

7-1-2000

# A Police Probation Partnership: One City's Response to Serious Habitual Juvenile Offending

Kimberly D. Hassell

*University of Nebraska at Omaha*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

---

## Recommended Citation

Hassell, Kimberly D., "A Police Probation Partnership: One City's Response to Serious Habitual Juvenile Offending" (2000). *Student Work*. 2165.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2165>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).



**A POLICE PROBATION PARTNERSHIP: ONE CITY'S RESPONSE  
TO SERIOUS, HABITUAL JUVENILE OFFENDING**

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Criminal Justice

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

University of Nebraska at Omaha

By

Kimberly D. Hassell

July, 2000

UMI Number: EP73707

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73707

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ACCEPTANCE PAGE

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Acceptance for the faculty of the Graduate College,  
University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree Master of Arts,  
University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

Name

Department/School

Edward R. Maguire Criminal Justice  
Edward R. Maguire, Ph.D.

William Wakefield Criminal Justice  
William Wakefield, Ph.D.

Mary Ann Lamanna Sociology  
Mary Ann Lamanna, Ph.D.

Chairperson Edward R. Maguire

Date July 20, 2000

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank the members of the Dogginton Juvenile Offender Unit for their willing participation in this study. I would especially like to thank them for showing me what a “dog-eat-dog world” Dogginton can be. Does it still “all mean nothing?”

I would like to thank Dr. Edward Maguire for serving as the chair of my thesis committee. I consider myself very fortunate to have been given the chance to work with, and learn from, Dr. Maguire. Dr. EddieMac, thank you for all that you have taught me...I will always be grateful. In addition, I am very thankful to both he and Dr. Craig Uchida for providing me the opportunity to conduct this study. Thank you both for entrusting me with this research. In the same respect, I owe a huge thanks to Dr. Mary Ann Lamanna and Dr. William Wakefield for their support as my committee members. Particularly, I would like to thank them both for their encouragement.

A very special thanks is due Carol Ann Archbold. Her support, guidance, insight, encouragement and constructive criticism helped me tremendously. Carol read and edited several copies of this thesis. Booooots, I appreciate you very much.

In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Jihong “Solomon” Zhao and Hank Robinson for their comments, suggestions and assistance in writing sections of this thesis. I would like to thank Dr. Samuel Walker for his daily encouragement as well as Misty Werner, Julee Blaisdell, Shelly Enyeart and Jan Marie Lambert for their endless support.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to my father, Dan Hassell. His undying support and belief in me proves that I can, and will, do whatever I set my heart and mind on. Daddy, I am proud to be your daughter. This thesis is for you.

## Abstract

# A POLICE/PROBATION PARTNERSHIP: ONE CITY'S RESPONSE TO SERIOUS, HABITUAL JUVENILE OFFENDING

Kimberly D. Hassell

University of Nebraska at Omaha, 2000

Adviser: Edward R. Maguire, Ph.D.

The purpose of this study is to explore a police/probation collaboration in a large Western police department. While many of these collaborative approaches to crime and disorder have been formed, there has been scant empirical research conducted on their effectiveness. As such, this study explores the implementation and impact of a formal collaboration on both the police and probation departments, the juveniles targeted by the collaboration and the local juvenile justice system. In addition, this thesis addresses whether police and probation departments can maintain coordinating relationships to equitably, efficiently and effectively control delinquency in one Western city.

This study is mainly qualitative in that observations and unstructured interviews provide most of the data. This qualitative analysis is based on 105 hours of fieldwork and 34 unstructured interviews between January 26, 2000 and February 10, 2000. Quantitative agency data were also collected for descriptive analyses of the program's selection process, as well as the types of juveniles participating in the program.

The findings from this study suggest that the police/probation collaboration in Doggington operates inside an exchange system. As such, the collaboration has mended strained relationships between the police and probation departments. In addition, the collaboration is impacting both the juveniles participating in the program, as well as the local juvenile justice system. The analysis of Doggington's police/probation collaboration provides an excellent example of how two interdependent criminal justice agencies dealt with their conflicting ideologies and effectively coordinated in order to produce what appear to be equitable, efficient, and, possibly, effective results.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b>	1
<b>CHAPTER ONE</b>	
<b>Literature Review</b>	2
Introduction to Systems Theory	2
Introduction to Interorganizational Exchange Theory	3
Characteristics of an Exchange	4
Conflict and Coordination	7
Assumptions of Exchange Theory	9
Exchange Theory inside the Criminal Justice System	10
Characteristics of Exchange Theory in the Criminal Justice System	12
Conflict and Coordination	15
Collaborations within the Criminal Justice Exchange System	17
Police/Probation Collaborations	18
Summary	30
<b>CHAPTER TWO</b>	
<b>Research Methodology</b>	32
Setting	32
The Police Department	33
JOU Personnel	34
Data Collection Strategies	35
The Qualitative Paradigm	36
Field Research Data Collection	39
Interviews	41
Official Documents	43
Survey Instrument	43
Quantitative Data Collection	45
Summary of Research Areas	46
<b>CHAPTER THREE</b>	
<b>Qualitative Findings</b>	47
Part One: Implementation/Organization of Collaboration	47
History and Evolution of JOU	47
Current Structure of JOU	50
Summary of Part One	54
Part Two: Impact of JOU on Police and Probation Departments	55
Findings from Survey Data	61
Summary of Part Two	64
Part Three: Impact of JOU on Juveniles in the Unit	65
Criminality of the SHO/DIs	68

Racial and Gender Composition of SHO/DIs	70
Interviews with SHO/DIs	71
Summary of Part Three	79
Part Four: Impact on the Local Juvenile Justice System	80
Summary of Part Four	83
Conclusion	84
<b>CHAPTER FOUR</b>	
<b>Discussion/Conclusion</b>	85
<b>References</b>	93
<b>Table 1:</b> Interview Schedule	99
<b>Table 2:</b> Survey Question #1 – Are you familiar with the JOU?	100
<b>Table 3:</b> Survey Question #2 – Is the JOU doing a good job?	101
<b>Table 4:</b> Survey Question #3 – Do probation officers working alone do a good job?	102
<b>Table 5:</b> Survey Question #4 – Do probation officers working with police Officers do a good job?	103
<b>Table 6:</b> Survey Question #5 – Role of a probation officer according to Doggington patrol officers.	104
<b>Table 7:</b> Survey Question #5 – Role of a probation officer according to Doggington juvenile probation officers.	105
<b>Table 8:</b> Survey Question #6 – Role of a police officer according to Doggington patrol officers.	106
<b>Table 9:</b> Survey Question #6 – Role of a police officer according to Doggington juvenile probation officers.	107
<b>Table 10:</b> Number of offenses of juveniles in SHO/DI database	108
<b>Table 11:</b> Point levels of juveniles in SHO/DI database	109
<b>Table 12:</b> Juvenile point levels according to race/ethnicity	110
<b>Table 13:</b> Juvenile point levels according to gender	111

**Appendix A**  
Rights of Research Participants form

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

The current paradigm in the administration of criminal justice emphasizes “multi-agency” approaches to solving crime. Many of the popular buzzwords in criminal justice agencies today, such as “collaboration,” “partnership” and “joint programs” address the notion that agencies will be more equitable, efficient and effective when working together than alone. Many believe this is the cure for America’s crime epidemic (Crawford and Jones, 1995:17, Bayley, 1994:108). What is unclear is the effect these multi-agency collaborative approaches are having on the criminal justice system (Byles, 1985:549). Some claim that multi-agency approaches fail when agencies refuse to coordinate due to conflicting ideologies (Miller, 1958:20-23). In the criminal justice exchange system, both conflict and coordination are key characteristics of interorganizational relationships (Litwak and Hylton, 1969:340). The challenge, then, for criminal justice agencies is in managing this conflict.

Accepting this challenge, many cities have begun forming collaborations between local police and probation agencies (Corbett, 1996:1). The hope is that these partnerships will enhance both the functioning of the police and probation. Such partnerships emphasize information sharing and joint supervision projects (where both police and probation monitor the same clients). Some of these partnerships are informal and stress only improved information sharing, while some are formalized units that attempt to fundamentally change the duties of police and corrections personnel. This thesis examines the Dogginton Juvenile Offender Unit, a formalized police/probation

partnership. More specifically, this thesis will address whether police and probation departments, which are expected to have conflicting ideologies, can maintain coordinating relationships to effectively and efficiently control delinquency. This thesis also explores the implementation and impact of this collaboration on both departments, the juveniles targeted by the unit and the local juvenile justice system.

This chapter begins by summarizing the organizational literature as it pertains to exchange theory. It briefly discusses each of the four characteristics of the theory while focusing on two: conflict and coordination. The organizational literature is then applied to the criminal justice system to show how the criminal justice agencies operate inside an exchange framework. Particular attention is given to how conflict can impede coordination in interagency relationships. Finally, the remaining portion of the chapter describes various police/probation collaborations and their implication for the criminal justice system.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Theoretical Perspective

#### *Introduction to Systems Theory*

In certain types of organizations, the collective state partly controls functioning of each component (Ford and Lerner, 1992:94). This collective state is called a system.

Weiss (1971:14) defines a system as:

A complex unit in space and time so constituted that its component subunits, by systematic cooperation, preserve its integral configuration of

structures and behavior and tend to restore it after such nondestructive disturbances.

More simply stated, a system can be defined as a group of interrelated input-output processes working together toward common objectives (Zhao, 2000).

Ludwig von Bertalanffy introduced systems theory in the field of biology. Systems theory grew in the 1950s and 1960s as a viable theoretical basis for studying organizations. Not only did this theory offer a useful foundation for studying organizations, but it allows for studying systems of disparate elements in any field. This theory conceptualizes organizations as functioning and adaptive systems (Bertalanffy, 1968:10-16).

Systems are dynamic and are constantly adapting to their external environment. Inside each system are several components, such as structure, communication and control mechanisms (Zhao, 2000). Each of these components is interrelated and each is dependent on the others. When one element is affected, the others will be affected in turn (Bertalanffy, 1968:55). Systems theory emphasizes the interrelationship between these elements. The interrelationships of the separate organizations inside a system can be studied using interorganizational exchange theory.

### *Introduction to Interorganizational Exchange Theory*

Levine and White (1961) were the first to study interorganizational relationships inside an exchange framework. The authors provide a definition: “Organizational exchange is any voluntary activity between two organizations which has consequences, actual or anticipated, for the realization of their respective goals or objectives” (Levine

and White, 1961:588). This definition allows for interorganizational activity in general, meaning that the activity need not necessarily be reciprocal. The activity may be unidirectional. In addition, the definition is broad enough to permit researchers to observe many facets of organizational interaction (i.e., not just the transfer of material goods). Finally, the definition limits exchange relationships to voluntary exchanges. Therefore, forced or coerced relationships are not considered exchange relationships (Levine and White, 1961:588-589).

### *Characteristics of an Exchange*

Whether one studies the exchanges/interactions between organizations or personnel/actors, the characteristics that make up an exchange are the same. There are four main characteristics of exchange theory. The first characteristic is scarcity of resources. For an organization to achieve its stated objectives, it must have clients to serve, have resources with which to procure them (whether that be equipment, specialized information/training and/or money) and have personnel who can deliver the resources to the clients the organization serves. Ideally, an organization would have all of the elements in infinite supply, which would negate the need for organizational interaction. Pragmatically, however, most organizations need interorganizational exchanges to attain their goals (Levine and White, 1961:586-587). This leads to the second characteristic of exchange theory: goals of the organization.

Organizations in an exchange system have interdependent goals. These goals differ according to which need the agency is assigned to meet. For example, police

officers maintain public order while probation officers help integrate offenders into mainstream society. Each of these goals is separate and unique to the respective agencies. However, these agencies work to meet the system's goals. For example, both police and probation work to meet the system's goals but occupy different roles in doing so. It is these shared goals that force agencies to interact (Reid, 1964:421, Levine and White, 1961:586). Reid (1964:421) says that because each agency has a stake in the goal attainment of the other, this necessitates a need to enter into exchanges. Therefore, organizations must select "particular functions that permit them to achieve their ends as fully as possible" (Levine and White, 1961:586). "Functions" are defined as "a set of interrelated services or activities that are instrumental, or believed to be instrumental, for the realization of an organization's objectives" (Levine and White, 1961:586). Because organizations limit themselves to particular functions (due to scarcity of clients, resources and personnel), they frequently need to establish relationships with other organizations to meet the overall objectives and goals.

When organizations focus on meeting the goals of the system, there is a conflict of values. Organizations generally accept these conflicts as conducive to exchanges within the system. In fact, Litwak and Hylton (1969:340) say such conflict is required for interorganizational relationships. Herbert Simon (1964:8), in his famous article *On the Concept of Organizational Goal* says:

In a multiperson situation, one man's goals may be another man's constraints....Do manufacturer and farmer have the same goals? In one sense, clearly not, for there is a definite conflict of interest between them: the farmer wishes to buy cheap, the manufacturer to sell dear. On the other hand, if a bargain can be struck that meets the requirements of



both—if the feasible set that satisfies both sets of constraints is not empty—then there is another sense in which they do have a common goal.

Simon (1964:9) concludes “that there is little communality of goals among the several parts of large organizations and that subgoal formation and goal conflict are prominent and significant features of organizational life.” In order to accept these conflicting goals, while maintaining exchange relationships, organizations reach a consensus. Levine and White (1961:597) say there can be no exchange of elements if there are not agreements or understandings between the organizations. These agreements can be implicit or explicit.

Inside this sphere of conflict lies the agency’s domain. “The domain of an organization consists of the specific goals it wishes to pursue and the functions it undertakes in order to implement its goals” (Levine and White, 1961:597). The goals of an organization represent its promise of future functioning. Therefore, exchange relationships are based upon prior consensus as to each organization’s domain. Once the organization states its goals and these goals are accepted, domain consensus continues for so long as the organization is fulfilling its functions in order to meet its prescribed goals and is adhering to certain quality standards (Levine and White, 1961:597). The processes of domain consensus constitute the majority of the interaction between the organizations. In addition, “to the extent that these processes involve proffering information about the availability of elements as well as about rights and obligations regarding the elements, they constitute a form of interorganizational exchange” (Levine and White, 1961:599).

Since interactions among organizations are due to scarcity of resources, and these organizations share common goals, and each organization is responsible for meeting functions necessary for achieving the system’s goals, they must coordinate (Levine and

White, 1961:597-599). Snipes and Maguire say the foundation of exchange theory is that “much of what occurs between organizations can be attributed to informal exchanges between actors from different organizations” (2000:5, See also Eisenstein, et al, 1988, Eisenstein, et al, 1998). These informal exchanges are strengthened by daily interactions among the actors of each agency. Without cooperation from the actors and the individual organizations, there would be no informal exchanges. If there were no informal exchanges, the system would fail to operate equitably, efficiently and effectively.

These four main characteristics - scarcity of resources, shared goals, conflict of values and coordination - make up the crux of exchange theory. Most concede that interorganizational relationships occur due to scarcity of resources and shared goals. Agencies need what other agencies have. The most challenging aspects of interorganizational relationships concern the characteristics of conflict and coordination.

### *Conflict and Coordination*

Most conflicts between agencies occur because of their autonomy. Oliver (1991:944-945) defines autonomy as “an organization’s freedom to make its own decisions about the use and allocation of its internal resources without reference or regard to the demands or expectations of potential linkage partners.” When an organization has to invest its resources to further the goals of a partnering organization, its autonomy is threatened. When agencies establish joint programs, share resources or enter into written contracts, they sacrifice some of their organizational autonomy (Oliver, 1991:945). Much of the literature suggests that organizations avoid interorganizational relations

because of the loss of autonomy (1991:943). Oliver, however, in her 1991 study did not find support for this conclusion (1991:957). One possible explanation Oliver gives for her finding is that organizations that mutually and equivalently compromise their autonomy when interacting may be less likely to avoid relations. When organizations enter into joint projects or written contracts, parties are obliged to compromise (Oliver, 1991:957). Therefore, this conflict does not repress coordination. On the other hand, organizations that informally interact perceive greater threats to autonomy. If an agency's autonomy is going to be jeopardized, it may avoid such interactions (Boland and Wilson, 1994:343, See also Van de Ven and Ferry, 1980, Morrissey, et al, 1985). This can lead to fragmentation in the exchange system. Fragmentation can result in duplication of services, inequity, inefficiency and ineffectiveness (Webb and Wakefield, 1979:41, Moore, 1976:5-13, Munro, 1971:445-463, See also Coffey, et al., 1974).

However, if organizations realize they share some of the same goals and can control their conflict, the exchange system can operate successfully. Simon (1964:16) says:

In actual organizational practice, no one attempts to find an optimal solution for the whole problem. Instead, various particular decisions, or groups of decisions, within the whole complex are made by specialized members or units of the organization. In making these particular decisions, the specialized units do not solve the whole problem, but find a "satisfactory" solution for one or more subproblems, where some of the effects of the solution on other parts of the system are incorporated in the definition as "satisfactory."

When agencies find "satisfactory" solutions to goal (value) conflicts, coordination may not be impeded. On the other hand, autonomy threats can act as a barrier to

coordination. The key to successful coordination is in the management and control of conflict.

### *Assumptions of Exchange Theory*

Organizational goals are multidimensional; each organization has its unique goals while at the same time, maintains shared goals. These conflicting goals sometimes jeopardize the autonomy of the individual organization. It is clear that organizations have value conflicts with other organizations (Litwak and Hylton 1969:340, Lawrence, 1995:13). For example, police officers maintain the order of society through their arrest powers while probation officers attempt to reintegrate offenders back into mainstream society. These two objectives often conflict. However, both police and probation are individual entities of a larger system. Both departments have the same goals but different and competing ways of attaining these goals. Further, since the organizations in an exchange network must coordinate because of these shared goals and scarcity of resources, these conflicts often jeopardize the autonomy of each agency. When agencies experience conflicts, they must concede to sacrificing individual methods of goal attainment to find “satisfactory” solutions that blend the demands of all agencies involved. If agencies do not overcome conflict, the interorganizational relations will suffer (Miller, 1958:20). Therefore, for systems to operate equitably, efficiently and effectively, the individual agencies must manage their conflicting values in order to coordinate services.

### Exchange Theory inside the Criminal Justice System

In 1970, Cole applied Levine and White's interorganizational exchange theory to the study of the criminal justice system. From the time of the American Bar Foundation's Survey in 1955-56, the administration of justice in the United States has been widely regarded as a "system." The ABF Survey found, among many other significant findings, "that the various criminal justice agencies were interrelated in such a way that they constituted a criminal justice system" (Walker, 1992:59). For example, communities provide inputs for police. Police outputs become prosecution's inputs, which turn into outputs (in some instances) and inputs for the court and so forth (Snipes and Maguire, 2000:3). These inputs and outputs make up the criminal justice "system." The criminal justice system operates in an exchange framework (Cole, 1970:331, Cole, 1975:141, Cole and Gertz, 1998:1-8, Dill, 1975:670).

Cole says that the basis for exchange can be found in economics. He uses the economic concept of a marketplace as an example. In a marketplace, he says, inputs and outputs (or resources and products) are bartered. Exchange is this transfer of resources among others (organizations) that has consequences for the common goals (Cole, 1975:141-142). When one transfers resources to another, the receiver acquires a debt, which then must be returned in the form of a benefit. Cole says (1975:142), "the reciprocity of exchange relationships generates trust between actors and promotes a cooperative attitude that is strengthened by the reward structure of the organization." Cole goes further in his explanation of the criminal justice exchange system by saying:

In an exchange system, power and influence are largely due to an organization's ability to create clientele relationships that will support and

enhance its needs, for although interdependence is characteristic of the judicial system, competition with other public agencies exists. Since criminal justice units operate in an economy of scarcity, faced with more claims than they can fulfill with available resources, the organization must occupy a favorable power position vis-à-vis its clientele (1975:142).

Cole says that by viewing the administration of criminal justice with the conceptualization of an exchange system, one can study the individual components. He discusses Merton's "role-set," which can be used as one device for studying the roles of the criminal justice actors. By using Merton's "role-set," one is able to study the role of a police officer, which is adaptive to the different agencies he/she interacts with. For example, the role of a police officer is different when he/she is interacting with a prosecutor, a judge, a probation officer, or a member of the community. The police use different role behaviors when they interact with certain parts of the system (Cole, 1975:142-143). These different role behaviors are not specific to only police officers. Every actor in the criminal justice system adapts with each interaction. These interactions make up the criminal justice network exchange framework.

However, organizational analysis between agencies cannot be limited to actor interactions; interactions also occur between the individual organizations within a system. Analogous to Merton's role-set concept is what Evan calls "organization-set." In the "organization-set," Evan uses the organization (or a class of organizations) as the unit of analysis (as opposed to Merton who uses individuals as the unit of analysis). Evan then proposes to trace its interactions with the network of organizations within its environment (the organization set) (Evan 1956:220). The "focal organization" inside the organization-set is the point of reference (the organization at the center of attention). The relations

between the focal organization and its organization-set are conceived as mediated by: (1) boundary personnel role-sets, (2) information flow, (3) product/service flow and (4) personnel flow (Evan, 1956:220). Studying the interactions between both the actors and the individual organizations in a system provide a wider spectrum for viewing the functioning of the criminal justice system. This study uses both approaches for studying the effect of interagency coordination.

### *Characteristics of Exchange Theory in the Criminal Justice System*

It is imperative for the individual agencies inside the criminal justice system to exchange. First of all, the agencies operate with a scarcity of resources. Each agency has a piece of the available information on a client. Together, the agencies – police, courts and corrections - have the entire puzzle. For example, a probation officer will have knowledge of a client's entire criminal record. In addition, probation will know of the client's home environment, with whom the client associates, results from any psychological testing, sentencing restrictions, and so forth. Police have knowledge of the client's daily interactions with law enforcement, whether the client is suspected in any unsolved criminal mischief, where the client hangs out (in some instances), and other information that may be pertinent to case management. Working alone, each agency's resources are limited. Working together, police and probation departments have more information than when working alone. This scarcity of resources demands an exchange relationship.

The individual criminal justice agencies also share goals. The entire criminal justice system strives to be equitable, efficient and effective (Maguire, et al., 1998:39). In fact, the criminal justice system is constantly adapting to the pressure of meeting these goals. Maguire, Howard and Newman (1998:39) say that if the criminal justice system achieves maximum equity, it will have zero human rights violations. For the system to achieve maximum efficiency, it has zero costs and for maximum effectiveness, it has zero crime. It is unrealistic to think that the criminal justice system in America can reach maximum equity, efficiency and effectiveness. The idea is to “balance these three dimensions” (Maguire et al., 1998:39).

These same measures – equity, efficiency and effectiveness – need to be balanced within the individual agencies that make up the criminal justice system. These goals are outcome measures for each agency – police, courts and corrections. However, each of these agencies performs functions that conflict with the functions of the other agencies. Maguire, Howard and Newman (1998:34) provide an example: the goal of the corrections department is to treat its inmates according to state and federal rules and regulations. However, the court system may deliver an abundance of long sentences, which will result in prison overcrowding. Excessive overcrowding will violate state and federal penal laws. In addition, many cannot even agree on what the goal of prison should be (incapacitation, retribution, rehabilitation or deterrence). As Maguire, et al. (1998:34) make obvious, the nature of the criminal justice agencies is counterproductive. This counterproductivity creates a conflict of values.



Lawrence (1995) studied the interorganizational relationships between school personnel and juvenile probation officers. He found that schools and probation officers admittedly do not share identical goals, but they work with the same juveniles and their objectives are the same. The study revealed “differences in the methods and goals for working with problem students” (Lawrence:1995:13). Both school and court personnel share a common goal but their methods for attaining the goals are unique to their respective organizations. This also represents a conflict of values.

However, this conflict, as Litwak and Hylton (1969:340) argue, is a necessary and vital part of interorganizational exchanges. Snipes and Maguire (2000:4) argue that maintaining separations of goal and purpose protects the separation of powers. In essence, it acts as a checks and balance mechanism between the criminal justice agencies. For example, the police are based in the executive branch of government while probation is based in the judicial branch of government. The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution prohibits police from unlawful searches and seizures. In most cases, police officers must have probable cause and search and/or arrest warrants. On the other hand, since probation is not executing the law, per se, probation officers need not have probable cause and search warrants to search a client’s residence. If there was no separation of these two roles, individual liberties might be sacrificed for the benefit of crime control (Snipes and Maguire, 2000:4-5, See also Wright, 1980). Hence, conflict is a vital element in the criminal justice exchange system.

Coordination is the final characteristic in exchange theory. For over a decade, policy makers and academics have cried out for state agencies (such as police

departments) to coordinate with the public. The rationale is that such coordination provides the most effective delivery of crime prevention strategies (Crawford and Jones, 1995:17). For example, community policing grew largely out of the awareness that the police need community input in order to function effectively. Fragmentation between citizens and police personnel slows down the efficiency and effectiveness of the entire system. Community policing calls for collaboration with not only citizens, but with local business, e.g., Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Housing, Fire and Building Inspectors, etc. The idea is that if all agencies work together, communities can maintain public order (Bayley, 1994:108, See also Goldstein, 1979:236-258). Coordination is vital in successful interagency relationships.

### *Conflict and Coordination*

In looking at the criminal justice system, it is obvious that the individual criminal justice agencies exchange due to a scarcity of resources and shared goals. Each agency needs something the other agency has. The other two characteristics, conflict and coordination, warrant more attention than has been given in the past.

The conflicts between the individual agencies in the criminal justice system may or may not impair coordination. The literature shows that most programs requiring interagency collaboration have not produced favorable reviews (Byles, 1985:549, Miller, 1958:20-23). Miller (1958:23) found that “the major impediment to effectiveness in this field [delinquency prevention] relates more to the nature of relations among various concerned institutions than to a lack of knowledge as to effective procedure.” He

attributes the failure of the interagency relationship in a juvenile delinquency prevention program to the differing ideologies of the agencies involved (Miller, 1958:23). Lawrence (1995:13) also found that conflict over goals and methods between concerned institutions impeded coordination (See also Reid, 1964). Specifically, Lawrence (1995:13) found that the differing ideologies between school teachers and probation officers produced a “lack of coordination and a mutual blocking of efforts between schools and probation agencies.” In addition, he reports:

Efforts at coordination are unlikely to happen until school and probation personnel acknowledge that they share goals and resources, and when they believe the time and effort of coordination is worthwhile to each agency (Lawrence, 1995:13).

Recognizing conflict in interagency relationships, Crawford and Jones argue for formalized relationships between organizations. They cite Pearson et al. (1992:63), who found that informal interagency relations offered a “more workable basis for communication and negotiation.” On the other hand, Pearson et al. (1992:63) also found that in these informal relations, the “information exchanges are risky encounters which can endanger important confidentialities and might even sometimes constitute a threat to civil liberties.” Crawford and Jones (1995:26) say that informal relationships “leave differential power relations unchecked, hide decision-making practices from any review and remove them from any democratic input or control.”

Another aspect of effective interagency work, according to Crawford and Jones (1995:29), is the ability of not only individual organizations to overcome conflict, but the ability of the actors to deal with competing ideologies. They give an example of a

probation officer who was willing to cross over to the “opposite side of the camp” to interact with police officers. They quote from an interview with the Chief Police

Inspector in Tenmouth, UK:

I think the way [the project] was accepted at Tenmouth Police Constabulary was due not just to [the police officer] but also the way the probation officer had got on well with the police. When you are working with other agencies you do need the ability to switch into their culture, know what makes them tick and understand it. [The seconded probation officer] would often come in for coffee or lunch and would sit in the [police] canteen and wouldn't sit with me, but would go and sit over on that table with two or three constables, and that had quite a beneficial effect on, not just publicizing the project, but here's a probation officer who hasn't got horns coming out of the side of their head or something like that... This actually helps (Crawford and Jones, 1995:29).

The probation officer's courtesy, and lack of hostility, towards the police officers was an important component of the effective interagency collaboration. This example shows the significance of interpersonal relationships between the actors of competing organizations.

Crawford and Jones conclude that conflict itself, per se, does not impede multi-agency relations. Of greater importance is the “manner in which conflict is subsequently managed and regulated” (Crawford and Jones, 1995:31).

### Collaborations within the Criminal Justice System

As a result of the cry for “multi-agency” or “partnership” work that has been stressed in the last decade (Crawford and Jones, 1995:17), police and probation departments have recently joined forces. Realizing that both departments had information vital to the other, and that their roles overlapped, probation and police departments have started working together. The aim is to eliminate the fragmentation

between the two agencies so the criminal justice exchange system can operate equitably, efficiently and effectively. What follows is a description of some of these police/probation partnerships and their implication for the operation of the criminal justice system.

### *Police/Probation Collaborations*

Seeking ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness in the provision of community services, police and probation executives are forming partnerships that stress information-sharing and joint supervision projects. In those established, most target high-risk offenders, those whose offenses are of a violent and/or sexual nature (Evans, 1997b:126). These types of partnerships attempt to improve information exchange and strengthen informal interrelationships between all parts of the system, but specifically, between police and probation. Some of these partnerships are informal and stress only improved information exchange while some are formalized units that attempt to fundamentally change the duties of police and corrections personnel.

Generally, in these types of unions, probation officers accompany police officers on ride-alongs, making themselves visible at night in conjunction with police officers. Probation and police share information on any contacts either party has with probationers and of any changes in the status of targeted offenders. Probation and police also team up to make home visits. The partnerships highlight the fact that both groups are able to achieve benefits neither could accomplish on their own (Evans, 1997b:126-127, McKay and Paris, 1998:27-32). The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) emphasizes the need

for these partnerships in neighborhoods with a high incidence of crime and violence (Evans, 1997a:87).

Parent and Snyder (1999) note five distinct forms of police/probation partnerships: (1) enhanced supervision partnerships (the most common category); (2) fugitive apprehension units; (3) information-sharing partnerships; (4) specialized enforcement partnerships; and (5) interagency problem-solving partnerships. In July, 1997, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) asked Abt Associates Inc. to conduct a study of police-corrections partnerships. The project staff met with representatives from NIJ, the Corrections Program Office and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services to plan the study. The group reached a consensus of the operationalization of a police-corrections partnership: it is a formal or informal collaboration between police and correctional agencies that (1) involves staff from each agency in the joint performance of a line or support function and (2) provides benefits to both agencies (Parent and Snyder, 1999:16). The study had four components. First, project staff reviewed existing literature on police-corrections partnerships. Next, a panel of expert informants identified existing partnerships. After being identified as a partnership, the project staff interviewed officials at each partnership to collect basic descriptive information. Finally, the project staff visited nineteen partnerships located in 6 states (not all nineteen partnerships were written up in their report). The sites were selected to cover several different types of partnerships and to represent programs in which police and corrections staff played major roles (Parent and Snyder, 1999:16-17). At present, there have been no other published studies on the effectiveness of formalized police/probation collaborations

(Parent and Snyder, 1999:5). Therefore, the majority of the summary below is taken from Parent and Snyder's study. The collaborations discussed in detail are the enhanced supervision partnerships. These are the collaborations that have been more formally organized and are more applicable to the partnership that is explored. The remaining four types of collaborations are briefly described.

*Operation Night Lite; Boston, Massachusetts*

The first police-probation partnership occurred in Boston, Massachusetts and has become known as "Operation Night Lite." Operation Night Lite, in the Roxbury section of Boston, is a joint venture of the Boston Police and the Probation Department of the Dorchester Court. Police and probation officers work together to address community concerns related to youth violence. Joint patrols check for curfew and other violations of probation. Officers work with parents to help them reassert parental control. Schools, churches and other community institutions are also involved and help to supervise juvenile offending (Barajas, 1996:6. See also Corbett, Fitzgerald and Jordan, 1998:180-186 and Evans, 1997c:126-129 for a review of this partnership).

Boston's partnership is an enhanced supervision partnership. It had its roots in a chance encounter in 1990 between probation officers and members of the police department's gang unit. Both of these departments realized that they were often dealing with the same offenders. Gang activity in Boston was a major problem and these departments saw a collaboration as a way of handling this problem. This realization

sparked repeated brainstorming sessions in which police and probation officers explored ways in which they could work together more effectively (Parent and Snyder, 1999:17).

Probation officers, using intelligence information from the police gang unit, soon began asking judges to include curfew and area restrictions as conditions of supervision when gang-involved offenders were placed on probation. Probation officers actively started performing curfew checks and closely monitoring street activity to ensure that probationers were complying with their conditions (Parent and Snyder, 1999:17, Holmstrom, 1996:1). This precursor relationship was formalized in 1992 and named “Operation Night Lite” (Parent and Snyder, 1999:17).

Since 1992, Night Lite staff have been sharing intelligence information on gang members with local, State and Federal agencies such as the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Massachusetts Violent Fugitive Strike Force. The staff also met with local gangs and announced a “zero-tolerance” policy for gang related violence. The staff made it very clear that they were prepared to participate in an aggressive enforcement against gangs that engage in acts of violence. They have also cooperated with other agencies in efforts to “take down” gang leaders and break up gangs that continued to commit violent acts/crimes (Parent and Snyder, 1999:17-18, See also Kennedy, 1998:2-8). Operation Night Lite gives Boston police officers information about which juveniles are on probation and what conditions they are required to obey under the terms of their probation. As a result of this information exchange, police officers act as additional eyes and ears for probation “around the clock” (Parent and



Snyder, 1999:18). Because many gang leaders and members are on probation, technical violations can be grounds for getting them off the streets.

From the inception of this collaboration, police and probation officers have made more than 5,000 contacts with gang-involved probationers in the community. There have been no formal evaluations to determine the extent of the success in this collaborations' goal of lowering serious juvenile crime. Although there were several other initiatives under way in Boston to combat violence, Boston did see crime decline. The number of homicides, homicides with firearms and assaults with firearms all dropped sharply during the 1990s. In 1993, there were 93 homicides in Boston, compared to 39 homicides between January 1, 1997 and November 30, 1997. Sixty-five of the homicides in 1993 involved firearms compared to 21 in the first eleven months of 1997. Assaults with firearms dropped from 799 in 1995 to 126 during the first 11 months of 1997. Between 1995 and 1997, Boston went 2 ½ years without a juvenile homicide involving a firearm; in the previous 2 ½ years, 26 Boston teens died from gunshots (Parent and Snyder, 1999:18).

There has yet to be a formal evaluation of Project Night Lite (Braga, 2000). However, anecdotal testimonies revel in this city's partnership. Boston's project set the stage for the many other police/probation unions in the United States.

*Project One Voice; New Haven, Connecticut*

Project One Voice is a collaborative team of the New Haven Police Department and the adult and juvenile probation and parole departments. It started in 1997 and its mission is to provide enhanced supervision for juvenile probationers and parolees who are high-risk and/or have an affiliation with a gang in New Haven (Parent and Snyder, 1999:23).

Project One Voice was given life through an advisory board, consisting of local, State and Federal criminal justice agencies. This board created and continues to oversee the operations of the project. The police department made ten neighborhood groups, which advise the ten police substation commanders in the problem neighborhoods (Parent and Snyder, 1999:24). The goal of the project is to reduce gang related and/or violent crimes. This project branches out into two primary neighborhoods: Fair Haven and Newhallville. The project teams select those to be targeted by using information from police and probation official records, community contacts and/or informants (Parent and Snyder, 1999:24).

The program's four probation officers have desk space at two of the police department's substations. All four of these probation officers have reduced caseloads so they can focus more time on the targeted juveniles (Parent and Snyder, 1999:25). Approximately two times per week, probation officers and police officers conduct joint operations. Usually, one probation officer teams up with one police officer to make home visits or to just patrol the streets. When the police officers patrol without the probation/parole officers, they keep a notebook containing separate sheets on each of the

targeted juveniles. These notebooks are divided into four sections, one for each offender on State probation, State parole, pretrial detention and juvenile probation (Parent and Snyder, 1999:24). The sheets contain a picture of the targeted juvenile, his or her name, criminal record, a list of supervision conditions, a list of persons with whom the juvenile is not allowed to associate, names of fellow gang members, names of potential victims and the name of the juvenile's probation or parole officer (Parent and Snyder, 1999:24). This notebook better acquaints patrol officers with probationers/parolees, which increases the capability of noticing violations (Parent and Snyder, 1999:24). The goal is to "increase the odds that offenders will successfully complete community supervision, not to catch offenders violating conditions of supervision so that their supervision can be revoked and they can be confined" (Parent and Snyder, 1999:24-25).

Project One Voice has not been formally evaluated. The assigned probation officers believe that many of the probationers conform to their supervision requirements due to the heightened surveillance. Revocation rates have not significantly increased but the probation officers foresee increased revocations if the probationers refuse to desist in their criminal behavior. Parent and Snyder (1999:25) report that at a 1999 advisory meeting, police officers reported declinations in violent and property crimes in both of the target neighborhoods.

#### *Smart Partners Program; Bellevue and Richmond, Washington*

Smart Partners is a program in which law enforcement officers are trained as volunteer probation officers. They conduct home visits for a minimal caseload of high-

risk offenders on community supervision (Parent and Snyder, 1999:25, See also Morgan and Marrs, 1998:171). This program began in 1994 and has two underlying goals. One is to “provide additional surveillance of offenders released from prison to community custody” (Parent and Snyder, 1999:26). The second goal is to “develop inexpensive and efficient ways for police and community corrections officers to share information about persons under DOC supervision” (Parent and Snyder, 1999:26).

There are three components to the Smart Partners Program. First of all, police officers, who are trained as community corrections officers, conduct unannounced home visits on serious offenders who have been released from prison. These offenders were released on a form of enhanced supervision called community custody. Each community corrections officer has a small caseload of supervisees for which he/she is responsible (Parent and Snyder, 1999:27).

Secondly, the police department notifies the community corrections officers when patrol officers stop and interrogate their supervisees. The police officers complete FIR (Field Interview Report) cards on all persons with whom they speak. The police department then sends copies of the FIRs to the department’s crime analyst who checks the Washington State Crime Information System to see if the person is under DOC supervision (Parent and Snyder, 1999:27). Finally, when a supervisee is arrested and admitted to jail, the jail staff notifies the DOC (Parent and Snyder, 1999:28).

This program is ideal for Washington because it is an inexpensive way to enhance supervision of serious offenders and increase the flow of information among the various

criminal justice systems. Even though this program has yet to be formally evaluated, it has been expanded to 50 cities in the state of Washington (Parent and Snyder, 1999:28).

*Clark County Anti-Gang Unit; Vancouver, Washington*

The anti-gang unit is a collaboration made up of the Clark County Sheriff's Department, the Vancouver Police Department and the Washington Department of Corrections. This program promotes information sharing on gang members/crimes and increased supervision of known high-risk gang members who are either on probation or parole. This program had its origin in 1996 (Parent and Snyder, 1999:20).

The program's initial goal was "to suppress gang-related crimes in Clark County" (Parent and Snyder, 1999:21). In 1997, a task force, called the Clark County Anti-Gang Task Force, was created. This task force has three goals:

1. To suppress gang-related criminal behavior;
2. To prevent juveniles from getting involved with gangs; and
3. To provide support programs for those juveniles most at-risk (Parent and Snyder, 1999:21).

The three agencies adopted this mission, added staff to the Anti-Gang Unit and moved this unit into offices near the county courthouse. The unit targets those juveniles deemed to be most at-risk. All of the members of the unit receive a report on each targeted juvenile. As of March, 1999, the juvenile court and the juvenile probation department have not been active members in the partnership (Parent and Snyder, 1999:21).

The unit itself consists of 4 detectives (2 from the Sheriff's office and 2 from the police department), 1 sergeant from the Sheriff's office and 2 community corrections officers from the DOC regional office. The community corrections officers have a caseload of around 75 juveniles. They employ a youth outreach coordinator who creates and supports prevention and support programs (Parent and Snyder, 1999:21). The unit conducts home visits 2 nights per week. Usually, these visits involve a community corrections officer and a law enforcement officer. Sometimes, pending certain circumstances, a larger team may be deployed to conduct home visits. The goal is to reach anywhere between 10-15 residences per night (Parent and Snyder, 1999:21).

Every month, the unit holds a gang intelligence meeting. Participation at this meeting usually includes representatives from the police departments (departments from both Washington and Oregon), FBI, DEA, BATF and INS. Sometimes, representatives from the juvenile probation department, public school district and the county attorneys office may also attend. At these meetings, information is exchanged among these agencies (Parent and Snyder, 1999:23).

According to Parent and Snyder (1999:23), gang related incidents have continued to rise. They say that according to the unit's sergeant, this increase is not due to more gang activity, but due to the community's increased awareness of gangs. Once again, there has been no formal evaluation of this program.

#### *Neighborhood Probation; Maricopa County, Phoenix, Arizona*

Neighborhood probation in Maricopa County is a partnership between the adult

probation department, the Phoenix police department and various community organizations. There are three neighborhood probation programs in Phoenix, with the first beginning in 1996. Its goals are:

1. To lower recidivism; and
2. To change probation into a community focused program that provides needed services (Parent and Snyder, 1999:28).

Neighborhood probation does not assign cases according to offense, but according to preexisting neighborhood boundaries. In each of the three partnerships, the probation department maintains a solid, working relationship with the local law enforcement. Police aid probation in making home visits as well as just hanging around the probation offices to better familiarize themselves with the probationers. Parent and Snyder (1999:29) say that police have received increased cooperation from the community through its alliance with probation.

Each of the partnerships focuses on maintaining strong ties with the community. Probation officers attend all community meetings and participate in other service-oriented tasks, such as running errands for elderly citizens. In return, the communities keep both the police department and the probation department apprised of any neighborhood problems. Each partnership also tries to maintain a strong relationship with the probationers. Because probation officers are assigned geographically, they are better able to keep closer contact with their clients (Parent and Snyder, 1999:29). There has been no formal evaluation of this program but the probation department does report a 45%

decrease in crime in one of the targeted neighborhoods (Parent and Snyder, 1999:30).

### *Other Types of Partnerships*

These are just a few of the police-probation partnerships in existence across the Nation. As discussed above, there are four other types of police/probation partnerships (Parent and Snyder, 1999:33). The Fugitive Apprehension Units are collaborations between the police officers and probation officers to locate and apprehend probation or parole absconders (Parent and Snyder, 1999:8). Information Sharing Partnerships involve police and probation personnel initiating policies and procedures to increase the flow of information between the differing parts of the system. For example, police may inform the state prison of an inmate's gang affiliation and in return, the prison may inform the local police department of a gang-involved offender's release from prison (Parent and Snyder, 1999:8).

Specialized Enforcement Partnerships are teams of police and probation officers who attack specific community problems. Vallejo, California created a program called Operation Revitalization whose "prevention and intervention activities focus on school-aged children and youths from a single high-crime neighborhood" (Parent and Snyder, 1999:43). Thirteen organizations joined forces to target violent street criminals by using a community oriented policing strategy to develop relationships between these various organizations and the target neighborhood (Parent and Snyder, 1999:43). Finally, Interagency Problem-Solving Partnerships involve police and correctional leaders



regularly attending meetings to identify and provide solutions to problems of mutual concern (Parent and Snyder, 1999:8).

### Summary

It is clear that the criminal justice system operates in an exchange framework. Scarcity of resources and shared goals force the individual criminal justice agencies to cooperate. What is less clear is whether this exchange system operates equitably, efficiently and effectively or if it is plagued with rivalry, conflict and fragmentation.

In some jurisdictions, police and probation executives found themselves more competitive than cooperative (Braga, 2000, Parent and Snyder, 1999). Realizing their roles were overlapping and admitting that working together, both could provide better services to their clients (whether the clients be individuals or communities), police and probation agencies have begun collaborating. These collaborations provide an adequate illustration of managing conflicting ideologies to promote cooperation between interdependent organizations. The premise is that creating more formalized relationships (increasing the intensity of interagency dynamics) will mutually compromise the autonomy of both police and probation, therefore decreasing the risks of collaborating (Oliver, 1991:945). When the risk of compromising autonomy is lessened, agencies will feel secure enough to coordinate and pursue mutual goals. This coordination will increase the equity, efficiency and effectiveness of the criminal justice system.

This thesis examines a formalized police/probation collaboration. The major research question addressed in this study is whether the probation and police

departments, as well as the individual actors, can deal with their conflicting ideologies and effectively coordinate in order to produce equitable, efficient and effective results.

More specifically, the study focuses on four research questions:

- (1) How was the police/probation collaboration implemented? How does the unit handle the conflicting ideologies?
- (2) Is the collaboration between the police and probation departments repairing the fragmentation in the system?
- (3) Is the collaboration having an effect on the juveniles the unit is targeting?
- (4) Is the collaboration having an effect on the juvenile justice system?

The following chapter explains in detail the research methodology used to address these research questions.

## CHAPTER TWO

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

This chapter outlines the research methodology used in this study. The chapter begins by discussing the research setting and explaining the purposes of the data collection. Next, a summary and discussion of the qualitative research paradigm is provided to introduce the data collection strategies. Finally, I discuss each data collection strategy in detail, explaining the entire process of this study.

#### The Setting

Doggington<sup>1</sup> lies in the Western region of the United States. The city occupies 474.5 square kilometers of its state with a population in 1996 of 345,127 (a 23.1% increase from 1990) (1999 County and City Extra). The city's attractions show Doggington to be a favorable place to reside. The median age of its residents is 33.7 with a median household income of \$49,385. It is composed of 86% Caucasian, 7.2% African American, 8.7% Hispanic, 2.5% Asian American, .8% American Indian and 3.5% other. The ethnic makeup compares to similarly sized cities in the West. The average temperature is 48.5 degrees. The local average unemployment rate in 1996 was 4.6% (Doggington Web Site, 2000). In 1999, the crime index total for Doggington was 18,937 (UCR, 1999), which is relatively low when compared to other Western cities with similar populations. Overall, Doggington is a generally safe and esthetically pleasing place to

live.

### *The Police Department*

The Doggington Police Department (DPD) received its first federal accreditation in 1991 and was re-evaluated and re-accredited in 1993. The DPD is comprised of two bureaus: the Patrol Bureau and the Operations Support Bureau. The department has three geographic divisions: North, South and West. According to 1997 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) data, the department employs 754 full-time employees. Of those 754, 70% (528) are sworn officers. The department has 1.5 sworn officers per every 1,000 residents, which is low compared to the national average in 1998, which was 2.4 officers per 1,000 residents. Doggington's police to citizen ratio is low compared to other Western cities. In 1998, the ratio in Western states was 1.8 officers per 1,000 residents (FBI Crime in the United States, 1998). Ninety-five percent of the DPD's sworn officers are working in field operations (LEMAS, 1997). The ethnic make-up of the department is 82% white, non-Hispanic; 10% Hispanic; 6% black, non-Hispanic; 1% Asian, Pacific Islander and 1% American Indian, which is basically proportionate to the city's ethnicity (LEMAS, 1997).

The department has strict training requirements for its officers. The DPD requires 2,280 hours of training, which includes 720 hours of class training and 560 hours of field training. The minimum educational level required is "some college" (LEMAS, 1997). However, many of the department's personnel have earned Bachelors degrees, while

---

<sup>1</sup> Doggington is a pseudonym for the city where the study was conducted.

others have earned advanced graduate degrees. The quality of the DPD's officers and non-sworn personnel distinguish this department from many others around the United States.

### *JOU Personnel*

The Juvenile Offender Unit (JOU) consists of one probation officer, four detectives and one crime analyst. The probation officer has a Bachelors degree in criminal justice and a Master's degree in public administration. He has worked in the criminal justice field for 20 years; he worked as a counselor in a prison for 4 years and has spent the last 16 years working as a probation officer.

One of the core detectives has over 15 years experience in law enforcement. His experiences include working in patrol, street narcotics, gangs, sex crimes, career criminals and computer forensic investigations. He is currently completing his undergraduate degree in criminal justice and computer science. The other core detective has some college education and has been with the DPD for 13 years, working in the patrol division, gang program and the Juvenile Offender Unit.

One of the non-core detectives has been working for the DPD for 13 years. He has Bachelor degrees in sociology and English, a Master's degree in criminal justice, and is currently pursuing his Ph.D. in criminal justice. He worked as a local pastor for the United Methodist Church for four years and worked as a counselor in an adult alcohol rehabilitation center for five years. The other non-core detective has nine years of police experience with the DPD. He spent 5 years in patrol and assisted with a task force

focused on burglaries and motor vehicle theft. He has 4 years experience as a S.W.A.T. team member. He is the newest member of the JOU.

The crime analyst has a Bachelors degree in sociology and a Master's degree in communications. She is currently researching doctoral programs in similar fields of study. She has been a crime analyst for the DPD for three years. She started in major crimes and was moved to work with the JOU and the robbery unit. She has about 10 years of analytical experience.

The sergeant also has some college education and has been with the DPD since 1977. He has worked in patrol, intelligence, narcotics investigation and the SWAT unit. He has been a supervisor of patrol, the gang unit, the Major Crimes Unit (homicide) and currently is the supervisor of the JOU. He is also the director of a \$300,000 state grant to combat juvenile crime.

### Data Collection Strategies

The purpose of this study is to explore a police/probation partnership and its impact on the police and probation departments, the juveniles it targets and the juvenile justice system in Doggington. The data collected for this thesis were originally intended for an evaluation of the DPD's Juvenile Offender Unit (JOU). The DPD hired a private research firm, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Solutions (21<sup>st</sup> CS), to conduct an evaluation of the Community Policing Demonstration Center grant it received in 1998. This research firm provided a subcontract to the University of Nebraska at Omaha, Department of Criminal Justice, to complete the JOU portion of the overall evaluation.

All of the data were originally collected around the four research questions described in Chapter One. Given the information discovered during data collection, I applied a theoretical perspective to the data in a post hoc fashion. Because there had been no prior evaluations of these types of collaborations, the study was conducted in an exploratory manner. More specifically, while there were general guidelines used for the field research, most of the study was unstructured. In addition, most of the data obtained were qualitative in nature. This was necessary in order to determine the implementation process and exchange relationships between the actors and the departments. However, agency data were collected for a quantitative assessment of impact on probationers.

Before entering into a detailed discussion of the individual methods of data collection, I provide a brief introduction to qualitative research. This introduction touches on both the benefits and limitations of the qualitative research paradigm.

### The Qualitative Paradigm

Qualitative research found favor in sociology in the 1920s and 1930s. During this time, the “Chicago School” researchers showed qualitative research to be appropriate for the study of human group life (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994:1). Qualitative research has been described as: “multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter” (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994:2). Qualitative researchers observe and scrutinize their subjects in their natural environment, “attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (Denzin

and Lincoln, 1994:2). Qualitative researchers explore, observe and assign meaning to observable phenomena.

Some criticize qualitative researchers as being “journalists” or “soft scientists.” Their work is labeled “unscientific” and “full of bias” (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994:4). Glassner and Moreno (1989:6) assert that critics of this research approach find the methods “either inherently infected by the unacknowledged preferences of the practitioner or at least more liable to such infection.” While criticism of this type of research exists, the fact remains that qualitative research can be conducted in a sound and “scientific” manner. Glassner and Moreno quote Freud on the importance of words:

Nothing takes place between them except that they talk to each other. The analyst makes use of no instruments—not even for examining the patient—nor does he prescribe any medicines. If it is at all possible, he even leaves the patient in his environment and in his usual mode of life during the treatment... And incidentally, do not let us despise the word. After all, it is a powerful instrument; it is the means by which we convey our feelings to one another, our method of influencing other people. Words can do unspeakable good and cause terrible wounds. No doubt ‘the beginning was the deed’ and the word came later; in some circumstances it meant an advance in civilization when deeds were softened into words. But originally the word was magic—a magical act; and it has retained much of its ancient power (Freud, 1974:187-188, Glassner and Moreno, 1989:7).

For qualitative researchers, the natural environment is the workshop while words are the tools. Creating their work of art is a matter of perception and holistic understanding.

To protect the “scientific” nature of qualitative research, it is useful to acknowledge its possible limitations. As pointed out above, the biggest criticism of this research design is bias. Qualitative researchers bring their own personal values and bias with them into the field (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994:381). While most researchers



struggle to remain objective, human nature is fallible. It is also not unusual for field researchers doing participant observation to identify with their research subjects. Spending over ten hours a day for sixteen days with the members of the JOU created a feeling of actually being a part of the unit. In fact, the newest detective made the comment: "It is going to be strange with you gone. You are like a part of things." While I knew I was studying the unit, it was difficult not to identify with them. For example, there was one member of the unit the others disliked. They made several negative comments regarding this detective's personality and work habits. Hearing these comments prior to interviewing the detective made it difficult to remain objective. While it was imperative for me to listen and record what I heard from others, it was also important for me to record pertinent information given by this detective. I found myself struggling against internalizing the others' perceptions of the detective. If I had allowed myself to be swayed in this respect, I would have given into bias and subjectivity. This, in turn, would have limited the data I collected from the detective, which would have weakened this study (Bogdan, 1972:31-32). This is just one example of the potential limitations of qualitative research. It is also an example of overcoming natural tendencies that could restrict qualitative findings. Acknowledging these types of shortcomings and taking steps to protect the integrity of the data collection/analysis, qualitative researchers can provide a rich and detailed analytical exhibit.

### Field Research Data Collection

The present study is primarily based on 105 hours of fieldwork observation and several unstructured interviews. I observed the unit in its natural environment, participated in ride alongs, office meetings, community meetings, juvenile staffings, home checks, probation client meetings and other daily work assignments. The object was to observe what the unit was doing, as well as how and why it was doing it. I spent sixteen days with the unit (January 26, 2000 - February 10, 2000) for a total of 105 hours of observation. A significant portion of the field research was spent with the immediate members of the JOU.

When accompanying the probation officer and detectives, observations and notes were recorded with a pen and paper. The field notes make up the majority of the data that are used in this study. These notes were subsequently typed into a word processing program for organization purposes. The notes were first typed in chronological order (producing 59 single spaced typed pages) and were later organized by individual topics. By organizing the notes topically, I was able to search and identify recurring patterns. It is these patterns that shape the findings in this study.

When I first entered the department, the unit was hesitant to share information with me. Once a trusting relationship was established, the members of the JOU became active participants in the research project. It became apparent after some time in the field with the JOU that the members of the JOU, as well as members of the organization set (the agencies the JOU interacts with), knew that my desire was to learn from them. This is the purpose of field research: learning about the “who, what, when, where and why.”

Since I was there to glean information from the unit and its organization set, I made sure not to overly display my “academic” knowledge. Bogden (1979:29-30) says that in participant observation, researchers should be “unassuming” and should refrain from looking like a “know it all.” Showing over-competence may impede subjects from sharing their feelings and thoughts. For example, if I would have inundated them with my knowledge of studies on the deterrent effect of the police, they could have become defensive and uncooperative. As a result of my ambition to learn, they would often offer information that I would not have discovered otherwise. It was also apparent that the members of the unit voiced their trust and confidence of the project to members of the organization set. In fact, a detective from the robbery division of the DPD told me the JOU detectives told her I was “very nice” and “bright.” Before interviewing a probation officer, she commented that “they were all talking about how perceptive you are and how you ask really good questions.” Since others had confidence in my research abilities, she did as well and offered very detailed data. In fact, everybody was open to meeting and speaking about the project. Some even offered “sensitive” information that was “not to be a part of the report.”<sup>2</sup>

However, as with all observational research, when subjects know they are being watched and studied, they could change their behavior. This is often referred to as observer effects (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994:382). Research subjects usually act in a manner in which they think the researcher expects them to act. For example, if a

---

<sup>2</sup> In most cases, when “sensitive” information was delivered, I promised to use the data in a way that would not identify the interviewee. I also restated the fact that I was researching the JOU and any pertinent data collected would be used in the analysis.

researcher enters a police department identifying a study as being directed toward attitudes on community policing, some officers could report on how they love the community. This may or may not be true, but subjects could adapt their behavior to researcher expectations. In that respect, since I was evaluating the JOU for the police department, I expected favorable reviews from all involved. I also expected “by the book” behavior. At first, this is exactly what I observed. However, in this study, once I earned the trust of the JOU members, they allowed me to see the “real” picture (the day to day rigors and stresses of their work). In essence, the “by the book” rigidity loosened. The detectives and probation officer started joking with me, reveling me with JOU war stories. Some even shared intense personal memories with me. In a sense, they accepted me as a part of their work environment for the sixteen days I spent there. This allowed me to discover the “who, what, when, where and why” of the Doggington JOU.

#### Interviews with Members of the Organization Set

Information obtained from unstructured interviews also made up a large part of the data collection. I interviewed as many members of the organization set as was feasible in the time span of the study. All of the immediate members of the Juvenile Offender Unit were interviewed: four detectives, one crime analyst, one probation officer and one sergeant. Interviewed from the police administration were one lieutenant, one commander, one deputy chief and one grants administrator. From the probation department, interviews were conducted of the chief probation officer, two probation

---

supervisors, two probation officers and one client manager. Representatives from the juvenile court were also interviewed which included the chief judge of the Fourth Judicial District, one district judge, two magistrates, one district attorney, one deputy district attorney, two private defense attorneys, one guardian ad litem and one diversion program director. In addition, six of the juveniles in the unit were interviewed, as was one parent/guardian (See Table 1). All notes from interviews were recorded with pen and paper and later typed into a word processing program.

The JOU probation officer scheduled the majority of the interviews. Because I came in from out of town and was unfamiliar with the Dogginton criminal justice system, it was necessary that somebody other than myself set up the interviews. Also, there were a few interviews the probation officer attended. He sat in on an interview with the deputy district attorney, a guardian ad litem and a probation officer (the interviewees asked the probation officer to attend). One of the detectives was also present when the client manager was interviewed (the interview took place in an automobile on the way to meet one of the incarcerated SHO/DIs). Having members of the JOU present during these interviews could have influenced the data obtained during these interviews. All other interviews were conducted in private with only the interviewer and interviewee present.

The interviews were unstructured because of the nature of the data collection. Once I became more familiar with the criminal justice process in Dogginton, the more in depth the questions became. The longer I observed the unit and its interactions with actors from other agencies in the organization set, the more information there was to

obtain. The questions generally focused on each actor's perspectives and views about the JOU, its goals, the interagency relationships, the merger of probation and police, the unit's effectiveness and its efficiency. Each interview lasted anywhere from twenty minutes to two hours.

During each interview, I reported that the data collected would be used in both the DPD report and this thesis. I reassured each participant that the information he/she provided would remain anonymous and confidential. When interviewing juveniles, I signed a release form, obtained permission from their guardians and gave them a form outlining their rights as research participants. I thoroughly explained their rights of confidentiality and anonymity, and made sure they understood the voluntariness of the study (See Appendix A). There were no persons who refused to participate in the interviews.

### Official Documents

Official documents were also collected, which helped to explain the history of the unit. Police memoranda and JOU reports were also utilized to supplement the data. These data were used to strengthen the accuracy of the historical data on the evolution of the JOU obtained during interviews.

### Survey Instrument

In addition to the field research and interviews, I conducted a police roll call survey. I spent one day in each of the three geographic divisions (each with its own

police station) attending shift roll calls. The roll calls began at 6:00 a.m. and ended at 9:00 p.m. The police roll call survey was a six-page instrument. Its purpose was two-fold: the majority of the questions were focused on problem-oriented policing (which is another part of the Community Policing Demonstration Center evaluation) and there were six questions directed toward the JOU evaluation. When administering the survey, I introduced myself as a researcher working for 21<sup>st</sup> CS and described the purpose of the survey. I handed out an information sheet, which also outlined the purpose of the study while instructing of confidentiality guarantees. Many of the police officers questioned whether the DPD administrators would see the completed surveys. The officers seemed suspicious of whether the department was conducting the survey to “find out if we are doing our jobs.” At every roll call, I assured the officers that I would take the surveys directly back to the university with me and that nobody from the department would see the survey responses; only the analysis would be given to the department. That seemed to satisfy some of the officers’ concerns; however, there were still a few who refused to participate. In addition, some officers, apparently bored with the length of the survey, quit before completing it. Out of all of the surveys administered, I received 145 responses.

I created another survey instrument for the probation officers. This survey consisted of the six JOU questions asked of the patrol officers. I administered this survey to the Dogginton juvenile probation officers at a weekly juvenile probation officer meeting. When administering the probation officer survey, I introduced myself as a researcher from 21<sup>st</sup> CS and informed them that the data would be used in both the DPD

evaluation and my thesis. Once again, I handed out a form advising the probation officers of the purpose of the study, while making sure they understood their responses would remain anonymous and confidential. The probation officers seemed more than willing to participate in this survey. A total of 13 surveys responses were collected, which makes up the entire population of juvenile probation officers in Dogginton (this number includes the chief probation officer).

The JOU survey questions were designed to compare attitudes of police officers with probation officers. One goal of the survey is to determine how favorably each department (police and probation) views the Juvenile Offender Unit. Another goal is to determine if the ideologies of the patrol officers and juvenile probation officers are similar or different. This survey instrument is also used to supplement the data collected from interviews and research conducted in the field. Using a triangulated data collection approach strengthened the credibility, reliability and validity of this study.

### Quantitative Data Collection

In addition to the qualitative data, agency data were collected. The data included descriptive variables on all possible SHO/DIs (those who qualify according to the point levels), this includes those chosen to be SHO/DIs and those not chosen to be SHO/DIs. The descriptive variables include information regarding point levels, number of offenses, gender and ethnicity/race of the juveniles. These data were used to compare the SHO/DIs with the non-SHO/DIs. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare the means between the two groups. T-tests are used to determine if the



difference between the mean number of points and offenses of the SHO/DIs and non-SHO/DIs are statistically significantly different using a 95% confidence interval level.

### Summary of Research Areas

The following chapter describes in detail the data collected during my sixteen days in Dogginton. The sections are divided up into four parts:

- Part One: How was the police/probation collaboration implemented and organized?
- Part Two: Is the police/probation collaboration having an impact on the police and probation departments? Is there better information exchange? Are the two departments working together better now than before the establishment of the collaboration?
- Part Three: Is the police/probation collaboration having an impact on the juveniles it is targeting?
- Part Four: Is the police/probation collaboration having an impact on the local juvenile justice system?

Part Four of chapter three includes a descriptive analysis of the quantitative data. This analysis explores the types of juveniles the JOU is supervising. The findings in these four sections make up the analysis of this unit's equity, efficiency and effectiveness.

## CHAPTER THREE

### FINDINGS

#### Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings of the study and is organized into four parts:

- Part One: How was the police/probation collaboration implemented and organized?
- Part Two: Is the police/probation collaboration impacting the police and probation departments? Has information exchange improved? Are the two departments working together better now than before the establishment of the collaboration?
- Part Three: Is the police/probation collaboration having an impact on the juveniles it is targeting?
- Part Four: Is the police/probation collaboration having an impact on the local juvenile justice system?

#### Part One: How Was The Police/Probation Collaboration Implemented And Organized?

##### *History and Evolution of the Juvenile Offender Unit*

In September 1983, the Dogginton Police Department received a federal Grant from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to start a SHO/DI program, which focused on juveniles who were repeat offenders using drugs. At this time, SHO/DI stood for Serious Habitual Offenders/Drugs Involved. SHO/DI was designed to increase the effectiveness of all parts of the local juvenile justice system: police, prosecutor and other juvenile authorities. The goal was to “deal with and reduce juvenile criminal activity and drug use” (OJJDP, 1984:1). Dogginton was one of five sites selected for the SHO/DI program.

During this time, SHO/DIs were chosen based upon a points system. Once determined to be a SHO/DI, these youths could expect increased attention from patrol officers. However, I was told that only a few of the patrol officers would actually “work these kids.” Most of the time, the list of SHO/DIs was just tossed aside and ignored. This may have been due to an already overburdened patrol staff. The end result was that some of these juveniles were not given the amount of surveillance the program procedures stated they deserved.

In 1994, the police department, realizing that juvenile offending was becoming a serious problem, created a Juvenile Offender Unit (JOU). This unit was comprised of four detectives. At this time, SHO/DI was changed to Serious Habitual Offender/Directed Intervention. Each SHO/DI was assigned to a detective who was responsible for tracking the juvenile. The commander said the philosophy of the JOU at this time was “trail ‘em, nail ‘em and jail ‘em.” The JOU was given a crime analyst to assist with the selection of the SHO/DIs. In addition, the district judge signed a court Order lifting interagency confidentiality requirements. This meant that the district attorney’s office, police, probation, division of youth services, department of social services and the local school districts could now share pertinent information regarding these juveniles.

In 1998, the police department prepared a grant proposal for the Community Policing Demonstration Center grant. As a last minute addition, the department wrote in a probation officer to work with the Juvenile Offender Unit. The administration reports that they were starting to realize that just locking these juveniles up was not going to stop

the offending; these juveniles would eventually get out. The JOU's members started to see themselves as being part of the juvenile crime problem. The JOU detectives realized they needed to start looking at prevention and intervention with a goal of reduced offending. One of the core detectives said the JOU tried to become more socially aware of what was actually going on in the lives of these serious juvenile offenders. He said that crime is a result of social problems and they realized they needed to start addressing them. They became involved in some committees and subcommittees (such as the Dogginton Juvenile Justice Task Force), mainly as a way of training themselves on the issues surrounding juveniles. They were making an effort to see the whole picture and not simply viewing the kid as the problem. The detectives said they started working with families and just "becoming socially conscious."

During this time, the sergeant said he thought the JOU could be more efficient if all of the SHO/DI's, who were probationers, were assigned to one probation officer and if that probation officer was housed with the unit. All of the juveniles, at this time, were assigned to different probation officers and sometimes the detectives would call the probation officer who would then not return the call. Basically, both departments just did not understand what the other was doing. So, when the police department received the Community Policing Demonstration Center grant, the administration hired a probation officer. This probation officer is housed inside the police department with the Juvenile Offender Unit.

In late 1999, the Demonstration Center Grant funding ended. Based upon the perceived success of the unit, the probation department decided to keep the probation

officer housed in the police department. This probation officer is now funded once again by probation, yet works in the police department. He administratively reports to his probation supervisor and operationally reports to his police supervisor. In addition, the probation department has moved another probation officer inside the police department to work with the sex crimes unit, and plans on moving another in to work with the Domestic Violence Enhanced Response Team (DVERT).

#### *Current Structure of the Juvenile Offender Unit*

The JOU itself is made up of four detectives, one probation officer, one crime analyst and one sergeant. At the time of this study, three of the detectives are assigned to supervising the juveniles full-time while the fourth detective follows up on the committed juveniles and researches grant opportunities. There are two core detective positions in the unit; a core position is one in which detectives are permanently assigned to the unit. The other two detective positions are non-core and rotate every four years. One of the core detectives supervises the juveniles and also works in a developing forensic computer crime unit, while the other core detective researches grant opportunities. The two non-core detectives focus solely on the juveniles in the unit.

Currently, there are 71 juveniles on the SHO/DI roster. Twenty-two of these juveniles are incarcerated. This means that currently the unit is monitoring 49 SHO/DIs in the community. Forty-one percent of these SHO/DIs are on probation. The detectives work alongside the probation officer on all of those cases where the SHO/DIs are

probationers; the detectives separately supervise all others. The sergeant supervises both the Juvenile Offender Unit and the Robbery Division.

The crime analyst is also assigned to both the Juvenile Offender Unit and the Robbery Division. She determines which juveniles are going to be SHO/DIs and who will be assigned to whom. She reviews these files every three months. She selects the SHO/DIs based on criteria consisting of a point system and an evaluation of juveniles with more arrests for serious and/or violent activities (as opposed to arrests for property crimes). A juvenile must have 21 points to qualify as a Serious Habitual Offender. These points are assessed according to the juvenile's arrest record based on frequency and seriousness of the crime committed. One adjudication and one felony charge are required for inclusion in the SHO/DI program. The criteria for selection is as follows:

1. 6 points = Felony Persons Crime; e.g., murder, sexual assault, robbery assault;
2. 5 points = Felony Property Crime; e.g., burglary, larceny (over \$500), trespass (1<sup>st</sup> degree), etc.; and
3. 3 points = All Misdemeanors; e.g., petty offenses.

The crime analyst reports that the department uses a state data management system (CJIS) and they use host access (a computer program) to pull the data into the SHO/DI database. The SHO/DI database is supposed to have information on every juvenile that comes into contact with police officers. The SHO/DI data come from case reports and summonses. The data system automatically tallies the juveniles' points.

At present, the crime analyst identifies which juveniles will be moved up to SHO/DI status by assessing the point system and looking at the seriousness of the charge. This means that the SHO/DI selection process consists of a quantitative and a qualitative component. The quantitative part assesses a juvenile's eligibility based on number of points (and one felony charge and adjudication). The qualitative part determines the extent to which the juvenile's points are attributed to property or violent crimes. Violent, person crimes are deemed more serious. For example, if a juvenile has 51 points but has all property violations, he/she will not be bumped up to SHO/DI status. If a juvenile has fewer points, say 30, but has all violent violations, he/she is more likely to be moved to SHO/DI status. When a juvenile is selected for SHO/DI status, the detectives either mail or personally deliver a letter to the juvenile describing the program. Once the SHO/DI roster is updated, copies are passed out to all patrol officers and detectives so everyone knows which juveniles are SHO/DIs. Copies of this roster are also sent to the district attorney's office. All district attorney case files are physically stamped "SHO/DI" so all personnel know they are dealing with a serious habitual offender. Dispatch fields are updated so that when a patrol officer stops a juvenile, he/she will be notified if the juvenile is a SHO/DI and which detective is assigned to the juvenile. If the juvenile is a SHO/DI, the patrol officer is responsible for paging/calling the assigned detective and notifying him of the incidence of the contact. The detectives are on call 24 hours per day to handle any situation that involves a SHO/DI.

A juvenile who has been moved to SHO/DI status remains a SHO/DI until he/she turns eighteen, has been inactive for a period of one year or upon death. Even if the

SHO/DI moves out of the area, the detective is still responsible for monitoring his/her criminal activity. Once the juvenile turns eighteen, he/she is dropped from SHO/DI status and no further information is updated. Basically, the unit stops all contact with the juvenile.

I was told that about sixty percent of the unit's time is spent in the field. The probation officer and detectives conduct home visits, targeted patrols and attend various community meetings. When the unit is at the police department, time is spent in client meetings and routine follow-up. The members of the JOU are supposed to keep track of every contact they have with their SHO/DIs. They do this by keeping a log sheet, which is then updated into their computer. I was told that home visits are conducted numerous times during the week, usually every day. The assigned detective accompanies the probation officer during these visits. In some instances, usually a few times a month, the entire unit will head out together and spend the entire evening conducting home visits. If the home visit is for a juvenile on probation, the probation officer takes the lead and the detectives accompany to offer support and protection. If the home visit is for a juvenile who is not on probation, the assigned detective takes the lead.

The SHO/DIs also have scheduled meetings with the probation officer. These meetings are held in the police department. There is no formal procedure for these client meetings. From my observations, a typical client meeting is as follows: The probation officer receives a call from the front desk reporting that a probationer is present for his/her meeting. The probation officer leaves the second floor headed for the first floor to escort the probationer up to the meeting room. The client sits down, as does the



probation officer. "So, what has been going on?" asks the probation officer. They proceed to discuss school, work and other personal issues related to the client. The client is handed a Probation Department Supervision Report, which the client fills out. On this form, the client is asked to update his address and any other information. This form is then used to update files and the address is noted for home visits. After about 10 minutes, the detective stops by to see how the client is doing and inquires about any assistance he needs to offer. The detective remains in the meeting until the probation officer escorts the client back down to the lobby. In general, the meetings last anywhere from 20-40 minutes.

The JOU has weekly meetings, called Team Meetings, where the probation officer and detectives update the sergeant on matters regarding SHO/DIs and discuss new business. All of the members of the unit attend this meeting. In addition, the probation officer also attends a weekly probation officer meeting where he keeps his probation supervisor updated on his caseload and offers assistance to other probation officers.

### *Summary of Part One*

The SHO/DI program has been a work in progress since 1983. At that time, patrol officers were supposed to focus extra attention on problem youths using drugs and alcohol. In 1994, the police department created a Juvenile Offender Unit (JOU) and changed the scope of the SHO/DI program. The purpose of the JOU was to direct needed attention on problem youths who had a greater chance of becoming career criminals. Since then, the JOU has been evolving into a multi-agency approach to delinquency.

Observing fragmentation in the exchange system, the police department created a formalized union in 1998 with the juvenile probation department. The expectation is that the police/probation collaboration would produce more equitable, efficient and effective results. These results are examined in the remainder of this chapter. The following section discusses the impact of the collaboration on both the police and probation departments.

### Part Two: Is The Police/Probation Collaboration Having An Impact On The Police And Probation Departments?

After examining my interview notes, I found that the most obvious change is in the philosophy of the JOU. Since this program originated in the police department, one might expect to find the probation officer accepting and internalizing the ideology of the detectives. However, the police commander reported that the philosophy used to be about incapacitation; they wanted to remove these kids from society. When the police department administrators hired the probation officer, the police commander said the idea was to streamline the JOU. They wanted to facilitate the more rapid removal of youths from society. Instead, the surveillance increased and probation revocations dramatically dropped. The sergeant said that “we want to provide as much information, intervention and prevention for the kid to get turned around.” He said, “if you lock these juveniles up, they are going to become products of their environment.” What is occurring in the JOU is a change or shift in ideologies. The philosophy of the unit appears to be more like that of probation. The probation officer and three of the four detectives commented that the

detectives' mind-sets are becoming more like that of probation. They are more focused on helping the juveniles and preventing further criminality than they are with just arresting and incarcerating them. This was interesting because my initial reaction to the collaboration was that the probation officer would move into the police department and become more like a police officer. That is not happening in the Dogginton police department.

A second finding involves the members of the JOU. As mentioned, three of the detectives have adapted their ideologies to that of the probation officer. However, the fourth detective has not changed his ideology to match the probation officer's views. When asked what the philosophy of the unit was, this detective said, "We were not a rehab unit. My job, initially, was to stick career criminals in jail. That was the purpose. On paper, this is still the philosophy. It has evolved into a intervention based, rehabilitative program." When asked what his personal philosophy was, he said:

My philosophy is to talk to the kid. I am not here to be his friend or to hold his hand. If the kid does what he is supposed to do, then there will be no problem. I won't call or make home visits. That is not the way I handle my caseload. But when the kid messes up, I am the consequence. I won't handhold these kids. That is not my job. I am not a social worker. I am a law enforcement officer and my job is to enforce the law. These kids have [the probation officer], case-workers, therapists and all these people out here to see that they get all the help they need. This is not my job. My job is to make it clear to the kids that if they want to be on the wrong side of the law, then I am the consequence of that. I leave them alone and stay out of their life as long as they follow the law. These kids, and even addicts, know right from wrong. I am their consequence for being wrong.

The detective acknowledges that his philosophy is different from the “whole group and from the entire system.” He says this differing philosophy might be why he does not fit in with other members of the JOU.

The other members of the JOU also expressed concern with the 4<sup>th</sup> detective. The other members reported that he does not participate in home visits or night patrolling. The other detectives never call him for back up. In fact, not only do the other three detectives speak unfavorably about this detective, other detectives in other specialized police units also denigrate the detective.

The JOU personnel said the reason this detective is supervising the committed juveniles, and not active juveniles, is due to his differing ideology. According to the JOU members, he does not monitor his SHO/DIs; the other detectives have to carry his load. Out of frustration with the situation, the other three detectives went to the sergeant and asked if the incarcerated SHO/DIs could be put on the other detective’s roster. The sergeant agreed and assigned the detective to researching grant opportunities. During interviews with members of the JOU, and from direct observations, it became apparent that all of the other members of the JOU have the same working philosophy.

Another finding regards the communication between the police and probation departments. From information obtained through interviews, I learned that relationships between these two agencies before the collaboration were tense. One of the detectives reported, “there was a blanket attitude on both ends before we started this program.” He added that probation officers used to tell their clients not to talk with police officers; probation officers were looking out for the interests of the child too much. He gave an

example of a homicide case he once worked. He said the probation officer was very overprotective and told the probationer not to talk with the police. This impeded the investigation of the homicide. He said this has “improved a lot since this program.”

The diversion program director remarked that this police/probation collaboration was “long needed.” He said that historically, the relationship between police and probation was not cohesive, partly due to political influences. In the past, police would come into contact with a juvenile and would think the juvenile was in trouble but would not know what to do about it. At that time, there was no link to probation. He said kids were not held accountable for their actions because they would slip through the cracks. Reports were filled out by police officers and the probation officers would never know that one of their kids had been in trouble. There was a big misunderstanding about how each of the departments actually function.

In an interview, a probation supervisor told me that under the prior chief probation officer, relationships between police and probation were “extremely poor.” This probation supervisor said there was simply no relationship between the police and probation: “probation had a very poor reputation at that time.” She told me that when hearing about the Community Policing Demonstration Center grant, she was surprised. She could not believe that police officers would even want to work with probation officers. She mentioned that the current chief probation officer had no idea what he was coming into when he took the job in Dogginton. The supervisor said the current chief probation officer has been working hard to forge new relationships, but “it has been a challenge”.

When first approached with the idea of this collaboration, the chief probation officer said he was “very suspicious of the intentions of the police department.” Upon his arrival in Dogginton, he had a couple of bad experiences with the DPD and these experiences caused a distrust of police operations. He said he was very impressed when he saw that the police department had written in the grant that the purpose of the unit would be to “decrease the number of revocations and increase the successes of the kids.” With that language used in the grant, he was willing to take the risk.

He told me that at the outset, there were concerns that police would take advantage of some of the authority of probation officers. The chief probation officer was concerned that the detectives would want to conduct warrantless arrests and not adhere to search and seizure laws. He was also concerned that the roles would get blurred. He wanted to make sure each department could keep their roles distinct from the other. He said that his fears have not come to fruition. He said, “working with probation has helped police recognize that there is more than one tool in working with these juveniles.” Working with police has definite safety benefits for probation officers as well. He is “impressed” with the unit and it seems to be a beneficial tool for both police and probation. He remarked that probation officers are starting to build a different kind of relationship with police officers. He said his relationship with the police department is “undeniably improving,” and that if he had not kept the probation officer in the police department when the grant funding ended, it would have been “ignorant and negligent” on his part.

In addition, the diversion director said this union has helped increase police awareness of family issues with regard to juveniles. He said that at meetings, he hears the members of the JOU talking about treatment and family issues; “you would have never heard those words come out of their mouths before.” He has not seen a merging of roles but said they now understand each other’s language and that the police are starting to look at the overall picture. In addition, the probation officer can now go and “watch all of the issues play out.” Both departments have different interests and now they are working together to appreciate the differences and present a complete package for these youths.

After interviewing other members of the court personnel, it became apparent that some have a slightly different view of the JOU. One defense attorney said that, “speaking in the context of a defense attorney, it is horrible having police officers working with probation officers...too much information is being exchanged.” She said that probation officers know a lot more than they need to know. For example, she said that probation officers have more information about a juvenile’s misconduct than they normally would. She said a lot of the information is just talk on the streets; probation officers never would have heard this “talk” before the collaboration. She said that when she is wearing her Guardian ad Litem hat, she thinks this union is “really good.” She went further to say that from a community perspective, “the Juvenile Offender Unit is the thing we want to see...we need to see different sections of the system working together.” From a legal perspective, her concern is that probation officers become “honorary police officers.” She has not observed the JOU probation officer taking on the role of a police

officer but she has heard other attorneys say “it is a shame he is over there in the police department.” She says the JOU probation officer has the reputation for being compassionate and one of the most reasonable. Many initially thought the police department would “corrupt” this probation officer.

### *Findings from the Survey Data*

Findings from the police roll call survey and the probation officer survey offered valuable insights regarding the police/probation collaboration in Dogginton. Specifically, the six questions asked about the JOU, examine the relationships between the police and probation departments, attitudes toward the JOU and the ideology of each department can be drawn. For presentation purposes, I collapsed the four-category likert scale into two categories. For example, the “Disagree Strongly” and “Somewhat Disagree” categories were combined into a “Disagree” category. The same process was used with the “Strongly Agree” and “Somewhat Agree” categories.

When I looked at some of the frequencies from the police/probation survey, the data indicate that 68% of the patrol officers surveyed were familiar with the unit. This means that 32% of the patrol officers surveyed were not familiar with the JOU. All of the probation officers were familiar with the unit. Since patrol officers are responsible for updating the JOU detectives on their contacts with SHO/DIs, it was surprising to find that 32% of patrol officers did not know the JOU existed (See Table 2).

Of those who were familiar with the unit, 100% of the probation officers surveyed thought the JOU was doing a good job while 86% of the patrol officers thought the JOU



was doing a good job (See Table 3). This denotes an overwhelming acceptance of the program.

When asked if probation officers working alone do a good job of controlling the criminal behavior of their clients, 62% of the probation officers agreed while 71% of the police officers disagreed (See Table 4). This finding was not surprising. One would expect probation officers to think they were doing a good job of controlling their clients while one would expect police officers to think the opposite, especially since police see themselves as order maintainers/crime fighters.

Surprisingly, when asked if probation officers working with police officers do a good job of controlling the criminal behavior of their clients, all of the probation officers agreed. At the same time, 74% of the police officers agreed (See Table 5). From the interviews, I learned about the strained relationship between these two agencies (police and probation). Seeing that all of the probation officers concede that working with police, probation do a good job of controlling the criminal behavior of their clients indicates that relationships between these two agencies have mended. The data show a 40% increase from probation officers working alone to working with the police. It appears that these departments are starting to recognize a need for one another.

I also wanted to examine the philosophies of the two departments. Both departments were asked to rank (from 1 to 4, with 1 being the most important) what the role of a probation officer should be and what the role of a police officer should be.

There were four categories to choose from:

1. Retribution - punishing offenders for their criminal conduct;

2. Rehabilitation – restoring the offender;
3. Incapacitation – removing offenders from mainstream society; and
4. Deterrence – deterring offenders from future criminal conduct.

From the patrol officer standpoint, there was no clear distinction in what the most important role of a probation officer should be. The majority of patrol officers (38.2%) said incarceration should be the most important role. Probation officers were more clear: 75% said incapacitation should be the most important role. Rehabilitation, which has historically been the primary role of a probation officer, ranked second with probation officers and had no clear ranking among the patrol officers. In fact, almost half of the patrol officers said the second role of probation should be deterrence. There was no distinction among patrol officers for the third rank either while 83% of probation officers said deterrence should be their third role. Common to both was retribution as the least important role of a probation officer, with 53% of patrol officers and 67% of probation officers making this claim (See Tables 6 and 7).

When both departments were asked to rank the roles of a police officer, I saw more distinct answers. The majority of patrol officers thought their most important role was incapacitation (45%). Probation officers thought the same (58%). Patrol officers (68%) said deterrence should be the second role while probation officers (58%) thought deterrence should rank third. Both police (58%) and probation (58%) reported retribution as the least important role of police officers. Probation officers were unclear as to the role of rehabilitation for police officers while 41% of patrol officers saw it as next to the least important role (See Tables 8 and 9).

Both the patrol officers and the probation officers saw incapacitation as the most important roles for themselves and each other. Similarly, both saw retribution as the least important role for themselves and each other. Deterrence ranked third for both departments (when police answered about probation and vice versa). The only unclear area concerned rehabilitation. Probation officers could not clearly identify the role of rehabilitation with police officers and vice versa. Curiously, from this simple survey question, it appears that both see their roles as the same. Each say they should be more focused on removing offenders from mainstream society and each should be least focused on punishing offenders for this criminal conduct. The data show that both juvenile probation and police believe their goals should be similar.

### *Summary of Part Two*

According to the survey data and the qualitative data analysis, the collaboration is repairing relationships between the police and probation departments. Both departments seem to be more aware, and more appreciative, of the functions of the other. There is less hostility and more cooperation between the departments. In addition, the immediate members of the JOU are managing their conflicting ideologies. The one member of the unit who refuses to adapt to the changing philosophy of the JOU has been removed from supervising the SHO/DIs. It may be that if the majority of the JOU detectives adhered to the prior philosophy of “trail ‘em, nail ‘em and jail ‘em,” the collaboration would not have been successful and would have folded when the grant funding ended in 1999. Since

most of the members are willing to work together, the collaboration has survived the conflicting ideologies and has improved interagency relationships.

### Part Three: Is The Collaboration Having An Impact On The Juveniles (SHO/DIs)?

The detectives reported that the JOU is helping to repair relationships between police and the juveniles. They said that being seen with a probation officer helps members of the community trust and respect them more than before the collaboration. One probation officer reported that it is beneficial for police officers to get to know something about the juvenile they are arresting. She said that police officers probably see a lot of negativity in their contact with problem juveniles. She heard one of her probationers tell a police officer, "Fuck you...I'm not telling you shit." She said she expects that police officers see that all day long. She says it is good when juveniles can get to know a police officer as a person and not just in an adversarial way. One of the magistrates said, "A respectful, appropriate relationship with the police department makes a difference with respect to the many kids who have a negative attitude toward the police. Encountering police in a non-adversarial way is good. Police are starting to be seen as the solution and not just a part of the enemy."

In addition, data obtained during interviews with SHO/DIs indicate that the juveniles in the unit are taking their situation/probation sentence more seriously. They know they are being watched and they realize the consequences of further criminal behavior. Meeting in the police department and having a detective assigned to them has a significant effect on their behavior. As one mother said, "he [one of the SHO/DIs] was

strung out after court and up until you (the probation officer and the detective) saw him at home during house visits. He knows you are watching him. He has been an angel ever since the home visit.” One prosecuting attorney said, “The level of accountability of SHO/DIs is great. Just knowing that there will be follow-ups holds these kids accountable. Our system is notorious for not following up with juveniles.”

The detectives say they think the JOU is having an effect on the juveniles’ criminal behavior also. One of the detectives had this to say about the impact of the unit on juveniles:

Since [the probation officer] has been here, JOU is having an impact on whether a kid reoffends. We are having this impact through home checks, missed appointments and detective show-ups. We are having no impact on SHO/DI kids who are not on probation. Those offenders are not under any control. There is no hammer on them. The probationers know there is a consequence. If a kid is not on probation, there is nothing we can do to them. The JOU has had an effect on juvenile offender attitudes. A lot of kids say they don’t want to be SHO/DI kids. Detention hearings used to be a joke. Now, the judge will listen to the JOU and the judge will keep the kids in detention. The word got out that you don’t want to mess with the JOU.

Some court personnel voiced concern over the unit’s use of the SHO/DI label.

One of the magistrates said she is not “completely enamored” with the unit. Her issue is with the labeling. She said, “when you are dealing with kids that have a serious history, it makes sense for police and probation to work together to keep them from recommitting. I worry about the labeling and whether or not the police are scrutinizing these kids.” She added that she is not certain if this is happening, but it is something to be cautious about.

One defense attorney did not have a favorable view of the JOU, which he refers to as a “Gestapo.” This attorney is also concerned with the stigma that comes with being a SHO/DI. He says that not only is the SHO/DI stigmatized, but his/her associates are as well. He said, “I don’t like it at all. Kids get pigeon holed. For example, they are at a party and get labeled an associate of SHO/DI kids. You can’t be accountable for your cousin’s behavior. If you are around them, you get pigeon holed. You get suspicious about the associates. It is almost as bad as being labeled a sex offender and having to register. The label of SHO/DI is a bad thing. It does not accurately depict the kid.” The diversion director said he thinks some of the juveniles may wear the SHO/DI label as a “badge of honor, but the way they [the unit] present it is more personal and they are locking and loading. They are trying to get the kid out of crime.” Another issue the defense attorney has is with community review boards: “When the SHO/DI kids get presented to the community review board, and say they have 52 points, it looks real bad and it hurts them. It does not accurately depict what the kid is about as a person, such as socially.”

The juveniles say they are starting to recognize the consequences of criminality as a result of the JOU. Having a detective assigned to their case and meeting inside the police department has a significant effect on them. They see their situation as being more serious with increased penalty for misbehavior. In addition, they view the unit as a resource. None of the juveniles interviewed even hinted that the unit was mistreating them in any way. Most voiced concern over being in the unit because of its seriousness, but they all viewed the unit as helpful, courteous and respectful. In addition,

relationships between these juveniles and police officers are becoming less adversarial and more supportive. One detective even had a SHO/DI approach him and ask to be mentored by the detective. This unit appears to be positively impacting the juveniles it is serving.

Before introducing some of the SHO/DIs, it is necessary to see what types of juveniles are (1) eligible for SHO/DI status, (2) chosen as SHO/DIs and (3) not chosen as SHO/DIs. Therefore, I performed some descriptive analysis to introduce these juveniles. In addition, I wanted to see the differences between those who are and who are not chosen as SHO/DIs. More importantly, I wanted to see if the appropriate juveniles were being selected for the heightened surveillance.

### *Criminality of the SHO/DIs*

For the entire population of juvenile offenders qualifying for SHO/DI status, the mean number of offenses committed was 17. Of those not chosen as SHO/DIs, the mean number of offenses was 13, while those who were chosen to be SHO/DIs have a mean number of offenses of 24. An independent groups t-test was performed comparing the mean number of offenses for SHO/DIs ( $M=23.53$ ,  $SD=11.76$ ) with that for non-SHO/DIs ( $M=13.45$ ,  $SD=7.87$ ). The alpha level was .05. This test was found to be statistically significant,  $t(502.64) = -16.31$ ,  $p < .001$ ., indicating that SHO/DIs have a record containing more documented offenses than non-SHO/DIs (See Table 10). The strength of the relationship between the number of offenses and SHO/DI status (whether or not a juvenile is a SHO/DI or a non-SHO/DI), as indexed by  $\eta^2$ , was .35. (Eta-squared

indexes the strength of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables by representing the proportion of variability found in the dependent variable that is associated with the independent variable. The formula for calculating eta-squared is  $\frac{t^2}{t^2 + df}$  (Jaccard and Becker, 1997:275).

Before performing the t-test, it was necessary to determine the variance of both groups (SHO/DI and non-SHO/DIs). The t-ratio for independent samples t-test assumes that the population variances for both groups are equal (Fox, et al., 1999:214). However, the SHO/DI population variance (138.2976) is about twice the population variance of non-SHO/DIs (61.9364). Therefore, it was necessary to perform Levine's Test for Equality of Variances, which tests whether the differences between the population variances of the two groups are statistically significant (Jaccard and Becker, 1997:287). The Levine test showed the population variances of the number of offenses of SHO/DIs and non-SHO/DIs to be statistically significant at the .05 alpha level ( $p < .001$ ) which suggests the t-test values for "equal variances not assumed" are the appropriate values.<sup>3</sup>

The point levels of the juveniles in the SHO/DI database ranged from a minimum of 21 points to a maximum of 228 points. Of the entire population of possible SHO/DIs (1,948), the mean number of points earned was 37. Of the past and current juveniles categorized as SHO/DIs, the mean number of points earned was 56. The mean of those not chosen to be on SHO/DI status was 32. An independent groups t-test was performed comparing the mean number of points of SHO/DIs ( $M=55.52$ ,  $SD=25.02$ ) with that for

---

<sup>3</sup> Both t-tests (equal variances assumed and equal variances not assumed) were statistically significant at the .05 alpha level ( $p < .001$ ) (See Table 10).



non-SHO/DIs ( $M=31.74$ ,  $SD=14.70$ ) at the .05 alpha level. This test was found to be statistically significant,  $t(479.55) = -18.32$ ,  $p < .001$ ., indicating that SHO/DIs have a record containing more points than non-SHO/DIs. The strength of the relationship between the number of points and SHO/DI status (whether or not a juvenile is a SHO/DI or a non-SHO/DI), as indexed by  $\eta^2$ , was .41. Once again, Levine's Test for Equality of Variances found that differences between the population variances of the two groups are statistically significant at the .05 alpha level ( $p < .001$ ). Therefore, the "equal variance not assumed" independent samples t-test was used (See Table 11).

These statistical findings suggest that the JOU's qualitative step for determining SHO/DI eligibility consistently selects juveniles who are more criminally active. The unit clearly monitors juveniles who commit more offenses (as evidenced by their offense record) and who have earned more points (as described in Part One of this chapter).

### *Racial and Gender Composition of the SHO/DIs*

For all further analysis, the point levels were collapsed into three sections: (1) Level One is 21 to 31 points, (2) Level Two is 31 to 45 points and (3) Level Three is 45 to 228 points. Of the 1,948 possible SHO/DIs, 51% are Caucasian, 22% are Hispanic, 25% are African American with the remaining 2% in the "other" category. The racial composition of those chosen to be SHO/DIs is 41% Caucasian, 29% Hispanic and 29% African American. Hispanics and African Americans are clearly overrepresented in comparison to their proportion in the general population. As Table 12 indicates, higher percentages of both Hispanics and African Americans earn more points than Caucasians.

Of the entire population of possible SHO/DIs, 88% are males, while 12% are females. Of those who have been chosen as SHO/DIs, 94% are males, while 6% are women. The majority of females (72%) earned anywhere from 21 to 31 points which contrasts to males (51%). The females compare to males in the second point level, but fail to compete in the third level. More males (23%) have earned 45 or more points than have females (6%) (See Table 13).

#### *Interviews with SHO/DIs*

All interviews with SHO/DIs were scheduled by either a JOU detective or the probation officer. A detective arranged all interviews that occurred outside the police department. In one instance, the detective drove me approximately one and a half hours away from Dogginton to interview a SHO/DI who had been incarcerated (In essence, this juvenile failed while on SHO/DI status). It is my impression that if the detectives only wanted me to meet juveniles who had favorable dealings with the unit, they would not have allowed me to interview this particular juvenile. In addition, some questioning occurred during probation officer/probationer meetings (See footnotes for a description of the interview settings). These meetings were scheduled before my arrival in Dogginton. Therefore, selection bias is dissipated in these instances. Overall, the juveniles chosen for the interviews seem to be representative of the SHO/DI population.

The following sections contain information extrapolated from several SHO/DI interviews. The information obtained from these juveniles reports on the exact impact

the unit is having on them. Since they can better attest to the impact of the JOU, their voices are heard here.

*Interview with SHO/DI #1<sup>4</sup>*

SHO/DI #1 is a female who has been on SHO/DI status for 2 years. Her criminal activity includes motor vehicle theft, burglaries and 3<sup>rd</sup> degree assault. She is currently sentenced to electronic monitoring. When asked why she committed the crimes she did, she said, “my friends did it, my ex-boyfriend did it, so I did it. It was fun stealing cars.” She assaulted a student in school because “she talked shit about me...she ratted on me.” She said she just lost her temper. She also said she was not thinking about the consequences. She has been in “kid jail” 5 times.

She says she thinks it is good for probation and police to work together. She likes both the detective and the probation officer but says she does not like that they are in her life. She takes it more seriously now; she knows they are watching her. She says, “I feel like I have no freedom...I have stuff to do but I can’t leave the house. It was easier being in kid jail then it is being out here.” She says she is starting to realize that there are consequences. She said if the unit was not watching her, she “probably would” still break into cars. She knows she will get caught now. She said if she had a daughter, she would want the JOU to do for her daughter what they are doing for her.

---

<sup>4</sup> This interview occurred in the SHO/DI’s home. Two detectives and another researcher accompanied me to her residence. She and I spoke in the living room while the others waiting in the dining room.

*Interview with SHO/DI #2<sup>5</sup>*

SHO/DI #2 is a 16 year old female who is on parole. She spent one year in detention. She was in 4 different placements during this year; she spent 2 months in community placement with the Department of Human Services. She said she has stolen cars, been in fights, not followed the terms of her probation, run away from her DHS community placement and skipped school. When asked why she stole cars, she said she simply did not like staying at home...she needed a way to get around. She said, unbeknownst to her, her friends were stealing cars. Once they told her, she decided to do it so she could get out of the house. She said it was "fun, crazy and exciting." When asked why she fought, she bragged how she had given one of her mom's friends a fractured nose. She said the lady was talking about her family and so she beat her up. She had also been involved in a lot of fights at school.

She says, "I definitely know these guys are watching me." However, she says that even if these guys were not watching her, she still would stay out of trouble: "I would not break into cars now because I don't want to go back to jail." She says that being locked up has had a big impact on her. She realizes that she "just can't get away with stuff anymore." She says she thought she would not get caught before...she knows she will now. "I am smarter now. I won't commit another criminal act."

When asked about her plans for the future, she said she wants to be a sign language interpreter (both of her parents are deaf). At the time of the interview, she was working on her GED and planned to attend a community college after that. Further down

---

<sup>5</sup> This interview occurred in the juvenile's residence. Two detectives and another researcher also

the road, she would like to be a youth advocate. She said, "I want to help out people in my position, people getting into trouble." She said there were things going on in her life; for example, her dad is an alcoholic. In addition, they moved to a different neighborhood and had to leave all of her friends. "There was a lot of emotional stuff going on when I got into all of that trouble." She said she thinks she can help troubled people better. She said she would listen to them and give them attention. She wants to be like a sister to someone: "I would have wanted a youth advocate but never had the opportunity to have one."

*Interview with SHO/DI #3<sup>6</sup>*

SHO/DI #3 was on SHO/DI status and is now incarcerated. He is 14 years old and is in the Look Out Mountain Correctional Facility. This facility is a state school and is the most secure juvenile facility in the state. There are approximately 120 juveniles there. The detective described the environment as "harsh" and said it is a cross between a juvenile detention center and a boot camp. The juveniles are told how to walk (hands behind their back), they wear orange scrubs and all have shaved heads.

This SHO/DI was on probation from the time he turned eleven. He has five or six felony adjudications. One of his adjudications was for felony menacing. He held a knife up to his mother and told her that if she got any closer to him, he would kill her. He was

---

accompanied me on this interview. The juvenile and I went into her bedroom in order to speak privately.  
<sup>6</sup> This juvenile was interviewed at Look Out Mountain Correctional Facility. The juvenile's client manager and a detective accompanied me to this interview. The juvenile's guardian requested that the client manager be present for the interview. Therefore, the client manager was present for all questioning. The detective removed himself from the interview by leaving the building. The interview was conducted in the waiting area of the facility.

given probation on December 26, 1999 and reoffended 10 days later. He said that while he was a SHO/DI, he committed crimes that were not so serious and never got caught. He said he realized the consequences the entire time. He said he is more aware of the consequences now because "it has already happened." He said he did most of his crimes on impulse while he was angry or "maybe I was pushed." He said he realizes the consequences now because he is being punished. He said, "I knew them [the consequences] before but did not recognize them at the time because I was angry and impulsive."

When asked how he felt about meeting his probation officer in the police department, he said it was "a little bit of a change to meet in the police department. I would get butterflies in my stomach because I was meeting with detectives." He said he felt nervous and thought that other detectives "had things on him." He said it also made him more aware "of how the jail scene is. It was kind of like being back in jail, but not really being in jail." When asked how he felt about the home visits, he said that, "sometimes they surprised me but I would expect them." He said it was not really weird to have the detective accompany the probation officer. He said his detective and probation officer were "alright to get along with. They were not too pushy but they do expect you to get things done. I felt like they cared about me. They watched me to try to keep me out of trouble. They were trying to help me straighten out my life. When I called them on the telephone and left a message for them, they got with me as soon as they could. They never got on my nerves."

His client manager (juvenile parole officer) asked him how it felt to be a committed SHO/DI. He said, “they label me as a bad person. It tells me that I couldn’t make it in the past as a SHO/DI.” He also says that his relationship with the detective is not the same since he has been committed. He says he is more tense now and he misses his relationship with the detective. He said that when the staff at Look Out Mountain start yelling at people, he really misses the detective. He said that neither the detective nor the probation officer ever “yelled or lectured” him. “They always told me what they were doing. They weren’t keeping secrets.” He said that while he was a SHO/DI, he would call the unit “when things were bad in the neighborhood. [The detective] would ask if he needed to look into anything. He would let me make the decisions.” He said he has also called the probation officer when he needed him. He told us about a time when he called his detective after an argument with his mother and was tempted to leave. He said, “They were the type of people you could talk to. They would understand me. I kept a lot of things to myself.”

He said he felt the detectives and probation officer respected him. He, in turn, said he had a lot of respect for them. He said they definitely monitored him. He knew he was being watched. “They weren’t trying to scare me but they were watching me. I know I messed up as a SHO/DI but it was because of me. They tried to help but I messed it up.”

*Interview with SHO/DI #4<sup>7</sup>*

SHO/DI #4 is a 17 year old male who has been on SHO/DI status for about a year. He is on probation. He said, "It is no big deal to be a SHO/DI. I think it is good. They keep me out of trouble. They do curfew checks, urinalysis tests and check on all of my classes." When asked about his criminal background, he said he has received 2 theft charges, an assault charge, possession of a deadly weapon and possession of an illegal substance while driving under the age.

When asked about meeting his probation officer inside the police department, he said, "it is weird to meet in the police department. It doesn't really bother me though. It kind of scares me because of all the cops here. It makes me want to stay out of trouble so I can stop coming here." He said the unit treats him "pretty good." If he has a problem, he says the unit takes care of it for him so he does not get in any more trouble. He thinks they respect him and he does not see anything that needs to change with respect to the unit. He said he has not reoffended for "a whole year. I got rid of all my friends when I got on probation."

*Interview with SHO/DI #5<sup>8</sup>*

SHO/DI #5 is a 14 year old female. Her mother accompanied her to this client meeting. I asked the mother if the unit was having an effect on her daughter and the

---

<sup>7</sup> This interview occurred in a conference room of the police department. All questions were asked during a probation officer/probationer meeting. Therefore, the probation officer was present for all questioning. The probation officer became an active participant in this interview, by asking questions of his own. The juvenile seemed frank and honest. However, having the probation officer present could have influenced the responses from this juvenile.



mother quickly said, "My daughter turned herself around. It's over. My daughter will never be a criminal again." Both the mother and the juvenile says it "does not bother" them when a detective arrives at their home. Both she and her daughter appear to be very proud of the fact that it has been over a year since her daughter has been involved in criminality. The juvenile said she knows she is being watched and says she will not commit another criminal act. She likes her assigned detective and the probation officer. Both the SHO/DI and her mother said they know the unit cares for them.

Interestingly, the SHO/DI informed the probation officer during this meeting of another SHO/DI who has been getting into trouble. She did not seem like she was "tattle-tailing," but wanted the probation officer to know that this other SHO/DI needs help. She told the probation officer to have a urinalysis done on this other SHO/DI. The SHO/DI demonstrated that a certain level of trust has been established between the unit and herself.

*Interview with a Probationer who is not a SHO/DI<sup>8</sup>*

This juvenile is not a SHO/DI but is on the probation officer's caseload because of the seriousness of his charges. He is sixteen years old and is an adjudicated sex offender. He has been on probation for one year. When asked how he felt about meeting his probation officer in the police department, he said, "I was shocked to find out that I would have to meet [the probation officer] at the police department. As long as I get

---

<sup>8</sup> This SHO/DI was interviewed in the police department during a probation officer/probationer meeting. The probation officer was present during the interview but he refrained from asking questions.

through it, it will be better.” He said he feels the program is more severe and that he is more supervised: “When you have to go to the police department, it is more severe. I feel like I need to do better.” He said that meeting in the police department gives him more of an incentive to do better: “I do not want to screw it up.” He said, “It is slim to none that I will reoffend.”

### *Summary of Part Three*

The quantitative data show that the JOU is choosing the appropriate juveniles for participation in the SHO/DI program. The juveniles chosen for SHO/DI status are participating in greater criminality. From data obtained from the SHO/DI interviews, it is apparent that the JOU collaboration is having a positive effect on the SHO/DIs. The SHO/DIs are starting to build relationships with the detectives. The juveniles take their status (as a SHO/DI) more seriously and they are starting to realize that there are consequences for their criminal behavior. None of the juveniles interviewed said they thought the JOU was just trying to “trail ‘em, nail ‘em and jail’ em.” They all realize the JOU is trying to help them. Every SHO/DI interviewed had positive and favorable things to say about the detectives and the probation officer. The juveniles say they are not reoffending because they know they will get caught; they know the JOU is watching them. Meeting in the police department also appears to be a deterrent. The juveniles say that meeting their probation officer inside the police department makes it seem “more

---

<sup>9</sup> This interview occurred during a probation officer/probationer meeting. This juvenile is not a SHO/DI but I wanted to gauge from him the impact of meeting in the police department for probation meetings. The probation officer did not participate in any questioning but was present.

serious.” The JOU enhanced supervision partnership is impacting the juveniles it is targeting.

#### Part Four: Is The Collaboration Having An Effect On The Juvenile Justice System?

When I asked if more SHO/DIs are formally going through the juvenile justice system as a result of the JOU, half of the interviewees did not know, while the other half offered anecdotal testimony. As one magistrate reported, “If the police want to make the crime rate go up, then they can do it. The police create crime rates. If they are more active in arrest, then the crime rate increases.” He did say that his anecdotal impression is that there is “less recidivism with these kids.”

One of the district attorneys reported that SHO/DIs get more attention than the typical juvenile offender because of their status as a SHO/DI but also because of the seriousness of their criminal record. These juveniles are serious offenders and so they get more attention for that reason. He also said he is less likely to be lenient with a SHO/DI. He says he examines all of the facts of each and every case, but these juveniles have such a serious criminal history that there is “no incentive to give them a break. They earn their penalty.” One of the district judges said, “If you are a SHO/DI and if you come to court, then chance of committing is higher.” (When a juvenile is committed, this means he/she is incarcerated in some manner).

The district attorney says that everybody gives SHO/DIs more attention. Every case deserves the amount of attention the SHO/DIs get, but pragmatically, the juvenile justice system is already strained and inundated and they are unable to do so. He wanted

to make it very clear that being a SHO/DI does not mean you are unreasonably scrutinized: “SHO/DI is not a hit squad for juveniles. They don’t get committed any faster, they are just on such a short leash that it helps the community.” A defense attorney reported that she believes SHO/DIs receive more minor charges. She said, “I see things filed that would not be filed on the average kid.”

One defense attorney said the JOU is increasing the number of minority juveniles in the juvenile justice system. He said, “straight up it is...it absolutely is.” When asked how the JOU could affect the number of minorities inside the system, he replied, “the level of contact has to do with the unit in terms of direct filing. The DA is ultimately responsible for direct filing but SHO/DI kids get direct filed more often. It is a discriminatory practice with more minorities in the system. As an attorney, I will get a better deal for a white person than for a minority person. This has a lot to do with peoples’ mind-sets. The JOU plays a role in this discriminatory practice. The focus is quicker on a group of minorities than on whites. There is a faster response to minorities than to whites. I do not buy that SHO/DIs are picked by prior offense only.” This attorney thinks the way the JOU assesses the information in the database is inaccurate but did say that the increased surveillance by the JOU is benefiting some juveniles.

When some of the court personnel were asked what they thought of having a probation officer inside the police department, one of the magistrates said that when the probation officer went over to the police department, the magistrate’s impression was that the probation officer was a “real wimp.” She said her first impression was that he was too soft; she soon found out her impression was incorrect. She said, “He is really for

these kids. I would be ready to commit a kid and he would want to try new things with him.” She reports that she has about 12 SHO/DIs on her docket. She has only committed 1 or 2 of the SHO/DIs since the collaboration began in 1998. She said that with the additional services, the kids are working their way through the system. She said, “they are not coming in front of me as much and these are kids I was ready to commit.”

Every person who was interviewed, with the exception of the two defense attorneys, said that the information exchange between police and probation aids them in performing their jobs. One of the district attorneys said, “The information I get from the JOU detectives is: Can I or can’t I prosecute this case? The information I get from the JOU probation officers is: Should I or shouldn’t I prosecute this case? I get a full picture with this unit.” He also said he “almost always” goes with the probation officer’s recommendation on a case. One of the magistrates said that as a result of this collaboration, when the probation officer makes a recommendation in court, the judges feel that his recommendations are more founded than other probation officers because he has more information on the juvenile. He said, “The more coordination between the elements of the juvenile justice system, the better it is. I got the sense when I was a district attorney that probation officers were closer to district attorneys than prosecutors. There was a wall between district attorneys, police officers and probation officers. [The JOU probation officer] breaks down that wall.”

One day, while I was accompanying the probation officer to court, the probation officer said he had spoken with the presiding judge prior to a SHO/DI’s hearing about the needs of the SHO/DI. He said he told the judge that he thought the juvenile needed to be

encouraged and that if the juvenile felt that the system was opposing him, he would most likely recidivate. The judge took the probation officer's recommendation and was very encouraging to the SHO/DI. At another court hearing, the judge came down very hard on a SHO/DI. He told the juvenile that this was "his last chance." The probation officer said this was what this particular SHO/DI needed to hear. There appears to be a trusting and respectful relationship between the judges and the members of the JOU. As one of the magistrates stated, "Anything that helps me with my job, I am grateful for." The district judge concluded his interview by stating: "Society is helped; kids are helped."

#### *Summary of Part Four*

The multi-agency relationships between the JOU, probation, police and the courts appear to be improving the administration of justice in Doggington. The recommendations of the JOU probation officer are given more credibility than are the recommendations of other probation officers. This is because the JOU probation officer has more information regarding his clients than other probation officers. Whether or not more SHO/DIs are going through the local juvenile justice system is unclear. Some of the interviewees say the SHO/DIs are committed (incarcerated) more while others say they are not. An analysis of SHO/DI recidivism rates is needed to determine whether more SHO/DIs are being processed through the local juvenile justice system. However, due to the complexity of the data, this type of analysis is beyond the scope of this thesis. Nonetheless, all of the prosecuting attorneys, magistrates and judges interviewed say the

JOU is helping them be more effective and efficient. What is clear is that the JOU is helping to repair departmental relationships in the Doggington juvenile justice system.

### Conclusion

The police/probation collaboration in Doggington is accomplishing many of the objectives it set out to meet. The JOU is repairing relationships between the police and probation departments. The information exchange has improved; both departments appear to be working together toward common goals (helping juvenile offenders). The juveniles, as well as the local juvenile justice system, are benefiting from this collaboration. The SHO/DIs are starting to recognize the consequences of their behavior. They say they are not reoffending because they know they will get caught and there will be penalties. The SHO/DIs are beginning to recognize the seriousness of delinquency. The collaboration is also helping the juvenile justice system by offering better services and representation to those responsible for determining the fate of these repeat offenders. The JOU is changing the administration of justice in the city of Doggington for the better.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION

Collaborations between criminal justice agencies are a new and innovative way to deal with crime and disorder. However, the research shows that many interagency collaborations fail due to conflicting ideologies and autonomy issues (Miller, 1958:20-23). In order to maintain quality exchange relationships, interagency coordination is imperative (Litwak and Hilton, 1958:20-23, Cole 1970:331). Oliver (1991:945) suggests that by creating formalized partnerships between interdependent agencies, agencies may be able to overcome their conflicting ideologies in order to achieve better coordination. The premise is that if both organizations mutually compromise their individual autonomy, the risk of collaborating is lessened (Oliver, 1991:945). The formal police/probation collaboration in Dogginton provides an excellent test of this theoretical premise.

The present study examines four questions. First, it explores the implementation process of the JOU. More specifically, the study focuses on the evolution process of the collaboration, how the JOU currently operates, and the impact of Dogginton's police/probation collaboration on the police and probation departments. Secondly, the study also addresses whether the police and probation departments work better together after the implementation of the collaboration than they did before the collaboration. Third, this study examines the impact the police/probation collaboration has on the SHO/DIs. The study seeks to determine if better coordination between the two departments enhances the JOU's ability to effectively supervise and monitor these serious



juvenile offenders. Finally, this study assesses the impact the collaboration has on the local juvenile justice system. More specifically, this study examines whether the JOU's enhanced supervision of the SHO/DIs affects SHO/DI reoffense patterns. The findings of this study produce valuable implications for police and probation practitioners and researchers alike.

One major finding of this study involves the philosophy of the JOU. The SHO/DI program originated as a police technique for dealing with delinquent juveniles. The JOU detectives were supposed to target chronic juvenile offenders and remove them from the streets. As the commander reported, the philosophy was to "trail 'em, nail 'em and jail 'em." When the probation officer moved into the police department in 1998, the original idea of the police administrators was to pool resources with probation to facilitate the quicker removal of these delinquents from mainstream society. However, a decline in probation revocations occurred instead. This meant that more juveniles were complying with the terms of their probation. The commander said this result surprised the police administrators.

It is clear from interviews with, and observations of, the members of the JOU, that the JOU has experienced a change in ideology. The immediate members of the JOU report that the philosophy of the unit has changed from a "lock 'em up" mentality to a mindset more like that of probation. Many other court and probation personnel reported the same observation. Because this program originated in the police department, one might predict that the probation officer would adopt and conform to the ideology of the police officers. This is not the case in the Dogginton police/probation collaboration.

The police/probation collaboration in Dogginton has helped to repair strained relationships between the police and probation departments. My field notes are replete with stories of the tense history these two departments have experienced with each other. One probation supervisor described the past relationship between the police and probation departments as “non-existent.” Everybody I interviewed, with the exception of the SHO/DIs, commented on how this collaboration has mended the fragmentation that was so evident between these two agencies. As a result of the formal collaboration, the exchange relationships between police and probation have improved. In addition, all of the probation officers surveyed, and 86% of the patrol officers surveyed, said the JOU is doing a good job. Furthermore, all of the probation officers surveyed, and most of the patrol officers surveyed (74%), said that when probation officers work with police officers, probation officers do a good job of controlling the criminal behavior of their clients. These findings are consistent with Clark, Hall and Hutchinson’s (1977:189-191) finding that when a high degree of coordination exists among interdependent agencies, performance is judged to be effective.

In addition, the findings of this study also support viewing the Dogginton juvenile justice system as an exchange framework. The survey data show that both departments (police and probation) believe their goals should be similar. It is apparent from the survey data that both departments share common goals. It is also clear from observations and interview data that each department performs different functions for the administration of justice in Dogginton. In addition, both the interview and the survey data indicate the police and probation departments recognize a need for coordinating with

each other. Police officers have information that probation officers need and probation officers have information that the police officers need. The Doggington JOU illustrates how a local juvenile justice system operates in an exchange network. The Doggington JOU also illustrates how a formal collaboration between interdependent agencies can repair fragmentation inside the exchange network. The next question is whether the improved exchange relationships in Doggington increase the equity, efficiency and effectiveness of the administration of juvenile justice.

The findings of this study indicate that the police/probation collaboration in Doggington has a positive effect on the SHO/DIs. The SHO/DI interview data reveal that the juveniles in the JOU program are starting to realize the consequences of their criminality. All of the SHO/DIs reported that they are taking their status as SHO/DIs more seriously; they know there will be repercussions for delinquent behavior. The SHO/DIs say this is the reason they are not reoffending. This finding suggests that the enhanced supervision partnership of the police and probation officers acts as a deterrent of SHO/DI criminality. In addition, the interview data uncovers the idea that the SHO/DIs see the JOU as a resource for help, not only as a punishment.

The quantitative analysis indicates that the JOU targets the appropriate juveniles for participation in the SHO/DI program. The independent samples t-tests show that the quantitative method used to identify the pool of potential SHO/DI candidates is genuinely based on individual offender's documented criminality. The t-ratios for both number of offenses and point levels between SHO/DIs and non-SHO/DIs were statistically significant; juveniles selected for participation in the SHO/DI program have more

offenses and points than those not selected. Additionally, the eta-squared indices for both measures suggest a robust relationship between number of offenses/points and SHO/DI categorization.

Hispanics and African Americans are clearly overrepresented among SHO/DIs in comparison to their proportion in the general population. This disparity appears to be explained by the higher point levels attributed to African American and Hispanic juveniles. Higher percentages of both Hispanics and African Americans earned more points than Caucasians (See Table 12). It must be remembered that points are assessed based on a juvenile's number and severity of offenses. "Offenses" are based on incidents resulting in a juvenile's arrest. Consequently, the primary determination of a juvenile's offense record and, hence, his or her eventual categorization as a SHO/DI, can be attributed more to arrest practices than JOU's eligibility system. To the extent that police monitoring and apprehension practices disproportionately produce minority arrests, the overrepresentation of Hispanic and African American juveniles among SHO/DIs can be expected. Because the present study did not examine juvenile arrest patterns for racial bias, the degree to which the JOU's eligibility system increases the overrepresentation of minorities among SHO/DIs cannot be determined.

Similarly, males are grossly overrepresented among possible and chosen SHO/DIs in comparison to females. This is hardly surprising given the consistent overrepresentation of men in the United States' arrest, court and prison statistics. (LaFree, 1998: 39) Nonetheless, for the same reasons explained in the discussion of race

factors directly above, the possibility that the JOU's system might be biased against males, or in favor of females, cannot be definitively assessed.

At the same time, the descriptive statistical analysis indicates a strong relationship between offense rates/severity and likely inclusion in the SHO/DI pool. This suggests, that notwithstanding potential discrimination by other parts of the overall juvenile justice system, the JOU's method of SHO/DI selection appears to be based primarily on objective criteria, rather than personal characteristics. This evaluation indicates that the SHO/DI program is based on an equitable and efficient system for selecting those offenders who need more intensive supervision. The system quickly identifies serious, habitual offenders and does not appear to unduly discriminate against any group.

The effectiveness of the SHO/DI program depends on how one defines its success. One limitation of this study is that the extent to which SHO/DI reoffense rates changed after the collaboration between police and probation cannot be determined without the benefit of advanced statistical techniques. Similarly, the relative offense rates between SHO/DIs and non-SHO/DIs has not been statistically examined. However, SHO/DI interview data attests to the positive effect the JOU has on serious, habitual juvenile offenders' criminal propensities.

A final limitation of this study is its generalizability. This research is a cross-sectional case study of one police/probation collaboration in a large Western police department. The findings only directly apply to the police/probation collaboration in the city of Dogginton. However, this study serves as one of the first empirical examinations of the impact of police/probation partnerships in the United States, and as such, provides

a foundation from which other researchers can explore police/probation collaborations nationwide. As more of these collaborations are identified and explored, additional insight into their effectiveness can be examined with continued research.

This evaluation of Dogginton's police/probation collaboration shows that when two competing organizations within a local juvenile justice system commit to formal partnerships, issues of autonomy and conflicting ideologies can be successfully managed. Exchange relationships were improved due to increased cooperation and coordination, which produce favorable results. Specifically, Dogginton's experience is instructive in that probation philosophies were not co-opted by the police culture. The core goals around which the partnership was originally built proved capable of withstanding competing interests.

The police administration's initial intention to use probation resources to increase juvenile offenders' removal from the community was gradually replaced by probation's desire for increasing successful outcomes among juveniles. While the primary functions of police and probation remain distinct, the definition of program success reflects a compromise. This compromise appears to be at the heart of Dogginton's ability to maintain this formal collaboration. Based on the qualitative and quantitative analyses completed, the exchange relationship between Dogginton's probation and police departments has improved, whether one considers it from a process or a substantive standpoint.

The analysis of Dogginton's JOU provides an excellent example of how two interdependent criminal justice agencies dealt with their conflicting ideologies and

effectively coordinated in order to produce what appear to be equitable, efficient, and, possibly, effective results.

## REFERENCES

- 1999 County and City Extra Annual Metro, City, and County Data Book  
 1999 (Eds.) C.M. Slater and G.E. Hall. Lanham: Bernan Press.
- Barajas, Edward  
 1996 Moving Toward Community Justice. Community Justice: Striving for Safe, Secure, and Just Communities. United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Washington, D.C.
- Bayley, David H.  
 1994 Police for the Future. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Bertalanffy, Ludwig  
 1968 General System Theory. New York, NY: George Braziller.
- Bolland, John M. and Jan V. Wilson  
 1994 Three Faces of Integrative Coordination: A Model of Interorganizational Relations in Community-Based Health and Human Services. Health Services Research 29(3): 341-366.
- Braga, Anthony  
 2000 Personal Communication, 3/30/00 (9:05am).
- Bogdan, Robert  
 1972 Participant Observation in Organizational Settings. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Byles, John A.  
 1985 Problems in Interagency Collaboration: Lessons from a Project that Failed. Child Abuse and Neglect 9:549-554.
- Clark, John P., Richard H. Hall, Bruce Hutchinson  
 1977 Interorganizational Relationships and Network Properties as Contextual Variables in the Study of Police Performance. In David H. Bayley (ed.), Police and Society. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications. 177-193
- Coffey, Alan, Edward Eldefonso, Walter Hartinger  
 1974 An Introduction to the Criminal Justice System and Process. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.



Cole, George F.

1970 The Decision to Prosecute. *Law and Society Review* 4(3): 331-344.

1975 *The American System of Criminal Justice*. Massachusetts: Duxbury Press.

Cole, George F. and Marc C. Gertz

1998 Politics and the Administration of Justice. In George F. Cole and Marc C. Gertz, *The Criminal Justice System*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co. 1-8.

Corbett, Ronald P.

1996 Probation Blue?: The Promise (And Perils) of Probation-Police Partnerships. *Correctional Management Quarterly* (Spring): 1-22.

Corbett, Ronald P., Bernard L. Fitzgerald

1998 Boston's Operation Night Light: An Emerging Model for Police-Probation Partnerships. In Joan Petersilia (ed.), *Community Corrections*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. 180-186.

Crawford, Adam and Mathew Jones

1995 Inter-Agency Co-Operation and Community-Based Crime Prevention. *British Journal of Criminology* 35 (1): 17-33.

Crime in the United States: 1998

1999 Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Denzin and Lincoln

1994 *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Dill, Forrest

1975 Discretion, Exchange and Social Control: Bail Bondsmen in Criminal Courts. *Law and Society Review* 9 (4): 639-674.

Eisenstein, James, Roy B. Flemming and Peter F. Nardulli

1988 *The Contours of Justice: Communities and Their Courts*. HarperCollins Publishers.

Eisenstein, James, Roy B. Flemming and Peter F. Nardulli

1998 The Criminal Court Community in Erie County, Pennsylvania. In Cole, George F., Gertz, Marc C., *The Criminal Justice System*, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition. Belmont, Ca; Wadsworth Publishing Co. 297-318.

Evan, William M.

1965 Toward a Theory of Interorganizational Relations. *Management Science* 11(10): 217-230.

Evans, Donald G.

1997a Exploring Police/Probation Partnerships. *Corrections Today* 59(1): 86-87.

1997b Promoting Public Safety. *Corrections Today* 57(3): 126-127.

1997c Boston's Probation and Police Partnership. *Corrections Today* 59 (4):126-129.

Ford, Donald H. and Richard M. Lerner

1992 *Developmental Systems Theory: An Integrated Approach*. London: SAGE Publications.

Fox, James Alan, Jack Levin and Michael Shively

1999 *Elementary Statistics in Criminal Justice Research*. Reading, Massachusetts: Longman.

Freud, Sigmund

1974 *The Question of Lay Analysis*. Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud.

Glassner, Barry and Jonathon D. Moreno

1989 *The Qualitative-Quantitative Distinction in the Social Sciences*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Goldstein, Herman

1979 Improving Policing: A Problem-Oriented Approach. *Crime and Delinquency* 25: 236-258.

Holmstrom, Dave

1996 'Operation Night Light' keeps offenders in for the evening. *Christian Science Monitor* (May 15) 88 (119):1.

Jaccard James and Michael A. Becker

1997 *Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. Albany, NY: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Kennedy, David.

1998 Pulling Levers: Getting Deterrence Right. *National Institute of Justice Journal* (July):2-8.

LaFree, Gary.

1998 *Losing Legitimacy*. John Hagan (ed.), Series. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics

1997 *Data for Individual State and Local Agencies with 100 or More Officers*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice: Washington, D.C.

Lawrence, Richard

1995 *Controlling School Crime: An Examination of Interorganizational Relations of School and Juvenile Justice Professionals*. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal* \*: 3-15.

Levine, Sol and Paul E. White

1961 *Exchange as a Conceptual Framework for the Study of Interorganizational Relationships*. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 5 (4): 583-601.

Litwak, Eugene and Lydia F. Hylton

1962 *Interorganizational Analysis: A Hypothesis on Co-Ordinating Agencies*. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 6: 395-415.

1969 *Interorganizational Analysis: A Hypothesis on Co-Ordinating Agencies*. In Amitai Etzioni (ed.), *A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 339-356.

Maguire, Edward R., Gregory J. Howard and Graeme Newman

1998 *Measuring the Performance of National Criminal Justice Systems*. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice* 22(1): 31-59.

McKay, Brian and Barry Paris

1998 *Forging a Police-Probation Alliance*. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* 67 (11):27-32.

Merton, Robert K.

1957 *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe, ILL: Free Press.

Miller, Walter B.

1958 *Inter-Institutional Conflict as a Major Impediment to Delinquency Prevention*. *Human Organization* 17 (3): 20-23.

Moore, Richter, H., Jr.

1976 *The Criminal Justice Non-System*. In Richter H. Moore, Jr., Thomas C. Marks, Jr., and Robert V. Barrow (eds.), *Readings in Criminal Justice*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 5-13.

Morgan, Terry and Stephen D. Marrs

- 1998 Redmond, Washington's SMART Partnership for Police and Community Corrections. In Joan Petersilia (ed.), *Community Corrections*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. 170-179.

Morrissey, J. P., M. Tausig and M. L. Lindsey

- 1985 Network Analysis Methods for Mental Health Service System Research: A Comparison of Two Community Support Systems. Pub. No. ADM 85-1383. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Munro, Jim L.

- 1971 Towards a Theory of Criminal Justice Administration: A general Systems Perspective. In Richter H. Moore, Jr., Thomas C. Marks, Jr., and Robert V. Barrow (eds.), *Readings in Criminal Justice*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill. 445-463.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

- 1984 Serious Habitual Offender Drug Involved Program. United States Department of Justice.

Oliver, Christine

- 1991 Network Relations and Loss or Organizational Autonomy. *Human Relations* 44 (9): 943-961.

Parent, Dale and Brad Snyder

- 1999 Police-Corrections Partnerships. *National Institute of Justice* (March):1-88.

Pearson, G., Blagg, H., Smith, D., Sampson, A. and Stubbs, P.

- 1992 Crime, Community and Conflict: The Multi-Agency Approach. In D. Downes, (ed.), *Unravelling Criminal Justice*, London: MacMillan.

Reid, William

- 1964 Interagency Co-Ordination in Delinquency Prevention and Control. *Social Service Review* 38 (4):418-428.

Simon, Herbert A.

- 1964 On the Concept of Organizational Goal. *Administrative Science Quarterly* (June):1-22/

Snipes, Jeffrey B. and Edward R. Maguire

- Foundations of Criminal Justice Theory. In David Duffee and Edward Maguire (eds.) *Readings in Criminal Justice Theory* (tentative title). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing. (Forthcoming)

Van de Ven, A. H. and D. L. Ferry

1980 *Measuring and Assessing Organizations*. New York: Wiley.

Webb, Vincent and William Wakefield

1979 *An Application of the Interorganizational Perspective to Community Based Corrections in an Urban Area*. *Criminal Justice Review* 4 (2):41-50.

Walker, Samuel

1992 *Origins of the Contemporary Criminal Justice Paradigm: The American Bar Foundation Survey, 1953-1969*. *Justice Quarterly* 9 (1): 47-76.

Weiss, P.A.

1971 *Hierarchically organized systems in theory and practice*. New York: Hafner.

Wright, K.N.

1980 *The desirability of goal conflict within the criminal justice system*. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 9:209-218.

Zhao, Jihong

2000 *Personal Communication*, 7/3/00.

**TABLE 1: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE**

<b>DEPARTMENT</b>	<b>PERSONNEL</b>
Juvenile Offender Unit	4 Detectives 1 Probation Officer 1 Crime Analyst 1 Sergeant
Police Administration	1 Lieutenant 1 Commander 1 Deputy Chief 1 Grants Administrator
Probation Department	1 Chief Probation Officer 2 Probation Supervisors 2 Probation Officers
Court Personnel	1 Chief Judge (4th Judicial District) 1 District Judge 2 Magistrates 1 District Attorney 1 Deputy District Attorney 2 Private Defense Attorneys 1 Guardian <i>Ad Litem</i> 1 Diversion Program Director 1 Client Manager
SHO/DIs	6 Juveniles 1 Parent/Guardian

**TABLE 2: SURVEY QUESTION #1 - ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE JOU?**

ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE JUVENILE OFFENDER UNIT?		
DEPARTMENT	YES	NO
Police Department (N=139)	67.6%	32.4%
Probation Department (N=13)	100%	0%

**TABLE 3: SURVEY QUESTION #2 - IS THE JUVENILE OFFENDER UNIT DOING A GOOD JOB?**

THE JUVENILE OFFENDER UNIT IS DOING A GOOD JOB				
DEPARTMENT	DISAGREE STRONGLY	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	SOMEWHAT AGREE	AGREE STRONGLY
Police Department (N=92)	2.2%	12%	66.3%	19.6%
Probation Department (N=13)	0%	0%	23.1%	76.9%



**TABLE 4: SURVEY QUESTION #3 - DO PROBATION OFFICERS WORKING ALONE DO A GOOD JOB?**

PROBATION OFFICERS WORKING BY THEMSELVES DO A GOOD JOB OF CONTROLLING THE CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR OF THEIR CLIENTS.

<b>DEPARTMENT</b>	<b>DISAGREE STRONGLY</b>	<b>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</b>	<b>SOMEWHAT AGREE</b>	<b>AGREE STRONGLY</b>
Police Department (N=122)	32.8%	37.7%	28.7%	.8%
Probation Department (N=13)	23.1%	15.4%	38.5%	23.1%

**TABLE 5: SURVEY QUESTION #4 – DO PROBATION OFFICERS WORKING WITH POLICE OFFICERS DO A GOOD JOB?**

PROBATION OFFICERS WORKING WITH POLICE OFFICERS DO A GOOD JOB OF CONTROLLING THE CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR OF THEIR CLIENTS.

<b>DEPARTMENT</b>	<b>DISAGREE STRONGLY</b>	<b>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</b>	<b>SOMEWHAT AGREE</b>	<b>AGREE STRONGLY</b>
Police Department (N=122)	5.7%	20.5%	59.0%	14.8%
Probation Department (N=13)	0%	0%	38.5%	61.5%

**TABLE 6: SURVEY QUESTION #5 – ROLE OF A PROBATION OFFICER  
ACCORDING TO DOGGINGTON PATROL OFFICERS**

THE ROLE OF A PROBATION OFFICER SHOULD BE FOCUSED ON THE  
FOLLOWING:

(Answer from the **Patrol Officer Survey**, N=110)

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RETRIBUTION</b>	<b>REHABILITATION</b>	<b>INCAPACITATION</b>	<b>DETERRENCE</b>
Rank 1 (Most Important)	20.9%	21.8%	38.2%	19.1%
Rank 2	13.6%	26.4%	14.5%	45.5%
Rank 3	12.7%	23.6%	31.8%	31.8%
Rank 4 (Least Important)	52.7%	28.2%	15.5%	3.6%

**TABLE 7: SURVEY QUESTION #5 – ROLE OF A PROBATION OFFICER  
ACCORDING TO THE DOGGINGTON JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICERS**

THE ROLE OF A PROBATION OFFICER SHOULD BE FOCUSED ON THE  
FOLLOWING:

(Answer from the **Probation Officer Survey**, N=13)

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RETRIBUTION</b>	<b>REHABILITATION</b>	<b>INCAPACITATION</b>	<b>DETERRENCE</b>
Rank 1 (Most Important)	0%	8.3%	75%	16.7%
Rank 2	41.7%	50%	0%	8.3%
Rank 3	0%	0%	16.7%	83.3%
Rank 4 (Least Important)	66.7%	33.3%	0%	0%

**TABLE 8: SURVEY QUESTION #6 – ROLE OF A POLICE OFFICER  
ACCORDING TO THE DOGGINGTON PATROL OFFICERS**

THE ROLE OF A POLICE OFFICER SHOULD BE FOCUSED ON THE  
FOLLOWING:

(Answer from the **Patrol Officer Survey**, N=111)

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RETRIBUTION</b>	<b>REHABILITATION</b>	<b>INCAPACITATION</b>	<b>DETERRENCE</b>
Rank 1 (Most Important)	9%	23.4%	45%	22.5%
Rank 2	0%	6.3%	26.1%	67.6%
Rank 3	33.3%	40.5%	16.2%	9.9%
Rank 4 (Least Important)	57.7%	29.7%	12.6%	0%

**TABLE 9: SURVEY QUESTION #6 – ROLE OF A POLICE OFFICER  
ACCORDING TO DOGGINGTON JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICERS**

THE ROLE OF A POLICE OFFICER SHOULD BE FOCUSED ON THE  
FOLLOWING:

(Answer from the **Probation Officer Survey**, N=13)

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RETRIBUTION</b>	<b>REHABILITATION</b>	<b>INCAPACITATION</b>	<b>DETERRENCE</b>
Rank 1 (Most Important)	0%	25%	58.3%	16.7%
Rank 2	16.7%	33.3%	25%	25%
Rank 3	25%	8.3%	8.3%	58.3%
Rank 4 (Least Important)	58.3%	33.3%	8.3%	0%

**TABLE 10: NUMBER OF OFFENSES OF JUVENILES IN SHO/DI DATABASE**

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF NUMBER OF OFFENSES IN SHO/DI DATABASE					
STATUS	N	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
All Possible SHO/DIs	1,948	1	116	16	
Not Chosen as SHO/DIs	1,543	1	90	13	7.87
Chosen as SHO/DIs	405	4	116	24	11.76

LEVINE'S TEST FOR EQUALITY OF VARIANCES		
	F	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
Equal Variances Assumed	87.267*	.000
Equal Variances Not Assumed		

\* Significant at the .05 alpha level ( $p < .001$ ).

INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TEST				
	T	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL (2-TAILED)	MEAN DIFFERENCE
Equal Variances Not Assumed	-16.313*	502.640	.000	-10.08

\* Significant at the .05 alpha level ( $p < .001$ ).

**TABLE 11: POINT LEVELS OF JUVENILES IN SHO/DI DATABASE**

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF POINTS IN SHO/DI DATABASE					
STATUS	N	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
All Possible SHO/DIs	1,948	21	228	36.68	19.86
Not Chosen as SHO/DIs	1,543	21	176	31.74	14.70
Chosen as SHO/DIs	405	21	228	55.52	25.02

LEVINE'S TEST FOR EQUALITY OF VARIANCES		
	F	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
Equal Variances Assumed	151.96	.000
Equal Variances Not Assumed		

\* Significant at the .05 alpha level ( $p < .001$ ).

INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TEST				
	T	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL (2-TAILED)	MEAN DIFFERENCE
Equal Variances Not Assumed	-18.321*	479.549	.000	-23.79

\* Significant at the .05 alpha level ( $p < .001$ ).



**TABLE 12: JUVENILE'S POINT LEVELS ACCORDING TO RACE/ETHNICITY**

CROSSTABULATION OF RACE/ETHNICITY AND POINT LEVEL			
POINT LEVEL	CAUCASIAN	AFRICAN AMERICAN	HISPANIC
1 (21-31)	59%	49%	47%
2 (31-45)	24%	26%	29%
3 (45+)	17%	25%	24%

**TABLE 13: JUVENILE'S POINT LEVELS ACCORDING TO GENDER**

CROSSTABULATION OF GENDER AND POINT LEVEL		
POINT LEVEL	MALES	FEMALES
1 (21-31)	51%	72%
2 (31-45)	26%	22%
3 (45+)	23%	6%

# APPENDIX A

## THE RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

### AS A RESEARCH PARTICIPANT AT THIS INSTITUTION YOU HAVE THE RIGHT . . .

**. . . to be fully informed about the research before you are asked to decide whether or not to participate.** This means that all information which you will need in order to make a decision will be provided to you. The information will be explained to you in a way which ensures that you have an adequate understanding of the research.

**. . . to make your decision whether or not to participate in research without coercion, undue influence, or duress.**

**. . . to decide not to participate in this research or withdraw from participation at any time without affecting your relationship with the investigator(s), 21<sup>st</sup> Century Solutions.**

**. . . to participate in research where your safety and welfare will always come first.** The investigator(s) will display the highest possible degree of skill and care throughout this research. Any anticipated risks or discomforts will be minimized whenever possible.

**. . . to be treated with dignity and respect at all times.**

**. . . to privacy and confidentiality.** The investigator(s) will safeguard the confidentiality of research data to prevent the disclosure of your identity to non-authorized persons.

**. . . to ask questions about the research at any time before, during and after participation in this research.** Every effort will be made to answer your questions honestly and to your complete satisfaction.

**. . . to maintain all your rights and privileges as a citizen.** No waiving of any legal rights is implied or intended by your participation in research.

**IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS CONCERNING YOUR RIGHTS,  
CONTACT DR. CRAIG D. UCHIDA  
TELEPHONE (301) 438-3132**