

ICPSR 3324

**Justice in the Delivery of
Government Services [United
States]: Decision Norms of
Street-Level Bureaucrats in
Select Southwest and Midwest
U.S. Cities, 1996-1999**

Steven Maynard-Moody

*University of Kansas, Policy Research
Institute and Department of Public
Administration*

Michael Musheno

*Arizona State University, School for Justice
Studies*

First ICPSR Version
December 2004

Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
www.icpsr.umich.edu

Terms of Use

Bibliographic Citation: Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Maynard-Moody, Steven, and Michael Musheno. JUSTICE IN THE DELIVERY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES [UNITED STATES]: DECISION NORMS OF STREET-LEVEL BUREAUCRATS IN SELECT SOUTHWEST AND MIDWEST U.S. CITIES, 1996-1999 [Computer file]. ICPSR version. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, Policy Research Institute and Department of Public Administration/Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State University, School for Justice Studies [producer], 2001. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2004.

Request for Information on Use of ICPSR Resources: To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Visit the ICPSR Web site for more information on submitting citations.

Data Disclaimer: The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.

Responsible Use Statement: In preparing data for public release, ICPSR performs a number of procedures to ensure that the identity of research subjects cannot be disclosed. Any intentional identification or disclosure of a person or establishment violates the assurances of confidentiality given to the providers of the information. Therefore, users of data obtained from the ICPSR archive and/or any of its special topic archives agree:

- To use these datasets solely for statistical analysis and reporting of aggregated information, and not for investigation of specific individuals or organizations, except when identification is authorized in writing by ICPSR
- To make no use of the identity of any person or establishment discovered inadvertently, and to advise ICPSR of any such discovery
- To produce no links among ICPSR datasets or among ICPSR data and other datasets that could identify individuals or organizations

Redistribution: ICPSR data may not be redistributed or sold to other individuals, institutions, or organizations without the written agreement of ICPSR.

Bibliographic Description

ICPSR Study No.: 3324

Title: Justice in the Delivery of Government Services [United States]:
Decision Norms of Street-Level Bureaucrats in Select Southwest and
Midwest U.S. Cities, 1996-1999

Principal Investigator(s): Steven Maynard-Moody, University of Kansas, Policy Research
Institute and Department of Public Administration
Michael Musheno, Arizona State University, School for Justice Studies

Funding Agency: National Science Foundation

Grant Number: SBR-9511169

Bibliographic Citation: Maynard-Moody, Steven, and Michael Musheno. JUSTICE IN THE
DELIVERY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES [UNITED STATES]:
DECISION NORMS OF STREET-LEVEL BUREAUCRATS IN SELECT
SOUTHWEST AND MIDWEST U.S. CITIES, 1996-1999 [Computer
file]. ICPSR version. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, Policy
Research Institute and Department of Public Administration/Tempe,
Arizona: Arizona State University, School for Justice Studies
[producer], 2001. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research [distributor], 2004.

Scope of Study

Summary: This study examined the various factors involved in the decision norms of street-level bureaucrats. The principal investigators explored how police officers, school teachers, and vocational rehabilitation counselors decided what was fair and right in individual cases and how this assessment affected the delivery of governmental services. The data in this collection consist of street-level work stories or narratives, semi-structured entry and exit interviews, and a structured questionnaire. Participants from the aforementioned job categories were drawn from select southwest and midwest United States cities over a period of three years (1996-1999). Part 1 includes the quantitative data from the structured questionnaire. Part 2 includes transcripts of the narratives and interviews. The entry interview was designed to gather background information on the participants and to explain and schedule the story collection process. Participants were queried about their work history, current job, and relations with citizen-clients, coworkers, and supervisors. They were asked to describe their various personal, professional, and group identities and how their social identities related to those of the citizens with whom they interacted. They were also asked to describe any critical incidents in the history of their agency, such as a public scandal or change of administration, that influenced their work environment. At the

conclusion of the entry interview, the participants were given instructions and materials for the narratives. The participants were asked to write down a rough outline of two or three different stories describing situations that took place within their agency. These stories were to focus on instances when the participants' perception of "fairness or unfairness" impacted their decision-making in encounters with citizen-clients or with the agency. The narratives were collected during a scheduled meeting between the researcher and participant. The researcher asked the participant to tell his or her stories, which were tape-recorded. During the initial storytelling, the researchers interrupted as little as possible, asking questions at the conclusion to encourage the story teller to fill in missing or unelaborated details. The tape-recorded stories were transcribed verbatim. The transcripts were lightly edited for clarity and to introduce the observations added in response to researcher probes. The exit interview involved a structured questionnaire and a brief open-ended interview. The questionnaire data were not intended to allow for statistical inference but to describe the participants. The questionnaire asked direct questions about discretion and justice as well as a series of standard questions on task authority, task variety, the frequency of work expectations, the applicability and clarity of rules, and the percentage of time spent working directly with citizen-clients. Participants were queried about the adequacy of resources, work load, job satisfaction, and perceptions of fairness at work. They were also asked questions on ideology and political orientation, as well as hypothetical questions regarding the distribution of rules. The exit interview involved three open-ended questions: What the word "justice" meant to participants, whether participants felt there were groups in America that were treated unfairly, and if any of the rules or procedures at work struck participants as unfair.

Subject Terms: bureaucracy, civil service, counselors, government agencies, government employees, government services, police, police citizen interactions, police community relations, police departments, social services, teacher attitudes, teacher student relationship, teachers, vocational rehabilitation

Geographic Coverage: United States

Time Period: 1996-1999

Date(s) of Data Collection: 1996-1999

Universe: Street-level bureaucrats in select southwest and midwest United States cities.

Data Type: survey data, and machine-readable text

Data Collection Notes: The codebook for Part 1 and the qualitative interview data (Part 2) are provided by ICPSR as Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The

PDF file format was developed by Adobe Systems Incorporated and can be accessed using PDF reader software, such as the Adobe Acrobat Reader. Information on how to obtain a copy of the Acrobat Reader is provided on the ICPSR Web site.

Methodology

Sample: Nonrandom, stratified purposeful sample, consisting of three different types of street-level bureaucrats: police officers, vocational rehabilitation counselors, and middle school teachers distributed across five sites in two states. Forty-eight participants were drawn from select southwest and midwest United States cities over a period of three years (1996-1999).

Data Source: personal interviews and self-enumerated questionnaires

Extent of Processing: CDBK.ICPSR/ DDEF.ICPSR/ REFORM.ICPSR

Access and Availability

Extent of Collection: 2 data files + machine-readable documentation (PDF) + SAS data definition statements + SPSS data definition statements

Restrictions: This data collection may not be used for any purpose other than statistical reporting and analysis. Use of these data to learn the identity of any person or establishment is prohibited. To protect respondent privacy, Part 2 (Qualitative Interview and Narrative Data) is restricted from general dissemination. To obtain these files, researchers must agree to the terms and conditions of a Restricted Data Use Agreement in accordance with existing ICPSR servicing policies.

Data Format: Logical Record Length with SAS and SPSS data definition statements, and SPSS portable file

File Specifications

<i>Part No.</i>	<i>Part Name</i>	<i>File Structure</i>	<i>Case Count</i>	<i>Variable Count</i>	<i>LRECL</i>	<i>Records Per Case</i>
1	Quantitative Questionnaire Data	rectangular	48	33	264	1
2	Qualitative Interview and Narrative Data	-	-	-	-	-

Codebook for ICPSR 3324

Justice in the Delivery of Government Services: Decision Norms of Street-Level Bureaucrats in Select Southwest and Midwest U.S. Cities, 1996-1999, Part 1

Variable	Variable Description				
	Please Note: The "(M)" to the right of the value indicates the code has been designated as a missing value.				
REGION	site location				
Start: 1 End: 8 Width: 8.2 Type: numeric (ISO) Interval: discrete	<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
	0.00	Southwest	18	37.5 %	37.5%
	1.00	Midwest	30	62.5 %	62.5%
	<i>Valid</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
	48	0.00	1.00	0.62	0.49
TYPE	Agency type				
Start: 9 End: 16 Width: 8.2 Type: numeric (ISO) Interval: discrete	<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
	1.00	PD	20	41.7 %	41.7%
	2.00	VR	18	37.5 %	37.5%
	3.00	School	10	20.8 %	20.8%
	<i>Valid</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
	48	1.00	3.00	1.79	0.77
Q1	task authority				
Start: 17 End: 24 Width: 8.2 Type: numeric (ISO) Interval: discrete	<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
	1.00	none	2	4.2 %	4.8%
	2.00	little	1	2.1 %	2.4%
	3.00	some	10	20.8 %	23.8%
	4.00	quite a bit	14	29.2 %	33.3%
	5.00	very much	15	31.2 %	35.7%
	. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-
	<i>Valid</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
	42	1.00	5.00	3.93	1.07

Variable	Variable Description
----------	----------------------

Q2	authority to est rules & procedures
----	-------------------------------------

Start: 25
End: 32
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	none	2	4.2 %	4.9%
2.00	little	4	8.3 %	9.8%
3.00	some	11	22.9 %	26.8%
4.00	quite a bit	15	31.2 %	36.6%
5.00	very much	9	18.8 %	22.0%
. (M)	-	7	14.6 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
41	1.00	5.00	3.61	1.09

Q3	authority to make exceptions
----	------------------------------

Start: 33
End: 40
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	none	1	2.1 %	2.4%
2.00	little	4	8.3 %	9.5%
3.00	some	17	35.4 %	40.5%
4.00	quite a bit	18	37.5 %	42.9%
5.00	very much	2	4.2 %	4.8%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
42	1.00	5.00	3.38	0.82

Q4	agency has clear goals
----	------------------------

Start: 41
End: 48
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	to a very small extent	7	14.6 %	16.7%
2.00	to a little extent	3	6.2 %	7.1%
3.00	to some extent	12	25.0 %	28.6%
4.00	to a great extent	19	39.6 %	45.2%
5.00	to a great extent	1	2.1 %	2.4%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
42	1.00	5.00	3.10	1.14

Variable	Variable Description
----------	----------------------

Q5	frequency of client exceptions
----	--------------------------------

Start: 49
End: 56
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	very rarely	7	14.6 %	17.5%
2.00	occasionally	12	25.0 %	30.0%
3.00	quite often	10	20.8 %	25.0%
4.00	very often	8	16.7 %	20.0%
5.00	constantly	3	6.2 %	7.5%
. (M)	-	8	16.7 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
40	1.00	5.00	2.70	1.20

Q6	% time procedures deal with work
----	----------------------------------

Start: 57
End: 64
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	0-29%	3	6.2 %	7.1%
2.00	21-40%	8	16.7 %	19.0%
3.00	41-60%	9	18.8 %	21.4%
4.00	61-80%	13	27.1 %	31.0%
5.00	81-100	9	18.8 %	21.4%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
42	1.00	5.00	3.40	1.23

Q7	do written rules specify tasks
----	--------------------------------

Start: 65
End: 72
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	very general	6	12.5 %	14.3%
2.00	mostly general	13	27.1 %	31.0%
3.00	somewhat specific	13	27.1 %	31.0%
4.00	quite specific	9	18.8 %	21.4%
5.00	very specific	1	2.1 %	2.4%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
42	1.00	5.00	2.67	1.05

Variable **Variable Description**

Q8 extent follow sop

Start: 73
End: 80
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	to no extent	0	0.0 %	0.0%
2.00	to a little extent	1	2.1 %	2.4%
3.00	some extent	19	39.6 %	46.3%
4.00	great extent	20	41.7 %	48.8%
5.00	very great extent	1	2.1 %	2.4%
. (M)	-	7	14.6 %	-

<i>Valid</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
41	2.00	5.00	3.51	0.60

Q9 extent perform same tasks every day

Start: 81
End: 88
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	to no extent	5	10.4 %	11.9%
2.00	to a little extent	4	8.3 %	9.5%
3.00	some extent	14	29.2 %	33.3%
4.00	great extent	18	37.5 %	42.9%
5.00	very great extent	1	2.1 %	2.4%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-

<i>Valid</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
42	1.00	5.00	3.14	1.05

Q10 Tasks, day-to-day variety

Start: 89
End: 96
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	completely different	3	6.2 %	7.1%
2.00	very much different	10	20.8 %	23.8%
3.00	quite a bit different	15	31.2 %	35.7%
4.00	mostly the same	13	27.1 %	31.0%
5.00	very much the same	1	2.1 %	2.4%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-

<i>Valid</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
42	1.00	5.00	2.98	0.98

Variable	Variable Description
----------	----------------------

Q11A	percent work is face-to-face
------	------------------------------

Start: 97
End: 104
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	none	1	2.1 %	2.4%
2.00	about 25%	6	12.5 %	14.3%
3.00	about 50%	8	16.7 %	19.0%
4.00	about 75%	16	33.3 %	38.1%
5.00	all	11	22.9 %	26.2%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
42	1.00	5.00	3.71	1.09

Q11B	working with clients, variety day-to-day
------	--

Start: 105
End: 112
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	completely different	4	8.3 %	9.5%
2.00	very much different	2	4.2 %	4.8%
3.00	quite a bit different	22	45.8 %	52.4%
4.00	mostly the same	12	25.0 %	28.6%
5.00	very much the same	2	4.2 %	4.8%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
42	1.00	5.00	3.14	0.95

Q12A	easy to know if your work is correct
------	--------------------------------------

Start: 113
End: 120
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	very difficult	2	4.2 %	4.8%
2.00	quite difficult	10	20.8 %	23.8%
3.00	somewhat easy	17	35.4 %	40.5%
4.00	quite easy	10	20.8 %	23.8%
5.00	very easy	3	6.2 %	7.1%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
42	1.00	5.00	3.05	0.99

Variable	Variable Description
----------	----------------------

Q12B	% work sure of outcomes
------	-------------------------

Start: 121
End: 128
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	LE 40%	5	10.4 %	12.2%
2.00	41-60%	10	20.8 %	24.4%
3.00	61-75%	11	22.9 %	26.8%
4.00	76-90%	13	27.1 %	31.7%
5.00	GT 90%	2	4.2 %	4.9%
. (M)	-	7	14.6 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
41	1.00	5.00	2.93	1.13

Q13	extent resources are adequate
-----	-------------------------------

Start: 129
End: 136
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	to a very small extent	3	6.2 %	7.1%
2.00	to a little extent	4	8.3 %	9.5%
3.00	to some extent	22	45.8 %	52.4%
4.00	to a great extent	13	27.1 %	31.0%
5.00	to a very great extent	0	0.0 %	0.0%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
42	1.00	4.00	3.07	0.84

Q14	work load last month
-----	----------------------

Start: 137
End: 144
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	light	1	2.1 %	2.4%
2.00	a bit light	0	0.0 %	0.0%
3.00	just about right	12	25.0 %	28.6%
4.00	heavy	23	47.9 %	54.8%
5.00	too heavy to keep up	6	12.5 %	14.3%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
42	1.00	5.00	3.79	0.78

Variable **Variable Description**

Q15 **loyalty to agency**

Start: 145
End: 152
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	no loyalty	2	4.2 %	4.8%
2.00	very little loyalty	6	12.5 %	14.3%
3.00	some loyalty	12	25.0 %	28.6%
4.00	quite of bit of loyalty	14	29.2 %	33.3%
5.00	very strong loyalty	8	16.7 %	19.0%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-

<i>Valid</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
42	1.00	5.00	3.48	1.11

Q16 **work compensation is fair**

Start: 153
End: 160
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

<i>Value</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	5	10.4 %	12.2%
2.00	14	29.2 %	34.1%
3.00	15	31.2 %	36.6%
4.00	7	14.6 %	17.1%
. (M)	7	14.6 %	-

<i>Valid</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
41	1.00	4.00	2.59	0.92

Q17 **administrators are paid fairly**

Start: 161
End: 168
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	strongly agree	5	10.4 %	12.2%
2.00	somewhat agree	13	27.1 %	31.7%
3.00	somewhat disagree	14	29.2 %	34.1%
4.00	strongly disagree	9	18.8 %	22.0%
. (M)	-	7	14.6 %	-

<i>Valid</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
41	1.00	4.00	2.66	0.96

Q18 **concerned about pay diff between workers and admin in agency**

Start: 169
End: 176

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	strongly agree	5	10.4 %	12.5%

Variable **Variable Description**

Q18 concerned about pay diff between workers and admin in agency (cont.)

Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
2.00	somewhat agree	13	27.1 %	32.5%
3.00	somewhat disagree	8	16.7 %	20.0%
4.00	strongly disagree	14	29.2 %	35.0%
. (M)	-	8	16.7 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
40	1.00	4.00	2.77	1.07

Q19 concerned about pay diff between workers and admin in societ

Start: 177
End: 184
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	strongly agree	12	25.0 %	29.3%
2.00	somewhat agree	14	29.2 %	34.1%
3.00	somewhat disagree	7	14.6 %	17.1%
4.00	strongly disagree	8	16.7 %	19.5%
. (M)	-	7	14.6 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
41	1.00	4.00	2.27	1.10

Q20 more concered with fair comp than fair treatment at work

Start: 185
End: 192
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	strongly agree	7	14.6 %	17.5%
2.00	somewhat agree	9	18.8 %	22.5%
3.00	somewhat disagree	24	50.0 %	60.0%
4.00	strongly disagree	0	0.0 %	0.0%
. (M)	-	8	16.7 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
40	1.00	3.00	2.42	0.78

Q21 job satisfaction

Start: 193
End: 200
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	unsatisfied	4	8.3 %	10.0%
2.00	somewhat unsatisfied	9	18.8 %	22.5%
3.00	satisfied	14	29.2 %	35.0%

Variable **Variable Description**

Q21 job satisfaction (cont.)

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
4.00	quite satisfied	9	18.8 %	22.5%
5.00	very satisfied	4	8.3 %	10.0%
. (M)	-	8	16.7 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
40	1.00	5.00	3.00	1.13

Q22 distribution rules

Start: 201
End: 208
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	need	20	41.7 %	47.6%
2.00	how hard they tried	10	20.8 %	23.8%
3.00	performance	10	20.8 %	23.8%
4.00	near equal awards	2	4.2 %	4.8%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
42	1.00	4.00	1.86	0.95

Q23 role of govt is to help people

Start: 209
End: 216
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	strongly agree	12	25.0 %	28.6%
2.00	somewhat agree	18	37.5 %	42.9%
3.00	somewhat disagree	5	10.4 %	11.9%
4.00	strongly disagree	7	14.6 %	16.7%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-

Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
42	1.00	4.00	2.17	1.03

Q24 govt benefits make people not want to work

Start: 217
End: 224
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	strongly agree	4	8.3 %	9.5%
2.00	somewhat agree	17	35.4 %	40.5%
3.00	somewhat disagree	11	22.9 %	26.2%
4.00	strongly disagree	10	20.8 %	23.8%

Variable	Variable Description
----------	----------------------

Q24	govt benefits make people not want to work (cont.)
-----	--

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-
Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
42	1.00	4.00	2.64	0.96

Q25	responsibility of govt to meet everyone
-----	---

Start: 225
End: 232
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	strongly agree	3	6.2 %	7.3%
2.00	somewhat agree	14	29.2 %	34.1%
3.00	somewhat disagree	15	31.2 %	36.6%
4.00	strongly disagree	9	18.8 %	22.0%
. (M)	-	7	14.6 %	-
Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
41	1.00	4.00	2.73	0.90

Q26	high social and economic positions indicates special abiliti
-----	--

Start: 233
End: 240
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	strongly agree	1	2.1 %	2.4%
2.00	somewhat agree	9	18.8 %	21.4%
3.00	somewhat disagree	12	25.0 %	28.6%
4.00	strongly disagree	20	41.7 %	47.6%
. (M)	-	6	12.5 %	-
Valid	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev
42	1.00	4.00	3.21	0.87

Q27	govt should provide only defense and police
-----	---

Start: 241
End: 248
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

Value	Label	Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	strongly agree	1	2.1 %	2.5%
2.00	somewhat agree	8	16.7 %	20.0%
3.00	somewhat disagree	7	14.6 %	17.5%
4.00	strongly disagree	24	50.0 %	60.0%
. (M)	-	8	16.7 %	-

Variable	Variable Description
----------	----------------------

Q27	govt should provide only defense and police (<i>cont.</i>)
-----	--

<i>Valid</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
40	1.00	4.00	3.35	0.89

Q28	political views
-----	-----------------

Start: 249
End: 256
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	extremely liberal	0	0.0 %	0.0%
2.00	liberal	3	6.2 %	12.5%
3.00	slightly liberal	7	14.6 %	29.2%
4.00	moderate	7	14.6 %	29.2%
5.00	slightly conservative	2	4.2 %	8.3%
6.00	conservative	4	8.3 %	16.7%
7.00	extremely conservative	1	2.1 %	4.2%
. (M)	-	24	50.0 %	-

<i>Valid</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
24	2.00	7.00	4.00	1.41

AUTH	task authority scale
------	----------------------

Start: 257
End: 264
Width: 8.2
Type: numeric (ISO)
Interval: discrete

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	none	1	2.1 %	2.4%
2.00	little	2	4.2 %	4.9%
3.00	some	13	27.1 %	31.7%
4.00	quite a bit	21	43.8 %	51.2%
5.00	very much	4	8.3 %	9.8%
. (M)	-	7	14.6 %	-

<i>Valid</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
41	1.00	5.00	3.61	0.83

Original Documentation from
Primary Investigators

***JUSTICE IN THE DELIVERY OF GOVERNMENT
SERVICES: DECISION NORMS OF STREET-LEVEL
WORKERS***¹

by

Steven Maynard-Moody
Policy Research Institute &
Department of Public Administration
The University of Kansas
1541 Lilac Lane, rm. 607
Lawrence, KS 66044-3177
785.864.9099
smm@ku.edu

and

Michael Musheno
School for Justice Studies
1711 S. Rural Rd.
Wilson Hall, rm. 331
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-0803
480.965.7698
Musheno@asu.edu

19 November 2001

¹ Research for this book was supported by the National Science Foundation grant number SBR-9511169

METHODOLOGY

This research involved three years of fieldwork, from September 1996 to September 1999. We spent six to ten months in each of five research sites. The research involved the collection of street-level work stories or narratives. We did not, however, rely exclusively on narratives but employed multiple methods as is common practice in field research. As part of the field research, we completed semi-structured entry and exit interviews with each participant, took notes on observations, and collected relevant agency documents about policy and process. During the exit interviews each participant also completed a questionnaire. The archive includes: the full text of the narratives, transcripts of the entry and exit interviews, and the discretion questionnaire data. Texts are in PDF format; data are in an SPSS file.

Our methodology is best described by detailing the process used in each site: entering the site, collecting the data, and data analysis and interpretation. Although there was some variation in specifics, the overall process was replicated in each successive site.

* * * * *

We began by selecting three very different types of street-level work: police, vocational rehabilitation counseling, and teaching. The differences between these types of workers are described below. We chose these three types because their differences strengthen and discipline generalizations: we were able to identify observations and themes that cut across these different types of work, while at the same time we could isolate the distinctive characteristics of the different forms of street-level work.

Getting permission to study street-level workers is labyrinthine. Street-level workers occupy the bottom of large and often tangled government bureaucracies. Getting permission for research follows, by necessity, the same top-down path of the rules and procedures that circumscribes street-level work. With Vocational Rehabilitation, we started with the state commissioners and followed the chain of command to the supervisors of the community Voc Rehab centers where we would work. With police, we began with the chief-of-police in the two cities, and in one city we also needed permission from the city administrator. To gain permission to work in the middle school, we started with the district superintendent before we identified a particular school and discussed the project

with the principal. When asking for permission from the top administrators, we also informally interviewed them on issues of policy and street-level influence on policy implementation.

The next major hurdles were permission from the Voc Rehab and police supervisor and the school principal. We made it clear to these individuals that participation was authorized but not required. We also stressed that we would not report findings to higher administrators and that individual workers would have the ultimate right to choose or reject participation. We did promise to report observations back to the participants and work teams. Although this research was scholarly rather than applied, we shared the hope that it would be a learning experience for the participants as well as the researchers.

After gaining agency-level approval, we identified work groups of approximately ten individuals. The work group for the middle school was the eighth grade team that included all the core and special service teachers. Police work is organized geographically, and we chose teams in each site that patrolled a particular beat. The Voc Rehab sites were community-based centers. Focusing on work groups provided an ample number of street-level workers and an intact work subculture: these were the individuals who routinely interacted with and relied on each other in the course of completing their work. They also shared a supervisor.

After gaining permission from the supervisors, we set up a group meeting with all of the street-level workers in the targeted team. Again we reiterated that participation was authorized but not required. We asked for two levels of permission: collective and individual. Without discussing our theoretical frames and questions, we presented our research procedures to the group and asked if they would, as a group, permit us to proceed. It was important that the entire group accept our presence, even if individuals chose not to participate. After their questions were answered, we left the room to allow them to make a collective judgment.

Once we received work group permission, we then asked individuals for written consent to participate. Again we stressed that group approval did not require individual approval. In several sites, a few work group members declined to participate but remained welcoming of our presence. As shown in Table 1, forty-eight street-level workers distributed across five sites in two states participated in interviews and story collection. We concluded the group meeting by scheduling individual interviews with those workers who had agreed to participate.

Table 1. Distribution of Street-Level Worker Participants

Agency Type	Site Location	
	Southwest	Midwest
Police Dept.	9	10
Vocational Rehab	9	10
Middle School	—	10
	18	30

* * * * *

Data collection began with the entry interview. Transcripts of the entry interviews are in the folders for each research site. This interview served two purposes: to gather background information on the storytellers and to explain and schedule the story collection process. The entry interview flexibly followed the protocol reproduced in the “interviews” folder. We began by asking about their work history and then about their current job and relations with citizen-clients, coworkers, and supervisors. We asked them to described which citizen-clients proved the easiest and most difficult. With some prodding, the storytellers described their various personal, professional, and group identities and how their

social identities related to those of the citizens with whom they interacted. We ended by asking them to describe any critical incidents in the history of the agency, such as a public scandal or change of administration, that influenced the work environment.

When the entry interview was completed, we scheduled our initial story collection approximately one month into the future. We then handed out pamphlet-sized storybooks. These booklets included the instructions adapted slightly for the three different agency types. The instructions for the two Voc Rehab sites read:

Over the next several weeks, we would like you to use this sketch book to write down a rough outline of 2 to 3 different stories. These stories should describe a situation that takes place within your agency during this time, or that you might remember from the past. The rough outlines will help you remember the story when you tell it to us later; you will not be required to share these notes with us.

We are interested in stories about how or when your own beliefs about fairness or unfairness help you make decisions. At times your beliefs may have conflicted with the department's formal and informal policies. At other times, policies may have

facilitated your reliance on your own beliefs.

Stories can involve an encounter between you and clients. They can also be about encounters between you and your agency or among you and other members of your agency. You may also retell a story that happened to someone else, even if you are not a character in the story.

The stories should, as much as possible: 1) have a plot or storyline with a beginning, middle, and end; 2) tell us who the characters are; 3) explain the relationships among the characters; 4) describe the feelings of the characters toward each other and the events; and 5) include a description of the setting and circumstances in which the event(s) occurred.

We delayed story collection for a month and asked the storytellers to jot down notes in the storybooks to encourage the collection of stories that are told within the normal routine of the agency. As seen in the instructions, we did not, however, preclude stories recalled from the past. The instructions focused the storytellers on instances of “fairness or unfairness” and could be about encounters with citizen-clients or with the agency. The instruction also listed five characteristics of a fully developed story. There was room in each storybook for text or notes on three stories. Storytellers were told that the books would not be

collected; they were for the storyteller.

At the appointed time, the researcher and storyteller would find a private place to meet. To initiate story collection, we merely asked the street-level worker to tell his or her stories, which were tape-recorded. During the initial storytelling the researchers interrupted as little as possible; we asked questions at the conclusion to encourage the storyteller to fill in missing or unelaborated details. During a single session we collected one to three stories and then rescheduled the second session one month later. Typically, we repeated the process three times.

The tape recorded stories were transcribed verbatim with the “ums” and other verbal utterances included. We also transcribed the probes and responses. These transcripts were lightly edited for clarity and to introduce the observations added in response to researcher probes into the body of the text. The goal of this editing was to strengthen the narrative order in the text. These edited versions were shared with the storytellers, who could suggest changes. Although we discouraged major re-writes, we gave the storytellers the final say on the stories to assure them and us that these were their stories. No storyteller made significant changes. A few further eliminated verbalisms. The full text of the final versions of all the stories are in the folders for the five research sites.

The story collection and revision process does transform stories from an oral

to written form, and the change in form could alter interpretation. In oral stories inflection and gesture convey meaning that is often lost when written down. Oral stories are also less fixed in content and form. We did not ask the street-level workers to write stories because we didn't want to base our data collection on the range of writing skills of our storytellers. Moreover, writing demands more work than telling. We transformed the stories from oral to written to facilitate the analysis and communication of stories. This transformation was done to minimize changes in the spoken structure of the stories, but nuances of the oral presentation were inevitably lost.

Interviews and story collection provided opportunities for extended observations, although the observations took different forms in the different agencies. Like Voc Rehab clients, we waited in anterooms before appointments, and like Voc Rehab counselors we chatted in the halls and break rooms before and after interviews. We became familiar with routines and the support staff. As in the Voc Rehab sites, we often arrived early for appointments at the school site. We waited outside the principal's office—usually sharing the waiting room with students lined up for disciplining—and walking the halls. We did not routinely observe teaching but usually held interviews and story collection sessions in vacant classrooms.

In the two police sites, we did some interviews and story collections at the

station, but the primary opportunity to interact with and observe the police was during “ride-alongs.” Spending time in patrol cars as officers cruise their beats has become a staple of police ethnography. Often police officers insist that outsiders ride with them so that they can see the world as the officers see it. We were in the Voc Rehab offices, middle school, and police departments one to two days a week for three to four months.

Immediately after spending time in the field the researcher would take notes of observations. Since our primary method of analysis is a close and interpretive reading of the stories, these field observation notes help calibrate our interpretive eye.

For each site, we also collected relevant documents that described the rules, procedures, and organizational structure. These documents were used, in part, to describe the settings and to provide a backdrop for the stories. For example, the new procedure that required central office approval for high-speed chases provides context for the police story about turning off the radio during an unauthorized pursuit. We did not include field notes or documents in the archive.

The exit interview involved a structured questionnaire and a brief open-ended interview, both are in the “interview” folder. It is important to note that our small, non-random sample of 48 street-level workers does not allow statistical inference. These data are used to describe our storytellers. The SPSS data file for

the questionnaire for all five sites is in the “interviews” folder. The transcripts of the exit interviews are in the folders for the individual research sites.

The exit questionnaire and interview were the first time we directly asked the street-level workers about discretion and justice. We waited until the end to avoid channeling the stories in researcher-defined directions. The questionnaire asked a series of standard questions on task authority, task variety, the frequency of work exceptions, the applicability and clarity of rules, and the percentage of time working directly with citizen-clients. We also asked about the adequacy of resources, work load, loyalty, job satisfaction, and perceptions of fairness at work. We concluded with a series of questions on ideology and political orientation. To get a their views of justice, we asked a hypothetical question regarding distribution rules:

Which of the following should be taken into account in deciding how to distribute scholarship money to applicants to medical school?

- Scholarships should be given to applicants according to how much they need the money in order to attend medical school.
- Scholarship money should be given to applicants according to how hard they have tried to get prepared for medical school.
- Scholarship money should be given to applicants based on their

grades and medical school admission test scores.

- Scholarship money should be given to applicants in such a way that the smallest scholarships are not much less than the largest awards.

The brief exit interview involved three questions. We asked, “What does the word ‘justice’ mean to you?” Responses to this question underscored the power of stories: the same street-level workers who told richly textured narratives about fairness offered only flat, standard, and socially acceptable answers to this direct question. To get at questions of ideology, we asked if they felt there were groups in America that are treated unfairly. We concluded by asking about fairness at work and if any of the rules or procedures struck them as unfair.

* * * * *

The analysis of the stories relied primarily on close and repeated reading, supplemented by note-taking and coding. The analysis looked first at the individual stories and then for common themes across stories. Much of this is irreducibly subjective. To facilitate collaborative interpretation within the research team, we began our analysis by completing a detailed description of each story on a “Story Cover Page.” A blank cover page is reproduced in the “codes”

folder. We identified: the story type, role of the narrator, the social identity of the storyteller (this was taken from the entry interview), the characters in the story, and the time frame. Each cover page included a brief synopsis and a list of the themes.

We then divided the stories among the four members of the research team. After our initial reading, we developed a specific set of codes. These codes are listed in the “codes” folder and cover a range of issues relevant to the nature of the stories and street-level judgment. Codes included: story structure, decision norms, decision rules, worker and client identities, relational dynamics at work and on the street, and characteristics of the work place. A member of the research team would read the story, block off sections of the text that reflected an individual code (some received multiple codes), and marked the code in the margins. A second researcher from a different field site would then review the coding for completeness and accuracy. Disagreements were resolved by the coders and code checkers. We decided against blind double coding because our goal was not inter-rater reliability but rather completeness and consensus.

We used the codes to create indices to locate key discussions and to focus our interpretations. We did not count frequency of mention nor, as is common, examine out of context phrases with similar codes. Although we experimented with this approach, we found that the coded phrases lost meaning when

“disembodied” from the story. Words, phrases, and passages are most meaningful in the specific context of the story, not as statements of observations or beliefs taken out of the narrative. The need to keep the text intact may be a stronger requirement in narrative analysis than other forms of interpretive research.

The primary value of the coding and code checking was the contribution they made to the close reading of the text and to facilitate our own memory of text elements. It also provided a means for the research team to discuss varying interpretations of the text and to more easily locate stories and story passages across our relatively large collection of stories.

RESEARCH SITES

Three research sites are in an economically-depressed, mid-sized Midwestern city, where we did field work in the urban middle school, one police department, and one vocational rehabilitation center. This city is an island of poverty in an area of prosperity and growth. A twenty-minute drive in any direction will lead to ever expanding suburbs, packed shopping malls, office parks, and prosperous rural towns. This run-down city has few shops and businesses save for the overpriced convenience stores, used car lots, pawn shops, check-cashing windows, and the tenets of last resort: federal, state, and local government offices. There are no hotels or motels and few national chain stores. Within the city limits

there are places you could call “middle-class” but even those are on the edge of viability with pockets of deteriorating homes. Many of the neighborhoods are decidedly dilapidated, especially the large public housing projects. This city has the highest crime rate, highest murder rate, lowest median income, highest percentage of minorities, and lowest educational level in the state.

The middle school is a large, older brick building at the bottom of a hill. It sits between the rail yard and a housing project. The high school is at the top of the hill with older kids hanging out near the middle school at the beginning and end of the school day. Court-ordered desegregation split the school evenly: one third African-American, one third Hispanic, and one third white. Without the court order, the school would be mostly black with a growing presence of Hispanics. Most of the teachers are white. The school is locked twenty-four hours a day with security patrolling inside and out. The eighth grade team, regular and special subject teachers, participated in this research.

Two other research sites are within a ten-minute drive. Near the downtown, in an old shopping mall that was converted to government offices, is the local branch of the state Vocational Rehabilitation office, the second site. The local parole office is next door. These vocational rehabilitation counselors work in cubicles with curtains for doors or out in the community visiting clients and other service providers. Further downtown is the police department, the third site. It is

located in a tall municipal office building. Although patrol officers come to the base for before and after shift briefings—several joked that local thieves always chose shift changes for break-ins since no officers were on the streets—most of their work is out in their patrol area. The officers in each patrol area are assigned shifts. The patrol area for our research site was in a destitute area of the central city that had the highest crime rate in this high-crime city.

We also collected street-level worker stories from a vocational rehabilitation office and police patrol in a prosperous and densely populated urban city located in the center of a Southwestern metropolis, the fourth and fifth sites. The population of the Southwestern city is ethnically and economically diverse and a point of settlement for new immigrants, including many illegal Latinos. Still, the Southwestern city does not have the pervasive poverty or the rundown neighborhoods of the Midwestern city. The Southwestern VR office is located in an area with a number of governmental offices that lease space from owners of low-rise business complexes. It is surrounded by residential apartment complexes populated by students who attend a local university and workers in service and tourist industries. Each counselor had a private office, and although they have a diverse caseload, their clients are not as poor as those in the Midwestern city.

The Southwestern police patrol units we came to know operate in the downtown headquarters of the agency. The headquarters is just across the street

from the City's municipal building and in the heart of a redeveloped downtown that is a destination point for residents and tourists alike. The patrol units work the downtown area and the surrounding neighborhoods which include a long-established barrio, student rental properties, and renovated older homes occupied by professionals drawn to the downtown scene. In contrast to the police department of the Midwestern city, the patrol units and their supervisors are more diverse with women prominent in management and supervisory roles. At the beginning of the field work the Patrol Commander was a white woman, which is unusual in a still male dominated profession. Also in contrast to the Midwestern site, this department has a reputation for being innovative. The Midwestern department was organized around prowling patrol cars and quick 911 response, whereas the Southwestern department is based primarily on community policing.

* * * * *

Our five research sites are located in two contrasting urban areas and encompass three very different types of street-level work. Teachers are respected, if undervalued, professionals. Like all street-level workers they are in constant face-to-face contact with citizen-clients: in their case, kids and parents. Behind the closed classroom door they are in charge. Although working with a set

curriculum, one they have little or no say in designing, and under the supervision of the principal and his vice principals, teachers have wide discretion about how they treat their students and their families. The external environment of the school is dangerous, and the halls and lunchroom can be chaotic and threatening, but the classrooms are havens of control and order. The teachers are painfully aware of how little they can do for the kids who are so briefly their students.

Vocational Rehabilitation or Voc Rehab is a state-managed but primarily federally-funded program for disabled workers. Originally established in 1918 to help disabled World War I veterans return to work or be retrained for alternative work, Voc Rehab now encompasses all disabled citizens. To be eligible for Voc Rehab services you do not need to be poor: you have to have a documented disability—the definition is continually revised, however—and you need help to prepare for, obtain, or maintain appropriate employment. Voc Rehab counselors have little discretion over who qualifies for services, but they have and exercise broad discretion over the nature and quality of the services provided.

Voc Rehab clients range from high-school-age young adults to those nearing retirement age. Some are injured on the job and need physical therapy. Others need a prosthesis, retraining, or “work hardening,” learning how to avoid injuries. Still others survived crippling auto accidents or have poor health from years of hard drinking. Some clients are blind or deaf, some have congenital disabilities,

many are mentally ill. Even within these categories there is a wide range of individuals. In the Midwestern Voc Rehab office nearly all the clients were also poor and lacked social skills and social support.

Teachers and Voc Rehab counselors work in human services; police do not. Although police work directly with citizens, they do not have clients. In a diffuse, inchoate way they serve the public. More narrowly they sympathize and do their best to help victims, but their job is to prevent crime and apprehend criminals. They are required to treat criminals as citizens with rights but, do not serve the drunk driver or shop lifter or drug dealer in the same way that a teacher serves his students or a Voc Rehab counselor serves her clients.

Unlike teaching and counseling, police work, whether in the car or on foot, involves cruising territory.² Their work is often routine and tedious but punctuated with moments of action and danger. Even the routine rarely feels settled or calm because of this ever present possibility of a 911 call, a car chase, or an “officer down” alert. Their work and encounters with citizens are often unpleasant. “Incivility, disrespect, hostility, insult, threat, and assault are every day features of policing,” observe Peter Manning and John Van Maanen.³

² Steve Herbert, *Policing Space: Territoriality and the Los Angeles Police Department* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997).

³ Peter K. Manning and John Van Maanen, editors, *Policing: A View from the Street* (Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1978), 51.

Much more than teachers and counselors, police represent and are authorized to act on the coercive power of the state. Cops, whose bodies are uniformed with state symbols, use force to stop citizens, interrogate them, detain them, and, sometimes, brutalize them. Police see themselves not only as enforcers of the law but as agents of social order and morality, a characteristic they share with teachers and Voc Rehab counselors. After years of observing police work, Peter Manning notes that, “Policing is an exercise in symbolic demarking of what is immoral, wrong, and outside the boundaries of acceptable conduct.”⁴ Steve Herbert, drawing on field observations of the Los Angeles Police Department, agrees, “Officers are preeminently focused on those who violate moral-cum-legal codes, and define their actions as part of an attempt to protect the good through expunging the evil.”⁵

Although their work worlds differ, teachers, counselors, cops, and all street-level workers develop norms and beliefs in response to the dilemmas and difficulty of their jobs. These beliefs are encrypted in the language they use and especially in the stories they tell.⁶

⁴ Peter Manning, *Police Work* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1997), 319.

⁵ Steve Herbert, “Morality in Law Enforcement: Chasing ‘Bad Guys’ with the Los Angeles Police Department,” *Law & Society Review* 40, no. 4, 1996: 800.

⁶ For a description of police language see, Marcus Laffrey, “The Word on the Street: What a Cop Says and How He Says It Can Matter More Than His Stick or His

Gun," *The New Yorker*, 10 Aug 1998, 36-39.

Questionnaires

Face-to-Face Interview Protocol:

INITIAL INTERVIEW WITH ALL MEMBERS OF WORK SITE

These interviews should, if possible, be tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim.

- Introduction:
 - Thank you for taking the time to talk with me.
 - Before we begin let me explain a little about our research project:
 - This is academic research funded by the National Science Foundation. Although we have permission from [the director's name] to do the research, we are not reporting to him [or her] or anyone else in the government. What you tell us is confidential and anonymous. We will use what we learn for scholarly writing but will not link specific observations with individuals. We will, however, identify the type of agency and the city.
 - Our purpose is to gain a greater understanding of decision making of front-line, public employees, such as yourself. The study focuses on police officers, school teachers and disability claims processors working in three metropolitan areas.
 - Our research involves field observation, interviews, and the collection of stories from front-line staff about work experiences.
 - The stories will be our primary source of information about decision making, but today I'm not asking for stories
 - My purpose today is to get to know a little more about the nature of name of

organization] and about you.

- Do you have any questions?
- May I proceed?
- First, can you tell me a little about yourself.
 - Why are you in this job? What made you decide to become a [police officer, teacher, or disability claims worker]?
 - How long have you been working [name of organization]?
 - Can you tell me a little about other jobs that you have had?
- What's it like working here?
 - Probe: feelings about the work (e.g. Scary, boring, overwhelming, etc.)
 - Probe: relations with other workers (e.g. Cooperative, contentious, friendly, cold, etc.)
 - Probe: relations with supervisors (e.g. Cooperative, "bossy," appreciated, unappreciated, etc.)
- Probe: relations with clients [or citizens or what ever is appropriate to the setting] (e.g. Friendly, unpleasant, scary, rewarding, matter-of-fact or business-like, etc.)
 - Can you describe the typical client [or citizen] you serve?
 - How are they similar to you? How are they different?
 - Who are the easiest to serve? Who are the most difficult?
 - Are there any complaints from particular groups of clients [or citizens]?
- Social identities assessment
 - We are all members of different groups or social affiliations. Some of these groups pertain to your sex, race, ethnicity, or social class. We are also member of different occupational groups.
 - Describe the social or occupational group that is **most** important to your sense of what kind of person you are.

- Identify critical incidents
 - Thinking back over the history of your agency, are there any specific events that changed the way you do things? These events could be anything: a court case, an investigation, a well publicized success, or what ever.
 - When did these things happen?
 - How did they change how you do things?
- Collect the Social Identity and Demographic questionnaires at this time
- Thank you very much. We will be in your office from time-to-time for the next six months. If you think of anything else or just want to talk just let me or [other member of the team] know. Thanks again.

**DISCRETION QUESTIONNAIRE AND
EXIT INTERVIEW**

(Example: Teacher Site)

Please fill out the following questionnaire.

1. How much authority do you have in determining what tasks to perform day-to-day?

- None
- Little
- Some
- Quite a bit
- Very much

2. How much authority do you have in establishing rules and procedures about how your work is to be done?

- None
- Little
- Some
- Quite a bit
- Very much

3. How much authority do you have in determining how student exceptions are to be handled?

- None
- Little
- Some
- Quite a bit
- Very much

4. To what extent does your school have clear-cut, reasonable goals and objectives?

- To a very small extent
- To a little extent
- To some extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent

5. During a normal week, how frequently do student exceptions arise in your work?

- Very rarely
- Occasionally
- Quite often
- Very often
- Constantly

6. When considering the various situations that arise in performing your work, what percentage of the time do you have written procedures for dealing with them?

- 0-20%
- 21-40%
- 41-60%
- 61-80%
- 81-100%

7. How precisely do these written rules and procedures specify how your major tasks are to be done?

- Very General
- Mostly General
- Somewhat specific
- Quite specific
- Very specific

8. To what extent did you follow standard operating procedures or practices to do your major tasks in the last month?

- To no extent
- Little extent
- Some extent
- Great extent
- Very great extent

9. To what extent do you perform the same tasks from day-to-day?

- To no extent
- Little extent
- Some extent
- Great extent
- Very great extent

10. In performing your major task, how different are the day-to-day situations?

- Completely different
- Very much different
- Quite a bit different
- Mostly the same
- Very much the same

11a. How much of your work deals directly with people face-to-face?

- None.
- About 25%
- About 50%
- About 75%
- All of my work .

11b. When it comes to working with [students], how different are the day-to-day situations?

- Completely different
- Very much different
- Quite a bit different
- Mostly the same
- Very much the same

12a. How easy is it for you to know whether you did your work correctly?

- Very difficult
- Quite difficult
- Somewhat easy
- Quite easy
- Very easy

12b. What percentage of the time are you generally sure of what the outcomes of your work efforts will be?

- 40% or less
- 41-60%
- 61-75%
- 76-90%
- 91% or more

13. To what extent are the resources you have to work with adequate?

- To a very small extent
- To a little extent
- To some extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent

14. How heavy was your work load in the past month?

- Light
- A bit light
- Just about Right
- Heavy
- Too heavy to keep up with

15. How much feeling of loyalty do you have toward this [school]?

- No Feeling at all of loyalty
- Very little
- Some
- Quite a Bit
- Very strong feeling of Loyalty

16. I feel the compensation I receive for my work is fair.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

17. I believe that administrators in my organization are paid fairly.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

18. I am concerned about the differences in pay between the teachers and administrators in my organization.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

19. I am concerned about the differences in pay between front-line staff and managers in society in general.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

20. I am more concerned about fair compensation than about fair treatment at work.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

21. All in all, how satisfied are you with your job?

- Unsatisfied
- Somewhat unsatisfied
- Satisfied
- Quite a bit Satisfied
- Very Satisfied

22. Which of the following should be taken into account in deciding how to distribute scholarship money to applicants to medical school?

- Scholarships should be given to applicants according to how much they need the money in order to attend medical school.
- Scholarship money should be given to applicants according to how hard they have tried to get prepared for medical school.
- Scholarship money should be given to applicants based on their grades and medical school admission test scores.
- Scholarship money should be given to applicants in such a way that the smallest scholarships are not much less than the largest awards.

23. The role of government should be to help people.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

24. When government provides welfare benefits such as disability, unemployment compensation, and early retirement pensions it only makes people not want to work.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

25. It is the responsibility of government to meet everyone's needs, even in case of sickness, poverty, unemployment, and old age.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

26. If someone has a high social or economic position, that indicates the person has special abilities.
- Strongly agree
 - Somewhat agree
 - Somewhat disagree
 - Strongly disagree
27. Would you like to live in a society where the government does nothing except provide for national defense and police protection so that people could be left alone to earn whatever they could?
- Strongly agree
 - Somewhat agree
 - Somewhat disagree
 - Strongly disagree
28. Please chose the category that best describes your political views.
- Extremely liberal
 - Liberal
 - Slightly liberal
 - Moderate, middle of the road
 - Slightly conservative
 - Conservative
 - Extremely conservative

The following open ended questions will be asked once the questionnaire has been handed back.

1. What does the word “justice” mean to you? Are their groups or types of people who are treated unjustly in America today? (If yes) Who?
2. Do you feel that there are any kind of people who get special treatment by your agency? Is that fair? Are their others that are discriminated against by your agency?
3. Are there any agency rules or procedures that you feel are unfair?

EXIT INTERVIEW

The following open ended questions will be asked by one of P.I.'s once the questionnaire has been handed back.

1. What does the word "justice" mean to you?
2. Are there groups or types of people who are treated unjustly in America today? (If yes) Who?
3. Do you feel that there are any kind of people who get special treatment by your agency? Is that fair? Are there others that are discriminated against by your agency?
4. Are there any agency rules or procedures that you feel are unfair?

Coding Instruments

STORY COVER PAGE

Site:

Storyteller: (Number)

Story ID:

1. **Story Type** (circle one)
 - a. Official (“those that our boss, our government, our parents, or anyone in authority instructs us to tell”; stories that present a “public relations” view of the organization; tell how the organization would like to see itself or be seen.)
 - b. First hand experiential (Narrator tells story about personal experience.)
 - c. Second hand (Narrator tells story that someone else told him or her.)
 - d. Culturally common (Common stories of the organization; No one person tells the, and no one person makes them up; clue is if more than one storyteller tells the same story)
2. **Role of the Narrator:**
 - a. Job: (detailed description of the job of the person telling the story)
 - b. In story: (Same as above, or as described in story, such as narrator, bystander, actor)
3. **Social Identity of Storyteller:** (Taken from first interview)
4. **List of Characters with Descriptive Details:** (using the name or identifier from the story)

- a.
- 5. **Time of Story:**
 - a. Present (within 1 yr/on going)
 - b. Near past (1-3 yrs.)
 - c. Past (More than 3 yrs.)
 - d. Indeterminate
- 6. **Synopsis:** (One or two line summary of the story)
- 7. **Meta Themes:**
 - a. Triumph of Goodwill
 - b. Being Reformed
 - c. Who are the Worthy?
 - d. Getting the Bad Guys
 - e. Justifying Action, "Father Knows Best"
 - f. Self-aggrandizement
 - g. Street-Level Worker vs. Management
 - h. Other:

STORY CODES

INSTRUCTIONS: For story and thematic codes, mark with brackets on the right margin the text segments that are coded. Mark any and all codes that apply to that text. First coder uses red; second uses blue. Mark all disagreements by circling the code and flag the text area.

STORY CODES

Interrupts: (INT) A premature halt in the action sequence or a shift from one action sequence to another. An interrupt is often, but not always, associated with change of place and characters.

Repetition: (REP) A restatement of a descriptive or action detail with or without variation.

Symbols/Signs/Artifacts: (SYM) Objects or words that are presented in the story that connote meaning beyond their narrow meaning. Examples: bullet wound scars, accommodation ribbons, pictures.

Causation: (CAU) Causal attribution: statement that infers an “if/then” relationships between actions, motives, etc. E.g., police officer justifies use of deadly force, “if he wouldn’t have come so close to me, I wouldn’t have had to shoot.” “Being on crack gave him super powers.”

THEMATIC CODES

Decision Norms (DN): Reason from the perspective of: following the rules or **legality/rules (DN-LAW)**; doing what was equitable, fair, impartial or **justice (DN-JUS)**; acting to protect the good, acting against the bad or **morality (DN-MOR)**; looking out for me or **self-interest (DN-SIN)**; protecting the profession, seeing to the reputation of the organization or **organizational interest (DN-ORG)**; and doing what the situation calls for or **pragmatism (DN-PRAG)**.

Decision Rules (DR): follow the rule (**DR-FOL**); ignore the rule (**DR-IGN**); bend the rule (**DR-BND**); subvert or take action against the rule (**DR-SUB**).

Consequence to SLW (CON): What happens to the worker as a result of decision or action. For example, nothing, punished, rewarded.

Worker Affect (WA): Worker depictions of feelings in the context of being a member of a profession, working the streets, interacting with others, including expressions of fear, satisfaction, bitterness.

Worker Self-Identity (WI): Who one is or depicting oneself as an American, a worker, as gendered, as family-oriented, sexualized, as racialized, as ethnically-embedded, as religiously inclined.

Worker Self-Worth (WW): Characterization of one self as virtuous, flawed, brave, caring.

Client Identity (CI): Who the client is as an American, as worker, as family-oriented, as gendered, as family-oriented, sexualized, as racialized, as ethnically-embedded, as religiously inclined.

Client Worth (CW): Characterization of the client as deserving, lazy, flawed, caring.

Workplace Relational Dynamics (WD): depicting relations and interactions in the workplace between subject/storyteller/interviewee and: **subordinate (WD-SUB)**; **supervisor (WD-SUP)**; **fellow worker (WD-WKR)**; **other organizations (WD-ORG)**.

Street Relational Dynamics (SD): depicting, at times stereotypically, relations and interactions on the job between subject/storyteller/interviewee and: **client (SD-CLT)**; **student (SD-STD)**; **suspect (SD-SUS)**; **victim (SD-VIC)**; **groups of citizens** such as rich, poor, women, etc. (**SD-GRP**); **media (SD-MED)**; **advocacy groups** such as Independence Inc. (**SD-ADV**); **public**, as in protecting the public (**SD-PUB**); and another governmental entity, such as state agency, “the feds,” the mayor, etc (**SD-GOV**).

Organizational Culture (OC): the work atmosphere, as collegial, as conflicted, as divided, as in transition, and the relation of worker to organization.

Place/Space (PS): depictions of setting where one is doing work, including expressions about doing work in public places (e.g., street corners) as distinct from private places (e.g., a citizen's home).

Resources (RES): the characterizations of resources available to do job, including time, how workers cope with deficiencies in resources, and engage in rationing.

Critical Events (CE): changes in key personnel, in organizational process; dramatic news about the organization or particular workers as reported in the media.

Publications (as of November 2001)

- Maynard-Moody, Steven and Suzanne Leland. "Stories from the Front-Lines of Public Management: Street-Level Workers as Responsible Actors." In *Advancing Public Management: New Developments in Theory, Methods, and Practice*, edited by Hal Rainey and Jeff Brudney. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1999.
- Maynard-Moody, Steven, and Michael Musheno. *Cops, Teachers, and Counselors: Narratives of Street-Level Judgment*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, forthcoming.
- . "State-Agent or Citizen-Agent: Two Narratives of Discretion." *Journal of Public Administration Theory & Research* 10, no. 2 (April 2000): 329-59.
- Oberweis, Trish, and Michael Musheno. "Cops Identities and the Communicative Aspects of Policing." In *Between Law and Culture*, edited by Lisa Bower, David Theo Goldberg, and Michael Musheno. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001.
- . *Knowing Rights: State Actors' Stories of Power, Identity and Morality*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate/Dartmouth, 2001.
- . "Policing Identities: Cop Decision-Making and the Constitution of Citizens." *Law and Social Inquiry* 24, no. 4 (1999).