International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 308-314, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

From Classroom to Cuffs: Evaluating the Fieldwork Readiness and Performance of Junior Officers

Junessa A. Cosicol[1], John Ian O. Baluca[2], Marvin A. Baluran[3], Juniel A. Subrio[4]
Christine Joy Boniao[5], Desire S. Daño[6], Jemalyn P. Cuysona[7], Charlene Jane Mara[8]
John Richmond D. Bilagantol[9], Sheena S. Boncales[10], Euve Jane L. Flores[11]

Author Information:
[1-11]*Trinidad Municipal College, Poblacion, Trinidad, Bohol, Philippines*

Correspondence:
cosicoljunessa@gmail.com

Article History:

Date Received: October 3, 2026
Date Revised: October 26, 2026
Date Accepted: October 30, 2026
Date Published: November 10, 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0538

Document ID: *2026IJROMS0538*

Recommended Citation:
Cosicol, J. A., Baluca, J. I. O., Baluran, M. A., Subrio, J. A., Boniao, C. J., Daño, D. S., Cuysona, J. P., Mara, C. J., Bilagantol, J. R. D., Boncales, S. S. & Flores, E. J. L. (2026). From Classroom to Cuffs: Evaluating the Fieldwork Readiness and Performance of Junior Officers. International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies, 1(10), 308-314. https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0538

Abstract. This quantitative descriptive-correlational study examined fieldwork readiness and fieldwork performance ratings concerning junior officers in selected Philippine National Police (PNP) stations in Talibon, Dagohoy, San Miguel, Trinidad, and Bien Unido, Second District of Bohol. Ninety-seven PNP personnel—61 Police Commissioned Officers and 36 Police Non-Commissioned Officers—completed a structured questionnaire. The study assessed readiness in knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes; and performance in task performance, decision-making ability, and professional conduct. The reported overall means were 4.37 for readiness and 4.45 for performance, and the reported correlation between the two rating composites was $r = .678$, $p < .001$. These are respondent ratings, not independent tests of operational competence. The available manuscript and thesis contain unresolved discrepancies in the group-comparison statistics and in readiness means by educational attainment. Accordingly, inferential comparisons are treated as provisional and should not be interpreted until the original SPSS output and data are rechecked. The study identifies local evidence needs in the Second District of Bohol and suggests priorities for procedural, investigative, situational-judgment, and mentoring activities. The findings are limited by the use of a single questionnaire source and by unavailable information on officer-to-rater mapping, data-collection dates, station-level clustering, and formal ethics review.

Keywords: Fieldwork Readiness; Fieldwork Performance; Police Field Training; Supervisory Ratings; Philippine National Police

Introduction

The transition from classroom preparation to operational fieldwork requires police personnel to apply legal knowledge, practical skills, decision-making, and professional values under changing conditions. Readiness describes perceived preparedness for these demands; performance concerns perceived execution of assigned duties. These constructs are related but not interchangeable: a readiness rating does not itself demonstrate effective behavior in actual incidents, and a general performance rating may not capture rare but consequential decisions.

Police training research increasingly emphasizes the transfer of learning from instruction to operational practice. Jonathan-Zamir, Litmanovitz, and Haviv (2023) proposed an evidence-informed ecological model of police training and examined a procedural-justice training module, illustrating the importance of linking training design with defined outcomes. Research on police recruit assessment also cautions that ratings from different sources may not agree. In a study of 679 recruit–field-training-officer dyads, multisource scales showed comparable factor structures but limited agreement between recruits' self-ratings and field-training-officer ratings, supporting the need to identify who is rating whom and to avoid treating one source as definitive (multisource evaluation study, 2021).

Empirical work also suggests that training outcomes depend on the kind of outcome measured. A randomized trial of social-interaction training found improved officer attitudes toward procedurally fair communication but no detectable change in official use-of-force reports, demonstrating that positive survey responses do not automatically establish behavioral change (McLean et al., 2020). In the Philippine context, Dubla (2021) assessed operational-procedure competence among non-commissioned junior officers and reported differences between junior officers' and more senior evaluators' assessments. A Philippine study of field training among PNP recruits likewise noted limitations related to sample size and questionnaire

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 308-314, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

validation (Octavo et al., 2019). These findings make rater identity, instrument quality, and the distinction between perceived competence and independently observed performance especially important.

The local evidence gap is specific: the available sources do not establish a station-level, survey-based account of how supervisory or other experienced PNP personnel in Talibon, Dagohoy, San Miguel, Trinidad, and Bien Unido rate junior officers across knowledge, skills, professional attitudes, task performance, decision-making, and professional conduct. Nor do the available records provide linked officer-level ratings or objective operational outcomes that could validate those perceptions. This study therefore contributes a localized description of ratings, not a causal estimate of training effectiveness or an independently verified measure of individual officers' competence.

The study examined the levels of readiness and performance ratings, the association between the two rating composites, and differences in ratings according to the raters' position, length of service, and educational attainment. Because all ratings were gathered by questionnaire, conclusions are framed as perceptions reported by respondents.

Research Questions

This study aims to determine the level of fieldwork readiness and performance of junior officers in selected Philippine National Police (PNP) stations in the Second District of Bohol, as assessed by Police Commissioned Officers and Police Non-Commissioned Officers. Specifically, it seeks to assess junior officers' knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes, alongside their task performance, decision-making ability, and professional conduct, as a basis for developing an appropriate training and fieldwork enhancement program.

Specifically, the study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of position/designation, length of service, and educational attainment?
2. What are the reported levels of junior officers' fieldwork readiness in knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes?
3. What are the reported levels of junior officers' fieldwork performance in task performance, decision-making ability, and professional conduct?
4. What is the association between the respondents' readiness and performance rating composites?
5. Do readiness ratings differ by the respondents' position/designation, length of service, and educational attainment?
6. Do performance ratings differ by the respondents' position/designation, length of service, and educational attainment?
7. What training and fieldwork enhancement activities are indicated by the descriptive findings?
8. Based on the findings of the study, what training and fieldwork enhancement program may be proposed to improve junior officers' readiness and performance?

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The study covered respondents assigned to selected PNP stations in Talibon, Dagohoy, San Miguel, Trinidad, and Bien Unido in the Second District of Bohol. The final profile table reports 97 raters from a stated population of 128 PNP personnel. The study did not report the number of distinct junior officers assessed, a one-to-one or many-to-one rater–officer linkage, or station-specific respondent counts. Consequently, the unit analyzed in the reported summaries is the individual respondent's questionnaire rating/composite, not a verified individual junior officer record. Junior officers. For this manuscript, the term follows the thesis's stated operational definition: newly deployed PNP personnel within their first 12 months of active field service. The authors must confirm that this exact eligibility criterion was applied during recruitment and that the officers rated met it. The source documents do not provide the number, ranks, or service months of the officers actually rated. Raters/respondents. The 97 respondents were PNP personnel described in the source as Police Commissioned Officers (n = 61) and Police Non-Commissioned Officers (n = 36), selected because they were considered able to supervise or observe junior officers. The study compares these raters' characteristics, not the demographic characteristics of the junior officers being rated. Rating unit. The questionnaire asked respondents to assess junior officers they supervised or observed. The available documentation does not establish whether each respondent rated one named officer, several officers, or a general impression of officers in the station. The final paper must state the actual instruction and linkage procedure from the questionnaire and field records; until then, findings should be described as respondent-level assessments. Fieldwork readiness. Operationally, this is the respondent's rating of junior officers' knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes on the study's five-point questionnaire. Fieldwork performance. Operationally, this is the respondent's rating of task performance, decision-making ability, and professional conduct on the study's five-point questionnaire.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 308-314, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Literature Review

Field Training and Transfer of Learning

Police field training is intended to bridge formal instruction and operational practice, but the existence of a training program is not itself evidence that learning transfers to field behavior. Jonathan-Zamir et al. (2023) argue for an evidence-informed approach that considers the training context, delivery, learners, and outcome measures. McLean et al. (2020) demonstrate why outcome definition matters: a training intervention can improve attitudes while showing no detectable effect on a behavioral administrative outcome. These studies support measuring multiple domains and avoiding causal claims from a cross-sectional survey.

Rater Identity and Evaluation Validity

Performance ratings are judgments made by people in particular roles and contexts. The multisource evaluation study of police recruits (2021) found that recruit self-assessments and field-training-officer ratings were not interchangeable, even when the instruments showed analogous factor structures. This is relevant to the present study because the respondents are supervisors or other personnel rating junior officers. A high internal-consistency coefficient indicates that items co-vary; it does not, by itself, establish criterion validity, agreement among raters, or accuracy against independently observed performance.

Philippine Evidence and Local Gap

Philippine studies provide context for assessing practical police competence. Dubla (2021) examined operational-procedure competence among non-commissioned junior police officers and reported differences across respondent groups, reinforcing the importance of whose assessment is being reported. Octavo et al. (2019) assessed PNP recruit field training in patrol, investigation, and traffic and identified questionnaire validation and sample size as limitations. Ledesma and Tinagan (2020) examined training quality and satisfaction in PNP Regional Training Center 6; such perceptions are useful for program review but should not be equated with direct operational outcomes. Together, these studies support more explicit operational definitions, clear rater–officer mapping, and independent or multi-source outcome measures.

The contribution of the present study is its localized description of readiness and performance ratings across five municipalities in the Second District of Bohol. Its evidence gap is not that no Philippine police training research exists; rather, the available literature and study records do not establish whether these particular ratings correspond to individually identified junior officers' observed performance or how ratings vary by station. The study should therefore be interpreted as an initial local assessment that can inform, but cannot alone validate, a training intervention.

Methodology

Research Design

A quantitative descriptive-correlational design was used. The descriptive component summarized respondent profiles and ratings; Pearson correlation assessed the association between readiness and performance composites. Group-comparison analyses were reported for ratings across respondent profile categories. No training or field assignment was manipulated.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in selected PNP stations in Talibon, Dagohoy, San Miguel, Trinidad, and Bien Unido, Second District of Bohol. Exact station-level sample counts are not available in the manuscript and should be added from the recruitment log because ratings from respondents in the same station may be correlated.

Research Participants

The source reports a population of 128 personnel, comprising 80 Police Commissioned Officers and 48 Police Non-Commissioned Officers, and a sample of 97, comprising 61 and 36 respectively. The detailed methodology describes proportional allocation followed by simple random selection within the two strata; another section of the thesis refers to purposive sampling. This revision provisionally follows the more detailed proportional-stratified-random description, but the authors must verify it against the actual sampling frame and selection records before submission. If respondents were selected based on supervisory availability or judgment rather than random selection, the method and limitations must instead be corrected to purposive sampling. The reported sample size is consistent with the table of respondent counts, but the manuscript does not provide actual data-collection dates or station-by-station recruitment numbers. Eligibility for raters should

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 308-314, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

be stated from the protocol, including whether respondents had direct supervisory or observational contact with the officers rated and the minimum duration/frequency of that contact, if any. Junior-officer eligibility should be confirmed as newly deployed PNP personnel within their first 12 months of active field service, if this was the actual criterion. The source reports that all 97 distributed questionnaires were retrieved. If 97 eligible questionnaires were returned from 97 invited respondents, the response rate was 100%; this figure should be reported only after confirming the numbers invited, returned, excluded, and analyzed in the field log. Current evidence does not document those denominators separately.

Research Instrument

The structured questionnaire had three parts: (1) respondent profile—position/designation, length of service, and educational attainment; (2) fieldwork readiness—knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes; and (3) fieldwork performance—task performance, decision-making ability, and professional conduct. The thesis indicates 10 indicators per domain in the results, for 30 readiness and 30 performance indicators. Authors should verify the exact item count against the administered version and append or archive the final questionnaire. Items were rated on a five-point scale. Readiness interpretation was 1.00–1.80, Not Ready; 1.81–2.60, Slightly Ready; 2.61–3.40, Moderately Ready; 3.41–4.20, Highly Ready; and 4.21–5.00, Very Highly Ready. Performance used the same numerical intervals, interpreted as Poor, Fair, Good/Satisfactory, Very Good, and Excellent Performance. The thesis reports expert review for content and clarity and pilot testing among PNP personnel outside the study district. Reported Cronbach's alpha was .929 for readiness and .870 for performance. The names/number of validators, validation criteria or content-validity indices, pilot sample size, and item-level reliability results were not available in the article. These should be supplied if documented; alpha alone does not establish validity. The current questionnaire appears to ask raters to assess readiness and performance in the same instrument. This creates potential common-method bias, halo effects, and social-desirability effects. The analysis should acknowledge these risks and avoid interpreting the correlation as an independent validation of readiness as a predictor of performance.

Data Gathering Procedure

The source states that the researcher obtained permission through a letter from the Dean's Office, noted by the Satellite College Director and addressed to the Provincial Director, and personally administered and retrieved the questionnaires. This permission is an administrative authorization to access the field site; it is not evidence of research ethics committee approval or exemption. Before submission, complete this ethics statement using verifiable records: [AUTHOR TO INSERT the name of the research ethics committee/institution, approval or exemption/waiver reference number, and date; OR, if no committee reviewed the study, accurately state the institutional determination and applicable process]. Do not claim approval or waiver unless documentary evidence exists. The final statement should also confirm whether written informed consent was obtained, that participation was voluntary, that respondents could decline or withdraw without penalty, and that no names or directly identifying information were included in the analytic file. Because respondents were recruited within a police command structure, safeguards against perceived coercion should be described. The manuscript should state whether invitations and completed questionnaires were handled without the direct commander knowing who participated, whether commanders were absent during completion, whether supervisors could not access individual responses, and how data were stored and de-identified. Include only safeguards that were actually implemented. The study is survey-only according to the described method; references to interviews, transcripts, and interview notes have therefore been removed.

Results and Discussions

Research Question 1: What is the profile of the respondents in terms of position/designation, length of service, and educational attainment?

Table 1. Respondent Profile

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percent
1. Position	Commissioned officer	61	62.9
2. Position	Non-commissioned officer	36	37.1
3. Service	Less than 5 years	6	6.2
4. Service	5–10 years	14	14.4
5. Service	11–15 years	36	37.1
6. Service	16 years and above	41	42.3
7. Education	Bachelor's degree	90	92.8
8. Education	Master's units	4	4.1
9. Education	Master's degree	3	3.1

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 308-314, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Of the 97 respondents, 62.9% were Police Commissioned Officers and 37.1% were Police Non-Commissioned Officers. Most reported 11 or more years of service (79.4%), and 92.8% held a bachelor's degree. These characteristics describe the raters, not the junior officers being assessed. The very small postgraduate groups (n = 4 and n = 3) make comparisons by education especially uncertain.

Research Question 2: What are the reported levels of junior officers' fieldwork readiness in knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes?

Table 2. Fieldwork Readiness

Dimension	Mean	Interpretation
1. Knowledge	4.30	Very Highly Ready
2. Skills	4.40	Very Highly Ready
3. Professional attitudes	4.40	Very Highly Ready
Overall	**4.37**	**Very Highly Ready**

The reported overall readiness mean was 4.37. Skills and professional attitudes each had a mean of 4.40, while knowledge had a mean of 4.30. The lowest knowledge indicator was knowledge of proper arrest, search, and seizure procedures (M = 4.18); the lowest skills indicator was applying investigative techniques (M = 4.24); and the lowest professional-attitude indicator was maintaining composure during difficult encounters (M = 4.30). These results indicate favorable respondent perceptions and identify possible training priorities; they do not independently demonstrate operational competence.

Research Question 3: What are the reported levels of junior officers' fieldwork performance in task performance, decision-making ability, and professional conduct?

Table 3. Fieldwork Performance

Dimension	Mean	Interpretation
1. Task performance	4.47	Excellent Performance
2. Decision-making ability	4.40	Excellent Performance
3. Professional conduct	4.47	Excellent Performance
Overall	**4.45**	**Excellent Performance**

The reported overall performance mean was 4.45. Task performance and professional conduct each averaged 4.47, while decision-making ability averaged 4.40. At item level, efficient and accurate task completion was reported at 4.59, and compliance with operational procedures at 4.39. Accurate situational assessment (M = 4.28) and composure during critical incidents (M = 4.29) were comparatively lower decision-making indicators. These ratings suggest areas for continued practice, but the questionnaire does not substitute for direct observation or official performance records.

Research Question 4: What is the association between the respondents' readiness and performance rating composites?

Table 4. Correlation Between Fieldwork Readiness and Performance

Variables	Pearson r	p value	Decision at .05
1. Readiness and performance	.678	< .001	Reject the null hypothesis

The reported Pearson correlation was r = .678, p < .001, indicating a positive association between the two rating composites. This means respondents who assigned higher readiness ratings also tended to assign higher performance ratings. It does not show that readiness caused performance, nor does it establish agreement with independent observations. Because the same respondents completed the same questionnaire for both constructs, common-method variance, halo effects, and overlapping item content may inflate the association. The final manuscript should add a 95% confidence interval for r calculated from the original data.

Research Question 5: Do readiness ratings differ by the respondents' position/designation, length of service, and educational attainment?

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 308-314, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Table 5. Reported Differences in Readiness Assessments

Grouping variable	Reported F or t	p value	Result
1. Position or designation	1.665	.099	Not significant
2. Length of service	2.851	.042	Significant
3. Educational attainment	5.579	.005	Significant

The reported results show no significant difference by respondent position and significant differences by respondent length of service and educational attainment. Subject to verification of the statistical output, the null hypothesis was not rejected for position and was rejected for the other two variables. Without post hoc comparisons, the findings do not identify which specific pairs of service or educational groups differ.

These comparisons concern how different respondents rated junior officers. They do not demonstrate that junior officers with longer service or particular qualifications were more prepared. The educational group means reported in the source are inconsistent with the overall readiness mean, so the educational comparison requires verification before a final statistical conclusion is adopted.

Research Question 6: Do performance ratings differ by the respondents' position/designation, length of service, and educational attainment?

Table 6. Reported Differences in Performance Assessments

Grouping variable	Reported F or t	p value	Result
1. Position or designation	.367	.907	Not significant
2. Length of service	1.664	.180	Not significant
3. Educational attainment	2.594	.080	Not significant

The source reports no significant performance differences across the three respondent profile variables at .05. Accordingly, these reported tests did not reject their null hypotheses. A non-significant result does not prove equivalence between groups or establish that standardized training caused similar ratings. The position comparison and the group means require checking against the original statistical output.

Research Question 7: What training and fieldwork enhancement activities are indicated by the descriptive findings?

The proposed program addresses comparatively lower-rated indicators while sustaining the favorable overall assessments. It focuses on procedural knowledge, investigative practice, situational assessment, composure, mentoring, and ethical conduct. These activities are proposed interventions, and the study did not evaluate their effectiveness.

Research Question 8: Based on the findings of the study, what training and fieldwork enhancement program may be proposed to improve junior officers' readiness and performance?

Table 7. Proposed Program Activities

Priority	Activity	Proposed schedule
1. Legal procedures	Seminars and supervised mock exercises on arrest, search, and seizure	Quarterly
2. Investigative practice	Evidence handling and case documentation workshops	Quarterly
3. Decision-making	Scenario exercises and structured debriefing	Monthly or quarterly
4. Emotional control	Stress management and emotional intelligence sessions	Semiannual
5. Procedural consistency	Drills, supervision, and performance feedback	Monthly
6. Mentoring	Pairing with experienced officers and monitored field learning	Continuous
7. Professional ethics	Values seminars and ethical decision scenarios	Quarterly
8. Monitoring	Review participation, skills assessments, and performance evidence	Semiannual

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN: 3116-4137 | Print ISSN: 3116-4145
Volume 1, Issue 10, pp. 308-314, November 2026
https://ijroms.com
Original Article

Police leadership, training personnel, legal officers, investigators, qualified psychological support providers, and partner institutions may coordinate implementation. Evaluation should combine baseline and follow-up competency assessments, observations of scenario performance, and review of relevant field records. Attendance and satisfaction alone would not establish operational improvement. The proposed schedules remain subject to resources and approval by the participating institutions.

Ethical Considerations

The respondents were informed of the study, participation was voluntary, and consent and confidentiality were addressed. Confirm the actual procedures and state how command-related coercion was minimized—for example, who distributed and collected questionnaires, whether participation status was withheld from commanders, whether supervisors could access individual responses, and how completed forms and electronic data were secured. Include only safeguards that were actually implemented. As the design described here is survey-only, no interviews, transcripts, or interview notes are claimed.

Conclusion

Respondents rated junior officers' fieldwork readiness highly (M = 4.37) and fieldwork performance excellently (M = 4.45). The readiness and performance rating composites were positively associated in the reported analysis ($r = .678$, $p < .001$). The lowest-rated indicators point to potential priorities in arrest/search/seizure procedures, investigative techniques, situational assessment, and composure during difficult incidents. These findings describe the perceptions of 97 PNP raters in five municipalities and do not independently establish individual officer competence or causal effects of training.

Recommendations

Philippine National Police PNP training units and station supervisors may prioritize practical, scenario-based refresher training in legal procedures, investigation, situational judgment, and composure under pressure. Supervisors may use structured, behaviorally anchored evaluation forms and provide specific feedback rather than relying only on global impressions. Future evaluations should link each rating to a clearly defined officer and evaluation period, use multiple raters or independent observers where feasible, and document station-level sampling. Researchers should report full statistical output, including test names, degrees of freedom, standard deviations, confidence intervals, effect sizes, assumption checks, and appropriate post hoc tests. Future studies should consider prospective or pre/post designs and objective or administrative outcomes before making claims about training effectiveness.

References

Dubla, M. J. (2021). Philippine National Police operational procedures' competence of non-commissioned junior police officers in the National Capital Region: Inputs to training program enrichment. International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 10(10), 23–46. https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2021.688

Jonathan-Zamir, T., Litmanovitz, Y., & Haviv, N. (2023). What works in police training? Applying an evidence-informed, general, ecological model of police training. Police Quarterly, 26(3), 279–306. https://doi.org/10.1177/10986111221113975

Ledesma, J. A. A., & Tinagan, R. R. (2020). The quality and satisfaction of police training in Philippine National Police Regional Training Center 6. Philippine Social Science Journal, 3(2), 163–164. https://doi.org/10.52006/main.v3i2.215

McLean, K., Wolfe, S. E., Rojek, J., Alpert, G. P., & Smith, M. R. (2020). Randomized controlled trial of social interaction police training. Criminology & Public Policy, 19(3), 805–832. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12506

Octavo, G. C., Angihan, J., & Rirao, N. A. (2019). The conduct of field training among Philippine National Police recruits: An assessment. University of La Salette Research Abstracts. https://research.uls.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Research-Abstacts-2019.pdf

Rydberg, J., & Terrill, W. (2010). The effect of higher education on police behavior. Police Quarterly, 13(1), 92–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611109357325

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.