminal justice agencies, we designed the study to obtain information about bias-based policing practices from the perspectives of both officers and citizens. The citizen questionnaire measured the citizens' perspective, and a comparison of the police and citizen perspectives was conducted to identify any gaps between the two.

Methods

To assess the citizen views on bias-based policing in the Commonwealth of Virginia, the researchers used a two-pronged approach. We first conducted a series of citizen focus group meetings throughout the Commonwealth. From these meetings we developed a questionnaire that we used to survey the citizens of Virginia.

Citizen Focus Groups

Seven sites were selected to hold the citizen focus group meetings. At each of the seven focus group sites, research staff asked the chief of police to invite community leaders to a citizen focus group meeting. The focus group meetings were held in public buildings, usually a public school gym or library. In an effort to ensure citizen participation, the researchers wanted to be certain that, at a minimum, community leaders were invited. Invited individuals included representatives from minority groups such as the NAACP, citizen police academy graduates, known community leaders, and ministers.

The second meeting took place in each location immediately after the first. The first meeting consisted of civic leaders, and the second meeting was open to all other citizens. Any citizen in the community who wanted to attend this meeting was welcome to do so. Both groups were polled. A staff member of the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) asked area television stations, newspapers, radio stations, and other media to run a public service announcement. In excess of 230 people attend the citizens' focus groups throughout the Commonwealth. The majority of participants were Black; however, Whites, Latinos, and Asians were also represented. The citizen focus group meetings were held not only to obtain information on the issues facing Virginia regarding bias-based policing but to help the researchers refine the questionnaires.

The meetings were informal and designed to provide the maximum freedom for participants to address any issues they thought were important for the researchers to be aware of.

Survey Instruments

The researchers developed the Virginia Police Public Contact Survey instrument to assess citizen perceptions for the present study. Researchers modified a survey used by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) in a 1999 national study of contacts between the police and the public, revising survey items and adding additional items to represent the issues discovered by the research staff through the citizen focus group meetings.

The final survey was the product of a lengthy literature review, a number of information gathering sessions with citizens in Virginia, and a series of meetings among the research staff. The staff reviewed questions proposed by the senior analysts, provided text for new questions, and assisted in rejecting questions that did not directly address issues relevant to this project. The Virginia DCJS also reviewed the citizen questionnaire and provided input.

Sample

To conduct the telephone survey, researchers purchased from a telemarketing firm a random sample of 20,000 phone numbers of citizens throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia. From this sample, the researchers initially selected a stratified random sample of 10,000 telephone numbers for the telephone survey. A stratified random sample was preferable to a completely random sample because it ensured that the number of telephone numbers from particular regions of Virginia were proportionate to the population data and that respondents with identified characteristics were represented in the study.

Six hundred and eighty (680) citizens completed the telephone survey out of approximately 11,000 phone calls. After removing the data errors, the total sample consisted of 659 respondents. The sample was 65% female, 35% male, 21% Black, and 79% White. Due to the small number of respondents indicating race as "Other," we conducted comparisons on White and Black respondents only.

In an effort to make the sample more representative of the population of Virginia, we reduced the sample to 386 respondents of which 52% were female, 48% were male, 74% were White, and 26% were Black. We accomplished this by randomly deleting complete data sets from within each demographic category until the sample more closely resembled the population distribution of Virginia. The final sample of 386 cases yielded an error rate of 5%.

Results

The survey issued to the citizens captured information in ten critical areas where police were likely to have contact with citizens. The following are the survey findings in each of these areas.

Citizen Police Academies

The first several questions on the survey addressed the practice of providing citizen police academies. About 15% of respondents indicated that their police department offers a citizen police academy with 13.1% of Whites answering affirmatively compared with 22.7% of Black respondents, which represents a statistically significant difference (p < .017). One of the most interesting findings from this section is that 69.1% of the citizens participating in the survey did not know whether their police department provides a citizen police academy. Most police departments believe that citizen police academies are effective at promoting positive relations in the community; however, citizen police academies cannot be very effective if the majority of citizens do not know they exist. It also appears that White and Black citizens are both somewhat uninformed about the existence of citizen police academies as 69.7% of Whites and 67% of Blacks did not know whether their department offers one, which is a significant difference (p < .017) between White and Black citizens. Of respondents who knew their departments provided a citizen police academy, 85.7% believed that they were valuable in promoting positive relations with the community. Furthermore, 91.2% of White citizens who were aware of citizen academies thought they promoted positive relations, while only 77.3% of Black citizens thought they were effective at promoting positive relations, which is a significant difference (p < .022). This finding could have implications for marketing or publicizing citizen police academies. Quite simply, the police need to make additional efforts to inform both White and Black residents of the existence of their citizen police academy and make contact information readily available. Departments might also want to increase the offering of citizen police academies to take advantage of this community interaction forum. Further, departments should determine why Blacks are less inclined to think that citizen police academies promote positive relations.

Trustworthiness and Responsiveness

Concerning whether citizens trust their police departments to do the right thing, 71.4% indicated that they trust the police to act appropriately. While Black and White citizens differ somewhat on this item, with 62.6% and 74.5%, respectively, trusting their department, it is important to note that the majority believe that their departments are trustworthy, and this difference is not statistically significant. Additionally, 89.4% of respondents reported that police officers are responsive or somewhat responsive to the needs of their community. White and Black respondents differed considerably in response to this question with 91.9% of Whites indicating that police are responsive or somewhat responsive to the needs of their community compared with 84.2% of Black respondents, which is a significant difference (p < .015). In both instances, there is room for the police

to improve; however, it is encouraging to see public perceptions of the police this high on such important items.

Satisfaction With Police Services

Respondents were asked about their satisfaction with the services their police department provides, and 90.7% reported that they were satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the police services their department provides. Again, Black and White citizens differed considerably on this item with 93.4% of White citizens reporting they are satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their police service compared with only 83.4% of Black citizens. This difference is statistically significant (p < .001) and indicates that the levels of satisfaction with police services differ significantly depending on the race of the citizen. Additionally, when asked about the amount of police presence in their neighborhood, 61% of citizens responded that no change was needed, 35.6% responded that more presence was needed, and only 3.4% responded that less presence was needed. Of those participating, 64.5% of White citizens and 51.5% of Black citizens believed no change in presence in their neighborhood was needed.

Interesting discussions transpired between Black and White citizens during the various focus groups the research staff conducted. The intensity of Black citizens' distrust and dissatisfaction with the police on various levels came out clearly. Unexpectedly, Black citizens were as concerned about Black officers as they were about White officers. Departments throughout the country have enhanced their recruiting and hiring practices to ensure, to one degree or another, racial diversity throughout the department. Certainly, this is less true as one ascends the ranks, overall, but significant strides have been made. Black citizens were, on the one hand, quick to applaud the inclusion of minorities in the ranks of the police, but, unexpectedly, they would later make a statement such as, "They do what their White masters tell them." When asked "If it was wrong, why would Black officers do those things?" The response was, "If they didn't, they would get fired."

Such statements are disturbing on several levels, but we will address this result as it directly affects the intent of this study. To begin, one of the perceived advantages of ensuring a racial distribution among officers that mirrors the racial distribution of the population policed is that the department will become more sensitive to the community. Now, we discover that this assumption might not be completely accurate. In fact, officers, White and Black, admitted to the researchers that some Black officers are harder on members of their own race than are White officers. There seems to be an effort on those Black officers' part to prove themselves to their colleagues. It represents a form of overcompensation, and/or possibly a reaction to embarrassment they experience about members of their racial group posing a problem for the police.

Treatment of Citizens

Two questions asked whether citizens believe that police officers treat minority groups and White people with respect. In response to these questions, 57.7% of respondents indicated that they think police officers treat minority groups with respect, while 76.2% think that police officers treat White people with respect. In general, Black and White respondents responded quite differently with 46.5% of Black respondents indicating that minority groups are treated with respect, while 63.7% of Whites think that minority groups are treated with respect, which constitutes a significant difference ($p < .000$). Black and White respondents were in more agreement concerning how the police treat White people with 77.7% of White respondents indicating that White people are treated with respect and 72.7% of Black respondents indicating that police treat White people with respect.

The previous data raise two obvious concerns. First, while differences exist between the response of Whites and Blacks, a large percentage of members of both groups do not think that police treat either minority groups or Whites with respect. Second, minority groups are far more likely to perceive that Blacks are not treated with respect. There is considerable ground for the police to cover regarding the issue of respect. Black citizens in the focus groups often commented on how they were demeaned, or they would make statements such as "You are stripped of your dignity," "You don't feel part of the community," or "They make you feel like a Black life isn't worth anything." The citizens attending the focus groups were respected members of the community. They were not a group of ex-felons lamenting about their bad luck at being caught and blaming the police for all the ills of society. The attendees were concerned citizens who had experienced, in many cases, first-hand poor treatment. In fact, several attendees were retired police officers. These comments simply add credence to the problem and further emphasize the point that officers must do more to ensure that interactions do not bring about such perceptions of abuse. This is true whether the citizen is Black, White, or the member of another racial group. This theme seems to resonate with Black citizens across the country, and this finding is similar to that of the Police Executive Research Forum's National Study on "Racially Biased Policing" (Fridell, Diamond, Kubu, & Lunney, 2001).

Bias-Based Policing

Several questions on the survey addressed citizens' perceptions of the prevalence of bias-based policing in Virginia and their hometown department. It is of concern that 42.8% of respondents believe that Virginia police departments currently practice bias-based policing; however, it is not surprising considering the publicity this issue has gained in the past few years. In fact, it is more surprising that a larger percentage did not report a perception that bias-based policing occurs in Virginia. While the majority of residents

believe that the police do not practice bias-based policing, one cannot ignore that a large percentage of the population believes that bias-based policing occurs. In fact, as expected, Black and White respondents differed significantly ($p < .000$) in response to this question with 60% of Black citizens indicating that bias-based policing is currently practiced in Virginia compared with 35.6% of White citizens. When asked to what extent they think bias-based policing is an issue for <u>their</u> department, 16.5% responded that it is a serious issue, 35.4% think it is somewhat of an issue, and 21.5% think it is not an issue in their department. Interestingly, 60.6% of Black respondents think bias-based policing is not an issue in their department compared with only 35.9% of Whites. These findings are consistent with the PERF study, which revealed 59.9% of the blacks surveyed do not believe bias-based policing is a significant issue (Fridell et al., 2001). The responses to these two questions are somewhat perplexing. On one hand, Black citizens believe that bias-based policing occurs in Virginia, but about the same percentage think it is not an issue in their department. Perhaps respondents took a "not in my backyard" approach to the question by indicating that bias-based policing occurs but not in their area.

A total of 29.6% indicated that police officers' behavior is affected by the race of citizens, and 20.1% indicated that minority officers are more fair in dealing with minorities. Interestingly, only 22.1% of White respondents believe that police behavior is affected by the race of citizens compared with 47.5% of Black citizens, and only 16.3% of White citizens think minority officers are fairer in dealing with minorities compared with 29.3% of Black respondents.

Information

Three questions on the survey concerned collecting information about bias-based policing and the manner in which this information is shared with the public. When asked if they thought the police should collect information concerning bias-based policing, 61.9% responded yes. To this question, White and Black citizens responded somewhat differently with 58.9% of White citizens agreeing that bias-based policing information should be collected while 68.8% of Black citizens responded affirmatively. However, this difference in perception is not significant.

When asked whether the police department openly shares information with the public, 41.5% of respondents indicated that the police openly share information. White respondents indicated that the police openly share information with the public at a higher rate than did Black respondents (45.3% to 34.7%, respectively), and this represents a significant difference ($p < .001$).

Overall, citizens do not perceive that the police share information with the community as a whole, and this belief is most pronounced in the Black communities. In discussions

with department personnel, we learned that many of them perceive that they do much to inform the public and to interact with them. A review of the programs and efforts of several of these departments indicates that they had numerous programs designed to assist in opening communications with the public. However, many citizens do not participate or are uninformed of the programs available in the community regardless of the efforts by the department to inform citizens, and often it is the same group of citizens who work with the police.

Finally, in the information category, citizens were asked whether the media reports bias-based policing incidents honestly, to which only 26.6% answered yes. Given the influence the media have on such issues, it is curious that such a small percentage of the respondents think that the media report such incidents honestly. While these results are an obvious indicator of distrust of the press, they also serve to further demonstrate the hurdles departments have to overcome in their efforts to be seen as responsive and ethical to the public they serve.

Crime Reporting

Next, respondents were asked whether they had ever contacted the police to report a crime. Those who answered affirmatively were asked several questions about the respondent's role in the crime and the manner in which the police handled the situation. In response to a question asking whether the victim's rights were explained to the victim, 44.2% indicated that the victim's rights were explained to the victim. Black and White citizens differed considerably on this item with only 22.2% of Black respondents reporting that the victim's rights were explained compared with 50% of White respondents. While these percentages are significant, this difference is not statistically significant. Concerning written reports, 74.5% indicated that the officer made a written report in response to the contact. By race, responses to this item differed with 79.1% of White citizens reporting that a written report was made compared with only 57.1% of Black citizens. This difference also is not statistically significant.

Of those who indicated a report was not written, 27.3% believed that a bias was the reason no report was written. It is very interesting that Black and White respondents completely disagree in response to this question. Zero percent of White citizens thought that bias was the reason police officers failed to write a report, while 100% of Black citizens thought that bias was the reason police did not write a report on the incident. This is a significant difference ($p < .008$) and warrants more attention and investigation. This variation illustrates that, regardless of what the actual reason might be, citizens make presumptions regarding officer behavior relative to their perceptions of the police as a whole. As much as any question on the citizen questionnaire, this single question

demonstrates the need for departments to attain and maintain the respect and trust of the entire community. It further demonstrates the need for officers to communicate better to inform citizens what they are doing, why officers take such actions, and what the citizen should expect to occur as a result of the actions of officers. It is clear throughout the study that citizens often perceive officer behavior as arrogant, unresponsive, abusive, and racially biased especially in Black communities. This appears to be a consistent theme and matches the findings of the national survey conducted by PERF (Fridell et al., 2001).

When asked about follow-up contact regarding the report, 55.3% of respondents indicated that the police department did not contact them to follow up on the report. White respondents were split evenly in responding to this question with 50% reporting follow-up contact after reporting a crime, while Black respondents reported less follow-up contact (22.2%). It is troubling to discover that White respondents were almost 10 times more likely to receive follow-up contact from police than Black respondents.

When asked whether racial bias was exhibited in handling the incident, 90.4% of respondents indicated that bias was not exhibited. Again, Black and White responses differed on this item with only 2.4% of White respondents indicating that racial bias was exhibited during the incident compared with 36.4% of Black respondents, which is a significant difference ($p < .05$). When asked whether gender bias was demonstrated during the handling of the incident, 90.4% of respondents indicated that bias was not demonstrated. Police departments should conduct efforts to determine why perceptional differences exist and to institute policies and procedures, training, and management strategies that will help to alleviate problems where they occur.

Traffic Stops

Respondents also were asked whether they had ever been stopped by the police while in a motor vehicle. Of those who had been involved in a traffic stop, 59.6% were stopped for speeding (of which 74.7% were White and 23% were Black), 3.4% were stopped for running a red light (of which 80% were White and 20% were Black), 5.5% for a vehicle defect (of which 62.5% were White and 25% were Black), 7% for a roadside check for drunk drivers, and 3.4% to check their license plate, driver license, or registration (of which 40% were White and 60% were Black). Seventy percent of those involved in a traffic stop indicated that they thought the police had a legitimate reason for stopping their vehicle with 74% of White respondents believing the stop was legitimate compared with 61.3% of Black respondents. While this difference appears considerable, it is not statistically significant. Overall, the responses in this category indicate that Blacks and Whites perceive that they are treated similarly by the police in Virginia.

Concerning the outcome of the traffic stop, 15.1% of those responding indicated they received a warning, 56.2% Indicated that they received a citation. Of the traffic stop outcomes, no significant differences occurred between Blacks and Whites for receiving a warning, a traffic ticket, being arrested, or questioned about being in the area. Of those responding to this section of the survey, 21.9% (n = 32) indicated that someone was mistreated by the police officers during the encounter. This mistreatment included verbal abuse (5.5%), rudeness (11.6%), and the use of physical force (1.4%). White citizens reported instances of verbal abuse at a slightly higher rate—57% for Whites and 43% for Blacks—and more instances of rudeness and physical force. The reader should keep in mind that while these findings are of interest, the n for each of these categories was too low, and the data are not statistically significant.

The data demonstrate clearly that both Blacks and Whites perceive equally that officers were rude in the situations this series of questions described. Officer verbal abuse and rudeness are management issues, and every department should ensure that such behavior is not tolerated and is addressed quickly when discovered. It should also be understood, however, that regardless of how diligent departments become in their attempts to stop these forms of harassment, they likely will never be harassment-free. This statement is not offered as an excuse to ignore the problem but to counsel departments to be realistic in their attempts to rid the department of such behaviors and to encourage continued vigilance. Further, there appears to be no significant differences in officer rudeness reported by Blacks and Whites. During the focus group meetings we heard a significant number of complaints about rudeness on the part of the officers during a traffic stop. This was consistent with the PERF national study, which also found the same type of citizen complaints pertaining to traffic stops. This suggests a need to evaluate traffic stop procedures and to develop training and administrative oversight to ease this problem.

Use of Force
In general, very few incidents involving the use of physical force were reported by respondents in the sample. Only 18 respondents indicated that they had experienced situations where a police officer made a threat to use or used force against them or someone who was with them. Obviously, the information provided about the use of force was statistically significant.

Demeanor of Police Officers
The final section of the survey asked citizens to describe their contact with police officers in the following situations: traffic accidents, crime investigations, citizen matching the

description of a wanted person, or officer(s) serving a warrant. Of those who answered questions in this section of the survey, 87% indicated that they were informed of the reason for the contact with the police. White and Black citizens reported being informed of the reason at about the same rate (88.6% and 87.5%, respectively).

Interestingly, 25.2% indicated the police treated them or others present rudely during such contacts, and of these 23.7% were White and 39.1% were Black. This difference is not significant. Additionally, respondents were asked to identify the race of the person treated rudely by the officer(s). White citizens were the target of this rudeness nearly four times as often as Black citizens. Seventeen percent of those reporting rude treatment by the police were White, 4.4% were Black, 1.5% were Hispanic, and 0.7% were Asian. Of those treated rudely, 14.9% thought that it was due to race, 8.1% thought it was due to gender, and 8.1% thought it was due to lifestyle. Black respondents were twice as likely as Whites to perceive the rudeness as related to race.

Conclusion

Overall, the citizen questionnaire provided insight into the citizens' perception of how police departments in the Commonwealth of Virginia interact with the public. Some promising findings include the fact that the majority of respondents believe police respond in a reasonable amount of time when summoned, 70% of respondents trust the police, and 90% are satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their police departments. These results indicate that the Commonwealth of Virginia police are keeping their citizens satisfied, in a broad sense, while building a rapport with the people. Additionally, citizens reported that call takers at the police station were generally courteous and polite. A compelling 100% reported that the officers were courteous when the citizens walked in to the department or stopped a police vehicle to make a complaint or report a crime.

Some discouraging findings of the citizen questionnaire include the significant differences between citizen perceptions when examined by race. Both Whites and Blacks believe that the police treat Whites with respect, but more Blacks than Whites believe that Black citizens are not treated respectfully. Despite those findings, White citizens who participated in the survey were four times more likely to be the target of rudeness from the Virginia police. This represents a perplexing finding considering that Black citizens should have been more subject to rude treatment if they are indeed less likely to be treated with respect. One would assume that rudeness and disrespect go hand-in-hand. As a side note, the majority of citizens represented in the survey do not believe that the media report police incidents honestly.

References

An Act Criminalizing Deprivation of Civil Rights, Including Racial Profiling, 210th Leg. N.J. § S.B. 429 (2002). Retrieved February 15, 2007, from http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2002/Bills/S0500/429_R4.PDF

Carter, D. L. (1983). Hispanic perception of police performance: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *13*, 487–500.

Cheurprakobkit, S. (2000). Police-citizen contact and police performance: Attitudinal differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanics. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *28*, 325–336.

Coker, D. (2003). Foreword: Addressing the real world of racial injustice in the criminal justice system. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, *93*(4), 827–852.

Dateline NBC. (2004, April 9). What is a consent search? *MSNBC Interactive* [online news]. New York: MSNBC. Retrieved May 17, 2004, from http://msnbc.msn.com/id/4703573

Davis, R. L. (2001). Bias-based policing. *Women Police*, *35*(2) 9–15. [Also available at http://www.nacole.org .].

Dunham, R. G., & Alpert, G. P. (2001). The foundation of police role in society. In R.G. Dunham & G. P. Alpert (Eds.). *Critical Issues in Policing* (4th ed, pp. 1–16). Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.

Farrell, A., McDevitt, D. J., Bailey, L., Andresen, C., & Pierce, E. (2004, May 4). *Massachusetts racial and gender profiling study*. Boston, MA: Institute on Race and Justice, Northeastern University.

Fridell, L., Diamond, D., Kubu, M., & Lunney, R. (2001). Racially biased policing: A principled response. *Police Executive Research Forum*.

Gold, A. D. (2003). Media hype, racial profiling, and good science. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *43*(3), 391–399.

Harris, D. A. (1999). *Driving while Black: Racial profiling on our nation's highways*. NY: American Civil Liberties Union.

Harris, D. A. (2002). *Profiles in injustice: Why racial profiling cannot work*. NY: The New Press.

Kruger, K. J. (2002). Collecting statistics in response to racial profiling allegations. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, *71*(5), 8–12.

Lundman, R. J., & Kaufman, R. L. (2003). Driving while Black: Effects of race, ethnicity, and gender on citizen self-reports of traffic stops and police actions. *Criminology*, *41*(1) 195–220.

MacDonald, H. (2001, Spring). The myth of racial profiling. *City Journal*, *11*(2). Retrieved August 9, 2004, from http://www.papillonsartpalace.com/mythof.htm

Malti-Douglas, F. (2002). Review essay/The "P" word: Profiling. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, *21*(2), 66–73.

Martin, V. (1999, July 13). Driving while Black is part of the burden of being Black. *Baltimore Sun*, p. A11.

New Jersey: New law makes race profiling a felony. (2003, March 14). *Crime Control Digest*, p. 7.

Pfaff-Wright, C., & Tomaskovic-Devey, D. (2000). *Self-reported police speeding stops: Results from a North Carolina record check survey*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Rice, S. K., Reitzel, J.D., & Piquero, A.R. (2004, March). *Shades of brown: Perceptions of racial profiling and the intra-ethnic differential*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Las Vegas, NV.

Riksheim, E., & Chermak, S. M. (1993). Causes of police behavior revisited. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *2*, 353–382.

Sherman, L. W., (1980) Causes of police behavior: The current state of quantitative research. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *17*, 69–100.

Singleton, R., & Straits, B. (1999). *Approaches to social research* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, M., & Alpert, G. (2002). Searching for direction: Courts, social science, and the adjudication of racial profiling claims. *Justice Quarterly*, *19*(4) 673–704.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2001, February). *Contacts between police and the public: Findings from the 1999 national survey*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Weitzer, R. (1999). Citizens' perceptions of police misconduct: Race and neighborhood context. *Justice Quarterly*, *16*, 819–846.

Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S.A. (2002). Perceptions of racial profiling: Race, class, and personal experience. *Criminology*, *40*(2), 435–457.

Wortley, S., & Tanner, T. (2003). Data, denials, and confutations: The racial profiling debate in Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *45*(3), 367–389.

Community Policing: A Critical Analysis of a Small Police Department

Gregory E. Sumner

This study critically analyzed the community policing program and operational practices of patrol officers at a small police department in the southeastern United States. The department's mission statement, community policing policy and procedure, reports, and patrol officers' opinions were used to determine whether the community policing program was being implemented in accordance with an operational definition of community policing. A qualitative, holistic, case study design used participant observation to report and analyze interview questions asked of patrol officers. Coding and comparing specific community-policing-related words and phrases were the basis for analysis. Results revealed that while participants believed they were practicing community policing, they did not fully understand its philosophy or implementation.

Community policing is based on the concept that the police and community can work together to solve such problems as crime, fear of crime, social and physical disorder, and neighborhood decay. It shifts the way traditional police departments operate by decentralizing the rank and file and allowing police officers to identify and address core community problems instead of merely answering calls for service (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990). Because much federal funding assumes that a community policing model is in effect, it is important to evaluate purported community policing programs to determine whether they adhere to the tenets of community policing. To date, little research has done this.

Local law enforcement composes slightly more than three fourths of all officers employed in law enforcement. Local police departments employ 565,915 persons, while sheriff's departments account for 293,823 full-time employees (U.S. Dept. of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2007). While both police and sheriff's departments have implemented community policing, police departments make up the majority of law enforcement personnel in the United States. For this reason, it was appropriate to evaluate the efforts of a particular police department to implement community policing and the extent to which department personnel understand and practice community policing methods. Most studies of community policing have been case studies (Scott, Duffee, & Renauer, 2003), most of which have focused on large urban police departments (Falcone, Wells, & Weisheit, 2002). Accordingly, it was appropriate to focus on a smaller police department located in a rural setting.

This qualitative study critically analyzed the community policing program and operational practices of patrol officers in the police department of a small city (population 31,000) in the southeastern United States. The study used the department's mission statement, community policing policies and procedures, reports, and patrol officers' opinions to determine whether the implementation of the community policing program was in accordance with the operational definition of community policing. Results revealed that while participants believed they practice community policing, they did not fully understand its philosophy or proper implementation.

Community policing was initially introduced in the Centerville Police Department in 1992 by its then-current chief of police and became department-wide in 1999.[1] The department received national accreditation from the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) in 1986 and has been reaccredited in 1991, 1996, 1999, and 2005. CALEA accreditation is voluntary and does not require a police department to accept community policing as a philosophy; however, it does demonstrate a department's desire to maintain a progressive approach to contemporary policing.

Objective

Community policing has become an accepted component of law enforcement throughout the United States. To help implement community policing, law enforcement entities sometimes apply for federal grants. Such applications must include descriptive statements of the applicant's community policing program. However, because the concept of community policing is subject to differing interpretations, it is important to specify what the concept means and to apply accepted criteria in evaluating whether a purported community policing program does in fact practice what it preaches.

The primary purpose of this case study was to assess the community policing program of a small rural police department in the southeastern United States and to determine the extent to which the department's patrol officers understood and practiced actual community policing. The results of this study will be useful in giving the chief of police of the organization under study an independent evaluation of the department's community policing program to better equip the organization in fulfilling its mission. Beyond that, this study will help other law enforcement agencies assess their community policing programs and improve their ability to serve the citizens in their jurisdiction.

---

[1] Centerville is a pseudonym. All other information in this article about the police department under study is factual.

Methods

This qualitative study employed a holistic case study design. It was based on normative sponsorship theory and compared Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux's (1994) definition of community policing with practitioner assessments to determine whether the spirit of the department was in compliance with the definition of community policing and normative sponsorship theory. The study used three sources of data collection: "asking questions, making direct observations, and examining written records" (Maxfield & Babbie, 2005, pp. 210–211). Data collection depended on participant observation during scheduled ride-alongs authorized by written permission from the chief of police. As an independent observer, the researcher asked specific questions and observed policing behavior of participants. During the scheduled ride-alongs, the researcher made observations and notes to identify themes that emerged and drafted most documentation at the end of each ride-along. The researcher conducted further analysis once all five ride-alongs had been completed.

Sample

Participants represented a stratified random selection of five officers from the patrol division of the Centerville Police Department, which was accomplished by using badge numbers. A sample of five participants represented 15% percent of the total number of patrol officers (34) working the first or second shift. This number was deemed sufficient in light of Yin's (1994) observation that case studies do not need a minimum number of cases and that researchers must work with the situation that presents itself in each case. Stratifying the selection of officers by randomly selecting three officers, one from each category based on race (Caucasian, African American, and other) and two officers based on sex (one male and one female), provided for homogeneous subgroups within a subgroup (Trochim, 2001). To maintain participant anonymity, the study refers to them by letter: A, B, C, D, and E.

Patrol officers have the most frequent contact with the community on a daily basis. When a citizen calls the police department or 911, those calls for service are most frequently answered by patrol officers. The most appropriate participants, therefore, were members of the patrol division. The Centerville Police Department has three patrol shifts; participants were chosen from the first and second shifts only. The first shift is from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m.; the second shift is from 3 p.m. to 1 a.m. The third shift is from 9 p.m. to 7 a.m., which would not have allowed sufficient public contact to evaluate community policing. In the course of a 10-hour ride-along, many opportunities for conversation arise; however, since the study's focus was to assess officers' responses to interview questions in light of six coded terms and to observe whether they practiced community policing, only those

observations and conversations that were relevant to the study's purpose form the researcher's notes.

Data Analysis

The researcher analyzed the Centerville Police Department's mission statement, standard operating procedures, and other relevant departmental reports, including crime statistics, and compared them with Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux's definition of community policing (1994). Immediately after each ride-along, the researcher typed and analyzed participant interviews and compared community policing terms interviewees used with those Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux used (partnership, fear of crime, quality of life, department-wide commitment, problem solving, decentralization). The researcher coded and tallied all relevant words and phrases and evaluated them in light of the literature on community policing, then conducted further analysis to determine whether the Centerville Police Department consistently practices community policing as conventionally defined.

Literature Review

While the literature is clear about the philosophy of community policing (Kelling, 1981; Trojanowicz, 1982; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990; Wilson & Kelling, 1982), its application is often misinterpreted. The philosophy of community policing is supported by the theory of normative sponsorship, which describes the way a group (e.g., the police) must establish and legitimatize its intent as a facilitator of social control. For example, the police act in the best interests of the community to create a better social environment—to bridge the gap between the police and the community. Without community support, community policing will be unsuccessful (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990).

Normative sponsorship theory was developed by Sower, Holland, Tiedke, and Freeman (1957) in connection with research about community perceptions of public health. They argued that the efficacy of surveys eliciting such perceptions depends on community support (p. 18). The theory stipulates that a community program will be sponsored only if it is *normative*, "within the limits of established standards," to all persons and interest groups involved (Trojanowicz & Dixon, 1974, p. 332). Normative sponsorship theory was illustrated in Trojanowicz's (1982) foot patrol study in Flint, Michigan, which demonstrated that the police cannot make positive social change in a community without public support.

A major consideration when planning and implementing community development programs is understanding of how various interest groups can achieve consensus. According to Sower et al. (1957), communities that follow the tenets of normative sponsorship theory will have a higher likelihood of success. The philosophy of community

policing postulates that the community and the police will work together in a concerted effort to solve community problems. The role of a community police officer is that of leader, facilitator, educator, and role model. It is the officer's job to work with and for the community to serve its needs based on personal observations and information that emerges from the community. Once the community and police department begin to develop a working relationship, both parties engage in the process of goal sharing, resulting in a congruent relationship (Trojanowicz & Dixon, 1974).

Although positive police-community relations by themselves do not constitute community policing, they are an important first step in establishing a working relationship with the community. According to proponents of community policing, every officer in a police department should be an efficient and effective public servant by establishing positive police-community relations. Such efforts are threatened if they are viewed as a "sell" instead of a sincere effort by the police to work with the community (Trojanowicz & Dixon, 1974). "Normative sponsorship theory postulates that programs that challenge the 'skeptics' through involvement, participation, and cooperative action will be more effective than programs that are conflict oriented" (Trojanowicz, 1972, p. 411). The police cannot be the only problem solvers and planners in a neighborhood. An effective police-community relations program requires a grassroots effort of the police and community working together to form a partnership and provide for a better quality of life. For this to occur, the police must receive leadership and direction from their department.

Community Policing

Community policing can be distinguished from the professional model, which casts police officers more squarely in the role of respondents to requests for service. In between calls for service, officers practicing community policing might randomly patrol their area in an effort to deter any crime by virtue of their physical presence (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990). The most thoroughgoing explication of community policing is that of Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994), who list 10 principles:

1. *Philosophy and organizational strategy.* As consumers of police services, the people in a community deserve to be informed about the process of problem solving and change. This strategy describes the ways the police and community can forge partnerships and work together as coproducers of a better quality of life.

2. *Commitment to community empowerment.* Both the police and civilian personnel must be community problem solvers by working to identify and solve problems creatively with freedom and autonomy. With their understanding of the significance of problem solving and their ability to use their own discretion without being bogged down by bureaucracy, police can be more effective.

3. *Decentralized, personalized policing.* Officers assigned to a community-oriented policing unit must be able to provide direct assistance to the people on their beat without being dispatched to calls outside their beat.

4. *Immediate and long-term proactive problem solving.* The role of community-oriented policing officers is to act as generalists and provide continuous contact and support to law-abiding citizens. Working together with private citizens and other public organizations, each officer serves as an ombudsman for the community. The goal is to work together to improve the quality of life in the community not only by answering calls for service and making arrests but also by listening to the needs of the community and providing long-term solutions.

5. *Ethics, legality, responsibility, and trust.* Community policing implies a new way of thinking and acting. The police must provide a clear vision of hope for the welfare of the community as they work together for a better quality of life for all members; a mutual effort takes trust and respect from the community. Once the police have established themselves as a catalyst for the betterment of the community, they can ask citizens to take more responsibility for minor issues that constrain the police, enabling them to focus on long-term solutions for problems citizens have identified.

6. *Expanding the police mandate.* The police have a responsibility to educate citizens they serve about community policing. For the long-term betterment of the community, the police must use their resources in the most productive manner.

7. *Helping those with special needs.* By serving special and immediate needs in a community, police act as a catalyst to other programs often associated with community policing, such as crime prevention and public relations.

8. *Grassroots creativity and support.* Community policing is a grassroots effort by police to establish good human relations with the community. Its focus is on relationships and trust. Officers must be empowered to make short-term decisions and work to produce long-term results in creative ways, which makes them problem solvers and community generalists.

9. *Internal change.* The police must communicate the significant long-term effect they can have in a community to others in the department who are not otherwise assigned to a community policing unit. The idea is to incorporate all members of the department into the philosophy of community policing.

10. *Building for the future.* The police must legitimize their philosophy of community policing within the community in order to work as independent resource providers. Community policing is the process of continuously assessing the needs of the community and providing long-term solutions in partnership with law-abiding citizens.

According to Zhao, Lovrich, and Robinson (2001), because community policing has achieved considerable prominence in law enforcement circles, local police departments may feel pressure to espouse its principles even though they continue to operate according to a professional model of policing. Walker and Katz (2005) conclude that for many departments, community policing is little more than rhetoric. A disjuncture between stated philosophy and actual practice is perhaps troubling wherever it occurs, but the stakes are raised if money is involved, as it will be if a police department has received outside funding to implement community policing.

Centerville Police Department

The Centerville Police Department is one of four law enforcement agencies in its county, located in the southeastern United States. Its leadership includes a chief of police, deputy chief, and three bureau majors supervising administrative services, field operations, and support services. The community policing coordinator is located under the field operations bureau. Other parts of field operations include patrol division, selective enforcement, K-9 teams, reserve unit, SWAT team, DUI task force, hostage negotiation, bicycle patrol, wrecker services, and bomb squad. The police department employs 98 sworn officers and 13 nonsworn civilians. Of the 98 sworn officers, 13 are female and 85 are male. The medium age of sworn officers is 38 years. The racial makeup for sworn officers is 85% Caucasian, 9% African American, and 6% other.

The Centerville Police Department—through its mission statement, written policies and procedures, and public pronouncements—says it practices community policing. However, based on previous observation of the department, the researcher had reason to believe it operated much closer to a professional model. A disconnect between stated and actual behavior has several potential consequences. It could diminish the Centerville Police Department's effectiveness, and it could jeopardize the department's receipt of additional federal funding, which is based on implementing community policing.

The problem this study addressed is the possible disjuncture between community policing philosophy and practice in the Centerville Police Department. The study critically analyzed the community policing program and the practices of patrol officers in the department to determine the benefits from this program for the community. It considered the department's mission statement, community policing policies and procedures, reports, and patrol officers' opinions of their role to determine whether implementation of its program was in accordance with community policing as Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994) define it. The study sought to determine whether patrol officers believe the following: (a) they work in concert with their mission statement and written policies; (b) the mission statement, policies, and procedures allow them to deliver community policing to

their community; and (c) the community gets the best value from its police as a result of the department's mission statement and community policing policies and procedures.

Results

Document Review

Document review was limited by scarcity of police department records. The researcher had access to all relevant department files, but relevant information was limited to the mission statement, standard operating procedures, and departmental crime statistics. Data analysis addressed the question of how well the Centerville Police Department implements community policing as defined by Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994).

Document review indicated that community policing at the Centerville Police Department appears to have evolved from indirect community interest. In 1992, the local housing authority received a federal grant under the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program. It does not appear that the housing authority wanted the Centerville Police Department to establish a community policing program, specifically; rather, it was the housing authority's intent to provide more foot patrol officers to interact with residents and improve their quality of life. Nevertheless, this grant can be seen retrospectively as the first step toward what would later evolve into a department-wide effort to incorporate community policing.

The initial $250,000 grant provided funding for four police officers (one supervisor and three officers): $78,000 for law enforcement services and $172,000 for drug prevention. The money for law enforcement services paid for the officers' salaries, an office, and some equipment. The Centerville Police Department paid for all officer benefits, the use of a patrol car and gas, duty equipment, radio, and uniforms.

The housing authority was successful in securing a Public Housing Drug Elimination grant for 1992 but was unsuccessful in 1993. In 1993, the city of Centerville decided to incur the costs of the program in the hope that the housing authority would reapply and obtain full funding the next year. This action would allow the city to continue providing foot patrols and crime prevention programs without any disruption of services. In 1994, the housing authority reapplied and again received federal funding from the Public Housing Drug Elimination grant. From 1994 to 1998, the housing authority continued to contract with the Centerville Police Department for police officers to provide security services. In 1999, the housing authority decided to discontinue its contract with the Centerville Police Department and to employ off-duty police officers.

In 1999, the police department decided to incorporate the philosophy of community policing as a department-wide commitment to all residents. In the past, the department's efforts had been limited to the area served by the housing authority. The written record

suggests that the police department decided that what its officers had been doing was worthwhile because of the positive interaction between officers and citizens. Therefore, they decided to make it a department- and community-wide commitment.

A need to change is often precipitated by rising crime rates. The Centerville Police Department keeps statistics on many different crimes, including nine index offenses—the most serious crimes. Monitoring these nine offenses allows the department to better understand the type and amount of crime. Table 1 reviews the nine index offenses two years before and after the Centerville Police Department implemented community policing in 1999.

Table 1. *Centerville Police Department Incidents by Classification of Crimes, 1997–2001*

Crime	1997	1998	Total (1997–1998)	1999ᵃ	2000	2001	Total (2000–2001)
Homicide	1	3	4	2	3	3	6
Forcible Rape	11	8	19	8	9	13	22
Robbery	95	69	164	55	68	51	119
Aggravated Assault	158	157	315	151	150	126	276
Aggravated Battery	366	368	734	375	404	263	667
Burglary	645	557	1,202	435	465	394	859
Theft (felony)	810	565	1,375	430	589	465	1,054
Auto Theft	173	169	342	123	107	157	264
Arson	25	18	43	19	14	13	27
Total	2,284	1,914	4,198	1,598	1,809	1,485	3,294

ᵃThe year community policing was implemented at the Centerville Police Department.

These figures indicate that the number of index offenses committed decreased after community policing implementation; however, there is no scientific way to determine whether implementing community policing had any effect on the reduction of crime in Centerville. Many variables could have caused the index offense to decrease after community policing implementation.

On March 25, 1999, the Centerville Police Department drafted a plan to address how it would implement the new community-oriented policing (COP) program. The plan detailed seven areas of importance: (a) COP implementation, (b) ways to inform the community, (c) duty of the first-line supervisor, (d) duty of management personnel—upper and midlevel, (e) responsibility of officers in the field, (f) COP coordinator responsibilities, and (g) training unit strategies. The department kicked off the COP program officially on

April 17, 1999, at an event billed as COP Awareness Day. On May 8, 1999, the police department officially incorporated the COP program department-wide. On November 19, 2001, the police department further confirmed the community policing philosophy by adding it to the standard operating procedures manual.

The department generated two distinct community policing job descriptions, one for the initial COP supervisor assigned to the housing authority in 1992, the other for the current COP coordinator. Major duties of the COP supervisor included ensuring adherence to departmental rules, regulations, and policies; monitoring performance of officers in the field; patrolling all projects and assisting other units; enforcing laws and investigating crimes and accidents; responding to all major calls to assist and advise; attending departmental meetings, housing authority meetings, and community-oriented programs; and working with the Centerville Housing Authority and the drug elimination coordinator to improve housing project areas. The community-oriented policing coordinator is responsible for planning, developing, coordinating, and maintaining community relations programs as well as the timely submission of all reports.

The mission statement of the Centerville Police Department describes a department that is clearly committed to the community it serves. It articulates a sense of pride and professionalism for the services the department provides to its community and reinforces four of the six terms coded in this study: *partnership* (used twice), *quality of life* (twice), *department-wide commitment* (once), and *problem solving* (once). Two coded terms not found are *fear of crime* and *decentralization*.

The Centerville Police Department's policy and procedure manual uses the term *community relations* in three places. It mentions two of the six terms coded in this study: *partnership* (once) and *department-wide commitment* (once). The primary focus is on accountability. The COP coordinator is responsible for maintaining a database to monitor whether officers on first and second shifts complete a citizen contact sheet demonstrating that they initiated two nonenforcement contacts with citizens per shift. The COP coordinator compiles this information in a monthly report submitted to the chief, deputy chief, bureau majors, watch commanders, unit/division supervisors, and accreditation manager.

Interviews

In ride-along interviews, the research asked participants five questions.

1. *How do you define community policing?*

Participants emphasized interacting with citizens.

2. *Would you recommend any changes to the way community policing is being implemented at the Centerville Police Department?*

Participants mentioned having more individual contact with people and being assigned to more specific areas. One interviewee recommended doing away with the program: "It seems the community runs the police department. There should be more of an us versus them mentality."

3. *Do you think community policing is being used to its full potential at the Centerville Police Department?*

Most participants answered in the negative. Several complained that patrols leave insufficient time to knock on doors and get to know people.

4. *Do you think community policing is being implemented in accordance with the Centerville Police Department's mission statement and standard operating procedure?*

All but one participant answered affirmatively.

5. *What is the most significant problem the patrol officers of the Centerville Police Department encounter on a daily basis?*

Participants mentioned drug use, loitering, lack of respect from citizens, and lack of individual contact with people.

Responses to interview questions were coded for terms mentioned in Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux's (1994) definition of community policing. Participants used few of these terms (participation, partnership, fear of crime, quality of life, department-wide commitment, problem solving, decentralization). Of the five interviewees, two used the term *partnership* and the term *problem solving*.

Based on these results, it does not appear that officers of the Centerville Police Department practice community policing as defined by Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994); however, the officers appear to believe they practice community policing to some degree because they are directed by their standard operating procedure to make two nonenforcement contacts a day. The coded terms alone should not serve as a definitive indicator of whether patrol officers practice community policing. These terms represent one of three methods of qualitative data collection methods: asking questions (Maxfield & Babbie, 2005). Asking questions, when combined with direct observations and examination of written documents, allows for converging lines of inquiry (Yin, 1994).

To further analyze the data, the researcher extracted words and phrases from each interview question response to establish a theme. Table 2 summarizes these excerpts.

In addition to interviewing five patrol officers of the Centerville Police Department, the researcher made observations and took notes during full-shift ride-alongs to see whether officers practice community policing in their natural setting. Scant evidence

Table 2. *Critical Analysis of Interview Questions*

Interview Questions	Participant A	Participant B	Participant C	Participant D	Participant E
1. How do you define community policing?	Interaction with citizens-getting their opinion and views of what needs to be done.	When patrol has contact with people.	Interaction with people.	Getting to know the community. To be more personable.	Interaction between the residents in the commu-nity and the police department.
2. Would you recommend any changes to the way community policing is being implemented at the Centerville Police Department?	Yes. More one-on-one contact with people in the community.	No.	Yes. Go back to the way it used to be by having a community policing unit.	Yes. We need to get to know the people in our community better.	No. I would do away with the whole thing. Go back to the way it used to be when the COP team would put people in jail. There should be more of an us vs. them mentality.
3. Do you think comm-unity policing is being used to its full potential at the Center-ville Police Department?	No. Need to make a better effort to talk to citizens more on a one on one basis.	Don't know.	No. Need to have more interaction with the people. This is where a smaller unit has more time to go door to door.	Yes. Although more could be done as a department. The Comm-unity Oriented Policing team concept worked better.	No. Most of us just put down contact information. We typically don't go door to door to get contact information.
4. Do you think comm-unity policing is being im-plemented in accordance with the Centerville Police Department's mission statement and standard operating procedure?	Yes. I know our admini-strative staff follows our policy and procedures.	Yes. I haven't heard any complaints from the community and our supervisors and admin-istrative staff are good about im-plementing policy.	Yes. Because we actually make citizen contacts, if we have time.	Yes.	No. Not real sure what it says.

Table 2. (continued)
Critical Analysis of Interview Questions

5. What is the most significant problem the patrol officers of the Centerville Police Department encounter on a daily basis?	Lack of respect from citizens.	High activity of drugs, especially marijuana and metham-phetamine.	Not enough one-on-one time spent with citizens.	A lot of people in the public don't like us and have an attitude toward us.	Juveniles and respect, especially from younger kids.

Emerged that participants practice community policing. One incident stood out because it was an unusual example of engaging the public in community relations. One participant stopped at a rally sponsored by the housing authority in recognition of National Night Out, a nationally recognized crime prevention program. This event was coordinated by an officer who works part-time with the housing authority and who had sent a memorandum to the patrol division major requesting as much police participation as possible. The department responded by sending its mobile command center, motorcycle officers, and drug dog. The event was staffed primarily by officers who work part-time for the housing authority and officers from the selective enforcement unit. Patrol officers who work during that shift did not participate in the rally or subsequent parade. No other observation was made of patrol officers engaging in community policing.

All five of the participants appeared receptive to having an observer ride along with them. Collectively, they displayed an adherence to the professional model of policing rather than to community policing. They consistently responded to service calls from the dispatcher rather than proactively identifying problems and formulating solutions. Their primary sense of obligation seemed to be demonstrating accountability to the shift supervisor by turning in a daily log that reflected their response to dispatcher-initiated service calls.

Conclusion

The philosophy of community policing became well known in the law enforcement community when Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990) published *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*. In 1994, federal funds were made available through the United States Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (2005), under Title I of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, to hire 100,000 police officers in the United States. Many law enforcement agencies took

advantage of the opportunity to receive federal money. The Centerville Police Department was not one of those agencies. In 1999, the department decided to incorporate the philosophy of community policing both department- and community-wide, after having a four-officer team work in local housing projects from 1992–1998.

Not receiving federal money also meant the Centerville Police Department did not receive any federal guidelines on how to implement community policing. The only information on community policing the officers received was from the deputy chief before an inservice training session. Participants invoked interaction with people in the community to describe what makes their efforts distinctive; however, interaction alone does not define community policing. Police officers inevitably interact with the community regardless of whether they practice community policing.

The department appears to have implemented community policing because it believed in the efficacy of the four-officer team working in the housing project. Full agency commitment to community policing reflected a conviction that officers needed better communication with the community at large and not just in the housing project. The housing authority was not under any mandate to incorporate community policing; it simply wanted to provide a better quality of life for its residents. One of the most significant decisions the housing authority made was to assign officers to foot patrol, which allowed them to get to know the residents. Foot patrol removes officers from the patrol car, which serves as a barrier. In addition, officers in the housing project worked the same hours and days so residents knew when a particular officer was working.

The Centerville Police Department did not provide specific training for community policing, although the department's community-oriented policing plan stated that officers would receive training in crime prevention and community relations strategies. The plan did not call for any training in community policing itself. Lack of training appears to be the primary cause for the department's failure to incorporate conventional community policing in Centerville.

New Centerville Police Department hires are sent to one of 10 regional academies to complete 404 hours of training in a basic law enforcement training course. The current curriculum for that course includes a two-hour segment on community policing crime prevention techniques. In reality, this course should simply be called crime prevention techniques. Nowhere does the lesson plan define or discuss the philosophy of community policing. New officers coming into the police department receive no introduction to the philosophy of community policing while at the police academy nor when they arrive at the department.

The Centerville Police Department did initially seek community input by hosting a public awareness day. They have also administered four neighborhood surveys—two in

2001, one in 2002, and one in 2005. In addition, the accreditation manager administers one survey every three years to comply with the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies and the department's standard operating procedures. This Likert survey is administered to any person who comes in contact with the police department during a particular month. In 2001, 172 people received the questionnaire by mail. Twenty-seven replied, a response rate of 16%. Results revealed that 89% of the respondents found the service of Centerville Police Department officers to be average. A limitation of this survey is that it does not reflect the entire community; it targets only those who have had some form of documented contact with the police department.

The four neighborhood surveys were administered under the direction of the community-oriented policing coordinator. Both of the two 2001 neighborhood surveys—one administered in north Centerville and one in south Centerville—addressed quality-of-life issues in particular areas. The response for action reflects language associated with community policing, such as soliciting input from the community, assigning officers to particular areas, providing a mobile command center, working with building inspectors to enforce clean-it-or-lean-it ordinances, cooperating with the street department on drainage problems causing flooding, partnering with solid waste personnel to inform community members of trash pick-up dates, and teaming with public works to remove graffiti.

No follow-up analysis was implemented to determine whether any recommended actions were taken. The report said the timeline for implementation is contingent on the supervisor. While supervision is necessary in law enforcement agencies, Thacher (2001) argued that a decentralized department with "minichiefs"—officers who regularly work in a particular area of the community, identify problems, and coordinate the appropriate corrective action—is more effective than a top-down agency.

In 2002, a neighborhood survey was administered because complaints were made to the city manager by residents of south Centerville about decaying quality of life. The city manager in turn sent a memorandum to the chief of police to establish a strategy of keeping him informed through monthly reports. The memorandum asked the chief to deal with drug dealing and loitering in the south Centerville area and provide a report of his findings. The police department complied with the city manager's request and drafted a plan of action, including a Likert survey with nine questions. The community-oriented policing coordinator directed the selective enforcement unit to collect surveys by going door to door asking citizens' opinions regarding the neighborhood. Some 188 surveys were collected between March 11 and March 15, 2002. In some cases, members of the unit filled out the questionnaire for a resident, which could have caused some bias in how citizens answered the questions. Nonetheless, survey respondents rated the nine

categories in order of importance as follows: drugs, traffic, noise, trash, crime, residents, poor maintenance, unsupervised children, and vandalism/graffiti.

The department responded to the neighborhood survey findings by conducting a road check in the south Centerville area, where they arrested seven people and issued 60 citations. They seemed to believe that by conducting a road check they would reduce the amount of drugs, traffic, and noise in the south Centerville area. Road checks are a form of zero-tolerance policing, not community policing. This single incident does not indicate the Centerville Police Department does not conduct community policing, but it does imply that the department operates under the professional model of policing as opposed to community policing. The department appears to be more concerned with "dealing with the running of the organization rather than the impact of the organization on the community's problems" (Goldstein, 1990, p. 15). This attitude may further explain why the participants in this study overwhelmingly stated lack of respect by members of the community as one of patrol officers' most significant problems. The perceived lack of respect may hinder their attempts to discover the core social ills of their community and instead attack crime with a letter-of-the-law mentality.

The patrol officers of the Centerville Police Department do not appear to subscribe to normative sponsorship theory. Most community meetings are attended by administrative staff but not patrol officers. No evidence suggests any initial effort by the police department to solicit community support for a community policing program. It is the police department's job to work with and for the community to serve its needs. As stated previously, once the community and police department develop a working relationship, both parties can engage in the process of goal sharing and, as a result, form productive working relationships (Trojanowicz & Dixon, 1974).

The department does have a training unit that organizes Neighborhood Watch meetings for residents; however, officers from the training division host these meetings, not those officers who patrol areas where the meetings are held. Hosting Neighborhood Watch meetings is a good way for community members to voice their concerns to the police about ways to improve their quality of life, but these concerns should be discussed with officers who regularly work that particular area, thereby encouraging residents to confide in an officer with whom they have an established relationship.

The index crimes for the Centerville Police Department have dropped steadily since implementation of community policing (Table 1); however, the number of calls for police service has increased. In 1997, the department received 108,274 calls for service; in 1998, it received 110,737; in 1999, 113,346; in 2000, 123,653; and in 2001, it received 126,544 calls. The increase in the number of calls places the patrol officers in a position to have more interaction with the public and solve more social problems.

The patrol officers of the Centerville Police Department believe they practice community policing; however, they lack knowledge about the philosophy of community policing. Bailey found that only about 50% of chiefs and sheriffs in America understand what community policing means (cited in Walker & Katz, 2005).

Community policing, by its name, may seem simple to incorporate; however, as one investigates the philosophy of community policing, it becomes obvious that it is a complex set of ideas reduced to an umbrella term for scholars and practitioners to use in establishing relationships and preventing crime. The hallmark of community policing is that the police serve the community's best interests, not just use a buzzword to create better public relations. Hunter and Barker (1993) warned that "for many people community policing seeks to be all things to all people, with little meaningful content" (p. 157). Community policing should be used to identify and solve problems that are significant to the community, including preventing crime from occurring. Under the auspices of community policing, the police should shift gears and start to focus on why crime occurs, deploying proved crime-prevention methods to deter crime rather than continuing to respond to an escalating cycle of crime or a set of beliefs based on their own sense of what is best for the community.

The patrol officers of the Centerville Police Department appear to believe they practice community policing because they have a mission statement and a policy that they make two citizen contacts a day. But the officers in this study were not able to define community policing, probably because they have never been provided with any training in community policing, and, therefore, they cannot make an educated assessment of what community policing is and how it can benefit a community.

As noted above, only about half of police chiefs and sheriffs in the United States clearly understand what community policing is. Despite this fact, nearly everyone affirms that community policing is valuable, and most departments claim to practice it. This study confirmed that the gap between intentions and results, between vague familiarity and in-depth knowledge, is real. By tracing the history of community policing in the Centerville Police Department, this study shows how good intentions fail to be realized in the absence of follow-up, ongoing training, and consistent monitoring.

References

Falcone, D. N., Wells, E. L., & Weisheit, R. A. (2002). The small-town police department. *Policing*, *25*(2), 371–384.

Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-oriented policing*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Hunter, R. D., & Barker, T. (1993). BS and buzzwords: The new police operational style. *American Journal of Police, 12*(3), 157–158.

Kelling, G. (1981). *The Newark foot patrol experiment*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Maxfield, M. G., & Babbie, E. (2005). *Research methods for criminal justice and criminology* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.

Scott, J., Duffee, D. E., & Renauer, B. C. (2003). Measuring police-community coproduction: The utility of community policing case studies. *Police Quarterly*, *6*(4), 410–439.

Sower, C., Holland, J., Tiedke, K., & Freeman, W. (1957). *Community involvement*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Thacher, D. (2001). Equity and community policing: A new view of community partnerships. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, *20*(1), 1–16. Retrieved February 20, 2004, from the EBSCOhost database.

Trochim, W. M. K. (2001). *The research methods knowledge base*. Mason, OH: Atomic Dog Publishing.

Trojanowicz, R. C. (1972). *Police-community relations*. Criminology, *9*, 401–423.

Trojanowicz, R. C. (1982). *An evaluation of the neighborhood foot patrol program in Flint, Michigan*. East Lansing, MI: National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center, Michigan State University.

Trojanowicz, R. C., & Bucqueroux, B. (1990). *Community policing: A contemporary perspective*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Trojanowicz, R. C., & Bucqueroux, B. (1994). *Community policing: How to get started*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Trojanowicz, R. C., & Dixon, S. L. (1974). *Criminal justice and the community*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2007). State and local law enforcement statistics. Retrieved February 18, 2008, from http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/sandlle.htm#policing

U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. (2005). *What is community policing?* Retrieved December 9, 2007, from http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/default.asp?Item=36

Walker, S., & Katz, C. (2005). *The police in America: An introduction* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982). The police and neighborhood safety: Broken windows. *The Atlantic Monthly*, *3*, 29–38.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Designs and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zhao, J., Lovrich, N. P., & Robinson, H. T., (2001). Community policing: Is it changing the basic functions of policing? Findings from a longitudinal study of 200+ municipal police agencies. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *29*(5), 365–377.

Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment Among Probation and Parole Officers: A Case Study

Seble Getahun, Barbara Sims, and Don Hummer

Numerous studies have focused on job satisfaction and organizational commitment of police officers and correctional personnel, but few have examined these concepts within community corrections agencies. This study draws on prior research into job satisfaction of criminal system actors and looks at the explanatory power of these concepts for probation and parole officers from one county in a northeastern state. Results indicate that employees are most satisfied when their occupational tasks are meaningful experiences into which they have input and are collaborative efforts with supervisors. Background characteristics of officers had no influence on job satisfaction, indicating that organizational culture and management style are the more important factors in explaining employee satisfaction and, possibly, retention.

"Employee satisfaction" and "organizational commitment" are two buzzwords associated with the retention of personnel in a variety of occupational settings. Nowhere are these concepts receiving more attention than in the field of corrections, where empirical links are being made between employee commitment, organizational culture, and institutional performance (Byrne, Taxman, & Hummer, in press; Hogan, Lambert, Jenkins, & Wambold, 2006). Much of the interest in assessing and analyzing employee satisfaction stems from a concern about possible on-the-job behavioral consequences (Camp, 1994). Low levels of job satisfaction among correctional employees have been shown to produce various undesirable behaviors, such as using the organization's time to pursue personal tasks, psychological and practical withdrawal from the job, and behavioral changes that alter the work place environment (Camp, 1994). Additional negative consequences associated with low levels of job satisfaction include attendance problems, higher rates of turnover, early retirements, lack of active participation in job tasks, and psychological withdrawal from work (Camp, 1994).

Job satisfaction refers to the extent that the working environment meets the needs and values of employees and the individual's response to that environment (Camp, 1994; Lambert, 2004; Tewksbury & Higgins, 2006). Lambert (2004, p. 210) defines job satisfaction as "the degree to which a person likes his/ her job," while Lambert, Barton, and Hogan (1999, p. 97) define the term as "the fulfillment of gratification of certain needs that are associated with one's work."

In studies Camp (1994) and Lambert (2004) conducted, correctional worker job satisfaction was measured as fulfillment from work, pay, coworkers, supervision, and promotion. Another common measure maintains that job satisfaction is associated with five dimensions, namely skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback (Glisson & Durick, 1988). Glisson and Durick note that of these five dimensions, only three—task significance, role ambiguity, and skill variety—strongly predict levels of job satisfaction.

Models that empirically measure job characteristics and their relationship to job motivation and satisfaction have been applied to various work environments in different occupations. Some researchers rely on the response of individuals in assessing overall job satisfaction, whereas others calculate the complex measures of job satisfaction from different dimensions of the job. Each approach has its strengths and weaknesses. Measuring the different dimensions helps to identify problem areas within the organization. For example, employees may point out that they are pleased with the salary but may be unhappy with other aspects of the organization such as how they are supervised (Camp, 1994).

Various studies have examined the predictors of job satisfaction among police officers and correctional personnel (Blau, Light, & Chamlin, 1986; Brough & Frame, 2004; Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2003; Cullen, Latessa, Kopache, Lombardo, & Burton, 1993; Lambert, 2004; Lambert et al., 1999; Zhao, He, & Lovrich, 2002; Zhao, Thurman, & He, 1999). As Zhao et al. (1999) indicate, two distinct models of job satisfaction are apparent in these studies. The first model focuses on demographic characteristics such as gender, ethnicity/race, educational level, rank, and years of service within the organization. The second model places emphasis on the individual's work environment. The work environment model consists of various dimensions of the work performed: skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback (Zhao et al., 1999).

Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation (as cited in Zhao et al., 1999) has also provided a theoretical framework for scientifically assessing police officers' job satisfaction. Herzberg's theory claims that the work environment determines police officers' job satisfaction and identifies three main sources of job satisfaction in the work environment: the work itself, the responsibility one has in the work, and recognition received from performing the work (Brody, DeMarco, & Lovrich, 2002; Zhao et al., 1999).

This study suggests that similar predictors of positive or negative job satisfaction found among police or corrections officers will be found among probation/parole officers due to the commonalities all criminal justice personnel share, e.g., they are in contact with individuals who have broken society's laws. Further, criminal justice personnel are continually asked to perform their jobs in under-resourced conditions and sometimes

within unsafe environments. It also is likely that many of the issues related to low levels of job satisfaction among non-criminal justice personnel apply equally to probation and parole officers. For example, the more general literature suggests that employees are better satisfied with their jobs when they are adequately recognized for a job well done and when they have an opportunity to contribute to policies and procedures of the organization (Slate, Wells, & Johnson, 2003). The current study examines the predictors of job satisfaction among probation and parole officers, drawing on the methodologies and findings of previous studies that examined both criminal justice and non-criminal justice related organizations.

Literature Review

According to Glisson and Durick (1988), it is important to understand certain job characteristics and how they affect behavioral outcomes. The characteristics of the job workers perform, the characteristics of organizations where they perform the job, and the characteristics of the workers performing the job all play a crucial role in job performance. Glisson and Durick define *job task* as the actual job performed and include characteristics such as skill variety, task significance, task ambiguity, and conflict. *Organization characteristics* include the work group size, budget, type of leadership, and the age of the organization. *Worker characteristics* refer to the individual's years within the organization, age, gender, education, and salary. Their findings indicate that the characteristics of job tasks are the best indicators of job satisfaction while organizational characteristics are the best predictors of organizational commitment (Glisson and Durick, 1988).

Finlay, Martin, Roman, and Blum (1995) suggest that some standardization measurements in job satisfaction studies do not differentiate between job characteristics such as job ambiguity, variety, and autonomy and organizational characteristics such as rule enforcement, openness of information flow, standardization procedures, and authority structure. To further understand the relationship between organizational structure and job satisfaction, the authors argue that it is important to separate measures of job characteristics from measures of organizational characteristics. Based on their efforts to do so, Finlay et al. (1995) found that organizational structure, with informal communication and loose chains of command, coupled with a management style that promotes teamwork as well as participatory decision-making, results in more productive and satisfied employees.

Job Satisfaction Among Police Officers

Research on job satisfaction among criminal justice personnel is relatively new compared with similar research conducted among employees in other occupations (Brough &

Frame, 2004). These studies in general are inconclusive with variable results (Blau et al., 1986; Brough & Frame, 2004; Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2003; Cullen et al., 1993; Lambert, 2004; Lambert et al., 1999; Zhao et al., 2002; and Zhao et al., 1999). Job satisfaction associated with policing, for example, has been examined within several different theoretical frameworks. Issues related to gender and race are prominent in this body of literature. Female officers have been found to view their administrators and supervisors as unfair and less supportive of their efforts (Butler, Winfree, & Newbold, 2003). Dowler (2005) found that Black/African-American police officers were more likely to believe that they are perceived as militant by their fellow officers when they speak out about perceived racial problems, thus causing some reduction in overall job satisfaction.

Other job satisfaction studies associated with police officers reveal several interesting findings. Brough and Frame (2004) found that the amount of leave taken, along with no opportunity for advancement, were both negatively associated with job satisfaction. Zhao et al. (1999) found that police officers who rated higher on job dimensions such as skill variety, task significance, and autonomy viewed their work positively. Most officers believe that they perform a significant work and that they possess the necessary skills to accomplish their tasks. According to Zhao et al. (1999), supervision plays an essential role in improving the working environment of police officers, thus enhancing job satisfaction. Brough and Frame (2004) report the influence of insufficient supervisory support and a lack of ongoing training programs on job satisfaction and turnover intentions (Brough & Frame, 2004). Finlay et al. (1995) found that officers express a higher level of job satisfaction when their professionalism is recognized and when bureaucratic formalities do not impede their autonomy. Changes in the structural contexts and management practices of police organizations are also believed to affect job satisfaction (Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2003).

Halsted, Bromley, and Cochran (2000) assessed the effects of work orientations, namely community service vs. crime control functions, on police officer job satisfaction. Their findings suggest that officers with strong community service orientations are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs than are those officers more oriented toward crime control functions.

Adams, Rohe, and Arcury (2002) examined the effect of community policing (COP) on officers' perceptions of non-traditional modes of policing and job satisfaction. They conclude that officers involved in COP are more accepting of COP principles and strategies, more accepting of their agency, and more satisfied with their job position. Moreover, officers who perceive their organization as having a participatory management style are more likely to support COP, be optimistic about police-community relations, and be satisfied with their positions.

Bennett and Schmitt (2002) focused on cynicism directed toward the police organization itself. They measured police cynicism from three dimensions: the work environment, organizational setting, and individual characteristics. Their findings indicate a significant relationship between organizational settings and police cynicism. The organizational setting measures were the work assignment, relationship with the community, relationship with supervisors, relations with fellow constables, and job dissatisfactions. No statistically significant relationship was found between the working environment (work load, available resources, and criminal violence) and police cynicism. The individual characteristics examined (rank, length of service, and socioeconomic status) also failed to reach statistical significance. The authors conclude that police cynicism and its effect on job satisfaction can better be explained by organizational conditions rather then the working conditions and individual characteristics (Bennett & Schmitt, 2002).

Job Satisfaction Among Correctional Personnel

Regarding correctional institutions, Lambert (2004) examined job characteristics such as job-related stress, supervision, job variety, and job autonomy as factors determining job satisfaction among correctional officers. Lambert defines job stress as "an employee's feelings of job-related stress, tension, anxiety, frustration, worry, emotional exhaustion, and stress," and defines job autonomy as "the degree of freedom that employees have in making job-related decisions" (2004, p. 211). Lambert refers to job variety as "the degree of variation in a job" (p. 211). Lambert theorized that these job characteristics are an important aspect of the work environment that helps shape job satisfaction among correctional officers; however, the study found only job variety and supervision to influence all the group categories studied (supervisory staffs, non-supervisory staffs, and correctional staffs). The study found job autonomy to be important in shaping the job satisfaction of non-supervisory and correctional staff but not supervisors (Lambert, 2004).

Lambert found that only job stress and supervision had a significant effect on organizational commitment. Organizational commitment is "generally defined as loyalty to an organization, identification with an organization, and a desire for involvement in an organization" (Lambert, 2004, p. 211). Neither job variety nor job autonomy was found to effect organizational commitment among correctional staff members. Job satisfaction was found to have the greatest effect on organizational commitment. Job satisfaction, together with job characteristics, accounted for the greater portion of the variance in organizational commitment. The findings support the assertion that work environment factors have a great effect on job satisfaction (Lambert, 2004).

Tewksbury and Higgins (2006) argue that emotional dissonance is associated with work-related stress, which, in turn, correlates with satisfaction with supervisors. According to the authors, emotional dissonance is a precursor of work stress and work stress is a precursor of supervision satisfaction. They suggest that understanding that emotional dissonance is stressful will assist correctional administrators to better predict the nature of work dissatisfaction among staff members.

Britton (1997) examined the role of race and gender on perceptions of work. She found that gender and race shape the perceptions of the work environment among correctional officers; however, the working environment itself did not account for the differences. The analyses demonstrate that race and gender should be considered as they interplay in the lives of individuals working in correctional settings.

Cullen et al. (1993) explored the overall job satisfaction among prison wardens and the factors that influence job satisfaction. Generally speaking, prison wardens are satisfied with their work and report significantly higher levels of job satisfaction compared with line officers. The job satisfaction determinants Cullen et al. examined were individual variables, organizational variables, work role variables, previous work roles, and social context (1993). The social context, organizational conditions, individual variables, and previous work were found to have no significant relationship with job satisfaction among prison wardens. However, the work role conditions (warden's influence on the daily activities of the prison) were significantly related to job satisfaction (Cullen et al., 1993).

Lambert et al. (1999) measured job satisfaction among correctional staff in relation to work attitudes, behaviors, and job performance. Their findings indicate that satisfied correctional staff tend to engage in more positive relationships with inmates and hold more positive attitudes toward rehabilitation. Lower levels of job satisfaction were linked with negative work behavior such as absenteeism, tardiness, and higher turnover (Lambert et al., 1999). Inconsistency and poor communication were also found to be sources of dissatisfaction among subordinates in correctional institutions, reinforcing the belief that there is a strong relationship between effective communication and job satisfaction (Lambert, 2004).

Blau et al. (1986) focused on the influences of individual and contextual characteristics on stress and job satisfaction among correctional officers. They suggest that in addition to stress, the main determinants of job satisfaction involve factors that relate to organizational culture. They found bureaucratic control and administrative policies to be the possible sources of dissatisfaction among correctional officers. The organization's stability, administrative directives, and administrator's ability to maintain stable force were all found to affect officer job satisfaction. Their findings indicate that the

social controls embedded within the bureaucratic administrative system are predictors of job satisfaction and job morale (Blau et al., 1986).

In one of the few studies focusing on non-institutional corrections employees, Slate et al. (2003) found probation officers' stress levels to be greater than the mean within the general public. The key stressors of probation officers Slate et al. identified were inadequate salary, leniency of the courts on offenders, lack of promotional opportunities, excessive paperwork, lack of recognition for a job well done, inadequate support from management, ineffectiveness of correctional systems, and the lack of adequate community resources (2003). Further, they found employees' perceptions of participation in workplace decision-making to have a significant influence on job satisfaction. Slate et al suggest participatory management within the probation organization as a means of reducing stress and burnout among probation officers (2003).

Summary

The research findings reviewed here suggest the need for the inclusion of several key measures in any study examining job satisfaction among criminal justice personnel. For one, supportive relationships between supervisors and employees are important if the latter are to remain satisfied with their jobs. Similarly, ongoing training programs for supervisors that focus on effective supervisory practices and effective communication with staff appear to play an essential role in improving the working environment and increasing overall job satisfaction of organizational members.

Even with the stressors common for many who work in the criminal justice field (e.g., police and correctional officers), employees appear to function better if the following factors exist: (1) they have effective training; (2) they believe their supervisors support them; (3) they believe they have a say-so in the development of policies and procedures under which they function; and (4) they associate a sense of some autonomy with their job tasks. Thus, understanding the culture surrounding the work environment is key to explaining the behavioral outcomes of employees. A focus on individual characteristics (e.g. socio-demographic variables) alone limits the extent to which job satisfaction among criminal justice personnel in general, and probation and parole staff in particular, can be explained.

Methods

Our research sought to identify the predictors of job satisfaction among probation and parole officers, an area of study that has received less than adequate attention in the more general literature. The participants in this study were probation and parole officers employed by a county department of probation/parole with approximately 104 officers: 68

field probation and parole officers and 36 officers assigned to the county's work release center program. Eighty-five officers participated in the study, yielding a response rate of 82 percent.

Administering the Questionnaire

The study used a non-probability, convenience sampling technique. No effort was made to pull a random sample because the entire population was sampled. The county was selected based on an exisiting relationship between the lead author and the agency itself. The study's questionnaire was administered through interoffice mail. In advance of distributing the survey packets, the lead author sent an e-mail message to all officers notifying them that they were being asked to participate in a research project. This initial contact e-mail also included information about how to participate. The survey packets included a cover letter from the researchers stating the purpose of the study and encouraging participation, a copy of the study's implied informed consent form, a copy of the study's questionnaire, and a self-addressed return envelope. Study participants were asked to complete the questionnaire, seal it in an envelope, and either give the envelope directly to the lead author or place the envelope in a mailbox set aside for completed questionnaires in the agency's main office. Approximately a week after the distribution of the survey packets, the lead author sent a reminder notice by means of agency e-mail reminding subjects who had not yet done so to complete and return the questionnaire.

Characteristics of Respondents

Table 1 presents a summary of the characteristics of respondents in the study. Sixty-one percent of the respondents were male, and the majority (83 percent) of the respondents were white. More than half (64 percent) of the respondents were married or were in a live-in relationship at the time of the study. The subjects represented a highly educated group, with all subjects having at least a four-year college degree or equivalent experience and almost one fourth (24 percent) reporting at least some postgraduate educational experience. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents were field probation officers, 38 percent were work release officers, and the remaining 5 percent were individuals in administrative positions.

The average years of employment at the present job was nine with a range of 1–34 years. About 80 percent of POs had not worked in any other probation and parole department, and 65 percent had not worked in other criminal justice-related fields before employment with the studied agency. The mean age of probation and parole officers at the time of the study was 37 years, with the youngest officer being 26 and the oldest 64.

Table 1. *Background Characteristics of the Sample*

Variables	Numbers	Percentage
Gender		
Male	50	61
Female	32	39
Race		
White	68	83
Non-white	14	17
Marital Status		
Married/live in relationship	51	64
Not married	29	36
Education Level		
Four years college/equivalent experience	62	76
Postgraduate work	20	24
Current Position		
Field officer	45	57
Work release	30	38
Administration	4	5

Note. Numbers may not total to 85 or percentages 100 due to missing data and rounding.

Independent Variables

The central premise of the current study is, "To what extent can characteristics associated with training, supervisory roles, the agency's reward system, perceptions of communicated directives, officers' sense of input into decision-making, individuals' perceptions of the meaningfulness of their jobs, and job-related stress predict officers' expressions of satisfaction with their jobs?" A number of independent variables were included, tapping into several key factors, to adequately conceptualize this rather dense question (see Table 2).

    All of the independent variables use a 5-point Likert Scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree nor agree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. Where appropriate, items were reverse coded so positive responses received the highest numerical code, thus providing for consistency in scale construction. The following indices were constructed as predictors of job satisfaction among probation and parole officers.

    Training. Training is an important component because it refers to the preparation to perform the *required* task. The survey assessed the influence of training by using a three-item measure: the availability of adequate training to perform the job; provision of orientation to new hires; and accessibility of training to advance on the job.

    Supervisory Role. The type of supervision within the organization is believed to affect job satisfaction. The survey measured supervisory role by means of a seven-item measure. The participants indicate their opinions on the fairness of their supervisors and

their supervisor's willingness to provide guidance and assistance on a daily basis when required.

Officers Input Into Polices and Procedures. Employees' participation in decision-making within the organization is theorized to affect job satisfaction. The survey measured participation in terms of giving input into the policies and procedures of the organization by using a three-item measure: "officers are often asked to participate in departmental decision-making," "officers make decisions on their own without consulting supervisor," and "officers are encouraged to establish their own individual work plan."

Meaningfulness of the Job. Job meaningfulness refers to the actual job performed and was assessed by using a six-item measure. Sample items from the scale are "my job makes good use of my skills and abilities," "the job can sometimes be challenging," and "the job gives me a sense of personal accomplishment."

Work Stress. The negative consequence of stress is costly both to the individual and the organization. The survey used a five-item measure to assess job stress. Sample items from the scale are "I often feel tense when I am at work," "the job is frustrating," and "I feel under a lot of pressure at work."

Reward System. Reward systems in the private sector are argued to have an effect on job performance and job satisfaction. This study examined whether reward systems also affect individuals involved in probation/parole work by means of a four-item measure. Sample items include "recognition depends on a job performed well," "pay raises depend on performance," "high performance is recognize and promoted," and "high performing employees receive non-monetary rewards."

Perception of Communicated Directives. Research findings are not conclusive on the effect of organizational structure on job satisfaction. The survey assessed the influence of perceptions of communicated directives within the organization on job satisfaction by using a three-item measure: "clear rules and regulations are in place," "there are chances for mobility and promotion," and "clear communication exists within the organization."

Dependent Variables

Job Satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured by using a six-item measure. The measures include satisfaction with the job, salary, and benefit packages (see Table 2).

Demographic Measures

Studies on job satisfaction have examined the influence of demographic measures such as age, gender, race, marital status, educational level, position, length of employment, and years of experience. This study recognizes the importance of these indicators as control variables and includes them in subsequent multivariate analysis.

Table 2. *Scale Items*

Training (3 items)
1. Probation/parole officers are given adequate training related to their individual jobs.
2. Officers are encouraged to attend various trainings aimed at assisting them to advance.
3. Supervisors and/or team leaders provide adequate orientation and on-the-job training for new hires.

Supervisory Role (7 items)
1. Supervisors here are fair in their dealings with officers.
2. Supervisors here are helpful to employees when it comes to making sure all policies and procedures are understood by officers.
3. Supervisors and administrators acknowledge and recognize officers for a job well done.
4. Officers here receive guidance and assistance they need on a daily basis from their direct supervisors.
5. Supervisors provide officers with constructive criticism aimed at improving overall job performance.
6. All too often, supervisors will blame officers when things go wrong.
7. When there is a dispute between an employee and a supervisor, the supervisor handles the matter in a professional manner

Input Into Policies and Procedures (3 items)
1. Officers here are often asked to participate in departmental decision-making.
2. Officers have the freedom to make some decisions on their own without consulting a supervisor.
3. Officers are encouraged to establish their own work plans and schedules.

Meaningfulness of the Job (6 items)
1. My job here utilizes well my skills and abilities.
2. I find my job to be challenging and often difficult.
3. My job is challenging, but in a way more positive than negative.
4. My job allows me to feel as though I am being productive and contributing something.
5. This job allows me opportunities to try out new and innovative (creative) ways to carry out my responsibilities as a probation/parole officer.
6. With this job, I feel a real sense of job security.

Table 2. (continued)

Job-Related Stress (5 items)
1. I often feel tense when I am at work.
2. My job is often frustrating in ways that cause me to become angry.
3. I feel I am under a great deal of pressure when I am at work.
4. There are many aspects of my job over which I feel I have no control.
5. I sometimes feel a threat to my personal safety when I am on the job.

Reward System
1. Recognition of employees depends on how well they perform their jobs.
2. Pay raises in this agency depend on how well employees perform.
3. High-performing employees are recognized for their efforts through promotion.
4. Exceptional employees are often the recipients of non-monetary rewards as well (e.g. praise, recognition letter, etc.).

Perception of Communicated Directives
1. There are clear rules and regulations specifying what I can and cannot do on the job.
2. There are chances for mobility and promotion within the organization.
3. There is adequate communication between supervisors and/or administrators and officers.

Job Satisfaction
1. Overall I am satisfied with my job.
2. This job measures up to the goals I had in mind for myself when looking for employment.
3. I would say that I enjoy the work I do here.
4. My satisfaction with my job here is sufficient that I have no immediate plans to look for another job elsewhere.
5. Overall, I am satisfied with the salary associated with my job.
6. Overall, I am satisfied with the benefit package associated with my job.

Note. All items coded on a standard 1–5 Likert scale, with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree

Scale Reliability Analysis & Coding

The researchers conducted a series of scale reliability analysis to assess to what extent the various underlying concepts measured what they purported to measure. The results appear in Table 3.

Each of the scales constructed produced a Cronbach's alpha of at least .590. All items in the original questionnaire were used in the indices except for two items from the Perceptions of Communicated Directives within the Organization section of the question-naire. Originally, five items combined into one index produced a Cronbach's alpha of .376.

Table 3. *Scale Reliability Analysis*

Scale Name	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Mean	St. Dev
Training	3	.590	10.12	2.528
Supervisory Role	7	.710	23.06	4.176
Input Into Policies and Procedures	3	.596	9.31	2.330
Meaningfulness of the Job	6	.798	20.45	4.358
Job-Related Stress	5	.763	14.36	3.845
Reward system	4	.840	7.75	2.853
Perception of Communicated Directives	3	.611	8.91	2.589
Job Satisfaction	6	.774	21.60	4.229

A factor analysis was performed on the five items to better examine underlying theoretical constructs. Through factor analysis, two underlying theoretical dimensions were found. Three of the questions pertaining to clear rules and regulations, chances for mobility and promotion within the organization, and communication loaded on the same factor, while the other two questions related to hierarchical decision-making and rigid policies leaving no room to officers' discretion loaded on a second factor. A decision was made to discontinue the use of the latter two questions and subsequent scale reliability analysis on the new three-item index yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .611 (see Table 3).

Six items were used for the outcome measure of job satisfaction. Out of the six, three items were derived from the Brody et al. (2002) study. As Table 3 shows, scale reliability analysis on the six items yielded a fairly high Cronbach's alpha of .774. Several of the demographic measures were dummy coded for inclusion in the full model. Gender was coded as 0 = male and 1 = male. Race/ethnicity was coded as 0 = non-white and 1 = white. Marital status was coded as 0 = not married and 1= married/live-in relationship. Education was coded as 0 = postgraduate work and 1 = four years degree/equivalent experience. Current position was coded as 0 = work release and 1 = probation/field officers. Age, Years Employed at Present Job, Years Worked Elsewhere in Probation/Parole, and Years Worked in Some Other CJ-related Field remained coded as continuous measures.

Results

To examine the overall research question—to what extent can job characteristics predict probation/parole officers' level of job satisfaction—controlling for officers' background characteristics, an Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression was used with job

satisfaction as the dependent variable. The overall model is significant (p = .000) and explains 58 percent of the variance in the dependent variable (see Table 4).

Table 4. *Regression Analysis: Job Satisfaction as Dependent Variable*

	ß	T	Sig.
Independent Variables			
Training	-.002	-.015	.988
Supervisory roles	.171	1.580	.120
Input into policies	.086	.659	.513
Meaningfulness of the job	.441	3.473	.001
Job-related stress	-.309	-3.473	.003
Reward system	.066	.582	.563
Perception of communicated directives	.165	1.084	.283
Age	.123	.864	.392
Gender	-.185	-1.902	.062
Race	.094	1.029	.308
Marital status	.158	1.800	.077
Education	.074	.829	.411
Current job position	-.218	-2.018	.049
Years employed at present job	-.119	-.935	.354
Years worked elsewhere in probation/parole	-.077	-.740	.462
Years worked in some other CJ related field	.098	.950	.346

Sig. = .000
Adjusted R^2 = .578

Note. Age, gender, marital status, education, and current job position were dummy coded.

The study's overarching argument is partially supported by the results of the multivariate regression. None of the control variables (demographic characteristics of officers, years employed at the current job, years of experience either in probation/parole or criminal justice related field) are significant predictors of the variance in the dependent variable (job satisfaction), with one exception: current job position. From the way the data were coded, it is interpreted that probation/field officers have a higher degree of job satisfaction than work release officers.

Of the remaining variables, meaningfulness of the job (ß = .441; p = .001) and on-the-job stress (ß = -.309; p = .003) are significant predictors of officers' job satisfaction. The findings support the assertion that officers who report higher levels of job meaningfulness are more likely to report a higher level of job satisfaction. Further, officers who report less stress at work are more likely to report a higher level of job satisfaction. Both of these

results are in the expected direction, as they replicate similar findings from studies of job satisfaction and commitment in other contexts (e.g. policing and institutional corrections).

Several of the predictor variables that were found to be significantly related to job satisfaction in the bivariate analysis (not shown) failed to remain so in the full model; however, this issue deserves further explanation. For example, the bivariate correlations revealed that older officers report a higher level of job satisfaction as did those with the most years of employment with the agency. This finding contradicts Butler et al.'s (2003) assertion that the interaction between age and length of employment has no correlation with job satisfaction.

There appears to be a link between job longevity, age, and officers' job satisfaction. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents report that they are satisfied with the benefits package associated with the job. It is likely that the level of job satisfaction increases with age, as officers are eligible for retirement benefits after working the twenty-year minimum. Forty-nine percent of the officers believe that chances for mobility and promotion within the organization are limited, and 84 percent believe that high-performing employees are not recognized through promotion. It is likely that these factors contribute to the low level of job satisfaction among younger officers. Perhaps future research should further analyze the interplay between age and length of employment as they affect job satisfaction.

As indicated by Zhao et al. (1999), many of the studies conducted on job satisfaction among criminal justice personnel are limited to testing the relationships between demographic variables and job satisfaction. However, the findings from this study suggest that work-related characteristics are better predictors of job satisfaction and, indeed, override any bivariate associations between officer characteristics and job satisfaction. Multivariate analysis in this study revealed that demographic characteristics, with the exception of current work position, have no significant relationship with job satisfaction. Administrators should give more attention to the work environment and organizational culture than to the individual background characteristics in trying to increase job satisfaction.

Regarding the one significant demographic measure (job assignment), work release officers appear less satisfied with their job than probation/field officers. As indicated by open-ended comments the officers provided, capricious rules, the court system, limited chances for promotion, long hours shift, lack of communication with management, lack of recognition for a job well done, favoritism shown among staff members, and lack of supportive relationship between departmental units are most problematic for officers assigned to the work release center. The agency must examine the culture of the work release environment more closely to determine the factors that might contribute to the lower job satisfaction among these officers.

As stated earlier, the negative relationship between job-related stress and job satisfaction is in the theoretically expected direction. Other study findings support the negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction (Blau et al., 1986; Slate et al., 2003; Zhao et al., 2002). Some of the least liked aspects of the job, again as noted in the open-ended comments, are similar to the total stressors Slate et al. identified (2003). As was the case in this study, some of the stressors are not within the reach of management; however, many could be addressed by altering management tactics (Slate et al., 2003). Involving employees in decision-making that directly affects the job and enhancing supportive relationships between the various units within the agency are suggestions for reducing stress and potentially improving overall job satisfaction.

Zhao et al. (1999) found that officers who rate higher on the various dimensions of job meaningfulness (skill variety, task significance, and autonomy) view their work more positively and are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs. The findings reinforce the belief that there is a strong relationship between the meaningfulness of the job and job satisfaction (Hogan et al., 2006; Zhao et al., 1999). Having a sense of job security, performing a job that allows productivity, and performing a job that uses the skills/abilities of officers were deemed as meaningful aspects of the job. Administrators should attempt to promote those aspects that provide meaningful experiences for officers to ensure job satisfaction.

This study supports the premise that job characteristics, particularly job stress and meaningfulness of the job, are aspects of the work environment that have significant effect on job satisfaction. This suggests that future research should examine in greater depth the effects of organizational culture, job characteristics, and management style to refine further the predictors of job satisfaction among probation and parole officers. These results also demonstrate possible dynamics behind retention issues in corrections. Younger officers and/or officers with fewer years on the job tend to be assigned to less desirable positions within the agency (e.g. work release). This disassociation between these officers and the organization so early in their careers could very easily lead to job dissatisfaction and result in officers leaving the organization. Administrators can help to offset this phenomenon by rotating officers between "sought-after" and "undesirable" assignments within the organization.

In sum, findings from the present study further demonstrate the need for community-based administrators to pay particular attention to several key elements of the working environment of their employees. It is not surprising that employees who see their work as meaningful and who experience less stress on the job are more likely to find some overall personal fulfillment related to their work. In such an environment, probation/parole officers, the clients they supervise, and local communities are all better served.

References

Adams, R. E., Rohe, W. M., & Arcury, T. A. (2002). Implementing community oriented policing: Organizational change and street officers' attitudes. *Crime and Delinquency*, *48*(3), 399–430.

Bennett, R. R., & Schmitt, E. L. (2002). The effect of work environment on levels of police cynicism: A comparative study. *Police Quarterly*, *5*(4), 493–522.

Blau, J. R., Light, S. C., & Chamlin, M. B. (1986). Individual and contextual effects on stress and job satisfaction: A study of prison staff. *Work and Occupations*, *13*(1), 131–156.

Britton, D. M. (1997). Perceptions of the work environment among correctional officers: Do race and sex matter? *Criminology*, *35*(1), 85–105.

Brody, D. C., DeMarco, C., & Lovrich, N. P. (2002). Community policing and job satisfaction: Suggestive evidence of positive workforce effects from a multi jurisdictional comparison in Washington State. *Police Quarterly*, *5*(2), 181–205.

Brough, P., & Frame, R. (2004). Predicting police job satisfaction and turnover intentions: The role of social support and police organizational variables. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, *33*(1), 8–16.

Brunetto, Y., & Farr-Wharton, R. (2003). The commitment and satisfaction of lower ranked police officers: Lessons for management. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *26*(1), 43–63.

Butler, E. K., Winfree, L. T., & Newbold, G. (2003). Policing and gender: Male and female perspectives among members of the New Zealand police. *Police Quarterly*, *6*(3), 298–329.

Byrne, J. M, Taxman, F. S., & Hummer, D. (in press). The National Institute of Corrections' Institutional Culture (Change) Initiative: A multisite evaluation. In J. M. Byrne, F. S. Taxman and D. Hummer, *The Culture of Prison Violence*. Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn & Bacon.

Camp, S. D. (1994). Assessing the effects of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on turnover: An event history approach. *The Prison Journal*, *74*(3), 279–305.

Cullen, F. T., Latessa, E. J., Kopache, R., Lombardo, L. X., & Burton, V. S. (1993). Prison wardens' job satisfaction. *The Prison Journal*, *73*(2), 141–161.

Dowler, K. (2005). Job satisfaction, burnout, and perception of unfair treatment: The relationship between race and police work. *Police Quarterly*, *8*(4), 476–489.

Finlay, W., Martin, J. K., Roman, P. M., & Blum, T. C. (1995). Organizational structure and job satisfaction: Do bureaucratic organizations produce more satisfied employees? *Administration & Society*, *27*(3), 427–450.

Glisson, C., & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *33*(1), 61–81.

Halsted, A. J., Bromley, M. L., & Cochran, J. K. (2000). The effects of work orientations on job satisfaction among sheriffs' deputies practicing community oriented policing. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, *23*(1), 82–104.

Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., Jenkins, M., & Wambold, S. (2006). The impact of occupational stressors on correctional staff organizational commitment: A preliminary study. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *22*(1), 44–62.

Lambert, E. G. (2004). The impact of job characteristics on correctional staff members. *The Prison Journal*, *84*(2), 208–227.

Lambert, E. G., Barton, S. M., & Hogan, N. L. (1999). The missing link between job satisfaction and correctional staff behavior: The issue of organizational commitment. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *24*(1), 95–116.

Slate, R. N., Wells, T. L., & Johnson, W. W. (2003). Opening the manager's door: State probation officer stress and perceptions of participation in workplace decision-making. *Crime & Delinquency*, *49*(4), 519–541.

Tewksbury, R., & Higgins, G. E. (2006). Examining the effect of emotional dissonance on work stress and satisfaction with supervisors among correctional staff. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *17*(3), 290–301.

Zhao, J., He, N., & Lovrich, N. P. (2002). Predicting five dimensions of police officer stress: Looking more deeply into organizational settings for sources of police stress. *Police Quarterly*, *5*(1), 43–62.

Zhao, J., Thurman, Q., & He, N. (1999). Sources of job satisfaction among police officers: A test of demographic and work environment models. *Justice Quarterly*, *16*(1), 153–173.

The Effect of Job Involvement on Correctional Staff

Eric G. Lambert

The driving force of corrections is the staff of correctional facilities. It is important to understand how the work environment shapes the attitudes of correctional staff; yet, the effect of job involvement on correctional employees has received little, if any, attention. Most of the research to date has focused on job stress and job satisfaction among correctional staff. Only recently has there been research on other important work attitudes, such as job involvement. Job involvement may have important effects on salient work outcomes. Therefore, there is a need to explore how job involvement may influence correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, life satisfaction, turnover intentions, family-on-work conflict, and work-on-family conflict. By using data acquired from a survey of staff of a state-run correctional facility in the Midwest, the researcher examined the effects of job involvement on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, life satisfaction, turnover intentions, family-on-work conflict, and work-on-family conflict. After controlling for gender, age, tenure, position, educational level, race, and supervisory status, the researcher conducted a multivariate analysis, which indicated that job involvement had a statistically significant positive relationship with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and both forms of work-family conflict. Job involvement was observed to have non-significant direct effects on correctional staff job stress, life satisfaction, and turnover intentions.

Work in corrections is often a hard, demanding job that usually holds little prestige in society, but it also can be a rewarding experience. "Few other organizations are charged with the central task of supervising and securing an unwilling and potentially violent population" (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004, p. 577). Armstrong and Griffin further contend that "correctional institutions are unique work environments in both context and purpose" (2004, p. 577). Further, corrections occupies an important place in the criminal justice system as well as in society (Goodstein & MacKenzie, 1989). Due to the importance of corrections in society and the criminal justice system, a growing body of research involves correctional officers.

This research is required to understand how correctional staff influence the organization and, in turn, how the correctional organization affects the workers. Correctional staff are the heart and soul of any correctional organization. Staff are responsible for myriad tasks and responsibilities that ensure that the organization meets its goals of providing a safe, humane, and secure environment. Correctional organizations

succeed (or fail) based on their employees. Archambeault and Archambeault point out that "correctional workers represent the single most important resource available to any correctional agency or institution in attempting to accomplish its mission, goals, and objectives" (1982: xxii). Correctional staff are the driving force of any correctional organization.

The correctional staff literature to date has focused mainly on the effects of work environment on the attitudes and behaviors of correctional staff, particularly on the antecedents of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. While many studies have focused on antecedents of work factors involving correctional staff, not all possible antecedents have been examined. The concept of job involvement has received very little attention in the correctional literature. This oversight is salient. Job involvement has been theorized to be the force that helps shape many employee and organizational outcomes. Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, and Lord argue that job involvement is "a key factor influencing important individual and organizational outcomes" (2002, 93). Furthermore, Brown contends that "increasing job involvement can enhance organizational effectiveness and productivity by engaging employees more completely in their work and making work a more meaningful and fulfilling experience" (1996, 235).

Outside the field of corrections, job involvement is theorized to be an antecedent of job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, life satisfaction, turnover intentions, and work-family conflict (Brown, 1996). Nevertheless, due to a lack of empirical exploration in the correctional literature, there is a question of what, if any, effects job involvement has on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, life satisfaction, turnover intentions, and work-family conflict. This preliminary study examines an empirical void in the correctional literature: the effects of job involvement on correctional staff. Specifically, it examines the effect of job involvement by means of a multivariate analysis, while controlling for the personal characteristics of gender, age, tenure, position, educational level, race, and supervisory status, on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, life satisfaction, turnover intentions, and work-family conflict.

Literature Review

Job involvement is the degree of importance an individual assigns the job in his or her life (i.e., central life interest) (Dubin, 1956; Elloy, Everett, & Flynn, 1995; Kanungo, 1982a, 1982b; Paullay, Alliger, & Stone-Romero, 1994). It is the psychological identification a person has with his or her job (Blau & Boal, 1987; Brown & Leigh, 1996; DeCarufel & Schaan, 1990; Kanungo, 1982a, 1982b; and Lawler & Hall, 1970).

> An individual with a high degree of job involvement would place the job at the center of his/her life=s interests. The well-known phrase 'I live, eat, and breathe my job' would describe someone whose job involvement is very high. . . . Persons with low job involvement would place something other than their jobs (e.g., family, hobbies) at the center of their lives" (DeCarufel & Schaan, 1990, 86).

The opposite of job involvement is job alienation (Kanungo, 1979, 1982a).

Job involvement is a distinct concept that differs from the concept of work ethic (Kanungo, 1982a, 1982b), which refers to the belief that work is important, and people should engage in work to better themselves (DeCarufel & Schaan, 1990). Job involvement is also a distinct concept from job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Job involvement is the importance of the person's job/work in his or her life, and job satisfaction is the degree of satisfaction an employee obtains from his or her job (Kanungo, 1982b). "[D]istinctions between emotional state of liking one=s job (job satisfaction) and the cognitive belief state of physiological identification with one's job (job involvement) have been advanced for some time" (Brooke, Russell, & Price, 1988, 139). Furthermore, organizational commitment is a bond with the organization, while job involvement is an attachment to the specific job (Kanungo, 1982a). Moreover, by using factor analytic procedures, Brooke et al. demonstrated empirically that job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment are indeed separate, distinct concepts.

Job involvement is a critical factor in shaping worker outcomes (Diefendorff et al., 2002; Lawler, 1986); for example, Hackman and Lawler (1971) theorize that job involvement is a salient factor in shaping the motivation of individual workers. Yet, little research has been conducted on the effects of job involvement among criminal justice workers. Most of the criminal justice research on job involvement has been limited to the police. A study of police psychologists found no statistically significant correlation between job involvement and job satisfaction (Bergen, Aceto, & Chadziewicz, 1992). A study of Canadian police officers observed that job involvement correlated positively with both job satisfaction and organizational commitment (DeCarufel & Schaan, 1990). A study of Midwestern police officers observed that job involvement correlated significantly with organizational commitment and turnover intentions (McElroy, Morrow, & Wardlow, 1999). In a study of Southern police officers, Lord (1996) reported a relationship between job involvement and the stressors of role conflict and role ambiguity. A study of Midwestern police officers found that supervisory initiation of structure in the workplace correlated positively with the level of self-reported job involvement (Brief, Aldag, & Wallden, 1976). Another study of Midwestern police officers reported that job involvement decreased during the eight months after academy training (Hazer & Alvares, 1981). A study of New

Zealand police officers found no difference in level of job involvement between male and female respondents (Love & Singer, 1988). Little, if any, published research exists on the effects of job involvement among correctional staff.

Job stress is generally defined in the correctional literature as a worker's feelings of job-related difficulty, tension, anxiety, and distress (Cullen, Link, Wolfe, & Frank, 1985; Grossi, Keil, & Vito, 1996). The researcher predicted that job involvement has a negative effect on job stress: those who are not involved do not look forward to their jobs; they work in jobs they care little about. Further, employees alienated from the job find it frustrating to attend work, day after day, which ultimately leads to increased job stress. Conversely, people who identify psychologically with their jobs may look forward to work.

Locke defines job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one=s job or job experiences" (1976, 1300). Job satisfaction is an affective response by a worker concerning his or her particular job, and it results from an overall comparison of actual outcomes with outcomes the worker needs, wants, or desires (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). Job satisfaction is the degree to which an individual likes his or her job (Spector, 1996). The researcher hypothesized that job involvement has a positive relationship with job satisfaction among correctional employees: people who are involved in work find it stimulating, which makes the job more satisfying.

Organizational commitment is loyalty to the organization, identification with the organization and its core values (i.e., pride in the organization and internalization of the goals of the organization), and a desire for involvement in the organization (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). A global concept, organizational commitment is much more than just a bond to the job or a work group. It is a commitment to the whole employing organization (Lambert, Barton, & Hogan, 1999). The researcher postulated that job involvement has a positive effect on organizational commitment: people who are not involved with their jobs are probably more likely to blame the organization for having a job they care little about, which means less likelihood of commitment to the organization. Conversely, people who are involved should form a greater bond with the organization from which the job originates.

Life satisfaction is the cognitive appraisal of the overall degree of satisfaction a person has with his or her life (Donovan & Halpern, 2002; Hart, 1999); it is a person's overall assessment of the quality of his or her life. The importance of work in a person's life might affect a person's overall satisfaction with life. Therefore, the researcher predicted that job involvement has a positive relationship with correctional staff life satisfaction. Work is an important part of most peoples' lives and occupies a significant proportion of their waking day. Besides consuming a considerable amount of time, a person's job often shapes his or her identity (Lambert, Hogan, Paoline, & Baker, 2005).

According to Terkel (1974), a job for many people provides "daily meaning as well as daily bread" (p. xi). If correctional staff have high job involvement, they should report greater satisfaction with life because they think they have purpose. Correctional workers who have low job involvement should report lower life satisfaction because they have a job they have little interest in doing.

Turnover intentions are the cognitive process of thinking, planning, and desiring to leave a job (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979). Turnover intentions generally occur before actual turnover; moreover, turnover intentions are generally the best predictor of voluntary turnover (Steel & Ovalle, 1984). According to Fishbein and Ajzen, "The best single predictor of an individual=s behavior will be a measure of his intention to perform that behavior" (1975, p. 369). The author hypothesized that job involvement is inversely linked with turnover intentions among correctional employees; people with high job involvement have little reason to leave the job. Conversely, correctional workers who are alienated from their jobs may, over time, develop a strong desire to leave their jobs.

Work-family conflict is "a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect. That is, participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by participation in the family (work) role" (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 77). Work-family conflict can be divided into two primary dimensions. One dimension occurs when family or social matters cause conflict at work. This type of work-family conflict is called family-on-work conflict. The second dimension of work-family conflict occurs when work matters affect family or social life, and this dimension is called work-on-family conflict (Netermeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996). Job involvement could be related to family-on-work conflict. Workers with low job involvement might not care when home issues cause distractions at work; however, employees who are highly involved with work may have greater family-on-work conflict. Job involvement could also be linked with work-on-family conflict. Brown argues that "high levels of job involvement could possibly lead to trading off family commitments in favor of job commitments" (1996, p. 239). Individuals too occupied with their jobs may experience problems at home when family members or friends push them to spend less time focused on the job. Thus, the researcher postulated that job involvement has a statistically significant positive correlation with both family-on-work conflict and work-on-family conflict among correctional employees.

Methods

Respondents

The researcher administered a questionnaire to the staff at a Midwestern state correctional institution that houses mainly medium to maximum security adult male inmates younger than aged 26 years. Staff were informed the survey was voluntary and

their responses would be anonymous. Of the 400 surveys issued, a total of 272 useable surveys were returned, which is a response rate of 68%. Respondents represented all areas of the correctional facility, such as correctional officers, case managers, medical staff, industry staff, and food service workers. The respondents also represented various administrative levels of the correctional facility, from line staff to supervisors and managers. The respondents appeared to be representative of the staff at the prison. Among the total prison staff, approximately 77% were male, 86% were White, and 53% were correctional officers. Among the respondents, about 76% were male, 81% were White, and 50% were correctional officers.

Variables

Control Variables. The personal characteristics of gender, age, tenure, position, educational level, race, and supervisory status were selected as control variables. Gender was measured as a dichotomous variable (0 = female and 1 = male); 76% of the respondents were male. Age was measured in continuous years and had a mean of 42.55 years, with a standard deviation of 8.32. Tenure at the correctional facility was measured in continuous years and had a mean of 9.64 years, with a standard deviation of 6.82. Position was measured according to whether the respondent worked in custody (coded as 1) or not (coded as 0); 50% were correctional officers. For this study, educational level represented whether a respondent had earned a college degree (1) or not (0); 41% of the respondents had earned some type of college degree (i.e., associate's, bachelor's, master's, or professional). Race was measured as a dichotomous variable (0 = Nonwhite and 1 = White); 81% of the respondents marked White. Finally, a variable representing whether the respondent was a supervisor of other workers (1) or not (0) was created; 24% of the respondents indicated they were supervisors.

Job Involvement. Job involvement was measured by using the response to three items ("I live, eat, and breathe my job," "The most important things that happen to me in my life usually occur at work," and "The major satisfaction in my life comes from work"). The items were adopted from Lawler and Hall (1970). Those surveyed responded to the three items by using a five-point Likert type of scale ranging from strongly disagree to agree, and the responses were summed together to form a job involvement index.

Dependent Variables. Job stress was measured by using five items (e.g., "During the past 6 months, how often have you experienced a feeling of being emotionally drained at the end of the workday" and "During the past 6 months, how often have you experienced a feeling of worry that the job is hardening you emotionally") from the Prison Social Climate Survey of the Federal Bureau of Prisons (Wright & Saylor, 1992). The response

options for the job stress items were rarely occurs, seldom occurs, occurs somewhat, usually occurs, and occurs frequently.

Job satisfaction was measured by using five items (e.g., "Most days I am enthusiastic about my job" and "I find real enjoyment in my job") from Brayfield and Rothe (1951). Respondents answered the job satisfaction items by using a five-point Likert type of scale ranging from strongly disagree to agree.

Nine items from Mowday et al. (1982) were used to measure organizational commitment (e.g., "I really care about the fate of this prison," "I feel little loyalty to this prison" (reverse coded), and "I find that my values and the prison=s values are very similar"). Respondents answered the organizational commitment items by using a five-point Likert type of scale ranging from strongly disagree to agree.

Life satisfaction was measured by using two questions from Quinn and Staines (1979). The first question was "Taking all things together, how happy would you say you are with your life?" (Response options were 1 = very happy, 2 = happy, and 3 = not too happy). The second question was "In general, how satisfying do you find the ways you're spending your life these days?" (Response: 1 = very satisfying, 2 = satisfying, 3 = not too satisfying).

The four parts of turnover intentions—1) thinking of quitting; 2) planning to stay or leave; 3) searching for alternative employment; and 4) a desire to leave current job—were measured by using items from Sager, Griffeth, and Hom (1998). The four items were as follows: "In the last 6 months, have you thought about quitting your current job?" (yes/no); "How likely is it that you will be at this job in a year from now?" (five-point Likert type of scale ranging from very likely to very unlikely); "How actively have you searched for a job with other employers in the last year?" (five-point Likert type of scale ranging from not at all to very actively); and "Do you desire to voluntarily leave/quit your job?" (yes/no).

Eleven items measured work-family conflict, which were adapted (and reworded for the correctional arena) from studies of work-family conflict outside the field of corrections (Bacharach, Bamberger, & Conley, 1991; Bohen & Viveros-Long, 1981; Higgins & Duxbury, 1992). Both dimensions of work-family conflict were measured. Family-on-work conflict was measured by using the response to two items (e.g., "My family life interferes with work" and "My social life interferes with my job"). Work-on-family conflict was measured by using nine items (e.g., "My job keeps me away from my family too much," "Work makes me too tired or irritable to fully enjoy my family and/or social life," and "I find that I frequently bring home problems from work"). Respondents answered the family-on-work conflict and work-on-family conflict items by using a five-point Likert type of scale ranging from strongly disagree to agree. The researcher created all the dependent variable indexes by summing the specific items together.

Results

Descriptive statistics for the measures this study used appear in Table 1. There appeared to be significant variation in the measures. All the indexes had a Cronbach's alpha value higher than .60, a level which is generally viewed as acceptable (Gronlund, 1981).

Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression models were estimated with the job involvement and the seven personal characteristics as independent variables and job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, life satisfaction, turnover intentions, family-on-work conflict, and work-on-family conflict as the dependent variables. Tables 2 and 3 present the results of the OLS regression models with job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, life satisfaction, turnover intentions, family-on-work conflict, and work-on-family conflict as the dependent variables.

In the OLS model with job stress as the dependent variable, job involvement had non-significant effects. In fact, none of the independent variables had a statistically significant effect on job stress. For the job satisfaction model, gender, supervisory status, and job involvement had significant effects. Women and supervisors, in general, tended to report higher levels of job satisfaction than men and non-supervisory employees. Job involvement has a positive effect: those with more job involvement reported higher levels of job satisfaction. In the organizational commitment equation, tenure, supervisory status, and job involvement all had significant effects. Tenure had an inverse association, which meant as age increased, organizational commitment decreased. In general, supervisors were more committed to the organization than were non-supervisory staff. Job involvement had a positive relationship. For the life satisfaction regression model, job involvement had a non-significant effect. Education level had a positive relationship.

Job involvement did not have a significant effect on turnover intentions. Education was the only variable to have a significant association with turnover intentions; it had a positive effect. For the family-on-work conflict, job involvement had a significant positive effect. None of the control variables had a significant relationship with the family-on-work conflict index. For the work-on-family model, position and job involvement had significant effects. Custody staff generally reported greater levels of work-on-family conflict than did non-custody workers. Job involvement had a positive relationship: increases in the job involvement measure were associated with increases in the work-on-family conflict index. Finally, the R^2 values, although modest, were the largest for the organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and work-on-family regression models. R^2 represents the amount of variance in the dependent variable explained/accounted for by the independent variables.

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics of Variables*

Measure	Description	Min	Max	Mean	SDev.
Gender	0 = Female, 1 = Male	0	1	0.76	0.43
Age	Measured in continuous years	20	61	42.55	8.32
Tenure	Measured in years at the facility	0	26	9.64	6.82
Position	0 = Noncustody, 1 = Custody	0	1	0.50	0.50
Education	0 = No college degree, 1 = College degree	0	1	0.41	.49
Race	0 = Nonwhite, 1 = White	0	1	0.81	0.39
Supervisory Status	0 = Not a supervisor 1 = Supervisor of staff	0	1	0.24	0.42
Job Stress	5 item index, α = .80	5	25	12.61	4.30
Job Satisfaction	5 item index, α = .89	5	25	17.50	4.29
Organizational Commitment	9 item index, α = .88	9	45	29.75	6.64
Life Satisfaction	2 item index, α = .87	2	6	4.11	1.09
Turnover Intentions	4 item index, α = .61	2	11	3.80	2.03
Family-on-Work Conflict	2 item index, α = .77	2	10	3.66	1.37
Work-on-Family Conflict	9 item index, α = .79	10	37	21.74	5.41
Job Involvement	3 item index, α = .74	3	12	4.75	1.70

Note. Min = minimum value, Max = maximum value, and SDev. = standard deviation. α represents Cronbach's alpha. The Turnover Intentions has a minimum value because the two questions with no/yes response categories were coded as 0 and 1, and the two questions measured with a five-point Likert type of scale were 1 to 5.

Table 2. *OLS Regression Results for the Effect of Job Involvement on the Dependent Variables of Job Stress, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Life Satisfaction*

Variables	Job Stress		Job Satisfaction		Org. Commitment		Life Satisfaction	
	B	β	B	β	B	β	B	β
Gender	0.01	.01	-1.52	-.15*	-1.19	-.08	-0.22	-.08
Age	0.01	.02	-0.01	-.02	-0.05	-.06	-0.02	-.15*
Tenure	0.02	.03	-0.07	-.11	-0.13	-.14*	0.01	.08
Position	0.35	.04	-0.81	-.09	-0.79	-.06	0.01	.01
Education	-0.17	-.02	-0.01	-.01	0.23	0.2	0.27	.12
Race	-0.73	-.06	0.040	.04	1.32	.08	-0.27	-.09
Supervisor	0.86	.08	1.86	.19**	3.82	.25**	-0.06	-.02
Job Involv.	0.01	.01	0.46	.18**	0.91	.18**	-0.05	-.08
R^2		.01		.15*		.16*		.06

Note. For a description of the variables, see Table 1; Org. = organizational, Involv. = involvement.

*p # .05   **p # .01

Conclusion

Many, but not all, of the predicted relationships were observed in this study. Job involvement appears to be important in helping shape the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of correctional employees. Employees who are involved with their jobs are much more likely to find satisfaction from the job than those who are alienated from their jobs. The psychological identification with the job ultimately leads to an affective response of a person liking his or her job. This relationship is probably due to the fact that greater job involvement leads to increased chances of the job meeting an employee's needs and desires. Correctional workers who are alienated from the job will probably put forth less effort at work, ultimately leading to an even smaller chance that the job will meet their emotional needs.

Table 3. *OLS Regression Results for the Effect of Job Involvement on the Dependent Variables*

Variables	Turnover Intentions		Family-on-Work Conflict		Work-on-Family Conflict	
	<u>B</u>	<u>ß</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>ß</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>B</u>
Gender	-0.34	-.07	0.01	.01	0.60	.05
Age	-0.01	-.02	-0.01	-.05	-0.02	-.04
Tenure	-0.03	-.11	0.02	.10	-0.04	-.05
Position	0.00	0.00	0.13	.05	3.48	.33***
Education	0.52	.13**	0.14	.05	-0.54	-.05
Race	0.06	.03	0.23	.06	-1.21	-.08
Supervisor	-0.14	-.03	-0.09	-.03	0.43	.03
Job Involvement	-0.05	-.04	0.18	.22***	0.36	.11*
R^2		.05		.06*		.14***

Note. For a description of the variables, see Table 1. Involv. = involvement.

*$p \leq .10$ **$p \leq .05$ ***$p \leq .01$

Furthermore, higher job involvement leads to greater commitment with the organization. This relationship is probably due to the fact that the person identifies with the job and the organization that created and controls the job. The organization needs to succeed in the long-term for the job to remain; therefore, it is in the best interest of a person with high job involvement to be committed to the organization. In the end, it is a win-win situation. The employee has a job he or she identifies with and the organization has a committed worker. Writing about employees in general, Blau & Boal (1987) refer to people with high levels of job involvement and organizational commitment as "institutionalized stars" who are critical to the long-term success of the organization. They refer to workers with low job involvement and organizational commitment as "apathetic employees" who may actually impede the long-term success of the organization. Thus, not only does the individual correctional employee benefit from increased job involvement, but the organization benefits as well.

It is in the best interest of correctional organizations to have satisfied and committed employees. Among correctional staff, higher levels of job satisfaction have been linked to positive work outcomes, such as greater support for rehabilitation, satisfaction with life, and compliance with organizational rules and goals (Fox, 1982; Kerce, Magnusson, & Rudolph, 1994; Lambert, Hogan, et al., 2005) Conversely, lower levels of job satisfaction have been found to lead to negative outcomes, such as burnout, absenteeism, turnover Intent and turnover (Byrd, Cochran, Silverman, & Blount, 2000; Dennis, 1998; Jurik & Winn, 1987; Lambert, Edwards, Camp, & Saylor, 2005; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986; Wright, 1993). Similarly, organizational commitment has been linked to positive correctional staff behaviors, such as higher levels of job performance (Culliver, Sigler, & McNeely, 1991) and negatively related to negative outcomes, such as absenteeism and turnover (Camp, 1994; Lambert, 1999, 2006; Stohr, Self, & Lovrich, 1992). The results of this study suggest that job involvement may lead to increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment among correctional workers.

Job involvement was also linked with both dimensions of work-family conflict. There was a positive correlation between job involvement and family-on-work conflict. It could be said that those employees with high identification with the job place too much importance on the job and become upset when their home life spills over into work. It is reasonable to expect that at times an employee's home life will affect him or her at work. It appears that those with high job involvement become more aware of this spillover and experience more stress from it. It also appears that placing too much importance on the job means that home life may suffer, as work-on-family conflict was also affected. A person with high job involvement may not have the time left to be with family and friends. Likewise, high levels of identification with the job may mean that the person spends too much time thinking about the job. Moreover, when problems occur on the job, a person with high job involvement may take out his or her frustrations at home on family and friends. In the end, it is possible that very high of job involvement may lead to the person becoming a workaholic.

As stated previously, high job involvement benefits both employees and the employing organization because it is linked with higher job satisfaction and organizational commitment. It also appears that negative effects may result from high job involvement such as increased work-family conflict. Work-family conflict has been found to be positively linked with increased job stress among correctional staff (Triplett, Mullings, & Scarborough, 1999). Thus, high job involvement may have negative consequences for correctional workers and the organization.

Interestingly, job involvement had no relationship in this study with job stress. It is possible that a relationship exists between the two variables that the study did not observe. It is also possible that there is no direct relationship between job involvement and job stress. Psychological identification with a job may not lead to either increased or decreased job stress for correctional workers. Research indicates that most stress for correctional staff comes from role stress, particularly in terms of role conflict, role ambiguity, role overload, perceived dangerousness of the job, and work-family conflict (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Cullen et al., 1985; Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Griffin, 2006; Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980; Hepburn & Knepper, 1993; Lambert & Paoline, 2005; Triplett et al., 1996, 1999; Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link, & Wolfe, 1991; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986). Job involvement is not a type of role stressor; it is a psychological phenomenon. It would be expected that apathetic (i.e., low job involvement) employees would experience less stress because they have less interest in the job. The lack of a relationship might result because job involvement is linked with job satisfaction, and job satisfaction has been found to be inversely related to job stress among correctional staff. Thus, it is possible that job involvement is not directly linked with correctional job stress. While it may not have direct effects, job involvement likely has indirect effects on job stress among correctional staff. Job involvement probably indirectly helps shape correctional staff job stress through work-family conflict. As previously indicated, job involvement was associated with both forms of work-family conflict. In turn, other research has found work-family conflict to be a stressor for correctional workers.

Job involvement also had non-significant relationships with both life satisfaction and turnover intentions. It could be that job involvement affects both life satisfaction and turnover intentions but the current study failed to observe an effect. It is also possible that there is no direct link between job involvement and either life satisfaction and turnover intentions among correctional staff. This does not mean that job involvement has no effect on either outcome. The effects of job involvement on turnover intentions and life satisfaction are probably indirect through job satisfaction and organizational commitment. According to Brown, "Proximal outcomes of job involvement mediate indirect relationships with more distal outcomes" (1996, 239). In other words, the immediate effects of job involvement are on job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and, in turn, job satisfaction and organizational commitment effect turnover intentions and life satisfaction. Past research has found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are important factors in helping shape life satisfaction and turnover intentions among correctional staff (Camp, 1994; Lambert, 2006; Lambert, Hogan, et al., 2005; and Stohr et al., 1992).

As with most research projects, this study has limitations. The findings are based on a single survey. Correctional employees at other correctional institutions need to be studied to determine whether the results reported here can be replicated. Without this additional research, it is impossible to conclude what, if any, effects job involvement has on correctional staff. Future research should use a more in-depth measure of job involvement. This study used three items to create the index for job involvement. The relationship with job involvement and other outcomes, such as absenteeism, job performance, and relations with coworkers, needs to be explored. In addition, future research should determine whether job involvement influences perceptions of the work environment. There is also a need to examine how job involvement is formed among correctional staff. Research among non-criminal justice employees has found that job involvement is generally shaped by work environment factors more than personal characteristics (Elloy, Everett, & Flynn, 1991, 1995). Clearly a need exists for much more research on job involvement among correctional employees.

In closing, correctional employees are the lifeblood of any correctional facility. Working in corrections is an experience like working in few, if any, other organizations. Because correctional staff are critical elements in any correctional organization, it is important to understand how the work environment affects them. According to Poole and Pogrebin, "We should be asking what the organization means to the worker instead of what the worker means to the organization" (1991, 170). The knowledge and understanding of factors that shape outcomes for correctional workers is critical for all parties involved, including correctional administrators, correctional employees, inmates, academicians, and society in general. In an era of increasing inmate populations, rising costs, shrinking budgets, and personnel shortages, this knowledge is paramount. Much more research is required on the effect of job involvement on correctional staff. This important area should not be ignored by either researchers or correctional administrators. Brown points out that "a deep understanding of job involvement and its antecedents and consequent influences has the potential to enrich a fundamental aspect of human experience (i.e., work) and contribute to heightened productivity in organizations and society by fostering greater use of human potential" (1996, 253). It is hoped that this study will generate more interest in job involvement among correctional staff.

References

Archambeault, W., & Archambeault, B. (1982). *Correctional supervisory management: Principles of organization, policy, and law.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Armstrong, G., & Griffin, M. (2004). Does the job matter? Comparing correlates of stress among treatment and correctional staff in prisons. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *32*, 577–592.

Bacharach, S., Bamberger, P., & Conley, S. (1991). Work-home conflict among nurses and engineers: Mediating the impact of role stress on burnout and satisfaction as work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *12*, 39–53.

Bergen, G., Aceto, R., & Chadziewicz, M. (1992). Job satisfaction of police psychologists. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *19*, 314–329.

Blau, G., & Boal, K. (1987). Conceptualizing how job involvement and organizational commitment affect turnover and absenteeism. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*, 288–300.

Bohen, H., & Viveros-Long, A. (1981). *Balancing jobs and family life: Do flexible work schedules help?* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Brayfield, A., & Rothe, H. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *35*, 307–311.

Brief, A., Aldag, R., & Wallden, R. (1976). Correlates of supervisory style among policemen. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *3*, 263–271.

Brooke, P., Russell, D., & Price, J. (1988). Discriminant validation of measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *73*, 139–145.

Brown, S. (1996). A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, *120*, 235–255.

Brown, S., & Leigh, T. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*, 358–368.

Byrd, T., Cochran, J., Silverman, I., & Blount, W. (2000). Behind bars: An assessment of the effects of job satisfaction, job-related stress, and anxiety of jail employees inclinations to quit. *Journal of Crime and Criminal Justice*, *23*, 69–89.

Camp, S. (1994). Assessing the effects of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on turnover: An event history approach. *The Prison Journal*, *74*, 279–305.

Cranny, C., Smith, P., & Stone, E. (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. New York: Lexington Books.

Cullen, F., Link, B., Wolfe, N., & Frank, J. (1985). The social dimensions of correctional officer stress. *Justice Quarterly*, *2*, 505–533.

Culliver, C., Sigler, R., & McNeely, B. (1991). Examining prosocial organizational behavior among correctional officers. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, *15*, 277–284.

DeCarufel, A., & Schaan, J-L. (1990). The impact of compressed work weeks on police job involvement. *Canadian Police College*, *14*, 81–97.

Dennis, G. (1998). Here today, gone tomorrow: How management style affects job satisfaction and, in turn, employee turnover. *Corrections Today*, *60*, 96–102.

Diefendorff, J., Brown, D., Kamin, A., & Lord, R. (2002). Examining the roles of job involvement and work centrality in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *23*, 93–108.

Donovan, N., & Halpern, D. (2002). *Life satisfaction: The state of knowledge and implications for government*. Retrieved December 9, 2007, from http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/upload/assets/www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/strategy/paper.pdf

Dowden, C., & Tellier, C. (2004). Predicting work-related stress in correctional officers: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *32*, 31–47.

Dubin, R. (1956). Industrial workers= world: A study of the central life interests of industrial workers. *Social Problems*, *3*, 131–142.

Elloy, D., Everett, J., & Flynn, W. (1991). An examination of the correlates of job involvement. *Group & Organization Studies*, *16*, 160–177.

Elloy, D., Everett, J., & Flynn, W. (1995). Multidimensional mapping of the correlates of job involvement. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*. Retrieved December 9, 2007, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3717/is_199501/ai_n8726804.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitudes, intention, and behavior*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Fox, J. (1982). *Organizational and racial conflict in maximum-security prisons*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Goodstein, L., & MacKenzie, D. (1989). *The American prison: Issues in research and policy*. New York: Plenum Press.

Greenhaus, J., & Beutell, N. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*, 76–88.

Griffin, M. (2006). Gender and stress: A comparative assessment of sources of stress among correctional officers. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *22*, 4–25.

Gronlund, N. (1981). *Measurement and evaluation in teaching*. New York: MacMillian.

Grossi, E., Keil, T., & Vito, G. (1996). Surviving 'the joint': Mitigating factors of correctional officer stress. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *19*, 103–120.

Hackman, J., & Lawler, E. (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *55*, 259–286.

Hart, P. (1999). Predicting employee life satisfaction: A coherent model of personality, work and nonwork experiences, and domain satisfactions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*, 564–584.

Hazer, J., & Alvares, K. (1981). Police work values during organizational entry and assimilation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *66*, 12–18.

Hepburn, J., & Albonetti, C. (1980). Role conflict in correctional institutions. *Criminology*, *17*, 445–459.

Hepburn, J., & Knepper, P. (1993). Correctional officers as human service workers: The effect of job satisfaction. *Justice Quarterly*, *10*, 315–335.

Higgins, C., & Duxbury, L. (1992). Work-family conflict: A comparison of dual-career and traditional-career men. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *13*, 389–411.

Jurik, N., & Winn, R. (1987). Describing correctional security dropouts and rejects: An individual or organizational profile? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *24*, 5–25.

Kanungo, R. (1979). The concepts of alienation and involvement revisited. *Psychological Bulletin*, *86*, 119–138.

Kanungo, R. (1982a). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *67*, 341–349.

Kanungo, R. (1982b). *Work alienation: An integrative approach*. New York: Praeger.

Kerce, E., Magnusson, P., & Rudolph, A. (1994). *The attitudes of Navy corrections staff members: What they think about confinees and their jobs*. San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.

Lambert, E. (1999). *A path analysis of the antecedents and consequences of job satisfaction and organizational commitment among correctional staff (turnover and absenteeism)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Albany.

Lambert, E. (2006). I want to leave: A test of a model of turnover intent among correctional staff. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, *2*, 57–83.

Lambert, E., Barton, S., & Hogan, N. (1999). The missing link between job satisfaction and correctional staff behavior: The issue of organizational commitment. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *24*, 95–116.

Lambert, E., Edwards, C., Camp, S., & Saylor, W. (2005). Here today, gone tomorrow, back again the next day: Absenteeism and its antecedents among federal correctional staff. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *33*, 165–175.

Lambert, E., Hogan, H., Paoline, E., & Baker, D. (2005). The good life: The impact of job satisfaction and occupational stressors on correctional staff life satisfaction—An exploratory study. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *18*, 1–26.

Lambert, E., & Paoline, E. (2005). The impact of jail medical issues on the job stress and job satisfaction of jail staff: An exploratory study. *Punishment and Society: The International Journal of Penology*, *7*, 259–275.

Lawler, E. (1986). *High involvement management: Participative strategies for improving organizational performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lawler, E., & Hall, D. (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *54*, 305–312.

Locke, E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Lord, V. (1996). An impact of community policing: reported stressors, social support, and strain among police officers in a changing police department. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *24*, 503–522.

Love, K., & Singer, M. (1988). Self-efficacy, psychological well-being, job satisfaction, and job involvement: A comparison of male and female police officers. *Police Studies*, *11*, 98–102.

McElroy, J., Morrow, P., & Wardlow, T. (1999). A career stage analysis of police officer commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *27*, 507–516.

Mobley, W., Griffeth, R., Hand, H., & Meglino, B. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological Bulletin*, *86*, 493–522.

Mowday, R., Porter, L., & Steers, R. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.

Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *14*, 224–247.

Netermeyer, R., Boles, J., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*, 400–410.

Paullay, I., Alliger, G., & Stone-Romero, E. (1994). Construct validation of two instruments designed to measure job involvement and work centrality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*, 224–228.

Poole, E., & Pogrebin, M. (1991). Changing jail organization and management: Toward improved employee utilization. In J. Thompson & G. Mayo (Eds.), *American jails: Public policy issues* (pp. 163–179). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Quinn, R., & Staines, G. (1979). *The 1977 quality of employment survey*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Sager, J., Griffeth, R., & Hom, P. (1998). A comparison of structural models representing turnover cognitions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *53*, 254–273.

Spector, P. (1996). *Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice*. New York: John Wiley.

Steel, R., & Ovalle, N. (1984). A review and meta-analysis of research on the relationship between behavioral intentions and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *69*, 673–686.

Stohr, M., Self, R., & Lovrich, N. (1992). Staff turnover in new generation jails: An investigation of its causes and preventions. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *20*, 455–478.

Terkel, S. (1974). *Working*. New York: Pantheon.

Triplett, R., Mullings, J., & Scarborough, K. (1996). Work-related stress and coping among correctional officers: Implications from organizational literature. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *24*, 291–308.

Triplett, R., Mullings, J., & Scarborough, K. (1999). Examining the effect of work-home conflict on work-related stress among correctional officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *27*, 371–384.

Van Voorhis, P., Cullen, F., Link, B., & Wolfe, N. (1991). The impact of race and gender on correctional officers' orientation to the integrated environment. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *28*, 472–500.

Whitehead, J., & Lindquist, C. (1986). Correctional officer burnout: A path model. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *23*, 23–42.

Wright, K., & Saylor, W. (1992). Comparison of perceptions of the environment between minority and nonminority employees of the Federal Prison System. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *20*, 63–71.

Wright, T. (1993). Correctional employee turnover: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *21*, 131–142.

Countering the "Contagion" of Inmate Nonamenability: Prison Specialization and Recidivism

Curtis R. Blakely

While current "get-tough" approaches to crime are popular, questions persist about the extent to which they promote public safety. This uncertainty is causing penologists to consider alternative ways to meet this objective. Prison specialization is one method that is attracting considerable attention. Proponents of specialization recognize that there are generally two groups of inmates—those that are amenable to therapeutic intervention and those that resist these measures. Under specialization initiatives, each prison houses either the amenable or nonamenable inmate but not both. The intent of this practice is to protect the integrity of the treatment process by shielding amenable inmates from the corrupting influence of those inmates whose presence may impede rehabilitation.

Let me preface this paper by stating that it is not for all intents and purposes a research article—instead, it is mostly conceptual in nature. The small amount of research that appears is based primarily on informal interviews conducted over the past decade. The purpose of this article is not to provide statistical information but rather to introduce readers to an alternative approach to inmate classification. This approach, known as prison specialization, has roots dating to the 18th century. The following introduction to prison specialization is intended to inspire readers to question current classification processes. If this paper helps renew interest in this area, it will have proved worthwhile.

As a contemporary penologist with access to a great amount of scholarship, I maintain it is inescapably obvious that few recent advancements have been suggested, developed, or implemented in the areas of inmate classification and treatment. Classification is the process of determining an inmate's security and treatment requirements (Winterdyk, 2004). All states require inmates to undergo the classification process at least annually; however, most inmates undergo the classification process more often due to institutional transfers or changes to housing or job assignments. Traditionally, inmates were classified as maximum-, medium-, or minimum-level offenders. Of course, this determination was based on an inmate's criminal record, propensity for violence, and factors such as gang affiliation. While governmental jurisdictions nationwide have adopted new security rating systems that designate inmates as Level I through Level V offenders (or some variation thereof), all approaches assess the risks a particular inmate poses. Closely related to an inmate's security rating is his/her institutional treatment plan, which

is based on an assessment of each inmate's emotional, mental, and intellectual states. Once an assessment is completed, an appropriate form of correctional intervention can be identified and delivered. Typical forms of intervention include educational, vocational, and counseling programs. While current classification practices are adequate and have withstood decades of litigation (see Brennan, 1988, with regard to classification and litigation), debate persists about how to make the treatment portion of this process more effective.

The Problem

An attribute long associated with the prison is the hesitancy of its officials to adopt new and innovative ideas (*Handbook*, 1965; Gill, 1972). This hesitancy may be especially true of the contemporary prison. This observation suggests that the prison has become a slave to its own traditions. Perhaps the prison has, to a greater extent than other institutions, come to rely more on rote activity than innovative practice. The prison's reliance on traditional approaches to its operations and classification procedures may hinder its ability to reform inmates and produce low recidivism rates. In fact, one might argue that since officials of the Walnut Street Jail first classified and separated inmates based on sex, age, and offense, few similar advances have occurred. Consider if you will that even the earliest depictions of the prison differ remarkably little from those of today. Penal practices and the scholarly statements they elicit exhibit a timelessness that is seldom found when dealing with other institutions.

As timeless as the prison may be, researchers continue to seek information about its operations and the effects of incarceration directly from those that know it best. Over a total ten-year period, between 1990 and 1992, 1994 and 1997, and 2002 and 2007, I spoke with inmates, ex-inmates, and staff of four different state correctional systems—two in the Midwest, one in the Southwest, and one in the Southeast. I conducted interviews with 278 individuals. These interviews were opportunistic and informal in nature. Most of the interviewees were offenders (222 or 80%) with terms of confinement ranging from 14 months to more than 50 years. One fifth (56 or 20%) were correctional employees, including new staff as well as those with careers spanning more than 20 years. These staff members included security, classification, treatment, and administrative personnel. All interviewees were asked open-ended questions about the prison's objectives, asked to rank-order these objectives by perceived importance, and offer observations about change within the prison. The penal objectives that respondents were asked to rank-order included incapacitation, retribution, deterrence, and rehabilitation. As interviews progressed, a consistency in participant statements appeared. Most participants (256 or 92%) indicated that the prison has changed little over the course of their confinement or

during their employment. Similarly, most inmates (193 or 87%) indicated that reform is given little attention by the criminal justice system.

As interviews progressed, one administrator provided me with an assortment of scholarship (all of which I still retain) relating to the early operations and objectives of the prison. Among this assortment of scholarship were references to numerous works, including one published by the American Prison Association in 1947 (now known as the American Correctional Association) and then republished in 1965. It took several years before I was able to locate a copy of this book titled *The Handbook on Classification in Correctional Institutions* (referred to herein as the *Handbook*). Yet once I did, it proved to be a valuable resource. The *Handbook* is a small and unassuming work that served for many years as the only national source of information available on inmate classification and treatment. While fifty years has passed since its initial publication, its authors (30 in total, including such luminaries as Loveland, Bixby, and Reckless) proclaimed offender-reform a necessary pursuit for the benefit of both the inmate and society. In addition to advocating offender reform and changes to classification processes, these penologists also called for the creation of specialized prisons. Noted penologist Howard Gill (an expert on inmate classification and treatment) lent considerable support to the contentions appearing in the *Handbook* by similarly asserting that treatment, if delivered within the proper setting (i.e. the specialized prison), would lower recidivism rates (1972). These penologists agreed that through the delivery of treatment within the specialized prison, society might be spared the personal, social, and financial costs associated with repeat criminality.

The *Handbook* serves as the basis for this paper, and while many classification manuals have been written, published, and adopted since its appearance, none have so clearly advocated or outlined the benefits of specialization. Before we consider prison specialization in greater detail, ponder the following excerpt that details the belief that the public's interest can best be served through inmate reform:

> The public's welfare can best be protected by returning as many prisoners as possible to the community, fitted educationally and vocationally, in physical and mental health and through changed attitudes and ideals, to take their places as law-abiding citizens. The necessity for a program, which will have a constructive effect upon prisoners, is based upon the inescapable fact that over ninety-five percent of all prisoners committed to prison are sooner or later returned to the community. The prison has the grave responsibility of determining whether they shall be returned less criminally inclined or with criminal

attitudes more fixed and with criminal abilities more fully developed (*Handbook*, 1965, p. 1).

The assertions made within this statement contain a profound logic—that logic being the necessity for prison officials to challenge those attitudes and actions (of either inmate or staff) that perpetuate criminality (see Clear, 1994, for a more complete review). In essence, the prison must be a proactive institution that embraces its role as a producer of public safety. When these statements are considered, it becomes evident that early penologists were convinced that the prison must be held to the highest standards possible with regard to facilitating inmate reform. Before proceeding, it is important that we acknowledge that there is currently little consensus about the definition of rehabilitation or what constitutes recidivism; however, recidivism is simply a measure of whether an inmate has forgone his/her criminal ways. A lack of agreement about recidivism's definition often pertains to the time frame under consideration (i.e. 5, 10 or 15+ years) and whether it occurs upon arrest, conviction, or incarceration. Regardless of the particular definition adopted, those penologists referenced above believed that prison specialization could lower recidivism rates.

What Is Prison Specialization

Contemporary proposals calling for the establishment of specialized prisons are historically based. In fact, prison specialization dates to the 13th century. It was then that officials in London, England, began to experiment with specialized prisons as part and parcel of their normal penal practice (Riley, 1859). While little scholarship exists to tell us about the operational specifics of these early institutions, each specialized prison nonetheless held a different "type" of offender. For example, some of these prisons appear to have housed the less serious and less experienced offender while others housed the serious, chronic, and hardened offender. While a complete description of these institutions is lacking, more complete writings exist concerning the basis for specialization's emergence in North America.

In North America, the groundwork for specialization dates to the 18th century. It was then that several important events took place. First, a group of progressive penal thinkers met at the home of Benjamin Franklin to develop an ideology for prison operations (Gill, 1972). It was then that ideals about treatment and inmate amenability began to emerge. This meeting represents the earliest recorded affirmation of treatment and rehabilitation as official American penal objectives. Shortly thereafter, officials of the Walnut Street Jail put many of these ideals into practice. The Walnut Street Jail (constructed in Philadelphia in 1776) is widely considered the first American prison to implement a classification

process promoting inmate well-being and reform. But why did its officials implement a new inmate classification system? Simply put, the citizenry demanded it. Such a progressive move occurred at the urging of the *Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons* (Champion, 2005, p. 203). This group of concerned citizens convinced jail officials to separate inmates based on sex, age, and perceived dangerousness. Before this approach all inmates, regardless of these characteristics, were housed in the same facility where contact occurred freely. As you can imagine, victimization of the weaker and less assertive inmate was common. Not only did traditional approaches perpetuate the cycle of victimization and violence, but it also discouraged reform. The decision to classify and separate inmates was a significant step in the evolution of the American prison. It also marked the first time in our history that offender attributes were recognized as a necessary consideration for determining an inmate's housing assignment. However, since officials stopped short of separating inmates based on amenability (an inmate's desire to undergo or forgo treatment, which is at the crux of specialization), prison specialization was never fully realized.

Let's leap ahead to modernity where specialization is still occasionally discussed. Generally speaking, advocates of specialization believe that all inmates can be separated into two groups. These groups consist of inmates that have the desire and capacity to undergo treatment (these inmates are considered amenable) and conversely those that are opposed to treatment (these inmates are considered nonamenable). A third category includes those "special needs" inmates that exhibit emotional or mental impediments. For simplicity's sake, I shall ignore the latter group of inmates since their condition may make rehabilitative treatment ineffective. Instead, for these inmates the prison must provide for their protection and care until they can be placed into one of the other categories. Thus, specialization requires correctional officials to determine into which group—amenable or nonamenable—each particular inmate belongs. This determination then serves as the basis for an inmate's institutional placement. Of course, amenable inmates would be housed in prisons designed to meet their specific needs while nonamenable inmates would be housed accordingly. This should not be confused with the traditional practice of segregating "disruptive" or "disciplinary" inmates. Yes, these inmates may also be nonamenable, but many more nonamenable inmates escape the attention of prison authorities.

As you can see, specialization runs counter to the contemporary practice of housing amenable and nonamenable inmates in the same prisons. For example, Gill, an outspoken champion of specialization during the sixties and seventies, declared the current approach poor penal practice but recognized that "most of our state prisons have

been built on this kind of hodgepodge intermingling" (1972). Advocates of prison specialization contend the following:

- a great deal of diversity exists within the inmate population,
- within this population there are inmates that desire treatment as well as those that oppose it,
- it must be determined into which group (amenable or nonamenable) an inmate belongs,
- treatment can lead to meaningful and lasting reform,
- inmates that object to treatment can be assertive and even violent when expressing their uninterest in correctional intervention,
- nonamenable inmates, if included in treatment programming, can have a corruptive effect on the amenable inmate and disrupt the therapeutic process,
- members of these two groups should be housed separately—just as we now separate female inmates from their male counterparts, juveniles from adult inmates, and serious offenders from those of a less serious nature,
- separating members of these two groups protects the integrity of the treatment process, increases the likelihood for successful reform, and promises a reduction in recidivism, and
- the separation of these two groups requires that each prison be equipped to deal with either the amenable or nonamenable inmate, but not both.

While one might agree that these observations appear reasonable, contemporary penal practice nonetheless calls for the housing of amenable and nonamenable inmates within the same institutions where contact between members of these groups occur freely. Furthermore, because no effort is currently undertaken to separate members of these two groups, it is also reasonable to believe that they attend many of the same treatment programs. Now, you might be of the initial opinion that this statement contradicts earlier ones concerning the nonamenable inmate's desire to forgo treatment. Even though nonamenable inmates lack an interest in personal betterment, they do attend treatment for several reasons, including mandatory participation statutes and staff directive (collectively referred to as compelled participation), boredom, and because they wish to earn early release. While I won't address the latter two possibilities, compelled attendance in treatment programs is a common practice. According to those officials I interviewed, there are two reasons for compelled attendance. First, it is a management tool for controlling large inmate populations. The greater the number of inmates involved in productive activities, the fewer there are to engage in disruptive activities. This practice ensures that during a normal day, the inmate population is reduced to smaller, more manageable groups that spend their limited time and energy on activities that do not

threaten institutional operations. Second, a majority (53 or 95%) of staff interviewed admitted that they have encouraged inmates to attend treatment regardless of the inmate's interest. These employees reasoned that this encouragement serves to motivate inmates toward reform. Of course, it is believed that when amenable and nonamenable inmates interact within a therapeutic setting, the nonamenable inmate may, through osmosis (for lack of a better word), become amenable. However, advocates of specialization argue that this is a dangerous practice and is ultimately counterproductive to public safety. This argument is based on the following conviction:

- the mere presence of the nonamenable inmate within a therapeutic setting degrades the treatment process, and
- by forcing amenable and nonamenable inmates to interact, the nonamenable inmate is more likely to challenge the convictions of the amenable inmate than the opposite to occur. (This reflects the old adage that it takes but one bad apple to spoil the barrel.)

While a desire by prison staff to encourage reform within the inmate population is admirable, specialization stipulates that nonamenable inmates will challenge the convictions of those that are amenable. Nonamenable inmates are, in all probability, more assertive and proficient at manipulating others than are their amenable counterparts (Gill, 1972). Thus, nonamenable inmates are well positioned to impede reform initiatives. Because amenable inmates tend to avoid confrontation, they may be at risk for control and exploitation by those that are more dominant. You are probably asking yourself, "What do nonamenable inmates gain by this manipulation?" Be patient and allow me a few additional comments before I reveal the answer. Meanwhile consider the following observation:

> Little consideration is given to the kinds of housing and types of persons
> with which he (the amenable inmate) will associate in his living quarters.
> His response to the entire program is frequently conditioned by those
> with whom he lives (*Handbook*, 1965, p. 79).

This excerpt suggests the necessity for the separation of these groups. To permit nonamenable inmates to attend treatment programs along with those that are amenable ignores the possibility that a waste of time, energy, and resources may occur. Therefore, early advocates of specialization endorsed selectivity in the delivery of treatment (*Handbook*, 1965). This approach is based on the premise that the nonamenable inmate may monopolize the attention of a therapist, counselor, or teacher, impeding the reform of those that might benefit from intervention. For example, consider the following statement:

To attempt to give all prisoners all services would be impractical, both because facilities would be diluted to the point where intensive work could not be done with any

and second, because such a program could fail to meet the specific needs of individual prisoners (*Handbook*, 1965, p. 1).

Thus, the basis for prison specialization rests on the premise that treatment be provided only to amenable inmates in an environment free from the presence of those that may degrade it. This is not to suggest that nonamenable inmates be treated more harshly than those that are amenable, just that the needs of each group warrant their separation. Consider this observation:

> All kinds of individuals are received in prison; experienced, hardened criminals and those who have committed their first offense; the serious escape risk and the person who would leave the institution only by legal process; the adolescent and the aged; the diseased and healthy; the intelligent and the feeble-minded; … the insane and psychopathic, and persons who are dangerous to themselves and others. The difficulty in providing a program that will adequately meet the needs and requirements of all these types in one institution is obvious. Efficient segregation is necessary for good custody, discipline, and rehabilitation (*Handbook*, 1965, p. 5).

This statement suggests that diversity among the inmate population is so extensive that it renders the "unspecialized prison" ineffective in meeting the many needs of its inmates. Of course, diversity includes demeanor. Advocates of specialization recognize that diversity in demeanor exists within the inmate population just as it does with other characteristics such as age and the seriousness of one's offence. In fact, Brennan recognizes classification as the mechanism that creates order out of diversity (1998). Inmate demeanor, therefore, must become a necessary consideration during classification processes. The rationale for this consideration is the belief that an amenable demeanor and a desire for treatment are necessary prerequisites for change. Similarly, no two inmates are alike nor can a single institution meet the needs of both amenable and nonamenable offenders. If the nonspecialized prison is not able to meet the needs of its inmate population, then it is reasonable to expect that the specialized prison may be better suited for this endeavor. You may have noticed that the "dangerousness" of some inmates is duly noted within this excerpt. This observation not only relates to an inmate's proclivity toward violence but also suggests the ability of the nonamenable inmate to dissuade amenable inmates from seeking treatment. When this happens, the criminal cycle is perpetuated and the resources of our criminal justice system become unnecessarily taxed.

Consider also that typical inmate socialization processes involve the indoctrination of new inmates into the unique subculture of the correctional institution. This process

includes the familiarization of new inmates to the typical values, norms, and beliefs of those inmates that have established dominance. Since nonamenable inmates are often more assertive and violent than are amenable ones, they have successfully established a "culture of opposition" to correctional intervention. This culture permeates most areas of a prison's operations that involve staff and inmate interaction. The existence and extent of this culture of opposition became a topic of conversation during interviews with inmates and staff. While there are inmates that desire treatment, perhaps their numbers are unnecessarily reduced by a more dominant group of inmates that value resistance and noncompliance (Wood, 2007). Simply put, nonamenable inmates may be responsible for an overall reduction in the number of inmates that pursue treatment. Certainly, if a culture of opposition exists within the prison, it is perpetuated by the nonamenable inmate population. But why would nonamenable inmates want to impede treatment processes? What could they possibly gain by doing so (returning to my earlier question)? In addition to its overall disruptive effect on prison operations, it also impedes the ability of officials to detect and investigate the illicit activities of inmate leadership. This leadership often derives its power from an underground economy fueled by the acquisition and sale of contraband items. Inmates participating in treatment programs are perceived as a threat because they tend to have good relationships with staff and might divulge information detrimental to the nonamenable inmate population. Of course, this cooperation potentially compromises the ability of nonamenable inmates to maintain their positions of leadership. By perpetuating a culture of opposition, nonamenable inmates reduce the number of amenable inmates within a prison and, thus, preserve their positions of prominence.

These possibilities have led advocates of prison specialization to insist that inmate amenability become an important consideration during classification processes. While few suggestions exist about how to undertake this objective, it appears implicit that all inmates would, by default, be assumed amenable. In essence, classification specialists would not determine amenability, rather nonamenability. By assuming all inmates to be amenable, the burden of proving otherwise would rest on the shoulders of correctional officials. This would protect inmate interests and help ensure an adherence to established due process procedures.

So how would one determine nonamenability? Consider if you will that inmates are generally quite clear about where they stand on practices that affect them personally, including those pertaining to treatment. Both solicited and unsolicited statements serve to provide insight into each inmate's personality during the normal classification process. It is common for inmates either to acknowledge a need for reform or refuse to participate in treatment initiatives. Thus, a determination of nonamenability might simply begin by asking each inmate how he/she feels about treatment during the initial classification

procedure. However, since humans are capable of deception, additional sources of information, including staff observations, a review of past criminal involvement, and psychological assessments, might prove informative (*Handbook*, 1965). Recognize that these are the same sources of information that classification officials currently consult. According to the *Handbook*, considering multiple sources of information reduces the likelihood for misclassification (1965). A few indicators of an inmate's nonamenable nature include the following:

- a vehement refusal to acknowledge criminal actions as personally and socially destructive,
- the development of excuses/justifications to minimize or eliminate responsibility, and
- seeing oneself as a victim rather than as an offender.

While additional indicators for nonamenability exist, all reflect an inmate's lack of interest in pursuing treatment. Since humans are in a constant state of change and maturation, mechanisms must also be developed to address shifts that may occur in an inmate's demeanor. It is recognized that amenable and nonamenable inmates may, at any given time, have a change of attitude with regard to their desire for treatment. An inmate's classification rating "cannot be fixed or final" (*Handbook*, 1965). Instead, provisions must be devised to protect the overall integrity of this process while permitting review and reclassification should it become necessary.

Discussion

In light of slowing prison admissions, an opportunity now exists for penologists to consider earlier proposals that may help reduce recidivism. A theme dominating early penal scholarship is the assertion that the prison can produce a safer society through offender reform. While contemporary scholarship is replete with evidence suggesting that reform has lost political support, it nonetheless offers society a reasonable solution to chronic offending.

Even though the objective of offender rehabilitation dates to the earliest American prison, its pursuit was dealt a crippling blow during the 1970s when Robert Martinson (1974) in his "*nothing works*" report, James Q. Wilson (1975) in his *Thinking About Crime*, and David Fogel (1975) in *We Are the Living Proof* proclaimed it unachievable. The anti-reform attack these scholars launched coupled with the media's coverage of the riots at Attica (1971) and the Penitentiary of New Mexico (1980) persuaded officials nationwide to reject reform ideology. In reality, these riots were fueled by administrative mismanagement and inhumane living conditions (see Friedman, 1993, for factors associated with prison riots). Nonetheless, the national political climate produced by these events diminished support for reform initiatives. Instead, the control and containment of

increasingly large inmate populations became a paramount objective. Thus, recidivism as a measure of the prison's effectiveness was replaced with the notion that a prison's value could be determined solely by the number of inmates it housed. In the absence of a reform ideology, the prison became increasingly harsh and the existence of amenable inmates largely forgotten.

When considering recidivism, one must also recognize that incarceration changes inmates either for the better or worse. The negative effect is reflected in high recidivism rates, and the positive effect is reflected in lower recidivism rates. Of those studies that exist with regard to recidivism, many suggest that about two thirds of all ex-inmates eventually reoffend—most within 36 months after release (Wood, 2007). Interestingly enough, this fact is used to further denounce reform initiatives and justify broadened get-tough sanctions. In essence, advocates of get-tough approaches have further attacked treatment based on high recidivism rates. Yet, it appears just as likely that treatment programs remain ineffective due instead to the indiscriminate mixing of inmates. Clearly the current political climate favors incapacitation at the expense of reform. This is especially evident when one compares contemporary penal writings with those from just a few decades past. Unfortunately, recidivism rates will likely remain elevated until treatment and reform are again valued.

In an opposite fashion, advocates of specialization argue that high recidivism rates do not justify current approaches but are instead a condemning testimonial to the indiscriminate mixing of amenable and nonamenable inmates. These advocates suggest that current get-tough approaches ignore the possibility that prisons may perpetuate criminality by mixing the experienced inmate with the first-time offender and by failing to treat that portion of the inmate population that desires therapeutic intervention. Closer attention to recidivism rates would help produce a prison system that seeks to reduce the negative effects of incarceration while enhancing its ability to facilitate inmate reform. Measures of recidivism also ensure that prison officials remain accountable to the citizenry with regard to their performance in promoting public safety. Citizens have little alternative but to support current practices since few alternatives or suggestions for improvement exist.

How do we begin to improve our prisons? The answer to that question is complicated. However, scholarship and debate about the potential benefits of specialization certainly help. Of course, the second step is the establishment of a pilot program to collect data on the effects of specialization. Following the findings of a pilot program, perhaps additional test sites might produce even greater amounts of data.

Conclusion

The consideration of alternative ways to house and treat inmates promotes a national dialogue about the purpose and destiny of the prison. By considering the potential benefits associated with specialization, penologists are taking a necessary first step toward improving public safety. While the prison's traditional objective of promoting public safety remains intact, the manner by which it pursues that objective is open to debate and modification. Practitioners and penologists must now determine whether the indiscriminate mixing of inmates within the prison is sound operational practice or whether it may prove beneficial to emulate officials of the Walnut Street Jail and boldly embrace innovative penal practices.

References

Brennan, T. (1998). Classification for control in jails and prisons. In Flanagan, J. J., Marquart, J. W., & Adams, K. G., (Eds), *Incarcerating Criminals: Prisons and Jails in Social and Organizational Context*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Champion, D. (2005). *Corrections in the United States: A contemporary perspective* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Clear, T. (1994). *Harm in American penology: Offenders, victims, and their communities*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Fogel, D. (1975). *We are the living proof: The justice model for corrections*. Cincinnati: Anderson.

Friedman, L. (1993). *Crime and punishment in American history*. New York: BasicBooks.

Gill, H. (1972). Correctional philosophy and architecture. In Carter, R. M., Glaser, D. & Wilkins, L. T., (Eds), *Correctional Institutions*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott.

Gill, H. (1962). Correctional philosophy and architecture. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*: *53*(3).

Handbook on classification in correctional institutions. (1965). Prepared by the Committee on Classification and Casework of the American Prison Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest*, *35*(22–54).

Riley, H. T. (1859). Liber albus. In *Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis: Liber albus, Liber custumarum, et Liber Custumarum* (vol. I). Rolls Series (12).

Wilson, J. Q. (1975). *Thinking about crime*. New York: Vintage Books.

Winterdyk, J. (2004). *Adult corrections: International systems and perspectives*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Wood, P. (2007). Exploring the positive punishment effect among incarcerated adult offenders. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *31*(2).

Adult Probation Department Mental Health Unit: An Outcomes Investigation

Kevin Jesse, David Bishop, Jose Thomas, and Jason Dudish-Poulsen

This study examined the outcome of probation cases (N=241) within the Cook County Adult Probation Department-Mental Health Unit (MHU) and followed the rates of recidivism among these cases from 2001 through 2004. The study was conceived to identify specific program operation areas in need of improvement within the Adult Probation Department-Mental Health Unit. From the inception of the unit, program operations changed little until the Illinois Office of Mental Health required that the unit become Medicaid certified (Title 59-Part 132 Medicaid community mental health services program) in 1997. This certification brought about wide, sweeping programmatic changes, which transformed the unit into a clinical unit comparable with very few in the country. This study found that 39% of the 241 cases did not re-offend in a three-year period. The study authors conclude that this positive result is due in large part to the case management style used by probation officers and the state oversight of the unit. This study demonstrates that planned programmatic improvements can have a positive effect in supervision of the mentally ill.

The Mental Health Unit (MHU) of the Cook County Adult Probation Department in Cook County, Illinois, serves probationers who have received a diagnosis of severe and chronic mental illnesses (e.g., schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depression). Many of these probationers also have drug and/or alcohol addictions. In addition to the sophisticated case management required to alleviate these problems, probationers often have additional needs for housing, food, acquiring entitlements (social security income and medical coverage), and employment. Probation officers must possess knowledge in each of these disciplines (e.g., substance abuse, housing, Medicare and Medicaid funding, criminal law procedures, psychiatry, etc.) to interact effectively with the probationer to achieve a desired outcome. In effect, the MHU officers are what Steadman (1992) calls "boundary spanners"—individuals who must have firsthand knowledge in the fields of law enforcement, mental illness, substance abuse issues, and social work. This approach forms the core of the MHU case management approach, which includes interventions with probationers, constant resource maintenance and development, and clinical practice.

The case management style the unit employs is a unique mix of the criminal justice and mental health systems. Mental health settings typically view case management in terms of services provided and they refer to individuals as patients; however, the criminal

justice system portrays management as supervision and refers to individuals as probationers. The former implies an agent at a designated treatment site performing services to improve symptoms. The latter implies court monitoring for purposes of rehabilitation and reduction of criminal recidivism. Case management services within the unit do not exactly mirror traditional community mental health models such as assertive community treatment (ACT) or intensive outpatient treatment. Nor does the unit's supervision fit with traditional risk/needs classifications of probation supervision models such as intensive probation supervision (IPS) or regular caseload. Rather, the style is an interrelated and multitiered system of case management practices that has evolved over the years. The MHU can be conceptualized as a fluid interaction of case management within both the criminal justice system and the mental health system with the criminal justice system as the outer parameter of case management. All cases assigned to the unit have a mental health mandate from the court, which requires probationers to participate in mental health treatment. Additionally, the court may impose other special conditions on the probationer such as no contact with victim, random urinalysis testing, and payment of fees. The MHU adheres to phases as a method of supervision/case management. The phases provide a structured reporting requirement for probationers. Additionally, fieldwork is another component of policy that requires officers to engage probationers in their community, make resource contacts, and speak with family members.

The relationship between MHU probation officers and probationers is delicate and complex. The MHU philosophies (care and intervention versus surveillance) and the treatment options available to probationers influence treatment implementation and criminal activity outcomes (Skeem, Encandela, & Eno Louden, 2003). This study sought to understand the long-term outcomes of 241 probation cases within the MHU, specifically, the recidivism rate of probation cases terminated in 2001, along with understanding how the effects of treatment can have positive outcomes (e.g., remaining mentally stable and arrest-free through appropriate treatment) of mentally ill probationers. Unit managers can use the information gained from this study to improve the unit's effectiveness while helping to make the unit a model for other correctional departments dealing with the mentally ill.

Literature Review

In 1999, the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics estimated that mentally ill people composed 16.0% of the American prison and jail population. This special report also noted that the percentage of probationers in the United States who were mentally ill was similar (16%). Slightly more than one half (56%) of these probationers but less than one half (41%) of the jailed probationers received treatment for

their mental illnesses (Ditton, 1999). The failure to identify and treat the mentally ill who enter the criminal justice system perpetuates a cycle of symptomatic behavior, substance abuse, homelessness, and arrests (Lurigio & Swartz, 2000; Lurigio, Thomas, & Jones, 1996; Teplin, 1990). This pattern became established after the shift in public policy from the institutionalization of persons with mental illness to their release for treatment in the community. Although state hospitals had been ridiculed as inadequate, sufficient community-based care for the mentally ill was never established (Lurigio & Swartz, 2000). Lurigio et al. (1996) point out that patients without family and employment, or whose mental illness was poorly controlled by prescribed drugs, faced homelessness and criminal incarceration.

Diagnostic Limitations

Due to this unintended use of the criminal justice system for the management of mentally ill persons, their contact with service providers who can make diagnoses and provide treatment may be delayed, limited, or fail to occur (Lurigio, Fallon, & Dincin, 2000; Teplin, 1990). The priorities of the criminal justice system differ from the mission of treatment agencies. By necessity, the criminal justice system must focus primarily on public safety and probationer supervision rather than the provision of social services. For this reason, mental health assessments and treatments are often unavailable to criminal probationers. These problems are compounded for mentally ill probationers with substance abuse problems. Current methods for the assessment of substance abuse were not designed for use with mentally ill persons. They are inadequate screens for this condition due to patterns of use and treatment processes that differ from those of persons who are not mentally ill (Wolford et al., 1999).

Treatment of the Noncompliant

A number of individual, societal, and systematic factors contribute to treatment noncompliance among mentally ill probationers. They include lack of entitlements, homelessness, poverty, poor insight into their illnesses, medication noncompliance, substance abuse, and lack of access to dual diagnosis treatment. In working with probationers, the Mental Health Unit helps negotiate each barrier to reduce the chance for noncompliance, particularly for two factors: the loss of entitlements and medication noncompliance. Probationers experience a discontinuation of benefits when they are incarcerated. Once released the probationer must see a psychiatrist again and start a regimen of psychotropic medications. Many psychiatric medications cause side effects such as facial tics, blurred vision, dry mouth, slurred speech, rapid weight gain, and slowed gait. These side effects cause discomfort and make the probationer less likely to

continue use of these medications. Probationers often tell MHU officers that these side effects make other people react differently to them and cause them to isolate themselves from others. If the medications alleviate some symptoms, probationers may think they can stop the medications and maintain their current functioning. At that point, the probationer might require hospitalization to control symptom renewal.

Issues of Substance Abuse

Substance abuse has become an increasingly more significant factor in the mentally ill probationer's noncompliance with treatment and probation. Hartwell (2003) states that living in the community with the double stigma of mental illness and a criminal background is problematic for many probationers. High rates of substance abuse among this population compound the issues related to helping those with mental illness (Draine & Solomon, 1994; Solomon & Draine, 1999a; Swanson, Borum, & Swartz, 1996). As this study shows, 70% of the MHU census was classified as having a dual diagnosis (co-occurring mental illness and substance use disorder). It has become more and more important that each MHU officer be, first, familiar with the drug culture and then proficient in working with probationers with these dual diagnoses. We encounter mentally ill probationers in differing stages of their addiction (relapse, sobriety, maintenance, binge using, etc.), and our experience has shown us that we must intervene before they are arrested on a related offense, decompensate, and need to be hospitalized. One option is facilitating admission to detoxification and inpatient dual diagnosis treatment. One of the barriers we have encountered is drug treatment facilities that have few available dual diagnosis beds or few staff who can deal effectively with the dual diagnosis. A probationer must be stable enough to participate in the treatment environment. Some facilities require psychiatric clearance before an admission, which poses another barrier to addiction treatment. A probationer with a dual diagnosis may be slightly symptomatic, and believing the probationer would be disruptive, substance abuse professionals might deny that individual entry into treatment. These issues hinder access to those who need these services at such a critical time.

Methods

This study examined the long-term outcomes of each offender terminated from the Cook County Adult Probation Department-Mental Health Unit in 2001. Data were collected from probation records and the Law Enforcement Administrators Data System (LEADS). The probation data consisted of case history, record sheet, felony or misdemeanor arrest records, and mental health intake assessment. The mental health section assessment included a description of symptoms, drug and alcohol history, current mental status, prior

psychiatric history, medications (current and past), social history, and social entitlements. It also included medical records that were obtained by the officer from previous treatment providers. The culmination of the information gathered in the mental health assessment results in the probationer receiving a clinical diagnosis from one of the MHU officers guided by the American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 4th edition (1994), or *DSM IV*.

A LEADS response was conducted on the 241 cases that terminated in 2001 to see whether any new arrests or convictions had been recorded. In the event of an arrest, the LEADS response was carefully reviewed to determine whether the arrest was a misdemeanor or felony arrest. These arrest types were then grouped into specific crime activity categories by specifying the type of crime that was committed.

Population Size and Sample Selection

The sample comprised 241 probationers whose cases were screened for eligibility or directly mandated to the MHU. The eligibility criterion was probationers with mental illness, both chronic and severe. Table 1 lists the mental health diagnoses of the participants in this study.

Table 1. *Primary Mental Health Diagnoses of Probationers*

Primary diagnosis	Number of Probationers (*n*)	Percent
Schizophrenia	57	24%
Major Depressive Disorder	49	20%
Bipolar Disorder	44	18%
Schizoaffective Disorder	34	14%
Alcohol/Drug Dependence	1	0.4%
Learning Disorder/Dementia	2	0.8%
Other Diagnosis	25	10%
Missing data	29	12%
Total	241	100%

Note. Missing data is defined as probationers that have either been incarcerated in prison, have absconded, and are deceased. This means the probationer's assessments were considered incomplete due to the above circumstances.

The first phase of the study also found that 82% of probationers had felony convictions; misdemeanor convictions totaled 17%. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (U.S. Department of Justice, 2004) reported the total number of adults sentenced to a term of probation in the United States totaled 49% for felony convictions and 50% for misdemeanor convictions. These notable differences suggest that MHU officers deal with

a very difficult population. Supervising the vast majority of the MHU probationers involves a deep understanding of the criminal justice system as well as mental health issues.

Table 2. *Primary Charge: Offenses/Convictions Affecting Sentencing Outcomes*

Offense	Number of Probationers	Percent
Delivery/Possession of a Controlled Substance	73	30.3%
Theft/Forgery/Fraud	39	16.2%
Burglary/Possession of a Stolen Motor Vehicle	26	10.8%
Aggravated Robbery	12	5.0%
Threatening/Obstructing/Resisting a Public Official	2	0.8%
Stalking	2	0.8%
Assault/Battery	7	2.9%
Aggravated Assault/Battery	21	8.7%
Domestic Assault/Battery	17	7.1%
Unlawful Possession/Use of a Weapon	6	2.5%
Arson/Aggravated Arson	4	1.7%
Vandalism	3	1.2%
Trespassing	1	0.4%
Other	28	11.6%
Total	241	100%

Variables and Data Collection Procedures

In the first phase of the study, we chose the following variables in a case to measure a probationer's outcome:

- Age at time of sentencing,
- Sex and race,
- Length of sentence,
- Primary charge,
- Class of offense,
- Dual diagnosis or mental illness diagnosis only
- Primary diagnosis,
- Primary substance abused,
- Number of violations of probation (technical violations and new arrests),
- Residence at termination (including type of residence at termination),
- Number of jail stays while on probation,
- Type of termination, and
- Whether transferred from other probation units to the MHU.

We collected the majority of the information from a review of the adult probation case data sheets. Other data was collected from mental health assessments and medical records.

Some variables require further definition. The primary charge was broken down into 13 varied offenses plus an additional category (Other) (see Table 2). These offenses

could have been categorized into drug offenses, property offenses, and assaultive (physically or verbally) offenses; however, categorizing these offenses into 14 separate ones gives a detailed view of the probationer's arrest.

This study reviewed whether a probationer had a dual diagnosis and what the primary diagnosis was. We determined a probationer's primary diagnosis by reviewing the probationer data sheet and the unit's mental health assessment (intake). The *DSM IV* (1994) defines the criteria for primary diagnosis. The criteria focused on the major mental illnesses (major depression, bipolar disorder, schizophrenia) and included alcohol and drug dependence.

Data Analysis

The variables were analyzed by using SPSS software to examine the probationer characteristics and sentence variables. Descriptive statistics along with ANOVA comparisons were conducted with the use of the SPSS software. Demographic characteristics are race, age, prior hospitalization, diagnosis, dual diagnosis, drug use, sentence type, offense type, and information concerning the index arrest and re-arrest. Analysis was done to examine the statistical relationship between these variables.

Limitations

One limitation of this study is that some arrest data were missing either from files or LEADS responses. While this investigation examined probation cases within the MHU of the Cook County Adult Probation Department, it did not evaluate a comparison group of other types of specialized probation cases within the Cook County Adult Probation Department.

Results

Results of this longitudinal study include analysis of the data from the 2001 study along with data from the 2004 investigation.

Probationer Characteristics

Most (72%) probationers assigned to the MHU were men. More than one half (58%) were African-American and more than one third (36%) were White. Only 5% of these probationers were Hispanic. On average, probationers were hospitalized for mental illnesses six times in their lifetimes. Only 15% of them had never been hospitalized for their mental illnesses. Table 3 shows area of interest in gender diagnoses for the MHU.

Table 3. *Areas of Interest in Gender Diagnoses of Mental Health Probationers*

Mental Health Diagnosis	Gender	Percent
Schizophrenia	Male	31%
	Female	16%
Bipolar Disorder	Male	21%
	Female	20%
Schizoaffective Disorder	Male	18%
	Female	10%

A larger percentage of White (30%) than African-American (15%) probationers had a diagnosis of bipolar disorder; however, more African-American (32%) than White (17%) probationers had a diagnosis of schizophrenia. Comparable proportions of White and African-American probationers had a major depressive disorder (25% and 22%, respectively) and schizoaffective disorder (15% and 16%, respectively).

Seventy percent of probationers had dual diagnoses of a mental illness and substance abuse. No significant differences existed between men and women in this regard. However, a greater proportion of African-American (77%) than White probationers (59%) had both these conditions. The primary substances of choice for this group of probationers were alcohol (28%) and cocaine or crack cocaine (31%). In addition, 21% of these probationers preferred marijuana, while 8% of them had a heroin addiction. Table 4 shows area of addiction for the MHU probationers.

Table 4. *Areas of Addiction for Mental Health Probationers*

Substance	Gender	Percent
Alcohol	Male	34%
	Female	15%
Marijuana	Male	24%
	Female	15%
Cocaine/Crack Cocaine	Male	30%
	Female	36%

Greater proportions of White (46%) than African-American (21%) probationers were addicted to alcohol. Instead, a greater percentage of African-American than White probationers abused cocaine or crack cocaine (36% and 17%, respectively) or marijuana (26% and 12%, respectively).

Most of the probationers (82%) were sentenced for felonies, but 18% received probation sentences for misdemeanors. Almost one third (30%) of the probationers were convicted of a drug offense. The same proportion (30%) had committed a violent offense.

In addition, more than one fourth (27%) of the probationers were convicted of burglary, theft, forgery, fraud, or possession of a stolen motor vehicle.

A greater proportion of women (91%) than men (79%) were sentenced for felonies, but comparable proportions of men and women committed the various types of crime. A higher proportion of African-American (89%) than White (72%) probationers were convicted of felonies. Table 5 gives an itemization of certain types of crimes the MHU deals with.

Table 5. *Types of Crimes of Which Mental Health Probationers Were Found Guilty*

Types of Crimes	Race	Percent
Violent Crimes	White	22%
	African-American	22%
Drug Offenses	White	17%
	African-American	41%
Theft/Forgery/Fraud	White	25%
	African American	12%
Burglary/Possession of a Stolen Auto	White	6%
	African American	11%

Not surprisingly, a greater percentage of probationers with dual diagnoses (42%) than solely mentally ill probationers (12%) were serving sentences for drug offenses; however, a larger proportion of solely mentally ill probationers (33%) than dually diagnosed probationers (20%) had been convicted of violent crimes.

Recidivism Rates

As Table 6 shows, the number of new arrests after probation was terminated has significant meaning in relation to whether the MHU is doing a good job with difficult individuals who are sentenced to probation. The finding that 39% of probationers had no new felony or misdemeanor arrests after probation termination is a good indication that the MHU deals effectively with the mentally ill.

Table 7 shows the gender and race data of MHU probationers re-arrested after termination. More specifically, the data show a significant difference in the number of males and females who were re-arrested in each of the four ethnic groups. In each of the ethnic groups, more males than females were re-arrested after probation was terminated. The number of both male and female MHU probationers who were re-arrested after probation was terminated totaled 42 Whites, 92 African–Americans, 5 Hispanics, and 2 that were categorized as Other.

Table 6. *Number of New Arrests After Termination of Probation (from 2004 LEADS Response Data)*

Number of Arrests	Number of Probationers	Percent
0	93	39%
1	44	18%
2	37	15%
3	14	6%
4	7	3%
5	5	2%
6	11	5%
7	1	0.4%
8	2	0.8%
9	3	1%
10	2	0.8%
11	2	0.8%
13	3	1%
14	1	0.4%
16	1	0.4%
18	4	2%
19	2	0.8%
24	1	0.4%
65	1	0.4%
Missing from data	7	3%
Total	241	100%

Table 7. *Gender and Race of MHU Probationers Re-arrested after Termination*

Gender	Race	Number of Probationers	Percent
Male	White	30	21%
Female	White	12	9%
Male	African-American	75	53%
Female	African-American	17	12%
Male	Hispanic	4	3%
Female	Hispanic	1	0.7%
Male	Other	1	0.7%
Female	Other	1	0.7%
Total		141	100%

Tables 8 and 9 show the number of misdemeanor and felony arrests of individuals after probation was terminated. The percentage of individuals with no new misdemeanor arrests was 50% while the percentage of individuals with no new felony arrests was 67%.

Table 8. *Number of Misdemeanor Arrests After Termination of Probation*

Number of Arrests	Number of Probationers	Percent
0	120	50%
1	46	19%
2	18	8%
3	13	5%
4	7	3%
5	9	4%
6	4	2%
7	1	0.4%
8	1	0.4%
9	2	0.8%
10	2	0.8%
11	1	0.4%
13	2	0.8%
14	1	0.4%
16	1	0.4%
17	3	1%
18	1	0.4%
21	1	0.4%
64	1	0.4%
Missing from data	7	3%
Total	241	100%

The average age of MHU probationers re-arrested after termination of probation was 35.2 years. This investigation also coded the three types of termination of probation and whether those individuals were re-arrested after probation was terminated:

- The percentage of individuals who terminated their probation satisfactorily and were re-arrested was 40%;
- The percentage of individuals who terminated their probation unsatisfactorily and were re-arrested was 48%; and
- The percentage of individuals who terminated their probation cases with termination-closing interest in case was 12%.

Note: termination-closing interest in case is defined as a probation case that has not been designated as either terminating satisfactorily or terminated unsatisfactorily.

Table 9. *Number of Felony Arrests After Termination of Probation*

Number of Arrests	Number of Probationers	Percent
0	161	67%
1	39	16%
2	21	9%
3	7	3%
4	1	0.4%
5	3	1%
9	2	0.8%
Missing from data	7	3%
Total	241	100%

Finally, Table 10 shows the top three types of new arrests by race and gender after termination of probation from the MHU. In these three crime categories, 97 subjects (69%) were re-arrested.

Table 10. *Top Three New Arrest Types for MHU Probationers After Termination*

Gender	Race	Drug-Related Crimes	Number of Probationers	Violent Crimes	Number of Probationers	Property Crimes	Frequency
Male	White	20%	8	12%	5	12%	5
Female	White	10%	4	2%	1	5%	2
Male	African-American	26%	24	23%	21	9%	8
Female	African-American	7%	6	7%	6	1%	1
Male	Hispanic	40%	2	20%	1	20%	1
Female	Hispanic	20%	1	0%	0	0%	0
Male	Other	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0
Female	Other	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0

Discussion

The mission of the Mental Health Unit is not only to ensure each probationer's compliance with the court-ordered sentence but also to improve his or her quality of life (Cook County Adult Probation Department, 2005). Accomplishment of both goals is integral to the successful completion of a probation sentence for a mentally ill probationer. For this reason, the documentation of accomplishments with particular case management techniques is also important.

The distribution of types of offenses was found to be similar to that of cases seen in Intensive Drug Probation, Intensive Probation Services, and Domestic Violence. Therefore, the MHU case management technique can be applied to all types of offenses.

This study shows that the MHU manages individuals with a range of major mental illnesses. Schizophrenia, major depression, bipolar disorder, and schizoaffective disorders constitute the diagnostic classification for many probationers in the unit. The MHU officer provides unique and specialized treatment that includes case management and use of varied communication styles. A brief description of communication styles and case management objectives follows.

Case Management and Communication

Case management within the MHU has had to incorporate all of the legal aspects expected of every probation officer and the varied roles a community mental health worker uses in working with the seriously mentally ill. Officers working in the mental health unit become the point of contact for legal cases as well as the broker for mental health services and other mandated services; therefore, officers use their knowledge and expertise in communicating with attorneys, public defenders, judges, social workers, psychiatrists, and people in other disciplines. MHU officers must understand their audience and be able to articulate a message effectively to achieve a particular outcome.

As a key element of the MHU approach, officers' facility with various communication styles helps them get their message across effectively and understand the other parties' interests. The communication expertise officers' display comes from knowing their audience and tailoring the message to the individual, whether it is a client, attorney, psychiatrist, community mental health caseworker, public aid caseworker, or nursing home admissions director. This skill guides MHU officers in discussing a client's noncompliance or a proposed plan of action.

In working with a client who is severely mentally ill, the traditional probation approach is not often effective because the illness may affect the client's comprehension of information. Most of the clients supervised in the MHU have both a mental illness and a substance abuse problem. Officers may have to help reduce clients' paranoia and compel them to participate in the planned interventions. MHU officers must step into the role as mental health workers and communicate to the doctor the symptoms they observe and the urgency of moving the appointment to a sooner date. Lastly, officers must communicate to the detoxification center the nature of the client's mental health issues so they do not become a destabilizing issue during detoxification. Our end goal would be to manage the situation so it doesn't rise to a level that would require going back to court.

MHU officers must harness all the information to inform the judge where the client experiences problems and where they are succeeding. A judge has to rely at times on our assessment of the situation, which incorporates the information from psychiatrists, caseworkers, housing staff, and substance abuse providers. This information is essential for giving the judge a balanced picture of the probationer and his or her issues. At times it may be necessary to factor in the client's criminogenic factors that would interfere with an ideal recommendation by the officer. It is this level of competence the officer must demonstrate when communicating and interacting in the courtroom. In an arena where evidence, allegations, and witnesses are the focus of daily proceedings in court, mental health officers must know how to communicate what they know in a concise and credible manner.

Aside from entitlements we are continuing efforts to communicate and develop resources with community providers. These providers vary greatly depending on what particular service we wish to explore. The most significant community providers, however, are the local mental health agencies. Officers frequently link, refer, consult, and advocate with these agencies. These community mental health centers in turn provide additional treatment services (day treatment, residential, assertive outreach) based on needs and level of care.

Skilled nursing facilities are another resource officers use. Some clients, based on their history of mental illness, may need a nursing home placement. The MHU uses various nursing homes throughout Cook County and frequently consults with staff regarding placement, monitoring, and treatment issues. Additionally, officers may have to hospitalize clients during crisis periods. Nursing home staff members often call on MHU officers for their knowledge of the MHU probationer committed involuntarily.

Another resource is substance abuse treatment. A significant number of mentally ill offenders have a co-occurring substance abuse disorder; however, integrated dual disorder treatment is lacking (Mojtabai, 2004; Lurigio & Swartz, 2000). It's therefore imperative for the unit to continue outreach possibilities to these limited agencies that provide this type of treatment. In addition staff has to be very knowledgeable about criteria and the necessary paperwork required for possible admissions.

Interventions

Interventions are a significant component to the unique case management style of officers in the MHU because of the number of interventions available and the frequency with which we can rely on them throughout the client's term of probation. On any given case, officers use myriad intervention options in either the criminal justice or mental health system. In general the following interventions within the mental health system occur:

assessment, treatment plan development, counseling, monitoring, support, advocacy, crisis, staffing, collateral contacts, and consultation with other providers. In addition, officers can rely on the criminal justice system to intervene when other options fail. This reliance can take the form of returning to court for status reports, motions, violation of probations, terminations of probation, reporting options, urinalysis testing, and monitoring other conditions of probation.

Several variables come into play in determining what interventions to use and when to use them. Depending on the presenting problem(s) (e.g., non-reporting, acute symptoms, treatment noncompliance, recidivism, illegal drug use), the officer can choose mental health or criminal justice system related interventions. Other considerations that factor into selecting interventions are the client's overall history and the desired outcome. The intervention options vary on case-by-case basis. Officers must prioritize the presenting problem if it involves the client's mental/emotional condition. In a crisis situation with the presence of acute symptoms (e.g., danger to self/others, inability to care for self), an officer must pursue hospitalization.

Resource Development

Resource development is another component of case management within the Mental Health Unit and takes the following forms:

- Weekly staff meetings in which officers seek resource feedback from their peers. In this supportive environment, officers can problem solve regarding appropriate resources that benefit their clients' treatment plan development. In addition, the MHU distributes new resource materials and provides updates about particular agencies.
- Invitations to particular agency staff to talk about their services and its benefit to our clients.
- Staff and management meetings with community resource agencies to increase support and strengthen current working relationships.
- Development of new resources that enhance the quality of life for clients.

MHU clients reside within a wide geographic range in Cook County, IL, and they require a number of resources. MHU officers and management must continue and further expand relations (both informal & formal) with community providers who work with the mentally ill. Entitlements such as social security income/disability and medical coverage are basic needs for our population however jailed clients often lose their entitlements. As part of MHU case management effort, officers seek to re-establish these entitlements, and the unit's association with the Social Security Administration helps officers accomplish reinstatement of client benefits. In addition, the MHU has become familiar with required Illinois Department of Public Aid paperwork to help clients get basic medical coverage.

Supervision of dual disordered probationers presents a greater challenge. The focus for most officers has been primarily the management of a probationer's single mental illness. But the MHU's goal is to meet the challenges of those clients with substance abuse as part of the diagnostic picture.

State Oversight

The implementation of the MHU began in response partly to the increase in incarcerations instead of treatment recommendations for the mentally ill (Teplin, 1984). In addition, the criminal justice system was failing to identify and meet the needs of mentally ill offenders. A Governor's Task Force was implemented in 1985 to study and make recommendations regarding the plight of the mentally ill offender (Lurigio, Thomas, & Jones, 1996). As a result of the task force findings, the Cook County Adult Probation received a grant from the Illinois Department of Human Services, Office of Mental Health (OMH), to form the Cook County Adult Probation Department-MHU.

In 1997, the MHU became certified to provide mental health services under the state's Medicaid program. Since 1997 the MHU has had to adapt to Medicaid guidelines for community mental health services under Rule 132 (Illinois Administrative Code, 2000).

The state oversight has helped the unit focus on providing services to mentally ill offenders and acquire qualified staff to do so. The rule has provided the MHU with standard services for clients and placed more emphasis on clinical practices (e.g., diagnosis, treatment planning, staffing, and crisis response) among staff. This state oversight has also allowed the MHU to understand what is expected of them as case managers, which is similar to case manager responsibilities in other mental health centers in Illinois, and staff are more cognizant about identifying mental health issues and responding appropriately. This type of state oversight has allowed the MHU to become more involved in a client's treatment team along with other providers. In addition, the MHU has had to appropriately document the services it provides to ensure Medicaid reimbursement.

Qualified Staffing

Medicaid guidelines for community mental health services under Rule 132 (Illinois Administrative Code, 2000) has also allowed the MHU to employ qualified staff to work with mentally ill probationers. For several years, the MHU has had a licensed psychologist consult monthly to assist with difficult cases. The two supervisors helping to manage the MHU are licensed clinical social workers, five officers are qualified mental health professionals, and the remaining staff are mental health professionals with experience working with mentally ill clients. The OMH has auditors survey the unit annually to review

staff credentials, verify documented services, review quality assurance, and ensure location site compliance. This type of rigorous review of the MHU by the state has allowed the Cook County Adult Probation Department to become a leader in the field of treating mentally ill offenders.

Conclusion

A growing number of probationers in jail, prison, and community corrections have severe mental illnesses. The criminal justice system has become the gatekeeper for the mental health system due to the criminalization of the mentally ill (Teplin, 1990). However, the criminal justice system has failed to properly identify and treat this special population. In addition, a gap remains between the criminal justice and mental health systems. Each system tends to remain within its boundaries and neglects the other systems' role and significance in assisting probationers with mental illnesses. To prevent criminal recidivism, the criminal justice system must make efforts to meet the needs of this special population by providing mental health treatment and related social services.

This study presents several important findings:

- The largest percentage of new arrests was for drug-related crimes. While this is not a shocking revelation, it shows the difficult tasks the MHU probation officers face in dealing with probationers who have a dual diagnosis.

- The majority of probationers have a co-occurring substance abuse diagnosis. The primary drugs of choice for probationers with a dual diagnosis were cocaine and alcohol. The supervision of this dual diagnosis population presents challenges in terms of proper assessment, treatment, and supervision. A smaller number of dually diagnosed probationers than probationers with mental illnesses only finished their sentences satisfactorily. Similarly, more dually diagnosed probationers received jail or prison time at termination compared with those with one mental illness. Additionally, the dually diagnosed probationer had a slightly higher average number of hospitalizations than mentally ill probationers during their sentences. Therefore, more effort is necessary within the MHU to meet the needs of this challenging population.

- A substantial percentage of probationers have committed a violent crime. Violent crime was defined under criminal offenses as both physical and verbal (threatening, stalking). As indicated in policy and procedures (10.06.01-05 eligibility criteria) a history of violence is generally an excluded category for acceptance into the MHU (Cook County Adult Probation Department, 2005). At times the judiciary directly mandates or refers violent probationers for supervision. Working with probationers who have a history of violence present unique challenges for officers, management, and the department as a whole. A

number of factors can precipitate violence or potential violence, including stress from one's environment, drug addiction, or symptoms of one's illness. The assignment of these probationers to the MHU necessitates the establishment of an approach to mediate any risk of violence and signifies the importance of ongoing officer training.

- The percentage of Hispanic probationers (5%) appears low in comparison with their percentage on regular probation. This number is lower than we expected and may be due to cultural factors such as language barriers or the stigma associated with revealing one's mental illness to his or her probation officer. Another point of interest is that almost one half of the probationers transferred into the MHU were internal transfers, suggesting the courts were unsuccessful in determining mental health issues. This finding suggests the poor identification of mentally ill probationers in pretrial court proceedings. Moreover, it highlights the substantial number of mentally ill probationers under supervision in regular probation units.

Several positive outcomes were evident from this study; for example, more than half of the probationers terminated their sentence satisfactorily. Less than one fourth received jail or prison time at the conclusion of their sentence. Additionally, more than one half ended their sentences with no violations for new offenses. More than half of all probationers were not hospitalized during the course of their probation. About three fourths of the probationers were domiciled at the conclusion of their sentence with most residing with family members. However, nearly one half of probationers were incarcerated at some point during their probation. This outcome suggests the court system uses incarceration as a method to manage mentally ill probationers who commit new offenses and fail to comply with court mandates. Additionally 60% ended their probation with no new offenses. Nearly 40% of the probation cases that terminated in 2001 did not re-offend and were not re-arrested for either a misdemeanor or felony arrest three years after probation was terminated.

These data suggest modest success in preventing recidivism and achieving positive sentence outcomes. However, additional research needs to be conducted to understand why some probationers didn't complete successfully and why others committed new offenses. Our findings further suggest that additional longitudinal studies for this population along with a comparison group (of a similar population) would greatly assist in this area. Moreover, this additional research would help guide correctional agencies in the development, practices, and needs related to treating the mentally ill.

Finally, this long-term study offers some guidelines as to how to maintain and produce positive results for the mentally ill probationer in a correctional setting. The level

of communication between officers and service providers along with the state oversight of the MHU has produced a national model in supervising mentally ill probationers. This study will show other correctional agencies that they can construct a mental health unit that can manage mentally ill probationers effectively in an increasingly complex societal environment.

Acknowledgments

References

American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Cook County Adult Probation Department. (2005). *Policy and Procedure Chapter 10.* Chicago: Author.

Ditton, P. (1999, July). Mental health and treatment of inmates and probationers. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*, *1–11*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice/U.S. Government Printing Office.

Draine, J., & Salomon, P., (1994). Jail recidivism and the intensity of case management services among homeless persons with mental illness leaving jail. *Journal of Psychiatry and Law*, 22, 245–261.

Hartwell, S. (2003). Short-term outcomes for offenders with mental illness released from incarceration. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *47*(2), 145–158.

Illinois Administrative Code-Title 59, Office of Mental Health, Illinois Department of Human Services Part 132. (2000). *Medicaid community mental health services program*. Springfield, IL: IDHS.

Lurigio, A., & Swartz, J. (2000). Changing the contours of the criminal justice system to meet the needs of persons with serious mental illness: Policies, processes, and decisions of the criminal justice system. *Criminal Justice*, *3*, 45–108.

Lurigio, A., Fallon J., & Dincin, J. (2000, October). Helping the mentally ill in jails adjust to community life: A description of a post release ACT program and its probationers. *International Journal of Probationer Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *44*, 450–466.

Lurigio, A., Thomas, J., & Jones, M. (1996). *A study of mental health unit operations*. Chicago: Cook County Adult Probation Department.

Mojtabai, R. (2004, August). Which substance abuse treatment facilities offer dual diagnosis treatment programs? *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, *30*(3), 525–536.

Skeem, J., Encandela, J., & Eno Louden, J. (2003). Perspectives on probation and mandated mental health treatment in specialized and traditional probation departments. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *21*, 1–30.

Solomon, P., & Draine, J. (1999a). Expanding lifetime criminal arrests among offenders of a psychiatric probation and parole service. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law*, *27*, 239–251.

Solomon, P., & Draine, J. (1999b). Using clinical and criminal involvement factors to explain homelessness among clients of a psychiatric probation and parole service. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, *70*(1), 75–88.

Swanson, J., Borum, R., & Swartz, M. (1996). Psychotic symptoms and disorders and the risk of violent behavior in the community. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, *6*, 317–338.

Steadman, J. (1992). Boundary spanners: A key component for the effective interactions of the justice and mental health systems. *Law and Human Behavior*, *16*, 75–87.

Teplin, L. (1984, July). Criminalizing mental disorder: The comparative arrest rate of the mentally ill. *American Psychologist*, *39*(7), 794–803.

Teplin, L. (1990, April). Detecting disorder: The treatment of mental illness among jail detainees. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *58*, 233–236.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2004). *Probation and parole in the United States, 2004*. Washington D.C.: Author/U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1999). *Mental health and treatment of inmates and probationers*. Washington D.C.: Author/U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wolford, G. L., Rosenberg, S. D., Drake, R. E., Mueser, K. T., Oxman, T. E., Hoffman, D.,et al. (1999). Evaluation of methods for detecting substance use disorders in persons with serious mental illnesses. *Psychology of Addictive Behavior*, *13*(4), 312–326.

Index

Positions Available for Part -Time Graduate and Undergraduate Schools of Criminal Justice Online Faculty

Kaplan University, an online University with an enrollment of more than 27,000 students, has positions available for Part-Time Online Faculty in the Graduate and Undergraduate Schools of Criminal Justice. Kaplan University is student-focused, results-driven, and committed to helping individuals build their futures through education. Kaplan has broadened access to educational and professional opportunities, including in many communities that have been underserved. Kaplan helps students acquire new skills, higher credentials, and better jobs.

Minimum Qualifications for Part-Time Online Faculty include:
- For graduate level courses, a terminal degree in criminal justice or related field and five years of criminal justice experience is preferred.
- For undergraduate level courses, a master's degree in criminal justice or related field and three years of criminal justice experience is preferred.
- Commitment to innovative teaching and student academic success.

Among the benefits of employment as a Kaplan University Part-Time Faculty Member:
- Training on the online learning platform and electronic academic resources.
- Flexible teaching hours and office hours through any Internet connection at your home office or other location.
- Access to University OnLine Library with Premium Research Resources.
- Availability of Professional Development through the Kaplan University Center for Teaching and Learning.
- Challenging curriculum that incorporates varied learning modalities.
- Opportunities to support research, scholarship, and critical thinking.
- Compensation commensurate with experience and degree.
- Limited accident and sickness insurance available to cover medical, hospital indemnity, vision care, dental, term life and accidental death, and short-term disability.
- Corporate discount program for computers and other consumer products.

Send curriculum vitae, cover letter, and list of references to:
Frank J. DiMarino, Dean
School of Criminal Justice
Kaplan University
550 West Van Buren, Suite 700
Chicago, Illinois 60607
fdimarino@kaplan.edu