

From the Editor

Hello everyone. After something of a hiatus, this new edition of *Police Forum* is finally being released. In this edition, you'll read a message of encouragement from our Vice Chair, John DeCarlo (below). In keeping with the very mission of the Police Section, Dr. DeCarlo highlights the importance of members of academe establishing research partnerships with police practitioners and administrators.

Our feature article in this edition of the *Police Forum* is a piece by Veronyka James of Virginia Union University. Dr. James is also the Police Section Secretary. In her article, she explores how situational context, as defined by police officers, may contribute to the inclination of officers to engage in misconduct on some occasions and reject misconduct on other occasions.

I hope you enjoy this edition of the *Police Forum*. As always, please consider submitting an article, essay, book review, or other informative piece for publication in the *Police Forum*. Contributor guidelines can be found in latter pages of this edition.

Jeff Bumgarner
Editor, *Police Forum*

From the Vice-Chair

By John DeCarlo

I am excited to be writing to the Police Section of the *Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences*. As I'm sure you do, I spend a lot of my time ruminating about the state of policing and how we, as academics, can help inform practice and make substantive, workable contributions to the field.

I spent 34 years of my life working as a police officer. I had the privilege of starting out as a patrol officer in a municipal department and working my way up the organizational ladder to eventually become a chief of police. I, along with many other officers at the time, attended college in the seventies, under the old Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) program. It was a period of awakening for me because it was the first time that I had left a police

car, actively doing the job every day, and was exposed to a wider world of ideas about policing than existed in my city or any other city for that matter.

I still remember my interest studying James Q. Wilson's, *Varieties of Police Behavior* (Wilson, 1978). The light it shed on the reasons things were done the way we did them still resonates just as strongly with me today as it did when I first read it.

Of course we also read the police administration texts by such distinguished and accomplished practitioner/scholars as O.W. Wilson and Roy McClaren (1973). We all learned how departments should be structured and the other important things that must be accomplished in the bureaucracies that police departments exist in, to deploy patrol assets and balance budgets.

The administration texts were and are the nuts and bolts that held police departments together. What they didn't always do was explain how to improve policing and make it more valuable to society. That's not a dig at any of the valuable works on police administration. It was just that policing was, and still is asking the question: "How do we do better?" Better, in this case means how can police prevent crime, reduce the fear of crime and substantially increase the quality of life in communities.

As I kept studying, through a few master's degrees and a PhD, I was exposed to the same kind of big ideas that I described above when I spoke about *Varieties of Police Behavior*. I will never forget reading *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment* (Kelling, Pate, Diekman, & Brown, 1974) and wondering why we were all still patrolling the way we always had! I recall going into the chief's office and asking, after reading *Calling the Police*, (Spelman & Brown, 1984) why we were still depending on rapid response as a solution to problems it didn't apply to. Rand (Greenwood, 1979) got me in trouble too, when I made a fuss about how we seemed to let crimes happen and then tried to reactively investigate them.

I don't even want to tell you what happened after I suggested we re-structure the detective division when I read James Tien's work on Wilmington (Tien, Simon, & Larson, 1978). *Broken Windows* (Kelling & Wilson, 1982) left me scratching my head thinking, "This is so logical, How can I make this happen where I work? Do these ideas extend beyond urban neighborhoods? Why hasn't anyone done this before?"

Because of my police research-fired enthusiasm, I collected quite a few sour looks from vested-in-the-status-quo bosses over the years. They usually sent me back to wherever I was working at the time with no substantive changes being made even though there was research and big ideas out there on how to improve what we did.

During my tenure as a police chief, I observed the same old thing happening, a resistance to change that held policing back. Big ideas and research that seemed to have answers but just didn't "stick" in the field. I admit, I was a huge fan of meaningful research and tried to always seek out police researchers from academia to try and partner with them. Some collaborations were successful and others, not so much. The fact however was that both the police department and the researcher learned from every attempt at working together. I

retired from public service a few years ago and now actively teach and do research on the subject I love so much – policing. For the first time, I am on the outside looking in. I wonder how to tell police departments what we are doing at my college, John Jay, and all of the wonderful work my colleagues are doing at their respective institutions. Cops usually don't have access to academic journals so we have to work on other ways to get the word on research out.

Crime does not just affect communities in big cities. Yes, violence and other urban problems occur in cities more often, based on the sheer population volume and other factors. That is not to say that policing cannot and should not improve everywhere, however. One of the most surefire methods of improving policing is the formation of lasting researcher/practitioner partnerships.

I respectfully ask every member of the Police Section to form a team with a police department. Not just the Detroit's, New Yorks, Chicagos and other large cities. Every community has pressing issues that research can help solve. Please try to get out there and actively recruit research partners and potential members from practice for the Police Section. I would love to see more practitioners at our conferences, not just listening but presenting also! We are sitting on a goldmine of methods, knowledge and information and we should share the wealth! Let's each try to get the great ideas that we hear about almost every day to take root and "stick."

References

Greenwood, P. W. (1979). *The Rand Criminal Investigation Study: It's Findings to Date*. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Kelling, G. L., Pate, T., Diekmann, D., & Brown, C., E. (1974). *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment, A Summary Report*. Washington, DC: The Police Foundation.

Kelling, G. L., & Wilson, J. Q. (1982). *Broken Windows, The Police and Neighborhood Safety*. *The Atlantic*.

Spelman, W., & Brown, D. (1984). *Calling the Police - Citizen Reporting of Serious Crime*. Washington DC: National Institute of Justice.

Tien, J., Simon, J., & Larson, R. (1978). *ALTERNATIVE APPROACH IN POLICE PATROL - THE WILMINGTON SPLIT-FORCE EXPERIMENT*. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

Wilson, J. Q. (1978). *Varieties of Police Behavior: The Management of Law and Order in Eight Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Joint Center for Urban Studies.

Wilson, O. W., & McClaren, R. C. (1973). *Police Administration* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

**In Another Time and Place:
How Definitions of the Situation Impact Police Misconduct**

Veronyka James, Ph.D.

Virginia Union University

Abstract

Police misconduct has occurred since the inception of police forces, and despite prohibitions against it, continues to occur. Although research has examined personal or organization factors that influence officers' misconduct, few, if any, examine how officers define misconduct. Even fewer researchers have attempted to examine how definitions of the situation may allow officers to engage in misconduct. The following paper examines the issue of definitions of situations and how this may allow officers to engage in misconduct given their specific definition of certain situations while defining the same behavior as unacceptable in other situations.

Introduction

Police misconduct is defined differently by both those who study it and those who participate in it (Kappeler, Sluder and Alpert, 1998). This differing in definitions makes the study of police misconduct difficult. Most of those who research police misconduct look at personal or organizational factors that may motivate certain officers to engage in those behaviors that fall under the umbrella of misconduct. Few, if any, researchers examine how officers themselves define misconduct and even fewer look at how these definitions may change depending on the certain situation and the definition the officer has of the situation. Some behaviors that would be viewed as misconduct in a certain situation (e.g., driving under the influence) would not be deemed as such when the officers hold a different definition of the situation. This paper will attempt to explore how symbolic interaction, specifically the concept of definition of the situation, explains incidents of police misconduct and why certain behaviors at certain times are deemed misconduct while at other times they are acceptable. The hypothesis that this paper is exploring is whether the decision to engage in misconduct is based on an officer's definition of the situation which arises through symbolic interaction. It is expected that based on the definition of the situation officers will decide to engage in misconduct because the behavior is acceptable within a certain situation, but if the definition changes the same behavior may not be engaged in because it would be deemed inappropriate or unacceptable.

Police Misconduct

Police misconduct has occurred since the inception of the police and, despite attempts to prohibit it, still occurs (Champion, 2001; Hunter, 1999; Kappeler et al., 1994, 1998). “To study the history of police is to study police deviance, corruption and misconduct” (Kappeler et al., 1994, p. 30). As a result of the special position police hold within society and the special powers accorded to them, misconduct poses problems that misconduct/deviance by ordinary citizens would not. Not only does misconduct reflect upon individual officers, but it also reflects upon the police department itself and diminishes the public’s trust and confidence in the department and the police in general (Barker, 1983; Champion, 2001; Kappeler et al., 1994, 1998).

Researchers have examined the possible personal motivations for misconduct and the possible organizational structures that can lead to misconduct (Hunter, 1999; Kappeler et al., 1998; Pagon, Duffy, Ganster, and Lobnikar, 1998; Punch, 2003; Stoddard, 1968; van Laere and Geerts, 1985). Some researchers examine personal determinants of these behaviors such as monetary rewards or peer group acceptance, whereas other researchers look at management styles and how these influence the behavior of officers. However, several researchers are now examining the role of the culture of policing and the issue of training and how this may influence behavior, especially deviance (Chappell and Piquero, 2004; Kappeler et al., 1998; Prokos and Padavic, 2002). Researchers have examined how officers are part of a specific subculture that may teach new recruits to become deviant and that also condones these behaviors through interaction and secrecy (Barker, 1983; Kappeler et al., 1994, 1998; Westley, 1956). It is hypothesized that through training and interaction with more veteran officers, rookies learn how to deviate, when to do so, and acquire peer support for these behaviors. Through this process of social interaction, even officers that had noble intentions become deviant and, are therefore, accepted by other officers into the subculture of policing. Those who do not engage in these behaviors are not as accepted or are shunned and thought of as untrustworthy by others (Herbert, 1998; Kappeler et al., 1994, 1998; Stoddard, 1968; Westley, 1956). However, although police misconduct is thought by some to stem from social interaction with other officers and the culture of policing, few look at this interaction from the perspective of symbolic interaction.

Despite the potential problems these behaviors cause there is a lack of research in this area, possibly due to the fact that it is difficult to study the phenomenon because of the secrecy of the behaviors and of the police culture itself. Some researchers have attempted to study the incidence of misconduct by officers and departments, but these studies generally rely on perceptions of officers of rates of misconduct or analyzing citizen complaints due to the type of behaviors (some illegal) being studied (Barker, 1983; Ekenvall, 2003; Maher, 2003; Hunter, 1999; Son & Rome, 2004; Westley, 1956).

In addition to the difficulty of studying police misconduct because of the secrecy involved with the behavior, this behavior is difficult to study because there is not one unified definition of what constitutes police misconduct (Barker, 1983; Kappeler et al., 1994, 1998; McCormack, 1996). Different researchers use different conceptualizations of what police misconduct refers to when conducting their studies. Under the umbrella of police misconduct are behaviors that vary from minor misdeeds (i.e., receiving free food/drinks) to severe misuse of

power (i.e., excessive force/sexual misconduct). “Police deviance is a generic description of police officer activities which are inconsistent with the officers’ legal authority, organizational authority, and standards of ethical conduct...It can encompass a plethora of behaviors for which an officer can be disciplined” (Barker and Carter, 1986, p. 13).

“Police occupational deviance refers to inappropriate work-related activities in which police may participate” (Kappeler et al., 1998, p. 22). These types of activities are also considered under the broad heading of police misconduct but so are illegal behaviors, such as larceny and drug use. Misdeeds occur from the abuse of the officers’ authority and discretionary powers while conducting routine job duties. Yet, because of the nature of the job, police are more often confronted with opportunities to misbehave than ordinary citizens. In addition to these temptations, police culture often condones certain behaviors that would be considered occupational deviance/misconduct by those not involved.

Although there are studies examining the culture of police and specifically police misconduct, no studies look at how officers’ definitions of situations impact their behavior. Studies examine the reasons behind misconduct, from personal factors to institutional factors and what the motivations of misconduct might be. Also, researchers look at ways to curb misconduct. However, few studies apply concepts of symbolic interaction. The exceptions are the study by Hunt and Manning (1991) on police lying and the application of neutralizations to police behavior by Kappeler et al. (1994, 1998). Additionally, none apply the idea of definition of the situation to understand how misconduct can occur sometimes and then not at other times and how some behaviors can be deemed misbehavior at one point and be seen as acceptable at another.

Definition of the Situation

Within symbolic interaction is the concept of definition of the situation where a social actor makes sense of the “situation” in which they find themselves, define it, and define the behavior in which they plan to engage. “Preliminary to any self-determined act of behavior there is always a stage of examination and deliberation which we may call the definition of the situation” (Thomas, 1931, p. 41). This definition is a way the individual can make sense of situations in which they are faced within social interaction and therefore decide how to act. Behavior is dependent on the definition of the situation that the individual has and different definitions of situations (even if they are similar situations factually) will result in different behavior and interaction by social actors. In addition, different individuals within the same situation may hold differing definitions based on previous interactions and social experiences. As a result, even “everyday” situations will be defined and possibly redefined and may have different definitions each time the individual is presented with the situation.

“Definitions of situations thus exist in the minds of the individuals who participate in them...each person acts on the basis of his or her ‘knowledge’ of the situation, role making and role taking in terms of its sensed role structure...Definitions of the situations are thus ‘shared’ by participants in the sense that each person acts on the basis of a definition that more or less resembles the definition held by others” (Hewitt, 1997, p. 127). Although the situation may

appear the same outwardly, different people may hold very different definitions of that particular situation and therefore act differently based on these definitions. As a result, a situation that may appear “normal” or similar may result in different behaviors and different actions by all those involved and these may require the situation to be redefined by one or more individuals within the interaction. Yet, definitions of the situation will only be known by those who hold them since they are internal processes and not manifested outwardly until someone acts upon their definition of the situation (Emerson, 1970; Hewitt, 1997; Thomas, 1931). Unless explicitly stated or possibly understood from previous interaction, the different social actors within a situation will not know what the others’ definition of the situation is and whether this definition is similar or contrary to their definition of the situation.

(Mis)Definition of Situations

Officers may define particular situations with certain circumstances as allowing for certain behaviors that in another situation may not be allowed (or seen as permissible). Based upon the definition of the situation, officers may decide that misconduct is allowed or at least not prohibited, but in another situation with a different definition of the situation these same behaviors might be seen as wrong or at least not allowed. For example, if an officer pulls over a vehicle for DUI and the driver is another officer, the driver might be given a warning and be “escorted” home while in another situation, if the driver were a citizen they would be arrested and/or cited. The behaviors are the same, the only difference is the person operating the vehicle and the definition the patrol officer has of the particular situation. “One has a role in the situation relative to the roles of others” (Hewitt, 1997, p. 126). Certain behaviors are seen as allowed in particular situations because of officers’ definitions of these situations and the roles they are expected to take within them. Their definitions may allow these behaviors that in other contexts would be deemed wrong and/or illegal based upon subcultural norms and expectations (despite the fact that many of these behaviors are condemned and proscribed by official regulations and rules within departments and would garner a reprimand if observed by supervisors).

“Each person, by acting on the basis of a definition of the situation, constructs acts that fit with the expectations of others in the situation” (Hewitt, 1997, p. 127). As such, definitions of the situation(s) would be dependent on the officer(s) who are involved within that situation. For example, rookies might define a certain situation differently than veteran patrol officers might. These may be based upon interactions within the department, with other officers and from social learning of the formal rules (through field training and the academy) and informal rules and expectations. Gender might also influence definitions and involvement in misconduct since research has indicated that male officers tend to engage in higher rates of misconduct than do female officers (Hunt and Manning, 1991; Maher, 2003; Pogarsky and Piquero, 2004; Prokos and Padavic, 2002).

In addition, based upon the definition of certain situations officers may decide to engage in particular behaviors (which could be considered misconduct) to present a certain type of self to other officers, as well as, themselves. Officers may want to appear to be trustworthy, understanding, and want the acceptance of the group and therefore engage in misbehavior which

they may or may not believe is acceptable in which to engage. This is particularly true for rookies who are trying to show they are trustworthy and want to be accepted by the other, more veteran, officers within a department (Barker, 1983; Hunt and Manning, 1991; Kappeler et al., 1994, 1998; Pogarsky and Piquero, 2004).

“Situations that were defined in one way can be redefined; situations that were defined can become undefined; situations that were defined congruently can become defined less congruently” (Hewitt, 1997, p. 130). A behavior that may be defined as accepting of misconduct through one definition of the situation may in another situation be seen as unacceptable. In one instance, the situation is defined as accepted behavior (though it could be considered misbehavior by some), but in another instance, the same situation can be redefined and this same behavior is no longer acceptable. Also, a situation can begin to be defined one way by officers (as ordinary, though technically misconduct, such as receiving free drinks) and quickly be redefined and be seen as unacceptable. Officers could do the opposite and a situation that was once defined as unacceptable may become defined as acceptable behavior through socialization or interaction with other officers.

Since “...culture is what ultimately provides our definitions of situations” (Hewitt, 1997, p. 128), it can be inferred that the specific subculture of policing can provide definitions of particular situations where misconduct is deemed appropriate or acceptable and other situations where misconduct may be seen as unacceptable, despite the fact that the officers are engaging in the same behavior and/or types of behaviors. Through training (both formal, such as the academy) and informal (through interaction with other officers), new officers learn the definitions of situations with which they will be presented while on the job and learn which situations (as they are socially defined through the lens of policing) allow for misconduct-like behaviors. Officers may learn through socialization with a particular group or department which establishments offer “gratuities” (i.e., free drinks/food) and which do not. New officers will learn who shares the definitions of the situation as allowing for certain behaviors (misconduct) and who does not share these definitions (or more likely, who is trustworthy with information pertaining to misdeeds and who is not). Those entering the police academy may not hold the same definitions of the situation that other, more veteran officers hold, but through entering the culture of policing and adopting the rules and values of this culture, rookies may change their definitions of the situation that they have and “learn” to accept misconduct (Conser, 1980; Chappell and Piquero, 2004; Prokos and Padavic, 2002).

Since it is thought that through training and socialization within the subculture of policing officers learn to deviate and learn when such activities are condoned and when they are not, it would be expected that officers would also learn definitions of situations through this same interaction. “When people define a situation, they do so from their social perspectives as actual or potential participants. People locate situations temporally from the vantage point of shared ideas about the meaning of events as they occur in time” (Hewitt, 1997, p. 125). While “on duty” an officer may define a certain situation one way (whether allowing for misconduct or not), but when not on duty the same individual may define the situation in a completely different way. While on duty situations are defined through the social lens of being a police officer, “off duty” situations, despite being the same and involving the same people and/or behaviors, would

no longer be defined through the “officer” lens, but through the lens of another social identity the individual has (whether that be wife, mother, husband, or father). Therefore, receiving a free drink while in uniform may be seen as acceptable because the definition of the situation allows it, while not in uniform or not on duty, the same individual may decide to pay for the drink since the definition of the situation has changed based on the identity being assumed by the individual. “Definitions of the situation imply roles and identities” (Hewitt, 1997, p. 128). In one situation, defined in one way, a certain role can be taken, whereas if the definition changes (regardless of a change in the actual situation) a different role can and should be taken.

In addition, because of the nature of police work, definitions of situations can change swiftly and without notice. “Under some conditions, the relative social and temporal locations of participants in a situation, as well as the larger context within which the situation is itself embedded, can be drastically and swiftly transformed” (Hewitt, 1997, p. 127). What was possibly defined as a situation that would allow for a certain behavior may quickly change into a different situation (based on a new definition of the situation), which no longer allows for the same behavior and where the participants involved need to change their course of action, interaction, and ultimate behavior. For example, an officer may start to arrest someone due to vandalism based on the definition of the situation including a crime having been committed; but this definition may quickly change once ID is produced by the suspect showing them to be a relative of the chief or another supervisor. The officer may then change the definition of the situation to allow for a warning rather than an arrest (which may ultimately turn into a case of misconduct as well). As a result of the change in the definition of the situation a completely different course of action is started and the participants engage in behavior different from the original behavior that had been planned.

Conclusion

Although several researchers examine the issue of police misconduct, few, if any, examine these behaviors from a sociological lens. In addition, even fewer examine these behaviors by applying concepts from symbolic interaction, specifically the concept of definition of the situation. Although some have indicated how officers are taught misconduct through socialization, training and social interaction, few discuss the idea of symbolic interaction and how these concepts can help shed more light upon the problems of police misconduct (Hunt and Manning, 1991; Kappeler et al., 1994, 1998). By examining how definition of the situation can impact police misconduct and police behavior in general, hopefully more information about these behaviors can be gleaned and future research can be conducted within this area. Empirical research should be done to further examine how symbolic interaction and definition of the situation influences police behavior, specifically police misconduct.

References

- Barker, T. & Carter, D. L. (1986). *Police Deviance*. Cincinnati, OH: Pilgrimage.
- Barker, T. (1983). Rookie police officers' perceptions of police occupational deviance. *Police Studies*, 2, 30-38.
- Champion, D. J. (2001). *Police Misconduct in America: A Reference Handbook*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC- CLIO.
- Chappell, A. T. & Piquero, A. R. (2004). Applying social learning theory to police conduct. *Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 25, 89-108.
- Conser, J. (1980). A literary review of the police subculture: Its characteristics, impact and policy implications. *Police Studies*, 15(1), 46-54.
- Ekenvall, B. (2003). Police attitudes towards fellow officers' misconduct: The Swedish case and comparison with the USA and Croatia. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 3, 210-232.
- Emerson, J. (1970). Behavior in private places: Sustaining definitions of reality in gynecological examinations. In J. O'Brien and P. Kollock (Eds.), *The Production of Reality: Essays and Readings on Social Interaction* (pp. 265-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Herbert, S. (1998). Police subculture reconsidered. *Criminology*, 36, 343-369.
- Hewitt, J. P. (1997). *Self and Society: A Symbolic Interactionist Social Psychology*. (7th edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hunt, J. & Manning, P. (1991). The social context of police lying. *Symbolic Interaction*, 14(1), 51-70.
- Hunter, R. D. (1999). Officer opinions on police misconduct. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 15, 155-170.
- Kappeler, V.E., Sluder, R.D. & Alpert, G. P. (1994). *Forces of Deviance: Understanding the Dark Side of Policing*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Kappeler, V.E., Sluder, R.D. & Alpert, G. P. (1998). *Forces of Deviance: Understanding the Dark Side of Policing*. (2nd edition). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Maher, T. M. (2003). Police sexual misconduct: Officers' perceptions of its extent and causality. *Criminal Justice Review*, 28, 355-381.
- McCormack, R. J. (1996). Police perceptions and the norming of institutional corruption.

Policing and Society, 6, 239-246.

Pagon, M., Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C. & Lobnikar, B. (1998). Understanding police deviance: Personal and interpersonal determinants. *Security Journal*, 11, 179-184.

Pogarsky, G. & Piquero, A. (2004). Studying the reach of deterrence: Can deterrence theory help explain police misconduct? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, 371-386.

Prokos, A. & Padavic, I. (2002). 'There oughtta be a law against bitches': Masculinity lessons in police academy training. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 9, 439-459.

Punch, M. (2003). Rotten orchards: "Pestilence", police misconduct and system failure. *Policing and Society*, 13, 171-196.

Son, I. S. & Rome, D. M. (2004). The prevalence and visibility of police misconduct: A survey of citizens and police officers. *Police Quarterly*, 7, 179-204.

Stoddard, E. R. (1968). The informal "code" of police deviancy: A group approach to "blue-coat crime". *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 59, 201-213

Thomas, W. (1931). *The Unadjusted Girl*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

van Laere, E. M. P. & Geerts, R. W. M. (1985). Deviant police behavior. *Policing*, 3, 187-198.

Westley, W. (1956). Secrecy and the police. *Social Forces*, 34(3), 254-257.
doi:10.2307/2574048

Call for Papers, Authors, Applicants?

If you are working on a project and need authors for book chapters or encyclopedia entries, let us know. We'll include that call in the *Police Forum* for free.

Or, if you are hosting a conference or seminar and need participants, let us know that too. We'll be happy to help spread the word. For free.

Or, if you have a job opportunity—particularly of interest to those teaching or researching in areas related to policing—we'd love to help you announce that position...and yes, we'll do it **for free!**

Send any announcements that you would like to have included in the next issue of the *Police Forum* to Jeff Bumgarner at...
bumg0004@umn.edu.

ARE YOU AN ACJS LIFETIME MEMBER?

Please remember that you still must pay the Police Section dues annually to remain a member of the Police Section. Membership is \$37 per year and includes a subscription to *Police Quarterly*. Payment of dues is made to ACJS. Thanks!!!

Submission Guidelines for the *Police Forum*

Format Criteria

The format criteria for all submissions are as follows: reasonable length (less than 30 pages), double-spaced, and in a font similar to 12 pt Times New Roman. All submissions should be in Word format. All charts, graphs, pictures, etc. must be one page or smaller and contained within standard margins. Please attach these at the end of the submission as appendices. Due to formatting limitations all appendices must be in a Word, Excel or similar format - PDF's cannot be used.

Feature Articles

Feature Articles can be quantitative or qualitative. Tables, figures and charts should be kept to a minimum and should be inserted at the end of the document with an appropriate reference to placement location within the text. The page limits are flexible, however the editors reserve the right to edit excessively long manuscripts.

Practitioners Corner

Articles written from the perspective of persons currently or formerly working in the field, expressing personal observations or experiences concerning a particular area or issue. Page limits are flexible, however long articles may be edited for length.

Academic Pontification

Articles for this area should focus on making an argument, presenting a line of thought, or formulating a new conceptual idea in policing.

Point/Counterpoint

Authors are encouraged to work with another person to develop a point/counterpoint piece. The initial argument should be between 2 and 5 pages. The initial argument should contain roughly 3 to 5 main points. Following exchange of

Submission Guidelines – cont.

articles between debating authors, a 1 to 3-page rejoinder/ rebuttal will be submitted.

Research Notes

Research notes should describe a work in progress, a thumbnail outline of a research project, a conceptual methodological piece, or any other article relating to research methods or research findings in policing.

Reviews

Book reviews on any work relating to policing. Reviews of Internet sites or subjects concerning policing on the Internet are also welcome.

Policing in the News

News items of interest to the police section are welcomed in any form.

Legal News in Policing

Reviews of court cases, legal issues, lawsuits, and legal liability in policing are welcomed submissions.

Letters to the Editor

Questions, comments or suggestions pertaining to a given Criminal Justice topic, article or research.

This Date in History

Submissions on prior hot topics, research or research methods in Criminal Justice from the past.

Submission Guidelines – cont.

Good News

Submissions relating to professional and personal good news for our members - promotions, new jobs, marriages, etc.

How to Submit

Submissions may be made electronically by sending copy in a Word format to bumg0004@umn.edu or by sending a copy on CD or memory stick to Dr. Jeff Bumgarner, Editor, Police Forum, 2900 University Avenue, Selvig Hall 217, Crookston, MN 56716. CDs or sticks can be returned if requested.

Disclaimer

The editor(s) of this publication reserve the right to edit any submissions for length, clarity or other issues.

OPEN LETTER TO POLICE SECTION MEMBERS

RE: INVITATION TO JOIN THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE (IACP)

Dear Academic Colleague:

The IACP is the oldest and largest law enforcement leadership organization in the world. Under our banner of ‘Serving the Leaders of Today, Developing the Leaders of Tomorrow’ we seek to create dynamic and innovative leadership in federal, state, tribal and local law enforcement across the country.

One way we are achieving this goal is through a strong partnership between law enforcement and academic researchers in U.S. colleges and universities. Our *Research Advisory Committee* (RAC) serves as a model of academic/practitioner partnerships, with equal representation of both disciplines among the 30 appointed members.

As the Co-Chairs of the RAC, we write to invite you to become a member of the IACP. We strongly believe that joining IACP can be of great assistance to you as you achieve your academic mission. Here are just a few examples of the products and services IACP can provide:

Cutting edge, evidenced-based, policing and justice system policy publications to enhance you and your students’ awareness of emerging issues and the police leadership role

Our monthly *Police Chief Magazine* that highlights innovative police practices and ground-breaking police/academic research results

Opportunities within our Student Internship Program, offering 12-week internships to both undergraduate and graduate students in the justice and/or law enforcement field

Advice and support to you, those that teach in your department and your students as they design and carry out thesis or dissertation-level research in justice and law enforcement

Direct linkage to over 22,000 federal, state, tribal and local law enforcement leaders (IACP members) to help you in your work, and to help you guide students considering careers in law enforcement

Membership in the IACP is only \$125.00 per year and it entitles you to a broad spectrum of information and services well beyond the few examples listed here. If you would like to become

a member, we'd be pleased to be sponsors for your application. A copy of that application is attached here with our IACP membership numbers already included. And if before joining you have questions, please contact John Firman, IACP's Director of Research and the staff liaison to our committee.

We hope you'll join us as we work to build a stronger bridge between the academic and practitioner communities that we know will benefit both groups equally and in the end ensure increased public and officer safety to American citizens.

Sincerely,

Ed Davis
Commissioner
Boston Police Department

Laurie Robinson
Professor
George Mason University

Editor's Note: Please contact Laurie Robinson via email at laurieorobinson@gmail.com if you would like join. She will provide you with a sponsor number, which will be needed for the application.

FACULTY VACANCY

Virginia Union University
Richmond, VA

Assistant/Associate Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice

The Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Virginia Union University invites applications for a non-tenure track (but tenure-eligible) position at the assistant or associate professor level. The Department seeks to fill this position for fall 2014. Criminology and Criminal Justice is the largest academic major on the campus and the department has a unique partnership with the City of Richmond Police Training Academy which is located on the University's campus.

Minimum Qualifications: A Ph.D. in Criminal Justice or Criminology from a regionally accredited institution is required at the time of appointment (a JD is not an appropriate degree for these positions). Official copies of college transcripts must be on file by the appointment date. Teaching experience, service, and record of scholarly activity appropriate to the rank are desirable.

Preferred Qualifications: The department seeks a dynamic individual to teach core undergraduate courses in criminal justice and criminology. Preference will be given to candidates with expertise in the following areas: Research Methods and Statistics or Forensic Investigations. Individuals who have experience with the development and teaching of online courses will also be given preference. In addition to teaching, the position entails undergraduate student advising, active participation in department, college and university committees, and active involvement in scholarly activities such as publishing and obtaining grants. Other duties may be assigned as needed, and excellence in teaching, research, and service is required for future promotion and tenure consideration.

The selected applicant may be required to submit to a background investigation. VUU is an Equal Opportunity, Affirmative-Action Institution committed to cultural, racial, and ethnic communities and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. It is expected that successful candidates share in this

Virginia Union University Vacancy Announcement – continued

commitment. Persons who need reasonable accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act to participate in the application process should contact the Office of Human Resources at 804-257-5841.

Application Deadline: Review of applications will begin immediately and will continue until the position is filled.

Contact: For qualified applicants, the application packet should contain a letter of interest, curriculum vita, a copy of graduate transcripts, sample publication and syllabus, and three current letters of recommendation (at least one of which addresses teaching qualifications.) The application package may be e-mailed to Resumes@vuu.edu. Mail complete package to the following address: Virginia Union University, Office of Human Resources, Attention: CCJ Faculty Search Committee, 1500 North Lombardy Street, Richmond, VA 23220. Please contact Dr. Julie Molloy, Chairperson of the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, if you have questions about this position. She may be reached at 804-257-5682 or jamolloy@vuu.edu. Please visit www.vuu.edu for additional information about the University.

ACJS 2015 Awards

Criteria, nomination, and contact information for all 2015 ACJS Awards are now online at http://www.acjs.org/pubs/167_770_3512.cfm. Please be sure to note the deadlines on the website for individual awards:

2015 ACJS Awards – Includes Bruce Smith, Sr. Award, Academy Fellow Award, Academy Founder's Award, Outstanding Book Award, William L. Simon/Anderson Publishing Outstanding Paper Award, Michael C. Braswell/Anderson Publishing Outstanding Student Paper Award, Donal MacNamara Award, Academy New Scholar Award, ACJS Minority Mentorship Grant Award, Outstanding Mentor Awards, and the Sage Junior Faculty Professional Development Teaching Award.

2015 ACJS Student Scholarship Awards

2015 Affirmative Action Awards – Includes Minorities and Women Section Esther Madriz Student Travel Awards and Affirmative Action Student Scholarship Mini-Grant Travel Awards.

2015 ACJS Section Awards

Questions regarding the above awards should be directed to the contact individuals listed on the ACJS Awards website page (link above).

Be sure read through all the award information and send in your nominations today!

Looking forward to seeing everyone in Orlando next March.

Cathy Barth, ACJS Association Manager

ACJS 52nd Annual Meeting

“Broadening the Horizon of the Criminal Justice Sciences: Looking Outward Rather Than Inward”

March 3-7, 2015

2015 Hotel Accommodations

Caribe Royale All-Suite Hotel and Convention Center

8101 World Center Drive
Orlando, FL 32821
407-238-8000

This hotel is an all-suite property. There is no concierge level upgrade available. The hotel group per night rate for the 2015 ACJS Annual Meeting will be:

Single Occupancy	\$159.00
Double Occupancy	\$159.00
Triple Occupancy	\$174.00
Quad Occupancy	\$189.00

Upgrade to King Deluxe Suite Additional \$20 per night

Two-Bedroom Villa \$259.00

The above occupancy rates are available only until February 11, 2015, subject to available space in the ACJS room block. The room fees and taxes total approximately 12.5% in addition to the rates listed above. Note also that room rates will include complimentary in-suite internet, complimentary access to the Fitness Center, no resort fees, and complimentary self-parking.

It is preferred that you reserve your hotel accommodations through the online reservation system, which also provides more detailed information about the hotel. If you choose to call the hotel for reservations, be sure to mention that you are with the ACJS Annual Meeting group.

The online hotel reservation system link is: <https://resweb.passkey.com/go/acjs15>

NOTE: The minutes below are to be considered and approved, with corrections, at the Police Section Business meeting in Orlando, FL during the 2015 ACJS Annual Meeting.

DRAFT

**Minutes
ACJS Police Section General Business Meeting
Philadelphia, PA**

February 21, 2014

Meeting called to order at 1705. Approx. 47 in attendance.

1. Approval of 2013 General Business Meeting Minutes.
Motion made and seconded. Approved.

Introductions, new vice-chair, Don DeCarlo (will become chair after Orlando). Jeff Bumgarner stepping down as secretary, Veronyka James taking over as secretary. Stan Shurnock (not in attendance) (term ending, Pat Nelson stepping in as counselor). Mike Buerger executive counselor, Jeff Smith executive counselor.

2. Treasurer's Report

New position: Denise Womer, recruitment & membership, Facebook page and group. Staffed police section table and will staff it in Orlando also. Created a social media presence.

3. Police Forum & Police Quarterly Report

Forum editor, Jeff Bumgarner: *Forum* is a non-peer-reviewed quarterly newsletter publication of the section (use information of members from Cathy Barth to send it out to section members). If can fix returned emails, if members are not getting it, and should be contact Jeff B. The minutes are included in the *Forum*. Suggestions or corrections send to secretary and will be fixed before meeting. There are currently 0 articles in the bank for the forum; challenging to get people to submit articles, pilot studies, reviews, etc. The *Forum* needs submissions for newsletter, might wait to get information and submissions after meeting. Fallen to tri-annually (rather than quarterly) due to lack of submissions, if people know students or others interested let them know to submit to *Forum*. Only reviewed by editor. Faculty students, encourage colleague to submit to *Forum*. Also looking for news items, published books, awards, new positions/promotions, job vacancy announcements (no charge), no cost for announcements.

Police Quarterly: contract still not completely finalized but will be soon. Section members subscription to quarterly issues will be delivered completely online, will happen and will lower costs approx. \$5-7 per subscription. Exec board talked about lowering dues approximately the same amount. Not sure what to do with cost savings, nothing realized until final negotiation completed. Not really decided what to do about savings. Currently largest section, need discussions and votes over next couple years. John Worrall, editor, continues to get inquiries from practitioners from field and has relationship with the population, he doesn't want it to be a journal purely for academics. Editor wants to keep PQ relatable to practitioners and academics; fair amount of desk rejections to keep broad readership appeal.

4. Fiscal Report

There are about 225 members at \$37 a piece, bring in about \$8000 per year, publication costs about \$5000 a year and other costs about \$1000, \$1500 a year. Balance is about \$26,000-\$27,000. Section stayed frugal with ice cream social, largest membership, and has bank account and is maintaining it. If there are any ideas for spending monies suggest to the board. Have ability to move some money.

5. Thank You

Rich Mason, retired law enforcement, teaching with Camden County College, introduced and thanked for bringing students to conference and meeting.

6. Awards

Lucy Hochstein received award for ACJS Police Outstanding Service Award for outstanding service for being police section historian. Just awarded a sabbatical for developing more of the historical perspective of the police section and why it is important and why people should join. May have some papers/presentations in the future. Has been historian since 2003; wants everything related to archives/history of police section.

If there is anything related to the ACJS police section, it would like to be acquired and sent to historian. Contact information for historian is in the *Forum*.

Penny Shtull committee chair for O. W. Wilson Award presented it to Edmund McGarrell (he was nominated by previous award winner). He was nominated due to being director for 13+ years, significant work in publication with drug market intervention, public safe neighborhoods, worked with the Department of Homeland Security, is a great mentor to younger faculty in conservation of criminology, counterfeiting, very diverse areas within law enforcement.

7. New business

There was conversation of doing something for student members (cost reduction for dues?) but you need to be a member of ACJS to be a section member. Will have lifetime membership discussion; never had student fee (always the same \$37 for everyone). Will be working on student fee for discounted rate and receiving membership perks.

Section members can download *Police Forum* on ACJS section page and the current officers and information is there.

Motion to adjourn.
Moved & seconded.
Adjourned at 1735.



www.ipes.info

IPES Institutional Supporters

The International Police Executive Symposium, IPES, www.ipes.info, is a registered not-for-profit educational corporation for the encouragement of police educational endeavors and providing professional service to the police of the world. **It is in special consultative status with the United Nations.** It relies on the assistance of institutional supporters to carry out its mission.

Institutional supporters are encouraged to be active participants in the IPES, contributing to its policies and programs. The IPES offers institutional supporters a spectrum of services, from providing police education solutions to executing training courses.

Institutional supporters are part of the IPES global network of criminal justice elites: A large and diverse multinational group represented by influential police policy makers, high-ranking practitioners and scholars at top academic institutions who initiate and advance the activities of the IPES.

For an annual fee of US \$ 400.00, institutional supporters receive:

- Full access to the informational resources and professional global contacts of the IPES
- Invitation to the IPES annual meetings
- Free accommodations and hospitality at IPES annual meetings (after payment of discounted fee)
- Six issues of Police Practice and Research: An International Journal (PPR) FREE (Annual subscription, January – December)
- Free copies of IPES publications which include official brochures and executive summaries of annual meetings
- Participation in United Nations Meetings as IPES representatives
- Publication of the names of all Institutional Supporters in every issue of the Journal, in all IPES books and IPES website

For all inquiries about Institutional Supporter issues, please contact: Paul Moore, IPES Treasurer/Secretary, at paul@ipes.info (phone: 318-322-5300). Institutional Supporters may also contact IPES President, Dr. Dilip Das, at dilipkd@aol.com

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences

Police Section

Executive Board

Chair

Charles L. Johnson
Western New England University
webecougs@gmail.com

Vice-Chair

John DeCarlo
John Jay College of Criminal Justice, CUNY
jdecarlo@jjay.cuny.edu

Immediate Past Chair

Janice Ahmad
University of Houston Downtown
ahmadj@uhd.edu

Secretary

Veronyka James
Virginia Union University
vjjames@vuu.edu

Historian

Lucy Hochstein
Radford University
lhochstei@radford.edu

Executive Counselors

Pat Nelson
Minnesota State Univ, Mankato
patricia.nelson@mnsu.edu

Michael Buerger
Bowling Green State University
mbuerge@bgsu.edu

Jeff Smith
Lawrenceville (GA) Police Dept
jsmith@lawrencevillepd.com

Editor:

Jeff Bumgarner
North Dakota State University
jeffrey.bumgarner@ndsu.edu

http://www.acjs.org/police_section.cfm

Membership: Join online at www.acjs.org

ISSN - 1061-1517