Organization design and management practices have transformed over time in response to changes in society. New organizations emerge when fresh needs are discovered or new technologies are available. Alternatively, organizations die or are transformed when the needs satisfied by them no longer exist or have been replaced by other needs (Katz & Kahn, 1966; Mitroff, Mason, & Pearson, 1994). Organizational theory is a way to examine and analyze organizations more precisely and intensely based on patterns and trends in organizational design and behavior, which otherwise may not have been done (Daft, 2001). The purpose of this chapter is to explore the nature of organizations and organizational theory. Scholars have provided various models to characterize organizations in order to view them more scientifically. These models become the basis for explanations of organizational events, and they can be broadly classified as closed systems or open systems depending on their starting presumption (Thompson, 1967). The closed-system models tend to focus on internal
events when explaining organizational actions and behavior, while open-system models focus on events occurring external to the organization that influence changes within the organization. A systems view considers an organization as a set of interacting functions that acquire inputs from the environment, process them, and then release the outputs back to the external environment (Daft, 2001). At the outset, it needs to be clarified that the words model and theory will be used interchangeably in this chapter, though at a more subtle level it could be argued that they have fine differences in their implications.

The rest of the chapter is loosely divided into three sections. The first provides a discussion on the closed-system models, where the three main subfields of the classical perspective are presented—namely, scientific management, administrative management, and bureaucratic management. Within each subfield, the advantages and disadvantages in managing the criminal justice system are examined. In the second section, the open-system models are reported, where the humanistic and behavioral perspectives are introduced. This section provides a discussion on the total quality management model and the supply chain/synergy model, which introduces a new concept of including the customer’s perspective in designing open systems. Within each model, the advantages and disadvantages in managing the criminal justice system are examined. The third section examines the changing face of the criminal justice system, making a strong argument for building learning organizations. Such organizations, which are more effective and better suited to the criminal justice system, can only be developed on the foundations of an open system.

**Closed-System Models: The Classical Perspective**

Closed-system models consider the external environment (technological advancements, the cultural and demographic characteristics of the community, legal decisions, political decisions, etc.—described in detail in Chapter 4) to be stable and predictable, and they assume that it does not intervene in or cause problems for the functioning of an organization. Therefore, the closed-system models do not depend on the external environment for explanations or solutions to managerial issues; instead, they are enclosed and sealed off from the outside world (Daft, 2001). These models rely primarily on internal organizational processes and dynamics to account for organizational, group, and individual behaviors. The central management objective addressed in these models is the efficient running of the organization. Closed systems are easier to deal with theoretically than open systems, and are preferred, despite their limitations. For example, if abuse of prisoners took place in a certain prison, a closed-system approach would look for explanations for the abuse within the prison itself, and then adopt correctional procedures. The prison would examine the prison policies, prison warden, correctional officers, prison culture, officer–inmate interaction, inmate–inmate interaction, and other organizational components of the prison. It would not pay attention to the external environment to identify the causes of the problems. In other words, the external environment would not be blamed for the abuse. The prison and its officials would assume that something within the facility led to these issues.
The closed-system models, some of which may seem unrealistic in the present circumstances, were the products of the problems and subsequent changes that emerged during the Industrial Revolution. At the beginning of industrialization in the mid-1800s, the early factories were highly inefficient. There were no documented correct ways of doing work. Organizations were constantly thinking of ways to design and manage work to increase productivity, with the focus primarily being internal. The theories and models that emerged as a result are often termed machine models, also popularly known as classical models or traditional models. These models sought to make organizations run like efficient, well-oiled machines by correcting the internal functioning of the organizations.

The three main subfields of the classical perspective are scientific management, administrative management, and bureaucratic management. As will be examined, scientific management focuses on the productivity of the individual worker, administrative management focuses on the functions of the management, and bureaucratic management focuses on the overall organizational system within which the workers and management interact. Though each subfield has a somewhat different focus, nevertheless they contain some overlapping elements and components. All of these models assume that people are rational beings, who act logically and correctly when faced by a given situation. In other words, these models assume that labor is homogeneous, and that workers behave and act the same way every time they face a similar situation. According to these models, the correctional officer, the police officer, and the jury will all behave the same way when presented with similar situations at different times and in different places.

**Scientific Management**

In scientific management, the focus was on improving individual productivity. *Frederick Winslow Taylor* (1856–1915), the father of scientific management, believed that poor management practices and procedures were the primary problems. While employed at Midvale Steel Company in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, he began experimenting with methods that focused on the worker–machine relationship in manufacturing plants. Based on his observations, he formulated opinions in the areas of task performance, supervision, and motivation that are discussed below (Locke, 1982; Taylor, 1911).

**Task performance:** Taylor (1911) was convinced that decisions about organizations and job design should be based on precise, scientific study of individual situations. He believed that there was one right way of doing each task, and he attempted to define and document those optimal procedures through systematic study. Taylor calculated that with correct movements, tools, and sequencing, each man was capable of loading 47.5 tons of steel per day instead of the typical 12.5 tons, and Midvale Steel would be able to reduce the number of shovelers needed from 600 to 140.

These types of observations are examples of *time and motion studies*, which identify and measure a worker’s physical movements and record the time of activity to
determine how to do an activity through the least amount of effort. To implement these scientific principles, it was expected that management would do the following:

- Develop standard procedures for performing each job
- Select workers with appropriate abilities and skills to do each job
- Train workers in the standard procedures
- Support workers through careful planning of their work

**Supervision:** Taylor felt that a single supervisor could not be an expert at all of the tasks on the shop floor. Since the supervisor had been promoted after demonstrating high skills in performing a particular function, he or she should be considered an authority only in that area of expertise. Therefore, each first-level supervisor—called *foremen* on the shop floor of a manufacturing plant—should be responsible only for workers who performed a common function familiar to the supervisor. Several of these supervisors would be assigned to each work area, with each having separate responsibility for planning, production scheduling, time and motion studies, material handling, and so forth in his or her area of expertise.

**Motivation:** Taylor believed that workers could be motivated to work at their fullest capabilities through monetary incentives. Therefore, he advocated a piecework system, in which the workers’ pay was tied to their output. Workers who met a standard level of production were paid a standard wage rate; higher rates were paid for higher production. He also worked out an incentive system that paid each employee $1.85 per day for meeting the new standard, an increase from the previous rate of $1.15. Productivity at Midvale steel shot up overnight.

Besides Taylor’s contribution to scientific management, the husband and wife team of Frank and Lillian Gilbreth also made significant contributions to the field. Frank Gilbreth specialized in time and motion studies (Gilbreth, 1923/1970; Locke, 1982). He identified the most efficient ways to perform tasks in 17 work elements (such as lifting, grasping, hammering, etc.) and called them *therbligs*. In one of his studies, he used motion picture film to record and examine the work of bricklayers; he then restructured the tasks in a way that reduced the number of motions from 18 to 5, resulting in a 200% productivity increase (Lewis, Goodman, & Fandt, 2001). Lillian Gilbreth focused on the human aspects of industrial engineering for improving efficiency and productivity. She favored standard days, safer working conditions, scheduled lunch breaks and rest periods, and abolition of child labor.

Contemporary industrial engineers still use time and motion studies and the principles of scientific management to design jobs for greatest efficiency. These methods are also employed in sports. Coaches take their players through hours of videotapes along with commentary on how to perform an action correctly with the least amount of energy and maximum effect. The positions the players are recruited to play have been carefully matched to individual strengths. In law enforcement, the principles of scientific management are greatly emphasized when designing physical strength–building routines and in training officers to deal with uncooperative or dangerous situations.
offenders. Hours of videotapes are used to train law enforcement officers in physically handling uncooperative offenders and in the use of force. Every move is carefully planned and simulated by law enforcement officers using task performance and the time and motion studies.

Where criminal justice sometimes fails is in correctly applying the scientific management propositions in administration. Supervisors are considered an authority in their area of proficiency; however in criminal justice, they are often also considered an authority in other areas where they may or may not have experience. Such an attitude of presumed expertise by the supervisor is a growing problem as the field is becoming more and more specialized. In line with the argument presented by Taylor, rising specialization can be better handled by requiring several different supervisors to work as a team. Each team member may have separate responsibility for planning, training, and so forth in his or her area of expertise, which will result in better preparedness of the officers being supervised and in good-quality service.

The strongest criticism that comes against scientific management involves the treatment of the worker as a machine. It is hard to imagine that workers, who have emotions, unlike machines, would always act in a predictable way like machines. For example, two law enforcement officers will not act the same way in dealing with a similar situation; in fact, the same law enforcement officer will not deal in exactly the same way when confronted with a similar situation every time. This difference in action will emerge despite the best of training given to the officers. An officer called to the mall for a juvenile shoplifting incident may not make an arrest the first time he or she responds to the scene. However, upon a second response, the officer may take custody of the juvenile and transport the child to the police station. In both instances, the amount of property stolen may be the same, but the officer makes a different decision.

A second criticism brought forth against Taylor and Gilbreth’s research is their consideration that workers are hired for their physical ability and not for using their mind. Their work establishes that the role of management is to maintain stability and efficiency, with top managers doing the thinking and workers doing what they are told. As mentioned in Chapter 1, innovative or creative thinking is not always a valued characteristic in criminal justice. One would assume that such an assumption would be insulting to any worker in any given organization, but it is at times a reality in criminal justice. In law enforcement, officers are faced with numerous situations that they may be experiencing for the first time, in which they have to react immediately before the situation become a catastrophe. Given such demands, it is hard to envision managing the criminal justice system effectively by having first-line officers always referring back to their senior officers for directions; however, this is close to what occurs. Law enforcement has tried to implement this approach by creating policy manuals that cover just about any action and situation an officer will come into contact with. Consequently, officers are limited, in many cases, in their responses to everyday calls for service. It is not uncommon for officers to spend the first or second 8-hour day of their training with an agency doing nothing but reading the policy manual.
Administrative Management

Scientific management was focused primarily on the technical core; that is, the work performed on the shop floor by the frontline workers. In contrast, administrative management focuses on managers and the functions they perform. Henri Fayol (1841–1925), a French mining engineer, gained popularity when he revitalized a struggling mining company and turned it into a financial success. Based on this successful experience, he identified management functions as planning, organizing, commanding/leading, coordinating, and controlling. He proposed 14 general principles of management, which formed the foundation for modern practice and organizational design (Fayol, 1949), and are discussed below.

Fayol’s General Principles of Management

1. **Division of work.** Efficiency and productivity could be improved by dividing the work into smaller work elements called tasks and assigning them to the workers. High repetition of tasks improves the learning, thus increasing the efficiency and productivity of employees.

2. **Authority.** To carry out managerial responsibilities, the managers should have the authority to issue commands to their staff.

3. **Discipline.** The staff should be disciplined to obey the issued commands and the rules of the organization for its smooth functioning.

4. **Unity of command.** Each worker should get orders from one boss to whom he or she reports. This clear line of command will avoid conflicts and confusion.

5. **Unity of direction.** All similar and related activities should be organized and directed under one manager. Such an arrangement will also facilitate unity of command.

6. **Subordination of individual interest to the general interest.** The goals of the organization should supersede the interests of individual employees.

7. **Remuneration of personnel.** The financial compensation for the work done should be based on the principle of fairness to both the employees and the organization.

8. **Centralization.** Power and authority should be concentrated at upper levels of the organization. However, the middle management and their subordinates should be given sufficient authority to perform their jobs properly.

9. **Scalar chain.** A single continuous line of authority should extend from the top level to the lowest frontline worker in the organization.

10. **Order.** An organization should provide a work environment where the policies, rules, instructions, and so forth are clear and easily understood, resulting in both material and social order. Worker productivity improves when the system ensures that materials are in the right place at the right time, and the right workers are assigned to the jobs best suited to their skills.

11. **Equity.** Management should display equity, fairness, and a sense of justice toward subordinates.
12. Stability of personnel tenure. Employees learn with experience, making them more productive and efficient with tenure and job security. Therefore, employee turnover should be prevented as far as possible.

13. Initiative. The general work environment should provide the subordinates sufficient freedom to take initiative in carrying out their day-to-day work.

14. Esprit de corps. Management should foster worker morale, team spirit, and harmony among workers to create a sense of organizational unity.

Many of the principles proposed by Fayol, such as division of work, authority and responsibility, unity of direction, remuneration of personnel, and order (Fayol, 1949), are compatible with the views of scientific management and apply well to the criminal justice system. Fayol favors division of labor, a principle that is implemented in criminal justice agencies. There are line personnel (police officers, correctional officers, probation officers, juvenile officers) who are frontline workers implementing the organizational goals and objectives. Specialized staff work behind the scenes, supporting the frontline officers by providing advice in such areas as planning, research, legal issues, and so forth. Auxiliary functions provide logistical support, including record keeping, communications, operations, map directions, coordination, and so on (Wren, 1994). Specialization and division of labor bring efficiency by focusing on understanding the law and mastering the technicalities of work. Specialization allows workers to develop greater expertise, thus enabling them to perform the work more efficiently. Fayol also favors centralization of power and authority at upper levels of the organization.

Furthermore, Fayol (1949) proposes subordination of individual interests to the goals of the organization. Such centralized authority is observed in policing and corrections. Most decisions are vested in the hands of the administration and are delivered from the top down. Work is often designed and assigned to criminal justice officers with efficiency and productivity in mind. Authority resides with the supervisors to enable them to give orders and get the work done. There is strict discipline, making it essential that members of the criminal justice system respect the rules that govern it. There is unity of command, unity of direction, and adherence to the uninterrupted chain of authority in law enforcement, corrections, courts, and security agencies. There is also a lot of emphasis placed on equipment being well maintained and put in the right place to be available at the right time—since numerous situations that arise in criminal justice require very fast response times.

Mismanagement of Fayol’s organizational elements can lead to breakdown and disorganization (Dias & Vaughn, 2006; Wren, 1994). For example, when unity of direction is not strictly adhered to, the criminal justice system fails. Dias and Vaughn cite the example of administrative breakdown during the riots of May 1992 in Los Angeles after the acquittal of the police officers who were charged with the beating of Rodney King. It was reported that no specific senior officer of the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) could be identified from whom the frontline officers were to receive orders or to whom they were to report (Police Foundation, 1992). Similarly, the abuses at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq were attributed to the unclear dissemination of procedures,
goals, and objectives, which resulted from conflicting directions that soldiers got from multiple senior officers. There was a lack of unity of command that led to administrative failure (Hersh, 2004).

Though Fayol’s (1949) managerial functions of planning, organizing, leading, and controlling are routinely used in criminal justice agencies, some of the principles are not compatible with those of contemporary management. For example, centralization of power and authority at upper levels of the organization is not considered to be a favored practice. Instead, modern management principles allow frontline workers more autonomy and authority for making and carrying out decisions. Modern management places much more emphasis on good training that will enable the officers to make appropriate decisions rather than always reverting back to the centralized power hub to get directions. Training improves officers’ skills, making them more aware of the demands of the environment in which they are working, and thus enabling them to provide superior service to all of their customers (i.e., citizens, clients, offenders, arrestees, detainees, etc.). By definition, anybody to whom an agency provides a professional service is the customer. Contemporary management views employees as valuable assets whose interests must be considered at all times (Lewis et al., 2001).

**Bureaucratic Management**

Whereas scientific management focuses on the productivity of the individual worker, and administrative management focuses on the functions of the manager, bureaucratic management focuses on the overall organizational system in which both the workers and the managers interact. The *bureaucratic model* was developed by Max Weber (1947), and it emphasizes designing and managing organizations based on five principles:

1. **Impersonal social relations.** Weber did not favor employees relating on a social basis in the workplace. He felt such interactions led to nepotism (favoritism based on social connections), which compromised productivity and efficiency. Therefore, he said that organizations should operate according to laws, which would eliminate such favoritism. According to him, performance should be the sole measure of performance. He emphasized distance between supervisors and workers and felt there was no place for emotions in rule enforcement. Maintaining personal distance was considered a strong defense against the potential loss of power in the event a supervisor was required to reprimand the subordinate. In application to criminal justice, correctional officers in prisons are trained to maintain social distance with the inmates to prevent a loss of control and to heighten their ability to reprimand inmates.

2. **Employee selection and promotion.** Weber emphasized that employees should be selected based on their skills and technical competence, and they should be promoted based on performance and not on whom they know. He felt that nepotism had no place in a bureaucratic setup. Though that may be true for most big organizations, there is still nepotism in personnel policies of smaller organizations, including law-enforcing agencies.
3. *Hierarchy of authority and spheres of competence.* According to Weber, within an organization, job positions should be ranked according to the amount of power and authority each possesses. In the resulting pyramid-shaped hierarchical structure, power and authority increase as the levels get higher, and each lower-level position is under the direct control of one higher-level position. Weber believed that authority and responsibility should rest in a position and not be based on who is holding that position. For example, if the written rules state certain expectations of duties from a supervisor, then these obligations cannot change when different individuals hold that same supervisory job. Adapting this Weberian tenet to law enforcement, there is continuous innovation in designing new aptitude-assessing tools followed by more rigorous and creative training methods. More thorough background checks and better oral tests are also being employed for screening purposes. An emphasis on professionalism and community policing is encouraging autonomy among police officers. Various law-enforcing agencies have raised their requirements for recruitment and promotions to improve the sphere of competence in their officers. Nationally, more police departments are requiring college credits for hiring and college degrees for promotions (McFall, 2006). Hiring and promotions are not always based on education. Police officers in most states are not required to have a bachelor’s degree to begin with. A high school diploma or GED is sufficient. As a result of increased professionalism, some departments are implementing promotion standards that include degree requirements; although, it is not standard throughout the United States. In areas requiring degrees, the advanced degree weighs into the promotion process.

4. *System of rules and procedures.* Weber emphasized the need to provide clear formal rules and guidelines for performing all organizational duties, to which employees must strictly adhere. He believed that provision of a comprehensive set of rules and procedures enabled people to make decisions that are more objective, without allowing their personal judgments to interfere. Moreover, rules and procedures help maintain continuity when people retire or leave. Such a system will not be sensitive to people leaving because the formal rules, structure, and written records allow the organization to continue to operate as it had in the past.

Organizations at national, state, and local levels (such as the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Police Executive Research Forum, the National Sheriffs’ Association, and the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives) have invested much time and effort in writing standards and rules by which to regulate employee behavior in law enforcement agencies. Although there are no national mandates on police departments, outside of laws, there is an accrediting body called the Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies, that works with departments to standardize rules and expectations for employees. In this way, a police department seeking accreditation can better identify hiring, promotion, evaluation, and supervision standards while clarifying standards upon which agency and individual performance can be measured. Not every department is accredited (an issue that is also discussed in Chapter 9), but all departments set minimum standards and policies for their officers. In some cases, the standards for hiring and supervision may also come from the state and federal levels, depending on whether the officer works for a...
state or federal agency. For example, in Illinois, police departments face mandates on the reporting of offenses charged against police officers, on newly hired police officers, and on weapons and training requirements. According to the mandates, a new police officer must complete the Law Enforcement Basic Training Course within the first 6 months of hire, sheriffs and deputy sheriffs must complete 20 training hours per calendar year, and all law enforcement officers must complete the Mandatory Firearms Training Course and requalify annually in firearms training. Agencies must report to the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board (2008) any arrest or conviction of a law enforcement officer.

5. Task specialization. Weber believed that task specialization provides greater efficiency. He emphasized that the duties should be divided into simpler, more specialized tasks to enable an organization to use its workers more efficiently. Such division of work leads to less interference, and allocates responsibility with each job. Task specialization is used today in all criminal justice agencies. In policing, for example, officers may be assigned to units such as community policing, juvenile divisions, homicide divisions, special victims divisions, or detectives units. Probation officers are trained to work with specific types of offenders. They may work with those offenders on low-risk probation in which the offender is referred to many treatment and rehabilitation programs and the probation officer is simply a liaison and coordinator for the offender. Other probation officers may work specifically with unique populations of offenders such as those on electronic monitoring, those placed inside facilities such as boot camps or drug rehabilitation centers, or sexual offenders. In either case, the employees are able to work more efficiently since they are responsible for just one part of the overall agency’s population.

The advantages of Weber’s bureaucratic principles include the following:

- Productivity is increased by matching personal competence with job requirements.
- Efficiency is enhanced through the adoption of task specialization. Furthermore, employees are selected and promoted based on their skills and competence, which ensures the best available person for the job.
- Duplication of work is eliminated by strictly allocating designated spheres of work activity to individuals, thus creating clear lines of control.
- With the given procedures and rules, each employee can predict the effort required to earn rewards, and is more clear on the career progress path, which results in greater loyalty.
- Rules and procedures eliminate impartiality, and allow greater standardization and continuity through easy replacement of employees.

The bureaucratic model can best be applied in a very structured work environment characterized by a well-defined chain of command, a rigid hierarchy, and strict formal rules. These conditions are best adapted to a system providing standardized services. However, there are a number of criticisms against the bureaucratic and machine models when applied to the criminal justice system, where every encounter is different.
As mentioned before, machines do not have feelings like human beings and can provide the same outcome when operating under similar conditions. However, human beings have emotions that can change during interactions with other human beings, even when the conditions may be the same as in other encounters. Since criminal justice services are highly labor-intensive and involve a high degree of contact between the officer and the other person (i.e., offender, victim, citizen, complainant, etc.), there is a significant scope of human emotions and feelings surfacing during decision making, which may lead to different outcomes even under similar conditions. Consequently, principles of Weber’s management model that are embedded in the unrealistic assumption of treating people as machines have limitations when applied to the criminal justice system. According to the machine and bureaucratic models, given procedures and rules, anyone can take the supervisory role effectively. However, as will be discussed in Chapter 7, personality traits of individuals can confound their leadership abilities and can introduce inconsistency between what they are supposed to do and what they actually do.

One can see the impact of human emotions and feelings play out in the courtroom. Judges working in juvenile court often adopt parent figure or lawgiver roles when listening to cases and determining what is in the best interest of the juvenile. Judges acting as parent figures are most concerned with the overall well-being of the youth and less concerned about the formalities of due process in the court and the courtroom. In this case, the judge may allow for the youth or the youth’s family to present information and to show remorse. Once that occurs, the judge weighs the information and emotion in the final determination of adjudication and disposition. Instead of a standard punishment, the judge may provide continuances so that a resolution outside of court can be determined, or the judge may place the child on supervision for an undetermined amount of time while problems are resolved. Lawgiver judges are just the opposite. These judges are primarily concerned with procedural requirements. This type of judge holds the child’s total well-being and personality to be less important than due process. Even if the child is in need of care and rehabilitation, the judge may dismiss a case if the prosecutor cannot prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the youth committed the act alleged in the petition. Treatment or identification of problems in the child’s life is secondary to statutory requirements. The personalities of both types of judges influence how they function in the courtroom (Cox, Allen, Conrad, & Hanser, 2008). So it is hard to imagine comprehensive coverage of all situations by extensive rules and procedures.

Often, situations will emerge that are fuzzy and are not clearly under the command of any single department. This phenomenon is truer for service industries where new situations emerge all the time that had not been thought of by the management. Especially in criminal justice, unique situations emerge constantly and require a lot of innovativeness to address. The same set of rules cannot be enforced in the exact same fashion in all situations. In juvenile justice, some detention centers operate under a policy that forces youth who commit felony offenses to remain in detention for a minimum period of time. Although this provides ammunition for increased funding at the end of the budget year, it is not always feasible, nor is it necessary, to hold every felony
offender in detention. Incarceration is supposed to be reserved for those who pose the most threat to society. If one looks at shoplifting statutes, for example, a child who steals an HDTV from a retail store in Missouri can be charged with a felony offense if the television is worth over $500 (Missouri Revised Statutes, 2007). A person must ask if this child is really a threat to society. Does this child really belong in detention with others who might have committed much more serious offenses such as robbery, rape, and so forth? In this case, a generalized rule regarding detention of youth may not be appropriate for all.

Rulification, emphasizing the rules and policies of the organization that best meets the needs of every situation, consistent with Weber’s principles of management, is impossible in the criminal justice system. Rulification gives rise to bureaucratic red tape, a term often used for strict adherence to procedures and rules. Bureaucratic red-tapism works against organizational innovativeness and progress, leading to a sharp decline in service quality. Strict adherence to procedures and rules and an unwieldy chain of command in a bureaucratic structure slows the pace of change, adversely influencing flexibility and innovativeness. Everything has to be done in accordance with the rules, with no place for innovative approaches to deal with new situations that are emerging from changes in the environment (discussed in detail in Chapter 4). Nowhere is this seen more obviously than in the war on drugs. Policies have been enacted to control drug distribution and manufacturing. The United States has spent billions of dollars fighting the war on drugs, only to see a drug raid occur one hour and the drug market flourishing in the same neighborhood within the next hour. Statutes require the incarceration of drug offenders even though other approaches to preventing continued drug involvement may be more effective. Little creative thought is entertained in this approach to crime control.

Furthermore, due to strict vertical lines of command and multiple layers of hierarchy, bureaucratic structures stifle communication, often giving rise to the grapevine. This informal communication may not provide entirely true information, but it becomes a powerful source of filling the void created by formal communication. It may also give rise to informal leaders, who can interfere with the authority of the formal leaders and adversely affect the employees’ attitude toward their work. Consequently, the formal leaders may face difficulty in enforcing procedures and rules. Therefore, criminal justice agencies must pay special attention to combat the negative influence of grapevines through innovative structural changes. For example, detention centers often use linking pins, or individuals who convey information from one shift to another, thus maintaining continuity. In one detention center familiar to the authors, one employee was hired to work 4 hours of his shift with the day staff and 4 hours with the evening staff. He was able to provide informal information from one shift to the other. Since he was the only employee in this position, the organization held him accountable for the information shared. In other words, there was a single, identifiable source for informal communications between the two shifts. This was beneficial for both the employees and the agency because formal and informal communication could be passed in a somewhat controlled manner.

Another tenet of Weber’s (1947) theory is specialization of tasks, which brings efficiency. However, it is now seen that specialization up to a point improves efficiency, but
then it acts detrimentally to the very same cause. As employees get more and more specialized, they start losing perspective on the full picture of the organization and they start working in silos. These workers lose flexibility to accommodate any variability in a situation that does not fit into their rigid job definitions. An accompanying implication of specialization is the resistance to change. Furthermore, too much specialization promotes suboptimal utilization of resources, adversely impacting organizational capacity. For example, visiting a bank that operates on specialization, one will typically find long lines in front of some customer service representatives and no work for others. This is due to the nature of customer needs, which are not equally divided on any given day among all employees specializing in different areas. This bank obviously is unable to fully utilize all of its employees, some being overworked and some having very little work. On the other hand, another bank where the employees are cross-trained will be better able to fully utilize all of its personnel. In this bank, customers with different needs can stand in any line and can be served by any customer service representative, thus leading to almost equal lines in front of all employees. Similarly, in law enforcement there should be some amount of specialization, which should be integrated with cross-training for officers to handle a broad spectrum of functions.

The bureaucratic and machine models do not give much attention to the interdependence between various subsystems of an organization. Instead, they promote specialization that breeds the departmentalization mentality, where the department becomes more important than the organization. This isolation defeats the overall efficiency of the organization because departmental excellence supersedes the organizational goals. For example, consider a travel department in an organization that flies the sales associates for business purposes on red-eye flights. The express objective is to curb travel costs, an important measure used to evaluate the performance of the travel department. However, the sales associates complain that they are very tired and unproductive the next day after having traveled the previous night. Consequently, they cannot procure much business for the organization, the very objective for which they traveled. In this example, interdependence between the two subsystems (travel and marketing) has been ignored, and the travel department’s performance goals have superseded the organizational performance goals.

Although there is the positive argument that specialization brings ownership, ownership can cause agendas to shift (Braiden, 1992) and personal interests to become more important than organizational interests. If one was to look at the organizational chart of a police department today, one would notice that there are many more divisions than there were 30 years ago. There are traffic, drugs, vice, fraud, crime prevention, juvenile, homicide, special victims, and detective divisions, and the list goes on and on. It is easy for detectives from several of the divisions to work cases involving the same suspects, yet not collaborate because their specialties keep them from doing so (Braiden, 1992). Although this may be efficient in solving a particular incident, it is not efficient for the overall accomplishment of the goal of law enforcement or to provide high customer satisfaction.

According to the Weberian principles, employees have to fit a role definition stated in rules and procedures. Individual creativity has no place in a bureaucratic structure. This inflexibility is in direct conflict with the changing face of modern organizations.
In today’s organizations, managers are required to display greater creativity and innovation to make decisions that solve problems as they work toward achieving the organization’s goals. Employee creativity and innovativeness is of special significance in service industries, where customers desire customization to their specific needs. Failing to allow frontline officers to voice concerns or adopt productive approaches to solving the problems they face is a recipe for disaster. What this produces is a demoralized officer who checks out of the job by doing only what is minimally required to get by and to stay out of trouble. In an article on the demoralization of employees, Braiden (1992) states,

They are the inevitable product of the drudgery of routine labor that ultimately dulls the brain and saps the spirit. . . . Sadly, bright people literally chain their brain at the gate coming in, function through their shift, and pick it up again on the way out. We go out of our way to hire the brightest people we can find, and then we teach them to follow orders like soldiers. (p. 96)

This is clearly a part of the bureaucratic mind-set of controlling and managing each aspect of the employee’s day. Breaking tasks into the smallest pieces possible is key in a bureaucracy to allow for accountability, efficiency, and standardization of tasks, even though it may not be the best way to handle the job at hand. Despite the several negative characteristics, bureaucracy remains the dominant model within criminal justice organizations (although it can be argued that community policing initiatives have worked to change this approach). Consequently, there is great reluctance within the criminal justice system to open up and accommodate changes to meet the shifting needs of the society whom it serves.

**Career Highlight Box: Police and Detectives**

**Nature of the Work**

People depend on police officers and detectives to protect their lives and property. Law enforcement officers, some of whom are State or Federal special agents or inspectors, perform these duties in a variety of ways depending on the size and type of their organization. In most jurisdictions, they are expected to exercise authority when necessary, whether on or off duty.

Police and detectives pursue and apprehend individuals who break the law and then issue citations or give warnings. A large proportion of their time is spent writing reports and maintaining records of incidents they encounter. Most police officers patrol their jurisdictions and investigate any suspicious activity they notice. Detectives, who are often called agents or special agents, perform investigative duties such as gathering facts and collecting evidence.

The daily activities of police and detectives differ depending on their occupational specialty—such as police officer, game warden, or detective—and whether they are working for a local, State, or Federal agency. Duties also differ substantially among various Federal agencies, which enforce
different aspects of the law. Regardless of job duties or location, police officers and detectives at all levels must write reports and maintain meticulous records that will be needed if they testify in court.

Uniformed police officers have general law enforcement duties, including maintaining regular patrols and responding to calls for service. Much of their time is spent responding to calls and doing paperwork. They may direct traffic at the scene of an accident, investigate a burglary, or give first aid to an accident victim. In large police departments, officers usually are assigned to a specific type of duty. Many urban police agencies are involved in community policing—a practice in which an officer builds relationships with the citizens of local neighborhoods and mobilizes the public to help fight crime.

Police agencies are usually organized into geographic districts, with uniformed officers assigned to patrol a specific area such as part of the business district or outlying residential neighborhoods. Officers may work alone, but in large agencies, they often patrol with a partner. While on patrol, officers attempt to become thoroughly familiar with their patrol area and remain alert for anything unusual. Suspicious circumstances and hazards to public safety are investigated or noted, and officers are dispatched to individual calls for assistance within their district. During their shift, they may identify, pursue, and arrest suspected criminals; resolve problems within the community; and enforce traffic laws.

Some agencies have special geographic jurisdictions and enforcement responsibilities. Public college and university police forces, public school district police, and agencies serving transportation systems and facilities are examples. Most law enforcement workers in special agencies are uniformed officers; a smaller number are investigators.

Some police officers specialize in a particular field, such as chemical and microscopic analysis, training and firearms instruction, or handwriting and fingerprint identification. Others work with special units, such as horseback, bicycle, motorcycle, or harbor patrol; canine corps; special weapons and tactics (SWAT); or emergency response teams. A few local and special law enforcement officers primarily perform jail-related duties or work in courts. (For information on other officers who work in jails and prisons, see correctional officers elsewhere in the Handbook.)

Sheriffs and deputy sheriffs enforce the law on the county level. Sheriffs are usually elected to their posts and perform duties similar to those of a local or county police chief. Sheriffs’ departments tend to be relatively small, most having fewer than 50 sworn officers. Deputy sheriffs have law enforcement duties similar to those of officers in urban police departments. Police and sheriffs’ deputies who provide security in city and county courts are sometimes called bailiffs.

State police officers, sometimes called State troopers or highway patrol officers, arrest criminals statewide and patrol highways to enforce motor vehicle laws and regulations. State police officers often issue traffic citations to motorists. At the scene of accidents, they may direct traffic, give first aid, and call for emergency equipment. They also write reports used to determine the cause of the accident. State police officers are frequently called upon to render assistance to other law enforcement agencies, especially those in rural areas or small towns.

State law enforcement agencies operate in every State except Hawaii. Most full-time sworn personnel are uniformed officers who regularly patrol and respond to calls for service. Others work as investigators, perform court-related duties, or carry out administrative or other assignments.
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Detectives are plainclothes investigators who gather facts and collect evidence for criminal cases. Some are assigned to interagency task forces to combat specific types of crime. They conduct interviews, examine records, observe the activities of suspects, and participate in raids or arrests. Detectives and State and Federal agents and inspectors usually specialize in investigating one type of violation, such as homicide or fraud. They are assigned cases on a rotating basis and work on them until an arrest and conviction is made or until the case is dropped.

Fish and game wardens enforce fishing, hunting, and boating laws. They patrol hunting and fishing areas, conduct search and rescue operations, investigate complaints and accidents, and aid in prosecuting court cases.

The Federal Government works in many areas of law enforcement. **Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) agents** are the Government’s principal investigators, responsible for investigating violations of more than 200 categories of Federal law and conducting sensitive national security investigations. Agents may conduct surveillance, monitor court-authorized wiretaps, examine business records, investigate white-collar crime, or participate in sensitive undercover assignments. The FBI investigates a wide range of criminal activity, including organized crime, public corruption, financial crime, bank robbery, kidnapping, terrorism, espionage, drug trafficking, and cyber crime.

There are many other Federal agencies that enforce particular types of laws. **U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) agents** enforce laws and regulations relating to illegal drugs. **U.S. marshals and deputy marshals** protect the Federal courts and ensure the effective operation of the judicial system. **Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives agents** enforce and investigate violations of Federal firearms and explosives laws, as well as Federal alcohol and tobacco tax regulations. The **U.S. Department of State Bureau of Diplomatic Security special agents** are engaged in the battle against terrorism.

The **Department of Homeland Security** also employs numerous law enforcement officers within several different agencies, including Customs and Border Protection, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and the U.S. Secret Service. **U.S. Border Patrol agents** protect more than 8,000 miles of international land and water boundaries. **Immigration inspectors** interview and examine people seeking entrance to the United States and its territories. **Customs inspectors** enforce laws governing imports and exports by inspecting cargo, baggage, and articles worn or carried by people, vessels, vehicles, trains, and aircraft entering or leaving the United States. **Federal Air Marshals** provide air security by guarding against attacks targeting U.S. aircraft, passengers, and crews. **U.S. Secret Service special agents** and **U.S. Secret Service uniformed officers** protect the President, Vice President, their immediate families, and other public officials. Secret Service special agents also investigate counterfeiting, forgery of Government checks or bonds, and fraudulent use of credit cards.

Other Federal agencies employ police and special agents with sworn arrest powers and the authority to carry firearms. These agencies include the Postal Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs Office of Law Enforcement, the Forest Service, and the National Park Service.

**Work environment.** Police and detective work can be very dangerous and stressful. In addition to the obvious dangers of confrontations with criminals, police officers and detectives need to be
constantly alert and ready to deal appropriately with a number of other threatening situations. Many law enforcement officers witness death and suffering resulting from accidents and criminal behavior. A career in law enforcement may take a toll on their private lives.

The jobs of some Federal agents such as U.S. Secret Service and DEA special agents require extensive travel, often on very short notice. They may relocate a number of times over the course of their careers. Some special agents in agencies such as the U.S. Border Patrol work outdoors in rugged terrain for long periods and in all kinds of weather.

Uniformed officers, detectives, agents, and inspectors are usually scheduled to work 40-hour weeks, but paid overtime is common. Shift work is necessary because protection must be provided around the clock. Junior officers frequently work weekends, holidays, and nights. Police officers and detectives are required to work whenever they are needed and may work long hours during investigations. Officers in most jurisdictions, whether on or off duty, are expected to be armed and to exercise their authority when necessary.

Training, Other Qualifications, and Advancement

Most police and detectives learn much of what they need to know on the job, often in their agency’s police academy. Civil service regulations govern the appointment of police and detectives in most states, large municipalities, and special police agencies, as well as in many smaller jurisdictions. Candidates must be U.S. citizens, usually at least 20 years old, and must meet rigorous physical and personal qualifications.

**Education and training.** Applicants usually must have at least a high school education, and some departments require 1 or 2 years of college coursework or, in some cases, a college degree.

Law enforcement agencies encourage applicants to take courses or training related to law enforcement subjects after high school. Many entry-level applicants for police jobs have completed some formal postsecondary education, and a significant number are college graduates. Many junior colleges, colleges, and universities offer programs in law enforcement or administration of justice.

Physical education classes and participating in sports are also helpful in developing the competitiveness, stamina, and agility needed for many law enforcement positions. Knowledge of a foreign language is an asset in many Federal agencies and urban departments.

Many agencies pay all or part of the tuition for officers to work toward degrees in criminal justice, police science, administration of justice, or public administration and pay higher salaries to those who earn such a degree.

Before their first assignments, officers usually go through a period of training. In State and large local police departments, recruits get training in their agency’s police academy, often for 12 to 14 weeks. In small agencies, recruits often attend a regional or State academy. Training includes classroom instruction in constitutional law and civil rights, State laws and local ordinances, and accident investigation. Recruits also receive training and supervised experience in patrol, traffic control, the use of firearms, self-defense, first aid, and emergency response. Police departments in some large cities hire high school graduates who are still in their teens as police cadets or trainees. They do clerical
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work and attend classes, usually for 1 to 2 years, until they reach the minimum age requirement and can be appointed to the regular force.

To be considered for appointment as an FBI agent, an applicant must be a college graduate and have at least 3 years of professional work experience, or have an advanced degree plus 2 years of professional work experience. An applicant who meets these criteria must also have one of the following: a college major in accounting, electrical engineering, information technology, or computer science; fluency in a foreign language; a degree from an accredited law school; or 3 years of related full-time work experience. All new FBI agents undergo 18 weeks of training at the FBI Academy on the U.S. Marine Corps base in Quantico, Virginia.

Most other Federal law enforcement agencies require either a bachelor's degree or related work experience or a combination of the two. Federal law enforcement agents undergo extensive training, usually at the U.S. Marine Corps base in Quantico, Virginia, or the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia. The educational requirements, qualifications, and training information for a particular Federal agency can be found on the agency's Web site.

Fish and game wardens also must meet specific requirements. Most states require at least 2 years of college study. Once hired, fish and game wardens attend a training academy lasting from 3 to 12 months, sometimes followed by further training in the field.

Other qualifications. Civil service regulations govern the appointment of police and detectives in most states, large municipalities, and special police agencies, as well as in many smaller jurisdictions. Candidates must be U.S. citizens, usually at least 20 years old, and must meet rigorous physical and personal qualifications. Physical examinations for entrance into law enforcement often include tests of vision, hearing, strength, and agility. Eligibility for appointment usually depends on performance in competitive written examinations and previous education and experience.

Candidates should enjoy working with people and meeting the public. Because personal characteristics such as honesty, sound judgment, integrity, and a sense of responsibility are especially important in law enforcement, candidates are interviewed by senior officers, and their character traits and backgrounds are investigated. In some agencies, candidates are interviewed by a psychiatrist or a psychologist or given a personality test. Most applicants are subjected to lie detector examinations or drug testing. Some agencies subject sworn personnel to random drug testing as a condition of continuing employment.

Advancement. Police officers usually become eligible for promotion after a probationary period ranging from 6 months to 3 years. In large departments, promotion may enable an officer to become a detective or to specialize in one type of police work, such as working with juveniles. Promotions to corporal, sergeant, lieutenant, and captain usually are made according to a candidate's position on a promotion list, as determined by scores on a written examination and on-the-job performance.

Continuing training helps police officers, detectives, and special agents improve their job performance. Through police department academies, regional centers for public safety employees established by the States, and Federal agency training centers, instructors provide annual training in self-defense tactics, firearms, use-of-force policies, sensitivity and communications skills, crowd-control techniques, relevant legal developments, and advances in law enforcement equipment.
Employment

Police and detectives held about 861,000 jobs in 2006. Seventy-nine percent were employed by local governments. State police agencies employed about 11 percent, and various Federal agencies employed about 7 percent. A small proportion worked for educational services, rail transportation, and contract investigation and security services.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics, police and detectives employed by local governments primarily worked in cities with more than 25,000 inhabitants. Some cities have very large police forces, while thousands of small communities employ fewer than 25 officers each.

Job Outlook

Job opportunities in most local police departments will be excellent for qualified individuals, while competition is expected for jobs in State and Federal agencies. Average employment growth is expected.

Employment change. Employment of police and detectives is expected to grow 11 percent over the 2006–16 decade, about as fast as the average for all occupations. A more security-conscious society and population growth will contribute to the increasing demand for police services.

Job prospects. Overall opportunities in local police departments will be excellent for individuals who meet the psychological, personal, and physical qualifications. In addition to openings from employment growth, many openings will be created by the need to replace workers who retire and those who leave local agencies for Federal jobs and private sector security jobs. There will be more competition for jobs in Federal and State law enforcement agencies than for jobs in local agencies. Less competition for jobs will occur in departments that offer relatively low salaries or those in urban communities where the crime rate is relatively high. Applicants with military experience or college training in police science will have the best opportunities in local and State departments. Applicants with a bachelor's degree and several years of law enforcement or military experience, especially investigative experience, will have the best opportunities in Federal agencies.

The level of government spending determines the level of employment for police and detectives. The number of job opportunities, therefore, can vary from year to year and from place to place. Layoffs, on the other hand, are rare because retirements enable most staffing cuts to be handled through attrition. Trained law enforcement officers who lose their jobs because of budget cuts usually have little difficulty finding jobs with other agencies.

Earnings

Police and sheriff's patrol officers had median annual earnings of $47,460 in May 2006. The middle 50 percent earned between $35,600 and $59,880. The lowest 10 percent earned less than $27,310, and the highest 10 percent earned more than $72,450. Median annual earnings were $43,510 in Federal Government, $52,540 in State government, and $47,190 in local government.
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In May 2006, median annual earnings of police and detective supervisors were $69,310. The middle 50 percent earned between $53,900 and $83,940. The lowest 10 percent earned less than $41,260, and the highest 10 percent earned more than $104,410. Median annual earnings were $85,170 in Federal Government, $68,990 in State government, and $68,670 in local government.

In May 2006, median annual earnings of detectives and criminal investigators were $58,260. The middle 50 percent earned between $43,920 and $76,350. The lowest 10 percent earned less than $34,480, and the highest 10 percent earned more than $92,590. Median annual earnings were $69,510 in Federal Government, $49,370 in State government, and $52,520 in local government.

Federal law provides special salary rates to Federal employees who serve in law enforcement. Additionally, Federal special agents and inspectors receive law enforcement availability pay (LEAP)—equal to 25 percent of the agent’s grade and step—awarded because of the large amount of overtime that these agents are expected to work. For example, in 2007, FBI agents entered Federal service as GS-10 employees on the pay scale at a base salary of $48,159, yet they earned about $60,199 a year with availability pay. They could advance to the GS-13 grade level in field nonsupervisory assignments at a base salary of $75,414, which was worth $94,268 with availability pay. FBI supervisory, management, and executive positions in grades GS-14 and GS-15 paid a base salary of about $89,115 and $104,826 a year, respectively, which amounted to $111,394 or $131,033 per year including availability pay. Salaries were slightly higher in selected areas where the prevailing local pay level was higher. Because Federal agents may be eligible for a special law enforcement benefits package, applicants should ask their recruiter for more information.

Total earnings for local, State, and special police and detectives frequently exceed the stated salary because of payments for overtime, which can be significant.

According to the International City-County Management Association’s annual Police and Fire Personnel, Salaries, and Expenditures Survey, average salaries for sworn full-time positions in 2006 were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Minimum annual base salary</th>
<th>Maximum annual base salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police chief</td>
<td>$78,547</td>
<td>$99,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy chief</td>
<td>68,797</td>
<td>87,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police captain</td>
<td>65,408</td>
<td>81,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police lieutenant</td>
<td>59,940</td>
<td>72,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police sergeant</td>
<td>53,734</td>
<td>63,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police corporal</td>
<td>44,160</td>
<td>55,183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the common benefits—paid vacation, sick leave, and medical and life insurance—most police and sheriffs’ departments provide officers with special allowances for uniforms. Because police officers usually are covered by liberal pension plans, many retire at half-pay after 25 or 30 years of service.

Open-System Models: The Humanistic Perspective

Classical thinkers made significant contributions to the theory and practice of management. However, their theories did not always achieve the desired results because they did not include the behavioral perspective of management. During the early 20th century, the industrialized nations of the world were experiencing social and cultural changes. Their standards of living and working conditions were improving. It was increasingly noted that the actions of management were not necessarily consistent with the ones predicted by the closed-system models. More and more, human behavior was being seen as an important factor in shaping managerial style and worker actions (Daft, 2001).

In 1924, various studies were being performed at Western Electric Company’s plant in Hawthorne, Illinois, trying to understand how different factors would increase productivity (Rieger, 1995; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1956). One such study (Parson, 1974) examined the impact of levels of lighting on productivity. Two groups were formed, the test group was subjected to different levels of light, and the control group was subjected to the same level of light. The results demonstrated that the productivity of the test group went up when the light was increased, when the light remained the same, and when the light decreased; however, the productivity of the control group went up as well, even though the lighting level remained the same. These were rather confusing results.

Elton Mayo, a Harvard professor, was invited with his team to study this phenomenon in greater depth. They found that the increase in productivity was being caused by the human behavior, which they called the Hawthorne effect (Parson, 1974). They explained that workers in both groups perceived that special attention was being given to them within their organization because they were chosen for the study, causing them to develop a sense of pride, which in turn motivated them to improve their performance. The so-called Hawthorne studies also revealed that organizations work as social systems, which promote the formation of informal groups that operate parallel to the formal structure within an organization. These informal groups are formed on the basis of the social relations that members may develop inside and outside of the organization. Mayo believed that work attitudes and sentiments of the members of a group are important motivating factors that determine their productivity. The Hawthorne studies introduced the human element to management thinking that had been missing from the closed-system models. Though the Hawthorne studies were conducted between 1924 and 1933, their influence on management thinking was not felt until the 1950s due to the Great Depression and World War II.

Workers are members of social groups and work organizations, both of which play important roles in shaping worker behaviors and actions. As the workers move back and forth between the workplace and their social groups, they inadvertently bring external influences into the organization in the form of values and behaviors, impacting the internal functioning of an organization. This realization that organizations cannot be isolated from the external environment and should be integrated into the management principles led to the birth of open-system models. These models are embedded in human relations theory, which comprises the research of scholars such as Elton Mayo, Abraham Maslow, and David McGregor (see detailed discussion in Chapter 6). The primary theme of these human relations models favors the designing
of jobs such that the workers are allowed to use their full potential. The four basic characteristics that flow from human relations theory, which differentiate the open-system models from the closed-system models, are as follows:

1. **Individual differences**: Management must recognize that people are different and will react differently to similar situations. Therefore, management must not assume employees to be homogenous when designing and allocating tasks. However, greater standardization among employees can be achieved through good training.

2. **Motivation**: Individuals can be motivated to work toward achieving organizational goals. Therefore, it is essential for the managers to be constantly designing and creating schemes to stimulate the interests and desires of the employees towards planned goals of the organization (see detailed discussion in Chapter 6).

3. **Mutual interest**: Employees have an inherent need to socialize at their work, which drives them to pursue membership in informal groups that have common interests. The management must recognize that these needs cannot be satisfied by formal groups. Therefore, the management must facilitate the formation of informal groups, which brings employees together to pursue common interests. Having a lounge where officers can have lunch or a coffee break, or an in-house gym facility where officers can work out, allows for the creation of informal socialization among those that take advantage of the opportunities.

4. **Human dignity**: Employees like to be treated with respect. Their individuality needs to be respected in order for them to love their job and work toward organizational goals.

In **open-system models**, the principle starting assumption is that the external variables or events play a significant role in explaining what is happening within an organization. Revisiting the example of prisoner abuse that was discussed earlier under the closed-system model, an open-system approach would look for external reasons to explain the problem. Researchers may discover that the problem started 2 years back when the governor visited the state prison. In his speech, the governor mentioned reducing the budget for the prisons, which was not well received among the inmates. The conditions at that prison were already appalling. Any further cut in the budget was perceived by the inmates as implying a worsening of inmate privileges and security, making them angry and confrontational. Such defiant inmate behavior led to more hours of work for the correctional officers, who were already underpaid due to restrictive budgets. The officers became angry and resorted to dealing with the prisoners heavy-handedly, thus leading to abuse. Close examination of this example shows the interaction among an external stimulus, officers’ responses, and inmates’ (customer) reactions, all collectively interacting to create the chaos.

Yet another open-system example is that of the brutality and discrimination scandals that were rampant among police departments in Los Angeles and Milwaukee (Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993). The researchers found that these communities, especially the minority populations, were apprehensive due to a lack of adequate representation in the local police force. Consequently, they would not be cooperative with the local police force. As a result, the local police force was not friendly and helpful to the minority community, and often would look at its members suspiciously. The actions of the local
police force seemed discriminatory. In this example, to get a clearer perspective to the existing problem, one has to include the role played by the employees and the customers, who are a part of the external social system.

The above examples illustrate that the open-system models are definitely more realistic in identifying workable solutions as compared to closed-system models, but they are extremely difficult to interpret due to dynamic interactions among the external variables. These external influences can be experienced by organizations from the actions of the existing competitors, potential competitors, suppliers, customers, and government. The influence of these external factors has been amplified in recent years due to a changing environment as reflected in growing globalization, increased diversity, rising ethical standards, and rapid advances in technology accompanied by rising e-commerce. Next we discuss two popular open-system models that have express implications for improving service quality in the criminal justice systems.

**Total Quality Management (TQM) Model**

In the 1970s and 1980s, Japanese organizations made a significant impact throughout the world with their extremely high product quality. The success of the Japanese companies was attributed to their shift from the American model of an inspection-oriented quality approach to a prevention-oriented quality approach through employee involvement. They incorporated the suggestions from their employees in improving the manufacturing process to prevent errors from occurring. They also introduced the *voice of the customer* in designing the product and modifying the process to provide higher quality, because they realized that the customer is the final judge of product quality. A product that is well made but that does not satisfy the needs of the customer will not be highly rated by the customer on his or her scale. Four important elements of this model, dubbed *total quality management (TQM)*, were the following:

1. **Employee involvement:** This means companywide participation of the workers in quality control and quality improvement. It also means active thinking on the part of all employees on how to improve the system. This radical thinking was a significant departure from the classical management models in which the workers were hired for their physical work and the thinking was to be left to the management.

2. **Customer focus:** Instead of focusing on product attributes that management thinks are important, which was the dominant paradigm for the classical management models, the TQM companies consult on these attributes with their customers who are the final judges of quality. The TQM companies then try to meet or exceed the needs and expectations of their customers.

3. **Continuous improvement:** The TQM companies are not satisfied with their performance, but are constantly striving to do better. They are constantly making incremental improvements in all areas of the organization, which are typically suggested by the employees. Employee involvement is a paradigm shift as compared to the classical models where the improvement was initiated by the management. These small changes are easy to implement because they have been identified and approved by the employees who feel involved; and secondly because these modifications do not require drastic changes to the existing work conditions.
4. **Benchmarking:** The TQM companies are constantly studying the best companies in the business to identify areas where improvements can be made, and to find the best method of incorporating improvements. Benchmarking is outward looking, which is again a paradigm shift in comparison to the classical models that were inward looking for making any changes and improvements.

The above concepts are very difficult to accept and implement by most criminal justice officers who are deeply entrenched in the Weberian model of bureaucracy. However, more recently there has been a change in philosophy in allowing victims and offenders, seen as customers who assess the quality of the justice they receive, more of a say in their cases and in sentencing decisions. In 2004, victims were given new and expanded rights in the courtroom, as discussed in In the News 2.1. Not only can they now appear and be seen in court, but they can also provide victim impact statements and they are given much more information on the processing of the offenders in their cases. This change may raise the bar in how cases are handled when a victim is involved by providing more quality services to the victim and offender (concepts proposed by TQM). In the News 2.1, however, shows how court personnel, especially defense attorneys, have concerns about the victim’s involvement in court sentencing and bail hearings because it has the possibility of bringing about biased consequences.

---

**In the News 2.1**  
**Giving Crime Victims More of Their Say: A Federal Law Has Created Tensions in the Legal System**

W. Patrick Kenna felt cheated. In 2000, he invested $20,000 with a currency trading company, hoping to earn enough to start a new business. Instead, he lost nearly the entire sum, defrauded along with dozens of other investors. A Los Angeles businessman, Kenna took some comfort in knowing that the two men responsible—father and son owners of the company—would spend significant time behind bars, but he wanted to make sure the judge knew just how much trouble they had caused.

Kenna made his anger clear during the father’s 2005 sentencing, but when the son’s day in court arrived three months later, the federal judge denied Kenna’s request to speak. “I listened to the victims the last time,” Judge John Walter said. “There just isn’t anything else that could possibly be said.” Kenna was furious. “We didn’t feel that the judge was taking into consideration the victims in the case,” he says. So he turned to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, which ordered the judge to let Kenna speak at a new hearing.

The reversal in Kenna’s case reflects the growing influence of crime victims since the passage in 2004 of landmark federal legislation granting them new and expanded rights. Three years later, the changes are beginning to have an impact, shifting the balance of a legal system that historically has been solely a two-party affair. One result is tension between legal parties and concern among defense attorneys who fear that a greater role for victims conflicts with the right of defendants to a fair trial.

Historically, the adversarial legal system has carved out roles in criminal cases only for the prosecutor and the accused. Victims have been relegated to the sidelines unless they were testifying. Although the interests of prosecutors usually align with those of victims, they are not always the
same: for instance, when victims want tougher sentences than prosecutors do. Victims’ rights advocates hope the changes are just the start and are pushing to put victims on an equal footing with defendants and prosecutors. “What our goal should be is to put the victim back into the position as if no crime had been committed,” says Paul Cassell, a former federal judge who resigned this year to advocate for victims.

Crime victims began winning rights at the state level decades ago, but the 2004 legislation brought the protections to the federal level for the first time. Victims now must be notified about court developments. They must be allowed to speak during bail and sentencing hearings. And most important, the law gives them the ability to appeal rulings when they think their rights are being violated, as Kenna did. The Justice Department is even funding three legal clinics, in Maryland, Arizona, and South Carolina, to help victims assert these rights in court.

Bias. But defense attorneys say that changing the adversarial system further would have dangerous consequences. Most problematic, they say, would be allowing victims more control over prosecutorial decisions. Victims can be biased, attorneys say, and they sometimes fail to understand how their case fits into the system as a whole.

It’s often hard to define a victim in the first place. For instance, is a woman a victim in a marijuana-dealing case because her boyfriend beat her while he was high on drugs he bought from the dealer? A court said no. Could an Arizonan tell the judge he opposed the death penalty at the sentencing hearing for the man who killed his wife? That judge, too, said no.

Defense attorneys are also wary of the influence that victims may have on plea agreements. And they point out that a victim’s testimony, in bail or sentencing hearings, is not subject to the same cross-examination as is the testimony of other witnesses. Overall, they worry that inserting victims more broadly into the process pits the defendant against not one, but two, adversaries.

Victims’ rights advocates make just the opposite argument. They say the victims’ rights laws are not uniformly enforced on a federal level—and are almost nonexistent in many states. Instead, they say, victims often get little guidance from the government. Mindful of such problems, a small group of advocates is helping victims with appeals and other legal issues through the federally funded clinics. “Having the attorney there is starting to turn the rights into more than rhetoric,” says Meg Garvin, a lawyer at Lewis and Clark Law School who coordinates the clinics.

One satisfied client of the clinic is Marylander Tracy Palmer, a 41-year-old mother of two who had been trying to escape her ex-husband since 1994, when he first was convicted of assaulting her. In 2001 he was sentenced to 15 years in jail, but it was only by chance that Palmer found that a judge was about to release him after just four years. She protested that she was not notified of the hearing. A judge rebuffed her, but the federal clinic helped her win another review of her ex-husband’s release, a decision now on appeal.

The victims’ rights laws are changing the system for prosecutors like Trey Gowdy in Spartanburg, S.C. He now may have to make an extra phone call to keep victims’ lawyers in the loop, but Gowdy says he’s never had a major conflict. Still, he thinks the best service for victims—as for defendants—is the government doing its job well. “The better the prosecutors,” says Gowdy, “the less you will feel victims having needs.”

Supply Chain/Synergy Model

Most complex organizations are often viewed as a collection of interrelated systems, where changes in one subsystem will impact the functioning of the other system. Therefore, promoting coordination and cooperation between different subsystems, known as a supply chain perspective, will accomplish more than when the subsystems are working in isolation. This property, in which the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, is referred to as synergy (Lewis et al., 2001).

The supply chain phenomenon plays very well in the criminal justice system that is composed of different agencies. For example, when a crime is committed, the law enforcement agency responds. Once the criminal suspects are apprehended, they are screened for prosecution by the state’s prosecutors. Once the offenders are charged, they are entitled to a trial, which is presided over by a judge. If the defendants are found guilty of the crime(s), they are sentenced. At this point, the corrections department supervises offenders in various ways. As the offender passes from one agency to the next in this chain of activities, the agency that hands over the offender is the supplier, and the agency that receives the offender is the customer. In this supply chain approach, at each stage of the criminal justice system there is a supplier and a customer. As the offender moves to the next stage, the agency that was a customer in receiving the offender now becomes the supplier to the next agency. For the criminal justice system to work efficiently and effectively, there needs to be a high degree of coordination between different agencies involved in its enforcement. One can thus understand the problems with the criminal justice system when police officers apprehend criminals and the court system lets them go with lesser charges or a softer penalty by striking a plea bargain. The law enforcement officer (acting as supplier) may not fully understand why the court system (acting as customer) operated in the way it did. The police may have expected a harsher penalty and may be disappointed when this does not happen. Consequently, when faced with the same case scenario again, the police may handle the situation in a different fashion, knowing that the court will not proceed as they had hoped.

In the business world, to benefit from the synergy among different entities working in the supply chain network, one of the latest trends is the adoption of enterprise resource planning (ERP), which is a complex information system that collects, processes, and provides information about an organization’s entire activities, leaving no blind spots. It integrates the different functions of the organization, allowing the managers and employees to use the information to adjust plans and respond to opportunities and threats in real time. Lack of integration of different agencies involved in security functions was an essential problem in the response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Law enforcement did not have the systems necessary to integrate the information they were receiving from various sources and agencies to identify the potential threat to the United States. They could not connect the dots to prevent the terrorist activities. Now, 8 years later, there are still issues with information systems planning. Even though systems have been put in place for the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other agencies to share information, they are restricted in what they can share with one another. They have not developed clear-cut plans for emergencies in each U.S. city, and the upper-level management
has experienced turnover so many times that policies and procedures in homeland security are ambiguous at best. In the News 2.2 discusses some of the issues still faced by the U.S. government in the fight against terrorism on American soil and abroad.

The supply chain model discussed above includes the role of employees, customers, and suppliers in introducing outside influence into the working of an organization, thus making the solutions to the existing problems more realistic. This model mandates that the managers must focus on relationship building with customers, suppliers, and other partners in their attempt to create modern organizations. In criminal justice, one can see this application in probation offices, where officers within probation are commonly brought together to informally staff or discuss cases as a group. This allows for the officers to address any issues or concerns they may have about a particular case, the policies or procedures surrounding their job functions with regard to the case, and potential ideas they may have that are not traditionally utilized. When looking at a single case, for example, and if a probation officer allows it to be staffed, the officer working the case may receive multiple suggestions on how best to handle the case from others in the office. This shows that not all officers would respond to the situation in the same manner. The probation officer can also bring up a program or treatment opportunity that he or she is aware of but that is not commonly used by the agency. Comments or information can be gathered from others in the group on whether the program or opportunity would work well in this situation. Support can also be given to the probation officer to assist him or her in the decisions being made. All involved feel more valued at having contributed to the case and to the decision-making process while also having worked toward the organizational goal of treatment and rehabilitation of offenders. Adoption of such integrated practices in other areas of the criminal justice system will only add value.

In the News 2.2 Are We Safer Today?

Two years ago, we and our colleagues issued a report card to assess the U.S. government’s progress on the bipartisan recommendations in the 9/11 Commission report. We concluded that the nation was not safe enough. Our judgment remains the same today: We still lack a sense of urgency in the face of grave danger.

The U.S. homeland confronts a “persistent and evolving terrorist threat,” especially from al Qaeda, according to a National Intelligence Estimate in July. Six years after the attacks, in the wake of a series of ambitious reforms carried out by dedicated officials, how is it possible that the threat remains so dire?

The answer stems from a mixed record of reform, a lack of focus and a resilient foe. Progress at home—in our ability to detect, prevent and respond to terrorist attacks—has been difficult, incomplete and slow, but it has been real. Outside our borders, however, the threat of failure looms. We face a rising tide of radicalization and rage in the Muslim world—a trend to which our own actions have contributed. The enduring threat is not Osama bin Laden but young Muslims with no jobs and no hope, who are angry with their own governments and increasingly see the United States as an enemy of Islam.
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Four years ago, then-Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld famously asked his advisers: "Are we capturing, killing or deterring and dissuading more terrorists every day than the madrassas and the radical clerics are recruiting, training and deploying against us?"

The answer is “no.”

U.S. foreign policy has not stemmed the rising tide of extremism in the Muslim world. In July 2004, the commission recommended putting foreign policy at the center of our counterterrorism efforts. Instead, we have lost ground.

Our report warned that it was imperative to eliminate terrorist sanctuaries. But inside Pakistan, al Qaeda “has protected or regenerated key elements of its homeland attack capability,” according to the National Intelligence Estimate. The chief threat to Afghanistan’s young democracy comes from across the Pakistani border, from the resurgent Taliban. Pakistan should take the lead in closing Taliban camps and rooting out al Qaeda. But the United States must act if Pakistan will not.

We are also failing in the struggle of ideas. We have not been persuasive in enlisting the energy and sympathy of the world’s 1.3 billion Muslims against the extremist threat. That is not because of who we are: Polling data consistently show strong support in the Muslim world for American values, including our political system and respect for human rights, liberty and equality. Rather, U.S. policy choices have undermined support.

No word is more poisonous to the reputation of the United States than Guantanamo. Fundamental justice requires a fair legal process before the U.S. government detains people for significant periods of time, and the president and Congress have not provided one. Guantanamo Bay should be closed now. The 9/11 Commission recommended developing a “coalition approach” for the detention and treatment of terrorists—a policy that would be legally sustainable, internationally viable and far better for U.S. credibility.

Moreover, no question inflames public opinion in the Muslim world more than the Arab–Israeli dispute. To empower Muslim moderates, we must take away the extremists’ most potent grievance: the charge that the United States does not care about the Palestinians. A vigorous diplomatic effort, with the visible, active support of the president, would bolster America’s prestige and influence—and offer the best prospect for Israel’s long-term security.

And finally, no conflict drains more time, attention, blood, treasure and support from our worldwide counterterrorism efforts than the war in Iraq. It has become a powerful recruiting and training tool for al Qaeda.

Beyond all our problems in the Muslim world, we must not neglect the most dangerous threat of all. The 9/11 Commission urged a “maximum effort” to prevent the nightmare scenario: a nuclear weapon in the hands of terrorists. The recent National Intelligence Estimate says that al Qaeda will continue to try to acquire weapons of mass destruction and that it would not hesitate to use them. But our response to the threat of nuclear terrorism has been lip service and little action. The fiscal 2008 budget request for programs to control nuclear warheads, materials and expertise is a 15 percent real cut from the levels two years ago. We are in dire need of leadership, resources and sustained diplomacy to secure the world’s loose nuclear materials. President Bush needs to knock heads and force action.
Military power is essential to our security, but if the only tool is a hammer, pretty soon every problem looks like a nail. We must use all the tools of U.S. power—including foreign aid, educational assistance and vigorous public diplomacy that emphasizes scholarship, libraries and exchange programs—to shape a Middle East and a Muslim world that are less hostile to our interests and values. America’s long-term security relies on being viewed not as a threat but as a source of opportunity and hope.

At home, the situation is less dire, but progress has been limited. Some badly needed structures have been built. In 2004, Congress created a director of national intelligence to unify the efforts of the 16 agencies that make up the U.S. intelligence community. The new DNI, Mike McConnell, must now take charge and become the dynamic, bold leader whom the commission envisioned, rather than just another bureaucratic layer. He has recognized the importance of sharing intelligence, of moving from a culture based on the "need to know" to one based on the need to share, as we recommended in our report. But he is still struggling to gain control of budgets and personnel. No DNI will be able to make reform last without significant time in the job and strong support from the president.

Congress also created the National Counterterrorism Center, where CIA analysts, FBI agents and other experts from across the government sit side by side and share intelligence continuously. This is a clear improvement over the pre-9/11 way of doing business, but those inside the center still face restrictions on what they can share with their home agency—a disturbing echo of failed practices. State and local officials also complain that they are not getting the information they need.

In 2004, George Tenet, then the director of central intelligence, testified that it would take five years to fix the CIA. Three years later, we have seen signs of progress, but it is not fixed yet. Flush with resources, the CIA is investing heavily in the training of intelligence analysts and improving its ability to collect information on terrorist targets, particularly by agents on the ground. Disappointingly, despite recruitment drives, only 8 percent of the CIA's new hires have the ethnic backgrounds and language skills most needed for counterterrorism.

A wider problem is that, because of intelligence failures (notably involving Iraq and 9/11) and controversial policies (notably about abuse and interrogation), the public lacks confidence in the CIA. That is not good for the agency or the country. We recognize that intelligence agencies must keep many secrets, but more candor and openness are the only ways to win sustained public support for the reforms we still need.

The FBI, the agency responsible for domestic intelligence, also has much more to do. The number of bureau intelligence analysts has more than doubled since 9/11 (to about 2,100), but they are still second-class citizens in the FBI’s law enforcement culture. Modern 21st-century information systems are not yet in place, and top positions are turning over too often. Six years after 9/11, the FBI’s essential unit on weapons of mass destruction is just beginning its work.

When it comes to transportation security—the failure so basic to 9/11—we have seen some successes. For example, the Terrorist Screening Center, a football-field-size room filled with a giant electronic board and dozens of experts, tracks the flight manifests of 2,500 international flights arriving in the United States each day. But the prescreening of passengers is still left to the airlines, which lack access to complete watch lists of suspected terrorists. Congress mandated national standards for
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secure driver’s licenses but has not given states the money to make it happen. Moreover, technological improvement has been far too slow. A pilot program of high-tech explosive-detecting “puffer devices” at airports is of doubtful effectiveness and has been delayed indefinitely. Advanced baggage-screening systems will not be in place until 2024. That timeline might work for our grandchildren, but it won’t work for us.

Nor will the pace of efforts to prepare the country to respond to future attacks. Congress passed a better formula for distributing federal homeland-security grants to the states on the basis of risk and vulnerability, rather than pork and politics. But the new law still allows the broadcast industry until February 2009 to hand over the prime slice of the broadcast spectrum that police and firefighters need to beam radio messages through concrete and steel. Disaster could well strike before then.

We also lack a legal framework for fighting terrorism without sacrificing civil liberties. The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board created in response to our recommendations has been missing in action. The board has raised no objections to wiretaps without warrants and to troubling detention and interrogation practices. It even let the White House edit its annual report. Now strengthened by a new law, the board must become a firm, public voice in support of civil liberties.

Finally, there’s the question of Congress. Three years ago, we said that strengthening congressional oversight of counterterrorism was among the most difficult and important of our recommendations. Congressional oversight of homeland security and intelligence must be robust and effective. It is not. Three years ago, the 9/11 Commission noted that the Department of Homeland Security reported to 88 congressional committees and subcommittees—a major drain on senior management and a source of contradictory guidance. After halfhearted reforms followed by steps backward, that number is now 86.

Those are just the main items on our list of concerns. Six years later, we are safer in a narrow sense: We have not been attacked, and our defenses are better. But we have become distracted and complacent. We call on the presidential candidates to spell out how they would organize their administrations and act urgently to address the threat. And we call on ordinary citizens to demand more leadership from our elected representatives. The terrible losses our country suffered on 9/11 should have catalyzed efforts to create an America that is safer, stronger and wiser. We still have a long way to go.

NOTE: Thomas H. Kean and Lee H. Hamilton are the former chairman and vice chairman of the 9/11 commission.

Changing Face of the Criminal Justice System—Need for a Learning Organization

With globalization, the Internet, and rapid technological changes, the environment for all organizations is becoming unpredictable, characterized by complexity and surprises. In this highly volatile environment, managers are working to redesign their
companies toward *learning organizations*, which are highly flexible and adaptable in embodying the tenets of the open-system model (Daft & Lewin, 1993). The attention in these companies is on problem solving (Gebert & Boerner, 1999). These organizations value open communication and cooperation, engaging everyone in identifying and solving problems. Such progressive organizations are based on little hierarchy and a culture that promotes employee and customer participation.

These rapid changes in the environment have also provided different sets of challenges for the criminal justice system, each of which is briefly discussed below.

1. Significant changes have occurred in the last 50 years that have altered the demographics of criminal activities. The traditional family of the 1950s, which consisted of a husband, a housewife, and two children, is fast being replaced by the two-income family. For this new family unit, time is at a premium, resulting in children spending greater amounts of time without adult supervision, watching television, and surfing the Internet. The children are easily influenced by violence that is being propagated through television and the Internet.

2. In the United States, immigrants accounted for a major share of the increase in the labor force in the 1990s, and they are expected to provide a growing share of the workforce in the 21st century. By the year 2020, it is estimated that Asian Americans, African Americans, and Hispanics will comprise more than 35% of the U.S. population and will form 30% of the U.S. workforce. Also by the year 2020, it is forecasted that women will comprise 50% of the U.S. workforce (Judy & D’Amico, 1997). The growing diversity in the U.S. workforce, also true for criminal justice services, is bringing a variety of challenges to the workplace in the form of supporting diversity, balancing work and family concerns, and coping with the conflict brought by different cultural styles. Another trend is the change in prisoner demographics with a greater number of immigrants or second-generation immigrants and women becoming involved in criminal activities. This change has introduced challenges for criminal justice agencies to deal with gender and cultural issues.

3. Technology, especially information technology including the Internet, is playing a primary role in knowledge management and the sharing of information. Companies today assume that ideas can emerge from everyone, and the role of the manager is to facilitate open channels of communication to allow ideas, information, and knowledge to flow throughout the organization. An emphasis on knowledge management and information sharing has led to flattening of organizational structures and greater empowerment and involvement of employees. This technology age has created more white-collar jobs, a direct consequence of which is the increase in intricate white-collar crimes, thus adding another layer of complexity to the jobs in the criminal justice system.

4. Over the last several years, the confidence of the American public in businesses has reached a new low. Consequently, there is resurgence in the public expectations toward corporate responsibility, as they demand higher standards related to business ethics, corporate governance, regulation of business, and other stakeholder considerations.
The American public is pushing the corporations to maintain higher socially responsible behavior and to fulfill their economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities toward their stakeholders. These public expectations of higher ethical and moral responsibilities from corporations have created new duties for the criminal justice system. In addition, the standards the public holds for corporate responsibility and accountability also apply to criminal justice agencies and employees.

5. As mobility and communication have become cheaper and faster, law and order problems are acquiring a unified global field. The Internet has torn down the boundaries of time and space, providing terrorists with a far-reaching global network, reaching people they could not have reached before. In the 21st century, law-enforcing agencies will have to learn to work in cooperation with agencies in other parts of the world because the planning of terrorist activities may be done in one country or a nexus of countries, the recruiting of terrorists in other countries, and implementation of terrorist activities in still another country. As of this writing, there is evidence that the masterminds of the al Qaeda organization, Osama Bin Laden and Al Zawahiri, are located in the mountains of Afghanistan; the terrorists are being recruited in the Middle East; and terrorists’ activities are being carried out in the United States and Europe. Pakistan has become somewhat of a safe haven for al Qaeda, even though the United States has assisted Pakistan in the past.

In the News 2.3 Planning for Attack Done Outside of U.S.

The 19 terrorists suspected in the Sept. 11 attacks spent about $500,000 preparing an operation that was planned and launched from overseas, beginning several years ago in Germany with support in Britain, the United Arab Emirates and Afghanistan, senior government officials have tentatively concluded.

U.S. investigators have determined that four hijackers were trained in camps in Afghanistan run by Osama bin Laden—whose al-Qaeda network is believed responsible for the assaults on New York and Washington—and have developed tentative links to the terrorist mastermind for most of the others, according to preliminary conclusions reached by the Justice Department, the FBI and the CIA. Government investigators are becoming increasingly convinced that one or two other hijackings were in the works, officials said, and are focusing on three men in U.S. custody who received flight training. One was detained while seeking flight simulator training in Minnesota before the hijackings, and two others were arrested on a train in Texas after departing a jet that was grounded after the attacks, sources said.

Government officials said other people in the United States may have provided minor assistance or had knowledge that a terrorist operation was underway. But the FBI has found little evidence so far that the teams of hijackers received much support here, sources said.

“There seems to be no U.S. mastermind,” one official said.

The Justice Department has cast a global dragnet over the last two weeks in a hunt for accomplices. It is narrowing its criminal investigation to a number of individuals and is beginning to formulate
criminal charges that could be filed against them, sources said. But a senior Justice official declined to predict when the first indictment might be handed down.

“We are past the first phase, and we are beginning to sharpen and focus the investigation,” one Justice official said. “You don’t get smoking guns in a case like this. The key is going to be in the details, in putting together the pieces, and we’ve gone a long way to doing that. . . . We’re looking with particularity at a number of people.”

The disclosures provide the fullest picture yet of the direction and scope of the U.S. investigation into the deadliest terror attack in American history, which have left 6,500 people missing or dead in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania. The hijackings have led to arrests on every continent but Antarctica.

In tracing $500,000 flowing into U.S. bank accounts used by Mohamed Atta and other members of the hijacking teams, the FBI has documented numerous large cash withdrawals and a long trail of hotels, rental cars and airplane trips that largely dispel any notion of an austere plot, a senior government official said. Previous reports have said the attacks cost no more than $200,000.

Some of the money used to prepare the attack has already been linked to accounts in the Middle East, the source said, and investigators have documented instances of simultaneous withdrawals from the same account in different cities.

“This was not a low-budget operation,” the official said. “There is quite a bit of money coming in, and they are spending quite a bit of money.”

Investigators are now convinced that the details of the terror plot were hatched in Hamburg, Germany, where Atta and two other suspected hijackers, Marwan Al-Shehhi and Ziad Jarrahi, are believed to have run a terrorist cell out of a second-floor student apartment.

In the hours following the Sept. 11 terror attacks, German intelligence agents intercepted a phone conversation between jubilant followers of Osama bin Laden that led the FBI to search frantically for two more teams of suicide hijackers, according to officials in both countries.

The Germans overheard the terrorists refer to “the 30 people traveling for the operation.” The FBI already knew that 19 suspected hijackers had died on four planes, and started scouring flight manifests and any other clues for 11 more people still at large, who might have been part of the plot.

The FBI is doubling its contingent of agents working on the investigation in Germany, in the belief that the trail will lead from there to the Middle East, one official said. The initial concept for the Sept. 11 attacks likely came from Afghanistan, where bin Laden is believed to be hiding, another official said.

Investigators have found that the leaders in the plot moved in and out of the United States beginning at least 18 months ago, with lower-level hijackers not arriving until this year. Atta returned to Germany at least twice after arriving in the United States, a source said.

“There were two groups on each plane,” one senior official said. “You’ve got the brains, who are the pilots and the leaders, and then you have the muscle coming in later on. They were the ones who held the passengers at bay.”

The FBI is deeply suspicious of the circumstances surrounding three key men who have been detained in the case. Zacarias Moussaoui was taken into custody in Minnesota in August after he attempted to pay cash to learn how to steer, but not take off or land, in a jumbo jet.

(Continued)
As the world becomes more connected through modern communication and information technologies, the environment for criminal justice agencies is becoming extremely complex. Criminal justice organizations have to learn to cross lines of time, culture, and geography in order to be successful. Law enforcement officers today, for example, need to know a second and third language and develop cross-cultural understanding. The mind-set needed by officers in criminal justice is to expect the unexpected and be prepared for constant change. Moreover, the increase in white-collar crimes, the rising number of women criminals, more young kids involved in criminal activities, and increased international terrorism all have created greater awareness and involvement of the general public in the criminal justice system. As a result, there is greater scrutiny by citizens of the existing criminal justice system to examine the quality and effectiveness of the service being delivered. As administrators of the criminal justice system struggle to create customer-oriented learning organizations, they are finding that specific dimensions of their organization, entrenched in Weber’s bureaucratic model, have to be changed. “The learning organization is incompatible with the bureaucratic configuration of police organizations” (Oettmeier, 1992, p. 52). The five areas of organization design that need to be revisited in the criminal justice system are structure, tasks, systems, culture, and attitude. They require change in the following ways:
1. **From vertical to horizontal structure:** Traditionally, the most common organizational structure has been functional, in which activities are grouped together by common work (function). A chain of command flows within each function from the top to the bottom, with decision-making authority residing with upper-level management. Typically, communication across different functions takes place only at the top level. Therefore, to communicate across functions, information has to flow from the bottom to the top within a function and then be communicated to the other functional head, who then passes the information down within his or her function. This strict chain of command slows the flow of information, which may be crucial in this rapidly changing environment. Even now, it is being debated whether, if the information had flowed faster between different law-enforcing agencies, they could have prevented the September 11, 2001, terrorist acts.

   In a learning criminal justice organization, the vertical structure that creates distance between the administrator at the top and the staff is a mantra for failure. Therefore, the vertical hierarchy must be drastically reduced. Flatter organizations that reduce the distance between different ranks should be designed to promote faster information flow and greater coordination. Moreover, departmental functions ought to be eliminated; instead, structures have to be created that promote horizontal workflows. Self-directed teams with members from several functional areas are the fundamental work unit in a learning organization (Daft, 2001).

2. **From routine tasks to empowered roles:** Scientific management advocates precisely defined jobs and the exact steps to perform them. Each job is defined as a sequence of narrowly distinct tasks, which are done in a sequence of steps like a machine. Knowledge and control of these tasks resides with the senior management, and employees are expected to do as they are told. However, in this volatile environment, the requirements for each job change so rapidly that officers in the criminal justice organizations need to use their discretion and responsibility to solve the problem rather than be guided strictly by the rules of the task. Historical limitations on discretionary decisions need to be readdressed as the implementation of a learning organization is analyzed. In a learning criminal justice system, the officers need to play a role in the team or department, which is constantly redefined or modified. The officers need to be trained extremely well and then encouraged to work with one another to find solutions rather than be constantly looking at the supervisors or senior officers for directions.

3. **From formal control systems to shared information:** In large organizations, such as the criminal justice system, information processing is centralized at the top. Formal systems are often implemented to manage the growing amount of complex information and to help identify any variation from accepted norms and measures (Hurst, 1995). However, such formal procedures also increase the distance between leaders and their workers, thus slowing the processing of information and further adding to the complexity.

   In a learning criminal justice organization, information needs to be widely shared, and officers must often be entrusted with complete information to enable them to react quickly. Information control should not be used as a means of power, but rather,
senior officers should find ways of disseminating information and keeping lines of communication open. Communication should be maintained with all stakeholders, including other agencies involved in criminal justice and society at large, to enhance the learning capability.

4. From rigid to competitive to adaptive culture: In traditional organizations, strategy is formulated by senior officers and imposed on the organization, leaving little scope for swift adjustments to external environmental changes. These organizations become victims of their own system when the environment changes dramatically.

On the other hand, in a learning criminal justice organization, each officer is a valued contributor, and the organization thrives on creating relationships that allow officers to develop their full potential. Consequently, the officers are aware of the big picture and how various parts fit together. The empowered workforce is fully involved in contributing to strategy development, making it more realistic and amenable to environmental changes. Since officers are in touch with the diverse group of stakeholders, the strategy emerges from the input of all stakeholders. Such culture encourages openness and equality, and it is geared toward continuous improvement.

5. From confrontational to collaborative: In traditional organizations, the customers and suppliers are not considered as partners, but rather competitors who need to be kept at arm’s length. However, the learning organizations approach their customers and suppliers as partners who can provide important information to allow improvements (Daft, 2001). Instead of using the “us against them” mentality, criminal justice agencies can (and have, in some cases) survey offenders, victims, and the community about procedures, policies, and processes that work or fail to work effectively in the processing of cases.

The above discussion suggests that in this highly uncertain environment, criminal justice agencies need to be modified and redesigned toward becoming learning organizations, which supports the line of thinking presented earlier in the open-system models. Although the authors of this textbook acknowledge that criminal justice agencies may be limited in how far they can go in becoming learning organizations (because of laws, mandates from courts, etc.), the adoption of some learning approaches is better than nothing. Numerous criminal justice organizations fail in providing superior service because they close themselves from external influences and are primarily guided by their own agency subcultures, which may not conform to the external environment. Without input from external environments, criminal justice agencies are shortsighted regarding the changing political, economic, social, and legal realities, and consequently are unable to meet the demands of society. Often when criminal justice agencies shut themselves off from the external environment and public scrutiny, they become insular and function with impunity until they are revealed through scandals, judicial intervention, governmental intervention, governmental investigation, or commission reports (Dias & Vaughn, 2006). To move in the direction of creating flexible and adaptable learning organizations, there is a need for criminal justice officers to adopt the human relations approach propagated in the open-system models. In addition, there is need to reduce hierarchy, promote
open communication and cooperation, and encourage greater employee and customer participation, so that organizations can continually align themselves with the changing needs of the external environment. Although this has been accomplished in some areas of criminal justice (e.g., community policing, probation and parole, etc.), there is much work to be done to the system as a whole in terms of greater employee and customer participation. Identification and involvement of the customers is crucial in improving service quality because the customer is viewed as an input to which value is added by the service process in the criminal justice system. Chapter 3 will include a discussion about service quality and identification of all of the customers of criminal justice services.

Chapter Summary

- Organizations continually confront the uncertainty of new challenges and problems that they have to address in a timely, efficient, and effective manner for their survival. Therefore, organizations die or are transformed when the needs satisfied by them no longer exist or have been replaced by other needs.
- Organizational theory is a way to examine and analyze organizations more precisely and intensely based on patterns and trends in organizational design and behavior.
- A systems view considers an organization as a set of interacting functions that acquire inputs from the environment, processes them, and then releases the outputs back to the external environment.
- Closed-system models consider the external environment to be stable and predictable and assume that it does not intervene with or cause problems to the functioning of an organization. These models rely primarily on internal organizational processes and dynamics to account for organizational, group, and individual behaviors. The central management objective addressed in these models is the efficient running of the organization.
- The theories and models that emerged from closed systems are often called machine models; they are also popularly known as classical models or traditional models. These models sought to make organizations run like efficient, well-oiled machines by correcting the internal functioning of the organizations.
- The three main subfields of the classical perspective are scientific management, administrative management, and bureaucratic management. Scientific management focuses on the productivity of the individual worker, administrative management focuses on the functions of the management, and bureaucratic management focuses on the overall organizational system within which the workers and management interact.
- During the early 20th century, the industrialized nations experienced better standards of living and improved working conditions. Simultaneously, it was being observed that effective managers were not necessarily following all of the principles laid down in the classical closed-system models. Human behavior was an important factor in shaping the managerial style and worker actions.
Acknowledging that human behavior could influence the working of an organization was an acceptance that factors external to an organization had to be considered in the management principles, giving birth to the open-system models. In open-system models, the principle starting assumption is that the external variables or events play a significant role in explaining what is happening within an organization.

Since most work is done by teams in direct contact with customers, the open-system models (total quality management model and supply chain/synergy model) include customers in an attempt to create modern organizations.

The total quality management (TQM) model supports the inclusion of the voice of the customer in designing the product/service and modifying the process to provide higher quality. Four important elements of the total quality management model are employee involvement, customer focus, benchmarking, and continuous improvement.

For the criminal justice system to work efficiently and effectively, there needs to be a high degree of coordination among different agencies involved in its enforcement. In this supply chain relationship, at each stage of the criminal justice system there is a supplier and a customer. Therefore, promoting coordination and cooperation among different subsystems, known as a supply chain perspective, will accomplish more than when the subsystems are working in isolation. This property, in which the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, is referred to as synergy.

The environment facing the criminal justice system is rapidly changing due to globalization, demographics, the Internet, and rapid technological changes. In this highly volatile environment, managers of the criminal justice system need to redesign and modify their agencies to become learning organizations, which are highly flexible and adaptable. In an attempt to create learning organizations in the criminal justice system, the five areas of organization design that need to be revisited are structure, tasks, systems, culture, and attitude. In each of these areas, the emphasis should be on problem solving by promoting a culture of employee and customer participation.

Chapter Review Questions

1. Describe the primary differences in closed-system and open-system models.

2. If you were to apply closed-system models to criminal justice agencies, which areas of criminal justice would they best fit? What about open-system models?

3. Describe how the principles of the bureaucratic model apply to law enforcement.

4. How are probation and parole officers specialized in the tasks they perform? What about police officers and corrections officers?

5. Explain how criminal justice agencies can become learning organizations.
The city of Smithville has a population of 38,500 people. On any given day, approximately 97,000 people visit the city for work, shopping, school, and recreational activities. The Smithville Police Department handles about 51,000 calls for service per year. There is a chief of police, 4 lieutenants, 7 corporals, 12 sergeants, and 47 patrol officers on staff. The chain of command and organizational structure of the department mirrors other police departments in the area. The closed system allows for a top-down structure with those in command determining the policies and procedures to be followed by the lower-level employees. The department has many of the traditional specialized units seen in other policing agencies—traffic, detectives, homicide, special victims, community policing, juvenile, and so forth. Officers are assigned to divisions depending on their area of expertise.

In May of 2007, the department received a call about a car accident on Highway 17 on the outer edge of town. Patrol Officer Mike Brady was dispatched to the accident. Upon arrival, he found two vehicles involved in a head-on collision. Josie Carmen, the 16-year-old driver of one of the vehicles, had crossed the yellow line and collided head-on with a semi-truck and trailer. Josie was pronounced dead at the scene of the accident. No one else was injured.

Officer Brady filed a report on the traffic accident that indicated Josie was responsible for the collision. In a follow-up report, Officer Brady stated that Josie had been with a number of individuals earlier in the day at Chewies, a local teen hangout. Josie and a female companion, identified in the report as unknown, met up with four other persons, including one adult male, at TE’s Deli. All six individuals left the deli for an unknown location at approximately 3:30 PM. A witness placed the group at a Taco Bell parking lot around 6:15 PM. Josie and the female companion drank vodka in the restaurant parking lot. Josie, the unknown female, and the adult male left the rest of the group at Big Daddy’s, a teen club, at approximately 9:00 PM.

According to witnesses, the male drove Josie’s car to TE’s where he proceeded to get into his own car and drive away. Josie then drove the female to a nearby mall parking lot.

A toxicology report later showed that Josie was drunk at the time of the accident. Her blood alcohol level was 0.15%, nearly twice the legal limit.

Immediately following the accident, Josie’s parents were in constant contact with the Smithville Police Department. The Smithville police provided the family with a copy of the traffic accident report and supplement as well as a copy of Josie’s toxicology report. After that, no additional information was provided to the family even though the family had asked for an investigation into the possible sources of the alcohol.

Josie’s family sent Officer Brady, who had handled the accident and follow-up report, an email on August 24 asking about the progress of the case. The family provided the officer with the names of the unknown female and the adult male who had been with Josie on the day of the accident. The family had obtained this information from one of the companions left at Big Daddy’s on the night of the accident.

Officer Brady responded on September 1 with the following note: "I have forwarded this information to our Detectives Unit and they will be in touch soon. Thank you."

(Continued)
After 3 weeks of no response, the family emailed Brady again with the information. Again, Brady’s response on October 7 was that the case and the additional information had been forwarded to the Detectives Unit.

In December of 2007, the family received a call from Detective Adams who stated that no new information was available. According to Detective Adams, the police were still trying to interview witnesses from the day of the accident. The man and woman whose names had been provided by the family had not yet been located or interviewed. When the family asked why it was taking so long, they were told that the department was short-staffed because of training, vacation, and sick time.

At this point, the family paid one of Josie’s friends to give them the addresses of the man and woman identified as being with Josie on the day of the accident. In February of 2008, the female was interviewed by the Smithville Police Department. She stated that the adult male may have provided the alcohol to Josie but that she couldn’t be certain of it. In April of 2008, the adult male was interviewed. He denied providing alcohol to anyone on the day of the accident. The investigation apparently ended there.

No charges were filed. A spokesperson for the Smithville Police Department stated that he or she could not say for sure that Josie received alcohol from the adult male or the adult female. The spokesperson also said the department did not feel that there were any other substantial leads to follow in the case. The family spoke with many of Josie’s friends who had seen her on the day of the accident and identified many more persons who were aware of the alcohol and the actions of Josie on that day. The police department never interviewed any of them.

Josie’s family would like the police to reopen the investigation since “there were obviously more than three people there and they didn’t make it a priority to find out if the adult male did it. They only talked to two people.” The spokesperson for the police department claims that there are too many individuals named by the parents as having knowledge of the incident for police to track down which ones might have been with Josie that night. According to the police, if there was evidence of wrongdoing by a particular person, they would have filed charges. They claim that their investigation did not yield enough evidence for an arrest.

Questions for Discussion

1. How has task specialization played a role in this case? Has it been successful in increasing efficiency? Why or why not?

2. What should the family do now that the police department has closed the investigation even though other witnesses are available to be interviewed? Should the police department reopen the investigation? Why or why not?

3. How does this case, the actions of Officer Brady and the detective involved resemble an assembly line production?

4. How could the organizational structure of the police department be modified to better serve Josie’s family and the community at large?
Internet Resources

International Association of Chiefs of Police—http://www.theiacp.org
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