

An Empirical Assessment of Police-Community Corrections Partnerships in Texas: A Model for Asian Societies¹

Bitna Kim²

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Jurg Gerber

Sam Houston State University

Dan Richard Beto

Texas Regional Community Policing Institute

Police-community corrections partnerships have been in existence in the U.S. for about two decades. We review briefly their history in the U.S. and then turn our attention to how such partnerships are viewed by police officers. In general, it appears that partnerships between probation departments and police are better established than those involving police and parole departments. We then conclude by examining the prospects that such partnerships can be used as a model for Asian societies.

Community justice is a relatively recent concept (Clear & Cadora, 2003). Definitions vary on the meaning of this concept, but at its core are the ideas of *community policing*, *community courts*, and *community corrections*. More importantly, whereas the traditional criminal justice model deals with *cases*, community justice has the following foci: (1) Places, not just cases, (2) a proactive, rather than reactive approach, (3) problem solving, not simply allocating blame, (4) decentralization, not hierarchy, and (5) fluid organizational boundaries (Clear & Cadora, 2003). The last of these foci is the starting point for this paper. The criminal justice system in the U.S. is in many ways three loosely related subsystems. These three relatively independent subsystems are expected to keep communities safe and to control crime to the extent possible. However, this is exceptionally difficult because the system usually becomes involved only after crimes have been committed. In other words, the failure of social control has already occurred

¹ Paper presented at the 2010 annual meeting of the Asian Association of Police Studies, Seoul, South Korea. This paper is based in part on a report by Kim, Gerber, and Beto (2007). The authors would like to thank an anonymous reviewer of this journal for providing this suggestion.

² Corresponding author
Email address: bitna.kim@iup.edu



when representatives of criminal justice become active. Furthermore, the task of officers is complicated by the fact that the various agencies are involved at different times. Whereas police agencies are involved with offenders in the early stages of the criminal justice processes, community corrections agencies may become involved years later in the lives of these same offenders. To further complicate matters, police and community corrections see their own roles very differently. Police define their function primarily in terms of law enforcement, but parole and probation agents think of themselves as agents of corrections as the term community corrections implies (Corbett, 1998). Although police and community corrections agencies are part of one general system in theory, the reality is that there is little coordination in their activities and their efforts aimed at establishing and maintaining social control may be fairly disjointed (Cole & Smith, 2007). The most negative interpretation would be that the various subsystems can engage in a “turf battle,” the situation where two competing groups or organizations fight for influence at the expense of the other.

At the same time, there should be considerable coordination because there are some common concerns that underlie their responsibilities and duties. The monitoring of offenders provides one example. After an offender has been placed under some form of community supervision he or she may be monitored by an appropriate community corrections officer as well as law enforcement officers. In theory, this requires collaboration and cooperation between community corrections and police agencies. The more the representatives of the two types of agencies are familiar with each other's work, the more efficient and effective they are likely to be in their own. For instance, community corrections officers may assist police officers in their effort to investigate crimes. Parole officers may have intelligence about community activities that police may not have--one parolee may inform a parole officer about the criminal activities of one of his friends, but may be unwilling to share this information with a police officer (Byrne & Hummer, 2004). Similarly, a police officer who arrests a probationer may assist the probationer and the probation officer with a simple telephone call. Instead of proceeding with the usual criminal justice processes, a collaborative effort between the police and the probation department may lead to more efficient, and better, efforts to protect the community and reintegrating an offender who has transgressed again, albeit in a minor fashion.

In practice, partnerships between community corrections and police agencies have been in existence for many years, but in most instances they have been relatively informal. Instead of having elaborate and formal arrangements as their basis, they often relied on personal friendships. A particular probation officer may have had a good friend working for the police, and they collaborated, but they did so on a personal rather than an agency level. The collaboration likely ended when the personal link was no longer present. With retirements, reassignments, promotions, and changing priorities, many of these wonderful personal relationships evaporated during the 1980s, and the effectiveness of offender supervision suffered (Beto, 2005).

Our goal in this research is to evaluate the nature and extent of such partnerships from the perspective of the principles of *community justice*. To what extent do such partnerships exist? How are they seen by police officers? Do they achieve the goals of community justice? Although we begin by evaluating such partnerships in Texas, an

AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF POLICE-COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIPS IN TEXAS

important aspect of the paper is the application of such partnerships to Asian societies. In general, the empirical reality of many Asian societies is such that there are some conditions that are conducive to the existence of partnerships, but there are others that make them unlikely. In a discussion of the relative successes of community policing, Brogden and Nijhar (2005, p. 85) argued that criminal justice in Japan, Singapore, and China is characterized by: "close cooperation between police, state, prosecution, and the penal system," that "citizens are encouraged to assist in maintaining public order," that "the police are granted considerable discretion in dealing with offenders," and that "the community police have wider functions than in the West." All of these conditions are consistent with the idea of having extensive partnerships. However, a key requirement of community justice is the notion of decentralization of the criminal justice systems. In general, most Asian societies have very centralized criminal justice systems. In Japan, for instance, although some powers are found at the prefectural level, "actual control of the police rests with the National Police Agency, which coordinates the nationwide law enforcement system" (Terrill, 2003, p. 381). To the extent that the systems are centralized, extensive partnerships are not likely to evolve.

REVIEW OF POLICE-PROBATION PARTNERSHIPS

There were several formal partnerships that existed in the United States throughout the 1990s that were aimed at formalizing the informal arrangements of an earlier time. Operation Night Light in Boston was one such example that focused on youth violence. Responding to high rates of youth violence and the failure of the traditional crime control model that had probation and police officers working independently, Boston attempted a new approach that formalized collaboration between agencies. Furthermore, Operation Night Light also changed monitoring patterns. Instead of visiting high risk youths during conventional daytime hours, teams of probation and police officers made surprise visits between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and midnight. These changes resulted in a substantial decrease in arrest rates for probationers under this program (Corbett, 1998; Kelling & Corbett, 2003).

Around the same time, under the guidance of the Manhattan Institute, a nationwide effort to transform probation was initiated. The Reinventing Probation Council took its inspiration from the "broken windows" thesis on policing. In its most basic form, the broken windows thesis states that police should respond to minor problems in communities. If left unchecked, these minor problems will evolve into major ones. However, instead of simply enforcing the law, police officers should take a proactive problem solving approach to their work; an approach that includes meaningful partnerships with other agencies (Reinventing Probation Council, 2000).

Project Spotlight was such an effort in Texas. Grants from the Governor's Office allowed the creation of teams of juvenile probation officers, community supervision officers, and police officers in seven counties to provide better and more coordinated supervision of at-risk populations. Similar to Operation Night Light and the

recommendations made by the Reinventing Probation Council, the Texas program included supervision during late evening hours, but also the provision of services from various social and community agencies (Kalmbach, 2002; Beto & Kester, 2002; Beto, 2005).

Other examples of collaborative relationships developed in the 1990s between law enforcement and community corrections include: the Anti-Violence Initiative in Minneapolis, Minnesota; Clark County Anti-Gang Unit in Vancouver, Washington; Project One Voice in New Haven, Connecticut; Smart Partners in Redmond, Washington; Fugitive Recovery Enforcement Team in San Francisco, California; Indianapolis Violence Reduction Partnership in Indianapolis, Indiana; and an information sharing project in Phoenix, Arizona (Parent & Snyder, 1999; Griffin, et al., 2004). More recently we have witnessed the growth of partnerships between law enforcement and community corrections agencies for the purpose of conducting probation and parole sweeps throughout the United States (News from the Field, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c).

The creation of partnerships between probation and police agencies has not been limited to the United States. The value of such relationships has been seen in Canada, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Australia, where various forms of partnerships have been created (Evans, 2006; News from the Field, 2006a, 2006c).

The success of such programs hinges upon the level of support they receive from the parties involved. Research findings are mixed (Parent & Snyder, 1999). While formal evaluations are rare and assessments rely primarily on anecdotal evidence, Griffin, Hepburn, & Webb (2004, p. 5) evaluated a program in Maricopa County, Arizona and found “no hard evidence had surfaced that use of the shared database, under the existing circumstances and within the project period, had resulted in measurable reductions in crime.” If partnerships are simply mandated from “the top down” rather than endorsed and nurtured they are much less likely to work (for a discussion of similar issues on a global level, see Wisler & Onwudiwe [2011]).

SURVEY OF TEXAS LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Previous research has addressed the issue of police and community corrections collaboration in Texas. Kalmbach (2002) described Project Spotlight and Watkins addressed the issue more generally in “Formal Interagency Collaboration in Policing” (Watkins, 2001). To update their research, and to evaluate the partnerships that now exist, the Correctional Management Institute of Texas and the Texas Regional Center for Policing Innovation surveyed adult and juvenile community corrections agencies to determine the nature and perceptions of partnerships with police agencies (Beto, 2005). In the current survey, Texas law enforcement departments were asked about their perceptions. We asked about perceptions concerning partnerships in general, but we also asked about specialized partnerships focusing on issues such as *enhanced supervision*, *fugitive apprehension*, and *targeting high crime areas* (such specialized partnerships are commonly discussed in the literature—cf., Parent and Snyder, 1999).

AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF POLICE-COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIPS IN TEXAS

Borrowing from earlier surveys by Sexton (2000), Hughes (2000), Watkins (2001), and Kalmbach (2002), particular interest was focused on the nature and impact of the effect of leadership and organizational core culture on partnerships. Based on organizational literature (Bennis, 1996; Burke, 2001), we hypothesized that strong organizational leadership that supports and endorses partnerships with community corrections agencies would lead to more and better partnerships. Furthermore, we also hypothesized that police agencies that possess a core culture that values collaboration have a greater number of partnership agreements than agencies that see the police mission in more isolated terms (cf., Wang, 2006). Also of interest were differences between municipal police departments and sheriff's offices in terms of partnerships. It was hypothesized that the differences in political pressures on the two types of law enforcement departments might affect the extent to which they enter into agreements of any kind with other agencies. Whereas both types of agencies operate in a political environment, the pressures are much greater for sheriff's offices as sheriffs must be elected and reelected on a regular basis. Furthermore, community corrections departments and sheriff's offices are county-level agencies, unlike municipal police departments.ⁱ It was thus expected that sheriff's offices might have more and better established relationships with community corrections agencies.

Surveys were mailed to 243 sheriff's offices in Texas and also to a random sample of 262 municipal police departments. The survey was administered in two waves. All 505 agencies received the first wave, while only non-respondents received the second one. After the second wave, a total of 101 completed surveys were received from sheriff's offices and 130 from municipal law enforcement departments. The total response rate was 46 percent. The mailing was sent to the respective county sheriff or chief of police, but the instructions accompanying the questionnaire asked that the most appropriate officer in each department complete it. It may thus not be clear if all officers in certain departments are equally knowledgeable about agency partnerships.

Major Findings

Law enforcement departments tend to have more relationships with adult probation departments than with adult parole or with juvenile probation departments, although the difference between adult and juvenile probation is often minimal; see Table 1. For instance, about 65 percent of the law enforcement departments have an informal partnership with adult probation departments with respect to information and intelligence sharing (the corresponding figures for adult parole and juvenile probation are 51.3 percent and 62.3 percent, respectively). For most other forms of "enhanced supervision partnerships" and "specialized enforcement partnerships" the figures are lower, but they are consistently higher for adult probation than for adult parole and about comparable for juvenile probation. For instance, 49 percent of law enforcement agencies have an informal partnership with adult probation agencies with respect to "interagency problem solving partnerships" but only 26 percent do so with adult parole, while about 46 percent of law enforcement departments have them with juvenile probation. With most other

Table 1: Percentage of law enforcement departments having informal partnerships with community correction agencies

	Adult probation	Adult parole	Juvenile probation
Information & intelligence sharing	65.5	51.3	62.3
Interagency problem solving partnerships	49.4	26.1	46.1
Interagency training initiatives	29.4	11.3	31.9

Table 2: Percentage of law enforcement departments having “Enhanced Supervision” partnerships with community correction agencies

	Adult probation	Adult parole	Juvenile probation
Ride along	23.3	8.7	18.5
Beats/districts (geographical assignment)	14.7	5.2	13.8
Targeting high crime areas	22.1	10.4	16.8
Targeting high risk offenders	37.9	23.8	30.7

Table 3: Percentage of law enforcement departments having “Specialized Enforcement” partnerships with community correction agencies

	Adult probation	Adult parole	Juvenile probation
Sex offenders	49.6	34.6	31.5
Domestic violence	39.7	20.8	28.0
Gun removal	22.0	13.0	19.9
Bar checks	15.9	8.2	13.9
Gang interdiction	22.0	13.0	29.7
Drug trafficking	31.6	17.4	27.6
Quality of life issues	18.1	9.5	22.0
Fugitive/absconder apprehension units	38.4	27.8	34.1

forms of specialized enforcement partnerships (e.g., sex offenders, domestic violence, gun removal, drug trafficking, bar checks, and so on) and enhanced supervision partnerships (e.g., ride alongs, targeting high crime areas, and targeting high risk offenders) the figures drop considerably although in many cases 20-40 percent of law enforcement departments report some form of informal relationships between them and adult and juvenile probation departments (see Tables 2 and 3).

**AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF POLICE-COMMUNITY
CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIPS IN TEXAS**

Table 4: Percentages of Law Enforcement Departments that view existing partnerships positively

	Adult probation	Adult parole	Juvenile probation
(1) Working with (adult probation/adult parole/juvenile probation) agencies has given me a great appreciation for their job	56.9	50.4	66.9
(2) Working with (adult probation/adult parole/juvenile probation) agencies has been a positive experience	65.3	61.2	62.3
(3) The roles of (adult probation/adult parole/juvenile probation) agencies and police working in partnership complement each other	79.7	74.3	74.5
(4) The filed activities with (adult probation/adult parole/juvenile probation) agencies has reduced adult crime	24.7	13.3	26.6
(5) I am comfortable working with (adult probation/adult parole/juvenile probation) agencies	79.1	79.3	79.2
(6) The roles of (adult probation/adult parole/juvenile probation) agencies and police working in partnership are confused	38.3	39.7	43.9
(7) The information received from (adult probation/adult parole/juvenile probation) agencies as a result of the partnership is helpful	80.9	78.5	72.9
(8) There are conflicts in the roles of police and (adult probation/adult parole/juvenile probation) agencies	46.7	47.1	42.0
(9) I would be in favor of the partnership with (adult probation/adult parole/juvenile probation) agencies becoming standard operating procedure in my department	64.1	66.1	70.3
(10) I believe the partnership with (adult probation/adult parole/juvenile probation) agencies is an effective method for supervising offenders	80.9	81.8	77.4

However, the overwhelming majority of law enforcement departments do not have any formal partnerships with any community corrections agencies. The greatest number we found for any form of formal partnership was 14 between law enforcement departments and adult probation. Literally only a handful departments (i.e., less than five departments) reported formal partnerships with various types of community corrections agencies on specialized topics. This means that most of these partnerships are not likely to survive when key individuals are transferred or retire (see Beto 2005).

Second, we were interested in how respondents from law enforcement departments who have either formal or informal partnerships evaluate these partnerships. In other words, do they see the partnerships as beneficial to their own agencies or do they see

them as a strain on resources? In general, law enforcement representatives were quite positive in their assessments of the partnerships. As can be seen in Table 4, about 57 percent of the respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement that "working with adult probation agencies has given me a great appreciation for their job" (the corresponding figures for juvenile probation and adult parole are 67 percent and 50 percent, respectively). Similarly, more than 60 percent of all respondents say that the partnerships with each of the three kinds of community corrections agencies "have been a positive experience." Most optimistically, around 80 percent of respondents agreed with the statement, "I believe that the partnership with Adult Probation [Adult Parole or Juvenile Probation, respectively] is an effective method for supervising offenders." In contrast, however, only a small percentage of the respondents agree with the statement that "the partnerships have led to a decrease in adult and juvenile crime," respectively.

A related issue is whether law enforcement officers receive any formal training with respect to the work performed by the various community corrections agencies. Responses indicate law enforcement officers are much more likely to receive training with regard to juvenile probation than with regard to adult probation and parole. About 26 percent of law enforcement departments that have some form of partnership with a juvenile probation department receive at least some training on their work (the corresponding figures for adult probation and parole are 11 and 8 percent, respectively).

Third, we were interested in studying any differences in partnerships between sheriff's offices and municipal law enforcement departments. In Table 5, differences in both formal and informal partnerships between adult probation departments and the two types of law enforcement agencies are depicted. Sheriff's offices are much more likely to have partnerships with adult probation than do municipal law enforcement departments.

For instance, they are three times as likely to have formal partnerships with adult probation with respect to information and intelligence sharing. Similarly, they are more than six times as likely to have a formal partnership with respect to fugitive/absconder apprehension units. For many of the other enhanced supervision and specialized enforcement partnerships the differences are not as dramatic, but they indicate consistently that sheriff's departments are more likely to have both formal and informal partnerships than municipal law enforcement departments. The only notable exception to this rule is in the area of domestic violence where more municipal departments report having both formal and informal partnerships with adult probation than do sheriff's offices.

The situation is less clear with respect to partnerships involving adult parole and juvenile probation departments and law enforcement. An inspection of Table 6 indicates that sheriff's offices are consistently more likely than municipal departments to have both formal and informal partnerships with adult parole (although these differences were not statistically significant). Almost no law enforcement agencies have any formal partnerships with adult parole, with the exception of partnerships that focus on sex offenders.

Differences in partnerships between the two types of law enforcement agencies and juvenile probation departments are minimal as seen in Table 7. However, it is noteworthy that there are several areas in which municipal departments are more likely than sheriff's offices to have entered into partnerships, both formal and informal, with juvenile

AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF POLICE-COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIPS IN TEXAS

Table 5: Percentage of sheriff's offices and municipal police departments with partnerships with adult probation departments

	Formal partnerships		Informal partnerships	
	Sheriff's Offices	Municipal PDs	Sheriff's Offices	Municipal PDs
(1) Information & intelligence sharing	9.9	3.1	67.3	63.8
(2) Interagency problem solving partnerships	4.0	2.3	60.4	41.1
(3) Interagency training initiatives	0.0	0.8	34.7	24.8
(4) Ride along	0.0	0.8	27.7	19.2
(5) Beats/districts (geographical assignment)	0.0	0.8	20.8	10.0
(6) Targeting high crime areas	0.0	1.5	24.0	20.0
(7) Targeting high risk offenders	0.0	1.5	45.5	31.5
(8) Sex offenders	7.9	3.2	53.5	46.2
(9) Domestic violence	3.0	3.8	48.5	63.8
(10) Gun removal	2.0	0.0	26.7	18.5
(11) Bar checks	2.0	0.0	15.8	16.2
(12) Gang interdiction	2.0	0.0	22.8	21.5
(13) Drug trafficking	2.0	0.8	36.6	27.1
(14) Quality of life Issues	2.0	0.8	20.8	15.4
(15) Fugitive/absconder apprehension units	5.0	0.8	46.5	31.5

probation. For instance, there are more partnerships targeting high risk offenders and sex offenders that involve municipal departments than sheriff's offices.

Finally, we were interested in studying the relationship between the nature of the core culture of the law enforcement agency, support of the leadership of the agency, the existence of partnerships, and how they are seen by the agency. The concept of core culture was measured by support for statements such as: "The majority of employees in our organization believe that selected groups of offenders can change their behavior and life styles and that a balanced combination of sanctions, supervision, and services can assist them in doing so." The concept of leadership, in turn, was measured by agreements with statements such as: "The leaders of our organization know what it will take to create and maintain an interagency public safety alliance in our jurisdiction, and they are committed to doing so."

It was hypothesized that good leadership and supportive core culture could lead to more partnerships, and existing partnerships would be evaluated more positively (Bennis, 1996; Burke, 2001; Wang, 2006). The findings indicate partial support for these

Table 6: Percentage of sheriff's offices and municipal police departments with partnerships with adult parole departments

	Formal partnerships		Informal partnerships	
	Sheriff's Offices	Municipal PDs	Sheriff's Offices	Municipal PDs
(1) Information & intelligence sharing	2.0	2.3	51.5	50.8
(2) Interagency problem solving partnerships	1.0	1.6	32.7	21.1
(3) Interagency training initiatives	1.0	0.0	9.9	11.6
(4) Ride along	0.0	0.8	9.9	7.0
(5) Beats/districts (geographical assignment)	0.0	0.0	5.9	4.7
(6) Targeting high crime areas	0.0	0.0	10.9	9.4
(7) Targeting high risk offenders	0.0	0.8	22.8	24.0
(8) Sex offenders	6.9	7.0	35.6	33.3
(9) Domestic violence	1.0	1.6	23.8	17.8
(10) Gun removal	1.0	0.8	15.8	10.9
(11) Bar checks	0.0	0.8	7.9	8.5
(12) Gang interdiction	0.0	0.8	11.9	14.0
(13) Drug trafficking	0.0	0.8	21.8	13.3
(14) Quality of life Issues	0.0	0.8	10.9	7.8
(15) Fugitive/absconder apprehension units	1.0	1.6	34.0	22.5

hypotheses. It was shown that good leadership leads to more informal partnerships, but a core culture supportive of partnerships does not seem to lead to more partnerships.

However, there are very strong, positive relationships between supportive core culture and good leadership and positive evaluations of existing partnerships. Law enforcement departments that are characterized by a core culture that strongly supports interagency partnerships tend to evaluate them positively. The same holds true for departments that have leaders that see a benefit in partnerships. This study therefore finds support for the conclusions reached in a recent study by Lee and Moon (2011) who showed that attitudes of police officers towards COP in Korea were shaped by managerial leadership.

IMPLICATIONS

The results of the survey lead us to be cautiously optimistic about the future of partnerships between police and community corrections agencies. It appears that partnerships between probation departments and police are better established than those

AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF POLICE-COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIPS IN TEXAS

Table 7: Percentages of sheriff's offices and municipal police departments with partnerships with juvenile probation departments

	Formal partnerships		Informal partnerships	
	Sheriff's Offices	Municipal PDs	Sheriff's Offices	Municipal PDs
(1) Information & intelligence sharing	6.9	8.5	64.4	60.5
(2) Interagency problem solving partnerships	4.0	3.8	49.5	43.1
(3) Interagency training initiatives	2.0	3.1	33.7	30.0
(4) Ride along	1.0	1.5	22.8	14.6
(5) Beats/districts (geographical assignment)	1.0	0.8	16.8	10.8
(6) Targeting high crime areas	1.0	0.8	17.8	15.4
(7) Targeting high risk offenders	2.0	2.3	28.0	32.3
(8) Sex offenders	5.0	5.4	29.7	32.3
(9) Domestic violence	3.0	2.3	27.7	27.7
(10) Gun removal	2.0	0.8	22.8	17.1
(11) Bar checks	1.0	1.6	15.8	12.4
(12) Gang interdiction	2.0	1.5	29.7	29.2
(13) Drug trafficking	2.0	0.8	30.7	24.6
(14) Quality of life Issues	1.0	0.0	23.8	20.0
(15) Fugitive/absconder apprehension units	2.0	1.5	33.7	33.8

involving police and parole departments. However, there are also some troubling signs in the nature and extent of partnerships.

Beto (2005) showed that partnerships in the past were primarily informal in nature and thus were often terminated when key individuals retired, were transferred, or were promoted. Programs such as Operation Night Light and Project Spotlight included provisions that would formalize such arrangements and thus become more permanent. However, the survey results indicate that this is not the case in Texas at this time. The overwhelming majority of partnerships that exist at this time are informal rather than formal and are thus subject to the problems identified by Beto (2005).

Law enforcement departments have more partnerships with probation departments than with parole departments. Although items were not included in the questionnaire that would allow formal examination of this issue, it is reasonable to speculate that differences in the level of local control between probation and parole departments can account for this fact. Probation offices are under local county control whereas parole is under state-level control. This would lead us to predict that probation officers are more likely to seek out partnerships with local law enforcement departments (and vice versa)

than is the case for parole officers. Both sheriff's offices and municipal law enforcement departments are local stake holders rather than being oriented toward state-level issues.

It was previously noted that there might be differences between municipal law enforcement departments and sheriff's offices in their willingness to enter into partnerships with community corrections agencies. Although they both operate in a political environment, political pressures are probably greater in the case of sheriff's offices, as sheriffs must run for reelection on a regular basis. The findings of the survey indicate partial support for this interpretation, but it applies mostly to partnerships with adult probation departments.

One of the most encouraging findings of the survey is that we found support for the idea that law enforcement departments that have partnerships with community corrections agencies tend to view them favorably (cf., Lee & Moon, 2011). This leaves room for hope for expansion of such partnerships in the future. Transfers and movement of key individuals could lead to expansion. As they move to new positions in departments that do not have established partnerships, they may initiate them. Another way partnerships could proliferate is through enlightened leadership. Although one would hope that law enforcement officers would want to have partnerships, the reality is that they may not. Enlightened police managers may force rank and file officers into partnerships and the latter will develop favorable attitudes after they are forced to engage in the cooperative interaction. More generally, this research supports the idea that behavior may shape attitudes as much as attitudes shape behavior. A parallel can be drawn here between this study and community-oriented policing. Police officers who see their work primarily in terms of aggressive law enforcement may be openly hostile to this philosophy of policing. However, research indicates that once they become involved in community-oriented policing they often change their opinions and come to endorse the concept (Lurigio & Rosenbaum, 1994; Oliver, 2004). Given the obvious philosophical similarities between community-oriented policing and the partnerships we discuss, we are optimistic that the same attitudinal changes can occur with respect to partnerships between police and community corrections agencies.

Closely related to the above, this study also shows that leadership is more important in building partnerships than a core culture that is supportive of such arrangements. Leaders in probation and parole departments may be able to use these findings to push for more partnerships. A first step would be in the identification of police leaders who are sympathetic to their goals. Once they are identified, partnerships can be initiated. At first they may be informal, but should be formalized if at all possible. After the partnerships are in place, and supported by good leadership, they are likely to be evaluated positively by law enforcement personnel.

Applicability to Asian Societies

Probably the major difference between the American criminal justice system and the systems found in Asian societies is the degree of decentralization vs. centralization of the justice systems, respectively (Terrill, 2003). It is this decentralization in America that makes possible local control of criminal justice agencies. Furthermore, it is this local control that allows police chiefs, county sheriffs, local prosecutors, and probation chiefs

AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF POLICE-COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIPS IN TEXAS

to engage in partnerships that fulfill the needs of local jurisdictions. For instance, if a community has a problem with drug use, local law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and correctional officials are relatively free to work out local solutions. They have the option de-emphasize criminal justice solutions and instead pursue a public health approach for users, while maintaining a law and order approach for dealers. Similarly, in systems that decentralize decision-making, local officials can choose to deal with the problem of prostitution in ways that account for local opportunities and pressures (e.g., in a community with social workers that reach out to street prostitutes, police and probation officers have resources available to them that police in other communities may not have).

Conversely, most Asian societies have very centralized criminal justice systems. Whereas America has literally thousands of relatively independent police agencies, most Asian societies have one national police agency. This would lead one to believe that partnerships between different agencies of the criminal justice could not likely develop at the local level. Centralization is not part of what Clear and Cadora (2003) had in mind when they defined community justice. However, the reality is, as is often the case, more complex. Whereas the centralization of Asian societies has the effect of inhibiting partnerships, it is of course Asian societies such as Japan and China that have given rise to community-oriented policing. In fact, in a review of policing practices in China, Zhong (2009) simply called community oriented policing “old wine in new bottles.” Societies where there is a tradition of having the police officers being an integral part of the community in which they serve, can best respond to local pressures and opportunities. It is this very tradition that can make possible partnerships between law enforcement and community corrections agencies not only in America, but also throughout Asia, and indeed the world (Wisler & Onwudiwe, 2011).

CONCLUSION

The goal of this paper was to conduct an empirical assessment of police-community corrections partnerships in Texas and to speculate of how they could serve as a model for Asian societies. While we were successful in doing so, there are two major problems with our analysis. First, trying to draw conclusions about an entire continent based on an analysis of partnerships in one state of one country is probably inadequate. In a future project researchers should conduct a survey of partnerships in a representative sample of states in the US. Second, researchers should then also do a survey of nations in Asia to see if there are similar partnerships in these nations. For instance, it will be interesting to see if the patterns of partnerships, if any, are similar or different in Asia. Most importantly, although many Asian nations have a strong Confucian influences, it is the differences between these nations that may have important ramifications for the implementation of partnerships (Wisler & Onwudiwe, 2011; Zhong, 2009).

REFERENCES

- Bennis, W.G. (1966). *Changing organizations: Essays on the development and evolution of human organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Beto, D.R. (2005). Probation partnerships: Insights from the past, a view of the present, and a call for leadership. *Executive Exchange* (Summer).
- Beto, D.R., & J. Kester, Editors. (2002). *Project Spotlight: Focusing resources to prevent crime in Texas neighborhoods-program guide*. Huntsville, Texas: Center for Project Spotlight.
- Brogden, M., & P. Nijhar. (2005). *Community policing: National and international models and approaches*. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.
- Burke, P.B. (2001). Collaboration for successful prisoner re-entry: The role of parole and the courts. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5, 11-22.
- Byrne, J. M., & Hummer, D. (2004). Examining the role of police in recent partnership initiatives. *Federal Probation*, 68, 62069.
- Cole, G.F., & C.E. Smith. (2007). *The American system of criminal justice*. Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.
- Clear, T.R., & E. Cadora. (2003). *Community justice*. Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.
- Corbett, R.P., Jr. (1998). Probation blue? The promise (and perils) of probation-police partnerships. *Corrections Management Quarterly* (Summer).
- Evans, D.G. (2006). Probation and police partnerships. *Executive exchange* (Summer).
- Griffin, M., J. Hepburn, & V. Webb. (2004). *Combining police and probation information resources to reduce burglary: Testing a crime analysis problem-solving approach*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Hughes, D.K. (2000). *A comparison of Paterson juveniles under probation supervision before and after implementation of the Paterson Juvenile Justice Village*. Trenton, New Jersey: Institute for Court Management, Court Executive Development Program.
- Kalmbach, K.C. (2002). Project Spotlight: The Texas interagency initiative to provide intensive probation supervision. *TELEMASP Bulletin*, 9 (4). Huntsville, Texas: Sam Houston State University.
- Kelling, G.L. & R.P. Corbett, Jr. (2003). *This works: preventing and reducing crime*. Civic Bulletin, 32. New York: Manhattan Institute.
- Kim, B., J. Gerber, & D.R. Beto. (2007). Collaboration between law enforcement and community corrections agencies. *TELEMASP Bulletin*, 14 (1). Huntsville, Texas: Sam Houston State University.
- Lee, C.H., & J. Moon. (2011). Effects of officers' cynicism and their perception of managerial leadership on COP activities among South Korean police officers. *Policing*, 34, 31-48.
- Lurigio, A.J. & D.P. Rosenbaum. (1994). The impact of community policing on police personnel. In D.P. Rosenbaum (Ed.), *The challenge of community policing: Testing the promises*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- News from the field. (2006a). *Executive exchange* (Winter).

**AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF POLICE-COMMUNITY
CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIPS IN TEXAS**

- News from the field. (2006b). *Executive exchange* (Spring).
- News from the field. (2006c). *Executive exchange* (Summer).
- Oliver, W.M. (2004). *Community oriented policing: A systemic approach to policing (third edition)*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Parent, D. & B. Snyder. (1999). *Police-corrections partnerships*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Reinventing Probation Council. (2000). *Transforming probation through leadership: The "broken windows" model*. New York: The Manhattan Institute.
- Sexton, G.E. (2000). *Working together: Assessing organizational readiness for collaboration*. Knoxville, Tennessee: The Knoxville Safety Collaborative.
- Terrill, R.J. (2003). *World criminal justice systems: A survey, fifth edition*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Wang, Y.R. (2006). Does community policing motivate officers at work and how? *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 8 (1), 67-77.
- Watkins, D.J. (2001). Formal interagency collaboration in policing. *TELEMASP Bulletin*, 8 (1). Huntsville, Texas: Sam Houston State University.
- Wisler, D. & I.D. Onwudiwe. (2011). Community Policing in Comparison. *Police Quarterly*, 11, 427-446.
- Zhong, L.Y. (2009). Community policing in China: Old wine in new bottles. *Police practice and research*, 10, 157-169.

Bitna Kim is the Assistant Professor, Criminology Department, at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP). She received her Ph.D. from the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University. Specific areas of interest include meta-analysis, corrections, gender issues in CJ system, intimate partner homicide, and comparative criminology. Recent publications have appeared in *Crime and Delinquency*, *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Violence and Victims*, *Women and Criminal Justice*, and *Prison Journal*.

Jurg Gerber is professor of criminal justice and Director of International Initiatives in the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University. For the last seven years he has also served as *Professeur Invité* at the University of Lausanne (Lausanne, Switzerland) and he spent academic year 2000/01 as a Fulbright Scholar at Kaliningrad State University, in Kaliningrad, Russia. Research interests include white-collar crime, criminology, drug control policy, and international criminal justice issues. He has co-edited two books on drug policy, one on white-collar crime, and has published extensively in all of the above areas.

Dan Richard Beto, M.A., Chair of the Governing Board of the Texas Regional Center for Policing Innovation at Sam Houston State University, has devoted four decades of service to the criminal justice system. He is widely published in journals peculiar to the corrections profession and has served as editor of *Texas Probation*, *Texas Journal of Corrections*, and *Perspectives*. Mr. Beto is a member of the Editorial Advisory Board of *Federal Probation* and serves as editor of *Executive Exchange*.