In this era of globalization accompanied by complexity, ambiguity, rapid change, and diversity, managing an organization is a difficult task. Yet, good management is critical for the survival of an organization. In fact, good management is so important that Hanson (1986) found that a manager’s ability to manage is 3 times stronger in explaining firm profitability than all other factors combined. Managers are challenged with making decisions, formulating goals, creating a mission, enacting policies and procedures, and uniting individuals in the organization so that completion of all of these and other related tasks can be accomplished. Despite the fact that management pervades everything that an organization does, who “the management” actually is, is not always clearly defined. Management consists of many individuals in an organization at varying levels and ranks, often classified as lower management, middle management, and upper management. Hecht asserts that, “many a person who carries the title of manager is not really a manager” (1980, p. 1). People on the frontline may make decisions, formulate
procedures, and have input into the mission and long-term goals of the organization. Does this make them management? Individuals employed in positions considered to be at the second or third level may also have input or titles that indicate they are managers within the organization. Of course, people are familiar with the terms chief executive officer, director, president, chief operating officer, and so on. These are automatically assumed to be titles that indicate the ranks of management. But is this an obvious assumption? According to Hecht (1980), “management is an activity” and managers are “charged with a number of people working at the task of getting some activity accomplished within a set period of time” (p. 1). Research defining management has been ongoing and, to date, there is still not a clear definition of management for all organizations.

This chapter will investigate the definition of management as well as tasks commonly associated with managing an organization. The term organization will be defined and key aspects of organizational structures in nonprofit and for-profit agencies will be discussed. Leadership and how leaders work within organizations are discussed as well. As this book pertains to management in criminal justice, a brief summary of criminal justice agencies and their management structures is also provided to the reader. Each chapter in the text—this one included—ends with a fictional case study and summary discussion. The case studies provide scenarios likely encountered in real life. Although the case studies may resemble reality, they are based on fictitious names, places, and occurrences. There are questions at the end of each case. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Instead, the intent is to allow for application and processing of the information learned in the chapter.

**Defining Management**

As discussed earlier, management is a difficult term to define. It is easier to identify what a manager does or is supposed to do than to define the actual term. If one were to search for the term “management” on the Internet, words such as supervising, directing, managing, measuring results, and so on would display, which are all action-oriented terms. Dwan (2003) identifies management as planning goals and specifying the purpose of the agency; organizing people, finances, resources and activities; staffing, training, and socializing employees; leading the organization and the staff; and controlling, monitoring, and sanctioning when needed (p. 44). On closer scrutiny, one will find that both the explanation proposed by Dwan and the words displayed on the Internet identify management with tasks or responsibilities, while neither provides an exact definition.

Looking in another direction, one may find that management has been defined through theory such as scientific management, where those in charge of an organization are to maximize productivity through selection, training, and planning of tasks and employees. Management theory has also focused on Fayol’s (1949) five functions of management—planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and providing feedback—and bureaucratic management, where there is a clear division of labor, rules, and procedures (Weber, 1947). There are also those that see management as a “process” to be studied and analyzed through cases so that correct techniques can be taught to others (Dale, 1960). There is the human relations approach that perceives management as closely tied to sociology and the various social systems in society (Barnard,
1938; March & Simon, 1958), emphasizing a manager’s understanding of workers as socio-psychological beings who need to be motivated (Tannenbaum, Weschler, & Massarik, 1961). Management has also been discussed from both decision-making and mathematical perspectives (Koontz, 1961). Although most of these will be addressed in detail in future chapters, it is important to note that they appear to be the roles of management and not true definitions of what it is to manage.

Koontz (1961) stated that “most people would agree that [management] means getting things done through and with people” (p. 17). Management, as viewed in this book, is best defined within groups. It is an ongoing process that works toward achieving organizational goals. It may consist of multiple organizational layers, offices, people, positions, and so on. In other words, management is an ongoing process of getting things done through a variety of people with the least amount of effort, expense, and waste, ultimately resulting in the achievement of organizational goals (Moore, 1964).

**Career Highlight Box**

In each of the following chapters, look for Career Highlight Boxes, which will provide information concerning specific occupations, typical duties, pay scales, and job requirements within or related to the criminal justice system. Keep in mind that different jurisdictions have different requirements, so this is only a small representation of the possibilities and occupations available. In addition, in light of the recent downturn in the United States economy and the impact it has had on public and private criminal justice providers, readers are encouraged to examine the job outlook and prospects sections in each job description with a critical eye. The authors suggest that readers discuss career options with faculty and advisors as they narrow down their professional ambitions. Readers are also encouraged to contact individuals currently working in the field of criminal justice to discuss opportunities, interests, and concerns.

**Identifying an Organization**

Blau and Scott (1962) defined an organization by using categories. The first category consists of the owners or managers of the organization, and the second are the members of the rank and file. Third are the clients, or what Blau and Scott referred to as the people who are outside of the organization but have regular contact with it. Fourth is the public at large, or the members of society in which the organization operates. They suggest that organizations benefit someone—either the management, the membership, the client, or the commonwealth. This definition fits well with private enterprise in that the managers or shareholders may benefit greatly from the organization’s business and sales. Hecht (1980) suggested that “any organization is a complicated system of interactions between people working at various levels in that organization and reacting with the social, economic, cultural, political, and competitive systems which surround it” (p. 86). A more contemporary definition of an organization (and perhaps one more fitting to criminal
justices) suggests that it is “an organized or cohesive group of people working together to achieve commonly agreed goals and objectives. . . . The basic objectives of most commercial organizations are to create a product or service that customers will buy, thus creating profit” (McGovern, 1999, n.p.). In criminal justice, the typical organization is not attempting to generate a profit, but rather to deter, prevent, identify, and process crime and criminal acts. It is service based. The hope of achieving goals and objectives is the same, but the functions and activities are in contrast to commercial or for-profit organizations.

Members of an organization usually share a common vision, mission, values, and strategic goals. The vision is how the individuals imagine the goals of the organization being accomplished. Each person will have a particular way he or she sees the organization functioning. As long as the organization is working according to their vision, people perceive the organization as going well. The mission is the overall purpose of the organization and is used to help describe organizations to those outside of them, such as community members. The mission may be a statement or a list of goals to be accomplished (Ivancevich, Donnelly, & Gibson, 1989). A correctional institution’s mission may include statements regarding protecting the public, staff members, and inmates; providing opportunities for rehabilitation; and assisting in reintegrating offenders into society once released. A common mission statement in police departments may include phrases that support public safety, working with citizens and the community, and reducing crime. The Fairfax, County Police Department in Virginia, for example, states, “The Fairfax County Police Department protects persons and property by providing essential law enforcement and public safety services, while promoting community involvement, stability, and order through service, assistance and visibility” (Fairfax County Police Department, 2002, n.p.).

The values held in an organization are considered priorities. They incorporate aspects of the vision and the mission in order to focus the activities of an organization. The values are determined by the culture of the organization. In policing, the culture tends to revolve around providing services, controlling crime, and increasing public safety. There are strict policies and procedures to be followed in carrying out the activities of the policing agency. Officers’ positions are well defined, and there is a clearly identified hierarchy in the organization. Employees are expected to promote honesty and integrity while completing their tasks. Again, looking at the Fairfax County Police Department (2002), their values have been identified as the following:

We believe . . .

- The highest moral and ethical standards are the cornerstone of the agency, and all members are expected to adhere to these standards.
- The agency, through all of our employees and volunteers, strives to uphold the public trust and maintain accountability to the public.
- The employees are the most important asset of the Department, and only through teamwork, mutual respect, and cooperation can the community be best served.
- The role of the police is determined by the community it serves; through a partnership with the citizens, the Department improves the quality of life through control and reduction of crime.
• The police and the community share in the responsibility for crime control and public safety.
• The capability to accomplish our mission is determined by the dedication to public service, diversity and quality of the work force; therefore, we seek to recruit and retain individuals who possess those qualities.
• The agency must seek to collaborate with neighborhoods to better understand the nature of local problems and to develop meaningful and cooperative strategies to solve these problems.
• The agency must enhance the skills of all personnel to ensure motivation, creativity, dedication and professionalism, while creating an atmosphere of job satisfaction, enthusiasm, security and personal career development.
• Available resources, both personnel and financial, must be expended with maximum efficiency in order to provide optimum service to the citizens of Fairfax County.
• State-of-the-art technologies and up-to-date training are essential for the maintenance and enhancement of police service delivery to the citizens of the community.
• Through the application of these commonly held values, we will achieve excellence in policing in Fairfax County. (n.p.)

It is apparent in their statements that community inclusion, integrity, and training are key aspects of their organizational culture and, in turn, their value system. Expending funds in appropriate and accountable methods is also important to the Fairfax County Police Department. In other words, these are priorities to be accomplished by this organization.

Last, organizations use strategic goals. Members will work toward several organizational goals in order to accomplish their mission. The goals, also known as objectives, are the main concerns of the organization. They are generally set by the administration and passed down through formal and informal messages to employees. According to Hecht (1980), objections should filter all the way to the bottom of the agency with each unit or department working on their own individual goals, while keeping the larger organizational strategic goals in mind (p. 91). Employees may also have personal goals set for themselves. It is hoped that personal goals do not conflict with organizational goals. If this occurs, the employee may be unsuccessful with the agency, or the agency’s accomplishment of larger organizational goals may be blocked. The administration at that point must step in and reiterate the organizational strategic goals, retrain, or terminate the employee.

Take a look at In the News 1.1, for example. In this case, questions are raised about why law enforcement officers are so quick to shoot instead of using conflict resolution or mediation skills. Law enforcement’s larger goals are to protect citizens but, as the article points out, the community is questioning the use-of-force responses in citizen protection. Usually, organizational goals in policing may be somewhat similar to the declarations made in the mission and value statements of the agency.
That makes at least five people shot and killed by local law enforcement since 2000.
That doesn’t include Edwin A. “Skip” Keltner, who was shot by police in 2004, but lived. Or Eugene Pitchford, a homeless man who choked to death on his own vomit when restrained by police in 2000. Or Bruce Nicholson or Jeremy Baksai or Dennis Lane, who all died while in custody at the Peoria County Jail within the last year.
It’s quite a list.
Shannon Smith was 27 years old when he drove away from a Chenoa service station without paying for $15 worth of gas. Allegedly trying to ram his way out when trapped between police vehicles after a "low-speed chase," the mentally disabled man was shot in the back five times on July 24, 2000.
Forty-seven-year-old David Green was sleeping in his Glasford home on the morning of June 23, 2005, when 42 police officers and two helicopters descended for a potential drug bust. There were 10 bullet holes in him. He didn’t fire a shot.
Tyee Miller also was in his own home Dec. 22, upset about a pending divorce. A former Marine, the 41-year-old had taken a few shots at nothing in particular out the window. After an eight-hour standoff, police shot him to death in his kitchen.
James Lee also was in a domestic dispute. The 26-year-old was having a fight with his girlfriend, who called police to their home at 2200 W. Krause. Supposedly armed with a handgun, he was shot twice in the chest shortly after midnight on April 26.
Scott Sheets Jr. had wounded himself with a butcher knife. Family members had feared he was suicidal and alerted police he was near Lacon. Some of them were on the scene when he was shot in the throat and chest last Monday.
These five separate tragedies ignited the same debate about the use of force by police. On the one side, families and friends insist it was a fatal overreaction. On the other, police apologists plead procedure.
I’ve been corresponding for months with one guy who walks both lines. Tyee Miller’s brother, Todd, has worked as a cop. Tyee himself had volunteered as part of the Peoria County Sheriff’s Department’s auxiliary unit. Now living in California, Todd Miller has a lot of unanswered questions. This week’s shootings just brings them up again.
If Tyee was suicidal and armed, Todd can’t figure out why the neighborhood wasn’t evacuated within shotgun range. If Tyee was suicidal and armed, Todd can’t figure out why Tyee never spoke to a mental health worker. If Tyee was suicidal and armed, Todd can’t figure out why Tyee was tricked into coming outside and then chased back into the house when officers failed to tackle him.
Because even though he was suicidal and armed, Tyee had told a neighbor he would not hurt an officer unless they came into his home. He didn’t want to affect their families. Todd Miller says the officers had a right to shoot Tyee when they came in the house and his brother had the drop on them. Todd Miller doesn’t understand why they couldn’t have used other methods before things got to that point.
“...This is really pretty incredible to see how the local law enforcement is so totally unprepared to handle situations with anything other than, ‘Do as I say or I’ll kill you,’ and then the fall-out is, ‘He didn’t do as we said so we are justified in killing him,” Miller said. ”Amazing. Why is law enforcement out there in such a huge hurry to ‘get ‘er done’?”
That may be the best question of all.

The strategic goals will state what the agency plans to accomplish and the particular activities its employees are likely to use to achieve the goals. As was mentioned previously, the structure and culture of the organization are reiterated in the strategic goals. Likewise, the strategic goals of an agency provide employees the opportunity to align themselves and their personal goals with the agency’s stated goals. In addition, citizens in the community can determine whether an agency is accomplishing the mission by assessing the statements made in the strategic goals and the outputs delivered by the department.

The better organized an organization is, the better it will be able to accomplish its goals. The term organized can relate to structure. Organizations are structured vertically and horizontally. They contain departments, units, specializations, work groups, jobs, and so on.

The structure is typically determined by how formal the organization is. If there is a rigid hierarchy, or what some refer to as bureaucracy, the organization is seen as centralized. Centralized organizations house authority positions at the top of the hierarchy, in the upper levels of the administration. Managers are responsible for most decisions in centralized organizations, and communication is sent from management to lower-level staff on how to perform tasks and on changes in policy or procedure. However, if there are few levels of authority between the top managers and the line staff (those performing the everyday tasks or jobs), the organization is seen as decentralized. Decentralized organizations allow for lower-level staff to make decisions on policies or procedures that directly affect the accomplishment of tasks and goals (Ivancevich, Donnelly, & Gibson, 1989). Delegation of authority is foremost in decentralized organizations. The structure of organizations and the impact centralization or decentralization has on how organizations function and accomplish goals will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2. For now, it’s important to realize that the structure of an organization determines how much autonomy, or the power to self-govern, workers have within that organization.

The chain of command within an organization can also determine structure. A chain of command is the vertical line of authority that defines who supervises whom in an organization. If an organization has a well-defined, unyielding chain of command, the organization is formalized. Formal organizations are bureaucratic and have clearly defined rules, procedures, and policies. Those at the higher levels of the chain have the authority and power to issue commands to those at the lower level. Police departments tend to utilize formal chains of command with street officers reporting to sergeants, who report to lieutenants, who report to assistant chiefs, who report to the chief of police, and there may even be levels in between these. Skipping a level in the chain of command may result in formal reprimands and is highly frowned upon by coworkers and supervisors. In a formal chain of command, information will travel from the chief of police, to the assistant chiefs, to the commanders and sergeants, and finally to the street-level officers. Questions or comments regarding the information will travel back up the chain of command in a similar fashion. By looking at Figure 1.1, one can see a sample of the formal structure typical of a police department. Under the Assistant Chief of Operations, for example, the patrol officers report to the shift sergeants who report to the shift lieutenants in each squad. Each area of specialty has a defined chain of command within the overall chain of command or structure of the organization.
Figure 1.1  Organizational Chart of Normal Police Department, Normal, Illinois
On the other side of the spectrum, one can see criminal justice organizations that differ greatly in their level of formalization. Although the size of the department may make a difference, organizations such as probation have a tendency not to rely as heavily on formal chains of command. This does not mean there is no organizational structure (the larger the agency, the more formalized it may be); the structure just tends to be more loosely tied together. The organization therefore is less formalized. Probation officers tend to report to one individual (the deputy chief) who is directly linked to the chief probation officer. The chief probation officer, the deputy chief, and the field probation officers usually have a direct line of communication to the judge(s). In essence, this is a more *informal organizational structure*. In probation, the *line staff*, or probation officers working directly with the clients in the field, has more autonomy and input into the decision making of the organization than those in formalized organizations. They are able to interpret policy; ask managers questions directly; and answer questions asked by offenders, family members of offenders, service providers, the judge, and so on with little to no managerial input. Figure 1.2 demonstrates an organizational chart in a medium-sized probation department. Notice the flat horizontal structure compared to the vertical structure of the police department in Figure 1.1.

Organizations are also structured as systems (discussed in detail in Chapters 2 and 3). Basically, this means that organizations have inputs, outputs, processes, and feedback. The whole system is designed to accomplish the organizational goal(s) (McNamara, 2007). *Inputs* are taken in by the organization and include such things as resources, money, technology, people, and so on. The inputs are used to produce a *process* whereby the people in the organization, for example, spend money and resources on activities that meet the mission of the organization in hopes that the identified goals will be accomplished. The *outputs* are the tangible results (e.g., products, services, jobs, or in the case of criminal justice, lowered crime rates, better protection, etc.) of the efforts produced in the process (McNamara, 2007). These are identifiable by those outside of the organization and are generally used to determine if the organization is successful. The final step in the systems approach includes *feedback*. This feedback comes from the larger environment as well as from customers, clients, stakeholders, employees, the government, and so on. In systems open to the environment, the feedback may be used to modify the inputs and processes used in accomplishing future goals (McNamara, 2007). In those closed to the environment, the feedback may or may not be considered in changes that are made to the organization.

The organization may have subsystems that operate within the larger system as well. Each subsystem can be thought of as a separate organization that works to accomplish its own goals while contributing to the accomplishment of the larger organizational goal(s). The subsystems have their own boundaries, missions, and tasks, as well as their own inputs, outputs, processes, and feedback (McNamara, 2007). Detective units in police departments can be thought of as subsystems. These units have their own missions, goals, and values, yet they too are working to accomplish the larger policing goals of providing services, fighting and identifying crime, and working with and protecting the public.

Groups and individual employees within an organization can also be thought of as systems with common missions, values, goals, inputs, outputs, processes, and on it
goes. The organization can be thought of as multiple systems, all operating within multiple systems for one or more identified strategic goal(s). The systems approach will be investigated further in the next two chapters, but for now, suffice it to say that all organizations have systems in their structures. The impact of those systems on organizational activities, goals, and values varies greatly, however.

Organizations can be very complex organisms. They may operate within the confines of formal rules, regulations, and authority, or they may be more loosely based on the achievement of goals with little supervision. Organizations may also be open systems actively engaging and interacting with the environment or closed systems that accept little outside input and feedback, each of which is discussed in detail in Chapter 2. Either way, it is the managers who are tasked with clarifying the goals, systems, structure, and mission of the organization. A situation in which clarification was required occurred just recently in Abingdon, Illinois. A reading of the Illinois Compiled Statutes led to questions regarding an officer's position and responsibilities in the police department.
In the News 1.2 brings to light how statutory requirements may impact organizational structures, and how managers are called upon to identify organizational structures and employee tasks and responsibilities.

Abingdon-An Abingdon Police Committee meeting was held Thursday evening, July 26; a follow up to the previous meeting held the Wednesday before. At this meeting Abingdon Chief of Police, Ed Swearingen, and Lt. Jared Hawkinson, were present as were Aldermen Jason Johnson, Ronnie Stelle, Dean Fairbank, Dale Schisler, Myron Hovind, Mike Boggs, Mayor Stephen Darmer, Treasurer Jim Davis and Abingdon City Clerk Sheila Day.

At the previous meeting the question as to whether or not specific passengers riding in Abingdon squad cars were covered by City insurance was addressed with the understanding that certain passengers would not fall under the City insurance policy. Darmer says, after speaking with the City’s insurance representative this is not the case. “He said passengers are all covered under our insurance. They’re always covered. The only thing he had concerns about was the risk and this City management’s call.”

Johnson then addressed Illinois Compiled Statute 65 5/3.1-30-21 Sec. 3.1-30-21 regarding part-time police officers. The complete statute reads as follows: A municipality may appoint, discipline, and discharge part-time police officers. A municipality that employs part-time police officers shall, by ordinance, establish hiring standards for part-time police officers and shall submit those standards to the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board. Part-time police officers shall be members of the regular police department, except for pension purposes. Part-time police officers shall not be assigned under any circumstances to supervise or direct full-time police officers of a police department. Part-time police officers shall not be used as permanent replacements for permanent full-time police officers. Part-time police officers shall be trained under the Intergovernmental Law Enforcement Officer’s In-Service Training Act in accordance with the procedures for part-time police officers established by the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board. A part-time police officer hired after Jan 1, 1996 who has not yet received certification under Section 8.2 of the Illinois Police Training Act shall be directly supervised. This statute was adopted Jan 1, 1996. Previously, Abingdon Police Sgt. Carl Kraemer said part-time police officer Jared Hawkinson has duties that include, but not limited to, making the schedule for the Department and Hawkinson was reported to be in charge of the Department in the absence of Swearingen, which, according to the statute, is a violation of Illinois Law. Johnson, Police Committee Chair, said that is not the case, “At the meeting it was brought up discussing an officer, Lt. Hawkinson, being in charge of the Department in absence of the Chief. According to the Illinois Compiled Statutes it does say part-time officers shall not be assigned under any circumstances to supervise or direct full-time police officers of a police department. Now, when one reads that and when one looks at the semantics of the rank structure of the police department you see the chief, you see lieutenant and you see sergeant and being familiar with military command structure you can see where they stair-step. In fact, we have a ranking structure.”

(Continued)
Leadership

The manager is typically considered a leader by many inside and outside of the organization. The manager is charged with leading his or her subordinates through the task and into completion of the job. However, the manager may or may not be good at leading. Since “leadership can arise in any situation where people have combined their efforts to accomplish a task,” a leader is not always a manager (Ivancevich, Donnelly, & Gibson, 1989, p. 296). Management and leadership are not synonymous. An important task of leadership is to motivate others to accomplish organizational goals. Managers may tell subordinates what to do and how to do it, but they might not motivate subordinates to actually finish the job. Leaders inspire others to not only do the work, but also to finish it. Leaders promote change, keep an eye on the accomplishment of the job, look at long-term goals, and inspire and motivate, whereas managers maintain the status quo, monitor the means by which the job is getting done, and solve problems as they arise in the organization. Leaders and managers can actually be at opposition in their approach to the work and accomplishment of organizational goals.

Just as with other terms in management, there is some debate on whether leaders are born with leadership characteristics, taught to be good leaders, or are better able to perform leadership behaviors than others. Trait theories put forth that leaders are born
with specific characteristics that make them more capable of leading others (Bass, 1981; Lippitt, 1955; Stogdill, 1974). They may be more emotionally stable; be more business minded; or have more self-confidence, integrity, honesty, and a constant drive to promote change and to make improvements in their environments. Contrary to this approach, it may be that the person seen as a leader is simply better able to perform the behaviors associated with leadership—being supportive of others, friendly, approachable, able to set goals, give directions, assign tasks, inspire, and motivate—and get people in the organization to accomplish individual and organizational goals. This is a behavioral approach. Behaviorists are interested in how those perceived as leaders can motivate others to perform. In their mind, leadership can be learned (Shanahan, 1978).

The final approach to explaining leadership is situational. This approach realizes that no one behavior may be appropriate in all situations with all people, and that traits alone cannot always inspire others (Fiedler, 1967). Instead, leaders should be able to adapt (and may be taught to do so) to the situation put before them in determining how best to approach the goals of the organization and the individuals being led. In this case, leadership may be a learned quality. This seems to be the approach chosen by Parke-Davis Pharmaceuticals. They recently partnered with the University of Michigan Executive Education Center to develop curriculum to teach their scientists leadership skills. The curriculum required the scientists to develop an individual action plan that addressed teamwork, qualities for success and failure, self-awareness, coaching others, communication, creativity, motivation, organizational structure, setting direction, and promoting change. Parke-Davis believes that their managers have an improved sense of self-awareness, leadership behaviors, and self-confidence as a result of the program. In addition, the organization feels the program provides employees with a “clearer idea of responsibilities and values needed to lead others . . . [as well as improved] communication, teambuilding, and problem solving skills” (“Making Scientists Into Leaders,” 2001, p. 938). Learning how to lead, when best to lead, and in what situation leadership skills are most appropriate is the approach put forth in situational theories, as seen in the Parke-Davis curriculum.

The lack of leadership skills initially seen by Parke-Davis in the company’s scientists can also be seen, at times, in the criminal justice system. Managers, who are assumed to be the leaders in criminal justice agencies, are usually promoted from within and arrive at their positions because of the amount of time served with the organization, by community election, through appointment, or because of socialization skills or heroism. They do not necessarily possess the abilities to be good leaders and may not be able to adapt easily to situations that arise. Because of the way they obtained their positions, it may be more difficult for them to lead others employed by the agency, since there are relationships already formed with the community and employees. In a study of police chiefs and sheriffs, LaFrance and Allen (n.d.) found that sheriffs lived in the county they served for an average of 20 or more years longer than police chiefs, were more likely to have served in their current positions longer than police chiefs, and on average have worked for the agency they served for almost 6 times longer than police chiefs. Based on these statistics, even though the sheriff is elected, he or she has obvious relationships with the community and the employees in the sheriff’s office. These relationships may impact the ability to impose changes and lead the department.
In addition, employees in criminal justice agencies are not necessarily encouraged to think outside of the box, often due to constitutional and legal confines, so imagination, creativity, and long-term innovation may not be qualities valued by the agency or used by those viewed as leaders. Thinking of the sheriffs mentioned above, one is reminded of the old saying, “There’s a new sheriff in town,” but even with new administration, one may see very few changes occur in the organization and in the providing of services. Finally, leadership in criminal justice can be constrained by environmental factors that weigh into these agencies. Union contracts, budgeting constraints, legislative decisions, and court rulings may limit the amount of change a leader can accomplish inside a policing or correctional institution. They may also determine the means used and ends accomplished, so there is little a leader can do to challenge the system. Thus, the leader may not be inspired or motivated to accomplish the goals of the organization, and may end up doing little for those that look to him or her for guidance and encouragement. Shared leadership (between managers and subordinates) and increased focus on situational leadership skills may allow for criminal justice organizations to be more adaptive. Leaders need to be trained and not assumed to have the abilities to lead just because they have worked for an agency for a long time. An extensive discussion on leadership is provided in Chapter 7.

For-Profit and Nonprofit Organizations

Organizations can be classified into two broad categories, namely, for-profit and nonprofit. This classification of organizations is helpful because the underlying values, objectives, visions, and mission statements that form the guiding principles in attaining organizational goals in each category are different. The inherent differences and similarities found in nonprofit criminal justice organizations and for-profit types of businesses must be understood.

For-profit organizations, such as computer manufacturers, car dealerships, restaurants, and Internet service providers, exist to generate profits from products or services (McNamara, 2007). Their goal is to make a profit by taking in more money than they spend on development, training, personnel, marketing, distribution, and sales of goods and services. For-profit businesses are organized as privately owned or publicly held corporations. They may be unincorporated sole proprietorships owned by one person or partnerships between people or organizations, and the activities of the business are viewed as taxable personal income (McNamara, 2007). The sole proprietor is liable personally for all activities and operations of the business. For-profit businesses can also be organized as corporations (known as C corporations and S corporations). A corporation is considered its own legal entity, separate from the individuals who own it or who formed the organization. Corporations can be for-profit or nonprofit (government owned, for example) (McNamara, 2007). Corporations are usually formed to limit the liability the founders will face if there are poor operations or harmful activities, and so that stock can be sold in the business. A board of directors is appointed to oversee the activities of corporations. Finally, for-profit organizations may organize as limited liability companies (LLCs). The LLC combines the advantages of the corporation with
those of the sole proprietorship. The founders have minimum personal liability, unless a state or federal law is violated; they can sell stock in the business; they can retain a voice in management decisions, goals, values, and activities; and they can share in profits. This is a very popular form of for-profit organization (McGovern, 1999; McNamara, 2007).

For-profit businesses rely on a formal structure with a rigid hierarchy to accomplish their goals. A president or chief executive officer oversees the business by implementing strategic goals and objectives; working with the board of directors in governance; supporting operations; overseeing design, marketing, promotion, delivery, and quality of the product or service; managing resources; presenting a strong community image; and recruiting investors (McNamara, 2007). The hierarchy branches out from there to include vice presidents who specialize in the various aspects—marketing or promotion, human resources, operations, sales, finances, and so on—of the business. Assistants work directly under the vice presidents, and so it goes until one arrives at the employees working on the assembly line putting the product together or selling the service to consumers. In addition to the hierarchy, customers are sought after and, hopefully, retained to continuously purchase the product or use the service provided (McNamara, 2007). Investors are relied upon to buy stock in the business or, in the case of sole proprietorships, to fund the business until a profit is acquired. In the end, the results are the profits yielded from the sales of the product or service. These profits may be distributed among the investors or reinvested back into the organization (McGovern, 1999; McNamara, 2007).

Nonprofit agencies are created to fulfill one or more needs of a community (McGovern, 1999). Criminal justice agencies are considered nonprofit agencies that provide services to society by deterring, preventing, identifying, and processing crime and criminal acts. The goals of a nonprofit organization do not include generating monetary earnings, even though a service or product may be provided to customers using the agency. By calling an agency “nonprofit,” it can be assumed that the organization is structured in such a way that it is federally and legally forbidden to distribute profits to owners. A profit, in this case, means having more revenue than expenditures (McNamara, 2007).

All activities, goals, and values in a nonprofit organization are centered on the client. Clients are the consumers of the nonprofit organization’s services. In criminal justice, this includes the victim, offender, community member, witness, treatment provider, and so on. The nonprofit is designed to provide for the needs of the client (McGovern, 1999; McNamara, 2007). This means that the nonprofit must continually assess the desires of the clients and determine the appropriate means of providing for them. This is a service-oriented approach (and is one of the underlying themes of this textbook). Assessments may be done by the executive director or, in the case of criminal justice, the chief in charge of the agency. This person is responsible for carrying out the strategic goals of the organization. The executive director or chief is accountable for the work of the staff and to the public. If there are failures in meeting needs—for example, crime increases instead of decreases—the chief is the one called to the carpet, so to speak, for an explanation.
The executive director or chief may also engage in fundraising to meet the needs of the nonprofit agency and, subsequently, the clientele. Fundraising is not meant to create a profit but to meet the fiscal needs of the organization (McNamara, 2007). Funds may be garnered from grants, individuals, foundations, and for-profit corporations. Grants are likely considered one of the largest fundraising initiatives in the criminal justice system (alongside forfeitures). They are given by governmental agencies (federal or state governments), foundations, and corporations in order to operate a specific program or initiative. Grant monies are provided up front and require an audit at the end of the grant period showing success or failure at completing the goals identified in the grant application. Individual donations may come from members of the organization or its constituents (wealthy community members, for example). They are usually small, one-time contributions of money or other assets, such as buildings or land (McGovern, 1999; McNamara, 2007). Foundations and for-profit corporations may also choose to give one-time start-up costs to nonprofit organizations on issues they identify as worthy. Microsoft founder Bill Gates and his wife, for example, give charitable donations each year to nonprofit organizations that focus on children’s health, AIDS and HIV, and medical and other health issues.

Nonprofits rely heavily on staff and volunteers. The staff are hired and paid by the nonprofit. They report to the administration and work directly with the clients. Because the agency is not generating profits to pay for large numbers of employees, volunteers are commonly used to assist staff in the completion of tasks. The volunteers come from a number of sources including university intern programs, the AmeriCorps program, high school volunteer programs, civic agencies, and individuals in the community. They are not paid, but their contributions to the organization can be invaluable.

One of the key issues facing nonprofit organizations is devolution. *Devolution* is the term used to describe cutbacks in federal funding to nonprofit organizations (McNamara, 2007). Central to this issue is the fact that less money to a nonprofit means fewer services to clients. As a result of devolution, innovative staff and reliance on volunteers become even more important, as does the ability of the administration to raise funds from other outside sources (McNamara, 2007). Utilizing fees for services is one way nonprofits can overcome the effects of devolution, but it is by no means the most popular choice. In many cases, those utilizing the assistance of nonprofits cannot afford to purchase the services in the first place; otherwise they would likely go to a for-profit agency for the service. Assessing fees thus puts a hardship on the client as well as the agency. The agency is concerned that those most in need of the service cannot receive it because of the fee, and clients are concerned with how to pay for the service in the first place (McNamara, 2007). A second response to devolution is to bill an outside party for the fee. In some cases, state or county agencies are able to bill the federal government for each client who uses their service. The billed amount may not cover the full cost of the service, but it reimburses the nonprofit for some of the money spent on the client, and it does not require the federal government to make a commitment as significant as a grant (McNamara, 2007). One example of this is in treatment services where the client receives individual mental health counseling for free from a nonprofit agency. The agency then bills the state or federal government for each client serviced by the therapist. The therapist receives a monthly salary regardless of the
number of clients counseled, and the clients receive the treatment they need regardless of the cost.

Priorities for services by nonprofits are determined by the clients, the community, and the political environment, just as the demands for goods and services in for-profit agencies are determined by many of the same individuals. In both for-profit and nonprofit agencies, administrators, as well as staff, must be aware of changes in needs and wants in the environment (McNamara, 2007). Meeting those needs and wants is highly demanding, and there are no easy answers to how the organizations should manage themselves in order to meet these challenges. A constant concern for progressive organizations is how to continuously improve while offering a high-quality service or product to a diverse group of customers. These service encounters become complex for nonprofit service organizations, such as criminal justice, due to the nature of services demanded by diverse groups of stakeholders, which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

Some of the issues facing both nonprofit and for-profit organizations include the need for good leaders that also possess the ability to manage and to work as a team with vision, skill, and sufficient resources to accomplish the strategic goals identified by the agency. Setting realizable goals that are complex enough to challenge employees but not so complex that they cannot show results is also an issue. Utilizing diversity so that all perspectives can be taken into consideration and finding people good at planning, organizing, guiding, and motivating others are keys to organizational success (McGovern, 1999; McNamara, 2007). It is also necessary to have networks in place so that administrators can seek out the funds and investments needed to run a successful business. Seeking and receiving advice from experts outside of the agency is important, as well as realizing that all services, in the case of nonprofit agencies, are not going to have an impact immediately, just as all products are not going to be successful (McNamara, 2007). Basically, nonprofit and for-profit agencies have just as many similarities as they do differences. The most important difference to focus on is the size of the organization. “Small nonprofits are often much more similar to small for-profits than to large nonprofits. Similarly, large nonprofits are often more similar to large for-profits than small nonprofits” (McNamara, 2007, n.p.).

**What Are Criminal Justice Organizations?**

The criminal justice system is composed of many agencies working toward different though related tasks. It is important to understand these agencies, their goals and objectives, history, and clientele to be able to design an effective and efficient system. There are four primary areas of criminal justice—the police, courts, corrections, and security (although some would not include security since it is primarily profit-based).

The police are perhaps the most familiar component of the criminal justice system since they are the ones called when someone becomes a victim of a crime, the ones that stop drivers who violate traffic laws, and that community members see driving around the neighborhood on patrol. The police department is a highly structured agency primarily responsible for two tasks. First, the police enforce the law by responding to calls regarding law violations, arrest persons they witness or suspect to be violating the law,
and make traffic or other types of stops. They rely heavily on state statutes and constitutional requirements in performing these tasks. In this role, the police are essentially gatekeepers to the criminal justice system by determining who will be arrested and brought into the system and who will be warned, let go, or otherwise ignored by the system (Cox & Wade, 1997). Second, the police are responsible for providing services. Actual enforcement of the law is a minimal part of the police department’s daily responsibilities. Using negotiation skills and mediation abilities in situations where there are disputes between parties, providing first aid, checking security alarms on buildings, investigating accidents, transporting prisoners, providing information, fingerprinting, making public speeches, handling calls about animals, and other service-related tasks are common occurrences in the police officer’s day (Cox & Wade, 1997). Strict policies and procedures are followed by the police in carrying out both law enforcement and service-related duties. Police departments typically operate in a centralized manner so that quick responses can occur when calls for assistance are made to the organization. In both enforcement and service-related circumstances, the police are largely a reactive organization that depends on public cooperation in reporting crimes, providing social control, and requesting assistance (Cox & Wade, 1997). A detailed discussion on the police is provided in Chapter 9.

The courts are depicted on television in courtroom dramas such as *Law and Order*. Most people are aware that there is a prosecuting attorney, defense counsel, a judge, and a jury in the courtroom, but they may not be as certain of the court processes, rules, or procedures. Courts are also highly structured, centralized agencies reliant on formal procedures of presenting evidence and hearing cases. The major responsibility of the court system is to provide impartiality to those accused of committing criminal offenses. In court cases, both parties, the defendant and the prosecutor, are allowed to present their arguments within strict procedural guidelines, and the judge and jury are meant to act as decision makers in determining guilt or innocence. However, this is not the only function of the courts. The courts also determine bail, conduct preliminary hearings, rule on admissibility of evidence, interpret the law, and determine the appropriate sentences for offenders. Constitutional guarantees are the backbone of the court system. By utilizing formal procedures and structures, the court is better able to guarantee objective treatment of those coming before it and to more closely apply the law and constitutional requirements. Without such structure, the court would be full of bias and inconsistency. A detailed discussion on the courts is provided in Chapter 10.

Probation, parole, and treatment programs are not typically as structured as police departments and courts. Employees in these specialties are tasked with making decisions on rehabilitation alternatives that best meet the needs of each individual client. In this case, a strict policy or procedure explaining what to do or what program to use if the client consumes drugs, for example, may not be appropriate. The procedure described in the agency’s policy manual may actually encourage additional drug use in one person while discouraging it in another. Consequently, probation and parole officers and treatment providers must have the ability to choose from numerous alternatives, to weigh the costs and benefits of each against the client’s unique situation, and to make the decision on which alternative the client will profit from the most. In probation and parole offices and treatment programs, the administration uses a hands-off
approach as long as the employees are meeting the overall goals of the organization (It should again be noted that the size of the organization will make a difference, so the ability to generalize structure is limited.). The means used to achieve the goals are less important than the end result of rehabilitation in most probation, parole and treatment agencies. Probation and parole are discussed in Chapter 11.

As noted in Figure 1.3, corrections is the end result of the criminal justice system. Corrections is another area where individuals may have some experiences (in driving past a prison, knowing someone who was jailed, hearing descriptions of the experiences of jailed celebrities such as Paris Hilton, or watching a prison drama on television) but may not have experienced firsthand the spectrum of correctional alternatives. Thinking of corrections, one tends to think of prisons with fences, correctional officers, and uniformed inmates; however, corrections also includes probation, parole, treatment, diversion, and prevention programs. In this textbook, the authors will be discussing correctional institutions, like prison, in a chapter on prisons, jails, and detention centers (Chapter 12). Correctional institutions are found at both the state and federal levels. They have paramilitary structures, although there is autonomy in that the states can make decisions about their institutions separately from the federal system. The primary differences in the institutions may include the gender being housed, the age of the inmates, the types of offenses committed by the inmates, and the treatment programs provided. Yet, there are stark similarities in formalization with regard to policies and procedures, training of employees, security, and control (Cox & Wade, 1997). Employees in correctional institutions tend to follow strict policies, often explained in extensive policy manuals and academies, and to work within a highly structured chain of command. As noted, a more detailed discussion on corrections is provided in Chapter 12.

Security is the last area of specialty in criminal justice. It has garnered increased attention through Homeland Security (anti-terrorism) initiatives since the terrorist attacks in New York City and Washington, DC, in 2001. But the field of security includes many aspects such as private security (guards, protection services, loss prevention, and investigations), cyber security (computer-based crime), corporate security (finances, workplace violence, legal liability, health care issues, and risk assessment), as well as governmental security (executive security, investigations, and reporting). Security agencies differ greatly in their organizational structures. As discussed previously, what works for one organization may be unworkable for another. Since the security industry is one of the areas in criminal justice that can be in both private and public sectors, labeling this field as having only formal or informal organizational structure is impossible. If a person works for a university campus security program, he or she may find a highly formalized organization similar to that of the police department in a local town or municipality. Another individual working as a private investigator with a firm may find that there is little structure and much autonomy in this position. This person is able to decide when to work, how long to work in a day, and how to perform surveillance needed to get the information required. Both parties may have the exact same training and be involved in similar types of tasks, even though the organizational structure differs greatly, impacting the way in which they do their jobs. The various aspects of the security industry are discussed in detail in Chapter 13.
What is the sequence of events in the criminal justice system?

**Figure 1.3  The Criminal Justice System**

Figure 1.3: The Criminal Justice System
Chapter Summary

- Identifying management in an organization may be difficult because policies, procedures, goals, values, and the mission can be influenced by line staff as well as top administrators.
- Many theoretical attempts have been made to identify who management is and the responsibilities of management in an organization. According to this text, management should be efficient and effective in meeting organizational goals while utilizing the least amount of resources possible.
- Organizations differ greatly in size, structure, values, goals, and mission. Organizations can be formal or informal, centralized or decentralized. They may have defined chains of command and vertical communication or loosely identified chains of command and horizontal communication. The overall purpose of any organization is to achieve agreed upon goals and objectives.
- Organizations have a vision of how work should be accomplished by the line staff. They identify a mission statement so that those outside of the organization are aware of their purpose. Organizations create value structures that are dependent on the people working in the organization and the culture of the organization. Values are considered the priorities of the organization. In addition, organizations use strategic goals to guide their efforts and to accomplish their stated missions. The goals are measurable outcomes used to assess the overall effectiveness of the organization.
- Organizations can be considered systems consisting of inputs, processes, outputs, and feedback. Each organization is made up of smaller subsystems operating within the larger organizational system. Employees and managers can also be considered systems operating within subsystems.
- Leaders motivate others to accomplish organizational goals. They may or may not be identified as managers within an organization. Being able to lead is not the same as being a manager. Managers may or may not be good leaders. Theoretical attempts to explain leadership have focused on those born with qualities that make them able to lead others, those taught to be leaders, and those who learn to rely on situations to determine the best way to lead.
- For-profit agencies are designed to develop and deliver products or services that generate income. They may be organized as sole proprietorships, corporations, or LLCs. They tend to be structured formally, with ends being more important than means in accomplishing strategic goals.
- Nonprofit organizations are created to fulfill community and client needs. They are not concerned with generating earnings and rely heavily on fundraising through grants, corporations, individuals, foundations, and governmental agencies to meet budgetary needs. Line staff and volunteers are employed to accomplish strategic goals. One of the biggest issues facing nonprofit organizations is devolution.
- For-profit and nonprofit agencies are similar in that they both require inputs and feedback from the environment. They also rely on good leadership, sufficient resources, achievable goals, diverse staff, and planning for future activities in order to succeed.
- The biggest difference between nonprofit and for-profit agencies is the size of the organization.
- There are four areas of specialty in criminal justice—policing, courts, corrections, and security. Each area contains agencies that are organized differently depending on their size, clientele, and strategic goals. All of them work together to accomplish the larger system’s goals of upholding the laws, deterring criminal acts, and rehabilitating offenders.
Chapter Review Questions

1. How is management identified in an organization?

2. Think of an organization in which you are involved. What is the mission of the organization? Identify one or two of its strategic goals. How does it accomplish its goals? Would you consider it successful or unsuccessful in accomplishing the goals identified? Is the organization centralized or decentralized? On what information are you basing your response?

3. Identify potential inputs, processes, outputs, and feedback that may be found in a probation department.

4. What qualities do criminal justice agencies share? How are they different? What determines the organizational structure in criminal justice organizations?

5. What are the similarities and differences in nonprofit and for-profit agencies? Identify a for-profit agency in your community. Identify a nonprofit agency in your community. What are the differences and similarities between these two agencies? What types of products or services do they provide?

Case Study

Patowonk is a small county in Missouri with a population of 28,000. The Patowonk County Sheriff's Department has approximately 20 officers and 7 part-time auxiliary officers. The department has three officers dedicated to drug investigations. The officers primarily handle crimes related to marijuana distribution and manufacturing. Most other crimes in Patowonk are property offenses, juvenile delinquency, and domestic violence. Tom Beasley is the sheriff in Patowonk County. He has worked for the department for 28 years, beginning as a deputy patrol officer and working his way through the ranks. He has a high school diploma and no college education. He is 49 and has held his current position for the previous two years. When assuming the sheriff's position, he made very few changes to the department and did not plan to make any future changes since he believed it to be operating well. Sheriff Beasley gets along well with the city council, city police chief, the media, and the mayor. Community members have been supportive of the department, and everyone appears to be doing what is expected. Turnover and complaints within and about the department have been low.

Patowonk County is situated along Interstate 55 between St. Louis, Missouri, and Memphis, Tennessee. Although the interstate has not contributed to problems in Patowonk County in previous years, there has been an increase in drug arrests for transportation and distribution by federal agencies operating in the area. Most of the arrests have not involved citizens of Patowonk County and have not garnered media or citizen attention.

In July of 2008, an 85-mph high-speed chase of three individuals transporting 30 pounds of cocaine through Patowonk County to the border of Illinois led to the death of two persons and the injury of four others.

(Continued)
Steven Scott, 21 years of age, was driving a 1998 Jeep Grand Cherokee through downtown Macon, the county seat, when he failed to yield to oncoming traffic at an intersection. A deputy police officer, John Sims, witnessed the incident and attempted to stop the Jeep at the intersection of Franklin and Meadowbrook. The Jeep fled, reaching speeds of up to 85 mph within city limits. The chase lasted 4 minutes.

Scott went west on Fountain Street and made a sharp left turn at Macon High School. Students were exiting the school for the day and there was considerable foot and vehicle traffic in the parking lot of the school. The Jeep hit a book depository for the library, went airborne and struck two students and a vehicle parked in the handicap parking area for the building.

One of the students, Amanda Ben, struck by the Jeep on the school parking lot, was killed instantly. The other student struck by the Jeep, Susan Knight, recovered, but required extensive reconstructive surgery and hospitalization. A third student, Jack Harris, who was getting into a vehicle parked in the handicap parking area, was hospitalized briefly and fully recovered from non-life-threatening injuries. Steven Scott received minor injuries in the crash. A teenage passenger in the Jeep, whose name was withheld from the media, was thrown from the vehicle and died at the scene of the accident. A second passenger in the vehicle, Michael Lane, received several broken bones as a result of the crash. Deputy Sims' vehicle did not strike any pedestrians or vehicles in the parking lot. Deputy Sims was unharmed in the accident.

Although the suspects in the high-speed chase cannot sue the police department, the parents of Ben are suing for wrongful death of their daughter. They allege that the deputy should have ceased the chase once the Jeep turned toward the school. In their argument, continued pursuit of the Jeep led to Scott increasing speed and driving recklessly through school pedestrian traffic, causing the unnecessary death of Ben and injuries to Harris and Knight. The families of Harris and Knight have filed separate suits for medical expenses incurred as a result of the accident. Each has named the Patowonk County Sheriff's Department, Sheriff Beasley, several supervising officers, and Deputy Sims as defendants in the lawsuits.

Police departments have differing standards governing high-speed chases of vehicles because of the potential dangers associated with excessive speeds. In some jurisdictions, high-speed chases are discouraged and are only used as a last resort. A high-speed chase is considered a form of deadly force and has resulted in the injury and death of many offenders as well as innocent motorists and pedestrians. Patowonk County Sheriff's Department's policy on high-speed chases mirrored the requirements of the U.S. Supreme Court, which states that to use deadly force, an officer must show that a suspect poses a significant threat of death or serious injury to the officer or others.

Questions for Discussion

1. Should police officers pursue, at high speeds, motorists that violate traffic laws? Is the Patowonk County Sheriff's Department's policy on high-speed chases thorough enough? If so, why do you think that? If not, what would you add to the policy?

2. Is the Patowonk County Sheriff's Department responsible for the death of Amanda Ben and/or the injuries of Knight and Harris? Is Deputy Sims? Is Sheriff Beasley? Why or why not? Would you place responsibility on another person(s)? If so, who and why? Who can be considered the
"management" in this situation? Who is the line staff? Is the "management" responsible for what occurred, or is the line staff?

3. Does the police department involved or the officer involved need additional training in high-speed pursuit situations?

4. In your opinion, did leadership fail in this occurrence and if so, how? What was the service that was being offered in this case? Was the service successful or unsuccessful? Why?
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