DUMPING: POLICE-INITIATED TRANSJURISDICTIONAL TRANSPORT OF TROUBLESOME PERSONS

WILLIAM R. KING
Bowling Green State University

THOMAS M. DUNN
University of Northern Colorado

Those who write about the police have generally neglected the informal ways police officers handle situations involving troublesome persons. Troublesome persons, including homeless and mentally disturbed people, prostitutes, juveniles, and people under the influence of alcohol or drugs, are not necessarily best handled by arrest. In fact the recent move by many police agencies to handle situations with either aggressive order maintenance or community policing may encourage officers to handle troublesome persons via informal methods. This article focuses on one such informal method: police-initiated transjurisdictional transport (PITT) of troublesome persons, or dumping. This article describes PITT, explores the literature for examples of it, describes some of its possible causes, and proposes three ways to control PITT. We conclude with four research strategies for studying police dumping of troublesome persons.

Keywords: *dumping; transjurisdictional transport; police discretion; mentally ill; troublesome people*

Street-level interactions between police officers and various categories of disenfranchised, problematic, or disorderly persons have long concerned

---

An earlier version of this article was presented at the 1999 annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences in Orlando, Florida. We are indebted to the helpful assistance and comments of Robin Engel and Michael Buerger.

POLICE QUARTERLY Vol. 7 No. 3, September 2004 339–358
DOI: 10.1177/1098611102250586

observers of the police. During the past 35 years, research interests in police-citizen interactions have concentrated primarily on police use of coercive actions (e.g., arrest and use of force) against problematic citizens (for review, see Riksheim & Chermak, 1993). This trend has continued with the most recent examinations of police behaviors (Engel, Sobol, & Worden, 2000; Klinger, 1994, 1996; Mastrofski, Worden, & Snipes, 1995). Given the severity of the consequences for citizens associated with formal coercive actions, the concentration on arrest and use of force is certainly important. This focus, however, does not adequately reflect the majority of police-citizen encounters. Many of the early qualitative observations of police behavior suggested that officers very rarely use arrest or force to handle situations—rather, the majority of these encounters are handled informally (Bittner, 1967; Muir, 1977; Reiss, 1971; Rubinstein, 1973; Wilson, 1968).

Policing has evolved considerably since the 1960s to 1970s when much of this early qualitative research was conducted. In the past 20 years, many American police organizations have adopted community policing and/or aggressive order maintenance policies. The adoption of these policies has slightly different implications for officers' behavior at the street level. Some have suggested that community-policing policies will lead to greater use of informal handling of problematic situations encountered by officers (H. Goldstein, 1990; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990). In fact, the emphasis of community-policing strategies is to encourage officers to respond to problematic situations in ways other than traditional, formal responses such as arrest and use of force (H. Goldstein, 1990; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990). In contrast, aggressive order maintenance policies encourage officers to use formal coercive action toward citizens for even minor offenses that had been traditionally handled informally. Aggressive order maintenance entails using the threat of enforcing public order laws, such as curfews and loitering ordinances, as a way to control troublesome populations and, many claim, to control violent crime (Kelling & Coles, 1996). The recent passion with aggressive order maintenance as a crime control technique stems in part from the broken windows theory (Wilson & Kelling, 1982) and from claims that New York City's recent crime drop can be attributed to aggressive order maintenance (Eck & Maguire, 2000). These two dissimilar police tactics may lead officers to dump troublesome persons either in the interests of handling such situations informally (COP) or in the name of order maintenance.

Unfortunately, our knowledge of police interactions with troublesome persons has not kept pace with the changes in policing philosophies and strategies. This article expands our knowledge of police behavior, order maintenance, and troublesome persons in two unique ways. First, it concentrates on a type of informal handling of special populations that has received scant descriptive and/or empirical attention by police scholars: police-initiated transjurisdictional transport (PITT) of troublesome persons. Although the informal policy of transporting troublesome persons to another location—or police "dumping" of problematic citizens—is generally acknowledged by police practitioners, it has rarely been discussed in the policing literature or systematically studied. Second, this article expands the category of troublesome persons beyond the homeless and mentally disordered, who are traditionally studied by researchers, by including the informal handling of juveniles, prostitutes, and people under the influence of alcohol and drugs.

This exploration of a police response to troublesome persons is timely given the recent emphasis on community policing and aggressive order maintenance by the police. Although proponents of these policies certainly do not advocate dumping troublesome persons in other jurisdictions, it is reasonable to suspect that some officers may resort to such tactics as the most expedient way of handling troublesome persons.

This examination of transjurisdictional transport of troublesome persons unfolds in four parts. First, the notion of PITT is described and its consequences explained. Second, three general information sources (empirical and nonempirical social scientific writings, general research on police behavior, and journalistic accounts) are explored in an effort to better describe and examine the use of PITT by police officers. Third, we discuss the possible explanations for this type of informal handling of citizens and we offer suggestions for preventing it. Finally, this article concludes with four possible research strategies for studying the incidence of PITT.

DEFINING PITT

Dumping or PITT is a low-visibility police activity that stands outside the legal and moral norms of policing. PITT occurs when a police officer interacts with a mentally disturbed person, a person who is homeless, a prostitute, a juvenile, a drunk, or a person under the influence of drugs, the officer views this person as "troublesome," and the officer resolves the

situation by transporting that troublesome person out of that officer's (or the department's) jurisdiction and releases that person into his or her own recognizance. To qualify as PITT, the officer does not have to transport the person but can arrange transportation instead (e.g., by placing the person on a bus or train or by using another departmental vehicle, such as a patrol wagon). PITT does not include instances in which an officer transports someone to another location where they are released into the custody of another "capable guardian" (such as a mental hospital, jail, or the troublesome person's home). PITT only involves instances in which the troublesome person is released, unsupervised, somewhere else (but not instances in which the police refuse to transport someone from a dangerous area; see Kappeler, 1997). For example, an officer may give a homeless individual a ride to their jurisdiction's boundary, releases the individual, and instruct them to not return. Similarly, arranging transport, such as buying a bus ticket for a mentally ill person to send him or her to another city, exemplifies dumping. Generally, the jurisdiction into which the troublesome person is released does not know about or approve of the arrival of the troublesome person. In some larger areas, PITT involves transporting people to another part of the jurisdiction but not out of that department's jurisdiction.

PITT is analogous to other punishments imposed by the criminal justice system, such as banishment (Walker, 1998). Some courts have used "sundown parole" in which petty criminals were told to leave town or face imprisonment. PITT has also been referred to by a number of different terms. Transportation that involves buying troublesome people bus tickets to facilitate their removal has been called "diesel therapy." Indians in Saskatoon, Canada, have referred to PITT as a "scenic tour," a "starlight tour," or a "ride in the country" (Brass, 2001).

Transporting and dumping people who may be under duress may lead to three adverse outcomes. First, the dumped persons may be harmed or may harm others when they arrive at their destinations. In some cases, the dumped persons are free to wander and may become crime victims or may victimize others. It is plausible that behaviors that attract police attention in one jurisdiction will not cease when the people are moved to other jurisdictions because the cause of their behavior has not been addressed. In some situations, dumped persons may succumb to exposure to the elements, such as by freezing to death or suffering heat stroke, or they may be struck by vehicles. Second, moving troublesome people to unfamiliar surroundings may aggravate their behavior and separate them from their social support networks and, in the case of mentally disturbed persons, perhaps their

medication. Finally, it is possible that people such as juvenile runaways, persons who are homeless, and people who are mentally ill will end up in jurisdictions where they are easily overlooked (e.g., a large city) and will therefore be denied attention and possible treatment.

EXAMPLES OF PITT IN PRIOR LITERATURE

Despite the relevance of dumping to contemporary policing, especially given the recent emphasis on community policing and aggressive order maintenance, there has been little systematic attention given to this matter. The prior literature on policing troublesome population can be divided into three categories: empirical and nonempirical social scientific writings, more general research on police behavior, and journalistic accounts.[1] Accounts of PITT are sometimes incidentally caught by police researchers, but overall, the best accounts of PITT come from journalistic accounts.

Social scientific writings about troublesome persons are usually drawn from the observations, experiences, or thoughts of police researchers. In some cases, these writings are driven by some type of quantifiable data and in other cases, they are not. For example, Aaronson, Dienes, and Musheno (1984) relied on various police records to see how changes in local alcoholism laws affected police arrests of drunks. Similarly, William Muir's (1977) qualitative observation of police officers in one U.S. city led him to note how different police officers dealt with the inhabitants of skid row. Although Muir's research is more concerned with officer behavior in general and not interactions with troublesome persons, it is still an example of research that directly addresses troublesome persons and the police. Other examples of research in this category include discussions of how street police officers handle homeless people (Bittner, 1967), inhabitants of skid row (Muir, 1977), people who are mentally ill (Teplin, 1984), juveniles (Black & Reiss, 1970), or all these groups (Kelling & Coles, 1996; Wilson & Kelling, 1982). Some of these accounts also suggest how the police should deal with these groups (e.g., Kelling & Coles, 1996). Unfortunately, the empirical and nonempirical social scientific literature has rarely mentioned PITT. One exception is noted by Kappeler, Sluder, and Alpert (1994) and involves a case in which a police officer, "drove a young mugger far out of the precinct, forced the offender to strip to his shorts, and left him to make his own way back home" (p. 193). Generally, early observers of the police were more interested with informal ways of handling troublesome persons or police officers' use of arrest or physical force.[2]

A second body of research investigates the behavior of police officers on the street via systematic observation of police officers. This research is usually concerned with how police officers behave in general not just when dealing with troublesome persons.[3] Research in this second category uses trained observers who accompany police officers on patrol and record officers' actions. These data are not collected to observe police interactions with troublesome persons per se but rather to study police officer behavior in general. The larger of these studies have produced rich data sets that have been subsequently used by researchers for years after collection (e.g., the Black and Reiss data collected in 1965, Reiss, 1971; the Police Services Study data collected in 1977, Caldwell, 1978; and the Project on Policing Neighborhoods (POPN) data collected in 1996-1997, Parks, Mastrofski, DeJong, and Gray, 1999). Most often, these data have been used to explore the correlates of officers' decision to arrest, use physical force, investigate, and provide service to people (for reviews of most of these studies, see Riksheim & Chermak, 1993; Sherman, 1980).

The data from systematic observations sometimes provide information about possible cases of PITT; unfortunately, these data are of little use to explorations of PITT if observers did not collect information about citizens' housing situation, youth, occupation in prostitution, mental stability, or blood-alcohol content. Sometimes, however, discussions of these data have provided accounts of dumping. For instance, an account drawn from the Black and Reiss data (collected in 1965) describe a disturbing example of dumping in which two officers were flagged down by a man and woman who claimed that a Black man "was causing trouble inside the public transport station from which they had just emerged" (Reiss, 1973, p. 276).

> With that, they ran into the station and grabbed the Negro man who was inside. Without questioning him, they shoved him into a phone booth and began beating him with their fists and a flashlight. They also hit him in the groin. Then they dragged him out and kept him on his knees. He pleaded that he had just been released from a mental hospital that day and, begging not to be hit again, asked them to let him return to the hospital. One policeman said: "Don't you like us, nigger? I like to beat niggers and rip out their eyes." They took him outside to their patrol car. Then they decided to put him on a bus, telling him that he was returning to the hospital; they deliberately put him on a bus going in the opposite direction. Just before the Negro boarded the bus, he said, "You police just like to shoot and beat people." The first policeman replied, "Get moving, nigger, or I'll shoot you." The man was crying and bleeding as he was put onto the bus. Leaving the scene, the younger policeman commented, "He won't be back." (Reiss, 1973, p. 276)

Two studies using observational data of police response to troublesome persons deserve discussion. In 1980 to 1981, Linda Teplin trained graduate students to ride with officers in two Chicago precincts and record officer reactions to people who were believed to be mentally ill (see Teplin, 1984). Overall, Teplin's (1984) data led her to conclude that police officers are more likely to arrest people who are mentally ill compared with people who showed no signs of being mentally ill. Simply put, this conclusion supports the criminalization hypothesis, which posits that since deinstitutionalization in the late 1960s, mentally ill people are more likely to be arrested and processed through the criminal justice system. On the other hand, Engel and Silver (2001) found that police officers were less likely to arrest citizens exhibiting mental disorders (using observational data of the police collected in 1977 and 1996-1997). Unfortunately, neither Teplin nor Engel and Silver report on PITT or discuss it at length. Simply, there is a dearth of research on and discussion of PITT from quantitative data sets of police officer behavior.

Finally, the newsprint media reports occasionally on PITT. This article located instances of PITT in five cities (Cleveland, Ohio; Miami, Florida; Washington, D.C.; Schenectady, New York; and Saskatoon, Canada).

Allegedly, Cleveland police officers sometimes picked up homeless men and transported them to other parts of the city during 1992 and 1993.

> The city engaged in illegal dumping in an effort to "sanitize" downtown Cleveland. The ACLU began investigating the issue after receiving a tip that police were removing homeless people against their will from downtown shopping districts and dumping them in remote places. (Grant, 1997, p. 1B)

In February 1997 Cleveland settled a resulting lawsuit brought by the ACLU.

The city of Miami, Florida, was supposedly a popular homeless dumping area for local municipalities. During 2001, downtown Miami businesses and the Miami police accused other local police agencies of transporting their homeless to the Miami city limits or even to downtown Miami. In some cases, the homeless were allegedly transported across jurisdictional boundaries and left at downtown Miami homeless centers. In another instance, an ex–Key Biscayne police officer claimed she was ordered by her superiors to transport homeless people over a bridge and dump them at the Miami city limits (Corsa, 2001).

A similar incident occurred in July 1989 when Washington, D.C., metro police officers herded 24 prostitutes across the 14th Street Bridge from Washington into Arlington at 1:30 in the morning. The officers abandoned

their forced march when a photographer and reporter from the *Washington Post* arrived. One prostitute stated, "They said they were taking us to Virginia, that we could work over there. They said we'd go to jail if we stopped" (Byrd, 1989). Surprisingly, an Arlington police officer claimed he had been instructed to dump troublesome people in Washington, D.C.

> I was told by a supervisor to take one guy to the D.C. line and basically deal with the problem that way. He was put at the end of the bridge and we told him, that way is D.C. Go over there. (Goldberg & Dedman, 1989)

More recently, allegations surfaced that officers of the Schenectady, New York, police dumped people (Barry, 2001). A Schenectady resident accused two officers of taking him 11 miles outside the city, removing his boots (which were thrown into the woods), and leaving him in the woods. One of the officers later stated under oath that such relocations were "common practice." A sworn deposition taken from another Schenectady officer stated

> that Schenectady officers would sometimes drop an alcohol-addled person at the doorstep of another community's police department and say there was a party inside with "free food and girls." Other departments would often return the favor with a different drunk or drug addict . . . "you did it as a joke, and it went back and forth." (Barry, 2001, p. B1)

The final instance of PITT found in media accounts came from Saskatoon, Canada (Roberts, 2000). Two Saskatoon police officers were fired and later charged and convicted (of unlawful confinement) for dumping an aboriginal man outside the city on the night of January 28, 2000. The two officers had picked the man up for causing a disturbance but drove the man to a power station outside the city and released him with instructions to never return. The officers allegedly took the man's coat, although the temperature that night was below negative 22 degrees Celsius (Foss, 2001). The resulting trial raised other allegations of dumping, especially among local aboriginals. The bodies of five other men had been found outside Saskatoon between 1990 and 2000. Aboriginals alleged that the dead men were victims of police dumping, whereas others claimed they had been dumped by Saskatoon officers (Brass, 2001).

Overall, it appears that PITT is a method police officers employ sometimes to handle troublesome persons. Without further study, however, it is not possible to state definitively how often officers use it or what factors are related to its use because print-media accounts are not a representative

sample of police officer behavior. Drawing from the larger literature of what influences police officer behavior, however, it is possible to hypothesize about the causes of PITT.

CAUSES OF PITT

This article divides the hypothesized causes of PITT into three types: organizations, communities, and situational factors. Briefly, an officer's decision to dump a troublesome person is most likely influenced by a range of organizational, community, and situational characteristics. This categorization of the causes or correlates of officer behavior is in accord with prior reviews of police officer behavior (Riksheim & Chermak, 1993; Sherman, 1980).

ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS

Officers' decisions to dump people are likely related, in part, to certain organizational characteristics. First is the presence of a departmental emphasis on aggressive order maintenance (or zero tolerance) policing, departmental implementation of COP, and how widely implemented these policies are. The positive relationship between aggressive order maintenance and PITT is expected because of some departments' inducement that officers handle troublesome persons in a manner designed to quickly reduce disorder (as opposed to getting troublesome persons help or putting them under criminal justice control). The positive relationship between aggressive order maintenance and PITT differs based on how aggressively and how widely (geographically) departments implement zero-tolerance policing. It is likely that some departments will reserve certain areas of their jurisdiction for containing troublesome people (e.g., a skid row or a red-light district). Other departments, however, may eradicate all geographic areas for troublesome persons and hence will be more likely to engage in PITT (provided other facilities do not exist for holding troublesome people). Departments will vary in the temporal dimensions of their aggressive order maintenance. For example, departments embodying a strict, 24-hour aggressive policing stance are probably more likely to dump. These statements about aggressive policing are based partially on the assumption that PITT results because officers become frustrated with alternative methods of handling troublesome people such as arresting them or taking them to a shelter.

The geographic and temporal aspects of PITT also apply to departments implementing COP. Because COP increases police officer discretion and emphasizes informal solutions to problems, it is also likely that departments with COP will see increased incidence of PITT. Again, this predicted relationship is related to how widely COP is implemented organizationally (e.g., is COP a special unit or departmental wide? Is the entire jurisdiction covered by COP officers or just certain neighborhoods?). This relationship is also influenced by the presence or absence of attractive alternatives available for officers who deal with troublesome persons.

The likelihood of PITT is also related to departmental culture. PITT is more likely if it is viewed by police officers as an accepted (but perhaps not departmentally condoned) way of handling problems. PITT is a low-fuss way of making bad people disappear, and police culture (or subtypes of police culture; see Paoline, 2001) rewards creative, common-sense ways of handling problems (Crank, 1998).

Finally, it is expected that officers are more likely to use PITT on troublesome people if they have either seen or heard of PITT in their areas. This includes officers who become the victims of PITT by other agencies when the other agencies dump troublesome persons in their jurisdiction. PITT is expected to be more prevalent in departments in which officers can learn how to dump and where officers see that PITT is not punished. Departments in which PITT is more widely practiced are expected to more readily educate officers about how to dump (through social learning).

Community Factors

The prevalence of PITT is also related to various community characteristics, such as the presence of suitable dumping areas, easy access to transportation, and the presence of suitable alternative placements. First, suitable dumping areas need to both retain dumpees and be low visibility for the officers initiating the dump and for the dumpees. Dumping areas can retain troublesome persons either through some form of "trap" or via their attractiveness for dumpees. Some dumping sites trap troublesome persons (i.e., prevent their quick return) by being distant, such as when people are transported by interstate bus lines. Other dumping areas limit dumpees returns, for example, by forcing a dumpee to make a long walk over a bridge on a cold winter night. It seems likely that few dumpees would bother to make the cold, long return walk and risk being arrested upon their return. Other dumping grounds retain dumpees by their attractiveness for dumpees.

These dumping grounds are in areas, for example, with less police presence, that are warmer, or with easier access to alcohol or drugs.

Suitable dumping grounds must also be low visibility for both the officers dumping the persons and the dumpees. Officers who release dumpees on a journey to a dumping ground partially avoid being spotted directly dumping people (e.g., by taking them to the city limits and telling them to start walking or by placing dumpees on buses or transit lines). Dumping areas must also be low visibility for the dumpees so their arrival and presence are not noticed. Dumpees who call attention to themselves may also receive the attention of other police agencies, which may lead the dumpees to recount their tales of dumping. It is because of visibility that it is expected that suburbs are more likely to dump troublesome persons in neighboring cities than cities are to dump in the suburbs.

PITT is also related to easy access to transportation. Officers can usually opt to transport the persons themselves. However, transporting dumpees a great distance is a good way of ensuring they will not return, and such long-distance transport is best accomplished via transportation companies (such as bus lines, public transits, and so forth). Thus, the incidence of PITT is probably related to how much transport (bus lines and public transports) is readily available to officers. In some cases, officers may be able to enlist the assistance of other police agencies, which will transport troublesome persons a greater distance.[4]

The likelihood of PITT is also related to the availability of alternative placements for troublesome persons. These alternatives to PITT are "appropriate" (yet unsupervised) areas for such troublesome persons within jurisdictions (such as a skid row or a red-light district) or social service agencies where troublesome persons are supervised. Because the definition of troublesome persons posited here encompasses a wide-range of people, the appropriate alternative placements would also need to be broad to deter dumping. Telling someone to get back to skid row is a simple if unsophisticated alternative to PITT. Of course, troublesome persons are then left unsupervised. Social service alternative placements are places officers can bring troublesome persons where they will be supervised by professionals. These include hospital psychiatric units, alcoholism and substance abuse shelters, homeless shelters, shelters for prostitutes, and youth curfew centers. The mere presence of a suitable placement will not prevent PITT. Some homeless shelters will not accept people who are under the influence of alcohol or drugs. Some substance abuse shelters will not take involuntary placements. Shelters are sometimes full. It is expected that in such circum-

stances, officers who have exhausted their options will be more likely to dump the persons. Officers in areas with few or no shelters and alternative placements will be more likely to resort to PITT.

SITUATIONAL FACTORS

Past studies indicate the three best predictors of the police decision to arrest are all situational factors (the suspect's demeanor, a victim or complainant's preference for either arrest or leniency, and the seriousness of the alleged offense; Riksheim & Chermak, 1993; Smith & Visher, 1981). It is also likely that various attributes of both interactions between officers and troublesome persons and attributes of the troublesome persons influence officers' decisions to dump. For instance, people with a suitable place to go (such as a home or a friend's apartment) are more likely to be told to "go home" as opposed to being dumped. Likewise, troublesome persons who are compliant with officers' commands to leave an area are less likely to experience PITT as compared with people displaying recalcitrance or poor demeanor. Even factors such as personal hygiene (or lack thereof) probably influence the decision to dump. Most police officers treat their cruisers as offices with four wheels and are unwilling to transport people who smell or may vomit or defecate in their cars. Under such circumstances, officers may opt for ordering the people to walk from the area or may arrange some form of alternative transport (such as public transit).

It should be obvious from this discussion that officers' decisions to use PITT is not a simple decision. Rather, like all decisions made by police officers on the street, it is a solution influenced in part by certain agency, community, and situational attributes. Understanding the causes of PITT also helps guide possible ways of decreasing its occurrence.

CONTROLLING PITT

Preventing police officers from engaging in PITT is best thought of in light of the larger literature on controlling the discretionary decisions of criminal justice actors. Since the early 1960s, reformers have suggested and implemented various techniques to control discretionary decision making by criminal justice actors, including the police.

Generally, the following four ways of controlling criminal justice discretion have been offered: checking, structuring, confining, and using alternatives (Davis, 1969). Briefly, checking involves the review of criminal

justice actors' actions either before or after the acts. For example, police officers must obtain search warrants from a judge (who presumably checks that the officers have sufficient cause for warrants). Some police departments require that a supervisor be dispatched to certain, sensitive calls (such as calls involving the mentally ill) to ensure that responding officers handle the situation properly. Structuring involves the use of rules and guidelines to direct actors' behavior and to tell actors what factors to account for and how much to weigh them in decision making (Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 1988). Some police departments have structured their officers' decisions to engage in vehicle pursuits by asking officers to account for factors such as the suspected violation, traffic density, and road conditions before deciding to pursue. Structuring does not require that a decision maker adhere to a rule. Rather, guidelines can be disregarded provided the actors provide justification for why the guidelines were not followed. Third, decisions can be confined with concrete rules, which cannot be violated by actors even with justification. These "thou shalt nots" make it clear that some behaviors are absolutely inappropriate for criminal justice actors no matter what the justification. Confining discretion has been particularly successful in limiting police use of deadly force (Walker, 1993; White, 2001). Finally, adding discretionary options to a decision maker's repertoire can control discretion (Walker, 1993).

However, these four discretionary controls are only successful in certain circumstances. The following three key factors help explain why some discretionary reforms have been successful, whereas others have failed: visibility of decisions or acts, whether the decisions are reviewed and the actors are held accountable, and putting controls close to those who make decisions. First, highly visible decisions and actions are easier to control because actors are more likely to believe they are being observed (certainty) and actors' superiors are more likely to see and review the decisions (J. Goldstein, 1960). Thus, police shootings of citizens are highly visible and hence more amenable to control by police supervisors, other criminal justice actors (e.g., attorneys), or external, watchdog groups. It is hard to hide dead bodies or bullet holes in suspects (Fyfe, 1995). Actors are less likely to adhere to guidelines or rules during less visible actions, because these actions are less likely to be observed and hence less likely to be reviewed (J. Goldstein, 1960), or when the results of officers' actions can be explained away.[5]

Controls have often relied on review of officers' actions and holding officers accountable. Departments that have implemented a review procedure

for officers who discharge their firearms appear to have been successful at controlling the number of citizens killed by police firearms (Fyfe, 1988; Walker, 1993; White, 2001). Naturally, reviews work best when the behavior is visible. Reviews must also be conducted if they are to work. The presence of review procedures that are never used will not deter inappropriate behaviors (see, in particular, White, 2001). Successfully controlling discretion also relies in part on holding actors accountable for their actions. Again, the efforts to control police shootings appear to work because officers are held accountable for improper firearms discharges. Finally, controls work best when they are enacted close to the actors they seek to control. Walker (1993) suggested that rules created by individual police departments (e.g., deadly force policies) probably control officers better than do rules made by legislators (e.g., mandatory arrest laws for perpetrators of domestic violence).

Rules and Regulations

With these two related streams of thought (discretionary controls and the elements of effective controls) in mind, we suggest that police agencies first create clear policies to ban officer dumping. Administrative rule making has long been suggested as a way to control discretion (Davis, 1969; Walker, 1993). However, effective rules require that controlled behaviors are visible, that violations are reviewed, that officers violating policies are held accountable, and that attractive alternatives to dumping exist for officers.

Increasing Visibility

Second, departments can work to increase the visibility of interactions between police officers and troublesome persons. Increasing visibility will work best to ensure that rules are followed and enforceable. There are two broad ways to do this: via paperwork or by involving other police personnel in police interactions with troublesome persons.

Some departments require that their officers complete a form anytime officers interact with mentally ill persons. Some departments require that dispatchers dispatch a supervisor whenever calls involve mentally ill persons. Both these techniques increase the visibility and facilitate the review of police interactions. Officers can choose to not complete or submit a form, an action that thwarts later attempts to review their actions. As far as we

know, completing paperwork and dispatching supervisors have only been used in departments for dealing with the mentally ill not other troublesome people. Increasing the scope of paperwork to include a form completed for any persons with whom officers interact is one of the methods some departments are using to compile statistics on traffic stops in order to address the possibility of racial profiling. As such, if done properly, it may not be overly burdensome to use a form to record officer interactions with citizens. Of course, this method of increasing visibility will only work if officers comply with it. It is easy for officers to "forget" to complete an interaction form when they dump people. The annals of police research are replete with stories of the creative ways officers thwart the best-laid plans of managers and researchers (Petrocelli & Smith, 2000; Reuss-Ianni, 1983). It is likely that dispatching supervisors to all calls with troublesome persons would prove too burdensome for most departments.

One way to increase the visibility of police interactions with troublesome persons that also thwarts officers's attempts to transport the persons themselves is to require that officers use patrol wagons (and not their cruisers) to transport prisoners. Some police agencies already have such policies in place. If the transport officers in patrol wagons must log all their transports on paper and with a dispatcher, the likelihood of PITT decreases. Officers who are observed with someone in the back of their cruisers would have to explain why they were violating departmental policy. Using patrol wagons does not, however, keep officers from telling troublesome people to go elsewhere or from arranging their transport via another form of transportation.

ALTERNATIVE PLACEMENTS

A third possible way to decrease PITT is to use and increase the attractiveness of social service placements for troublesome persons. For example, detoxification centers, homeless shelters, shelters for prostitutes, psychiatric units at hospitals, and juvenile curfew drop-off centers all provide officers with alternatives to PITT. However, officers will only use such alternatives if they find them attractive. Unfortunately, some shelters will not take homeless people who are also drunk. Some psychiatric units will not accept people who are mentally disturbed and acting violent. Sometimes, the closest shelter is many miles away. In such circumstances, it is little wonder that officers resort to PITT. It is important then that options to PITT are available and that these options are attractive to officers.

Related to the use of social service placements is the use of social service crisis response teams. Generally, such social service crisis response teams have been created to assist the police in their interactions with the mentally ill. Among the most notable of these crisis response teams has been one created in Memphis to deal with the mentally ill (Vickers, 2000). It is possible to create other response teams to deal specifically with certain categories of troublesome people. Officers could call for such response teams, or these teams could work independently on removing troublesome persons (such as curfew violators). It seems likely that in some circumstances in which officer did not wish to arrest, the response teams not only would increase the visibility of the interaction but also could transport the persons to suitable placements. In this manner, the burden of dealing with troublesome persons is removed from officers.

DISCUSSION

PITT has eluded systematic study by police researchers who heretofore have been interested in studying more visible police behaviors (such as arrest and use of force). Although overlooked, it is a serious, extralegal police action that has resulted in lawsuits and the death of dumpees. Recent trends toward COP and aggressive order maintenance make it likely that PITT will become more prevalent. Ironically, this increase in PITT will occur at the same time that police scholars have begun to advocate "policing for people" (that is, policing that focuses on being responsive to citizens and treating them fairly) (Mastrofski, 1999). Public knowledge of PITT undermines public confidence in the legitimacy of the police. In sum, although dumping is a serious problem, it is almost invisible to observers of the police, and thus we know remarkably little about it.

For these reasons, PITT is worthy of study in its own right. Unfortunately, PITT is also a low-visibility behavior that is easily altered when officers think they might be observed. It also produces little or no "trail" of permanent social artifacts (i.e., paper work or dispatch records) with which to study it. These attributes make it a particularly difficult social event to study (Reiss, 1992). Studying PITT, however, will allow us to estimate the incidence of PITT in various locales and explore its causes (and possible solutions). There are four research strategies that could be employed to study this problem: interviews, participant observations, systematic social observations, and vignettes.

First, high-risk populations (such as prostitutes, the homeless, juveniles, and the mentally ill) and their guardians (i.e., shelter directors and workers and mental health workers) could be interviewed. Interviews may reveal overall trends in dumping, including preferred dumping areas and the modes of transportation used. Likewise, officers could be interviewed or surveyed about their experiences with PITT (either firsthand or vicariously). We have found officers to be mixed in their responses to questions about dumping. Some officers have been forthcoming in talking about PITT, whereas others have not. Both methods of probing PITT are imperfect (i.e., fraught with telescoping, fabrication, and embellishment by interviewees). The absence of research on this topic, however, means that interviews will yield useful information.

Second, because officers are recalcitrant discussing PITT with outsiders, it would probably be fruitful to enlist the help of officers. Hundreds of police officers are currently pursuing master's degrees in criminal justice and related disciplines. It is probable that officers could explore the extent of PITT in their agencies, the reasons provided for dumping, and what changes might decrease its incidence (such as streamlining admissions to homeless shelters).

The experiences of these officers represent an imperfect receptacle of memories of PITT, and these experiences should be tapped. Furthermore, using officers to collect these observations potentially solves the problems of respondent reactivity to talking about PITT with outsiders.

Third, systematic social observation has become a popular albeit expensive way of observing what police officers do (Parks et al. 1999; Reiss, 1971). In the past, observers have been trained to record officer response to mentally ill individuals (Teplin, 1984). It would be easy to train observers to also record incidents of PITT while they gather other relevant data. Finally, vignettes have been used to study the ways in which officers exercise their discretion (Mastrofski, Ritti, & Hoffmaster, 1987). Vignettes would allow us to explore the organizational and environmental determinants of officers' propensities to engage in dumping as opposed to other solutions to troublesome persons.

NOTES

1. Cases of dumping have also appeared in the legal literature. One case involved PITT to another state (*Ketchum v. City of West Memphis, Arkansas*, 1992), and one case involved a "deportation" from Hemet, California (*Klock v. Cain*, 1993).

2. A unique perspective is offered by noted criminologist Hans Mattick. Professor Mattick reported being dumped repeatedly by the New Orleans police during the late 1930s. See John Laub's (1983) interview with Professor Mattick.

3. An exception is Teplin's (1984) research, which is reviewed later in the article.

4. A noted police scholar recounted (to one of the authors) that while assigned as a military police officer at his base's front gate, he encountered a mentally ill veteran who wished to enter the base. The military police's commanding officer summoned the local sheriff and instructed the sheriff's deputy to take the veteran to the county limits and release him.

5. Fyfe (1995) noted that although bullet holes in suspects are hard to explain, officers can explain bruised and bloodied suspects by saying they fell down.

REFERENCES

Aaronson, D. E., Dienes, C. T., & Musheno, M. C. (1984). *Public policy and police discretion*. New York: Clark Boardman.

Barry, D. (2001, August 17). A force in trouble: Inquiry exposes police misdeeds. *The New York Times*, p. B1.

Bittner, E. (1967). Police discretion in emergency apprehension of mentally ill persons. *Social Problems*, *14*, 278-292.

Black, D., & Reiss, A. (1970). Police control of juveniles. *American Sociological Review*, *35*, 63-77.

Brass, M. (2001). *Starlight tours*. Retrieved December 8, 2001, from http://www.cbc.ca/news/national/magazine/starlight/index.html.

Byrd, L. (1989, July 27). Prostitutes trail of tears: VA. Not amused by forced march from D.C. *Washington Post News Service*. Available from http://www.lexis-nexis.com/universe

Caldwell, E. (1978). Patrol observation: The patrol encounter, patrol narrative, and general shift information forms (Police Services Study Methods Report, MR-02). Bloomington, IN: Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis.

Corsa, L. (2001, May 17). Finally a solution to the homeless problem: Just put them in your patrol car and take them to Miami. *The New Miami Times*. Available from http://www.miaminewtimes.com

Crank, J. (1998). *Understanding police culture*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Davis, K. C. (1969). *Discretionary justice: A preliminary inquiry*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Eck, J. E., & Maguire, E. R. (2000). Have changes in policing reduced violent crime? An assessment of the evidence. In A. Blumstein & J. Wallman (Eds.), *The crime drop in America* (pp. 207-265). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engel, R. S., & Silver, E. (2001). Policing mentally disordered suspects: A reexamination of the criminalization hypothesis. *Criminology*, *39*, 225-252.

Engel, R. S., Sobol, J. J., & Worden, R. E. (2000). Further exploration of the demeanor hypothesis: The interaction effects of suspects' characteristics and demeanor on police behavior. *Justice Quarterly*, *17*, 235-258.

Foss, K. (2001, September 24). Natives struggle with fallout from trial. *Globe and Mail*, p. A16.

Fyfe, J. (1988). Police use of deadly force: Research and reform. *Justice Quarterly*, *5*, 165-205.

Fyfe, J. (1995, March 11). *Training to reduce police violence*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Boston.

Goldberg, J., & Dedman, B. (1989, July 27). Prostitutes trail of tears: VA. Not amused by forced march from D.C. *Washington Post News Service*. Available from http://www.lexis-nexis.com/universe

Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-oriented policing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goldstein, J. (1960). Police discretion not to invoke the criminal process: Low visiblity decisions in the administration of justice. *Yale Law Journal*, *69*, 543-594.

Gottfredson, M. R., & Gottfredson, D. M. (1988). *Decision making in criminal justice: Toward the rational exercise of discretion*. New York: Plenum.

Grant, A. (1997, February 19). Cleveland settles with homeless; Suit accused police of "dumping" people. *The Plain Dealer*, p. 1B.

Kappeler, V. E. (1997). *Critical issues in police civil liability.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Kappeler, V. E., Sluder, R. D., & Alpert, G. P.(1994). *Forces of deviance: Understanding the dark side of policing*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Kelling, G., & Coles, C. (1996). *Fixing broken windows*. New York: Free Press.

Ketchum v. City of West Memphis, Arkansas, 974 F. 2d 81 (8th Circuit 1992).

Klinger, D. (1994). Demeanor or crime? Why "hostile" citizens are more likely to be arrested. *Criminology*, *32*, 475-493.

Klinger, D. (1996). More on demeanor and arrest in Dade County. *Criminology*, *34*, 61-82.

Klock v. Cain, 813 F.Supp. 1430 (Central District of California, 1993).

Laub, J. (1983). *Criminology in the making: An oral history.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Mastrofski, S. D. (1999). *Policing for people. Ideas in American Policing*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Mastrofski, S. D., Ritti, R. R., & Hoffmaster, D. (1987). Organizational determinants of police discretion: The case of drinking-driving. *The Journal of Criminal Justice*, *15*, 387-402.

Mastrofski, S. D., Worden, R. E., & Snipes, J. B. (1995). Law enforcement in a time of community policing. *Criminology*, *33*, 539-563.

Muir, W. K. Jr. (1977). *Police: Streetcorner politicians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Paoline, E. A., III. (2001). *Rethinking police culture: Officers' occupational attitudes*. New York: LFB.

Parks, R. B., Mastrofski, S. D., DeJong, C., & Gray, M. K. (1999). How officers spend their time with the community. *Justice Quarterly*, *16*, 483-518.

Petrocelli, M., & Smith, M. R. (2000). The implementation of a use of force study: Lessons learned for practitioners and researchers. *Police Forum*, *10*, 1-3.

Reiss, A. J. (1971). *The police and the public*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Reiss, A. J. (1973). How much "police brutality" is there? In S. M. David & P. E. Peterson (Eds.), *Urban politics and public policy: The city in crisis* (pp. 269-286). New York: Praeger.

Reiss, A. J. (1992). Trained incapacities of sociologists. In T. C. Halliday & M. Janowitz (Eds.), *Sociology and its publics: The forms and fates of disciplinary organization* (pp. 297-315). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reuss-Ianni, E. (1983). *Two cultures of policing: Street cops and management Cops*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishing.

Riksheim, E. C., & Chermak, S. M. (1993). Causes of police behavior revisited. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *21*, 353-382.

Roberts, D. (2000, April 12). Officers charged in alleged abandonment. *The Globe and Mail*, p. A8.

Rubenstein, J. (1973). *City police*. New York: Ballintine.

Sherman, L. W. (1980). Causes of police behavior: The current state of quantitative research. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *19*, 69-100.

Smith, D. A., & Visher, C. A. (1981). Street-level justice: Situational determinants of police arrest decisions. *Social Problems*, *29*, 167-177.

Teplin, L. (1984). Criminalizing mental disorder: The comparative arrest rates of the mentally ill. *American Psychologist*, *39*, 794-803.

Trojanowicz, R., & Bucqueroux, B. (1990). *Community policing: A contemporary perspective*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Vickers, B. (2000). *Memphis, Tennessee, police department's crisis intervention team*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Administration, Office of Justice Programs.

Walker, S. (1993). *Taming the system: The control of discretion in criminal justice, 1950-1990*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Walker, S. (1998). *Popular justice: A history of American criminal justice* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

White, M. (2001). Controlling police decisions to use deadly force: Reexamining the importance of administrative policy. *Crime & Delinquency*, *47*, 131-151.

Wilson, J. Q. (1968). *Varieties of police behavior: The management of law and order in eight communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. (1982). Broken windows: Police and neighborhood safety. *Atlantic Monthly*, *249*, 29-38.

William R. King received his Ph.D. in 1998 from the University of Cincinnati, Division of Criminal Justice, and is an assistant professor of criminal justice at Bowling Green State University in Ohio. His research focuses on applying organizational theories (particularly life course theory) to the study of police organizations and understanding discretionary decision making by criminal justice actors.

Thomas M. Dunn received his Ph.D. in clinical psychology from the University of Cincinnati in 1999. He is an assistant professor of psychology at the University of Northern Colorado in Greeley. His current research includes emergency management of the mentally ill, neuropsychological malingering, and issues of psychological assessment.